2003

Presidential image of George W. Bush as depicted by the New York times

Won Tai Seol
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

---

Recommended Citation

Seol, Won Tai, "Presidential image of George W. Bush as depicted by the New York times" (2003). *Master's Theses*. 2507.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.764w-t9ku>

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2507

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

PRESIDENTIAL IMAGE OF GEORGE W. BUSH
AS DEPICTED BY THE NEW YORK TIMES

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the School of Journalism
and Mass Communications

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

By
Won Tai Seol
December 2003

UMI Number: 1418736

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI Microform 1418736

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2003

Won Tai Seol

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM
AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "William Tillinghast", written over a horizontal line.

Dr. William Tillinghast

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "W. G. Briggs", written over a horizontal line.

Dr. William G. Briggs

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kathleen Martinelli", written over a horizontal line.

Dr. Kathleen Martinelli

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Paul C. Stahl", written over a horizontal line.

ABSTRACT

PRESIDENTIAL IMAGE OF GEORGE W. BUSH AS DEPICTED BY THE NEW YORK TIMES

by Won Tai Seol

This thesis examined how the *New York Times* depicted President George W. Bush during four critical time periods: his inauguration (Phase I), September 11th attacks (Phase II), Afghan War (Phase III), and the Second Gulf War (Phase IV). Content analysis of the 575 *New York Times* stories and photos showed that positive stories reached 359 (62.4%), negative stories 136 (23.7%), and neutral stories 80 (13.9%). In Phase I, the ratio of positive coverage was 62.50% and that of negative 20.22%; Mr. Bush enjoyed a "honeymoon." In Phase II, the ratio of positive soared to 70.96% and that of negative remained 20.16%; Bush was described as a crisis leader. In Phase III, the ratio of positive was 62.31%, and that of negative increased to 23.91%. In Phase IV, the ratio of positive coverage sank to 55.55%, and that of negative rose to 30.06%; Bush was depicted as a wartime leader but met with strong opposition. During Phase II, III, and IV, Mr. Bush "defined the situations" and this newspaper followed his lead.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My special gratitude goes to the Korea Press Foundation, which enabled me to start my master's courses by providing a scholarship for one year. I extend my thanks to my newspaper, the Kyunghyang Daily News, which granted me a one-and-a-half-year leave of absence.

I am deeply indebted to Professor William Tillinghast, my primary adviser, who gave me ample advice on this thesis. I am indebted to two other advisers, Professor William G. Briggs and Professor Kathleen Martinelli, who gave useful comments. I offer my special thanks to Professor Diana Stover, who taught me two courses.

I feel deeply grateful to Professor Martha Joynt Kumar at Towson University, Towson, Maryland, who sent me by email her paper titled "Communications Operations in the White House of President George W. Bush: Making News on His Terms." And my thanks to Sandeep Biswas, my friend from India, who retrieved her article with his computer and sent it back to me. I thank Ms. Kathy Munson at the A. Robert DeHart Learning Center, De Anza College, who lent me a book and helped me use the microfilm.

My most profound thanks go to my lifelong companion, Jung Hwa Koo, who has endured the hard life of being a student's wife. And thanks to my son, Jung Hoon Seol, and my daughter, Jee Eun Seol, for understanding their student-father.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Significance of the Research.....	2
Increasing Importance of the Presidential News.....	5
Why Does Presidential Image Matter?.....	8
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
Presidents' Discontent With Their Media Images.....	12
Grossman and Kumar's Study: "Presidential Stories and Photos Were Mostly Positive!".....	14
Story Types and Temporal Patterns of Presidential News.....	18
Presidents' Tactics: Control and Manipulation to Get Positive Images.....	23
Negotiation and Cooperation in Presidential Image Making.....	28
"Bubble Machine" of President George W. Bush.....	31
White House Strategies for Projecting Presidential Images: "Squeezing More Juice out of the Orange".....	41
Media's Framing of Presidential Images.....	53
Implications of the Presidential Images.....	64
Summary of Literature Review and Research Questions.....	70
III. RESEARCH METHODS.....	73

Time Periods for the Research.....	73
The Scope of Bush Stories and Bush Photos.....	74
Definition of Bush Stories and Bush Photos.....	75
Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis of Bush Stories and Photos.....	79
Operational Definition of Positive-Negative Scale.....	81
Five-Step Evaluation Scale.....	82
Babbie's Advice Applied to Analysis of Presidential Image.....	86
Triangulation of Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis.....	87
 IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	 88
 Qualitative Analysis.....	 88
Phase I. Bush's Inauguration and One Month in Office: "Jubilation, Cabinet Appointments, Successful Transition, and Policy Announcements.....	 88
Positive Coverage.....	89
Negative Coverage.....	104
Neutral Coverage.....	107
Phase II. September 11th Attacks and President Bush's Decision to Retaliate.....	 108
Positive Coverage.....	108
Negative Coverage.....	118
Neutral Coverage.....	120
Phase III. War in Afghanistan.....	121
Positive Coverage.....	121

Negative Coverage.....	127
Neutral Coverage.....	131
Phase IV. War Against Iraq.....	131
Positive Coverage.....	132
Negative Coverage.....	147
Neutral Coverage.....	155
Quantitative Analysis.....	157
Triangulation.....	160
Phase I. Inauguration.....	160
Phase II. September 11th Attacks.....	161
Phase III. Afghan War.....	163
Phase IV. Iraq War.....	164
Research Questions Revisited.....	165
Additional Findings.....	167
V. CONCLUSION.....	171
Summary of the Thesis.....	171
Limitations, Differences, and Future Questions.....	173
REFERENCES.....	180
APPENDICES.....	183

Appendix A

List of 44 Very Negative (-2) Stories.....183

List of 126 Very Positive (+ 2) Stories.....186

Appendix B

Korean Abstract.....196

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis analyzes President George W. Bush's image as portrayed by the *New York Times* during four crucial time spans in his presidency: His inauguration, September 11 terrorist attacks, War against terrorism (or War against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan), and War against Iraq (or Second Persian Gulf War).

After a month of indecision about the outcome of the presidential election, President-elect Texas Governor George W. Bush did not have enough time to form his cabinet. This administration started weak. The September 11 terrorist attacks on American soil marked a dividing line in the sense of national security or insecurity in Americans' minds. The national infamy and psychological shocks experienced by Americans posed a serious challenge for President Bush. This nation needed a "National Soother" and a "Crisis Leader" for the victims and Americans on the whole. The retaliatory war against the Taliban which followed the terrorist attacks meant that President Bush led the nation as a wartime leader. The war in Afghanistan increased in intensity gradually, first by bombing and then by sending in troops. The Second Persian Gulf War in 2003 was another opportunity for Mr. Bush to serve the nation as a wartime leader. Despite the pros and cons over the two wars against terrorism, it is undeniable that Mr. Bush led Americans through the two wars.

Generally speaking, strong national leadership is required during

these critical periods, especially, during the wartime. The above four periods may be very crucial in Bush's presidency. The war against terrorism in Afghanistan and the war against Iraq were controversial, given the domestic and international opposition. Under these critical circumstances, how the *New York Times* depicted President Bush can be a matter of grave concern. Did it portray him in a favorable light, highlighting his national and international leadership role, and thus advancing his policy goals? Or did this newspaper portray the Bush administration in a negative light by directly criticizing him or carrying reports of Bush's critics? This thesis will seek to answer these questions.

Significance of the Research

People are exposed to presidential news almost daily. They know what the president says or does through media reports. News stories about George W. Bush, the 43rd President of the United States of America, are so pervasive that not only American people but also people worldwide are interested in the presidential coverage conveyed by the news media. The pervasiveness of presidential news may be a reflection of the importance of the presidential news. Edwards and Wayne (1994) presented several research findings to show that almost three-fourths of national government news focuses on the president. This may be either the result of the public's demand for presidential news or the result of the White House's aggressive publicity efforts to supply presidential news.

Presidential communication, emanating from the White House, is arguably the utmost political communication mediated through news media or non-news media. It can be said that in this mediation process journalists on the one hand and the president or the White House publicity personnel on the other are continuously engaged in the wrangling over the newsworthiness of presidential coverage. The end product of these interactive processes are the news reports of the president, which may be either positive, neutral, or negative toward the president. In this vein, studying presidential image or presidential coverage conveyed by a news medium may mean analyzing the end result of interactions between journalists of a news organization and the White House publicity machine.

An understanding of presidential image in the media will equip consumers of presidential news with a better understanding of presidential politics. This understanding is all the more important, because policies made and implemented by a president can lead the whole country to a completely different destination. Understanding the mechanisms of the presidential image conveyed by the media will enable the public to look at the reverse side of the news story, which means image manipulation conducted by the White House publicity officials. The political procedures along which mass media convey the presidential image, the manners in which the presidential image is processed by the public, and the ways in which the publics shape their opinions based on the media image are indispensable conduits of agenda building and policy making in a democratic society.

Many scholars and media practitioners say that the proportion of

television news coverage is increasingly significant in domestic and international politics. Graber (2002) especially placed heavy emphasis on the importance of television in the modern political processes. She implied that television is perhaps more important than any major East Coast newspapers. Although the *New York Times* largely reflects liberal voices in American society, it is undeniable that this newspaper is one of the news media that play an important role in setting the political agenda in America (Fallows, 1997; Graber, 2002).

This researcher sought to analyze the presidential image conveyed by the *New York Times* for two reasons. First, this newspaper is one of the most influential Eastern news organizations, which report detailed movements of the American government. The *New York Times* frequently leads the tone of news coverage of certain events in American news media and sometimes in news media of the world. Grossman and Kumar (1982) wrote that the *New York Times* purports to be the "newspaper of the record" as compared with other news media. They described this newspaper:

The *New York Times* closely follows what a president does each day: the speeches he gives, the news conferences he holds, his business trips, ceremonies, and bill-signings. The *New York Times* is a newspaper of the record. Because of that emphasis, its stories record presidential events and actions in detail. They provide a complete treatment of what happened, who was involved, and what it means (Graber, 1982, pp. 105-08).

This researcher realized that the *New York Times* frequently ran transcripts or excerpts of important presidential addresses or other important political actors. Considering the comparative importance of the *New York Times* news in the agenda-setting role, analysis of this newspaper's coverage of the Bush presidency is meaningful.

President George W. Bush will be recorded in American history as the president who conducted the first war in the 21st century, even though the justifiability of the "war on terrorism" may need more discussion. While staging the war on Afghanistan and Iraq, Bush's presidency has transformed itself. He started as a weak president with little mandate (or small *political capital*), but he was granted broad powers to wage the antiterrorism war after September 11 attacks. It will be meaningful to examine how the *New York Times* portrayed Bush's presidency in this crucial modern period.

Increasing Importance of Presidential News

Plenty of news stories about President George W. Bush's activities are easily available today merely by accessing news stories online, watching television, or reading newspapers or newsmagazines. It is easy to turn to television sets or newspapers to learn about what President Bush has said or done and the public's reactions.

Technological innovations such as electric printing press, cable television, satellite TV, the Internet, plus increasing literacy of people have made it easier for people of today to access mass-circulation newspapers or television news (or non-news) programs which carry a variety of presidential news.

But things have not always been this way. Before the American Civil War, newspapers were generally small, heavily partisan, and limited in circulation. In the 20th century a view of presidential leadership different from that of the founding era began to emerge. The new

outlook --- one in which the president advances his agenda through direct popular leadership --- developed both out of the perceived necessity of bold national leadership because of dramatic changes in American politics and abroad and out of the words and deeds of "strong" presidents. The expansion of federal government's role during the Spanish-American War and World War I kindled support for and great interest in the activities of the government in Washington. The increased interest in national affairs was also caused by the renewed prominence of presidency following a long era of congressional ascendancy. Theodore Roosevelt (presidency, 1901-09) maintained that the president must act as a "steward" of the people. Roosevelt, who took an activist view of the presidency, exploited the new opportunities to reach the public provided by the mass-circulation press. He used the White House as a "bully pulpit" to dramatize himself and the issues in which he was interested. He sought and gained extensive access to the press in order to forge a more personal relationship with the American people.

Ever since the first Roosevelt occupied the White House, news about the president has played an increasingly prominent role in the printed press, both in absolute terms and relative to coverage of Congress or the national government as a whole. Research on contemporary presidency has found that almost three-fourths of national government news focuses on the president (Edwards and Wayne, 1994, p. 137, p. 166).

In addition to the increase in the quantity of news, the number of reporters who cover the White House has increased. This may be

closely correlated with the increase in news coverage. The White House press corps has grown, with much of the increase having taken place in recent decades. Kessel (2001) stated that about 1,700 persons hold White House credentials today. During Franklin Roosevelt's administration, the number of the reporters who covered the White House full-time and attended the press secretary's daily briefings (or the "regulars") was 15 to 20, and decades later no more than 22. By the time of Ford administration, 60 reporters attended press secretary Ron Nessen's briefings, and roughly 100 regulars covered the Carter White House. The sheer number of the journalists makes the news briefings more formal, Kessel remarked. These days about 70 reporters and 15 photographers regularly cover the White House and crank out massive presidential stories and photos almost everyday (Kessel, 2001, pp. 57-58).

Given the high percentage of coverage accorded the president, how much do presidents really matter to the news? Political scientists Cook and Ragsdale (1995) indicated how important the presidential news is to the media:

In recent decades, the White House has become more and more the central newsbeat in Washington, making the president the central protagonist not only of that beat, but perhaps of the entire national news --- especially of television news, in which the White House story commonly leads the broadcast. To a greater extent than any other political actors in the United States, presidents have reporters come to them rather than having to seek the reporters out. The media presume that, because of the president's centrality as head of state and head of government, virtually anything that presidents do could well be newsworthy. Indeed the president is probably the only political figure whose activities are followed 24 hours a day in the United States or in any other country which adopted the presidential system. One Washington bureau chief morbidly (but candidly) told the sociologist Herbert Gans that "they might cover the president expecting that he would die (Nelson, 1995, p. 306)."

Why Does Presidential Image Matter?

Political scientist Richard Neustadt (1960) emphasized the importance of persuasion as the source of presidential power. Neustadt noted that the challenge for activist presidents is to leverage their powers to persuade others to do what the president wants done. He argued that presidential power is "the power to persuade" (Nelson, 1995, p. 302). Presidential persuasion of today implies a very important aspect of presidential leadership. Presidents attempt to persuade other politicians by bargaining or domination (Kerbel, 1991). Presidents may appeal directly to the people (or "go public") for policy goals.

Considering these means of persuasion, mass media can be a convenient way to persuade the public. Nowadays, so many newspapers, major TV networks, and round-the-clock cable television stations cover the White House that the president can muster support from these mass media to pursue his policy goals. Media, especially electronic media, have been important means for presidents to "go over the heads of opponents" to the public. As persuasion is one of the powerful ways to carry out governance, mass media have been a tool for them. Favorable *presidential images* cultivated through the mass media enable presidents to implement their policies more easily.

These days media's depiction of presidents plays a major role in determining whether the *presidential image* can be positive, neutral, or negative (favorable, neutral, or unfavorable). The level of support for the presidential policies relies heavily on the presidential image. While the presidential images conveyed by the newspapers and television may

vary, it is undeniable that mass media play an active role in determining presidential images and thereby in influencing the success or failure of presidential policies. Political scientist Graber (2002) explained how and why media's images of the presidents are significant in the political arena of today:

Media coverage is the lifeblood of politics because it shapes the *perceptions* (Seol's emphasis) that form the reality on which political action is based. Media do more than depict the political environment; they *are* (Graber's emphasis) the political environment. Because direct contact with political actors and situations is limited, *media images* (Seol's emphasis) define people and situations for nearly all participants in the political process. The quantity of such images is rising thanks to new technologies (Graber, 2002, p. 277).

Why do presidents care about the media's portrayal of them, that is, their media images? Presidents need positive media images during election campaigns and their terms of office. Presidential candidates badly need media's positive depictions of them to win the election and need media to carry out their policies as presidents. After elections, the success of presidential policies; the length, vigor, and effectiveness, of a president's political life; and the general level of support for the political system depend heavily on presidential images that the media convey to the public. Making sure that these images are favorable, therefore, becomes a prime concern. Staffs of various presidents concur that the national media play a very significant role in the White House decision-making process and in the White House meetings. On the whole, the more time is spent discussing the media than any other institution, including Congress. All policies are developed and presented with media reactions in mind (Graber, 2002, pp. 277-78).

No matter how powerful a president may be, media coverage of him

(or "presidential image") is vital in shaping his public image, thus in making or breaking his policy making and policy implementation. Presidential coverage is all the more important because for most Americans, understanding the presidency occurs not primarily through textbooks but through the daily reporting and commentary of the media. Most people get to know the political world through the messages conveyed to them through the media. For that reason, presidents and their aides are profoundly concerned about what happens in the media. *Presidents understand that for the public, the media image of the president is reality* (Pfiffner and Davidson, 2003, p. 145).

With the importance of presidential image in news media increasing, media's image of the president can make or break the presidential politics. Presidents arguably depend on the media's coverage of them to lead the country. This thesis will seek to find out how the *New York Times* portrayed President Bush during the four critical periods in his presidency.

Before going into that, this thesis will discuss how news media and the White House interact or negotiate with each other to produce presidential news. The literature review section in Chapter II looks at the production mechanisms of presidential news. Although the White House exerts considerable control over media coverage of the White House, news media have their own framework to generate presidential images. *President Bush's images conveyed by the New York Times is definitely the end product of these complex and active interactions between the New York Times journalists on the one hand and the*

White House, the Bush administration, the American public, and the world community on the other (Seol's comment).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Presidents' Discontent With Their Media Images

In more than two centuries' history of American presidency, presidents have always wanted the print media and recently the electronic media to portray them in a favorable light. But presidents have largely been dissatisfied with their images conveyed by the media. Presidents have had ample resources to manipulate the media for pleasing coverage, whereas the media have resisted being manipulated. In the initial stages of the presidency in American history, presidents were troubled by extremely partisan newspapers. However, with the advent of the mass-circulation newspapers, the interaction of the two sides entered into a new phase. The history of interaction between the media and the presidency can be described as that of attempts to manipulate and to resist manipulation. Political scientist Smith (1990) described President Reagan's (presidency, 1981-89) discontent with the media as follows:

Ronald Reagan turned to an aide at the end of a picture session. "Sons of bitches," he muttered, referring to the assembled reporters. News microphones inadvertently recorded the president's private aside because technicians had not finished disconnecting the sound system. Reporters turned to presidential spokesman Larry Speakes. He replied that the president doesn't recall saying it --- he doesn't recall anybody else saying it. If he said anything, he said, "It's sunny, and you are rich (Smith, 1990, p. 1).

This episode shows that even former president Reagan, with the

nickname "Great Communicator" for his tactful manipulation of the media, was not content with the media's portrayal of him. The nickname was given to him, because he made great use of the media in publicizing his policies. Dissatisfaction with the media was not confined to actor-turned president Reagan.

Thomas Jefferson (presidency, 1801-09), the great defender of freedom of the press, was also dissatisfied with images of him conveyed by the press. When Jefferson became exasperated with the press as president, he complained that "even the least informed of the people have learned that nothing in a newspaper is to be believed." He said that newspapers, for the most part, presented only the caricature of disaffected minds and that the abuses of freedom of the press had been carried to a length never before known or borne by any civilized nation. These observations, it should be noted, came from the man who earlier had written that "were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate to prefer the latter" (Edwards and Wayne, 1994, p. 138).

Former president Bill Clinton (presidency, 1993-2001) was no exception in expressing his discontentment with the media. While he was president-elect, Clinton said emphatically about the role of the media. Cook and Ragsdale (1996) wrote:

I think the watchdog function is fine. But it's often carried to extremes in a search for headlines. And I am supposed to take these people seriously as our sole intermediaries to the voters of this country? Sure, they should do their watchdog function, but anyone who lets himself be interpreted to the American people through these intermediaries alone is nuts (Nelson, 1996, p. 297).

Grossman and Kumar's Study: "Presidential Stories and Photos Were Mostly Positive!"

Contrary to the deep-rooted dissatisfaction of the presidents with their media images, Michael Grossman and Martha Kumar (1981) showed in their research that American media portrayed their presidents in an unexpectedly favorable light. Grossman and Kumar conducted research on media portrayal of U.S. presidents by the *New York Times* and the weekly newsmagazine *Time* for 25 years from 1953 to 1978, and then CBS Evening News for 10 years from 1968 to 1978. The two scholars were surprised to find that the presidential images were unexpectedly favorable in all the three media. Their argument read:

When all White House stories in the *New York Times* and *Time* are considered for the 25-year period, one is struck by how favorable they are. Each organization presented two favorable stories about the White House for each that was unfavorable. Because the aggregate number of CBS stories were tabulated from the ten-year period that includes six years of Vietnam and Watergate, the CBS figures are not comparable to figures for the two print sources, which were based on stories for 25 years. But comparison based on a year-by-year analysis shows CBS Evening News following the same trends as the other two sources (Graber, 1982, p. 89).

In their research, the two scholars asked three coders to decide tone of the presidential news stories as positive, neutral, and negative, based on the overall impression that the stories gave them. The coders worked in pairs on each medium after having received a general instruction as to how to code the stories. Grossman and Kumar wrote that *in spite of the danger of the subjective nature of the coders' task* (Seol's emphasis), their responses were quite similar. The coders

working on the *New York Times* had the same assessment findings on tone in 86% of the stories while the coders for *Time* agreed on 77% stories, and those for the CBS News in 87% of the stories.

Their table assembled assessments recorded by the two coders like "positive-positive," "positive-neutral," "neutral," "negative-neutral," and "negative-negative." Here, "neutral" meant both of "neutral" assessments or balancing off of "positive" and "negative" assessment made by the two coders, that is, "neutral" means "neutral-neutral" or "positive-negative (or negative-positive)."

According to their research, the number of presidential stories amounted to 2,550 (*Time*), to 5,270 (*New York Times*), and to 922 (CBS Evening News). Grossman and Kumar showed their research results in the following table:

Table 1: Tone of White House Stories in the New York Times, Time, and CBS News

Tone of Story	N Y T (N=5,270)	Time (N=2,550)	CBS News (N=922)
Positive-positive(%)	39.5%	44.9%	31.6%
Positive-neutral "	9.2	15.1	6.9
Neutral "	24.1	11.8	22.9
Negative-neutral "	4.7	8.2	6.0
Negative-negative "	22.5	20.0	32.6

Source: Grossman & Kumar 1981, p. 256

According to Grossman and Kumar's survey, the number of

presidential stories is calculated to amount to 210.8 stories (*New York Times*), 102 stories (*Time*), and 92.2 stories (CBS News) per year, respectively. This ultimately means that the *New York Times* printed 0.57 stories per day, *Time* carried 1.96 stories per week, and CBS News broadcast 0.25 stories per day (Seol's calculation, based on their figures).

What presidential events were depicted as positive or negative? Grossman and Kumar identified certain events that tended to be positive or negative. According to them, the categories of stories which tended to be rated as positive in tone included those that emphasized the president's leadership role, his activities as a family man, his desirable personal qualities, and almost every story that deemphasized conflict and criticism. For example, when President Carter (presidency, 1977-81) went to New York City in August 1978 to sign a bill bailing out the city, he was surrounded by appreciative politicians who made supportive comments. The ceremony and comments were reported in the press. This piece was coded "favorable." The categories of stories judged to be negative included those that emphasized things that were going wrong for the president, conflict and criticism, what the administration had failed to achieve, and who wasn't supporting presidential policies. An example would be a May 11, 1978, *New York Times* article headlined "ABA Chief Criticizes Carter's Attack on Lawyers" (Graber, 1982, pp. 89-90).

What about presidential photos? Grossman and Kumar (1982) found that presidential photos were more favorable than stories. The two scholars assessed the White House photographs with the same

methods. The proportion of positive pictures was much higher than that of positive presidential stories. The authors explained that the ability of the White House to mold photographers' routines makes it more likely that positive pictures of the president will appear. They stated that the pictures accompanying news stories are even more favorable than the stories. Most pictures of the president convey a positive image because they are taken in settings that are favorable to the president, e.g., presidents speaking at the Rose Garden, leaving or entering church, or being on vacation. Grossman and Kumar showed how presidential stories and photos are placed together regardless of positive or negative value:

A negative news story, such as a front-page article suggesting the failure of a diplomatic meeting, may be accompanied by a positive picture in which the president appears at a ceremony with a foreign leader. There were almost no negative pictures, such as one of a president frowning at a popular congressman or interest-group leader, in either the *New York Times* or *Time*, and there were only a few negative films on the CBS News. In contrast to the two print sources, whose pictures were overwhelmingly favorable in tone, the majority of the CBS film was relatively neutral" (Graber, 1982, p. 91).

Grossman and Kumar pointed out that pictures and stories often do not go hand in hand, especially when the stories are negative. According to them, pictures usually are favorable even when they accompany an unfavorable story. Articles about the relationship between the president and Congress, the president and members of his administration and White House staff members were generally among the most negative stories that appeared in the *New York Times* and *Time* throughout the 25-year period. In *Time*, the stories about relations between the president and Congress were favorable in less

than 20% of the cases. In no subject area were stories favorable in more than 42% of the cases. Yet the majority of pictures accompanying the stories were favorable with only one exception (Graber, 1982, pp. 92-93).

With regard to the research findings of Grossman and Kumar, Graber, in the capacity of the editor of the book, pointed out a weakness of their study. She wrote:

The authors' evaluations of media matters are based largely on quantitative comparisons, yet the significance of stories may hinge more strongly on their substance than on the frequency of appearance. For instance, negative stories frequently have much greater impact than their positive counterparts. Ten stories about the presidents' polish and suavity in handling foreign diplomats may pale into oblivion in the face of one story about a major faux pas. In that situation, is it fair to claim that the president has received coverage that is predominantly favorable?" (Graber, 1982, p. 86)

In view of the strong impact of negative images, Graber's explanation sounds convincing, *even though it may be hard to calculate how many positive stories can offset the hurtful impact of one negative story* (Seol's comment). Graber pointed out that the mere fact that the presidential stories featured prominently in the media does not necessarily mean that they will be noticed or used by the public. Hence, the need to differentiate media images from media effects, which will be discussed afterwards.

Story Types and Temporal Patterns of Presidential News

Grossman and Kumar (1982) stated that the White House story is a

homogenized story. They argued that the three news media, the *New York Times*, *Time*, and CBS Evening News, showed strikingly similar patterns in the types of stories they write and the subjects they cover, as well as the overall tone of their coverage. They noted that approximately 80% of their stories are similar.

Grossman and Kumar presented a breakdown of types of presidential stories of the *New York Times*: News 78.9%, Analysis 2.6%, Feature 3.1%, Editorial 7.1%, Column 4.9%, Text 3.4%. Their breakdown of articles also showed a similarity in the subjects dealt with by the three media. Although there was a difference in the amount of coverage they gave to each subject, the same general categories of subjects were treated as important by the three news media. The categories shown by the *New York Times* were: Program and Policy 24.7%, Activity 30.5%, Personal 12.2%, Vice President 6.1%, Congress and administration 10.9%, Election 6.7%, Staff 2.7%, President and press 1.4%, Watergate 4.7%. The category of "program and policy" includes domestic and foreign policy news as well as budget. "Personal" encompasses lifestyle news about the president and his family. Activity involves messages, meetings, appointments, and the like.

Are there any temporal trends in the presidential coverage as presidents proceed with their office? One of the most outstanding contributions Grossman and Kumar made in media research may be their discovery of coverage patterns of the White House. Grossman and Kumar (1981) stated that the continuing character of the coverage can be seen in two important fluctuations that appear in most administrations, that is, the number of stories and their tone. According

to them, the largest number of stories and the largest number of favorable stories appear during the first year (honeymoon period). It is unusual for the tone to rise after that first year. There were six administrations in the 25-year span from 1953 to 1978. In all but two, those of Lyndon Johnson (presidency, 1963-69) and Richard Nixon (1969-74), there was a constant pattern in the number of White House stories appearing in all the news sources studied.

The pattern has been that the largest number of stories appear during the first year of the administration, and the lowest number are found in the final year. The two researchers said that "the first year of an administration has received the largest number of stories not because of the high level of activity but because newspeople believe that the public is keenly interested in learning about the new arrivals. They want to know what the president is like and what kind of people his family members are."

In respect of coverage trends of presidential news, Graber (2002) said that "the relationship between the media and the chief executive often displays *three distinct phases* (Seol's emphasis)." According to Graber, there used to be a honeymoon period, a time of cooperation when the media conveyed the president's messages about organization of the new administration, appointment of new officials, and plans and proposals for new policies. At this early stage few policies and proposals traditionally are implemented, so there is little opportunity for adverse criticism. Presidents and their advisors, eager to get their stories across, make themselves readily available to the media and supply them with ample information.

Once the administration embarks on controversial programs and becomes vulnerable to criticism of its record, the honeymoon ends. This is happening earlier and more abruptly now than in the past. Controversies are attractive to the Washington press corps when they involve dramatic conflicts at the highest levels of government. They can be easily covered through interviews with Washington-based sources. The White House may retaliate by withholding news, by restricting presidential contacts with the press, and by increasing public relations activities.

If the rifts between media and the executive branch become exceptionally wide, there may be a third period in which both sides retreat from their mutually hostile behavior to take a more moderate stance. This phase frequently coincides with a reelection campaign, when newspeople try harder to provide impartial coverage, and presidents are more eager to keep newspeople happy (Graber, 2002, pp. 282-84).

In the Nixon administration, however, the pattern changed. Watergate shattered any normal patterns in press coverage of his administration, with tremendous increase in the number of presidential stories with negative images.

Bill Clinton (presidency, 1993-2001) is another example not fitting into their pattern. Clinton never had a honeymoon with the press. From the start, tension and conflict underlay the relationship. His first several months, for example, were marked by coverage that leaned toward the negative images. Clinton's bad first weeks, with the storm over his proposal to lift the ban on gay men and lesbians in the

military, were followed by mini-scandals in May 1993 about the White House travel office and a \$200 presidential haircut. (Part of this will be shown in the Chapter IV.)

Highly positive coverage returned with Clinton's trip to the G-7 (Group of Seven Industrialized Countries) summit and his tour of the flood-ravaged Midwest. Presenting these facts, Cook and Ragsdale (1995) argued that little evidence exists of either a honeymoon or consistently increasing antagonism. Cook and Ragsdale commented that "the relations between the president and the press seem to be variable, even volatile, perhaps so unpredictable as to be inexplicable" (Nelson, 1995, p. 298).

Graber (2002) argued that incumbent President George W. Bush (presidency, 2001-) did not enjoy the honeymoon period, either. She wrote that "President Bush received far less attention from newspapers, newsmagazines, and network television news than either Clinton or the elder Bush had garnered. George W. Bush, as well as Bill Clinton, had his honeymoon spoiled by predominantly negative comments about his initial legislative programs." Graber (2002) observed that the Bush administration, which began in January of 2001, illustrates the shriveling of the honeymoon period (p. 283). These coverage trends show that the pattern Grossman and Kumar discovered does not necessarily hold water in recent years. As will be shown in Chapter IV, the *New York Times* reported that several of Bush's initial policy initiatives, which were purported to please the conservatives, met with direct opposition from parties concerned (Seol's comment).

Presidents' Tactics: Control and Manipulation to Get Positive Images

Researcher of presidential spin control Maltese (1992) introduced an episode in which Mr. Dick Cheney, then Congressman and currently Vice President of the United States (2001-) emphasized the importance of "controlling media agenda." Maltese described his conversation with Cheney, who was scheduled to leave for the White House to work as secretary of defense in the first President Bush's administration. While discussing presidential press relations with Maltese, Cheney emphasized the importance of controlling the media agenda. This episode clearly shows that the cabinet-level officials have deeply-ingrained convictions that the administration should always obtain positive presidential images for various political interests:

To have an effective presidency, Cheney reminded me, the White House must control the agenda. An essential element of that control, he explained, is the ability to maintain discipline within the administration itself. Any appearance of disunity among the president's ranks will be seized upon by the media as an opportunity for a story --- one that will undermine the president's agenda" (Maltese, 1992, p. 1).

It may be quite natural that an official like Dick Cheney, who served as White House chief of staff for President Gerald R. Ford (presidency, 1974-77), stressed the importance of controlling the media agenda. This implies that the president as well as presidential chief of staff wants to always control the media's portrayal of the presidency in their favor. With Dick Cheney as Vice President and George W. Bush, a president "equipped with demonstrated interest in control of communications" (Kumar's words), it is understandable why the Bush

administration has *an unprecedentedly tightly-knit communications operations* (Seol's emphasis). Thus, the White House has varied offices to control presidential images: Office of Communications for long-term presidential image making; Office of Telecommunications Policy for overall presidential influence on broadcast stations' programming by policy coordination; Office of Media Relations to influence local press; Press Office for day-to-day presidential image making by offering daily press conferences and other press-related activities, etc.. Television advisors were also recruited for improved presidential images on television. In a word, "the history of the media and presidential relations can be called that of media manipulation to obtain favorable presidential images" (Kessel, 2001).

Edwards and Wayne (1994) stated that the White House's relations with the media occupy a substantial portion of the time of a large number of aides. *About one third of the high-level White House staff is directly involved in media relations* (Seol's emphasis) and a policy of one type or another, and most staff members are involved at some time in influencing the media's portrayal of the president. The person in the White House who most often deals directly with the press is the president's press secretary. Probably the central function of press secretaries is to serve as conduits of information from the White House to the press. Press secretaries also serve as conduits from the press to the president. They must sometimes explain the needs of the press to the president.

Since the time of William Loeb, Theodore Roosevelt's (presidency, 1901-09) press secretary, the White House has attempted to coordinate

executive branch news. Presidents have assigned aides to clear the appointments of departmental public affairs officials, to keep in touch with the officials to learn what news is forthcoming from the departments, and to meet with them to explain the president's policy views and to try to prevent conflicting statements from emanating from the White House and other units of the executive branch.

Coordinating the news from the White House itself has also been a presidential goal. Presidents have sometimes monitored and attempted to limit the press contacts of White House aides, who have annoyed their bosses by using media for their own purposes. Recent administrations have also made efforts to coordinate publicity functions within the White House, attempting to present the news in the most favorable light, such as preventing two major stories from breaking on the same day, smothering bad news with more positive news, and timing announcements for maximum effect.

Graber (1997) elaborated on how the presidents utilize "control tactics" to get favorable images. She noted that the White House uses mostly three communication strategies (pp. 281-83).

(1) *Win favor.* Woo reporters by offering good story material as well as occasional scoops that may bring distinction to individual reporters. Cultivate reporters' friendships by being accessible, by treating them with respect, and by arranging for their creature comforts. To keep reporters in line, presidents may threaten them directly or obliquely with withdrawal of privileges. These may include accommodations in

the presidential plane, special interviews, or answers to their questions during news conferences. Presidents may also publicly condemn individual reporters or their organizations for undesirable reporting.

(2) *Shape the news flow.* Presidents try to guide the flow of news by the thrust of their commentary and by controlling contacts with the press. For example, when publicity about illegal transfers of arms to Nicaragua had damaged President Reagan's administration, Reagan managed to divert media attention from the affair by sponsoring a popular Economic Bill of Rights. Presidents periodically restrict their contacts with the media largely to picture sessions to avoid questions about embarrassing failures. Presidents may space out releases so that there is a steady, manageable flow of news. If they want emphasis on a particular story, they may withhold competing news that breaks simultaneously. Sometimes a barrage of news is released or even created to distract attention from sensitive developments. To control news flow and ensure that the administration speaks with a single voice, presidents may prohibit their staffs from publicly disagreeing with their policies on pain of dismissal.

(3) *Orchestrate coverage.* Ways of arranging activities to create favorable presidential image are limitless. They include creating newsworthy events, heightening suspense through news blackouts prior to major pronouncements, and staging public ceremonies as media spectacles at times when there are few competing events. Political successes may be coupled with political failures in hopes that publicity

for success will draw attention away from the failure.

These are only part of the tactics that presidents utilize to obtain favorable coverage. Presidents have their own internal news values that journalists can almost never ignore. Presidents have unlimited resources to control the media. In this regard, Cook and Ragsdale (1995) depicted how helpless journalists can be in the face of the powerful onslaughts of presidential communication tactics:

Because of their near-automatic news value, presidents, more than other sources, can dictate the terms of access. Consequently, reporters can easily end up as virtual prisoners in the all but hermetically sealed White House pressroom, reluctant to roam far from their connection to fame and fortune in the news business. Instead of encouraging innovation and enterprise, the White House breeds anxiety among reporters about missing the story that everyone else is chasing (Nelson, 1995, p. 306):

Overall, the prevailing definition of presidential news allows a president to make news virtually whenever he wants to do so. Over the past two decades, attention to the president has increased, and 25% of all domestic national news now concerns presidents or presidential candidates (Entman, 1990, p. 155). In terms of presidents' intention to control news media, Edwards and Wayne (2003) provided an apt argument:

No matter who is in the White House or who does the reporting, presidents and the press always struggle for dominance. Presidents are inherently policy advocates and want to be able to *define a situation and receive favorable coverage* (Seol's emphasis). They will naturally assess the press in terms of how it aids or hinders their goals. The press, on the other hand, has the responsibility for presenting and assessing what is really going on. Although the press may fail in its efforts, it will assess itself on those criteria. Presidents want to control the amount and timing of information about their administrations, while the press wants all the information that exists without delay. As long as their goals are different, presidents and the press are likely to be adversaries (p. 155).

Negotiation and Cooperation in Presidential Image Making

While the presidential control and manipulation tactics to get favorable media image is being carried out, the process of negotiation and cooperation between the White House and journalists proceeds. Cook and Ragsdale (1995) explained how the negotiation is conducted between the president and the press. The two scholars brought to light how the two sides can be simultaneously *interdependent and independent* (Seol's emphasis) vis-a-vis the other side:

Presidents and the news media rely heavily on one another to do their jobs. Presidents need the news media to get their message out, to set the political agenda, to create favorable public moods, and to pressure otherwise recalcitrant political actors. Similarly, the news media use presidents as central protagonists around whom they can organize their daily production of news. The top news story is typically a presidential story; the top domestic newsbeat is at the White House (Nelson, 1995, pp. 297-330).

These remarks reflect the day-to-day practices of the interaction between the presidents and the media. There is a constant negotiation evolving about the importance and interest in presidential news. Cook and Ragsdale noted that presidents designate importance in three ways. First, they select issues or ignore them for presidential involvement. Second, they can stage events that will draw attention to particular issues and concerns. Third, they can choose the venues for involvement with the media.

But the two sides can also be independent of each other in various aspects. The president and the press act independently of each other in pursuit of their own fundamentally different interests. Cook and Ragsdale (1995) commented on their independence:

Amid this mutual reliance, however, presidents and journalists are also independent of one another. The interests of presidents and the press, although intertwined, are fundamentally different. Presidents, like all politicians, want to get their information to the public and to other politicians in a form that is as favorable as possible to their own interests. But reporters, partly because of their commitment to serving their audiences, partly because of their commitment to balance and neutrality, and partly because of their professional aspirations, are not willing to be *unwitting adjuncts* to the White House. The result is what we call an ongoing *negotiation of newsworthiness* within the White House, within the news media, and between the two regarding which of the thousands of things that presidents, their families, and their advisors do in a given day will become news (Nelson, 1995, p. 299).

Cook and Ragsdale showed what can become news of the day. It can be safely said that there is an ongoing process of negotiation of newsworthiness between the president and the media. This negotiation involves what gets covered, who gets asked about a story, and how and for how long the story is covered. It is a negotiation that evolves between the White House and the press, as the stories rise, develop, and fall; as alternative sources speak out or clam up; and as presidential and journalistic strategies change during the course of a president's term and from one president's term to another's. What is newsworthy one day may be old news the next. What is good news coverage for one president may be critical news coverage for another.

Cook and Ragsdale argued that there are four phases of negotiation between the two sides: negotiation of process, negotiation of content, negotiation of valence, and negotiation of results. In terms of negotiation of news content, they indicated that importance and interest in news content are divergent between the two sides:

News, it is often said, is supposed to be both important and interesting. The president has the greatest control in ascertaining importance, but the

news media are more influential in designating interest. The division of labor was best captured by a plaque that appeared on the desk of Reagan's chief White House spokesperson, Larry Speakes: 'You don't tell us how to stage the news, and we won't tell you how to cover it.' Although jocular, Speakes' plaque reveals the area that each side is presumed to dominate --- and suggests that the news from the White House is a co-production (Nelson, 1997, p. 309).

This is an illustration of the negotiation of news content, which represents description of the president. This also shows how independently the media and the White House can operate. Does one party get the upper hand over the other in their relationships? The presidents and the media seem to be on an equal footing. Cook and Ragsdale drew a conclusion about the relationship of the president and the media as follows:

Although each side relies on the other in the negotiation of newsworthiness, neither dominates. The presidency and the news media are independent institutions that command important and unique resources. Journalists worry about maintaining access to powerful sources such as the president, but only if such access leads to a product that their superiors --- who, after all, pay their salaries --- will assess favorably. The two sides need to provide stories that maximize both the production values of vividness and clarity and the journalistic norms of balance and neutrality. Reporters, moreover, derive satisfaction and self-esteem from their professional autonomy. Any indication that they are mere press agents, or "flacks," for the president would lead to a loss of prestige within the profession (Nelson, 1995, pp. 308-09).

Even if presidents can restrict reporters' access and focus them on some topics, the news media still have the final say about the ultimate product --- by raising certain issues, interjecting doubts, questioning motives, and seeking out critical sources for balance. Hence, the Fourth Estate, even though the media are constantly exposed to the risks of being controlled and manipulated by the presidency. In this way, negotiation and cooperation will continue between the White House and the journalists over the presidential images.

"Bubble Machine" of President George W. Bush

Presidency scholar Kumar (2003) wrote that "President Bush has a demonstrated interest in communications and, in case of the war on terrorism, just what the challenges are in getting people to understand the issues and the urgency of response." According to her, Mr. Bush assembled White House officials and emphasized the importance of communications in fighting terrorism. Shortly after September 11th attacks, White House assistants sent some documents to Camp David for him to sign. These documents were purported to freeze financial assets suspected of sponsoring terrorism. Mr. Bush was furious. He wanted a signing ceremony to show that it was the first action to fight terrorism. Mr. Bush said "Why am I just signing this document and is Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill announcing this tomorrow? This is the first strike in this new war against terror. It's not with a missile. It's with a stroke of a pen." The communications operation put together a Rose Garden signing ceremony for the following morning. Head of Office of Communications Dan Bartlett said that Mr. Bush spotted the opportunities that his staff did not (Kumar's interview with Bartlett on May 22, 2002, in Washington D.C.).

As the first president to come into office with a master's degree in business administration and with decades of experience in business management, President George W. Bush employed management principles when he organized his administration. According to presidential personnel director and deputy chief of staff Clay Johnson

and presidential senior adviser Karl Rove, Bush's management style goes back to management analyst Peter Drucker. Rove fleshed out Mr. Bush's core principles: (1) Set the goal; (2) Bring the staff together and provide them with clear direction on how they should accomplish the stated goals, including methods and philosophy; and (3) Define limits within which individual staff members may operate.

In the communications area, the direction of the president's goals and results orientation can be summarized in the words of one of those assigned to carry out their plans. *At the heart of their communications operation is a management precept that President George Bush "makes news on his terms"* (Seol's emphasis). This was an observation made by Jim Wilkinson, the Director for Planning in the Office of Communications (Kumar's interview with Wilkinson on July 3rd, 2002, in Washington D.C.). Making news on the president's terms requires an organization focused on planning and getting ahead of events. Good communication requires well-prepared organization supporting the president's own communications abilities.

The communications strategies of the Bush administration appear to be based on political strategist Mary Matalin. According to Kumar, Matalin does not differentiate between communications in campaigning and governing. "Communication has to be clear, it has to be repetitive, it has to be coherent, it can't be internally or intellectually inconsistent. In addition, you have to have a receptive zone," Matalin said. "You have got to make people want to hear what you're saying. It has to have relevance. So you have different tactics for different places. Hitting all those zones requires a well tuned organization" (Kumar's

interview with Matalin on Oct. 3rd, 2002, in Washington D.C.). These principles of organization are just as important to the structure of the communications operations as they are to the functioning of the White House staff. Kumar (2003) explained that there are three levels of communications operations in the Bush White House: Strategy, Operations, and Implementation.

(1) Strategy Level: People and Instruments

The organizational structure Mr. Bush and his advisers developed to translate strategies into operations contains a group of four basic White House units with additional resources for those at the strategic level. The existing communications units found in the last three administrations are tied together through those at the strategic level. Karen Hughes, former Counselor to the President and *currently an outside adviser in regular contact with those at the White House* (that is, as of March of 2003 and afterwards, Seol's comment), had the communications portfolio coordinating planning with Karl Rove, Senior Adviser to the President.

The offices with the operations and implementation responsibilities are the Office of Communications, the Press Office, the Office of Media Affairs, and the Speechwriting unit. All four units handle tasks associated with publicity operations no matter who is president. Organizations that vary from one administration to another are the supervisory arrangements for the units. The Office of Strategic Initiatives and the other offices in the grouping of political outreach

units headed by Rove, is a resource for the communication operation. Like Hughes operation, Rove's office coordinates preexisting units dealing with political and interest group relations, including the Office of Political Affairs, the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, and the Office of Public Liaison. Between them, Hughes and Rove cover White House relations with nongovernmental groups and institutions. Both of the chief strategists are involved in the process of identifying goals and having them adopted.

A basic planning tool for the Bush communications team is the message of the day. They want to make certain not to overload the circuits with competing messages. "The idea is to give the press one thing to cover," said a White House staff member during a background interview. "You are going to get the President's word once a day, so if they are running a story, they have to use his words. And if they only get those words, it seems simple. That's why Karen's so good at breaking it down to the most simplistic terms" (Kumar, 2003). In circulating message of the day, the Bush administration is no different from the several previous ones (Seol's comment).

(2) The Operations Level: Carrying Strategy into Messages and Appearances

President Bush established an organization that retained the four basic elements of the publicity structure found in most administrations since that of Richard Nixon (presidency, 1969-1974). These offices are Press Office, the Office of Communications, the Office of Media Affairs,

and the Speechwriting unit. The number of people on staff in the four offices is fairly similar in the Bush and Clinton White Houses. The Bush people had a total of 43 people in 2001, while the Clinton people had 39 in 1998. The difference lies in the emphasis of each. The Bush White House favors the long-range planning operations and puts their resources there.

Press Office: Daily Operations. As it has traditionally done, the Press Office is focused on the daily operation. The Press Secretary plays little role in the overall communications strategies because of the daily emphasis of his office and the volume of work he deals with each day. Press Secretary Ari Fleischer (Jan, 2001 - July, 2003) explained, "The Press Office is much more operational and much more implementational." The Press Office is the place where daily press relations are handled and where plans developed elsewhere for daily coverage are carried out. Mr. Scott McClellan, Fleischer's deputy, took over the post of Press Secretary on July 15th, 2003 (*New York Times*, 08-12-03, A14).

Office of Communications: Events Management and Integration with Other Institutions. This office is responsible for creating the focus of the day, organizing the planning up to four months out, and coordinating with White House and administration personnel. Dan Bartlett, who heads the office also handles an assessment of how their work was received. While this office is the unit where events are internally planned and executed, it is also the place where they find

out how they are doing and develop strategies in response to what they are discovering.

Office of Media Affairs: Local and Specialty Press. This office deals with the regional and local press. Specialty press, such as Hispanic, Polish, and African-American news organizations, as well as radio, is taken care of through this office. In addition, the website is managed. In the Bush administration, this office is particularly geared towards the follow-up for presidential events. When he goes on the road following a speech, for example, this office handles the local press.

Speechwriting unit: The Words. President Bush came into the White House with a preexisting set of expectations on the part of those used to dealing with presidents. News organizations, government officials at every level, and interest groups counting themselves as important to the president's policy interests, all had expectations of hearing from the president in response to their interests. In their individual ways, each sector preferred to hear publicly from the president, rather than those of surrogates whether they were cabinet secretaries or the press secretary. The communications operation created and provided support for approximately 650 annual public appearances President Bush had in 2001 and then in 2002. In 2001, Mr. Bush had 136 question and answer sessions with reporters and another 19 news conferences. For all these sessions, the communications operation, especially the speechwriting unit, has an enormous load of work. The unit has gone from 10 to 12 staff members from 2001 to 2002.

Coalition Information Centers and Office of Global Communications: Communicating Abroad. The Bush White House added units to focus their communications operations on a world-wide market. They did so with the Coalition Information Centers created after the September 11th attacks and aimed at responding to the publicity attacks against the U.S. in Afghanistan and in Muslim countries where Americas were under attack. Tucker Eskew, who headed the Office of Media Affairs at the time of the September attacks, moved to London to coordinate publicity with Alastair Campbell, spokesperson for Prime Minister Tony Blair. The idea was to have an offensive and defensive operation where the American government and its allies could act within the same news cycle as the opponents, most especially the Taliban. This information battle was assessed successful afterwards.

A more formal and broader effort to combat an unfavorable U.S. image created the Office of Global Communications, a unit established in the White House in July, 2002, and then through an executive order in January, 2003. Eskew, who now heads that office, said that "It's going to be strategic and thematic and proactive. It's going to coordinate among agencies to try to take the President's construct, his framework for communications, and integrate it to what we are already doing." If there is something good that is communications-related and if it deserves to be on the President's schedule or agenda, this office will help elevate it to that level. The office is part of the White House, which indicates the office's importance to Mr. Bush (Kumar, 2003).

The Office of Strategic Initiatives: The most important secondary operation. This office is under the direction of Senior Adviser Karl Rove. His operation maintains liaison with state officials through Political Affairs, and with interest groups through the Office of Public Liaison. With his contacts outside of the White House, he can get a read on the effectiveness of their communications and guidance on where they need to focus their attention with their publicity for the president. This office serves as an echo chamber. An important aspect of Rove's operation is to listen to how they are doing as well as to get information out to those the president and his staff want to reach. This is two-way communication.

(3) The Implementation Level: "Winning the Picture"

Because presidential events are very often covered live on television from beginning to end by cable, the potential resonance of each word means a great deal of attention must be placed on taking advantage of the opportunity to get the president's message across to the public. Karl Rove described the importance of creating pictures that can communicate the message. Rove observed that "in the post-1980 era, we all owe it to Michael Deaver." According to Rove, Deaver said, "Turn off the sound of the television and that's how people are going to decide whether you won the day or lost the day, the quality of the picture. That's what they are going to get the message by, with the sound entirely off." While discussing the importance of pictures, Rove said:

There is a reason why that old saw, a picture is worth a thousand words, how we look, how we sound, and how we project is important. So winning the picture is important and having a president with the right kind of people to drive and hone the emphasis of the message, to be seen in a positive, warm, and strong way. The fact that they are on their best day is important. As in earlier administrations, most especially those of Presidents Reagan and Clinton, White House communications operations focus heavily on getting the picture right (Kumar's interview with Karl Rove).

(4) Control of Departmental Publicity Operations: Root Causes of Success for the Bush Communications Team

Kumar (2003) wrote that "an innovation of President Bush and his team is the successful control they exercise over publicity officers in the departments. While earlier administrations have paid attention to departmental public affairs units, they were not as successful as the Bush administration in controlling the appointment of officials there, coordinating policy themes, and making use of departmental resources." The White House established control over those positions when they came into office.

White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card explained: "I make sure our communications team is not just a team in the White House. It is a communications team for the Executive Branch of government. Our legal team is a legal team for the government." The move to control the release of information by departments is part of a larger effort to control relations of the departments with their outside world. Card explained the type of coordination devices they use to make certain people in the White House and those in the departments understand one another. "There is a call every morning with the communications teams from all of the cabinet agencies. And I know Josh Bolten keeps

in touch with their policy wonk types and White House Counsel Al Gonzales with the lawyers and so White House liaison people are very important too" (Kumar's interview with Card).

Kumar noted that controlling departmental public affairs offices allows the president and his staff to avoid the problem many previous administrations have faced with such units focusing their attention on the departmental secretary and his/her goals rather than those of the president. Victoria Clarke (Torrie Clarke), who was the public affairs officer at the Pentagon during the Second Gulf War worked in the campaign for George W. Bush and worked earlier for his father as well. (Clarke quit her job of Assistant Secretary of the Department of Defense after the war. She was in charge of the "embedded journalism" policy for war coverage, Seol's note.) As the Bush administration began, Mindy Tucker, who worked the Florida shift after the November election, was placed at the Justice Department in the public affairs operation. By having people with demonstrated loyalty to Mr. Bush and with a history of knowing the campaign, Mr. Bush and his staff avoid situations where the departmental spokesperson focuses on his or her attention on the cabinet officer to the detriment of the president. When President Carter was in office, he had trouble with Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Joseph Califano, who often would move in his own direction without consulting with the White House staff on initiatives he was taking, such as his campaign against tobacco usage.

From time to time, newspaper articles appear containing anonymous White House sources pointing out a cabinet member who appears to have strayed too far from his/her own original portfolio. On February

15th, 2003, a *Washington Post* article "A Star with Too Many Points? Critics Fear Candid Rumsfeld Impeded Iraq Coalition" was an anonymous warning from the White House to a cabinet member. In the story about Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and his impact on the administration's foreign policy efforts, an anonymous White House official observed: "Sometimes the stalking horse gets a little far out in front of the parade." Such criticism usually served to rein in the administration official singled out for the White House criticism.

(This section is indebted to Kumar's paper "Communications Operations in the White House of President George W. Bush: Making News on His Terms" (2003). Dr. Kumar sent this paper to the researcher via email on July 7th, 2003. This researcher guesses that she completed writing this paper in the spring of 2003.)

White House Strategies for Projecting Presidential Images: "Squeezing More Juice out of the Orange"

The fact that the Bush administration has adopted a management approach in its governance, and in communications operation in particular, does not necessarily mean that the White House staff view the White House as a company and Mr. Bush as their CEO. White House Deputy Chief of Staff Clay Johnson, who has a great deal of private sector experience, disabused of that notion. Clay said, "For me, one of the biggest differences is that I hear people describe the purpose of the White House as to maximize the value of the president's time and voice. The president's time is an incredible asset. I guarantee

you no company defines their headquarters' role as maximizing the value of their chairman's time and voice." The Bush White House is clearly one in which communication is valued throughout the organization with a structure to make optimal use of the president's time and voice (Kumar, 2003).

To maximize the president's time and voice, White House officials use a variety of techniques to project a positive image of the president. An incumbent president uses his numerous advantages to obtain favorable coverage in the media. The large, well-organized and well-financed White House staff makes elaborate and extensive preparations for the president's appearances at press conferences, public addresses, and ceremonies. It sets the ground rules and picks the locations for appearances by him or other White House officials. Although administrations differ considerably in their attitudes towards news organizations, they use the advantages of incumbency in similar ways to project their version of the president's personal qualities, leadership skills, and policy preferences. Each administration attempts to develop a positive image of the president by focusing the attention of the media on the man and his family. Each presents the president as a vigorous and capable leader. Each emphasizes that the president is an advocate of policies and a political philosophy that reemphasize traditional values while directing the country toward a better future.

Grossman and Kumar (1981) described some techniques employed by White House officials to project a positive image of the president: (1) Projecting personal qualities, (2) Projecting leadership qualities, (3) Projecting policy, and (4) Making the best use of news conferences. In

all these four processes, news organizations play an active role in projecting the president's character and achievements to the public. They often collaborate by presenting a favorable image to the public, especially at the beginning of an administration when many journalists are fascinated by the president's personal habits and are willing to present an uncritical picture of his vision of how he will build the "good society." Grossman and Kumar noted that "an important part in all these attempts is the manner in which news organizations collaborate with or resist White House efforts to exploit the president's advantages" (Grossman and Kumar, 1981, pp. 226-27).

(1) Projecting Personal Qualities

A Man of the People: The White House tries to project an image of the president as a man of the people, even though he is a celebrity with a retinue of aides and attendants whose every activity is followed by the media. Presidents' aides make complicated arrangements and engage in a great deal of promotional activity in this effort *to portray the president as an average citizen* (in Grossman and Kumar's words) or to make media do that (Seol's idea). In the Carter administration, for example, the president arranged to visit small towns such as Clinton, Massachusetts, and Salinas, California, where he stayed with local families before appearing at nationally televised town meetings. On television and in photos, the president was shown sitting at the breakfast table with his hosts. Later he was seen answering townspeople's questions in a setting that emphasized the participatory

and homespun nature of the event. But the preparations for these visits were anything but casual (Grossman and Kumar, 1981, pp. 228-29).

The Family Man: Since the public wants an admirable model of family life, White House officials invariably present the president as the nation's ideal husband, parent, and grandparent. Warm family portraits taken by photographers on the White House staff are available to the media. Photographers who work for news organizations are given opportunities to film the president with his children, grandchildren, and parents. Animals, especially dogs, are also part of the Chief Executive's public domestic life. Theodore Roosevelt's menagerie even included a turkey.

Projecting the President Through the First Lady: The president's wife plays an important role in projecting the image of the administration. The most typical role of the first lady is representing the president at cultural, charitable, and fashionable events. Although some first ladies --- Eleanor Roosevelt, for example --- have followed independent agendas and acquired their own followings, in most cases there has been an attempt to find a symbolic connection between the first lady's activities and those of her husband. Some first ladies become the president's alter ego for those segments of the public that sympathize with his politics but find his personality unattractive. Ford administration officials allowed Betty Ford to display her flair for life and express tolerant social attitudes because her husband was widely viewed as stodgy and conservative. On occasion a

president tries to distract the media from his problems by emphasizing the First Lady's attractive qualities as she performs these activities. John Kennedy used his wife in this way in 1961 when his diplomatic meetings with European leaders failed to achieve either real or symbolic achievements. Kennedy undoubtedly was quite happy to describe his role, as he did, as that of the "man who accompanied Jacqueline Kennedy to Paris."

Using the Children: The president's children, like his wife, often present a difficult target for his enemies to hit and an attractive subject for the media to cover. Like the first lady, the children are thus used as surrogates when it might be difficult or inconvenient for the president to appear. For example, President Ford's son Jack stood in for his father on several occasions during the 1976 presidential campaign. News organizations are interested in the romantic activities of the young adults in the president's family and the play activities of his small children. The weddings of the daughters of Lyndon Johnson (presidency, 1963-69) and Richard Nixon (presidency, 1969-74) were given extensive media attention. During John Kennedy's term (1961-63), his children were a continuing subject of newspaper and magazine stories.

Media Collaboration: News organizations usually are willing partners in White House efforts to publicize the personal life of the president and members of his family. Because his personal qualities are easier to portray than the complex policy developments of his administration,

editors have a larger appetite for family stories than for articles about, for example, governmental reorganization or natural gas deregulation. The desire of news organizations to obtain exclusive personal glimpses of the first family leads to opportunities for considerable manipulation by the White House. Because some reporters know their editors or producers will reward them for exclusive stories featuring the president's personal life, they *may* (Seol's emphasis) exchange favorable coverage of the president in the policy for access to him and his family (Grossman and Kumar, 1981, pp. 231-32).

(2) Projecting Leadership Qualities

White House officials want the media to portray the president as a decisive commander who is well regarded by political chiefs in America and other nations. When they suggest how he should respond to a crisis, implement a decision, or engage in diplomatic meetings, they consider how a particular course of action will "play" in the media. On many occasions, publicity benefits weigh heavily in the decision-making process. Former officials admit that publicity considerations are not neglected when a president decides to send in the marines, fire an unruly and unpopular subordinate, do something to demonstrate that he is an expert who is respected by the nation's intellectuals, or meet with other national leaders.

Appearing Decisive: Military Leadership and Firing Contrary Subordinates. Military decision-making provides great opportunities for

a president to win the respect of the media and the approval of large segments of the public. Most recent presidents have benefited from the public perception that they were decisive military leaders: Roosevelt and Truman during World War II, Truman and Eisenhower in Korea, Eisenhower in Lebanon, Kennedy in Cuba, Johnson and Nixon in Vietnam, and Ford in the Mayaguez incident with Cambodia after the Vietnam War. Presidents often recognize their need to be regarded as decisive by potential adversaries and military allies. Three presidents who served between 1965 and 1975, as well as their staffs and supporters, vowed that the United States would not be viewed to as a helpless, pitiful giant during their terms. Their desire to be portrayed as decisive military leaders by media critics also played an important part in their decisions to use military force (Grossman and Kumar, 1981, pp. 232-33).

A president also hopes to appear strong and decisive when he fires a subordinate who challenges his authority. The decision to remove a subordinate is usually taken because the president and his advisers feel that it is necessary for the president to reaffirm his image as a strong leader. For example, President Ford told a news conference that his decisions to remove Henry Kissinger from his White House post and James Schlesinger from the Defense Department were made because he desired his "team" in positions of authority. After Kissinger and Schlesinger left office, several aides admitted that they had hoped that the president's announcement would show that he and not the powerful Washington figures held over from the Nixon administration, was in charge.

Appearing to Be in Command: The President as Expert and Effective Intellectual. One way to make the president appear to be in command is to portray him as knowledgeable about the problems of the government and the nation. President Kennedy's performances at presidential press conferences are acknowledged to have been prime exhibitions of this quality. Kennedy responded to reporters' questions with detailed information that he seemed to have at his fingertips. This expertise was well rehearsed. Kennedy, like his successors, had the assistance of a staff that was able to predict a majority of the questions and to provide him with the appropriate answers. The White House creates special situations for the president to display his expertise. This was the case when President Ford answered reporters' questions at a special briefing on the budget in January, 1976. Since the budget is a vast, complicated document covering a large number of government activities, the president's ability to field a wide range of questions served to rebut the notion that he lacked intellectual capacity. This, in fact, was the intention of his advisers.

Although presidents are advised to avoid forming too close an identification with the intelligentsia, most recent incumbents have recognized that their ability to mix well with intellectuals adds to their images as leaders who can cope with major problems they must confront. Presidents have appointed economists, political scientists, historians, and sociologists to prominent positions in their administrations. Contacts with writers, philosophers, and artists are also thought to be important to show that the president is capable of the deep understanding of issues that these intellectuals regard as their

special achievement.

Being Recognized as an International Leader. The Value and Problems of Foreign Travel. Meetings between the president and foreign leaders are excellent opportunities for White House officials to portray the president as the embodiment of the national interest. During trips abroad and receptions in Washington, the president participates in impressive ceremonies that are reported by the media, but the actual negotiating sessions are closed. Thus correspondents usually have to accept the version given to them by government briefing officers. In Washington, reporters may be able to get around the blackout because, with so many people in Congress or the bureaucracy informed, someone is likely to talk. In a foreign setting, however, it is difficult for reporters to verify officially released information by checking with independent sources. Stories obtained from "leaks" by members of the president's entourage are likely to be self-serving versions planted by the administration. Finally, the "results" of the meeting often consist of a communique that is difficult for reporters to assess on the spot. In these circumstances, favorable publicity is a reward White House officials expect to obtain from their relations with reporters on presidential trips. Television is their primary target because it shows off the president in a glamorous or exotic setting.

However, the ever-larger press entourages that have followed presidents since Eisenhower's 1959 world swing have created problems for the White House. Foreign trips no longer provide automatic favorable coverage a president once could expect. Many news

organizations send specialists on the host countries in addition to the reporters who describe the ceremonial activities. These specialists often provide a perspective different from the official version.

Nevertheless, foreign travel remains an excellent presidential vehicle for displaying his leadership qualities. Most of the stories that appear on television or in print are straightforward accounts of the planned events of the trip that reflect favorably on what the president is doing. Further, there are many legitimate opportunities for trips that fill a useful diplomatic purpose and also contribute to the president's standing in the polls (Grossman and Kumar, 1981, pp. 235-38).

(3) Projecting Policymaker's Image

Liberal, conservative, and "pragmatic" presidents all use similar formats and forums to project their programs to the public. Often the forum becomes more important than any particular message to be communicated through it. The president may address a joint session of Congress or the opening of the United Nations; he may speak to a meeting of one of the numerous associations that offer him standing invitations; and he may address the nation on radio and television. In 1918 Woodrow Wilson (presidency, 1913-21) resurrected the practice of turning the president's constitutional obligation to "give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union" into a full-dress, personally delivered exhortation to adopt his legislative programs. Subsequently, it has been expected that the State of the Union address will be an occasion for the president to lay major policy proposals

before the public. The White House staff wants the media to emphasize those portions of the speech concerning what the president believes to be the central concerns of his administration. In order to insure that they understand what the president means, reporters generally are given copies several hours before the address is delivered. Aides brief reporters and answer their questions on the substance and style of the speech.

In addition, the president uses the symbols and ceremonies of his office to associate himself with particular causes or programs. Presidents use ceremonies to demonstrate their policy commitments because they are usually telegenic, easy to stage at the White House, and invariably receive coverage on the evening news. Presidents also hold public bill-signing ceremonies; they welcome important domestic or foreign leaders associated with particular policies to the White House; they have their staff arrange conferences on subjects the administration wishes to sponsor; and they call for briefings and conferences at which the president or an aide attempts to enunciate policies.

(4) Making the Best Use of News Conferences

The news conference is most important to news organizations because it is an event in which they are important public players. A presidential appearance almost always is a source of news, but it does not necessarily provide information. Although conferences have been held in many different settings and have been governed by varying

ground rules, control seldom has passed out of the hands of the White House. Reporters usually receive the information the White House plans to give them. A closer look indicates that news conferences always have favored the president.

Press conferences of Franklin Roosevelt have been described as informal events at which the president and reporters exchanged important information and good-natured banter. According to a sentimental version of the history of the relations between the president and reporters, this permissive and fruitful atmosphere soured when everything was placed on the record, and ended with the introduction of the live television news conference. The decision to allow in the cameras reflected White House concern that reporters might be filtering the message the president was trying to get to the public. The televised press conference created a theater in which the president calls upon reporters to play their supporting roles to enhance his starring performance.

The contemporary press conference often is viewed as an open forum where reporters raise questions that concern the interests of the public. Reporters are not limited by constraints like the requirement that existed from 1921 to 1933 that they submit questions in advance. They are not restricted in the use of information that the president declares to be on background, off the record, or subject to review, as was the case before 1961. The absence of constraints, however, has not prevented presidents from maintaining control. The president decides when to hold a conference, how much notice reporters will be given, who will ask the questions, and what the answers will be. The

president has a number of ways to set its tone and control what happens. He may begin the conference with an opening statement in which he announces a decision, appointment, or proposal that may become the basis for a number of reporters' questions. *Thus the ad hoc character of the conference is an illusion* (Seol's emphasis).

Presidents usually receive a thorough preparation for their news conferences. Probable questions are prepared by the staff along with suggested answers. For example, James Hagerty introduced briefing books during the Eisenhower administration in order to gather information from departments and agencies about the issues that might be raised by reporters. Sometimes presidents ask their aides to plant questions when they want to make statements on certain topics. Planting questions was a common tactic during the early years of the public press conference. During the Eisenhower administration, reporters knew that the president called on those whose questions had been cleared in advance by Press Secretary Hagerty. The practice of using planted questions continued throughout the 1960s. Lyndon Johnson in particular thoroughly approved of the practice. Planting questions was such a standard practice during the Eisenhower administration that some foreign diplomats operated on the assumption that every question could be a planted one (Grossman and Kumar, 1981, pp. 241-49).

Media's Framing of Presidential Images

- (1) America's *Imperial Media*: "Frame the Presidents!"

Regardless of how much power the presidents can exert to manipulate media's presidential portrayal, the media have *some leverage* (Seol's emphasis) against the president. Robert M. Entman (1990) described how powerful media can be while reporting on the presidents in his article "The Imperial Media" (DiClerico, 1990, pp. 154-67). Entman argued that the media complicate the task of presidential leadership by equating press interests with the public interest, by dissolving the distinction between public and private leadership, by focusing excessive attention on disputes within the executive branch, and by imposing contradictory expectations on the president. Entman explained how the media framed presidential images:

Media practices thrust the president into the news. Presidential management of the media is often compatible with journalists' needs. But in choosing and defining political news stories, journalists look for powerful cast of characters, for conflict or controversy between its members, and for potential personal impact on audiences (DiClerico, 1990, p. 155).

Moreover, journalists frame their stories based on their own news value system. Entman noted that the processes that journalists use to frame the presidential news stories are fourfold. These processes of framing presidential news may provide grounds for presidential dissatisfaction with their images in the media:

Personalization: the neglect of historical or structural explanations by concentrating on individuals whose deliberate choices cause events.

Source standardization: the use of the same group of informants on the

beat.

Dramatization: the depiction of interactions of news personalities so as to generate audience interest, pity, fear, and catharsis.

Surrogate representation: the enforcement of government responsiveness to the public by pressing politicians to explain candidly their actions, motivations, and plans. (DiClerico, 1990)

Although hindered by president's control over much newsworthy information and constrained by conventional definitions of news, reporters and their editors nonetheless have considerable autonomy, especially in seeking out news that can be narrated as drama unfolding. In the journalists' eyes, drama lies in stories of presidential involvement in domestic conflict and in history-making ventures, usually overseas. Drama is magnified when the outcomes are either highly uncertain or likely to mark a major change (Entman, 1990, pp. 155-56). In recent decades, journalists have taken a more aggressively critical stance toward the presidency since the perceived betrayals of Vietnam and Watergate.

(2) Presidential News Selection: "Important or Interesting?"

News media have their own editorial policy in evaluating the value of presidential news. In the newsroom, there is ongoing conflict over selection between important and interesting presidential news. Cook and Ragsdale (1995) discussed the media definitions of "interesting"

presidential stories. They argued that:

Although the president can designate importance, the media have an advantage in indicating what is interesting. Reporters must "sell" their stories to superiors, who decide both how much to "budget" for a story (paragraphs in print, minutes and seconds in broadcast), and what will go into the news and where. Lacking specific indicators of what the audience wants to read or see, and doubtful, in any case, of the audience's ability to know what is of most value, reporters rely on seat-of-the-pants journalistic standards of interest (Nelson, 1995, pp. 310-12).

This observation is closely related to the arguments offered by Pamela J. Shoemaker and Stephen D. Reese (1996) that messages are conveyed through the filters of media routines, individual factors, organizational influences, and ideological influences. Argument by Herbert Gans (1979) about "enduring values" is also relevant here. Drawing from Gans' criteria of news values, Cook and Ragsdale put forward two sets of considerations for the journalists to rely on for presidential news selection:

A. News must correspond to what Gans calls "product considerations" or what others term "production values." Journalists for all media presume that the more timely, clear-cut, easily described, vivid, colorful, and visualizable something is, the more newsworthy it is.

B. Reporters pay attention to cultural standards of what makes a "good story." Reporters return to what Gans has called the "enduring values" of the news, most overtly displayed in feature stories that celebrate "rugged individualism, mourn the passage of rural and small-town traditions, and discover altruistic leaders" in American life (Nelson, 1995, p. 311).

In this regard, Cook and Ragsdale added that reporters also rely on yesterday's news frequently. They said that "reporters determine the good stories of today based on the past stories."

(3) Categories of Presidential Activities and Relevant Presidential

News

George C. Edwards III and Stephen J. Wayne (1994) discussed presidency in terms of seven areas of presidential activities. These seven categories may in turn shape the categories of presidential news, which will convey the presidential image:

The president and the public: president who is interacting with public and how he is viewed by the public.

The president's office: how he behaves in the White House as chief executive and interacts with vice president.

Presidential decision making (policymaking): how he comes to a decision; This category includes arenas such as domestic, foreign, and defense policy making.

Personalized presidency: how he is portrayed as a human being.

The president and the executive branch: how he leads the executive branch.

The president and Congress: how he prosecutes presidential duties vis-a-vis the Congress.

The president and the judiciary: how he prosecutes presidential duties vis-a-vis the judiciary.

(4) Four Frames of Presidential News and Presidential Images

Are there categories of presidential news? And how can the presidential images be categorized? Cook and Ragsdale (1995) said that in all of the presidential stories, journalists and presidents alike depict an image of *a particular kind of protagonist* (Seol's emphasis).

This concept can be interpreted to be "an ideal of presidential image." Their discussion of the presidential image is well-organized and noteworthy:

The presidential narratives stem from an image of the president as the one person in charge of the government, speaking with a clear, lone voice. In this view, the president is the nation's principal problem solver, the one who identifies the nation's most pressing issues and offers solutions. In times of crisis, presidents single-handedly protect the nation. They symbolize the nation and embody its moral and patriotic values. Thus, when journalists express concern about a president's "drift," "lack of focus," "indecision," "muddle," and "inconsistency," they are implicitly endorsing the single executive image about how presidents should act --- decisively, clearly, and with determination" (Nelson, 1995, pp. 312-13).

This may be the widely held image of the presidency that people have. Cook and Ragsdale discussed four categories of "presidential narratives" (or presidential stories) which emanate from the *single executive image*, which means the single presidential image. They presented the four familiar presidential narratives as following:

A. *The story of the president as problem solver*: The story of the president as domestic problem solver has become a familiar one. Since Theodore Roosevelt (presidency, 1901-09) first introduced the Square Deal and Woodrow Wilson (presidency, 1913-21) followed suit with the

New Freedom, presidents have offered packages of legislative proposals designed to cure the most pressing ills of the nation. Some presidents have obligingly made the story more interesting by giving these proposals names --- the New Deal (Franklin D. Roosevelt, presidency 1933-45), the Fair Deal (Harry S. Truman, presidency 1945-53), the New Frontier (John F. Kennedy, presidency 1961-63), and the Great Society (Lyndon B. Johnson, presidency 1963-69).

The story typically begins at the time of the first State of the Union message, during which the president lays out the problems of the country and promises to fix them. The story is then revisited off and on during the next weeks, months, and years, as the president succeeds or fails in Congress, in the executive branch, and in the public eye. The news story almost always ends the same way --- with some degree of disappointment that the president did not accomplish all that he set out to achieve.

B. *The story of president as international leader:* The story depicts the president as the world leader whose decisions keep the free world free or make the oppressed world free. In the story, the president acts boldly, dramatically, with a sense of crisis, and alone.

Even when the secretaries of defense and state, the national security adviser, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the director of the Central Intelligence Agency are intimately involved in the decisions, the single executive image casts the president as the solitary decision maker, leading the forces of good against the forces of evil. During the cold war, the story was of presidents fighting the red

menace of communism.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, presidents now fight other tyrants and dictators. For example, the story pictured former president George Bush (presidency, 1989-93) as representing the forces of democracy against the "butcher of Bagdad," the former Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein. The story ends on an upbeat note with the president successfully protecting the nation's and the world's best interests.

C. The story of president as representative of the people:

Presidents are also part of a story about the American people in which the president articulates the American dream, American reinvigoration, and American success. In the story, the president acts as national cheerleader, boosting the collective morale of the country. The story is about presidents who match the values, aspirations, even the very lives of their fellow citizens. Thus, the story captures presidents in their ceremonial roles: lighting Christmas trees, laying wreaths at the tombs of war dead, visiting devastated disaster areas, and congratulating victorious athletes and returning astronauts.

It also reveals presidents as ordinary people who enjoy vacation, develop illnesses, and have wayward siblings. This narrative, which resembles the timeless human interest stories that fill out a newspaper or close a television broadcast, is not a continuing story and has no real ending. The ceremonial and ordinary-person aspects of the story capture press attention throughout presidents' terms, even when their popularity is low and news coverage is negative.

D. *The story of the president's mistakes*: This story depicts the president as having committed a major public, political, or policy gaffe. At worst, presidents are presented as villains or, more ambiguously, as naive fools. The story takes two twists. In the first, the president does something that backfires in the world, in Congress, or in public opinion. So, for example, there is the story of Jimmy Carter's ill-fated helicopter rescue attempt of the American hostages in Iran. Former president George Bush's broken promise of "no new taxes" and Gerald Ford's pardon of Richard Nixon are additional examples.

In another story line, the president acts illegally, appears to lie, says things publicly that contradict other reports about an event, or denies being aware of the apparently questionable actions of aides. In each instance, the president acts in a way that is contrary to the single executive image. One of the dominant stories during the Vietnam War was about President Johnson's "credibility gap." Johnson was routinely criticized for claiming ignorance about various efforts that intensified the American involvement in the war, many of which he had expressly ordered and each of which the press exposed in extensive daily war coverage (Nelson, 1997, pp. 312-14).

In sum, the four categories of "presidential narratives" tell the public, the press, and the president what to expect and when to expect it during the course of a presidential term. These narratives often effectively establish boundaries to the negotiation of newsworthiness between the White House and the media. They provide a set number of story lines that journalists are likely to pursue. What is newsworthy

depends on whether the event fits within one or more of the narratives. If the president does something outside the narratives or acts in ways that the narratives do not acknowledge, journalists are less likely to be cooperative in getting the president's message out. In particular, if the president cannot convincingly present himself as the problem solver, international leader, or representative of the people, the media can simply turn to the fourth available narrative of the "presidential mistakes and errors."

(5) Superficiality and Triviality of Presidential Image: "A Fallout"

Edwards and Wayne (1994) addressed the issue of superficiality and triviality in presidential images. According to them, early in the 21st century Woodrow Wilson complained that most reporters were interested in the personal and trivial rather than in principles or policies. The authors argued that things have not changed much in the ensuing generations. In a background briefing in 1979 President Carter complained to reporters:

I would really like for you all as people who relay Washington events to the world to take a look at the substantive questions I have to face as a president and quit dealing almost exclusively with personalities (Edwards and Wayne, 1994, p. 153).

Edwards and Wayne stated that media coverage of national news today is characterized by brevity and simplicity. Editors do not want to bore or confuse their viewers, listeners, or readers. Edwards and Wayne addressed the superficiality of presidential news:

One of the causes of the superficial coverage of the presidency is the demands of news organizations for information that is new and different, personal and intimate, revealing and unexpected. According to the White House correspondent for a major news chain: It's a lot easier for me to get 'my stories' into several newspapers in the chain with a story about Amy, President Carter's daughter, than with a story about an important policy decision. ABC White House correspondent Sam Donaldson once commented in much the same vein. He said that "A clip of convalescent Reagan waving from his window at some circus elephants is going to push an analytical piece about tax cuts off the air every time" (Edwards and Wayne, 1994, p. 156-57).

Edwards and Wayne explained that given the emphasis on the short run and the demand for details of the president's activities, reporters face continual deadlines. There is little time for reflection, analysis, or comprehensive coverage. Washington bureau chief of *Newsweek* once said that "The worst thing in the world that could happen to you is for the President of the United States to choke on a piece of meat, and for you not to be there." This journalist said that when former President Bush vomited at a state dinner in Japan, television networks had a field day, running the tape of the president's illness again and again.

A related factor contributing to the superficiality and triviality of the presidential news is the great deal of money and personnel needed to cover presidents, including following them around the globe on official business and on vacations. Because of this investment and because of the public's interest in the presidents, reporters must come up with something every day.

In addition, there are more than organizational imperatives at work. Reporters' backgrounds and personal interests also underlie the trivialization of the news. When they talk to each other about politics, they emphasize the superficial aspects --- who will be elected, what bills will pass, what personalities the principal actors have, who has

power. The typical White House reporter lacks special background on the presidency. Moreover, the White House press frequently lacks policy expertise relevant to understanding the issues with which the president deals. Thus, its focus on politics and personalities rather than on issues is not surprising (Edwards and Wayne, 1994, pp. 156-57).

Implications of Presidential Images

(1) Presidential Stories vs. Photos

The definitions of the word "image" provided by the Webster dictionary are varied. Among them are: 1) The idea of someone or something that is held by the public, 2) The character projected by someone or something to the public, especially by the mass media, 3) A reputation, and 4) A mental picture of something unreal or not present, and so on. By analogy, an "image" can be defined as "a mental image of something or somebody."

Therefore, "presidential image" may be operationally defined for this thesis as "the overall mental picture or impression that mass media project to the public in the form of stories or photographs."

Scholarly literature, for example, Grossman and Kumar's (1981) "Portraying the President: The White House and the News Media" discussed images of the White House in the media, but they did not give a definition of the presidential image. The definition of presidential image is closely linked to the scope of presidential stories. The two authors evaluated portrayal of the president ("tone of the White House

stories," in the authors' words) as positive (favorable), neutral, or negative (unfavorable).

Often, verbal images of the president and visual images of him differ. The discrepancy in verbal and visual images can be discovered occasionally. Graber (2002) illustrated how this happened in three news media:

The similarities between print and broadcast media in their patterns of coverage do not mean that various media organizations project identical images of public officials. For example, when a local newspaper, an elite newspaper, or network television covered two items --- a proposal by President Ronald Reagan to cut taxes and the president's 1984 trip to Europe --- three different sets of images emerged from the stories. The *Durham Morning Herald*, a local paper from North Carolina with limited resources for independent news analysis, presented accounts drawn largely from the wire services. These stories featured the themes, ideas, and perspectives provided by the White House and cast the president and the events into a favorable light. The elite *New York Times* also reported the White House version of events, but subjected the White House reports to critical analysis. This created a much less rosy impression of the state of affairs. The CBS Evening News presented a more mixed picture. Verbal images were predominantly negative, but visual images, based on presidentially controlled photo opportunities, were highly favorable. Audiences for these three news sources thus were informed about the same events, but the tint of the interpretative lenses varied" (Graber, 2002, p. 275).

Her explanation showed that news stories and news photos may not necessarily go together. Images as depicted through presidential news stories and presidential photos may not be identical. However, the strength of visual images should not be ignored. Hence, the need to content-analyze the presidential stories together with presidential photos. And the relative importance of presidential stories vis-a-vis that of presidential photos varies depending on the media types such as newspaper or television.

(2) President's Media Image vs. Reality

Media image and reality may not go together. Graber (1982) offered a definition of the notion of image as "subjective projections and perceptions of reality, which rarely reflect it with total accuracy." She raised the possibility of differences between image and reality. According to her argument, television made people aware that politics is largely a drama acted out before public audiences. It made them realize that images deserve to be investigated because of, rather than in spite of, the fact that they often diverge from reality in a major way. She presented a representative example of the discrepancy between the two:

Is it wise to study images when reality could be studied instead? The answer is a resounding "yes." Images are reality, even when they grossly distort what is actually happening. People's perceptions are the reality on which they base their actions. In fact, perceptions may be more important than the "real facts," if the real facts remain unknown. President Nixon was reelected in 1972 with a landslide majority of votes because his image remained largely untainted by the Watergate burglary, which had occurred several months earlier. Even after the reality became fully known and understood, the public abandoned its favorable image only reluctantly (Graber, 1982, pp. 15-16).

It is also true that presidential images can be affected by things that are beyond the reach of the president's press relations. According to Rozell (2003), Ford's presidential press secretary Ron Nessen claimed that "no White House can do much about a president's image." In his view, if the economy is sound and people feel secure about their future, the president does not need much stage managing or a crafty media strategy to look good. If the economy falters and people are anxious about the future, however, the president's image suffers, no

matter how articulate he may be or how much he glad-handles the press. Carter press secretary Jody Powell, responding to criticism that Carter's common-man symbolism was at the heart of the administration's image problem, stated that "a president might look good in blue jeans if it is going well and not so good if things are bad." Nessen and Powell are certainly correct to argue that forces larger than presidential press relations (e.g., the inevitable swings of the economy) significantly influence the public's perception of a president's leadership acumen, but the ways in which the public views those larger forces and the adequacy of the president's responses largely are determined by the media (Pfiffner and Davidson, 2003, p. 143).

(3) President's Media Images vs. Media Effects

Arguably, presidential coverage performed by a news organization may have effects on the public. But this research confines its scope to the presidential image conveyed by the *New York Times* and does not touch on its effects. Media scholars differentiate media contents from "media effects" in that the effects presuppose change of attitude or perception on the part of audiences. Audiences can accept media contents selectively, thus lowering the power of media effects. They may show three kinds of reactions: convert their existing perceptions; change their perceptions in a minor way; or reinforce their existing perception (McQuail, 2000, p. 423).

However, it is still elusive whether presidential coverage can affect the public's attitude to the president. Political scientist Cliff Zukin

argued that the strongest effect of the media is reinforcement of the existing attitudes and opinions. In this vein, Graber said that "Most media stories are promptly forgotten. Stories that become part of an individual's fund of knowledge tend to reinforce existing beliefs and feelings. Acquisition of new knowledge or changes in attitude are the exception rather than the rule" (Edwards and Wayne, 2003, p.177).

Although the public may selectively receive the impact from the news media, it is true that media's presidential coverage can build the public agenda. The presidents want to define the situation, and news media follow their lead under certain circumstances.

(4) Presidential Images vs. Public Relations

Presidential image can be shaped by active public relations activity, which may be part of White House media manipulation. Rozell (2003) said that Franklin D. Roosevelt was a superb manager of news and adept at direct popular leadership. Although reporters at that time did not exhibit the same skepticism of official Washington that is customary today, FDR captivated reporters and used them with great effect to promote the White House slant on events by sheer force of his personality and media savvy. For press conferences, reporters abided by White House rules that today would be dismissed as unacceptable: the president determined what information was on-background, off-the-record, or not-for-attribution. Reporters who did not follow the president's rules could be cut off from access to the White House. He requested that reporters who asked what he considered to be foolish

questions wear a figurative dunce cap. FDR also made a point of flattering reporters by using their first names, soliciting their advice on matters of state, and even inviting some to the White House to join the Roosevelts' small, family dinners. Newspapers strictly abided by the White House rule that FDR, who was disabled from polio, not be photographed in a wheelchair or when being carried by his aides. When FDR fell down face-forward in the mud just before he was to deliver his 1936 nomination speech at Philadelphia's Franklin Field, no photographs were taken, and no one reported the mishap. James E. Pollard wrote some 50 years ago that "here was an administration with a concept of public relations far beyond that of any predecessor. Much of the early success of the New Deal was undoubtedly due to the constant steady flow of organized information from the White House and to the fact that most of the working correspondents were on the side of Mr. Roosevelt. He played their game and very often they were inclined to play his" (Pfiffner and Davidson, 2003, p. 137).

Ronald Reagan proved that it was still possible for modern presidents to win the battle of imagery with the media. Reagan, a former movie actor, came to the White House with a unique set of skills conducive to image-crafting. His administration gave high priority to the public relations aspects of the presidency. To a large extent, the president's daily activities were driven by the needs of the news media. Both he and his press relations staffers understood well the relationship between positive coverage and moving forward a policy agenda. David Gergen, then-White House Office of Communications Director, said, "We molded a communications strategy around a

legislative strategy. We very carefully thought through what were the legislative goals we were trying to achieve and then formulated a communications strategy which supported them." During crucial periods of his tenure, Reagan was able to sustain enough public support to pressure Congress into approving his agenda and politically protect himself from the kinds of scandals and investigations that surely would have crippled other presidencies (Pfiffner and Davidson, 2003, p. 141).

Summary of Literature Review and Research Questions

Political scientists argue that favorable presidential image is indispensable for presidents to implement their policy goals. Apart from discussion of the effects of favorable image on the constituents, favorable presidential image is arguably all the more crucial in times of national crisis or when strong national leadership is required.

Traditionally, most American presidents have been discontented with the media's portrayal of them. That is why presidents have continuously made efforts to control and manipulate the media's presidential news and thus to get a positive presidential image. Although the presidents have overwhelming power in the game of getting the favorable presidential image, the media have their own respective power in framing the images of the presidency.

A newspaper can convey the presidential image in the form of straight news, analysis, feature, editorial, column, text, and photos. The news accounts may cover presidential behaviors in the areas of program and policy, ceremonial activity, personal acts, relations with

vice president, interactions with Congress and administration, election, interactions with staff, and relations with the media. Patterns of presidential coverage may change over time.

Presidential stories may cover such areas as (1) The president and the public; (2) The president interacting with vice president; (3) Presidential decision making (policymaking) in arenas such as domestic, foreign, and defense policy making; (4) Personalized presidents as human beings; (5) The leader of the executive branch; (6) The president and Congress; and (7) The president and the judiciary.

Media have tried to satisfy as large an audience as possible by framing presidential stories and ignoring pressures or demands from the White House. The stories that are printed or aired are also the end results that passed their product considerations.

A familiar image of the presidency propounded by Cook and Ragsdale (1997) may be part of the results produced by these complicated interactional processes. The two scholars argued that journalists and presidents alike have an idea of a *particular kind of protagonist*, which means "an ideal of presidential image." They stated that this single executive image of the presidency led to the four popularly held presidential images, which have been repeatedly conveyed and established by the mass media:

- (1) *The story of the president as problem solver,*
- (2) *The story of president as international leader,*
- (3) *The story of president as representative of the people, and*

(4) *The story of the president's mistakes.*

This thesis examined the media image of President W. Bush as conveyed by the *New York Times*. The research proceeded along the theoretical lines described in the literature review during four critical time spans. Although various theoretical frameworks presented in the literature review overlap to some extent, these were examined and refined while the research went on. Simultaneously, this research attempted to find out categories of presidential image not discussed by previous researchers, if any. This research also examined the following four questions:

(1) Was there a "honeymoon period" between the *New York Times* and President George W. Bush in the initial weeks of his presidency?

(2) Was the ratio of positive coverage higher than that of negative coverage? What was the percentage of the two and what do these figures stand for?

(3) The newspaper might have spotlighted President Bush as the leader dealing with a national crisis after September 11, and as the wartime leader during Afghanistan War and Persian Gulf War II. How did the *New York Times* do it? And what does this mean?

(4) Was there superficial or trivial coverage of Mr. Bush?

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

Time Periods for the Research

The time span for this thesis ranged from President Bush's inauguration on January 20th, 2001 to May 1st, 2003, on which day President Bush declared that "major combat operations in Iraq have ended." Bush said that the battle was "one victory in a war on terror that began on September 11th, 2001, and still goes on." This implies that Mr. Bush put great emphasis on U.S. wars on terrorism (*New York Times*, May 2, 2003, A1; *San Jose Mercury News*, May 2, 2003, A1; *Wall Street Journal*, May 2, 2003, A1). His first term of office will end in January, 2005.

This thesis probed how Mr. Bush was portrayed in the following four critical time spans in his presidency. The duration of about one month for each time periods may appear somewhat arbitrary, but the following four time periods are critically significant in Bush's presidency.

Phase I

From Jan 20, 2001 to Feb 19, 2001 (*New York Times*, From 01-21-01 to 02-20-01): Bush's inauguration and jubilation.

Phase II

From Sept 11, 2001 to Oct 6, 2001 (*New York Times*, From 09-12-01

to 10-07-01): September 11th terrorist attacks and period of national grief and consolation for Americans.

Phase III

From Oct 7, 2001 to Nov. 6, 2001 (*New York Times*, From 10-08-01 to 11-07-01): War against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, Beginning of anti-terrorism war. (June 13, 2002: Interim leader Karzai takes over power in Afghanistan, Seol's note.)

Phase IV

From Mar 18, 2003 to May 1, 2003 (*New York Times*, From 03-19-03 to 05-02-03): The Second Persian Gulf War.

(Jan 29, 2002; *New York Times* 01-30-02, Wed): Second State of the Union address. Some remarks about Afghan War.

(Jan 28, 2003; *New York Times* 01-29-03, Wed): Third State of the Union address. Some remarks and forewarning about War in Iraq.

The Scope of Bush Stories and Bush Photos

In evaluating Bush coverage by the *New York Times*, this thesis examined stories that carry "Mr. Bush" in major sections such as National, International, Business Day, World Business, Local Edition, and Weekend (WK). But sections such as Sports, Arts and Entertainment, Television, and Book Review were excluded. Stories on the front page and the penultimate page of section A were given heavier weight in

discussing Bush stories, because stories placed here are regarded as more important.

Story types of President Bush that were examined in this thesis consisted of straight news, analyses, columns, editorials, and photos. The researcher content-analyzed these five types of presidential stories and photos.

Definition of Bush Stories and Bush Photos

What news stories or photos constitute presidential coverage that conveys the images of President George W. Bush? Demarcating the scope of coverage which leads to depiction of presidential image can be the starting line for this research.

In the case of "Bush photos," it may be relatively simple. Photos that contain Bush's face, or his profile, or even his back may be regarded as Bush photos. But it still leaves the question unanswered whether the pictures that contained anti-war protesters who decried Mr. Bush about his war policy against Iraq in 2003 can be included in the Bush photos. In this thesis, these photos are included in the Bush photos.

When it comes to "Bush stories" that can affect Bush's images, it becomes more difficult to define. Grossman and Kumar's (1982) characterization of presidential news seems *deceptively simple* (Seol's comment):

The White House story is the president: who he is, what he does, and what his programs, actions, and goals are. White House media coverage

reflects the public president. The president is the most important continuing story the media deal with; he is of interest even when he is not active (Graber, 1982, pp. 101-02).

Following Grossman and Kumar's line of argument, Bush stories may be regarded as those stories that White House correspondents write about Mr. Bush. They may portray Bush favorably or unfavorably. But according to Grossman and Kumar's (1981) argument, White House reporters are less likely to produce stories that the White House finds offensive than are journalists who write signed columns of opinion and editorials, *because White House reporters need continuing frank discussion with White House officials if they are to get important background information* (p. 35, Seol' emphasis). This will be proved by statistical treatment of reporters' stories in Chapter IV.

In addition, Bush's image may also be affected by reporters who do not cover the White House but report on the effects of White House's or Bush administration's policy borne upon the public. *The scope of news stories or photos that can affect the presidential image either positively or negatively should thus be broadened* (Seol's idea). Straight stories that carry criticisms uttered by Bush's political opponents or critical columns written by columnists or experts of specific policy areas can surely affect the presidential image. Should these stories be included in the Bush story? This thesis included these stories in the "Bush stories" category and evaluated them as affecting Bush's image.

When it comes to various expressions such as "America" or "the United States," which may be a totality of representation symbolized by the president of the United States, the dividing line gets even fuzzier. Must these be included in the Bush stories? If the news stories were

about massive protests inside and outside of America against the "The Second Gulf War", should they be seen as negative presidential coverage, although no express reference to the Bush presidency is found in the stories? Should the opposition of Germany and France against U.S. war on Iraq also be counted into the negative coverage of Bush presidency? Admittedly, these news stories may affect the overall image of President Bush indirectly, given that he is the ultimate decision maker on war policy in the capacity of head of executive branch and commander-in-chief of American forces.

This thesis defined the scope of "Bush coverage" as inclusively as possible to assess the overall Bush's image printed on the pages of the *New York Times* during the four time spans for the research. In this vein, explicit expressions that clearly referred to President George W. Bush or Bush administration was naturally included in the Bush stories. Expressions such as "Bush," "Mr. Bush," "President Bush", "Bush administration," "Bush team," "Bush aides", "The White House," or "the president" that appear in the title, subtitle, or story paragraphs were also included in the "Bush stories." Stories that are clearly linked to Bush image were included in the Bush coverage, even when the stories did not have the expressions shown above.

The following are characterizations of "Bush stories" that this thesis regarded as affecting Bush's image in the *New York Times*:

- 1) Stories that have "Mr. Bush" in the title or subtitle: Yes. These should be naturally regarded as Bush stories. In these stories, Mr. Bush in the title or subtitle clearly tells that the stories discuss Mr. Bush.

Ordinarily, these stories have "Mr. Bush" within the story paragraphs.

2) Stories that do not have "Mr. Bush" in the title or subtitle, but have them within the paragraphs: Yes. These may not be problematic, either. In this case, stories that depict "Mr. Bush" explicitly within the story paragraphs will qualify as Bush stories. In 1) and 2), "Bush" ordinarily serves as the subject of a sentence.

3) Stories that depict Bush as an object of criticism or praise: Yes. When "Mr. Bush" does not appear in the title or subtitle, stories that depict Mr. Bush or his policy as an object to be praised or criticized by others will also be classified as Bush stories. Naturally, these stories affect the image of Mr. Bush favorably or unfavorably. They normally may have an explicit expression(s) "Mr. Bush" within the story paragraphs.

4) Stories that use Mr. Bush merely as a point of reference: No. Even when the title (subtitle) does not mention Mr. Bush, stories may also address "Mr. Bush," but in a very remote manner within the story paragraphs. These stories discuss other main topics apart from Mr. Bush. These will *not* be included in the Bush stories.

5) Stories that have "Mr. Bush" neither in the title nor in the subtitle nor within the story paragraphs: Yes or No. These are problematic. If stories reflect the stream of current presidential affairs or policies, they were included. In case of antiwar demonstrations, even

though the stories or the photos (or captions) did not include "Mr. Bush," these stories or photos were included in Bush stories if they were judged to affect Bush image indirectly to some extent.

Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis of Bush Stories and Photos

The researcher evaluated stories and photos qualitatively, if they were judged to be affecting President Bush's image. A list of evaluations on each day's issue of the *New York Times* was made as shown above.

First, the overall tone or impression of the Bush story was examined. Fairly frequently the titles say whether the coverage is positive or negative. Certain adjectives, nouns, verbs, or phrases that represented the whole image or tone of the Bush story were considered to evaluate the images of stories or photos. But this research has adopted a "holistic approach" in evaluating Bush coverage.

Second, the stories were evaluated and classified into five groups. "Five-stage positive to negative scale" (Seol's idea) was adopted based on the overall impression and analysis of the words or sentences used in the news stories or pictures. The evaluating words will be operationally defined below. This measurement was adopted as a kind of applied Likert-scale measurement.

The researcher made four lists of "Bush's Images" depicted by the *New York Times* based on four time periods. The list for each phase was made up of the following factors:

1. Date and day of the week of the Bush story.

Ex: 03-18-03 (Tue)

2. Serial number of the day's Bush story, the page of the story and its place within the page, and on what subsequent page(s) the story continued were also indicated. These factors indicate how much importance the *New York Times* attaches to the particular news stories or photos. If a story was printed "above the horizontal half-line," it was marked 1; if "under the horizontal half-line," marked 2, thus appearing in the shape of A1-1 or A10-2 (Seol's idea).

If a story occupies the space above the horizontal half-line of each page, then it is regarded as more important than the story under the half-line. When a story starting on top of a page occupied a long vertical column space on the a page, then it was marked "1", because its title was placed above the half-line. When there were a Bush story and relevant Bush photo together, then the one that takes higher place was reckoned.

Ex: 01-21-01, Sun, #1/ A1-1+A14+A16

3. Title, subtitle and other representative sentence(s) were shown.

Next, the name of the reporter was shown after a slash. Titles and subtitles were put on the list. Reporter's name was also indicated.

Ex: 03-18-03, #2, Tue, A1-1+A14, "A New Doctrine of War; In Age of Unseen Enemies, President Says, Waiting for Opponent to Attack Is Suicide" by David Sanger

4. Types of stories and existence of photos were indicated. Five-step coding (+2, +1, 0, -1, -2) of the story (or photo) was marked.

Ex: Str (straight news) + Pho, +2

"Bush Gives 48 Hours, and Vows to Act" (03-18-03, Tue, #1, Str+ Pho, A1-1+A14+A15, +2) by Richard W. Stevenson

5. Remarks, including reasons for evaluation.

Ex: Flattery or Direct criticism.

Afterwards, the list of each day's coding underwent a statistical treatment such as how many stories were positive or negative, how many very negative stories appeared on the front page, etc..

Operational Definition of Positive-Negative Scale

Grossman and Kumar (1982) provided definitions of positive, neutral, and negative coverage. In the content analysis of the presidential coverage, Grossman and Kumar requested two coders to evaluate the general tone of the *New York Times* presidential stories. Based on the results by the two coders, Grossman and Kumar concluded that presidential coverage was unexpectedly favorable. They used "three-stage evaluation" using the terms: *favorable*, *neutral*, and *unfavorable*.

Then they collapsed the results of the two coders into five-step measurement as was shown in the literature review:

Positive-positive,

Positive-neutral,

Neutral (Neutral-Neutral, Positive-negative, or Negative-positive),

Negative-neutral, and

Negative-negative.

Five-Step Evaluation Scale

Grossman and Kumar's (1982) characterizations of favorable, neutral, and unfavorable (or positive, neutral, and negative) coverage read:

(1) Positive : Stories rated "positive" in tone included those that emphasized the president's leadership role, his activities as a family man, his desirable personal qualities, and almost every story that deemphasized conflict and criticism.

(2) Neutral: "Neutral" stories contain contents that both coders found to be neutral and those that contain positive and negative elements which tend to balance each other off.

(3) Negative: "Negative" stories included those that emphasized things that were going wrong for the president, conflict and criticism, what the administration had failed to accomplish, and who wasn't supporting the presidential policies.

This research drew on their methods but used five-step evaluating

words based on the intensity of phrasing or wording (Seol's idea):

Very positive (+2),

Somewhat positive (+1),

Neutral (0),

Somewhat negative (-1),

Very negative (-2).

In addition, the characterization of neutral coverage was not clear in Grossman and Kumar's study. Their definition "*Contents that both coders found to be neutral*" does not provide any criteria. In this study, the present researcher provided more characteristics of positive, neutral, and negative coverage in addition to Grossman and Kumar's definitions:

(1) *Positive*: The researcher added to positive grouping the stories that described President Bush's activities in (great) detail, depicted what he wants to do or say in the future, and even what he thinks of and plans to do. Stories that describe the president with some emotion or in an intimate manner were also grouped under this category.

(2) *Neutral*: A bland description of Bush's behavior, which is not clear whether positive or negative. And a story having both positive and negative descriptions in itself. Some dry descriptions of presidential activities were thought to be really neutral, but the researcher included some of these stories in the positive grouping, because from the

publicity officers' viewpoint these can be positive coverage, which may be journalistically objective.

(3) *Negative*: The researcher added to this grouping the stories that criticized the president. Critical editorials or columns were classified into negative. Stories that convey popular opposition to the president belong here.

There may be some words, nouns, verbs, adjectives, phrases, or sentences which manifestly denote positive or negative images. Words or descriptors used for positive or negative coverage were examined as the content analysis proceeded. Words such as "declare, pledge, vow, and caring" can represent very positive images.

Grossman and Kumar (1982) admitted their content analysis did not provide a definitive portrait of media coverage of the presidency. It may be a bit more difficult to evaluate presidential stories to be clearly positive, neutral, or negative, especially when presidential coverage is interpreted to be more inclusive as in this thesis (Seol's idea).

If media's presidential image is confined to the White House stories reported by White House correspondents alone, the number of the presidential stories may be much less, and analysis of the stories may be simpler. The number of presidential stories counted in Grossman and Kumar study reached 5,270 for 25 years. This means that the coders assessed 210 stories on the *New York Times* for one year, that is, *merely 0.57 story per day* (Seol's emphasis). One factor that made

Grossman and Kumar's (1981) project appear plausible was high correlation (86%, 77%, 87%) between the two coders' assessments.

This researcher coded a total of 575 stories from 134 days' issues of the *New York Times*, that is, *4.29 stories per day*. The number of stories that were judged to affect the image of President Bush (i.e., the number of stories grouped based on the "Scope of Bush Stories and Bush Photos") amounted to 160 (inauguration phase), 124 (September 11th phase), 138 (Afghan War phase), and 153 (Iraq War phase), respectively. Content analysis of the *New York Times* stories (all kinds of stories and photos included) was conducted by coding them on microfilm from June to September, 2003.

It should also be noted that the operational definition of positive, neutral, and negative image differs from ordinary use of the words, because perception of the presidential images can vary depending on the audience's standpoint. To cite an example, Bush's 48-hour ultimatum to Hussein on "*New York Times*, 03-18-03, #1, A1-1" was assessed very positive (+2), considering that he exerted a decisive wartime leadership. But this piece must have had a very negative impact on Middle Easterners. Hence, the need to differentiate media image and impact on audience.

Graber (1982) noted that the impact of adverse coverage is felt more bitterly. Her argument is convincing to some extent. However, considering that how many positive images can offset how many negative images is not yet proven, this thesis simply counted the number of positive, neutral, and negative stories and performed some statistical treatment about positive or negative images of Bush stories

and photos.

Babbie's Advice Applied to Analysis of Presidential Image

Babbie (2001) discussed the concept of "manifest content" and "latent content" in conducting content analysis. Babbie argued that content analysis of the question "how erotic is a novel?" can be measured by counting words like "love, hug, kiss, and caress." He said that this kind of "manifest content" analysis would have the advantage of ease and reliability in coding and that this would let the reader of the research report know precisely how eroticism was measured (Babbie, 2001, p. 310). However, this method would have a disadvantage in terms of validity. Because the erotic novel conveys a richer and deeper meaning than the number of times the word "love" was used. Babbie's solution to this question was an alternative method: coding latent content, which measures underlying meanings. In the previous example, the coder might read an entire novel or a sample of paragraphs or pages and make an overall assessment of how erotic the novel was. This method of "manifest content" and "latent content" analysis is also applicable to analysis of news stories. Grossman and Kumar (1982) did not give detailed instructions to the three coders to have them measure the overall impressions of the presidential stories. Babbie's comment on latent content read:

Clearly, this second method (analysis of latent content) appears better designed for tapping the underlying meaning of communications, but its advantage comes at a cost to reliability and specificity. Especially if *more than one person* (Seol's emphasis) is coding the novel, somewhat

different definitions or standards may be employed. A passage one coder regards as erotic may not seem erotic to another. Even if you do all the coding yourself, there is no guarantee that your definitions and standards will remain constant throughout the enterprise. Moreover, the reader of your research report will likely be uncertain about the definitions you've employed (Babbie, 2001, p. 310).

Babbie's solution to this problem was to use both methods: analysis of both manifest and latent content. He wrote that "Wherever possible, the best solution to this dilemma is to use both methods. It may not necessarily be the absolute solution, but it may be a tolerable solution." The adoption of quantitative and qualitative analysis and then triangulation can be one solution to lower subjectivity of this research.

Triangulation of Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis

For a comprehensive interpretation of the research findings, triangulation of qualitative and quantitative analysis was performed. Research findings from qualitative and quantitative analysis was combined to extract meanings from them. Comparison with previous research or other scholarly work was also provided.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Qualitative Analysis

Phase I

Bush's Inauguration and One Month in Office: "Jubilation, Cabinet Appointments, Successful Transition, and Policy Announcements"

Presidential inauguration is a national celebration. Although there was a heated dispute over the results of the election, most of the Americans followed the decision of the Supreme Court that ruled that Bush was the winner. The *New York Times* stories conveyed or might have led this climate and congratulated George W. Bush as the legitimately-elected president. After the inauguration there ensued cabinet appointments, policy announcements such as education and overseas abortion policy, and Bush's initiatives of funding religious organizations in assisting the underprivileged. Some policies were opposed by relevant organizations affected by them, and this was reflected on the pages of this newspaper.

The *New York Times* conveyed a climate of jubilation, reported personnel appointments and policy announcements, and described Mr. Bush as an international and military leader. With the passage of one week in the Bush presidency, the newspaper ran a spate of stories that assessed the transition as being "smooth and without much fuss."

Positive Coverage

(1) Perfectly Positive Image: Inauguration, Jubilation, Successful Transition, and Appointments

The block-type headline "BUSH TAKING OFFICE, CALLS FOR CIVILITY, COMPASSION AND 'NATION OF CHARACTER' " that spanned the whole width of the newspaper, signaled the beginning of a term of the new president. This straight story subtitled "UNITY IS A THEME; In Inaugural Speech, He Asks Citizens to Seek 'a Common Good' "(01-21-01, #1, A1-1+A14+A16, +2) conveyed what Mr. Bush said in his inaugural speech and described the inauguration. (The notations in the parentheses denote date of issue, serial number of the story on the day, page and place within the page of the story, positive-negative coding, in the order.) Read how the first story on this day was written and grasp the message it tried to convey. In this story, Mr. Bush is the president and a "national unifier":

George Walker Bush was sworn in as the 43rd president of the United States today and, in an Inaugural Address that sought to unify the nation after one of the most disputed elections in its history, asked Americans to match "a commitment to principle with a concern for civility" (Para 1). Mr. Bush used that last word again and again as he sounded a call for a common national purpose that transcended political divisions and partisan tempers (Paragraph 2).

Mr. Bush pledged to dedicate himself to that ideal and, his voice and words as muted in their way as the grey scene around him, spoke of unity and duty and responsibility (Paragraph 4).

"I ask you to be citizens," Mr. Bush said. "Citizens, not spectators. Citizens, not subjects. Responsible citizens, building communities of service and a nation of character (Paragraph 5).

The news analysis on this day titled "Tradition and Legitimacy; A

Nation's Old Rituals Begin to Dissolve Lingering Clouds of a Bitter Election Battle" (01-21-01, #2, A1-1+A16, +2) granted legitimacy to Bush's presidency:

Inevitably, a question mark hung over George W. Bush as he raised his right hand in the chill, damp air of the capital today, and swore to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." But *at that very moment, through that very act, the president started to dispel the challenges to his legitimacy* (Paragraph 1). But *the debate* (about his legitimacy as president, Seol's note) *is likely to grow softer as the nation grows accustomed to pictures of Mr. Bush speaking from the Oval Office, boarding Air Force One, accompanied everywhere he goes by the strains of "Ruffles and Flourishes" and "Hail to the Chief."* ... (Paragraph 5).

On this day, a straight story linking Mr. Bush and his father offered a more emotional flavor to the scene of joy. The story titled "Proud Father and Son Bask in History's Glow" (01-21-01, #3, A1-1+A17, +2) discussed "crying over joy":

In the days leading up to the inauguration *they talked about crying*. Both son and father worried that they would go overboard with it, that a little telegenic mistiness might turn into something soggy (Para 1). President-to-be George W. Bush said that he would not look too long or hard at his dad, lest the floodgates open. *Former President George Bush joked that he had written his doctor to ask if he could "prescribe anything to dry up tears"* (Para 2). But the Bushes were also experiencing something more intimate and nuanced, *a peak moment of shared triumph in a father-son drama that could easily have turned out another way* (Para 7).

The three foregoing stories depicted Mr. Bush as the president, granted legitimacy to him, and described him as the joyful victor of the presidential election.

The next day, a straight story about Bush's first day in office appeared. The story "On First Day, Bush Settles Into a Refitted Oval

Office; He Greets Public After Touring New Home" (01-22-01, #1, A1-1+A12, +2) depicted Mr. Bush's first day at the White House. There was no important message from him, but the front page this story occupies reflects that presidential stories can be important even without significant political messages. (The movement of the Bushes to the White House itself can convey a very important political message, Seol's comment.) The story said that the president "slept pretty well" at the White House on his first night.

At the end of the first week of Bush presidency, the *New York Times* assessed the transition to be successful. A spate of related stories about Bush's "smooth start" appeared. Seven stories discussed Bush's smooth initial days in office.

The title of the story "BUSH'S TRANSITION LARGELY A SUCCESS, ALL SIDES SUGGEST; Careful Planning Seen; Analysts Find a Few Missteps but Note a Deft Touch in Dealing With Congress" (01-28-01, #1, A1-1+A14, +2) eloquently says what this piece is about. The message is easily grasped:

As President Bush completes his first week in office, prominent Republicans and even many Democrats agree that *he has presided over one of the most orderly and politically nimble White House transitions in at least 20 years* (Para 1).

If the first days offer any clue, they say, *Mr. Bush may avoid the kind of stumbles* that disrupted the early days of past presidents and hobbled them as they tried to turn their campaign promises into action (Para 2). Independent academics and analysts as well as politicians in both parties said *Mr. Bush had carefully calibrated his legislative offering* this week by introducing his education package in a way that made it palatable to many Democrats, even as he reassured conservatives by moving to prohibit federal aid to groups that counsel on abortion overseas (Para 3). They said that Mr. Bush displayed a deft touch in stroking lawmakers,

and that *his aides have been surprisingly responsive to members of Congress at a time when previous administrations would still be skirmishing over office space* (Para 4).

And next, the editorial "Mr. Bush's Smooth Start" (02-04-01, Sun, #2, WK16, +1) said that "Democrats in Washington admit to being impressed by the new president's charm offensive" (Para 1). A follow-up editorial "Smart Start on Defense Budgeting" (02-07-01, #3, A18-1, +2) conveyed a similar tone.

A column titled "White House Memo: Presidency Takes Shape With No Fuss, No Sweat" (02-10-01, Sat, #1, A1-1+ A12, +2) provided additional flavor to the stories of successful transition. This added a human and intimate touch to the description:

Every new chief executive inhabits the role in a distinctive way, and *George W. Bush is establishing a no-fuss, no sweat, "look-Ma-no hands" presidency*, his exertions ever measured, his outlook always mirthful (Para 7).

If Bill Clinton's trademark expression was the quarter-bitten lower lip, a deliberate signal of empathy, *Mr. Bush's is the impish grin, a deliberate signal of confidence and good cheer*. He revels in unpretentiousness, and he seems wholly undaunted by his new responsibilities (Para 8).

In this vein, the editorial "Between Two Eras" (02-11-01, Sun, #1, WK16-1, +2) said that "a president who entered office with a shaky mandate is performing above expectations" (Para 1). This editorial also said that "*Mr. Bush takes the presidency seriously*" (Para 2).

One week later, a feature story "Shadow President; This Episode of 'The Clintons' Makes Bush the Star" (02-18-01, Sun, #5, WK4, +1) said that "Mr. Bush's first weeks in office have passed with very little

critical examination in the news media, and the Democrats have been unable to challenge him effectively" (Para 6).

A feature on the same day titled "Week in Review; Entanglements; A New View of Where America Fits in the World; For Bush, taking charge of events means not getting overextended" (02-18-01, #7, WK1 + WK14, +1) conveyed a similar message.

In this regard, political scientist Pfiffner (2003) concurred. He noted that "President George W. Bush's transition into office was one of the shortest, but most efficiently run in recent times. He evaluated:

Because of the growth of the size and scope of the national government, transitions since 1970s have been elaborately planned and bureaucratized. There never seems to be enough time to fully prepare to take over the government. Yet because of the delay in the administrative outcome of the 2000 election, the incoming Bush administration had five fewer weeks for officially preparing to take office, about half as much time as other administrations. *Surprisingly, under the circumstances, they accomplished the major tasks of the transitions* (Seol's emphasis) --- designating a White House staff, naming a cabinet, and laying the groundwork for their initial policy agenda --- with dispatch (Pfiffner and Davidson, 2003, p. 454).

This made a good contrast with his predecessor Bill Clinton. In January, 1993, the images that the *New York Times* drew about then-President Clinton looked totally different. The titles of the following five stories explain themselves:

"Joint Chiefs Fighting Clinton Plan To Allow Homosexuals in Military" (01-23-93, A1-1+A10, Str),

"Clinton Concedes He Erred on Baird Nomination; Aides Say He Continues to Seek a Woman for Attorney General" (01-23-93, A1-1+A9, Str),

"Early Damage Control" (01-23-93, A1-1+A9, Analysis),

"Challenges From a Headstrong Public; Rebuking the Powerful On Baird and Gay Ban" (01-29-93, A1-1+A12, Anal),

and

"CLINTON ACCEPTS DELAY IN LIFTING MILITARY GAY BAN; BOW TO OPPONENTS; President Tells Pentagon to Draft Order for Him to Sign in 6 Months" (01-30-93, A1-1+A8, Str).

(2) The Image of a National Leader, Conciliator or Unifier

The incoming president George W. Bush had to reunite the divided electorate and rally support for him. He emphasized unity of the country in his inaugural address (01-21-01, #1, A1-1) and the *New York Times* analysis (01-21-01, #2, A1-1) seemed to grant legitimacy to him as discussed above. The following stories can be grouped here under this subcategory.

The straight story "Bush, the Conciliator, Meets With Democrats" (02-03-01, Sat, #1, A10-1, +2) conveyed the image of a "national

conciliator" after fierce election disputes:

President Bush *ventured into enemy territory* today, meeting with Senate Democrats to outline his hopes for his first year in office (Para 1). Later in the day, in a speech to Republican members of Congress at a retreat in Williamsburg, Va., he *vowed to make the case for deep tax cuts "over and over again"* until Americans were convinced that his plan would help the middle class and act as a remedy for economic slowdown (Para 2).

The seven stories below falls under this grouping. These stories conveyed Bush's image as a national leader, unifier, and conciliator in various ways:

"Transcript of inaugural address: President; 'I Ask You to Be Citizen' (01-21-01, #7, A14-2 + A15-2, + 2),

"THE SPEECH; In His Inauguration Address, Bush Lingers on a Promise to Care" (01-21-01, #8, A16-2, + 2),

"A Vision of Unity" (01-21-01, #14, Ed, WK16-1, + 1),

"Bush to Attend Democratic Caucuses; But President Restates Stance on Issues That Separate the Parties; Agreeing to a move intended to shift a partisan tone" (01-27-01, #1, A11-1, + 1),

"Bush, in Outreach Bid, Meets Black Caucus" (02-01-01, #2, A1-2 + A18, + 1),

"With Conciliatory Gestures, Bush Reaches Out in Reprise of Successful Clinton Tactic" (02-02-01, #5, A17-2, + 1), and

"A Day of Remembrance in Oklahoma City; Bush dedicates Museum at Site of Oklahoma City Bombing" (02-20-01, #2, A1-1 photo + A12 story, + 2).

(3) The Image of a Policymaker

During the initial days in office, presidents usually announce a number of "ambitious" policies to transform the country to a better place to live. Some are approved and some face public opposition. The news media at first convey what the presidents announce and then they report reactions from the people affected by the policies either positively or negatively. Sometimes government agencies can support the president's policy agenda, thus affecting Bush favorably. The following 16 stories are part of Bush stories as a policymaker:

"BUSH ACTS TO HALT OVERSEAS SPENDING TIED TO ABORTION; Reverses Clinton Policy; Action on 28th Anniversary of Roe v. Wade Limits the Use of Family Planning Aid" (01-23-01, #1, A1-1+ A14+ A16, + 1),

"Education Plan By Bush Shows New Consensus" (01-23-01, #2, A1-1 + A14, + 1),

"THE TAX CUT PLAN: Bush's Proposal to Cut Taxes Is Swiftly Introduced in Senate" (01-23-01, #5, A15-2, +1),

"IN POLICY CHANGE, GREENSPAN BACKS A BROAD TAX CUT; White House Is Pleased; Guarded Endorsement by Fed Chief, Who Says Vigilance Is Needed on Deficits" (01-26-01, #1, A1-1 + C1, +1),

"THE NEW ADMINISTRATION: Early Acts and Last-Minute Moves; THE ABORTION ISSUE: Opponents of Abortion Cheer New Administration" (01-23-01, #7, A16-1, +1),

"Bush Pushes Ambitious Education Plan; Would Use U.S. Aid to Force Schools to Meet Standards" (01-24-01, #1, A1-1+ A14, +2),

"Bush Education Plan Could Have Big Impact Locally; bonus money for improvements by poor students" (01-24-01, #7, B8-1, +1),

"In First Radio Addresses, Bush Softens on School Vouchers" (01-28-01, #3, A14-1, +1),

"NEW BUSH OFFICE SEEKS CLOSER TIES TO CHURCH GROUPS; Academic To Lead Effort; Plan will Seek the Integration of Private Organizations With Social Programs" (01-29-01, #1, A1-1+ A20, +1),

"President Offers Plan to Promote Oil Exploration; Uses California Crisis to Sell Energy Policy" (01-30-01, #1, A1-1+ A20, +2),

"Bush Fleshes Out Details of Proposal to Expand Aid to Religious Organizations" (01-31-01, #6, A15-1, +1),

"Bush Plans Small Rise for Pentagon Pending Review, Aides Say" (02-01-01, #5, A17-1, +1),

"Bush Wants Tax Cut Sooner To Aid Economy This Year" (02-05-01, #4, A12-1, +1),

"BUSH TO PROPOSE MAKING A TAX CUT EFFECTIVE IN 2001; Plan Moved Up By A Year" (02-06-01, #1, A1-1+ A16, +1),

"BUSH IN FIRST STEP TO SHRINK ARSENAL OF U.S. WARHEADS; To Order Defense Review" (02-09-01, #1, A1-1 + A10, +2), and

"BUSH DETAILS PLAN TO FOCUS MILITARY ON NEW WEAPONRY; A Break With The Orthodoxy" (02-14-01, #1, A1-1 + A26, +2).

As shown above, the president's policy areas are limitless. The above stories may be descriptions of the president's policymaking activities in an objective manner (neutral, 0) by the journalists. But from the perspective of the White House public affairs (or public relations) officials, these stories may be products of their publicity activities and thus can be assessed positive coverage (+2 or +1).

(4) The Image of a Decisive Military Leader

During this inauguration period, presidential image as military leader was not salient. However, when Mr. Bush approved U.S. jet attacks on Iraqi "No Fly" zone, the *New York Times* spotlighted Bush's role (or image) as the commander in chief (or military leader). The following five stories fall under this subgroup.

The front page straight story titled "U.S. AND BRITISH JETS STRIKE AIR-DEFENSE CENTERS IN IRAQ; Provocation Cited; Bush Approves Attacks Beyond 'No Fly' Zone" (02-17-01, #1, A1-1+ A4, +1) conveyed the image of a military leader. This story said that "air attacks against radar stations and air defense command centers ... were what Bush called a necessary response to Iraqi provocation" (Para 1).

Then, a relevant news analysis said that "Mr. Bush declared his leadership." The analysis "The World Stage, Act I; First Act For Bush, Declaring Leadership" (02-17-01, #2, A1-1+ A4, +1) justified and highlighted Bush's military action:

On the first four days of what President Bush designated "national security week," he promised troops in Georgia a pay raise, visited NATO outpost ... (Para 1).

He consented to the Pentagon's request to bomb Iraq, ... to make the statement that Mr. Bush, not yet a month into his presidency, had arrived on the world stage, that despite his inexperience there, he was a player (Para 3).

The related excerpt was carried with the title "In the President's Words on the Bombing; 'It's a Routine Mission' " (02-17-01, #4, A4-2,

+ 2).

The relevant editorial "Air Strikes in Iraq" (02-17-01, #5, A16-1, + 1) said that "Yesterday's attack was justified as a response to intensified targeting of allied planes patrolling the 'no-fly' zone."

And a column titled "No Choice But To Strike; To contain Iraq, expect more air strikes" (02-17-01, #7, A17, + 1) justified the attack.

(5) The Image of a Person in Charge: Making Appointments

The *New York Times* ran a spate of appointment stories, conveying the image of Mr. Bush as the person in charge. But the appointment of Ashcroft was controversial. The following 10 stories are part of appointment stories falling under this subcategory:

"Bush Appoints Powell's Son To Lead F.C.C." (01-23-01, #11, C1-1 + C2, + 1),

"Senate Confirms Nominees For E.P.A. and Interior Posts" (01-31-01, #7, A15-2, + 1), and

"Bush's Choice Seen Winning Trade Position" (01-31-01, #8, A15-2, + 1).

However, when it comes to Bush's nomination of Ashcroft as

attorney general, the *New York Times* ran a mix of stories. The editorial "Opposing the Ashcroft Nomination" (01-23-01, #9, A20-1, -2) offered direct opposition to Bush's nomination:

Given this newspaper's long history of defending civil liberties, reproductive freedom, gay rights and racial justice, we cannot endorse Mr. Ashcroft as an appropriate candidate to lead a department charged with providing justice for all Americans (Last para).

With the passage of time, Ashcroft nomination was accepted, and this newspaper ran a story on Congressional confirmation of him. The following shows how the stories evolved:

"SENATE COMMITTEE BACKS BUSH CHOICE FOR JUSTICE DEPT; Ashcroft Vote Is 10 to 8; Heated Debate on Nomination Begins on Floor, With Vote Likely Later This Week" (01-31-01, #1, A1-1 + A14, + 2),

"By Resisting Ashcroft, Democrats Send a Signal; This nomination appears clinched. The fight is over future ones" (01-31-01, W, #3, A14-1, -2),

"Excerpts From Remarks by Hatch and Schumer on Ashcroft's Nomination" (01-31-01, #4, A14-2, -2),

"ASHCROFT DEBATE SHOWS DEEP RIFTS; Democrats Deliver a Message, but Confirmation Is Likely" (02-01-01, #1, A1-1 + A20, -1),

"SEANTE CONFIRMS ASHCROFT AS ATTORNEY GENERAL, 58-42, CLOSING FIVE-WEEK BATTLE; Victory for Bush; But Tally of Democrats Hints at New Fights Over Court Picks" (02-02-01, #1, A1-1 + A16, + 2), and

"EDITORIAL OBSERVER; How George W. Bush Can Reach Black Voters; John Ashcroft makes racial detente much more difficult" (02-03-01, #2, A12-2, -2).

(6) The Image of an International Leader

During this period only a few stories appeared under this category. Bush's scheduled meeting with Vicente Fox was a major story.

A straight story "Bush and Fox Hope Nations Will Become Better Amigos" (01-31-01, #2, A8-1, + 1) portrayed Bush in a positive light:

Presidents Bush and Vicente Fox will meet on Feb. 16 at Mr. Fox's ranch (Para 2).
 "Our common border is no longer a line that divides us, but ... "
 (Para 3).

The following are other news stories which convey the image of Bush as an international leader:

"BUSH DUE TO VISIT MEXICO TO DISCUSS OBTAINING ENERGY; Plan Faces Big Obstacles; President's Vision of Shared Resources Would Be Costly and Legally Challenging" (02-13-01, #1, A1-1+ A10,

+ 1),

"U.S. and Mexico to Open Talks On Freer Migration for Workers; Bush Signaling New Focus on Immigration Issues" (02-16-01, #1, A1-1 + A8, + 1),

"BUSH GIVES MEXICO BACKING ON DRIVE AGAINST NARCOTICS; Annual Review At Issue; President Signals Support for Effort to End a Ritual That Carries Sanction Threat" (02-17-01, #3, A1-1 + A8, + 1),

and "Canada Determined to Be First Neighbor to Bush" (02-05-01, #2, A7-1, + 1).

(7) Projecting Personal Qualities: Intimate and Favorable Coverage

There appeared five personal quality stories which described Mr. Bush in an intimate and favorable light.

A story titled "INAUGURAL DIARY; Great Political Theater With a Touch of Pomp" (01-21-01, #5, A13-1, + 2) described the inaugural dance together with an advance photo on the front page in which the first couple danced:

The sense that American political life resembles a Robert Altman movie has rarely been more vivid than during the parade celebrating George W. Bush's inauguration. In the glare of television lights, the blue and white presidential reviewing stand looked as insubstantial as a stage set. *The leader of the free world, his family and company saluted and waved from behind a barrier of bulletproof plastic, looking tiny as toys* (Para 1).

And a feature story titled "The Nation; Oval Office; Room With a Hue" (01-28-01, Sun, #5, WK16-1, +1) gave additional flavor:

If presidential choices in decor were really any measure of judgment, then the country would have good reason for alarm ... (Para 1). George W. Bush promptly redecorated the Oval Office, replacing Bill Clinton's festive rug-sofa combo with more sober tones reminiscent of the Reagan years (Photo caption).

A column titled "Political Notebook: Back Home In Crawford And Having A Texas Ball" (02-19-01, #1, A13-1, +1) described "a belated inaugural ball staged for President Bush near his 1,600-acre ranch."

The foregoing stories are intimate, soft, and favorable to Bush and his family. The following two stories were already discussed:

"Proud Father and Son Bask in History's Glow" (01-21-01, #3) and

"On First Day, Bush Settles Into a Refitted Oval Office" (01-22-01, #1).

Negative Coverage

During this jubilant one-month period, there appeared only a limited number of negative (-2, -1) stories. The *New York Times* buried one harsh story deep inside, which described people protesting against Bush taking office. Other negative stories were concerned about public's opposition to Bush's new policies. The following eight stories are examples of negative coverage.

The story titled "THE DEMONSTRATIONS: Protesters in the Thousands Sound Off in the Capital" (01-21-01, #9, A17-1, -2) may be interpreted to be a direct opposition to Bush's presidency. Surprisingly, Bush was described as a thief of presidency and an egg was thrown at him:

As President Bush's limousine passed, many waved signs proclaiming "Hail to the Thief." Others carried American flags with corporate logos replacing the 50 stars. An egg was thrown at the president's car (Para 4).

The above story may be a representative example of striking a balance between positive and negative stories. At any rate, it is true that this story reflects part of the people's voice. But this story was buried deep inside. Therefore, the main focus of coverage rested on the positive aspect, that is, congratulating Bush.

An editorial titled "Faith-Based Services" (01-30-01, #6, A22-1, -2) criticized Bush's policy agenda as dangerous:

Mr. Bush's ambitious proposal to channel federal funds to "faith-based" groups to serve social needs is a potentially dangerous erosion of the constitutionally shielded boundary between church and state (Para 1).

The story titled "A Bush Aide Faults Plan to Repeal Estate Tax" (02-10-01, Sat, #4, A10-1, -2) provided a salient example of controversy within the administration. The story was about "rebellion from within." The *New York Times* carried this story on the national edition but crossed it out in the late edition. It was such a sensitive

and disruptive story!

A straight story titled "Bush Team Under Attack on Emissions Talks" (02-16-01, #3, A12-1, -2) was a direct attack on Bush team's environmental policy:

Critics, who include industry executives and some environmental lobbyists, say the administration is betraying a lack of urgency. "Damage is being done right now," said a Washington lobbyist for foreign oil exporters ... (Para 5).

A story titled "Critics Seek To Overturn Abortion Rule; Oppose Bush Limits On Aid Sent Abroad; An old policy, newly reinstated, rekindles an old debate" (02-16-01, #4, A12-1, -2) was direct opposition to Bush's abortion policy abroad:

A bipartisan group of lawmakers mounted a drive in the House and Senate today to overturn the new Bush administration policy on international family planning assistance, which they argue is counterproductive and cruel (Para 1).

A straight story titled "2 Moderate Republicans Oppose Bush Tax Plan as Democrats Offer Their Own; Criticism from two sides raises questions about how deep reductions might be" (02-16-01, #6, A16-1, -2) offered attacks on Bush's tax policy.

A column titled "A Deadly Global Gag Rule; Bush's abortion policy will cost lives overseas" (01-27-01, #4, A15-1, Op-Ed) again faulted Bush's abortion policy abroad.

And a story "Questions Raised On New Bush Plan To End Estate

Tax" (01-29-01, Mon, #2, A1-2 + A21, -2) attacked Bush's tax policy on the front page, thus having greater impact.

As shown above, negative stories are mostly concerned about Bush's policies. Attackers are columnists, people affected adversely by the policies, or interest groups.

Neutral Coverage

Advice to Bush, stories made up of positive and negative parts together in one story, or prediction of his future courses mostly constituted neutral (0) coverage. Read the following four stories.

"A Cliche-Free First 100 Days; Bush must serve sound ideals --- conservative ones" (Column, 01-21-01, #15, WK17-1, 0) was assessed neutral because it did not depict him either in a positive or a negative light. This column gave him advice.

A straight story titled "Bush to Focus on a Favorite Project; Helping Religious Groups Help the Needy; A vigorous debate over church and state is expected" (01-26-01, #2, A17-1, 0) showed a mix of positive and negative coverage, thus evaluated neutral (0).

A straight story "BUSH PROPOSES AID ON MEDICARE; Many in Congress See Need to Rework Program Instead" (01-30-01, #2, A1-1 + A18, 0) is another example of mixing positive and negative contents.

A column titled "Essay: Question Time; Can Bush handle the tough ones?" (02-15-01, #4, A31-1, Op-Ed, 0) raised questions about Bush's future, thus was assessed neutral. This story might have aroused readers' interest.

Phase II

September 11th Attacks and President Bush's Decision to Retaliate

September 11th terrorist attacks on America in 2001 had a tremendous impact on the American political arena as well as on the international society. This made a great turning point in American diplomacy and in Bush's presidency. The whole world was "artificially" reorganized by Mr. Bush into terrorist bloc on the one hand and anti-terrorist bloc led by America on the other. The *New York Times* stories portrayed President Bush as a national as well as an international leader on the counter-terrorism battlefield. The newspaper also shed light on his role as a "national soother" and then as a "crisis leader," which was hardly witnessed previously. Mr. Bush rallied support for this war on the Taliban regime, but he decided to act largely alone. In this process, there occurred controversy among Bush aides over the scope of retaliation against Afghanistan.

Positive Coverage

- (1) The Image of a Crisis Leader or Military Leader

The banner headlines on the September 12, 2001 issue of the *New York Times* showed the shocks Americans experienced at the sight of the surprise attacks. Stories conveyed and described the magnitude of shocks Americans received.

The first story about the attacks was titled "U.S. ATTACKED; HIJACKED JETS DESTROY TWIN TOWERS AND HIT PENTAGON IN DAY OF TERROR; President Vows to Exact Punishment for 'Evil'+ A14, Bush Commits U.S. to Hunt Down Both Terrorists and Their Supporters" (09-12-01, Wed, #1, A1-1+ A14, +2) conveyed the shocks, Bush's somber mood, and his intention to revenge:

Hijackers rammed jetliners into each of New York's World Trade Center towers yesterday, toppling both in a hellish storm of ash, glass, smoke and leaping victims, while a third jetliner crashed into the Pentagon in Virginia. There was no official count, but *President Bush said thousands had perished*, and in the immediate aftermath the calamity was already being ranked the worst and most audacious terror attack in American history (Para 1).

The attacks seemed carefully coordinated. The hijacked planes were all en route to California, and therefore gorged with fuel, ... (Para2).

President Bush, facing his first major crisis in office, vowed that the United States would hunt down and punish those responsible for the "evil, despicable acts of terror" which, he said, took thousands of American lives. He said the United States would make no distinction between those who carried out the hijackings and those who harbored and supported them (Para 16).

"These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat, but they have failed," a somber president told the nation in an address from the Oval Office shortly after 8:30 p.m. (Para 17).

"The search is under way for those who are behind these evil acts," Mr. Bush said. "We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them" (Para 18).

A relevant story titled "A Somber Bush Says Terrorism Cannot Prevail" (09-12-01, #2, A1-2+ A4, +2) delivered his solemn message

of retaliation and his efforts to calm the nation:

President Bush *vowed tonight to retaliate against those responsible* for today's attacks on New York and Washington, declaring that he would "make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them." "These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat, but they have failed," the president said in his first speech to the nation from the Oval Office. "Our country is strong. Terrorist acts can shake the foundation of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America" (Para 1). His brief speech this evening came after a day of trauma that seems destined to define his presidency. *Seeking to at once calm the nation and declare his determination to exact retribution, he told a country numbed by repeated scenes of carnage that "these acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve"* (Para 2).

This story demonstrated an unshaken, strong national leadership at the sight of the unheard-of national crisis on the American soil. Mr. Bush also showed his deep faith in the American system.

The straight story "AFTER THE ATTACKS; Washington's Responses; THE PRESIDENT; Bush Labels Aerial Terrorist Attacks 'Acts of War' " (09-13-01, #2, A15-1, +2) conveyed Bush's message that he defined it as acts of war:

President Bush *declared today that the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were "acts of war."* He spent much of the day trying to rally an international coalition for what would become a massive military response --- once the enemy was identified (Para 1).

The story titled "BUSH AND TOP AIDES PROCLAIM POLICY OF 'ENDING' STATES THAT BACK TERROR; LOCAL AIRPORTS SHUT AFTER AN ARREST; President to Visit New York --- bin Laden Singled Out" (09-14-01, Fri, #1, A1-1 + A18, +2) depicted Bush as vowing a comprehensive campaign:

The Bush administration today singled out Osama bin Laden, the Islamic militant who operates from Afghanistan, as a prime suspect in Tuesday's catastrophic terror attacks and *vowed a comprehensive military campaign* to demolish terrorist networks and topple regimes that harbor them (Para 1).

A related news analysis under the title "No Middle Ground Exists In War Against Terrorism" (09-14-01, #2, A1-1 + A4, +2) explained Bush's policy lines imposing a stark choice on other countries:

Sketching in the outline of an aggressive new American foreign policy, the Bush administration today gave the nations of the world a stark choice: stand with us against terrorism or face the certain prospect of death and destruction (Para 1).

One of the representative examples of military leadership may be the story about Bush ordering the military to get ready. The straight story titled "BUSH TELLS THE MILITARY TO 'GET READY'; BROADER SPY POWERS GAINING SUPPORT; Long Battle Seen; 'We're at War,' He Says --- Support in Poll for Armed Response" (09-16-01, Sun, #1, A1-1 + A5 + A6, +2) conveyed Bush's resolve to wage a war:

President Bush told American military today to get ready for a long war against terrorism, and vowed to "do what it takes to win" (Para 1)
In a brief appearance with his senior advisers at Camp David, where they met to plan the new offensive, Mr. Bush said point-blank: "We're at war. There's been an act of war declared upon America by terrorists, and we will respond accordingly" (Para 2).
"My message is for everybody who wears the uniform to get ready," Mr. Bush said (Para 3).

A straight story titled "BUSH ORDERS HEAVY BOMBERS NEAR AFGHANS; DEMANDS BIN LADEN NOW, NOT NEGOTIATIONS;

Deploys Warships; President Is Addressing Congress Tonight to Lay Out His Aims" (09-20-01, #1, A1-1 + B6, +2) forewarned an impending war decision:

President Bush ordered heavy bombers and other aircraft to within easy striking distance of Afghanistan and insisted that its ruling Taliban turn over Osama bin Laden and other suspected leaders of a terrorist organization believed to be behind last week's attacks in New York and Washington (Para 1).

The story titled "BUSH PLEDGES ATTACK ON AFGHANISTAN UNLESS IT SURRENDERS BIN LADEN NOW; HE CREATES CABINET POST FOR SECURITY; Bar Talks, Saying Hosts Will Share the Terrorists' Fate" (09-21-01, #1, A1-1 + B4, +2) showed Bush's resoluteness and forcefulness:

President Bush demanded tonight that Afghanistan's leaders immediately deliver Osama bin Laden and his network and close down every terrorist camp in the country or face military attack by the United States (Para 1).

"These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion," the president said in an address to a joint meeting of Congress (Para 2).

The story titled "BUSH SAYS 'TIME IS RUNNING OUT'; U.S. PLANS TO ACT LARGELY ALONE; Rumsfeld Returns; Administration Says It Has Enough Backing for Long Campaign" (10-07-01, #1, A1-1 + B5, +2) sounded like an ultimatum. This story offered the image of a strong military leader and conveyed the urgency of the situation:

Working with the fluid coalitions of friendly countries whose tasks are still undefined, President Bush warned the Taliban government of Afghanistan today that "full warning has been given, and time is running out" (Para 1).

With the advent of September 11th attacks, Bush's presidency has taken a totally new direction. The story titled "In Four Days, a National Crisis Changes Bush's Presidency" (09-16-01, #2, A1-2 + A19, +2) shed light on the transformation of Bush presidency:

In the course of the next four days, George W. Bush was transformed into a president at the helm of the White House, and a nation, in crisis (Para 5).

By this morning with downtown Washington locked down by the military, he was conducting a war council at Camp David and demanding that countries around the world, starting with the Arab world, declare whether they were allies in the war on terrorism (Para 6).

He seemed far steadier than he had in the week. He told the cabinet what he had seen in New York, calling the scene "the signs of the first battle of war." ... (Penultimate Para)

"This is a great nation, we're kind and peaceful," Mr. Bush said. "But they have stirred up the might of the American people, and we're going to get them" (Last Para).

(Connected with this, the *New York Times* carried a front story to this effect again on Jan 1, 2002. The story titled "Taking Command in Crisis, Bush Wields New Powers" said that Bush himself signed an order freezing the assets in the United States, which were suspected of having Islamic terrorist linkage. He did it instead of letting Treasury Secretary Paul H. O'Neill announce the measure to reinforce the message that Mr. Bush would direct the war against terrorism on many fronts.)

A story titled "THE PRESIDENT; In This Crisis, Bush Is Writing His Own Script" (09-19-01, #6, B11-2, +2) said that expressions like "want him dead or alive," "evil-doers," and "smoke them out and get them running" are things of Bush's own making. This was an intimate, personal, and soft story written by Elisabeth Bumiller, White House correspondent.

A column titled "WHITE HOUSE MEMO: For President, a Mission and a Role in History + B2, Role Finds Bush Onstage, Waiting; Shoulders that once shrugged now broaden with weighty resolve" (09-22-01, #3, A1-1 + B2, +2) conveyed a very important message that emphasized the purpose of the Bush administration:

"*This* (war on terrorism, Seol's note)," Mr. Bush told them, "*is the purpose of this administration*" (Para 4). One of the president's close acquaintances outside the White House said Mr. Bush clearly feels *he has encountered his reason of being*, a conviction informed and shaped by the president's own strain of Christianity (Para 8).

Retrospectively speaking, this story forecast the future course of the Bush administration (Seol's comment). "His sense of purpose of his administration and his encountering of his reason of being" became the foundation of his policy of war on terrorism, which became a buzzword since September 11th attacks.

The following four stories fall under this subgroup. See what they are about.

"U.S. PUTS AFGHAN STRIKE AHEAD OF FULL PLAN; BUSH REWARDING PAKISTAN FOR ITS SUPPORT; Focus On Bin Laden; Officials Say Course of War on Terrorism Is Still to be Decided" (09-22-01, #1, A1-1 + B4, +1) forewarned an imminent retaliation.

"PRESIDENT SAYS U.S. IS 'IN HOT PURSUIT' OF TERROR GROUP; A Guerrilla War; Allied Units Reportedly Entered Afghanistan --- No U.S. Word" (09-29-01, #1, A1-1 + B4, +2) said that the U.S.

embarked on the pursuit of terror groups but did not confirm the report.

"Bush Approves Covert Aid for Taliban Foes; \$100 Million to Help Refugees Is Also Set" (10-01-01, #1, A1-1 + B2, +2) was related to this development.

"Bin Laden Is Wanted in Attacks, 'Dead or Alive,' President Says" (09-18-01, #1, A1-1 + B4, +2) portrayed Bush as the punisher.

(2) The Image of a National Soother

Just after the crisis period after September 11th attacks, Bush acted the national soother who solaced victims and visited attacked sites.

The image of national soother was provided by the story "BUSH LEADS PRAYER, VISITS AID CREWS; CONGRESS BACKS USE OF ARMED FORCES; A Day of Mourning; President, in New York Offers Resolute Vows Atop the Rubble" (09-15-01, #1, A1-1 + A6, +2).

When Mr. Bush visited New York City, his image as the national conciliator was highlighted. A column titled "WHITE HOUSE MEMO: Two Strangers, Bush and New York City, Meet and Embrace in Calamity's Wake" (09-15-01, #4, A6-2, +2) said that "rescue workers cheered the president when he shook hands with Mr. Giuliani and Mr. Pataki, Democrats of New York City, which was 'a foreign place' for Republican Bush."

(3) Projecting Personal Qualities and First Family

While Mr. Bush's image as a crisis leader or military leader represented resoluteness, the *New York Times* ran soft stories of the First Family. Soother's role may also be played by the First Lady.

The story titled "THE FORMER PRESIDENT; Juggling Being a Father to a Son and a President" (09-14-01, #4, A18-2, +1) depicted the burden of the presidency during the crisis by borrowing words of Bush's father:

He is a former president but also a father, and he commingled those roles today, speaking protectively of his son while also *reflecting on the burden of confronting a global challenge from the loneliness of the Oval Office* (Para 1).

"I talk quite regularly to our son," the 41st president said affectionately of the 43rd president. "I've been doing that since he was a little kid" (Para 2).

A story titled "The Pennsylvania Crash; 44 Victims Are Remembered and Lauded; The first lady and a governor join the victims' families" (09-18-01, #4, B11-2, +1) conveyed Laura Bush's image as a national soother. This story also carried a photo of Laura Bush and Gov. Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania:

Some 240 relatives had traveled here from all over the country. Mrs. Bush, who arrived from Washington, told them that while America shared in their grief, and that of all the other victims in last week's terrorist attacks, the burden was greatest for the surviving relatives (Para 7).

"America is learning the names, but you know the people," she said at the service. "And you are the ones they thought of in the last moments of life. You're the ones they called, and prayed to see again. You are the ones they loved" (Para 8).

The story titled "THE FIRST LADY: Mrs. Bush Introduces Concert For Families; Music Meant to Soothe at Kennedy Center" (09-25-01, #6, B7-1, +1) convey a similar image:

Adding high culture to *her increasingly public role as a grief counselor for the nation*, Laura Bush tonight inaugurated a Kennedy Center concert of opera, jazz and folk music that was organized to raise money for the families of those who died in the attacks on September 11 (Para 1). Some relatives of the victims were in the audience, ready to listen to the music that Mrs. Bush called "the speech of the angels," and they gave her a loud, long round of applause (Para 2). Mrs. Bush quickly cut it off with a no-nonsense chop of her hand (Para 3). "I'm the one who should be applauding all of you," she said from the stage of the concert hall (Para 4).

(4) Other Stories That Depict Bush Positively

Stories that described other events can sometimes affect Bush favorably. Read the following three stories.

"THE RESOLUTION; Measure Backing Bush's Use of Force Is as Broad as a Declaration of War, Experts Say; Congress walks a fine line of showing unity and retaining power" (09-18-01, #3, B7-2, +1) shows that Congressional resolution backing Bush's proposition affects him favorably.

"WASHINGTON RESPONSE; Congress Joins In Support Of President" (09-21-01, #8, B6-1, +2) is a follow-up to the above.

"Bush 'Is My Commander,' Gore Declares in Call for Unity; Urging

support for the president in an effort to seek justice, not revenge" (09-30-01, Sun, #1, A29-1, + 2) also belongs here.

Negative Coverage

The *New York Times* did not run many negative stories. This period was such a time of crisis that the situation did not allow for room for criticism. But columnist William Safire criticized Mr. Bush for not having come back to the Washington area just after the attacks. The column titled "Essay; New Day of Infamy; The questions we must answer" (09-12-01, #5, A27, Op-Ed, -2) said:

But the Secret Service took full charge of President Bush, who was in Florida, running him secretly around the country making a nervous tape. Even in the first horrified moments, this was never seen a nuclear attack by a foreign power. *Bush should have insisted on coming right back to the Washington area, broadcasting --- live and calm --- from some secure facility not far from the White House* (Para 14).

In the president's absence from the city, Vice President Dick Cheney hurried to the Situation Room. No Haigian "I'm in charge" was needed, but an earlier and more visible sense of steadiness would have helped. Despite the evacuation of executive and Congressional offices, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld visited his wounded Pentagon troops and Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, remained in place (Para 15).

In an apparent response to this, a straight story appeared on the front page the next day under the title "Aides Say Bush Was One Target Of Hijacked Jet" (09-13-01, #1, A1-2 + A16, + 1). This piece said that "there was hard evidence that Bush was a target of terrorists."

In a counter-argument, Safire again wrote a follow-up column titled

"Essay; Inside The Bunker; The view from the 'President's Emergency Operations Center' " (09-13-01, #7, A27-2, Op-Ed, -2):

The most worrisome aspect of these revelations has to do with the credibility of the "Air Force One is next" message. It is described clearly as a treat, not a friendly warning --- but if so, why would the terrorists send the message? More to the point, how did they get the code-word information and transponder know-how that established their *mala fides*? (Penultimate Para).

"Bush Advisers Split on Scope of Retaliation" (09-20-01, #2, A1-1 + B5, -2) revealed disarray in front of the enemy. This was a rare piece of negative coverage on the front page:

The Bush administration is struggling with its first high-level quarrels over the scope and timing of its military response to last week's attack on the United States (Para 1). Some senior administration officials, led by Paul Wolfowitz ... earliest and broadest military campaign ... (Para 2). In response to these efforts, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell take the time to prepare the diplomatic groundwork for American military action ... (Para 5).

This visible split within the administration was soon resolved with a follow-up story titled "From Many Voices Advising Bush, One War Strategy; A Bush team often at odds before September 11 has since coalesced" (09-23-01, Sun, #3, A1-1 + B2, +2).

"SAFETY AND LIBERTY; Senate Democrat Opposes White House's Antiterrorism Plan and Proposes Alternative; Concerns that citizens' rights might be curtailed unnecessarily" (09-20-01, #5, B6-2, -2) was additional criticism to Bush's harsh counter-terrorism policy.

In this respect, the story "Lawmakers Tap Brakes on Bush's Hurtling

Anti-terrorism Measure" (09-25-01, #5, B7-1, -2) was additional opposing voice to Bush.

A news analysis titled "Issue Now; Does U.S. Have a Plan?" (09-27-01, #3, A1-1, -2) was a rare front page criticism to Bush's war plan. This piece said that "The rhetoric was rousing, but what form of military action to take appears to be an increasingly awkward issue" (Para 3).

A column titled "New Fears, New Alliances" (10-02-01, #1, A24-1, -2) carried a harsh criticism to the effect that "without any systematic analysis, without the usual process of review among government departments, the United States has adopted an entirely new foreign policy ... " (Para 1).

Neutral Coverage

Predictions, explanatory stories, and columns offering advice fell under this grouping. The following four stories are examples:

"Awaiting the Aftershocks; Washington and Nation Plunge Into Fight With Enemy Hard to Identify and Punish" (09-12-01, #4, A1-2 + A24, 0) was a prediction and explanation about the situation. This piece said that "For Mr. Bush the attacks constitute a threat and an opportunity."

"A New War And Its Scale" (09-17-01, #2, A1-2 + A3, 0) was

another explanatory piece.

The editorial titled "Nation-Building in Afghanistan" (09-27-01, #4, A20-2, 0) was advice to Bush as to what he should do in Afghanistan.

"MILITARY CALLED JUST ONE ELEMENT IN WAR ON TERROR; Briefing for Nato; Skepticism Among Allies --- Some Want to See bin Laden Evidence" (09-27-01, #1, A1-1 + B2, 0) was a mix of positive and negative contents.

Phase III

War in Afghanistan

News coverage during this period showed forceful military leadership of Mr. Bush, who made efforts to garner international cooperation. But he was forced to act largely alone and was hated by portions of Arabs. He showed some international leadership. In the war efforts, President Bush was supported by Democrats but was criticized by part of intellectuals. Although this war was retaliatory in nature, opposition to it was not negligible. During this period the image of Mr. Bush as a decisive military leader was more salient. This period was differentiated from Phase II, considering that military attacks on Afghanistan started.

Positive Coverage

(1) The Image of a Decisive Military Leader

The straight story titled "U.S. AND BRITAIN STRIKE AFGHANISTAN, AIMING AT BASES AND TERRORIST CAMPS; BUSH WARNS 'TALIBAN WILL PAY A PRICE'; Bomb and Missile Attacks --- Bin Laden Issues Threat" (10-08-01, Mon, #1, A1-1 + B3, +2) marked the start of the real retaliatory war. This piece showed Bush's strong military leadership:

Striking at night from aircraft carriers and distant bases, the United States and Britain launched a powerful barrage of cruise missiles and long-range bombers against Afghanistan today to try to destroy the terrorist training camps of Osama bin Laden's Qaeda network and the Taliban government that has protected it (Para 1).

"On my orders, the United States military has begun strikes," President Bush said in a televised statement from the White House at 1 p.m., just more than an hour after the first explosions were reported in Kabul, the Afghan capital (Para 2).

"These carefully targeted actions are designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations and to attack the military capability of the Taliban regime," Mr. Bush said (Para 3).

A related story titled "THE PLANNING; Quietly, Carefully, President Worked Toward a Decision on Attack - Aid Combination" (10-08-01, #6, B6-1, +2) was a supplementary piece to the above story. This piece made a good contrast with the above-mentioned column "New Fears, New Alliances," (10-02-01, A25-1) which denounced lack of systematic analysis before adopting a new foreign policy.

"THE PLANNING; A Look Behind the Scenes, From White House Aides" (10-09-01, #1, B7-1, +2) described the scenes where Mr. Bush decided upon military strikes. This was a detailed and intimate description of the things that happened in the White House situation

room, as narrated by the aides:

On Friday (Oct. 5th, Seol's note) morning in the White House situation room President Bush turned to General Richard B. Meyers, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and asked, "Dick, is Tommy Franks ready to go?" He was referring to the crusty Army general who commands the American military in the Middle East and South Asia, and who was rapidly assembling forces for the coming war in Afghanistan (Para 1). Assured that General Franks was prepared to strike, the president said, "All right, then we are ready to go," according to the first detailed account of the past few days provided by senior White House officials (Para 2).

"In One Month, A Presidency Is Transformed; A Leader With No Time For the Plans of Sept. 10" (10-11-01, #3, B1-1 + B11, +1) conveyed an image of "decisive Bush." This straight story described how Bush has transformed in a month (Bush's transformation was already discussed in Phase II):

Inside and outside the White House, friends and advisers who once complained that the president had trouble getting his bearings when faced with a panoply of issues now assert that *he is focused as never before* (Para 5).

"*He appears different up close*," said Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, a Democrat who has found himself in a new, warm relationship with Mr. Bush. "He has a resolve, he has a confidence. He still has the same way of putting people at ease but you can see that this is somebody who is in the process of rising to the occasion (Para 6).

Mr. Bush's ratings are at historic highs, greater than even those of his father after the Persian Gulf War. ... (Para 7).

"BUSH OFFERS TALIBAN '2ND CHANCE' TO YIELD; SAYS HE'D WELCOME U.N. IN NATION-BUILDING; FBI ISSUES ALERT ON SIGNS OF NEW TERROR; 'Just Bring Him In'; President Hints He Will Halt War if bin Laden Is Handed Over" (10-12-01, #1, A1-1+ B5, +2) showed Bush's powerful leadership in chasing bin Laden and in asking for the role of the United Nations in the reconstruction of Afghanistan.

"PRESIDENT REJECTS OFFER BY TALIBAN FOR NEGOTIATIONS; Demands Surrender of bin Laden --- U.S. Bombs Fall in Kabul" (10-15-01, #1, A1-1 + B2, +2) by Elisabeth Bumiller is a follow-up story.

The editorial "Mr. Bush's New Gravitas" (10-12-01, #5, A24-1, +2) offered a eulogy to Mr. Bush. Bush became a different man:

The George W. Bush who addressed the nation at a prime-time news conference yesterday appeared to be a different man from the one who was just barely elected president last year, or even the man who led the country a month ago. He seemed more confident, determined and sure of his purpose and was in full command of the complete array of political and military challenges that he faces in the wake of the terrible terrorist attacks of Sept. 11. It was for the most part a reassuring performance that gave comfort to an uneasy nation (Para 1).

"MEDIA WATCH; To Reassure World, Bush Flies Confidently and Forcefully Without a Net" (10-12-01, #7, B5-1, +2) is another piece praising Bush's confident leadership.

"Bush's War Troika Seeking Blend of Military and Civilian Decision-Making; An old issue of how much oversight to impose on field commanders" (10-24-01, #3, B1-1 + B2, +2) gave additional flavor to Bush's wartime leadership.

"THE WHITE HOUSE; Bush Plans Speeches With Coherent, Unified Message; The president moves to counter the stumbles in war-related information" (11-02-01, #6, B7-1, +1) showed how much emphasis Bush put on communications in his war on terror:

President Bush is planning several major speeches next week to counteract what some administration officials say has been a muddled effort to project a coherent, convincing message to Americans about the war in Afghanistan and their safety at home (Para 1).

Mr. Bush's speeches and appearances, one administration official said, was the first element in a new strategy of simplifying the messages that have come in a cascade of at times uncoordinated briefings from the White House, the Pentagon, the State Department and other government agencies (Para 2).

At the same time, American and British officials have set up shop in the Indian Treaty Room of the Old Executive Office Building, *preparing a daily message to be broadcast around the world about the goals of the war on terrorism --- and to reply to Taliban contentions of bombs gone awry, planes shot down and villages destroyed (Para 3).*

"For a President at War, Refuge at Camp David" (11-05-01, #1, A1-2 + B6, +1) was an intimate and favorable description of how Mr. Bush conducts the war on terrorism:

The plan had been to spend nearly every weekend at the Texas ranch, with the White House serving as a kind of Monday-to-midday-Friday pied-a-terre away from what was really home. *But then came Sept. 11, when George W. Bush was transformed into a wartime president who could no longer be seen fishing for long weekends in Crawford while sending Americans to fight in Afghanistan (Para 1).*

As a result, Mr. Bush is spending more time than he ever imagined at Camp David, the presidential retreat in the Catoctin Mountains of Maryland that was born in another wartime, 1942, when Franklin D. Roosevelt picked it as an antidote to the stresses of the White House and named it Shangri-La (Para 2).

It was at Camp David, Mr. Bush said, that the military campaign in Afghanistan was "first born" with his decision made on a Saturday morning, Oct. 6, to order the first wave of B-2 bombers from Missouri to their Afghan targets (Para 5).

"A president can never get away from his job," said the current President Bush, "but Camp David is set up for a president to both work and relax" (Last Para).

And Bush's photo captioned "AND HERE'S THE PITCH; President Bush threw the ceremonial first pitch last night at Yankee Stadium just before Game 3 of the World Series" (10-31-01, #1, A1-1, +2) was meant to symbolize that Americans returned to the normal life after September 11th.

(2) The Image of an International Leader

President Bush's summit meetings with President Jiang Zemin of China and President Vladimir Putin of Russia were instances of president's international leadership. Mr. Bush garnered support from them in fighting terrorism.

The photo captioned "First Meeting for Bush and Jiang; Mr. Bush emphasized his intention to press forward with the American fight against terrorism" (10-19-01, #1, A1-1) and the related straight story titled "THE PRESIDENT; Bush Meets China's Leader and Emphasizes Need to Fight Terrorism Together; Trying for detente, despite Republican distrust of China's military buildup" (10-19-01, #1-1, B4, +2) described Bush's efforts to gain China's cooperation:

President Bush and President Jiang Zemin of China met for the first time here this morning and emerged with Mr. Bush declaring that China had agreed to "cooperate with intelligence matters and interdict the financing" of major terrorist groups (Para 1).

A follow-up story titled "BUSH MEETS JIANG; Citing Support for War, President Plays Down Contentious Issues" (10-20-01, #1, A1-1 + B4, +2) reported that he won support from Jiang:

President Bush said here today that "support is near unanimous" among Pacific Rim nations for both the military strikes in Afghanistan and the broader war he has declared against terrorism (Para 1).

In another story, "Putin Sees Pact With U.S. On Revising ABM

Treaty; Would Let Bush Proceed on Missile Shield" (10-22-01, #1, A1-1 + A8, +1) sounded like another success for Bush.

(3) Presidential Image Making Through First Lady

Laura Bush's photo appeared with a title and a caption: A Special Storytime; Laura Bush read 'Grandfather's Journey' by Allen Say to 18 kindergarteners in Newark yesterday (10-17-01, #3, D5-2, +1). The first lady's visit was part of Teach for America Week 2001. Teach for America recruits college graduates to teach in schools in poor neighborhoods. Mrs. Bush, a former teacher, also gave a geography lesson and hugged the 5-year olds.

(4) Other Stories That Depict Bush Positively

The story "Rome Journal; A Bush Admirer Longs to Join America's A-List; A plan for a pro-American rally in Rome riles both right and left" (10-20-01, #2, A4-1, +2) provided a favorable image of Bush.

And the story titled "Bush Winning Gore Backers' High Praises; Foreign Policy Choices Seen as Ideal for Crises; Many Democrats are having a quiet change of heart on the president" (10-20-01, #5, B1-1 + B6, +2) is another example.

Negative Coverage

(1) Stories and Columns Conveying Opposition to Bush's War Plan

Bush's war plan met with a variety of opposition in and out of America. Some columns reminded Americans of the Vietnam quagmire and some said that guns won't win the Afghan war.

A column titled "A Military Quagmire Remembered; Afghanistan as Vietnam; Worries that sending ground troops would lead to a long war" (10-31-01, #5, B1-1 + B3, -1) sounded a warning by reminding the readers of Vietnam:

Like an unwelcome specter from an unhappy past, *the ominous word "quagmire" has begun to haunt conversations among government officials and students of foreign policy*, both here and abroad (Para 1). *Could Afghanistan become another Vietnam?* Is the United States facing another stalemate on the other side of the world? ... (Para 2). Strategically, the United States could benefit in Afghanistan from the Taliban's unpopularity with many Afghans, but American bombs falling on civilian targets will not win Afghan "hearts and minds" (Third from last Para).

Another column titled "Guns Won't Win the Afghan War; Only diplomacy and covert action can oust Al Qaeda" (Column, 11-04-01, #7, WK13, Op-Ed, -1) argued:

Neither the current bombing campaign nor the deployment of American ground forces to Afghanistan offers good military options for dealings with the Taliban and Al Qaeda. A better approach would emphasize ground-level diplomacy, with open wallets, among Pashtun leaders in central and southern Afghanistan, the fullest use of Pakistani intelligence and influence ... (Para 1).

A story titled "U.S. Appears to Be Losing Public Relations War So Far" (10-28-01, #3, B8-1, -1) gave a warning:

The Bush administration has belatedly deployed its forces for a propaganda to win over the Arab public. But the campaign, intended to convince doubters that the American attacks on Afghanistan are justified and its Middle East policy is evenhanded, has so far proved ineffectual (Para 1).

Thousands of words from American officials, it appears, have proved no match for the last week's news, which produced a barrage of pictures of wounded Afghan children and of Israeli tanks rolling into Palestine villages (Para 2).

A story titled "PROTESTS; In Streets of Pakistani Cities, Cries of 'Death to America!'; 'Bush is a dog! Israel is a dog! Russia is a dog!' a group chants" (10-09-01, #3, B9, -1) provided a different view of Bush:

Quetta's day of protests began with a student rally organized by Jamat-e-Ulema-e-Islam, the militant religious party whose leader was placed under house arrest n Sunday. Muhammad Noor, another of the party's leaders, told the crowd, "If there is no peace in Afghanistan, there will be no peace anywhere in the world." The response came in unison: "Death to America!" and "Stop the strikes!" (Para 23).

A story titled "Survey Shows Doubts Stirring On Terror War" (10-30-01, #1, A1-1 + B6, -1) represented doubts about the war in the form of a survey.

"THE CONTINENT; Public Apprehension Felt In Europe Over the Goals Of Afghanistan Bombings" (11-01-01, #6, B2, -1) reflected Europeans' view of the Afghan War.

"More and More, Other Countries See the War as Solely America's" (11-04-01, #3, B1-1 + B2, -1) provided a sobering view of the war.

(2) Other Stories That Depicted Bush Negatively

The editorial "Half a Commander in Chief" (11-05-01, #2, A16-1, -1) criticized that Bush could not control domestic affairs, because he concentrated his energies on war in Afghanistan:

America seems to be governed by two presidents. The George W. Bush who is commander in chief has been keeping the country united at a time when the war in Afghanistan has run into problems. But *the George W. Bush running domestic policy is an entirely different person*, less a leader than a narrowly focused politician. If America is to fight terrorism within its own borders and conquer the economic recession, the commander in chief is going to have to take control at home, too (Para 1).

"White House Memo: Home Front Is a Minefield For President" (10-25-01, #1, A1-1 + B8, -2) carried a similar tone.

A column titled "Abroad at Home: Mr. Bush's New World; His foreign policy turned upside down" (10-13-01, #1, A23-1, Op-Ed, -2) was additional criticism against Bush's abrupt about-face in foreign policy. The columnist argued that "Demonizing China as a potential enemy has disappeared with the need to enlist Beijing in the alliance against terrorism" (Para 4).

"Bush Is Said to Scale Back His Religion-Based Initiative; But He Hopes to Push for Full Bill Next Year" (10-14-01, #2, A18-1, -1) showed that Bush retracted from his previous policy after having faced opposition.

"G.O.P. Not Relying on Aid From Bush in '02 Elections; His Popularity May Not Translate Into Votes; Will the president's desire to appear bipartisan cost his party support?" (11-04-01, #2, A28-1, -1)

was coded negative in that this story detracted from the political value that Bush possesses.

Neutral Coverage

"POLITICAL MEMO: On Home Front, Bush Seeks to Avoid His Father's Fate" (10-09-01, #2, B7-2, 0) was coded neutral (0). It was neither positive nor negative.

"Charities: Bush Voices Pride in Aid, But Groups List Hurdles" (10-17-01, #1, B3-1, 0) was a mix of positive and negative sentences, and thus was coded neutral.

The editorial "The War Has Just Begun" (10-27-01, #1, A18-1, 0) was a bland piece of writing, neither praise nor criticism.

"THE DEBATE: Gauging the Use of Ground Troops and the Scale of the Afghan War" (Column, 11-04-01, #5, B3-1, 0) was explanatory in nature, thus was coded neutral.

Phase IV

War Against Iraq

The presidential image of this period can be characterized as a decisive wartime (or military) leadership. How the *New York Times* portrayed Mr. Bush as a wartime leader was the focus of analysis for

this period. Broadly speaking, the *New York Times* highlighted Bush's wartime leadership in a sophisticated and balanced manner, reflecting opposing voices from inside and outside of America. Presidential news appeared at crucial moments to provide meanings to certain critical turning points. For this, Mr. Bush might have made timely statements.

This newspaper portrayed Mr. Bush as a resolute wartime leader, provided authenticity and justification to his "pre-emptive strike" logic, and described war successes as expressed by Mr. Bush. This newspaper also conveyed human and intimate aspects of Mr. Bush in conducting the war. The cream of positive coverage may be the highlighting of media control policy (i.e., embedded journalism) on the battlefield to get favorable war coverage.

Positive Coverage

Arguably, America's war on Iraq officially started on March 17, 2003 (*New York Times*, 03-18-03), with President Bush's address to the nation (an ultimatum) "giving Saddam Hussein 48 hours to leave Iraq." Previously, Mr. Bush vowed repeatedly to disarm Iraq, regarding the country as a serious threat to America in his State of the Union address (*New York Times*, 01-29-03). Mr. Bush called Iraq, Iran, and North Korea "an Axis of Evil" in the State of the Union address, while emphasizing "Secure America is top priority" (*New York Times*, 01-30-02).

(1) The Image of a Military Leader

The top story on the March 18, 2003, issue of the *New York Times* had a full-length headline "Bush Gives Hussein 48 Hours, and Vows to Act; Ready to Attack; Diplomatic Effort *Ends* (Seol's emphasis) --- Terror Alert Level Is Raised for U.S." (03-18-03, #1, A1-1 + A15 + A14, transcript, +2). The story conveyed the image of a forceful military leader:

President Bush tonight gave Saddam Hussein 48 hours to go into exile or face attack from the United States and a handful of allies (Para 1). In an address to the nation from the White House, made hours after he *abandoned* attempts to forge a united diplomatic front against Iraq, Mr. Bush made clear that hostilities could begin as soon as his two-day ultimatum expires, perhaps sooner if Mr. Hussein openly spurns the demand from the United States that ... (Para 2). For the president, the speech marked a *failed end* to six months of diplomacy intended to convince skeptical allies like France and ... (Para 4). Having unable to get the United Nations behind him, Mr. Bush now faces a war with *only Britain* providing substantial military support and many other nations --- as well as a portion of domestic public opinion --- *condemning him* for what they have called a *rush to war* (Para 5).

As the italicized parts within the story show, the account itself appears to be quite balanced, conveying Bush's message and representing opposition to the war. But the headline carried a very stern message and it was strongly-worded; "time limit of 48 hours" and the phrases *vow to act* and *ready to attack* give a strong impact. The subtitle "Diplomatic Effort *Ends*" instead of "*Fails*" is favorable to Bush. Therefore, the appraisal was very positive (+2) to Bush's image. This piece represents a strong military leadership.

Connected to this, the front-page news analysis (03-18-03, #2, A1-1+ A14, +2) titled "A New Doctrine for War; In Age of Unseen Enemies, President Says, Waiting for Opponent to Attack 'Is Suicide' "

justified Bush's decision on war by providing theoretical backing, i.e., the pre-emptive strike logic, thus was assessed to be very positive (+ 2):

His argument for deposing Saddam Hussein boiled down to one precept. *In an age of unseen enemies who make no formal declarations of war, waiting to act after America's foes "have struck first is not self-defense, it is suicide"* (Para 2).

President Bush thus turned America's first new national security strategy in 50 years --- the doctrine of pre-emptive military action against potential enemies amassing weapons of mass destruction --- into the rationale for America's latest war (Para 3).

It is an aggressive view of America's duty that Mr. Bush never discussed during his presidential campaign, ... Yet he began to embrace that strategy within months of entering the Oval Office, and *it became his fierce passion after Sept. 11, 2001.* ... (Para 4).

"Bush's Speech on Iraq; 'Saddam Hussein and His Sons Must Leave'; A transcript of President Bush's speech as recorded by *the New York Times*" (03-18-03, #5, A14-2, +2) was appraised very positive (+2), because the transcript conveyed verbatim what Bush had said, neither edited nor interpreted.

According to Maltese (2003), presidents like to appeal directly to the nation (or "to go public") and the transcript may be a means of direct appeal (Pfiffner and Davidson, 2003, pp. 146-58).

A column "Good Reasons for Going Around the U.N.; The war might be illegal, but it could still be legitimate" (03-18-03, Tue, #11, A33-1, Op-Ed, +1) additionally justified Bush's war decision and his going around the U.N.:

By giving up on the Security Council, the Bush administration has started on a course that could be called "illegal but legitimate," a course that could end up, paradoxically, winning United Nations approval for a military campaign in Iraq --- though only after an invasion (Para 2). The relevant history here is from Kosovo. In 1999, the United States,

expecting a Russian veto of military intervention to stop Serbian attacks on ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, sidestepped the United Nations completely and sought authorization for the use of force within NATO itself (Para 3).

"The President's Day; Just Another Day, Except for Its Conclusion" (A14-1, +1) described how calmly Bush came to the war decision.

A straight story "BUSH ORDERS START OF WAR ON IRAQ; MISSILES APPARENTLY MISS HUSSEIN; President Warns of Difficulty --- Airstrikes on Baghdad" (03-20-03, #1, A1+A20, +2) conveyed presidential image of a strong wartime leader:

President Bush ordered the start of a war against Iraq on Wednesday night and American forces poised on the country's southern border and at sea began strikes to disarm the country, including an apparently unsuccessful attempt to kill Saddam Hussein (Paragraph 1). Mr. Bush addressed the nation from the Oval Office at 10:15 pm ... (Paragraph 2). He added, "These are opening stages of what will be a broad and concerted campaign" (Paragraph 3).

A story tracing the roots of pre-emptive strike against Iraq appeared. The story "Pre-emption; Idea with a Lineage Whose Time Has Come" (03-23-03, Sun, #2, B1-2, +2) was a follow-up to the above analysis (03-18-03, #2, A14). This analysis explained that Republican conservatives such as Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz pushed the preemption strategy to President Bush.

The straight story titled "Bush Warns That the War in Iraq May Last Longer Than Expected" (03-23-03, #3, B10-1, +2) was meant to prepare Americans' psychology for a longer war:

President Bush gathered his war council at Camp David this morning, while warning that the war in Iraq "could be longer and more difficult than some have predicted" (Para 1).

Mr. Bush's caution reflected a concern that the relatively quick progress made by forces moving through southern Iraq ... could create expectations of a quick victory (Para 2).

This story was brought up again the next day in the form of an analysis "Lowering Expectations; As Iraqi Resistance Stiffens, Bush Moves To Prepare U.S. Public for a Harder War" (03-24-03, Mon, #1, A1-2 + B2, + 2):

Like a coach seeking psychological advantage, President Bush pressed an effort today to temper public anticipation of an early, relatively painless victory in the fighting in Iraq (Para 1).

"It is evident that it's going to take a while to achieve our objective," the President said on the White House lawn after returning from Camp David (Para 2).

This topic was brought up for the third time in the form of a straight news, but the story appeared on the inside page, reflecting that this was not a new story.

The story "Commander in Chief; Bush Pleased by Progress, Tries to Lower Expectations" (03-24-03, Mon, #2, B12-2, + 2) said that Mr. Bush delivered the same message at the White House, not at Camp David as previously.

A strong war message was delivered when Mr. Bush met with British Prime Minister Tony Blair. Leaders of America and Britain vowed to finish off Saddam Hussein's regime. The story "War to Keep Going Until Regime Ends, Bush and Blair Say" (03-28-03, #1, A1-2+B13, + 2) read:

President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair of Britain stood side by side at Camp David today, defending the progress of the war in Iraq and *in their vow to finish off Saddam Hussein regime no matter how long and trying the battles ahead* (Para 1).

Mr. Bush said *the war would last "however long it takes to win,"* and that the coalition led by American and British forces was advancing day by day, in steady progress (Para 2).

A straight story appeared on the front page with a headline: "WHITE HOUSE SAYS WAR IS 'ON TRACK'; SHOW OF SUPPORT; Bush Assails Hussein --- Syria and Iran Warned Not to Interfere" (03-29-03, Sat, #1, A1-1+B11, +2). This piece said that the war is on track, a positive image to Bush.

President Bush stated that Saddam's government does not exist as a result of military attacks. The story titled "BUSH SAYS REGIME IN IRAQ IS NO MORE; SYRIA IS PENALIZED; Cutting an Oil Pipeline; U.S. Is Also Pressing Iran as It Tries to Reshape Region With a New Democracy" (04-16-03, Wed, #2, A1-1 + B3, +2) is additional example:

President Bush *declared* today that "the regime of Saddam Hussein is no more," and his administration used America's rapid success in overthrowing the Iraqi leader to put new pressure on Iran and Syria, neighbors of the newly occupied nation (Para 1).

The second Persian Gulf War *seemed to end* (Seol's emphasis) when Bush declared victory on May 1st, 2003. The straight news titled "Bush Declares 'One Victory in a War on Terror'; He Says Military Phase in Iraq Has Ended" (05-02-03, Fri, #1, A1-1 + A 16, +2) showed that Mr. Bush was a leader of the victor country and that he ended the war

successfully by this declaration:

President Bush declared tonight that the military phase of the battle to topple Saddam Hussein's government was "one victory" in a war on terror that began on Sept. 11th, 2001, and still goes on (Para 1). Speaking from the deck of the aircraft carrier Abraham Lincoln before thousands of uniformed sailors and aviators as the ship approached San Diego Harbor, he argued that by vanquishing Mr. Hussein's government, he had removed "an ally of Al Qaeda," and he vowed to continue to search for banned weapons in Iraq ... (Para 2).

(2) The Image of an International Leader

A story titled "Japanese Prime Minister Supports U.S. On Iraq Stance" (*New York Times*, 03-19-03, #4, A20-2, +1) was assessed to be positive (+1) to Bush's image as an international leader. The story said that "In the face of strong and growing opposition, Japan's Premier Junichiro Koizumi expressed strong support for the United States' ultimatum to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq ... " (Para 1).

Bush's visit to Belfast was depicted in a very favorable light on three consecutive days. Before Mr. Bush went to Belfast a story appeared with a title "Bush Visit Is Viewed as Hopeful Sign for Ulster Impasse" (04-07-03, Mon, #1, A2-2, +2).

The next day, a follow-up story appeared on the front page under the title "BUSH MEETS BLAIR; Conference in Belfast Over Role of U.N. in Iraq After the War" (04-08-03, Tue, #1, A1-1 + B9, +1). This piece said that the two leaders "turned their attention to planning for a post-war Iraq, seeking to bridge their differences over how much of a

role to give the United Nations in rebuilding the country and putting together a new government."

An editorial on this day titled "After the War" (04-08-03, #2, A22-1, +2) said that "Though more fighting lies ahead before the government of Saddam Hussein is crushed, Mr. Bush and Mr. Blair *wisely decided* (Seol's emphasis) to get together yesterday in Northern Ireland to start making decisions about the future of Iraq" (Para 2).

(This topic was rehashed in the form of an analysis titled "After the Conflict; Bush's Next Role; Mediator in Disputes Over Running Postwar Iraq; Two more battles; The United States vs. Europe, and State vs. Defense" (04-08-03, #3, B9-2, 0). This piece discussed the future role of Mr. Bush over Iraq in a dry style, and thus was assessed neutral.)

A favorable analysis appeared concerning Bush's message. The analysis "Bush's War Message; Strong and Clear" (04-09-03, Wed, #1, A1-2 + B6, +2) put a flattering spin on the story:

At least for the moment, the political planets seem to be sliding into alignment for President Bush, and he looked and sounded as if he knew it when he appeared in Belfast, Northern Ireland, for a news conference with Prime Minister Tony Blair of Britain (Para 1).

Mr. Bush was *self-assured, blunt-spoken and aggressive*. For once, *the English language seemed his ally* rather than his worst enemy. He betrayed not the slightest doubt about the decisions he has made on the war in Iraq so far or the ones he faces (Para 2).

A related straight story appeared on the same day under the title "Bush Sees Aid Role of U.N. as Limited In Rebuilding Iraq" (04-09-03, #2, A1-2 + B7, +1). This piece said that "President Bush pledged to

grant the United Nation a 'vital role' in postwar Iraq, but defined that principally as providing food, medicine and aid" (Para 1).

Another straight story followed under the title "Bush Pledges to Help as Ulster Nears a Junction in Peace Path" (04-09-03, #3, A4-2, + 1) by Warren Hoge in Hillsborough. This story said that "President Bush gave the Northern Ireland peace effort *a push at a timely moment.*"

A front straight story appeared under the title "BUSH URGING U.N. TO LIFT SANCTIONS IMPOSED ON IRAQ; 12 Years of Trade Curbs; Oil Money Seen as Paying for Rebuilding, but Plan Could Reignite Council Feud" (04-17-03, #1, A1-1+ B36, + 2) fell under this subgroup.

The same topic reappeared two days later under the title "Bush Plans to Ask U.N. to Lift Penalties Against Iraq in Phases; Oil-for-Food Program Would Continue" (04-19-03, Sat, #1, A1-1 + B6, + 2).

(3) Projection of Personal Qualities: Intimate Coverage

The *New York Times* carried fairly many stories revealing personal qualities or conveying intimate and soft aspects of the president. These stories might have softened the harsh images of the wartime leader or might have been intended to show that war is conducted by human beings.

"TV Watch: Soft Words That Convey a Hard Line" (03-18-03, #9, A18-2, +2) approached "blind flattery" and sounded quite subjective.

Read how the story is written:

President Bush's final warning to Saddam Hussein was to "get out of Dodge," but *his tone was less hard-nosed sheriff than Mr. Rogers gently urging a child to put down the loaded pistol* (Paragraph 1). For months, Mr. Bush has appeared *unwaveringly confident* about his showdown with Mr. Hussein. Viewers know he is convinced. Last night, with war approaching, Mr. Bush tried to be convincing (Para 2).

This piece was followed by another story "Days of Waiting and Wondering Ends with Word from President" (03-20-03, #2, A1-2 + A20, +2). This story described very favorably the way President Bush delivered the speech:

President Bush picked up a copy of the speech in which he would *tell the world* that he had launched military strikes to topple Saddam Hussein. He gave *a little shake of his fist*, according to a person who saw the scene on a television monitor ... (Para 1). Two hours later, Mr. Bush sat down in the Oval Office behind what is known the "*Resolute*" desk, which was donated to the United States ... (Para 8).

At the height of the war, a straight story described how much Mr. Bush was involved in this war. The story titled "President, No Matter Where, Keeps Battlefield Close" (03-30-03, Sun, #2, B1-1+ B11, +2) highlighted Bush's serious involvement in this war:

George W. Bush was standing three feet from his television screen in his cabin at Camp David last weekend, *absorbed in every detail of the news from Iraq*, when a correspondent came on to report that the president of the United States, according to White House officials, was not glued to TV (Para 1). Mr. Bush started laughing, said his close friend Ronald Betts, who was with the president at the time (Para 2). "He is just totally immersed," Mr. Betts said in an interview. Mr. Betts said that he and Mr. Bush talked of little else but the war over the last

two days at Camp David last weekend, and that the president regularly turned in to the cable channels for updates on Iraq. When Mr. Bush saw something that concerned him, Mr. Betts said, he picked up the phone to tell Condoleezza Rice, his national security adviser who was at nearby cabin to look into it (Para 3).

A week and a half into the invasion of Iraq, friends and administration officials say the president has emerged as *an engrossed commander in chief, who is far more gripped by daily battlefield developments than his father was in the first Persian Gulf War* (Para 4).

This piece may be an extremely detailed portrayal of the president's acts in conducting a war from the journalist's viewpoint, but it sounded like a "disguised" flattery to the president. It is also soft in nature.

A column with soft touches about Mr. Bush appeared in the form of a reporter's column under the title "White House Letter: Another President Bush Watches on the Sidelines" (04-07-03, #3, B2-1, + 2). This column, printed together with the photograph of former President Bush, described how the "41st" president (Bush senior) provided the "43rd" with the psychological assistance in this war:

So far, Mr. Bush's only public comments about the war have been *totally in support of his son*, even when he is asked why this White House failed to build the kind of international coalition that he did in support of the first gulf war. The situation was different then, Mr. Bush says, because the objective of driving the Iraqis from Kuwait was much clearer (Para 11).

One photograph of Mr. Bush visiting wounded soldiers appeared on the front page. The photo (04-12-03, Sat, #1, A1-1, + 2) was assessed to be very positive. The caption of this photo did not indicate whether the photo was related to any story, but a relevant story titled "THE PRESIDENT; Bush Says Hussein Is Out, But War Is Not Yet Over; The president handed out 13 Purple Hearts" (04-12-03, #5, B9-1, + 1) was

printed inside. The caption that preceded the story read:

SOLDIER'S HONOR: Visiting troops wounded in Iraq, President Bush gave a Purple Heart yesterday to Army Sgt. First Class Thomas Douglas, with his wife, Donna, at Water Reed Army Medical Center in Washington.

A story about an emotional scene watched from inside the White House appeared. This straight story titled "How 3 Weeks of War in Iraq Looked From the Oval Office" (04-14-03, Mon, #1, A1-2 + B11, + 2) described the scene in which Bush came to his decision on the war against Iraq, while Mr. Powell supported him psychologically:

Then the administration's warrior-turned-diplomat, Secretary of State Colin Powell, *reached out to touch the president's hand*. It was a *gesture of support*, but it was born, perhaps, of an understanding that the risks ahead were beyond the president's experience (Para 3).

Two more favorable columns revealing Bush's human aspects ensued. The one under the title "WHITE HOUSE MEMO: Bush Shows Looser Side in an Interview" (04-26-03, Sat, #1, A13-1, + 2) read:

Even when President Bush was in the middle of a meeting during the most critical moment of the war in Iraq, White House staff members would fetch him whenever the black-is-white Iraqi information minister, Muhammed Said al-Sahhaf appeared on television. Mr. Bush, it turns out, was a big fan (Para 1).

Another column "White House Letter: Playing It Straight at an Odd Washington Ritual; An annual dinner that reflects the tone of the capital has a subdued air" (04-28-03, Mon, #1, A18-1, + 2) described the scene where the White House correspondents dinner was held. The reporter wrote:

Saturday night's dinner for 2,500 in the Washington Hilton's cave-like ballroom, ... was presided over by a solemn President Bush, who was one of the presidents to make remarks from the dais that were intentionally not funny (Para 2).

"He wasn't in the mood for frivolity," Mr. Deans said. "*The main thing on his mind was the war*" (Penultimate Para).

In this story, Mr. Bush was frequently referred to. He was not in the mood for humor. This piece, directly and indirectly, described Bush's state of mind in a favorable light.

(4) War Reports Affecting Mr. Bush Favorably

An analysis of the battlefield success gave Bush favorable coverage. The news analysis "Dash to Baghdad Leaves Debate in Dust; Military Successes Give Bush a Boost" (04-05-03, Sat, #1, A1-1, + 2) described Bush in a very positive light:

No less remarkable has been the transformation of the political atmosphere at home and, to a lesser degree, abroad. The dramatic, lightning-like thrust of the tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles, their way eased by the devastating application of air power to the Republican Guard, has taken the political heat off President Bush and his hard-nosed Pentagon boss ... (Para 2).

The burgeoning debate over the size of the American force in Iraq has been tamped down (Para 3).

As the war hurtled toward American "victory" (although, as of November 2003, final victory seems to be still elusive, Seol's comment), the battlefield successes combined with Bush's high spirits. A straight story appeared under the title "U.S. FORCES TAKE CONTROL IN BAGHDAD; BUSH ELATED; Bush Tunes In And Sees Iraqis In Celebration" (04-10-03, Thur, #1, A1-2 + B10, + 2) showed this:

An elated President Bush watched celebrating Iraqis drag a statue of Saddam Hussein through Baghdad today as Vice President Dick Cheney and Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, barely disguised their glee and their disdain for critics of the Pentagon battle plan (Para 1). Although the official word from the White House was that there would be no gloating and that the battles were not yet over, Mr. Cheney and Mr. Rumsfeld seemed to treat cautionary notes about hubris as so much political politeness (Para 2).

A straight story about a poll finding that Americans see a clear victory conveyed a very favorable image of Mr. Bush. The story was titled "Americans See Clear Victory in Iraq, Poll Finds; Baghdad's fall has fortified Bush's political standing" (04-15-03, Tue, #1, B1-2 + B10, + 2).

A follow-up straight story "POLITICAL STRATEGY; Bush to Use Ratings in War to Sell Proposed Tax Cut; A president determined not to relive the experiences of his father; With Americans uneasy over economy, Bush begins a new battle" (04-15-03, #2, B10-1, + 2) gave an explanation of Bush's future political plans in a favorable light.

(5) Other Reports Affecting Mr. Bush Favorably

A story titled "Congress; Both Parties Close Ranks Behind the President" (03-18-03, #6, A14-1, + 2) was assessed to be very positive to Bush (+ 2), because Bush's speech received unconditional support from the Congress.

An unexpected boon from the above was a piece titled "Steep Losses Are Narrowed After Bush and Blair Speak" (03-28-03, Fri, #5, C6-1, + 1). The piece concerning stock prices began by mentioning Bush and Blair:

Stocks rebounded from early decline yesterday, erasing most of the losses, after President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair defended the pace of war against Iraq (Para 1).

One of the most favorable story appeared under the title "THE ADMINISTRATION; Even Critics of War Say the White House Spun It With Skill; A battlefield narrative that worked at home, if not everywhere" (04-20-03, Sun, #1, B14-1, +2). This piece detailed how the White House publicity officers devised ways to get a favorable spin and how journalists *collaborated* with them. This seemed an insider's story and a very favorable piece to Bush:

The second Persian Gulf War was not only a runaway victory for the United States military, but for another aggressive force that fired off round-the-clock verbal communications operation (Para 1). That is the assessment of the Bush administration's wartime public relations campaign by both its supporters and critics, who say the spin operation was extraordinarily successful in shaping a positive battlefield narrative, at least for American audiences (Para 2).

This story traced the success at home to three major factors. First was the repeated use of phrases that critics branded propaganda, such as "coalition forces" and "death squads," that became part of the accepted language of war. Second was the powerful cinema verite journalism (or "embedded journalism" policy by the Pentagon, Seol's comment) of reporters and photographers, whose words and pictures humanized the American soldiers they were with. Third was the message discipline of the White House that plotted appearances by top officials on a daily "communication grid," ensuring that in the first half of the day there was a news briefing by an administration official every

two hours, and that everyone was saying more or less the same thing (Para 3+Para 4).

According to this story, Dan Bartlett, the White House communications director, began to use "death squads" to refer to the "fedayeen," which literally means "dying for a noble cause." Bartlett was quoted as saying that "It's not a positive thing they were doing." Bush administration officials used the term "regime change" as a euphemism for "the overthrow of Saddam Hussein." Bush regularly referred to Hussein's troops as "thugs." The most blatant use of loaded language was the term "coalition forces" to describe "what was principally a coalition of only two armies, with help from small numbers of Scud-hunting Australian commandos in western Iraq ... ."

The Bush administration's embedded journalism policy was based on an agreement between the Pentagon and the media. It was a give-and-take. The Pentagon got its word out on its military might --- "shock and awe" was the well-worn phrase on every anchor's lips, while the television news was well fed by the dramatic video footage (Wall Street Journal, 03-24-03, A13).

Negative Coverage

(1) Bush's War Decision Criticized

The *New York Times* ran fairly many stories which deal with opposition to war. This newspaper ran three negative stories on March

18, 2003 alone. An editorial lambasted the decision on war; a column expressed profound doubts about the war decision; and a straight story addressed an antiwar resolution.

The editorial titled "War in the Ruins of Diplomacy" (03-18-03, #10, A32-1, -2) offered a direct criticism of Bush's war decision:

This war crowns a period of *terrible diplomatic failure, Washington's worst in at least a generation*. The Bush administration now presides over unprecedented American military might. What it risks is not America's power, but an essential part of its glory (Paragraph 5). At a time when America most needs the world to see its actions in the best possible light, they will probably be seen in the worst. This result was neither foreordained nor inevitable (Last paragraph).

The Column titled "Things to Come; Is this war only the beginning?" (03-18-03, #12, A33-1, -2) was additional attack on Bush's war plan:

What frightens me is the aftermath --- and I'm not just talking about the problems of postwar occupation. I'm worried about what will happen beyond Iraq --- in the world at large, and here at home (Paragraph 2). *The members of the Bush team don't seem bothered by the enormous ill will they have generated in the rest of the world*. They seem to believe that other countries will change their minds once they see cheering Iraqis welcome our troops, or that our bombs will shock and awe the Iraqis ... (Para 3).

The straight story "Dissent; A Mere 2 Votes Are Cast, but an Antiwar Resolution Jolts a Rural Township" (03-18-03, #8, A17-2, -1) datelined *Aaronsburg, Pa., Mar 12* said that "the antiwar resolution adopted *last fall* divided a rural town and that it was used as a propaganda by a Swedish television." This piece was regarded as a show of efforts to strike a balance, considering that the story dispatched on Mar 12 about an occurrence of last fall was printed.

When Mr. Bush issued an ultimatum to Hussein, several European leaders expressed worries. The front story titled "World Reaction; A Worried World Shows Discord, With France and Germany Leading Criticism of Bush" (03-19-03, Wed, #2, A1-2 + A15, -2) was evaluated very negative (-2), because the piece conveyed direct opposition to Bush's act on the front page.

Columnist Thomas L. Friedman faulted Bush's war decision. The column titled "D-Day; Making the best of a bad heart" (03-19-03, A29-1, -2) read:

President Bush is fond of cowboy imagery, so here is an image that comes to mind ... (Para 1).
President Bush has failed to build that (internationally cooperative) framework before going to war. Though the Bush team came to office with Iraq project in mind, it has pursued a narrow, ideological and bullying foreign policy that has alienated so many people that by the time it wanted to rustle up a posse for an Iraq war, too many nations were suspicious of its motives (Para 4).

A straight story titled "Threats and Responses: United Nations; Critics Say U.S. Lacks Legal Basis for Attack" (03-20-03, A19-1, -2) offered a direct attack on Bush's war decision:

Diplomats who had failed for the last two months to argue on a unified approach to the Iraqi crisis ... offering angry post-mortems on the *diplomatic debacle* and arguing that the planned American-led invasion to disarm Iraq and oust Saddam Hussein *had no basis in international law* (Seol's emphasis) (Para 1).

A straight story titled "Senator Deplores Attack on Iraq" (03-20-03, A20-2, -1) by the *New York Times* (no name of the reporter was

given) was assessed negative (-1), because the story was short and placed in the lower part of the page. This story carried no photo of the senator, reflecting that the newspaper did not highlight this piece. But the tone of the story was very strong:

Mr. Byrd, a Democrat first elected in 1958, said the Bush administration had made the world a more dangerous place by flaunting the nation's superpower status and asserting a new doctrine of pre-emption without international sanction (Para 2).
 "Today I weep for my country," Mr. Byrd said, in his latest floor speech against the war (Para 3).

The three foregoing stories and the story about Senator Byrd's objection to pre-emptive doctrine provided a good contrast with Japanese Premier's support of the war (03-19-03, #4, +1) and the column "Good Reasons for Going Around the U.N." (03-18-03, #11, +1) as discussed in the positive coverage section.

However, when American missiles were launched against Baghdad, the critical tone of the editorials became milder. The tone of the editorial itself became a little "strange." The editorial "The War Begins" (03-20-03, A32-1, -1) read almost permissive:

There is no strategic exit in the offing, as there was when the coalition forces stopped well short of Baghdad in 1991, ... There is no sense of international coalescence, a mission that bound disparate nations together (Para 2).

Our job here is not as transcendently clear as the soldiers' job. *Now that the first strikes have begun, even those who vehemently opposed this war will find themselves in a strange position of hoping for just what the president they have opposed is himself is hoping for: a quick, conclusive resolution fought as bloodlessly as possible.* People who have supported Mr. Bush all along may feel tempted to try to silence those who voice dissent. It will be necessary to remind them that we are in this fight to bring freedom of speech to Iraq, not to smother it back home (Para 3)

Whether they felt the idea of war in Iraq was a bad one from the

beginning, or --- like us --- they felt it should be undertaken only with broad international support, the yearning ... (Para 4).

(In comparison, the editorial of the *Washington Post* titled "First Strike," 03-20-03, A28, appeared to support the war, and a lead column of the *Wall Street Journal* titled "A War That Will Bolster Bush", 03-20-03, A19, clearly supported Bush. When the Bush administration failed to discover the evidence of the weapons of mass destruction, the editorial of the *New York Times*, 09-26-03, A24-1, revealed a sense of having been betrayed. The editorial titled "The Failure to Find Weapons" said that "although this page did not support the war in Iraq, it never quarreled with one of the basic premises.")

The story about the Senate's reduction of Bush's tax plan was appraised very negative (-2). The straight news on the front page titled "Senate Votes to Reduce Bush's Tax Plan" (03-26-03, A1-2, -2) read that "Capitalizing on the concerns about the costs of war in Iraq, Senate Democrats won a vote to reduce President Bush's proposed tax cut by half, *a rare political defeat for a wartime president* (Para 1).

A relevant news analysis accompanied the straight story. The analysis titled "How the President's \$726 Billion Plan Was Cut in Half" (03-26-03, A12-2, -2) stated that "In a form of political jujitsu, Democrats employed the *growing unease about the war's effect on a shaky economy* to reduce the president's \$726 billion tax cut proposal by half."

The analysis titled "Bush Peril: Shifting Sand and Fickle Opinion" (03-30-03, Sun, #1, A1-1 + B11, -2) by R. W. Apple Jr. was assessed very negative (-2), in that this appeared exceptionally on the front page. This piece was a direct attack on Mr. Bush:

With every passing day, it is more evident that the failure to obtain permission from Turkey for American troops to cross its territory and open a northern front constituted a diplomatic debacle. With every passing day, it is more evident that the allies made two gross military misjudgments in concluding that coalition forces could safely bypass Basra and Nasiriya and that Shiite Muslims in southern Iraq would rise up against Saddam Hussein (Para 4).

Deep doubts about the war were voiced within the Washington Beltway. The straight story "The Mood: As a Quick Victory Grows Less Likely, Doubts Are Quietly Voiced in Washington" (03-30-03, Sun, #3, B10-2, -2) by David Sanger described disarray on the battlefield inside Washington:

After ten days of watching smart bombs, sandstorms and stiff resistance from the Iraqi regime, a capital that usually embraces the president in wartime is beginning to show fissures (Para 1). Few have openly split with the president, or the decisions so far. But one does not have to scratch deep to hear the doubts (Para 2). There are the Central Intelligence Agency analysts, quietly complaining that their warnings that Saddam Hussein government might not crack like peanut brittle were dismissed. There are ex-generals on nightly television, expressing unease about a plan ... (Para 3).

There ensued five negative (-1) stories on the same page (B14) of the March 30th, 2003 issue of the newspaper. These all reported antiwar protests under the big title "A Nation at War: Coverage of the Conflict." These stories were assessed to be collectively offering unfavorable images of President Bush:

"The Opposition: Thousands Join in Boston to Demand End of War;
'This is not the United States I want to be associated with',"

"Marches: In New York and New Jersey, Hundreds Join as Antiwar
Protests Continue,"

"Demonstrations: French Rallies Against War Shift Focus to Israel,"

"Protesters: Decades Later, 60's Icons Still Live by Their Message,"

and "In Ithaca, A Voice of Dissent."

But the climate seemed to be reversed by a story that partly
rebutted the foregoing stories. A story titled "Bush Defends Progress of
War and Is Cheered; Privately, Republicans Fret Over Uncertainties"
(04-01-03, Tue, #1, B1-1+ B3, +1) read:

President Bush mounted a vigorous defense of the progress made in the
war against Iraq, seeking to rebut concerns in the military and
nervousness within his own party about how the conflict is going and
how it was planned (Para 1).
Some Republicans in Washington were clearly jittery about the course
and conduct of the war (Para 5).

This piece is a mixture of positive and negative coverage, but the
weight was put on the positive, therefore was assessed to be (+1).
The appropriate arrangement of these negative and positive stories
seemed part of the efforts to maintain balance or objectivity in

coverage or this may be a reflection of the complicated realities where pros and cons coexist (Seol's interpretation).

A columnist took issue with the manner Mr. Bush saluted the soldiers. The column "A Senseless Salute; It's a mistake for presidents to act like soldiers" (04-19-03, #2, A19-1, -2) said:

This gesture is of course quite wrong: such a salute has always required the wearing of a uniform. But there is more to this than a decline in military manners. ... (Para 2).

Two stories faulted the reconstruction contracts that went to Bechtel, which is closely linked to the Washington insiders.

The editorial titled "And the Winner Is Bechtel" (04-19-03, Sat, A12-1) argued that "The Bush administration should work hard to dispel that mistaken notion and should bend over backward to avoid reinforcing it" (Para 1).

And columnist Bob Herbert lambasted war pushers in his column titled "What Is It Good For?; The war pushers turn out to be the profit takers" (04-21-03, A23-1, -2). This implies that Bush's mention about weapons of mass destruction and Iraqi democracy might have been pretexts to assist those profit seekers.

(2) Other Reports That Affect Bush Negatively

Bush's asylum policy was criticized. The straight story titled

"Immigration: New Asylum Policy Comes Under Fire" (03-19-03, A22-1, -2) was coded to be very negative, because "the Bush administration's decision to begin detaining asylum seekers from Iraq and 33 other countries where Al Qaeda groups operated *met with harsh criticism* from civil liberties groups and immigration lawyers" (Para 1).

"Bush Orders a 3-Year Delay in Opening Secret Documents" (03-26-03, #4, A15-2, -1) was assessed to be negative.

And the relevant editorial "Secrecy: The Bush Byword" (3-28-03, #3, A16-2, -2) was assessed to be a harsh criticism.

Neutral Coverage

A straight story "Wait Over, Americans Voice A Mix of Relief and Anxiety" (03-18-03, #3, A1-2 + A17, 0) was a mix of positive and negative reports at the sight of the war decision.

"An Overview: March 17, 2003; Diplomatic Impasse, a U.S. Ultimatum to Iraq, and Civilian Fears" (03-18-03, #7, A14-2, 0) was a dry description of the day's events, thus was assessed neutral (0).

The straight news titled "U.S. BOMBS RAVAGE TARGETS IN BAGHDAD; WAVES OF TROOPS SWEEPING SOUTH IRAQ; Support for Bush Surges At Home, But Split Remains; Poll Indicates Deep Partisan Differences Over President and Handling of War" (03-20-03, Sat, A1-1

+ B10, 0) was coded neutral (0). This piece was a combination of very positive (+2) and very negative (-2) coverage:

American support for President Bush's policy in Iraq has surged now that the war began, but there are deep partisan divisions in the nation's view of the conflict, according to the latest *New York Times*/CBS News Poll (Para 1).

The poll found that 70 percent of Americans approved of Mr. Bush's handling of Iraq, an increase of 19 points in 10 days (Para 2).

"White House Memo: Delaying Talk About Cost of War; Different theories about why a costly conflict has had no price tag attached" (03-23-03, Sun, A24-1, 0) provided bland explanations. The column could have criticized Mr. Bush, but the piece simply gave reasons for Bush's behavior and did not justify him, thus was assessed neutral (0):

They said that setting out the big price tag for the war and its immediate aftermath ... would complicate if not doom the White House's efforts to push through Congress a budget that makes room for Mr. Bush's latest round of tax cuts ... (Para 4).

An analysis "After the Conflict: Bush's Next Role; Two more battles: The United States vs. Europe, and State vs. Defense" (04-08-03, B9-2, 0) discussed Bush's future role in postwar Iraq and was rated neutral (0). The piece was neither positive nor negative; it was explanatory.

Sometimes columns written by journalists or contributors make policy suggestions to the president. Do the suggestions affect the presidential image? Not quite. The column "Weighing the Price of Rebuilding; \$20 billion a year, and oil revenues won't help much" (04-12-03, A13-1, 0) belonged here:

President Bush should continue and expand his efforts to explain the rationale for postwar American engagement in Iraq and to describe the extent of the required commitment (Para 2).

Prediction of Bush's future course of action constituted neutral coverage. The piece titled "War Dividend: Looking for Domestic Gains From the Success Abroad; Can the president's strong hand help pass unpopular policies?" (04-13-03, Sun, WK3-2, 0) was assessed to be neutral.

In this vein, the analysis titled "Bush's Next Test: A Soft Economy and a Tax Cut Plan Loom Above Re-election Campaign; Applying lessons from the first Bush presidency" (04-17-03, A22-1, 0) belonged here.

A column giving advice to the president was also rated neutral (0). The column titled "Dear President Bush: Tips for running Iraq from one who knows" (04-30-03, A27-1, 0) by Thomas L. Friedman provided advice to Bush, and was assessed to be neutral.

Quantitative Analysis

The number of total stories for each phase and their breakdown of coding based on the qualitative analysis is shown in the following table. The table below also shows the trend of coverage.

Table 2: Tone of *New York Times* Coverage of President George W. Bush During Four Times Periods of His Presidency

Period Tone	Inauguration n=160	Sept. 11 n=124	Afghan War n=138	Iraq War n=153
Very Positive	17.5%	31.4%	12.3%	27.4%
Positive	45.0	39.5	50.5	28.1
Neutral	17.5	8.9	13.7	14.5
Negative	11.3	11.3	22.5	18.9
Very Negative	8.7	8.9	1.5	11.1

$$X^2 = (12, N=575) = 46.221, \quad p < .001$$

The differences were statistically significant beyond .001 level of chi square. Therefore, occurrences were not accidental.

Phase I (Inauguration): Data were collected from the *New York Times* for 31 days, ranging from January 21, 2001 to February 20, 2001.

Phase II (September 11): Data were collected from the *New York Times* for 27 days, ranging from September 12, 2001 to October 7, 2001.

Phase III (War in Afghanistan): Data were collected from the *New York Times* for 30 days, ranging from October 08, 2001 to November 07, 2001.

Phase IV (War in Iraq): Data were collected from the *New York Times* for 46 days, ranging from March 18, 2003 to May 02, 2003.

It was calculated that the *New York Times* carried 4.29 stories daily that can affect President Bush's image during the four research periods.

This makes a remarkable contrast with 0.57 stories per day that the *New York Times* printed in Grossman and Kumar's study.

As the above table shows, very positive (+2) coverage of Bush soared from his inauguration to September 11th (31.4%), declined during the Afghanistan War, and then increased again during the Second Gulf War (27.4%). This reflects that the *New York Times* highlighted Bush's role as a crisis leader (Sept. 11) and that the Afghanistan War was gradually expanded. This shows that in Afghan War there were less reports of Bush's decisive military leadership than during the Second Gulf War. In Second Gulf War, Mr. Bush frequently issued strongly-worded statements and the *New York Times* conveyed his messages verbatim, thus highlighting his military leadership. The trend in overall positive coverage (+2 and +1) shows that it started from 62.5%, increased to 70.9%, declined to 62.3%, which is Phase I level, and to the lowest 55.5%.

The trend of overall negative coverage (-2 and -1) shows that while it stayed at the same 20% level during Phase I (20.0%) and Phase II (20.2%), it increased to 24.0% during Phase III, and to remarkably high 30.0% during Phase IV. This means that the *New York Times* conveyed the increasing antiwar sentiments in Phase III and Phase IV. If the ratios of positive coverage (+2, +1) and those of negative coverage (-2, -1) are combined, the trend of *New York Times* tone becomes more comprehensive. In Iraq War, this newspaper highlighted Bush's wartime leadership and simultaneously conveyed popular voices opposing the Iraq War, striking a sophisticated balance.

Triangulation

Phase I. Inauguration

Presidential inauguration is a national celebration. Although there was a heated dispute over the results of the election, most Americans followed the decision of the Supreme Court that candidate Bush was the winner. The stories of the *New York Times* conveyed or might have led this climate and congratulated George W. Bush as the legitimately-elected president. After the inauguration there ensued cabinet appointments, policy announcements such as education policy, and Bush's initiatives of funding religious organizations which help the underprivileged. The *New York Times* conveyed a climate of jubilation, described personnel appointments and presidential policymaking, and showed Bush's international and military leadership. With the passage of one week in Bush presidency, the newspaper ran a spate of stories that assessed the transition as being smooth and without much fuss.

The percentage of positive coverage (62.50%; +2, +1) reflects that the *New York Times* profusely shed light on the positive aspect of the newly sworn-in president in a jubilant climate of the nation and of his attempts to rally the country towards harmony after the agonizingly disputatious indecision. In contrast, the ratio of positive coverage (positive-positive and positive-neutral) in Grossman and Kumar's study was 48.7%.

As was discussed above, the *New York Times* conveyed Mr. Bush's images as a national unifier, a conciliator, a policymaker at the initial

weeks, a military leader against Iraq, a person in charge in appointing cabinet members and other federal positions, or an international leader who widened the scope of international cooperation. In addition, a very favorable light was shed on Mr. Bush himself and his family. The assessment of the newspaper and presidency scholars was "successful transition," considering such a short period for preparations.

There was only one very negative (-2) "front story" titled "Questions Raised On New Bush Plan To End Estate Tax"(01-29-01, A1-2). In this respect, this research finding differs from Graber's argument (Chapter II, pp. 22-23).

The list of very negative and very positive stories from Phase I to Phase IV is attached in Appendix A (pp. 183-199).

Phase II. September 11th Attacks

September 11th terrorist attacks on America in 2001 had a tremendous impact on the American political arena as well as on the international society. This made a great turning point in American foreign policy and in Bush's presidency. The whole world was "artificially and abruptly" reorganized by Mr. Bush into terrorist bloc on the one hand and anti-terrorist bloc led by America on the other. During this period, the *New York Times* stories portrayed President Bush as a national as well as an international leader on the counter-terrorism battlefield. The newspaper also shed light on his role as a national soother and as a crisis leader, which was hardly witnessed previously. First Lady Laura Bush played the role of surrogate national

soother. Mr. Bush rallied support for this war on the Taliban regime, but he decided to act largely alone. In this process, there occurred controversy among Bush aides over the scope of retaliation against Afghanistan.

During this period, the percentage of positive coverage rose to 70.96%, signifying that Mr. Bush played the role of a crisis leader and a national soother. The *New York Times* conveyed the newly transformed presidential image. He gained support from the Congress allowing him to take broad retaliatory measures as well as drastic domestic security measures.

The fact that the percentage of positive coverage (70.96%) rose higher than during Phase I implies that this newspaper followed Bush's lead or conveyed his message verbatim. In this way, President Bush set the national agenda. In reality, Bush's job approval jumped from 51 percent in the September 7-10 Gallup poll to 86 percent on September 14-15 (Pfiffner & Davidson, 2003). The soaring of Bush's ratings may be correlated with the rise of positive coverage (Seol's comment).

There appeared four very negative (-2) "front stories" during this period:

"World Leaders List Conditions On Cooperation; World Leaders List Terms to Join U.S. in Coalition, and Press Multilateralism" (09-19-01, A1-1),

"Bush Advisers Split on Scope of Retaliation" (09-20-01, A1-1),

"Issue Now, Does U.S. Have a Plan?" (09-27-01, A1-1), and

"Bush Law-Enforcement Plan Troubles Both Right and Left" (09-28-01, A1-1).

Phase III. Afghan War

News coverage during this period showed more forceful military leadership of Mr. Bush, who made efforts to garner international cooperation on the anti-terrorism battlefield. He met Chinese leader Jiang Zemin to get support for his war on terror, but he failed to get wide support from other foreign countries. He was hated by large portions of Arabs. In the war efforts, President Bush was supported by Democrats but was criticized by part of intellectuals for his drastic security measures. Although this war was retaliatory in nature, opposition to it was not negligible. During this period, the image of Mr. Bush as a decisive military leader was rather salient. But as the war in Afghanistan was rather gradual (ground troops were sent in after bombing), news reports were relatively less urgent and less dramatic. The fact that the percentage of positive coverage (62.31%) was low and the percentage of negative coverage (23.91%) was a bit higher implies that the retaliatory war was gradual and met with some opposition. This period was differentiated from Phase II, considering that military attacks on Afghanistan started.

Only one very negative (-2) story appeared on the front page, which was titled "White House Memo: Home Front Is a Minefield For President" (10-25-01, A1-1).

Phase IV. Iraq War

The presidential image of this period can be characterized mostly as a decisive wartime (or military) leader. The war was performed dramatically in Iraq in a "shock and awe" fashion during the period of one month and a half. This war differed in nature from war in Afghanistan in intensity. The *New York Times* portrayed Mr. Bush as "a resolute" wartime leader. Simultaneously, this newspaper described the anti-war sentiments in and outside of America. The reports by the U.N. correspondent (03-20-03) and the London correspondent (03-19-03) offered a direct attack that this war is not legal. This newspaper seemed to grant legitimacy to the war by printing an analysis of pre-emptive strike logic on the front page.

How did the *New York Times* portray Mr. Bush as a wartime leader? Generally speaking, this newspaper highlighted Bush's wartime leadership in a sophisticated and balanced manner, conveying Bush's message verbatim while reflecting opposing voices from inside and outside of America. Presidential news appeared at crucial moments to provide meanings to certain critical turning points. For this effect, Mr. Bush might have made timely statements.

The *New York Times* portrayed Mr. Bush as a resolute national leader, provided authenticity and justification to pre-emptive strike logic, and described war successes as expressed by Mr. Bush. The newspaper also conveyed "human and intimate aspects" of Mr. Bush in conducting the war. A series of Elisabeth Bumiller's reports during this

period were very strong on this aspect. (See "Projecting Personal Qualities" section in Phase IV of Chapter IV.) The cream of positive coverage may be the highlighting of media control policy (or "embedded journalism") on the battlefield to get favorable war coverage. The fact that the percentage of positive coverage was low (55.55%) and the percentage of negative coverage was high (30.06%) implies that this war was controversial to that extent.

There appeared five very negative (-2) stories on the front page in this period:

"A Worried World Shows Discord, With France and Germany Leading Criticism of Bush" (03-19-03, A1-2),

"Senate Votes to Reduce Bush's Tax Plan" (03-26-03, A1-2),

"Bush Peril; Shifting Sand and Fickle Opinion" (03-30-03, A1-1),

"Senate Vote Could Sharply Reduce Bush Tax Cut" (04-12-03, A1-2),

and "IN A CONCESSION, BUSH LOWERS GOAL OF TAX CUT PLAN; Proposing \$550 billion; White House Talks Tough, but the Final Deal May Well be Closer to \$350 billion" (04-16-03, A1-1).

Research Questions Revisited

Returning to the four research questions raised at the end of

Chapter II (p. 72), the figures show the answers. First, about the honeymoon? This research found that the *New York Times* allotted 62.5% of their stories and photos to positive coverage (+2 and +1) of President Bush, whereas 20.0% was allotted to negative coverage (-2 and -1) during Phase I. Roughly speaking, this means that President Bush enjoyed his honeymoon for one month after his inauguration.

Second, about the ratio of positive and negative coverage? The total number of the positive coverage for the four time periods was calculated to be 359 stories out of 575, or 62.4%. That of negative was 136 stories, or 23.7%. This means that the *New York Times* carried 2.64 positive (+2, +1) stories per one negative (-2, -1) story. This is the ratio of positive/negative coverage with which the *New York Times* depicted President Bush. Might these figures be satisfactory to Mr. Bush? Very probably, no. Because *President Bush wants to "make news on his terms"* as was discussed in the Bush's Bubble Machine section (p. 32).

Third, was the image of a decisive leader conveyed? As was shown above, the *New York Times* spotlighted President Bush as the crisis leader after September 11, and as the wartime leader during Afghanistan War and Persian Gulf War II. The ratio of very positive coverage soared to 31.4% during Phase II, the highest out of the four periods. This means that the *New York Times* highlighted Bush's role as a crisis leader. The ratio of very positive coverage of Phase IV (27.4%) was higher than that of Phase III (12.3%). This implies that the *New York Times* carried Bush's words verbatim during Phase IV, allowing him to "set the public agenda." But the overall ratio of positive

coverage shows that positive coverage of Bush during Phase IV (55.5%) declined from Phase III (62.3%), meaning that antiwar sentiment was reflected by this newspaper. The increase of overall negative coverage from 24.0% in Phase III to 30.0% in Phase IV additionally corroborates this trend, thus striking a "sophisticated balance."

Fourth, was there superficial or trivial coverage of Mr. Bush? Some instances of intimate and soft coverage might belong here. But as the *New York Times* stories themselves said, Mr. Bush "took his presidency seriously." There was little superficial or trivial coverage of Mr. Bush.

(One of the exceptions might be the *New York Times*' front page report, photo on A1 and story on A18, on January 15, 2002, which discussed Mr. Bush's recovery after fainting while eating pretzel. But this piece can be a serious report depending on which aspect the public chooses to look at. The photo showed Bush with a bruise on his left cheek.)

Additional Findings

As shown in the list in the Appendix section, the number of very negative (-2) stories that appeared on the front page amounted to 11 stories (25%). This reflects that 33 stories (75%) out of all 44 that directly attacked or opposed Bush's policies were buried on the inside pages. It is undeniable that the *New York Times* carried opposing voices from inside and outside of the Bush administration and in and out of America. However, these stories did not form the mainstream of

the ongoing events. Just imagine that this newspaper has run on the front page a straight story that says that the war on Iraq lacks legal basis (03-20-03, #4, A19-1, Str, "Threats and Responses; United Nations; Critics Say U.S. Lacks Legal Basis for Attack" by Felicity Barringer). The negative impact on President Bush might have been much greater than when it was printed on page 19. The result is that this newspaper reflected the mainstream of the news (or followed the agenda set by the president), while conveying opposing voices in part.

Is there any correlation between story types and positive/negative coverage? The fact that 21 reports out of the whole 44 very negative stories are straight stories reflects that this newspaper made efforts to be objective by taking the form of straight stories. The fact that the number of news analysis by the reporters amounted to four while that of Op-Ed columns reached nine implies that outside columnists are freer to criticize Bush's policies.

The following table shows how the story types and negative/positive images are correlated. The table also shows that Bush stories on the Editorial and Op-Ed pages tend to be more negative than positive.

Table 3: Story Types and Positive/Negative Coverage

Story type	Straight	Analysis	Editorial	Op-Ed	Column	Others	Sum
Very neg (-2)	21(48%)	4(9%)	7(16%)	9(21%)	0	3(6%)	44 (100%)
Very pos (+2)	83(66%)	7(6%)	4(3%)	3(2%)	3(2%)	26(21%)	126 (100%)

Who Wrote the largest number of very negative (-2) or very positive (+2) stories? Editorial writers collectively wrote the largest number of very negative stories; 6 editorials. But writers of Op-Ed columns were diverse. Reporter Rosenbaum wrote 3 very negative stories; Bumiller, Sanger, Apple, and Toner wrote 2 stories apiece. This shows that there is no main attackers or critics of Mr. Bush. The distribution of attackers are dispersed.

Then, who wrote the largest number of very positive (+2) stories? The statistics shows that Sanger wrote 25 stories; Bumiller 18; Stevenson 8; Bruni and Apple 6 apiece. Therefore, these two reporters are very likely to be White House correspondents!! Their stories tell that they are covering the White House. Their stories show very clearly that they are in a position to write intimate and detailed stories about President Bush.

As the "List of Very Positive Stories" at the Appendix A shows, Sanger's stories tend to be hard, whereas those of Bumiller tend to be both hard and soft. Bumiller seems to be stronger than Sanger in writing soft, intimate, and positive descriptions of the president, thus reflecting that she benefits from close and intimate cooperation with White House aides.

During the same four time periods, Sanger and Bumiller wrote only two very negative (-2) stories. The two reporters wrote together "White House Memo: Home Front Is a Minefield For President" (10-25-01, A1-1+B8, -2). This story said that "the administration's response to the spreading threat of anthrax has been ragged and confused." Sanger wrote the story "The Mood: As a Quick Victory

Grows Less Likely, Doubts Are Quietly Voiced in Washington"

(03-30-03, B10-2, -2). Bumiller wrote the story "IN A CONCESSION, BUSH LOWERS GOAL OF TAX CUT PLAN" (04-16-03, A1-1+A14, -2).

The number of very positive (+2) stories that appeared on the front page was 61 stories out of the total 126 very positive stories, or 48.4%. This implies that the front page stories during these four time periods conveyed rather verbatim (did not edit) what the president said, described what he did as such, or justified his logic.

The ratio of very negative (-2) stories to very positive (+2) stories on the front page was calculated to be 11 to 61, that is, 18.03%. This implies that the *New York Times* mostly followed Bush's lead in setting the public agenda during the four research periods.

Altogether, these figures show that during the four critical periods, the *New York Times* might not have played the agenda-setting role but rather might have followed President Bush's lead in this function. During the first month of inauguration, this newspaper might have voluntarily highlighted Bush's bright side, while conveying opposing voices in part. But during the remaining three critical periods, this newspaper might have been forced to follow President Bush's lead, allowing him to define the situations. The situations were critical to that extent.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Summary of the Thesis

This thesis examined 575 stories out of 134 days' issues of the *New York Times* which might have affected the image of President George W. Bush. As the research findings showed, the positive (+2, +1) coverage during the four periods amounted to 359 stories (62.43%). The ratio of positive coverage on the whole was "much higher" than that of Grossman and Kumar's study, or 48.7%. It was calculated that the *New York Times* carried 2.64 positive stories per one negative story during the four research periods.

Given that the first "one hundred days" (or six months) are popularly believed to be a period of presidential "honeymoon" with the news media, it is understandable that a fairly high percentage (62.50%) of the stories during Phase I were positive (+2, +1). However, even during this honeymoon period, new policy lines proposed by the incoming president invoked opposition from the public or interested parties. Phase I can be characterized by Bush's image as a victor in the presidential election, a new national leader, a conciliator, a proponent of new policy lines, a military leader, a person with power to appoint federal officials, an international leader, and a new occupant in the White House. During this period, his image as a policymaker was a bit marred by opposition to his new policy on tax, abortion, emission, and religion.

In Phase II, everything changed following September 11 terrorist attacks. Mr. Bush was transformed into a national crisis leader and national soother. President Bush was granted by the Congress broad powers to declare war on terrorism. He was portrayed as a military commander conducting an anti-terrorism war. Positive coverage of him soared to 70.96% in this period. However, disputes were revealed among his aides pertaining to the scope of retaliation, and the order of the whole world was being reorganized forcefully and without deep foreign policy analysis under the imperative of the anti-terrorism war. Complaints were reported about the harsh security measures pursued by the Bush administration.

During Phase III, President Bush was mainly portrayed as a military leader. The *New York Times* said that he was transformed into a confident leader. Mr. Bush was described to be focusing on anti-terrorism operations. He flatly refused negotiations with the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. He gave an order to send special forces to this region. *New York Times* reporter Bumiller described how "carefully and deliberately" Mr. Bush prepared for the war. The newspaper also portrayed him as an international leader who met with Jiang Zemin of China and Vladimir Putin of Russia to seek support to his war on terrorism. The newspaper also reported the opposition to Bush's ground war plan and reminded the public about the nightmare of the Vietnam quagmire.

During Phase IV, President Bush was mostly portrayed as a resolute wartime leader and simultaneously a much-hated leader by large portions of Arab people. He issued an ultimatum to Saddam Hussein

asking him to go into exile and warned Americans about the prospects of a longer war. The *New York Times* carried an analysis justifying Bush's pre-emptive strike logic and traced this logic in another story. Mr. Bush was described as an international leader. Bumiller gave several intimate descriptions of Mr. Bush. Finally, Mr. Bush declared that "military phase in Iraq has ended and America gained one victory in a war on terror" (*New York Times*, 05-02-03, A1-1).

Through all these three critical periods (Phase II, III, IV), it is quite clear that President Bush "defined the situations." The *New York Times* mostly conveyed verbatim what he said or described what he did. In this manner, this newspaper portrayed President Bush as a national leader, a national unifier, a crisis leader, and a decisive wartime leader. Sometimes the newspaper provided very intimate descriptions of how he reached a war decision, how he conducted the war, and how seriously he was involved in the war. Although the *New York Times* provided intimate and personal aspects of Mr. Bush, this newspaper did not reveal the trivial aspects of him. Mr. Bush was assessed to be a "serious" office-holder, differentiated from his predecessor, President Clinton, whose image was marred with a variety of scandals. That is what Mr. Bush might have wanted the news media to do. The agenda of the *New York Times* were set by Mr. Bush by the forceful and dramatic crisis and wartime situations. But during Phase I, the *New York Times* arguably portrayed Bush in a positive light on a voluntary basis.

Limitations, Differences, and Future Questions

This research has been conducted by the researcher alone. Kumar advised the researcher to conduct the qualitative analysis by recruiting at least two more coders apart from the present researcher in her email on June 28, 2003. According to her, "there are a lot of people who do content analysis. Robert Richter does regular counts of coverage for favorability. There are those who look at the individual words, which are coded as being favorable and unfavorable, and others who seek to measure a story's favorability by the impression left by the piece." For that, she wrote, "you need at least three coders."

However, considering that this is a thesis research conducted by the researcher and that this is not a project sponsored by an academic institution, the researcher could not help but do it alone. This implies that the coding might be subjective to a limited extent, no matter how the researcher strove to be objective in evaluation of stories. And the researcher has to admit that the coding in this thesis can never be definitive, except for conspicuously negative or positive stories.

All the more, the use of additional coders might not have been functional. If the evaluations of additional coders turned out to be highly correlated with this research, then their results will be taken to corroborate this research as a matter-of-fact finding. On the contrary, if their findings are significantly less correlated with this research, they may only detract from the value of this research. (Or they might mean that this research is less "valuable" than this researcher thinks.)

Babbie (2001) did not spell out whether content analysis can be valid only if conducted by more than one coder. Babbie simply wrote

that newspaper articles are appropriate topics for content analysis and that the coding can be done by analyzing the manifest and latent content (Babbie, 2001, pp. 303-30).

Grossman and Kumar (1981) admitted that their "content analysis does *not provide a definitive portrait* (Seol's emphasis) of media coverage of the presidency" (p. 254). The authors wrote that their content analysis, however, "does produce a clear picture of how the president and the White House were treated" by the news media. In this vein, *this researcher will be satisfied if a rough picture of how the New York Times portrayed President Bush was drawn by this research.*

This researcher discovered that negative stories were comparatively easier to code. But there was some wiggle room for positive (+2, +1) stories to be coded neutral (0). The *New York Times* journalists may insist that they adhere to the principle of objectivity. In this case, the viewpoint of public relations practitioners was adopted to code the stories: How would a public relations officer assess this particular story? Will this story please the White House publicity officials?

Additionally, this study has adopted a five-step scale in coding the stories instead of three. This enabled the researcher to extract conspicuously positive or negative pieces. And a more detailed and refined definitions of the positive and negative images were provided for this research. In this respect, *this research was an attempt to be an objective analysis of the intrinsically subjective material in that every newspaper has their own color.*

This research has adopted a different approach from that taken by the Grossman and Kumar's study (1981). The definition of the scope of

presidential coverage differs from their study. The "presidential image" in this research means the news coverage of the president and those stories that can affect the president's image. The two scholars conducted a content analysis of stories of the president and the White House, that is, "who he is, what he does, and what his programs, actions, and goals are." But as discussed in Chapter II, it is highly difficult for White House correspondents to portray the incumbent president in a negative light, except in some exceptional cases. As shown in the Additional Findings section of Chapter IV (pp. 167-70), reporters who wrote the largest number of intimate (and thus favorable) stories of the president were the White House reporters.

Another difference from Grossman and Kumar's study is that this research has adopted a mix of evaluation methods: (1) To grasp the overall impression of the story by perusing the titles, subtitles, and the locus (page and place within the page) of the story in the newspaper and see whether there is a relevant photo, (2) To read the story lines and extract impressive ones, and extract the impressive words or phrases. But this research did not count the number of individual words. To borrow Babbie's words, this thesis tried to analyze the manifest and latent content in a comprehensive manner.

This research has confined its scope to the four time periods. The demarcation lines were drawn based on President Bush's definition of the situation and the reports of the *New York Times*. But the follow-up developments in late September 2003 implied that Mr. Bush has begun to lose his strong power to "define the situation" vis-a-vis the *New York Times*. As of late September, 2003, almost five months after the

declaration of victory against Iraq on May 1st, with no clear foreseeable exit from the chaotic situation in Iraq and with everyday casualties of American soldiers reported, the *New York Times* began to negate Bush's power to define the situation. This newspaper began to set its own agenda that differ from those of Mr. Bush. The following titles show how this newspaper began to set its own agenda:

"2 U.S. Fronts: Quick Wars, but Bloody Peace" (09-19-03, A1-1+A10, Str),

"Medals for His Valor, Ashes for His Wife" (09-23-03, A1-2+A12, Str),

"Bush, at U.N.. Defends Policy Over Iraq, Tense Opening Day at World Gathering" (09-24-03, A1-1+A10, Str),

"An Audience Unmoved (by Bush's U.N. Address)" (09-24-03, A1-1+A11, Analysis), and

"DRAFT REPORT SAID TO CITE NO SUCCESS IN IRAQ ARMS HUNT, 4-Month Search by U.S., No Illicit Weapons Found, but Officials Describe Evidence of Suspicious Material" (09-25-03, A1-1+A10).

These stories and other ensuing ones may need to be analyzed to see how they would affect Bush's image. These stories may become negative signs that ultimately affect his reelection bid in 2004.

Additionally, the *New York Times* editorial titled "The Failure to Find

Iraqi Weapons" (09-26-03, A24-1, -2) highlighted the crumbling of basic premises of the war on Iraq in which this newspaper had confidence.

Knight Ridder journalist Warren Strobel (1997) argued that "if policymakers, including the president, create policy or communication vacuum, news media begin to create their own policy (or policy agenda) and fill the gap." Five months after the end of military phase of the war in Iraq (as of October, 2003), there developed a "credibility gap" between Mr. Bush and the public, pertaining to the weapons of mass destruction and Iraqi situation.

This research could be more profound if the scope ranged from Bush's inauguration to his retirement, including the above developments. Future researchers may study the whole term of the Bush presidency. And, considering that television is increasingly more important in political communication, content analysis of the television news of President Bush may also be meaningful.

The scope of portrayal of Bush may further be extended to news contents of foreign news media such as newspapers of South Korea, Japan, or a European country such as France. If analyses of other countries' media contents are included and they can be compared and contrasted with that of American media, the research will become more comprehensive. The internationalization of this research may enable the researchers to figure out whether or not the reports of the *New York Times* have affected other countries' media coverage of President Bush.

Last, but not the least important, the writing styles of the *New York Times* articles may need to be studied. This researcher realized that

sentences and descriptions of the *New York Times* were sophisticated and highly refined. Some stories were thought to be emotion-rousing, especially when they described intimate aspects of the First Family. The question of how reporters wrote straight stories, analyses, and columns may be additional topics for future researchers.

REFERENCES

Babbie, Earl (2001). *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Cook, Timothy E. & Ragsdale, Lyn (1995). The President and the Press: Negotiating Newsworthiness at the White House. In Michael Nelson (Ed.), *The Presidency and the Political System* (4th ed., pp. 297-330). Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc.

Edwards III, George C. & Wayne, Steven J. (1994). *Presidential Leadership: Politics and Policy Making*, 3rd Ed., New York: St. Martin Press

Edwards III, George C. & Wayne, Steven J. (2003). *Presidential Leadership: Politics and Policy Making*, 6th Ed., Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning

Entmann, Robert M. (1990). The Imperial Media. In Robert E. DiClerico (Ed.), *Analyzing the Presidency*. Guilford: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Fallows, James (1997). *Breaking the News*. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc.

Graber, Doris A. Ed. (1982). *The President and the Public*.

Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues

Graber, Doris A. (1997). *Mass Media and American Politics*.
Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.

Graber, Doris A. (2002). *Mass Media and American Politics*, 6th
Ed. Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.

Grossman, Michael Baruch & Kumar, Martha Joynt (1981).
Portraying the President: The White House and the News Media.
Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Grossman, Michael Baruch & Kumar, Martha Joynt (1982). Images
of the White House in the Media. In Doris A. Graber (Ed.) *The
President and the Public*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of
Human Issues

Kernell, Samuel (1997). *Going Public: New Strategies of
Presidential Leadership*. Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc.

Kessel, John H. (2001). *Presidents, the Presidency, and the
Political Environment*. Congressional Quarterly, Inc.

Kumar, Martha Joynt (2003). Communications Operations in the
White House of President George W. Bush: Making News on His
Terms, unpublished paper.

Maltese, John Anthony (1992). *Spin Control: The White House Office of Communications and the Management of Presidential News*. The University of Northern Carolina Press.

McQuail, Dennis (2000). *Mass Communication Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Milkis, Sidney M. & Nelson, Michael (1984). *The American Presidency: Origins and Development, 1776-1993*. Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc.

Phiffner, James & Davidson, Roger H. Eds. (2000). *Understanding the Presidency*, 3rd Ed., Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.

Pfiffner, James (2003). The Transformation of the Bush Presidency. In Pfiffner, James and Davidson, Roger H. (Eds.), *Understanding the Presidency*, 3rd Ed., 2003, Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.

Rozell, Mark J. (2002). The Press and the Presidency. In Phiffner, James & Roger H. Davidson (Eds.), *Understanding the Presidency*. Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.

Smith, Carolyn (1990). *Presidential Press Conferences: A Critical Approach*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

List of 44 Very Negative (-2) Stories

Phase I

01-21-01, #9, A17-1, Straight: "THE DEMONSTRATIONS; Protesters in the Thousands Sound Off in the Capitol" by David E. Rosenbaum.

01-23-01, #9, A20-1, Editorial: "Opposing the Ashcroft Nomination."

01-26-01, #3, A17-2, Analysis: "Adding a Financial Threat to Familiar Promises on Education; Failure will be sanctioned, the new president says" by Jacque Steinberg.

01-27-01, #4, A15-1, OP-Ed, "A Deadly Global Gag Rule: Bush's abortion policy will cost lives overseas" by Daniel E. Pellegrum.

01-29-01, #2, A1-2+ A21, Straight, "Questions Raised On New Bush Plan To End Estate Tax" by David Cay Johnston.

01-30-01, #6, A22-1, Ed, "Faith-Based Services"

01-31-01, #3, A14-1, Analysis, "By Resisting Ashcroft, Democrats Send a Signal; This nomination appears clinched" by Alison Mitchell.

01-31-01, #4, A14-2, "Excerpts from Remarks (of Opposition) by Hatch and Schumer on Ashcroft Nomination"

01-31-01, #10, A20-1, Ed, "Wrong Way on Energy"

02-03-01, A12-2, #2, Ed, "Editorial Observer; How George W. Bush Can Reach Black Voters; John Ashcroft makes racial detente much more difficult" by Brent Staples.

02-10-01, A10-1, #4, Str, "A Bush Aide Faults Plan To Repeal Estate Tax" by Elizabeth Becker.

02-16-01, #3, A12-1, Str, "Bush Team Under Attack on Emissions Talks" by Andrew C. Revkin.

02-16-01, #4, A12-1, Str, "Critics Seek To Overturn Abortion Rule;

Oppose Bush Limits On Aid Sent Abroad; And old policy, newly reinstated, rekindles an old debate" by Robin Toner.

02-19-01, #2, A13-1, Str, "Federal Panel Warns Bush Of Social Security Problems; Service Inconsistent and Slow, Reports Say" by Robert Pear.

Phase II

09-12-01, #5, A27-1, Op-Ed, "New Day of Infamy; The questions we must answer" by William Safire.

09-13-01, #7, A27-1, Op-Ed, "Inside The Bunker; The view from the PEOC" by William Safire.

09-19-01, #2, A1-1+B6, Str, "World Leaders List Conditions On Cooperation" by Patrick E. Tyler and Jane Perlez.

09-20-01, #2, A1-1+B5, Str, "Bush Advisers Split on Scope of Retaliation" by Patrick E. Tyler and Elaine Sciolino.

09-20-01, #5, B6-2, Str, "Senate Democrat Opposes White House's Antiterrorism Plan and Proposes Alternative; Concerns that citizens' rights might be curtailed unnecessarily" by Neil A. Lewis.

09-25-01, #5, B7-1, Str, "Lawmakers Tap Brakes on Bush's Hurling Antiterrorism Measure" by Neil A. Lewis.

09-26-01, #3, B2-2, Str, "CHARITY; Islamic Aid Organization Expresses Anger at Its Inclusion on Bush Terror List" by Barry Bearak.

09-27-01, #3, A1-1, Anal, "Issue Now; Does U.S. Have a Plan?" by R. W. Apple Jr..

09-28-01, #2, A1-1+B5, Str, "Bush Law-Enforcement Plan Troubles Both Right and Left" by Robin Toner.

09-28-01, #3, B2-1, Photo, Captioned "Indonesia protesters chanted anti-American slogans outside the United States Embassy," Slogans such as "Bush dog" and "Big Satan."

10-02-01, #2, A25-1, Op-Ed, "New Fears, New Alliances" by Edward N. Luttwak.

Phase III

10-13-01, #1, A23-1, Op-Ed, "Abroad at Home; Mr. Bush's New World; His foreign policy has turned upside down" by Anthony Lewis.

10-25-01, #1, A1-1+B8, Str, "White House Memo; Home Front Is a Minefield For President" by Elisabeth Bumiller and David E. Sanger.

Phase IV

03-18-03, #10, A32-1, Ed, "War in the Ruins of Diplomacy"

03-18-03, #12, A33-1, Op-Ed, "Things to Come; Is this war only the beginning?" by Paul Krugman.

03-19-03, #2, A1-2+A15, Str, "A Worried World Shows Discord; World Reaction" by Alan Cowell in London.

03-19-03, #5, A22-1, Str, "Immigration; New Asylum Policy Comes Under Fire" by Philip Shenon.

03-19-03, #6, A29-1, Op-Ed, "D-Day" Thomas Friedman.

03-20-03, #4, A19-1, Str, "Threats and Responses; United Nations; Critics Say U.S. Lacks Legal Basis for Attack" by Felicity Barringer

03-20-03, #7, A29-1, Str, "Drilling in Alaska, A Priority for Bush, Fails in the Senate" by David Firestone.

03-26-03, #1, A1-2+A12, Str, "Senate Votes to Reduce Bush's Tax Plan" by David E. Rosenbaum.

03-26-03, #2, A12-2, Anal, "How the President's \$726 Billion Plan Was Cut in Half" by David Firestone.

03-28-03, #3, A16-2, Ed, "Secrecy; The Bush Byword"

03-30-03, #1, A1-1+B11, Anal, "Bush Peril; Shifting Sand and Fickle Opinion" R. W. Apple Jr..

03-30-03, #3, B10-2, Str, "The Mood; As a Quick Victory Grows Less Likely, Doubts Are Quietly Voiced in Washington" by David Sanger.

04-12-03, #2, A1-2+A8, Str, "Senate Vote Could Sharply Reduce Bush Tax Cut" by David E. Rosenbaum.

04-14-03, #2, A19-1, Op-Ed, "A Senseless Salute; It's a mistake for presidents to act like soldiers" by John Lukacs.

04-16-03, #1, A1-1+A14, Str, "IN A CONCESSION, BUSH LOWERS GOAL OF TAX PLAN; Proposing \$550 billion; White House Talks Tough, but Final Deal May Well be Closer to \$350 Billion" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

04-19-03, #2, A12-1, Ed, "And the Winner Is Bechtel."

04-21-03, #2, A23-1, OP-Ed, "What Is It Good For?; The war pushers turn out to be the profit takers" by Bob Herbert.

List of 126 Very Positive (+ 2) Stories

Phase I

01-21-01, #1, A1-1+A14+A16, Str, "BUSH, TAKING OFFICE, CALLS FOR CIVILITY, COMPASSION AND 'NATION OF CHARACTER'; Unity Is A Theme; In Inauguration Speech, He Asks Citizens to Seek 'a Common Good' " by Frank Bruni & David E. Sanger.

01-21-01, #2, Anal, "Tradition and Legitimacy; A Nation's Rituals Begin to Dissolve Lingering Clouds of a Bitter Election Battle" by R. W. Apple Jr..

01-21-01, #3, A1-1+A17, Str, "Proud Father and Son Bask in History's Glow" by Frank Bruni.

01-21-01, #5, A1-2+A13, Str, "Inaugural Diary; Great Political Theater With a Touch of Pomp" by Guy Trebay.

01-21-01, #7, A14-2+A15, Transcript of inaugural address.

01-21-01, #8, A16-2, Str, "THE SPEECH; In His Inaugural Address, Bush Lingers on a Promise to Care" by Melinda Henneberger.

01-22-01, #1, A1-1+A12, Str, "On First Day, Bush Settles Into a Refitted Oval Office; He Greets Public After Touring New Home" by David E. Sanger.

01-24-01, #1, A1-1+A14, Str, "Bush Pushes Ambitious Education Plan; Would Use U.S. Aid to Force Schools to Meet Standards" David E. Sanger.

01-24-01, #2, A1-1+A15, Anal, "School Book Balancing Act; The logic behind annual test" Diana Jean Schemo.

01-24-01, #4, A14-2, Excerpt from Bush's education initiative.

01-26-01, #1, A1-1+C1, Str, "IN POLICY CHANGE, GREENSPAN BACKS A BROAD TAX CUT; White House Is Pleased; Guarded Endorsement by Fed Chief" by Richard W. Stevenson.

01-28-01, #1, A1-1+A14, Str, "BUSH'S TRANSITION LARGELY A SUCCESS, ALL SIDES SUGGEST; Careful Planning Seen; Analysts Find a Few Missteps but Note a Deft Touch in Dealing With Congress" Richard L. Berke.

01-30-01, #1, A1-1+A20, Str, "President Offers Plan to Promote Oil Exploration; Uses California Crisis to Sell Energy Policy" by Joseph Kahn & David E. Sanger.

01-30-01, #4, A18-1, Str, "Nudging Church-State Line, Bush Invites Religious Groups to Seek Federal Aid" by Laurie Goodstein.

01-30-01, #5, A18-1, Excerpt, "Bush on the Creation of a White House Office Tied to Religion."

02-02-01, #1, A1-1+A16, Str, "SENATE CONFIRMS ASHCROFT AS ATTORNEY GENERAL, 58-42, CLOSING A FIVE-WEEK BATTLE; Victory for Bush; But Tally of Democrats Hints at New Fights Over Court Picks" by Alison Mitchell.

02-02-01, #4, A16-2, Excerpt from "Remarks in the Senate Debate on the Ashcroft Nomination"

02-03-01, #1, A10-1, Str, "Bush, the Conciliator, Meets With Democrats" by David E. Sanger & Alison Mitchell.

02-07-01, #3, A18-1, Ed, "Smart Start on Defense Budgeting"

02-09-01, #1, A1-1+A10, Str, "BUSH IN FIRST STEP TO SHRINK ARSENAL OF U.S. WARHEADS; To Order Defense Review; But Commitment to a Missile Shield Seems Firm, Even in Face of Allies' Worries" by Steven Lee Meyers.

02-10-01, #1, A1-1+A12, Str, "White House Memo: Presidency Takes Shape With No Fuss, No Sweat" by Frank Bruni.

02-11-01, #1, WK16-1, Ed, "Between Two Eras"

02-14-01, #1, A1-1+A26, Str, "BUSH DETAILS PLAN TO FOCUS MILITARY ON NEW WEAPONRY; A Break With Orthodoxy; President Joins Defense Debate on New vs. Old Technology --- Billions Are at Stake" by David E. Sanger.

02-14-01, #2, A26-1, Excerpt from "Bush's Remarks on the Military"

02-17-01, #2, A1-1+A4, Anal, "THE WORLD STAGE, ACT I, First Act For Bush; Declaring Leadership" Frank Bruni with David E. Sanger.

02-17-01, #4, A4-2, Excerpt "In the President's Words on the Bombing; 'It's a Routine Mission.' "

02-17-01, #7, Op-Ed, "No Choice But To Strike; To contain Iraq, expect more air strikes" by Anthony H. Cordesman.

02-20-01, #2, A1-1+A12, Pho+ Str, "A Day of Remembrance in Oklahoma City; Bush Dedicates Museum at the Site of Oklahoma Bombing" by Frank Bruni.

Phase II

09-12-01, #1, A1-1+A14, Str, "U.S. ATTACKED; HIJACKED JETS DESTROY TWIN TOWERS AND HIT PENTAGON IN DAY OF TERROR; President Vows to Exact Punishment for 'Evil' " by Serge Schmemmann.

09-12-01, #2, A1-2+A4, Str, "A Somber Bush Says Terrorism Cannot Prevail" by Elisabeth Bumiller with David E. Sanger.

09-12-01, #3, A4-2, Transcript of "Bush's Remarks to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks"

09-13-01, #2, A16-1, Str, "AFTER THE ATTACKS; Washington's Response; THE PRESIDENT; Bush Labels Aerial Terrorist Attacks 'Acts of War' " by Katharine Q. Seelye & Elisabeth Bumiller.

09-13-01, #3, A15-1, Transcript of "Bush's Remarks to Cabinet and Advisers (on Attacks)"

09-14-01, #1, A1-1+A18, Str, "BUSH AND TOP AIDES PROCLAIM POLICY OF 'ENDING' STATES THAT BACK TERROR; LOCAL AIRPORTS SHUT AFTER AN ARREST; President to Visit New York --- bin Laden Singled Out" by Elisabeth Bumiller & Jane Perlez.

09-14-01, #2, A1-1+A4, Anal, "No Middle Ground Exists In War Against Terrorism" R. W. Apple Jr..

09-14-01, #3, A18-1, Excerpts from "President's Remarks on Investigation Into Attacks; 'This nation is sad. But we're also tough and resolute.' "

09-15-01, #1, A1-1+A6, Str, "BUSH LEADS PRAYER, VISITS AID CREWS; CONGRESS BACKS USE OF ARMED FORCES; A Day of Mourning; President, in New York, Offers Resolute Vows Atop the Rubble" by Robert McFadden.

09-15-01, #2, A1-1+A16, Str, "U.S. Demands Arab Countries 'Choose Sides' by Jane Perlez.

09-15-01, #3, A6-1, Transcript of President's Remarks "We Are in the Middle Hour of Our Grief"

09-15-01, #4, A6-2, Column, "WHITE HOUSE MEMO; Two Strangers, Bush and New York City, Meet and Embrace in Calamity's Wake" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

09-15-01, #6, A7-1, Str, "Heartened by a Visit By Bush" by Clyde Haberman.

09-16-01, #1, A1-1+A5+A6, Str, "BUSH TELLS THE MILITARY 'GET READY'; BROADER SPY POWERS GAINING SUPPORT; Long Battle Seen; 'We're at War,' He Says --- Support in Poll for Armed Response" by Elaine Sciolino.

09-16-01, #2, A1-2+A19, Str+Pho, "In Four Days, A National Crisis Changes Bush's Presidency" by David E. Sanger & Don Van Natta Jr..

09-16-01, #4, A5-2, Text of Bush's radio address "A Different Battle Awaits"

09-17-01, #1, A1-1+A13+C6, Str, "NATION SHIFTS ITS FOCUS TO WALL STREET AS A MAJOR TEST OF ATTACK'S AFTERMATH; Bush Is Confident; Officials Seek to Avoid Sell-Off and Bolster Investors' Resolve" by Richard W. Stevenson with Jonathan Fuerbringer.

09-18-01, #1, A1-1+B4, Str, "Bin Laden Is Wanted in Attacks, 'Dead or Alive,' President Says" David E. Sanger.

09-19-01, #6, B11-2, Str, "THE PRESIDENT; In This Crisis, Bush Is Writing His Own Script" by Elisabeth Bumiller & Frank Bruni.

09-20-01, #1, A1-1+B6, Str, "BUSH ORDERS HEAVY BOMBERS NEAR AFGHANS; DEMANDS BIN LADEN NOW, NO NEGOTIATIONS; Deploys Warships; President Is Addressing Congress Tonight to Lay Out His Aims" by David E Sanger.

09-21-01, #1, A1-1+B4, Str, "BUSH PLEDGES ATTACK ON AFGHANISTAN UNLESS IT SURRENDERS BIN LADEN NOW; HE CREATES CABINET POST FOR SECURITY; Bars Talks, Saying Hosts Will Share the Terrorists' Fate" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

09-21-01, #3, A1-1+B5, Anal, "A Clear Message; 'I Will Not Relent'; A Vow to Root Out All Global Threats" by R. W. Apple Jr..

09-21-01, #4, A34-1, Ed, "Mr. Bush's Most Important Speech"

09-21-01, #5, B4, Transcript of Mr. Bush's Address on Terrorism Before a Joint Meeting of Congress; 'We will not tire. We will not falter and we will not fail.'

09-21-01, #6, Str, "THE SCENE; Joint Congress Transformed Into a United Showcase of Courage and Resolve; A defining moment for America, with few precedents" by Alison Mitchell.

09-21-01, #8, B6-1, Str, "WASHINGTON RESPONSE; Congress Joins In Support Of President" by David E. Rosenbaum.

09-22-01, #3, A1-1+B2, Col, "WHITE HOUSE MEMO; For President, a Mission and a Role in History; Role Finds Bush Onstage, Waiting; Shoulders that once shrugged now broaden with weighty resolve" by Frank Bruni.

09-22-01, #4, A3-2, Str, "Democrats in Senate Back Down on Missile Shield Issue; Opposition to Bush on any defense issue dissipates" by Adam Clymer.

09-23-01, #3, A1-1+B2, Str+Pho, "From Many Voices Advising Bush, One Battle Strategy" by Jane Perlez & David Sanger & Thom Shanker.

09-25-01, #1, A1-1+B4, Str, "BUSH FREEZES ASSETS LINKED TO TERROR NET; RUSSIANS OFFER AIRSPACE AND ARMS SUPPORT; Banks 'On Notice'; President Says Foreign Financial Institutions May Be Punished" by David E. Sanger & Joseph Kahn.

09-28-01, #1, A1-1+B6, Str, "Bush to Increase Federal Role in Security at Airports; National Guard and Oversight of Screening" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

09-28-01, #7, B6-1, Str, "THE NATIONAL GUARD; Bush Proposal Is Welcomed by Governors and Travelers" by Kate Zernike.

09-29-01, #1, A1-1+B4, Str, "PRESIDENT SAYS U.S. IS 'IN HOT PURSUIT' OF TERROR GROUP; A Guerrilla War; Allied Units Reportedly Entered Afghanistan --- No U.S. Word" by David E. Sanger & Steven Lee Meyers.

09-29-01, #3, A19-1, Op-Ed, "Abroad at Home; Progress and Problems; Mr. Bush has set exactly the right tone" by Anthony Lewis.

09-30-01, #1, A29-1, Str, "Bush 'Is My Commander,' Gore Declares in Call for Unity; Urging support for the president in an effort to seek justice, not revenge" by Richard L. Berke.

10-01-01, #1, A1-1+B2, Str, "Bush Approves Covert Aid for Taliban Foes; \$100 Million to Help Refugees Is Also Set" by Michael R. Gordon

& David E. Sanger.

10-07-01, #1, A1-1+B5, Str, "BUSH SAYS 'TIME IS RUNNING OUT'; U.S. PLANS TO ACT LARGELY ALONE; Rumsfeld Returns; Administration Says It Has Enough Backing for Long Campaign" by Elaine Sciolino & Steven Lee Meyers.

Phase III

10-08-01, #1, A1-1+B3, Str, "U.S. AND BRITAIN STRIKE AFGHANISTAN, AIMING AT BASES AND TERRORIST CAMPS; BUSH WARNS 'TALIBAN WILL PAY A PRICE'; Bomb and Missile Attacks --- Bin Laden Issues Threat" by Patrick E. Tyler.

10-08-01, #5, A17-1, Op-Ed, "Essay: Our 'Relentless' Liberation; Afghans now, Iraqis soon" by William Safire.

10-08-01, #6, B6-1, Str, "THE PLANNING; Quietly, Carefully, President Worked Toward a Decision on Attack-Aid Combination" by David E. Sanger & Elisabeth Bumiller.

10-09-01, #1, B7-1, Str, "THE PLANNING; A Look Behind the Scenes, From White House Aides" by Elisabeth Bumiller & David E. Sanger.

10-12-01, #1, A1-1+B5, Str, "BUSH OFFERS TALIBAN '2ND CHANCE' TO YIELD; SAYS HE'D WELCOME U.N. IN NATION-BUILDING; FBI ISSUES ALERT ON SIGNS OF NEW TERROR; 'Just Bring Him In'; President Hints He Will Halt War if bin Laden Is Handed Over" by Patrick E. Tyler & Elisabeth Bumiller.

10-12-01, #2, A1-1+B14, Pho+Str "Honoring Pentagon Victims, and Survivors; President Bush and his wife, Laura, at a ceremony"

10-12-01, #5, A24-1, Ed, "Mr. Bush' New Gravitas"

10-12-01, #6, B4, Excerpts from "the President's Remarks on the War on Terrorism"

10-12-01, #7, B5-1, Str, "MEDIA WATCH; To Reassure World, Bush Flies Confidently and Forcefully Without a Net" by Alessandra Stanley.

10-15-01, #1, A1-1+B2, Str, "PRESIDENT REJECTS OFFER BY TALIBAN FOR NEGOTIATIONS; Demands Surrender of bin Laden --- U.S. Bombs Fall in Kabul" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

10-19-01, #1, A1-1+B4, Pho+Str, "THE PRESIDENT; Bush Meets China's Leader" by David Sanger.

10-20-01, #1, A1-1+B4, Str, "BUSH MEETS JIANG; Citing Support for War, President Plays Down Contentious Issues" by David E. Sanger in Beijing.

10-20-01, #2, A4-1, Str, "Rome Journal: A Bush Admirer Longs to Join America's A-List" by Melinda Henneberger.

10-20-01, #5, B1-1+B6, Str, "Bush Winning Gore Backers' High Praises; Foreign Policy Choices Seen as Ideal for Crises; Many Democrats are having a quiet change of heart on the president" Richard L. Berke.

10-20-01, #6, A1-1+B2, Str, "More Than 100 G.I.'s in Afghan Ground Raid; NIGHTTIME ASSAULT; 2 Die in Copter Accident at Pakistan Base --- Taliban Site Hit" Eric Schmitt with Steven Lee Meyers.

10-24-01, #3, B1-1+B2, Str, "Bush's War Troika Seeking Blend of Military and Civilian Decision-Making; An old issue of how much oversight to impose on field commanders" by Eric Schmitt.

11-07-01, #2, B4-1, Excerpt from Bush's speech "In President's Words; 'Lift This Dark Threat'; 'An international coalition of unprecedented scope' "

Phase IV

03-18-03, #1, A1-1+A15, Str, "Bush Gives 48 Hours, and Vows to Act; READY TO ATTACK; Diplomatic Effort Ends --- Terror Alert Level Is Raised for U.S." by Richard W. Stevenson.

03-18-03, #2, A1-1+A14, Anal, "A New Doctrine for War; In Age of Unseen Enemies, President Says, Waiting for Opponent to Attack 'Is Suicide'; Allies say the gunslinging image is now an advantage" by David Sanger.

03-18-03, #5, A14-2, Transcript of Bush's Speech on Iraq "Saddam Hussein and His Sons Must Leave"

03-18-03, #6, A14-1, Str, "Congress; Both Parties Close Ranks Behind the President" No reporter's name.

03-18-03, #9, A18-2, Str, "TV Watch; Soft Words That Convey a Hard Line" by Alessandra Stanley.

03-20-03, #1, A1-1+A20, Str, "BUSH ORDERS START OF WAR ON IRAQ; MISSILES APPARENTLY MISS HUSSEIN; President Warns of

Difficulty --- Airstrikes on Baghdad" by Dvid E. Sanger with John F. Burns.

03-20-03, #2, A1-2+A20, Str, "Days of Waiting and Wondering Ends With Word From President" by Richard W. Stevenson.

03-23-03, #2, B1-2+B10, Str, "Pre-emption; Idea With a Lineage Whose Time Has Come" by Steven Weisman.

03-23-03, #3, B10-1, Str, "Bush Warns That the War in Iarq May Last Longer Than Expected" by David Sanger.

03-24-03, #1, A1-2+B2, Str, "Lowering Expectation; As Iraqi Resistance Stiffens, Bush Moves To Prepare U.S. Public for a Harder War" R. W. Apple Jr..

03-24-03, #2, B12-2, Str, "Commander in Chief; Bush, Pleased by Progress, Tries to Lower Expectations" by Richard Stevenson.

03-28-03, #1, A1-2+B13, Str, "War to Keep Going Until Regime Ends, Bush and Blair Say" by Tom Shanker & Elisabeth Bumiller.

03-28-03, #2, A11-1, Str, "White House Proposes New Rules for Overtime" by Steven Greenhouse.

03-28-03, #4, B12, Transcript from news conference by Bush and Blair "Speeches and Testimony; Bush and Blair at Camp David; 'Acting Together in a Noble Purpose' "

03-29-03, #1, A1-1+B11, Str, "WHITE HOUSE SAYS WAR IS 'ON TRACK'; SHOW OF SUPPORT; Bush Assails Hussein --- Syria and Iran Warned Not to Interfere" by Richard Stevenson.

03-29-03, #2, B11, Excerpts from Bush's Speech to Veterans Groups at the White House.

03-30-03, #2, B1-1+B11, Str, "President, No Matter Where, Keeps Battlefield Close" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

03-30-03, #10, Week in Review p. 1, Feature, "The End of Texas as We Know Them; Bush's fiscal revolution has just begun, and the economy may never be the same" by Daniel Altman.

04-04-03, #3, B9-2, Str, "Paying for the War; House and Senate Approve Bush's Wartime Spending Request" by David Firestone.

04-05-03, #1, A1-1, Anal, "Dash to Baghdad Leaves Debate in Dust; Military Successes Give Bush a Boost" by R. W. Apple Jr..

04-07-03, #1, A2-2, Str, "Bush Visit Is Viewed as Hopeful Sign for Ulster Impasse" by Warren Hoge in London.

04-07-03, #3, B2-2, Col, "White House Letter; Another President Bush Watches on the Sidelines" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

04-09-01, #1, A1-2+B6, Anal, "Bush's War Message; Strong and Clear" by R. W. Apple Jr..

04-09-03, #4, B7-2, Excerpts from Remarks by Bush and Blair "Iraq Will Soon Be Liberated"

04-10-03, #1, A1-2+B10, Str, "U.S. FORCES TAKE CONTROL IN BAGHDAD; BUSH ELATED; SOME RESISTANCE REMAINS; Bush Tunes In And Sees Iraqis in Celebrations" Elisabeth Bumiller & Douglas Jehl.

04-11-03, #2, B8-2, Transcript of taped statements by Bush and Blair "We Will Help You Build"

04-12-03, #1, A1-2, Pho+Str, "SOLDIERS' HONOR; Visiting troops wounded in Iraq, President Bush gave a Purple Heart yesterday to Army Sgt. First Class Thomas Douglas ... " by *New York Times* Photographer

04-14-03, #1, A1-2+B1, "How 3 Weeks of War in Iraq Looked From the Oval Office" by Elisabeth Bumiller et al..

04-15-03, #1, B1-2+B10, Str, "Americans See Clear Victory in Iraq, Poll Finds; Baghdad's fall has fortified Bush's political standing" by Adam Nagourney & Janet Elder.

04-15-03, #2, B10-1, Str, "POLITICAL STRATEGY; Bush to Use Ratings in War To Sell Proposed Tax Cut" Richard W. Stevenson.

04-16-03, #2, A1-1+B3, Str, "BUSH SAYS REGIME IN IRAQ IS NO MORE; SYRIA IS PENALIZED; Cutting an Oil Pipeline; U.S. Is Also Pressuring Iran" by David Sanger & Thom Shanker.

04-17-03, #1, A1-1+B6, Str, "BUSH URGING U.N. TO LIFT SANCTIONS IMPOSED ON IRAQ; 12 Years of Trade Curbs; Oil Money Seen as Paying for Rebuilding, but Plan Could Reignite Council Feud" by Richard Stevenson with Felicity Barringer.

04-17-03, #1, A1-1+B6, Str, "BUSH URGING U.N. TO LIFT SANCTIONS IMPOSED ON IRAQ; 12 Years of Trade Curbs; Oil Money Seen as Paying for Rebuilding" by Richard Stevenson.

04-17-03, #2, A1-2+A8, Str, "White House Is Pressing Israelis To Take Initiatives in Peace Talks" by Steven R. Weisman.

04-19-03, #1, A1-1+B6, Str, "Bush Plans to Ask U.N. to Lift Penalties Against Iraq in Phases" by Steven Weisman.

04-20-03, #1, B14-1, Str, "THE ADMINISTRATION; Even Critics of War Say the White House Spun It With Skill; A battlefield narrative that

worked at home, if not everywhere" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

04-22-03, #1, A1-1+A18, Str, "BUSH'S AIDES PLAN LATE SPRINT IN '04; Formal Campaign Would Start Near Sept. 11 Anniversary" Adam Nagourney & Richard W. Stevenson.

04-26-03, #1, A13-1, Str, "WHITE HOUSE MEMO; Bush Shows Loose Side in an Interview" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

04-28-03, #1, A18-1, Col, "White House Letter; Playing It Straight at an Odd Washington Ritual" by Elisabeth Bumiller.

04-29-03, #2, A19-2, Excerpt "In Bush's Words; 'Superb' Progress in Iraq"

05-02-03, #1, A1-1+A16, Str, "Bush Declares 'One Victory in a War on Terror'; He Says Military Phase in Iraq Has Ended" by David E. Sanger in San Diego.

05-02-03, #2, A16-2, Transcript from President Bush's Remarks on the End of Major Combat in Iraq"

05-02-03, #3, A17-2, Str, "THE SCENE; In Full Flight Regalia, the President Enjoys a 'Top Gun' Moment" by David Sanger.

Appendix B

Korean Abstract (국문 초록)

대통령의 의사소통은 여러 의사소통 영역 가운데 가장 중요한 영역이다. 대통령은 언론 매체의 긍정적 보도를 통해 정책 목표를 이행할 수 있는 국민적 지지를 얻을 수 있다. 매체는 그들이 국민을 향해 호소하도록 하는 중요한 채널이다. 이 때문에 미국의 대통령들은 언론의 보도를 길들이기 위해 다양한 노력을 해왔다. 이와는 대조적으로 언론 매체들은 대통령 기사를 보도하는데 있어서 스스로의 이해관계를 갖고 있다. 언론 매체들은 그들 나름의 시각에서 독자나 시청자를 만족시켜야 하며 이것은 기업적 차원에서 더욱 중요할 수도 있다. 미국 대통령들은 자신들에 관한 언론 보도를 통제하고 조작하기 위해 백악관 내에 강력한 공보 기구를 운영한다. 매체들은 정보를 얻기 위해 백악관 관리들과 협조해야 한다. 하지만 그들은 대통령의 정책을 비판하는 백악관 외부의 다른 소식통도 갖고 있다. 언론 매체와 백악관은 보도를 두고 지속적으로 협조하고 교섭하며 맞선다. 이런 과정의 최종 결과는 대통령과 그들의 정책목표와 이에 대한 국민의 반응을 보도하는 기사의 형태로 구체화된다.

뉴욕 타임스는 대통령의 정치적 의사소통을 진지하게 다루는 언론 매체 중 하나이다. 이 논문은 뉴욕 타임스가 중대한 국면에 처한 조지 부시 대통령을 얼마나 긍정적으로 또는 부정적으로 묘사했는지 살펴본 시도였다. 연구 대상이 된 4개의 중대 국면은 부시의 취임 기간 (타임스, 2001년 1월 21일부터 동년 2월 20일까지), 9-11 테러공격 (타임스, 동년 9월 11일부터 동년 10월 7일까지), 아프가니스탄 전쟁 (타임스, 동년 10월 8일부터 동년 11월 7일까지), 이라크 전쟁 (타임스, 2003년 3월 19일부터 동년 5월 2일까지) 이다. 연구자는 4개 기간이 취임과 위기와 전쟁의 시기로 부시와 미국에 중대한 기간이었던 만큼 타임스가 부시 대통령을

긍정적으로 묘사했을 것이라는 가설을 세웠다. 미국의 수많은 여론 조사는 국가적 위기 중 대통령에 대한 지지도가 상승했음을 보여주며 타임스 보도도 이런 흐름을 반영했을 것이라고 연구자는 가정했다.

연구자는 2003년 6월부터 9월까지 마이크로필름에 수록된 타임스의 기사에 대한 내용분석을 수행했다. 분석은 4개 기간 중 인쇄된 모든 종류의 기사와 사진을 대상으로 진행됐다. 연구자는 기사에 대한 5단계 측정 척도(매우 긍정, +2; 다소 긍정, +1; 중립, 0; 다소 부정, -1; 매우 부정, -2)를 택했고, 질적 분석 및 양적 분석을 차례로 수행했다. 그러나 질적 분석에 더 큰 무게를 두었다. 연구자는 기사 중 문장들이 어떻게 부시의 정책을 묘사했는지 그리고 미국인 또는 국제 사회의 반대 목소리를 전달했는지 파악하려 시도했다. 연구자는 선행 연구(1981년 그로스먼-쿠마르 연구)보다 '대통령 보도'의 범위를 확대해 부시 대통령의 이미지에 영향을 줄 수 있는 모든 사진 및 기사를 연구범위에 포함시켰다. 이 범위에 포함된 기사는 모두 134일분의 타임스 지면에서 575건에 달했다. 이미지 측정 평가는 연구자 한 명이 수행했다.

분석 결과 전 기간을 통해 긍정적 기사(+2, +1)는 359건(62.43%)에 이르렀고, 부정적 기사(-2, -1)는 136건(23.65%), 중립적 기사(0)는 80건(13.92%)에 달했다. 타임스는 부정적 기사 1건에 대해 긍정적 기사 2.64건을 보도한 것으로 계산됐다. 부정적 기사에 대한 긍정적 기사의 비율은 그로스먼-쿠마르 연구의 비율(48.7% 대 27.3%)보다 훨씬 높았다. 4개 연구 기간에 대한 개별적 분석을 보면 기간별 기사의 특성이 잘 드러난다. 제1기(취임)에는 긍정정보도의 비율이 62.50%, 부정적 기사의 비율은 20.22%로 나타났다. 이 기간 부시는 그의 일부 정책제안으로 국민의 반대에 직면했지만 대체로 언론과의 밀월기간을 가진 것으로 풀이됐다. 제2기(9-11 테러공격)에서 긍정정보도의 비율은 70.96%로 크게 올라갔으며 부정정보도의 비율은 20.16%에 머물렀다. 이것은 타임스가 부시를 위기의 지도자로 묘사했음을 의

미한다. 여론조사에 의하면, 테러 직후 부시에 대한 긍정 평가가 51%에서 86%로 급상승했다. 제3기 (아프가니스탄 전쟁) 중 긍정 보도 비율은 취임시 수준 (62.31%) 으로 하락했고 부정 보도 비율은 23.91%로 다소 상승했다. 이것은 이 전쟁이 약간의 반대를 초래했음을 암시한다. 제4기 (이라크 전쟁) 중 긍정 보도의 비율은 55.55%로 좀 하락한 반면 부정 보도의 비율이 30.06%로 크게 상승해 이 전쟁이 아프간 전쟁보다 미국 내외에서 더 강력한 반대를 촉발했음을 보여주었다. 재미있는 것은 타임스가 이 기간 중 매우 긍정적 (+2) 보도가 크게 늘었으나 동시에 부정적 보도 (-2, -1) 도 동시에 크게 늘었다는 점이다. 또 이 기간 타임스는 전쟁을 지휘하는 부시의 인간적 측면을 드러낸 매우 우호적인 기사를 더 많이 게재했다. 이들 기사는 주로 엘리자베스 뷰밀러 기자가 썼다. (논문 157-59쪽 참고)

연구자는 1면에 게재된 매우 부정적 (-2) 기사와 매우 긍정적 (+2) 기사의 비율이 의미있다고 판단한다. 전체적으로 보아 매우 부정적 기사 전체 44건 중 11건 (25.0%) 이 1면에 게재됐으며, 매우 긍정적 기사 전체 126건 중 61건 (48.4%) 이 1면에 실렸다. 1면에 게재된 매우 긍정적 기사에 대한 매우 부정적 기사의 비율은 11 대 61로 18.03%였다. 이들 수치는 전체적으로 매우 부정적 기사가 매우 긍정적 기사에 비해 타임스 지면의 안쪽 깊이 묻혔음을 보여준다. 이것은 궁극적으로 연구 대상 기간중 부시 대통령이 “상황을 규정”해 그가 의제를 설정했으며 타임스는 그가 끌여가는 방향으로 따라갔다는 얘기다. 결론적으로 연구 대상 기간을 통털어 부시 대통령이 상당한 정도로 뉴욕 타임스의 기사를 이끌어 긍정적 보도의 즐거움을 누렸다고 말할 수 있다. 그러나 부시 대통령이 타임스의 보도에 만족했느냐는 것은 별개의 문제다. “언론보도가 자신의 원하는 방향으로” 따라오기를 바라는 부시 대통령은 여전히 이라크전후 미군 사상자 발생을 주로 보도한 타임스에 여전히 불만을 가졌을 것으로 필자는 생각한다.