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Media Coverage of Transgender People Through Danica Roem’s Election Coverage

Danica Roem’s race in Virginia against incumbent Robert Marshall drew national attention, despite being an election for a state legislature seat. This is because Roem, a transgender woman and former journalist, was running against a man who once referred to himself as “chief homophobe” and introduced a failed bill to make it legal to discriminate against transgender, non-binary and genderqueer individuals. Prominent newspapers like the New York Times and USA Today covered Roem’s election, and the Washington Post had thorough coverage of Roem’s candidacy as well, as the election took place in its regional coverage zone.

Elements of the Associated Press and New York Times style guides align with best practices for media professionals by GLAAD and The Association of LGBTQ Journalists (NLGJA), media advocacy organizations seeking to improve coverage of LGBTQ people and issues they face. For example, both style guides allow for “they” as a singular pronoun and have entries for “transgender.” However, organizations like GLAAD and NLGJA believe there is more room for improvement. Prominent papers have continued to sometimes misgender people and use incorrect pronouns, which occurred in a 2017 New York Times opinion piece about actor Asia Kate Dillon. New York Times public editor Liz Spayd wrote this was due to vague top-down instructions, which told writers to avoid using the singular “they” unless absolutely necessary.

While conversations about pronoun usage are now fairly common in the industry, organizations such as GLAAD have argued media organizations need to go further to consider its coverage of the LGBTQ community. GLAAD has particularly called for more thoughtful coverage of bills seeking to discriminate against transgender people and for better context and framing. GLAAD has created numerous resources for media professionals, including a list of
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1 Lauren Easton, “Making a case for a singular ‘they,’” on The AP Style Blog.
problematic terms and alternatives, as well as tips such as not disclosing birth names and moving beyond the coming out narrative.  

This paper will examine prominent U.S. newspapers’ coverage of Danica Roem’s election and the stories that came out following the election for their adherence to GLAAD’s best practices and style for covering transgender people and the issues they face. The stories will be examined for style and framing within the context of research that shows media coverage shapes the way people perceive transgender people and how they think about issues facing transgender people.

**Literature Review**

According to GLAAD’s media reference guide, “transgender” is defined as “an umbrella term for people whose gender identity and/or gender expression differs from what is typically associated with the sex they were assigned at birth.” The entry also explains that while some transgender people take hormones or undergo surgery, not all transgender individuals do, and that transgender identity does not depend on physical appearance or medical procedures.

GLADD relies on a 2016 Pew Research Center poll to build an argument about the impact media coverage of transgender people and lives has on the public, particularly older generations. According to the Pew poll, 16 percent of Americans ages 65 and older said they knew a transgender person, compared to 32 percent for ages 30-49 and 50-64, and 37 percent for ages 18-29. GLADD argues that as a majority of Americans do not personally know someone who is transgender, many Americans learn about transgender people and issues through the media, and that media organizations must shift to acknowledge this responsibility. Organizations
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3 GLAAD’s Media Reference Guide  
4 Ibid.  
5 Pew Research Center, “Vast majority of Americans know someone who is gay, fewer know someone who is transgender,” 2016.
such as GLAAD argue that as the topic of “bathroom bills,” or bills aiming to discriminate against transgender, non-binary and genderqueer people, continue to be discussed in the national dialogue, the media plays a large role in how people see the issue through framing and language choice. A 2016 poll asking participants whether transgender people should be able to use the restroom that corresponds with their gender identity resulted in an almost 50-50 split, showing there is still significant contention over the issue of rights for transgender, non-binary and genderqueer people.6

The effect of media framing on audiences has been significantly studied. “If the media really are stunningly successful in telling people what to think about, they must also exert significant influence over what they think,” wrote Robert Entman in 2006. This went against the classic belief about framing to instead argue that the agenda setting, framing and priming effects of the media are more powerful than most scholars think, due to the presence of bias. Entman argues that the media not only determines what people think about, but also frames issues and operates with biases—often unintentionally—that have implications for power and the establishment or perpetration of cultural norms.7

A survey of Florida papers by Rick Kenney, who drew on Shanto Iyengar’s work on thematic and episodic framing, studied framing in 2007 news coverage of Steve Stanton, a transgender city manager in Largo, Florida.8 Kenney found that a majority of coverage used episodic framing, rather than thematic framing, which would have offered broader context, rather
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than a hyper-focus on the individual story. Studies have consistently shown that while episodic framing, which focuses on one story or piece of a larger issue, may lead to higher emotional impact, thematic framing, which explores the issue as a whole or places a story in full context, is more influential in its impact on individuals’ opinions and policy preferences.

Researchers have pointed to language as the prominent site of newspaper bias in stories and argue that while some choices may be made subconsciously, the selection of a phrase such as “pro-life” versus “anti-abortion” shows a bias that affects the way readers view an issue. While use of derogatory terms and blatantly problematic language has died out, GLAAD argues that issues are still prominent in modern media, but more subtly. One example of this, as argued by GLAAD, is use of the phrase “bathroom bill,” which, while simple for readers to comprehend, it says is defamatory, as these bills have been created by far-right politicians “to oppose nondiscrimination laws that protect transgender people,” and recommends a more explanatory description of these bills instead.

While there may be debate about this in the field, this in itself illustrates how language choices hold meaning. There is debate over the use of specific language or wording because language matters, advocacy groups such as GLAAD argue. Kenney bases some of his argument on other scholars’ work on “craft values,” which is convention adhering to traditional news elements such as prominence, timeliness, proximity and conflict. He argues that word choice is
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an “inherently ethical matter, with significant normative potential” that is not thought about enough, and calls on journalists to ask how they can contribute to readers’ understandings of LGBTQ issues, have inclusive and sensitive reporting, and question traditional style. Biases and the lack of serious thought in language choices frame issues a certain way and produce media effects, which Entman argues influence what issues people think are important and how they think about them, with real implications for power and societal understanding of a topic.

Transgender lives and issues have had increased coverage in the media, and that coverage has grown from being confined to stories focusing on social deviance or bodily transformation as it had been historically, according to Jamie Colette Capuzza. Capuzza’s research recognizes that “news media have the power to construct and challenge social ideologies.” Capuzza argues that the media can legitimize or delegitimize identities through influence of audience’s perceptions of others and their identities.

U.S. journalists do not have diverse sourcing, and when transgender sources are used, there is still a lack of diversity, according to Capuzza. This limits the scope of voices used in the media, especially as intersecting oppressions can lead to deeper marginalization and “social isolation” from journalists. In this sense, the news’ lack of innovation or branching out when sourcing can lead to invisibility in the press for some who identify as transgender, and results in a lack of recognition or representation for intersectionality and diversity within the transgender sources used.
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Capuzza found that stories about transgender lives in the *New York Times, USA Today* and *The Wall Street Journal* typically focused on sport news (which emphasized the physical aspect of transgender identity and made athletes’ genders a public question) or national news, and that all three publications had stories that violated guidelines from the *AP*, *NYT*, GLAAD and NGLJA style guides by not using chosen names or pronouns, including birth names, or switching between pronouns. Capuzza also found that GLAAD and NLGJA-defined derogatory terms were used in seven percent of the sampled 158 stories and that eight percent of the sample used the phrase “transgenders,” “a transgender,” or “transgendered.” GLAAD emphasizes that these grammatical violations are significant, as they can cause confusion, delegitimize the identity of a person by reducing it to the equivalency of a condition, and dehumanize transgender people.

Capuzza also found a tendency for coverage of transgender lives to focus on sports or soft news, which “invites readers to take this community and their issues less seriously,” and argues for news to focus on more serious issues transgender people face such as employment, legal, health and safety issues.

Data about transgender Americans is difficult to find, according to a GLAAD-sponsored report conducted in partnership with the Movement Advancement Project, National Center for Transgender Equality and Transgender Law Center. The report sought to address this lack of data by bringing together research on how transgender people are discriminated against and face violence, which it argues is not often given attention. The report found that transgender and gender-nonconforming people experience significant levels of workplace harassment,
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discrimination in housing and education, persistent bullying and harassment, and disproportionately high levels of incarceration.\textsuperscript{21}

In addition, the report looked at the demographics of transgender people, including statistics such as that 38 percent of transgender respondents reported being a parent, which can alter the way people view transgender individuals.\textsuperscript{22} GLAAD also argues that while the significant issues and discrimination transgender people face should be explored in the news, it is also important to include transgender people as sources in other stories, in order to give coverage of their full lives.

**Methodology**

The *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and *USA Today* were selected for this study, as they are prominent traditional newspapers with large circulation and national audiences. The *Washington Post* was selected in particular as Roem’s race was in its coverage zone. From each media organization, all stories published online that mentioned Danica Roem from Nov. 7, 2017 to Dec. 6, 2017 were analyzed for violations of GLAAD and NLGJA style guides and for general framing. Editorials and opinion pieces were excluded. The articles were specifically examined and coded for: use of discriminatory or problematic language as defined by the advocacy organizations, pronoun use, grammatical violations (such as the use of “transgendered” or “a transgender”), language related to “sex change,” and how the term “bathroom bill” was used (in quotes, without quotes or not at all).

The stories were also categorized into type of story (regional election round up with all the results from that area, national election round up not focused exclusively on Virginia, stories

\textsuperscript{21} Movement Advancement Project, National Center for Transgender Equality, Transgender Law Center and GLAAD, “Understanding Issues Facing Transgender Americans,” 2015.

\textsuperscript{22} Rebecca L. Stotzer, Jody L. Herman, and Amira Hasenbush, “Transgender Parenting: A Review of Existing Research,” Williams Institute, October 2014.
looking specifically at Roem, stories about the discrimination bill or stories about the history of transgender people in American politics). It was also noted how the articles primarily described Roem using the most common identities emphasized (the former journalist, the traffic wonk or a sign of change in the era of President Donald Trump), with some stories fitting into multiple categories. It was also noted whether a story contained any context about other transgender politicians, or substantive information about the difficulty of being transgender in politics. The framing analysis of this method is more subjective than the grammar and language analysis, but allowed for study of the way journalists wrote about Roem or used her story in coverage of the election nationally.

**Findings**

Examination of the articles from the *New York Times, Washington Post* and *USA Today* showed inconsistency in language choices (particularly in regard to how Marshall’s bill was described), a general lack of grammatical violations, and framing patterns. It should be noted that the sample size for this survey was small, as the national papers outside of the *Washington Post* all wrote articles about Roem, but did not cover the election or her candidacy as much as the *Post*, which regularly covers elections in Virginia. Due to the discrepancy between the number of articles by the *Washington Post* and the other national publications, the analysis was limited to election night onward, which resulted in nineteen *Washington Post* articles, five *New York Times* articles and five *USA Today* articles. This timeframe was also selected to focus on coverage of Roem not just from election night, but after, as well.

**Language and grammar analysis**

There were no pronoun violations in any of the three publications. All three used Roem’s she/her/hers pronouns in stories analyzed. There were no grammatical violations or derogatory
terms in any of the articles analyzed.

There were no name violations from the Washington Post or USA Today. Out of the five articles it wrote about Roem during the timeframe, the New York Times had one article with a name violation, using Roem’s dead name. The article said, “Ms. Roem, who covered local issues as a reporter for years under the byline Dan Roem, dove into long conversations about traffic lights, tolls and mass transit.”

All the articles about the actual election or Roem herself included that she is transgender. The two articles that did not were from the Washington Post and New York Times and were about traffic. These articles instead refer to Roem as a Democrat and politician focused on traffic issues in Virginia, and they were written after the election.

None of the articles analyzed included references to sex changes or operations, although a few included information about when Roem began transitioning, which led to some questions in reader comments about whether that information was necessary.

None of the articles used descriptors such as “biological,” “genetic” or “born as” when discussing gender, although one Washington Post article said “gender at birth,” against advocacy group recommendations emphasizing that gender is assigned at birth.

“Bathroom bill” analysis

Whether articles used the phrase “bathroom bill” or what they used as an alternative resulted in the most diverse findings.

The New York Times referred to Marshall’s bill in three of the five stories. In two, the phrase “bathroom bill” was used in quotes. In one, the bill was described, with not just the
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bathroom component included, but also the fact that the bill that would require schools to inform parents when students asked to be recognized as a gender not assigned at birth.

*USA Today* also referred to Marshall’s bill in three out of five stories. The phrase “bathroom bill” was used with quotes in one and without quotes in the second story, and the third story referred to it as a bill that would require people to use bathrooms that match their “birth certificate gender.”

The *Washington Post* referred to the bill in eight stories, five of which used the phrase “bathroom bill” in quotation marks. None of the analyzed stories used the phrase without the quotation marks. One story said the bill would require people to use bathrooms that matched their “gender at birth” and the other two said it would restrict bathroom use for transgender people in general.

**Context analysis**

Out of the total twenty-nine articles, eight included context about transgender people in American politics, such as context about other transgender politicians who faced severe discrimination or ruined careers after being outed to the public by journalists and others, or context about the difficulty of being a transgender politician in America.

Context was considered to be present when stories went beyond simply saying that Roem was the first transgender person in a U.S. statehouse and outlined her opposition through Marshall. When advocates’ voices were brought into the story discussing the difficulties of being transgender in politics, this was considered context. Of the eight stories that contained context, six were from the *Washington Post* (including one story on how some transgender politicians
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now feel they can be more public about their identities than transgender politicians in the past), one was from USA Today and one was from the New York Times.

**Story framing and general structure**

In fifteen out of twenty-nine articles, Roem was mentioned only briefly as a sign of change in the Trump era. These articles were not exclusively about Roem, and most were not Virginia political round-ups, but national round-up stories looking at a perceived backlash to President Trump by the wave of Democrats voted into office. Nine were published by the Washington Post, four were by USA Today and two were from the New York Times.

Two out of twenty-nine articles were traffic stories and Roem’s transgender identity was not mentioned, as explained earlier in this paper.

Only one out of the twenty-nine looked at her support for health care for transgender people.

**Discussion and Analysis**

The lack of grammatical and pronoun violations, as well as other phrases which are blatantly discriminatory or derogatory, from these prominent papers was not surprising, as these represent clearly problematic language and bias. The lack of these violations allowed for examination of the less implicit biases and problematic language. In some of the stories, for example, derogatory language and incorrect pronoun use by Marshall was included (which was not counted in the coding for these articles), which brought up questions of whether including these quotes was necessary or beneficial to readers. Further studies examining how quotes from Marshall were used, and what context was given around these quotes, would be telling, especially as journalists’ practice of covering all sides of debates has sometimes given a voice to discrimination in stories.
The *New York Times* name violation was surprising, as the inclusion of Roem’s former byline did seem as if it could have been avoided. Roem’s case can be seen as unique, as the byline adds a different dimension rather than just including a person’s dead name. However, that the nationally-focused *New York Times* was the violator was surprising, as the *Washington Post* stories did not do this, even though that paper covers the region and would be most likely to have readers who may have been familiar with Roem’s former byline. Considering that no other paper used Roem’s dead name is a sign that other papers did not feel it was necessary, and further studies looking into why the *Times* or the writer decided to use this in the story would be enlightening.

The *Washington Post*’s use of “gender at birth” in one story did show a phrase that was not endorsed by GLAAD and other advocacy organizations, although it did not meet the coding standards. While this is not as problematic as blatantly derogatory or discriminatory language outlined by advocacy organizations, it still signifies a topic that could be further considered and studied.

Overall, the general lack of language and grammatical violations was somewhat surprising, given Capuzza’s findings when examining the same papers. This could be due to the difference in time, as even the difference of a year may have made a difference, or perhaps the fact that the articles being analyzed were looking at Roem specifically, which may have lent itself to increased consideration of how language was used.

The biggest variant in all the stories was how stories described bills discriminating against transgender people, including, but not limited to, what bathrooms they can use. Many outlets put them in quotes, such as the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*. However, within these same outlets, and sometimes in stories by the same person, some stories would go beyond
simplifying the issue to the phrase “bathroom bill.” The lack of consistency within papers’ coverage, and within stories written by the same writer, outlines how news organizations are still struggling to decide how to cover issues such as this. This would lend itself well to future studies, especially as media advocacy organizations such as GLAAD have put effort into advocating on this topic.

Further work that looks at specific guidelines and style guides put forward by the newspapers themselves would be useful, as the variation in use of the phrase “bathroom bill” and whether quotations marks are used or not signifies a lack of concrete style guidelines for these kinds of topics. If a future study looked at how newspapers made the decisions for how to describe these kinds of bills, perhaps even through a hierarchy of influences model, it could be illuminating into how decisions are made in specific organizations, especially considering the perceived issues with the New York Times’ top-down directives.

This study did not deeply explore framing or story structure used by these papers. However, from this initial analysis of the framing of these articles, it appeared as if many stories followed a general format. Around half of the stories fell into the category of Roem being mentioned only briefly as a sign of change in the Trump era. This could be further examined for the benefits or problems with this use of Roem’s story, as perhaps using Roem’s story only briefly as a sign of change in America is problematic, especially as many of these stories took a variety of election results and simplified them into a sign of increased diversity in politics. In addition, more examination of the importance of context in stories could be looked at, as well general framing.

Sourcing research would also be beneficial going forward, as many stories sourced Roem and Marshall themselves, but few included sourcing from advocacy groups or other transgender
people. One article by the Post included a quote from a community member that read: “She’s never had menstrual cramps, and she’s never had a baby, and she never will be able to. She can take all the estrogen she wants, but she’ll never be a woman.”25 Similarly, some organizations included quotes from people who demonstrated transphobia. The inclusion of these sources could be analyzed to see why they were included and exploring the impact it has on reader perceptions of transgender people. Further field research interviewing reporters, editors and advocates could be conducted to determine whether the inclusion of these kind of quotes has any kind of benefit, as the industry as a whole has been re-examining the idea of objectivity and the value of representing all sides equally.

Overall, this study, despite its small sample size, shows some growth from Capuzza’s study one year ago. However, recent coverage of Roem’s election show there is still room for growth, as newspapers continue to grapple with how to best cover transgender, non-binary and genderqueer people and issues they face. In addition, it will have to be seen whether papers increasingly recognize the impact of their coverage and their responsibility when discussing transgender people. Future studies looking at whether coverage of Roem changes, such as when her being transgender is mentioned and when it is not, would allow for more examination of whether the industry has improved in covering transgender people, and where it still has room to grow.

25 Antonia Olivo, “Danica Roem of Virginia to be the first openly transgender person elected, seated in a U.S. statehouse,” The Washington Post, 8 Nov. 2017
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