

**Public Perception of Reproductive Rights: Post Dobbs v. Jackson Decision**

Ana Krstanovic

Department of Communication Studies

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

## **Public Perception of Reproductive Rights: Post Dobbs v. Jackson Decision**

### **Introduction**

#### **Brief History of Reproductive Healthcare Access in the United States**

In the United States, obtaining full and free reproductive rights has come with a variety of obstacles and hardships. From a historic battle for birth control access to recent abortion bans, reproductive healthcare access has proven to be an ongoing challenge for people across the nation. These access buffers have arisen from years of national divide, healthcare inequity, and changing political ideologies.

The 1960s marked the introduction of the birth control pill, which allowed married women to delay pregnancy for the first time by their own choice (Howard University, 2023). During this time, it was not abnormal for religious institutions to actively oppose contraceptive use. Several states even banned the sale of contraceptives, sometimes going so far as to hinder married couples from obtaining them. It was not until 1972, in the case of *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, that the right to contraception was extended to unmarried individuals. In 1973, *Roe v. Wade*, a landmark Supreme Court decision, upheld that constitutional rights were being overridden in states that banned abortion (Howard University, 2023). Although abortion bans were ruled unconstitutional and contraceptives had been released to the public at that point, there were still roadblocks to achieving reproductive healthcare access. To this day, birth control access is limited for many people, and organizations such as Planned Parenthood face daily challenges to provide services.

In 2022, *Dobbs v. Jackson* was decided by the Supreme Court. This case overturned *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, or the precedent that protected the constitutional right to abortion in the United States. Abortion bans were then left up to the states to implement.

As of April 2025, there are 19 states with abortion restrictions (McCann & Walker, 2024).

Abortion restrictions vary widely depending on the location, but some restrictions relate to the timing of the pregnancy, whether the fetus is endangered, whether the mother's life is endangered, and pregnancies resulting from rape and incest (Haines, 2024). In terms of recent birth control and healthcare access news, there has been a push to develop male birth control, as well as to find user-controlled methods that protect against sexually transmitted diseases (Our Bodies Ourselves Today, 2024).

### **Media Coverage of Reproductive Healthcare Issues**

Broadcast news media coverage has the ability to persuade, influence, and sway public perception of issues (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). The impact of words and discourse in regard to reproductive health has spanned across multiple channels, trickling into a variety of news outlets and social media platforms. In the media coverage that has been studied, there have been two macro themes: how reproductive healthcare access has been framed and the prominence of certain voices in the reproductive healthcare narrative.

#### ***Framing***

Consistently across news coverage, the abortion debate has been framed as a political issue as opposed to a healthcare issue. Findings consistently show that existing abortion narratives are taken up by different sides of the debate to push political agendas (Schmid et al., 2023). When healthcare discourses are invoked, anti-abortion activists frame abortions as a health risk and shift blame onto abortion seekers and providers; pro-choice supporters frame abortions as essential health care and a structural issue (Schmid et al., 2023). This framing also translates to newspaper coverage of abortion, which does not contribute to public understanding that abortions are common, safe reproductive healthcare services (Woodruff, 2019). Overall,

news coverage communicates to the public that political aspects of abortion are more important than personal ones (Goldfish, 2023). Similarly, whenever contraception is covered, figures within television media emphasize the political and controversial aspects of it (Patton et al., 2017). For example, news on the science of emergency contraception was overwhelmed by coverage of the political controversy over the FDA's actions (Krasnow & Woodruff, 2015). The political framing of reproductive health issues is prominent across coverage in news outlets.

In addition to this, conservative news outlets tend to be on the offensive while liberal news outlets tend to be on the defensive, furthering the political agenda that has rooted itself in reproductive rights. When conservatives lessened the impact of liberal narratives, they saw gains in state legislation and public opinion (Jensen, 2009). Upon seizing the majority in 2008, House Republicans brought attention to “partial-birth abortion” and used that to propel state abortion bans (Jensen, 2009, p. 13). Because of this, conservative reproductive health narratives have been more influential than liberal ones in shaping public debate and state-level policy (Jensen, 2009). Because of hefty allegations, ranging from “complacency in allowing sexual abuse” to “violation of religious freedom,” liberals have had to go on the defensive, denying accusations rather than articulating narratives of their own (Jensen, 2009, p. 71). Overall, news coverage of the abortion debate in the United States has been consistently framed politically (Kempton, 2024).

### ***Prominence of Certain Voices***

Additionally, there seems to be a point of privilege in broadcast news media coverage; who can voice their opinions on the matter of reproductive health seems to be based on factors other than professionalism. For one, there is a strong gender divide within the reproductive health debate. Studies indicate that the media reinforces traditional gender norms and

expectations in reproductive health needs and experiences, mostly in association with roles as current or future mothers (DeWees & Miller, 2022). Article content also reflected and maintained masculine bias and a binary view of sex and gender (DeWees & Miller, 2022). Additional findings showed that women were generally quoted more than men in most categories except “politician” (Kempton, 2024). In the 2000–2013 *New York Times* and *Los Angeles Times* press coverage of contraception, a woman’s ability to control her own reproductive needs was debated and restricted largely by men (Gardner & Mendez, 2014). In fact, studies suggest that although many of the news sources (i.e., from polls, interviews, and surveys) were women, male politicians’ voices dominated the narrative of women’s reproductive rights in the United States (Kempton, 2024). Women themselves rarely appear in news coverage of abortion, and when they do, their abortion stories do not reflect average patient experiences of abortion (Woodruff, 2019). Women of color, whom abortion legislation impacts the most, are typically erased from the narrative (Goldfish, 2023). In terms of news media coverage, women were given a platform to speak about accessibility issues beginning in 1873. However, continuous studies of coverage showed that this power appeared to be lost by 2013 (Garner & Mendez, 2014). Essentially, accepting the ideology that contraception is no longer a reproductive rights issue allowed the press to exclude women from the debate (Garner and Mendez, 2014). This body of work suggests that women have been almost entirely excluded from the reproductive health conversation.

Ironically, given that abortion is a medical procedure, health professionals are also rarely featured in news media coverage. National network news coverage of contraception frequently focuses on contraception in political and social terms and uses nonmedical figures such as politicians and church leaders as sources (Patton et al., 2017). Statistically speaking, the most

frequently used sources were political figures (40%), advocates (25%), the general public (25%) and Catholic Church leaders (16%); medical professionals (11%) and health researchers (4%) appeared in a small minority of stories (Patton et al., 2016). Only 31% of the segments analyzed provided any medical input (Patton et al., 2017). News coverage of contraception also frequently focused on contraception in political and social terms and used nonmedical figures such as politicians and church leaders as sources (Patton et al., 2017). Generally, health professionals and medical advice are rarely featured in the reproductive rights discussion.

### **The Current Study**

The consistent polarization and politicization of reproductive healthcare within broadcast news media coverage have left many questions to be asked and answered. From current research, we are still unsure of what educational, informational, and societal gaps this news media coverage has created. Overall, it is important to determine how and why this broadcast news media coverage impacts public perception of reproductive health. As a first step, my goal in the current study is to analyze the content of broadcast news from sources representing the United States' current two-party system: MSNBC and FOX News.

### ***Theory***

This thesis is guided by agenda-setting theory. By definition, agenda-setting theory is the ideology that mass media outlets have the ability to transfer the salience of issues on their news agenda to the public agenda (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Essentially, the public looks to news professionals for cues on where to focus their attention (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). In the case of reproductive health, news coverage uses agenda-setting theory to push public perception to be more polarized and political as opposed to health-related. Findings indicated that this could be true within multiple channels. For example, press coverage revealed that contemporary efforts to

regulate women's bodies were disguised with discussions about the Affordable Care Act, religious freedom, morality, and employer rights (Garner & Mendez, 2014). Furthermore, most (55%) news stories focused on contraception in general rather than specific methods (Patton et al., 2016). Post *Dobbs v. Jackson*, abortion is likely still being framed as a polarizing political issue (Goldfish, 2023), yet studies to date have not investigated whether coverage of reproductive health issues has changed since *Roe v. Wade* was overturned. Hence, my goal is to explore the framing of news stories after the *Dobbs v. Jackson* decision. I will be guided by the following research question:

RQ: Following the *Dobbs v. Jackson* decision, how did MSNBC and Fox News cover stories related to reproductive health?

### **Method**

To answer this research question, I conducted a content analysis of news media coverage in the three-month time period following the Supreme Court ruling of *Dobbs v. Jackson*. I pulled content from predominant news outlets that showcased both sides of the current two-party system: the more "conservative" side and the more "liberal" side. The content was analyzed by five distinct variables. The examination of these variables revealed what strategies and tactics are used by political propaganda to sway public opinion.

### **Sample**

In order to conduct a thorough content analysis on news media coverage of reproductive rights, I downloaded archived news segments from two major news outlets: [MSNBC](#) and [FOX News](#). FOX News was the primary source for the conservative perspective, while MSNBC was the primary source for the liberal perspective. The news segments were pulled from a strategic time frame of June 2022 to October 2022, which was within the three months following the

Supreme Court ruling of *Dobbs v. Jackson*. Each news segment was a regularly programmed show from each of the respective channels: “The Reidout” from MSNBC and “FOX News Sunday” from FOX News. Additionally, the chosen news segments consist of key terms such as “abortion,” “contraception,” “reproductive healthcare,” or other words that consistently align with reproductive rights.

### **Data Analysis**

The chosen news segments were content analyzed for five variables. Firstly, the segments were studied for language and word choice because word choice and placement can influence and persuade the public to perceive reproductive rights in different manners. Specifically, I analyzed the terms chosen in the context of reproductive rights by assessing the frequency of 20 terms in each news story. A complete list of terms is available in Table 1. Second, news outlets utilize guests to boost a specific political agenda and emphasize language that may align with common beliefs and misconceptions. I documented the number of guests in each segment, their credentials (occupation), and their gender presentation (woman, man) to determine which population is most heavily represented in the guest demographics. The third variable was framing style. Are the news outlets attempting to frame reproductive rights as a political, social, economic, or healthcare-related issue? What decisions do they actively make throughout the segment that contribute to this overall interpretation of reproductive rights? The fourth variable was appeal. Are these news outlets trying to appeal to the audience’s emotional or logical side of reproductive care? I coded each segment for its primary framing of reproductive rights as a political, healthcare, social, economic, or criminal issue and coded its appeal to the audience as primarily emotional, logical, or based on speaker credibility. Finally, the fifth variable was news segment length. I analyzed the length of each segment to determine whether FOX News and



MSNBC differed in the time they dedicated to reproductive rights following the *Dobbs v. Jackson* decision. Length was operationalized by counting how many words were dedicated to each story.

## **Results**

I analyzed a total of 18 shows ( $n = 9$  MSNBC,  $n = 9$  Fox News) that aired in the three months following the *Dobbs v. Jackson* decision. Of those 18 shows, 15 of them featured stories about reproductive health. The sections below reflect analysis of those 15 stories.

### **Language**

To capture the language FOX and MSNBC anchors chose to use when discussing reproductive rights, I examined the frequency of 20 reproduction-related words. Table 1 illustrates the total number of uses and the mean and standard deviation across all shows. Then, it shows the total, mean, and standard deviation for FOX versus MSNBC. I conducted a series of independent sample t-tests to illustrate the differences between the two shows that exist in word choice when discussing reproductive rights. The t-tests showed whether any words were more prevalent on one network than the other. Certain words, such as “pro-life” and “pro-choice” carry established political association, while other words like “abortion,” “fetus,” and “baby” are commonly used when discussing reproduction. By analyzing terms like these, I sought to examine whether there was an underlying bias or framing within word choices. The only significant difference was related to the word “anti-choice,” which was used significantly more by MSNBC than by FOX News.

### **Number of Guests, Guest Credentials, and Guest Gender**

The number of guests on both FOX and MSNBC was also analyzed. The range of guests was 0 to 6, meaning that some news stories featured no guests, while others had up to 6 guests.

The total number of guests across all shows was 37,  $M = 2.06$  ( $SD = 1.80$ ). FOX ( $M = 2.89$ ,  $SD = 1.90$ ) had significantly more guests than MSNBC ( $M = 1.22$ ,  $SD = 1.30$ ),  $t(16) = 2.17$ ,  $p < .05$ .

Overall, 20 guests were men, and 17 were women. FOX ( $M = 1.67$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ) featured significantly more men than MSNBC ( $M = .56$ ,  $SD = .53$ ),  $t(16) = 2.50$ ,  $p < .05$ , but the number of women between FOX ( $M = 1.22$ ,  $SD = 1.20$ ) and MSNBC ( $M = 0.67$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ) was not significantly different,  $t(16) = 1.07$ ,  $p = .15$ .

The credentials of the guests are listed in Table 2; most guests were journalists or reporters. Results of the  $t$ -tests comparing guest credentials between FOX and MSNBC are available in Table 3. The only significant difference was related to journalists; FOX featured significantly more journalists as guests than MSNBC.

Certain news segments chose to open up their communication, offering reproductive rights as a discussion with multiple viewpoints, opinions, and beliefs. Other news segments closed off that pipeline, choosing not to feature any extra commentary.

### **Framing Style**

Each of the chosen news segments was evaluated for framing style. In other words, was the discussion of reproductive rights framed in a political, social, economic, healthcare, or criminal lens? Political framing was the most commonly used amongst both channels, representing approximately 93.3% ( $n = 14$ ) of the chosen news segments. The healthcare framing style was used in  $n = 1$  story (6.7%), and the remaining frames were used  $n = 0$  times.

A chi-square test was conducted to examine the difference in framing style between FOX and MSNBC. The chi-square test showed no statistical significance ( $p = .21$ ) between the networks' respective framing styles. Both FOX News and MSNBC framed their stories about reproductive rights politically, and there was little variance in between.

## Appeal

Each of the chosen news segments was also evaluated for appeal. In other words, was the discussion of reproductive rights presented in a logical, emotional, or credible manner? Further analysis showed that about 86.7% ( $n = 13$ ) of chosen news segments (a large majority) applied an emotional appeal in their stories. Conversely, a logical appeal was only used in 13.3% ( $n = 2$ ) of news segments.

A chi-square test was conducted to examine the difference in appeal style between FOX and MSNBC. The chi-square test showed no statistical significance ( $p = .22$ ) between either channel and its respective appeal style. Both FOX and MSNBC used emotional appeals in their stories about reproductive rights, and there was little variance between them.

## Length of Segments

In order to determine the prevalence of reproductive rights content across both FOX and MSNBC, word count was used as a measure for length. The average length of news stories concerning reproductive rights was 1,890.50 words ( $SD = 2,673.06$ ). The overall word count ranged from 0 to 9,052 words. These findings indicate that while some news segments concentrated heavily on the changing landscape of reproductive rights in the United States, others provided little to no commentary.

A t-test was conducted in order to compare the average news segment length between FOX and MSNBC. The results showed that FOX had a longer average length, with a mean of 2,195.44 words ( $SD = 2,835.33$ ). For comparison, MSNBC had a mean of 1,585.86 words ( $SD = 2,633.49$ ),  $t(16) = 0.47$ ,  $p = .32$ . The difference between these two was not statistically significant; although the average word length varied, there was not a large enough gap to suggest a meaningful discrepancy.

### **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine how reproductive rights were being discussed in news media coverage following the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*. By taking into account news segments from both FOX News and MSNBC, this study aimed to identify explicit narratives and biases within news coverage. Assessing elements such as framing, appeal, and guest credibility allowed for a further understanding of recurring themes and noteworthy decision-making. I conducted a quantitative content analysis of segments from each of these networks, evaluating core differences in news delivery. The results indicated that both networks tended to frame reproductive rights as a political issue as opposed to a healthcare one. Although both networks hosted a wide variety of guests, only one healthcare professional was featured in the segments. Nearly every other guest was either a journalist, reporter, or politician. Furthermore, “anti-choice” was the one phrase that was used more by one network than the other, and it was used more frequently by MSNBC. Additional variations were identified in language choice, source qualifications, and overall attitudes in this study in an effort to highlight the political leanings in media coverage. The following discussion will further interpret the findings, showcasing their implications for public perception and potential impact on healthcare narratives and political rhetoric.

### **Guests**

In this study, an analysis of the guests in both FOX News and MSNBC news segments was conducted. Essentially, who are the figures discussing reproductive rights in front of millions of people, and do they have the established qualifications to talk about a medical matter? The results indicated an imbalance in representation, as a majority of the guests were men. Despite reproductive rights being a concept that primarily affects women and people who

have given birth, the issue was predominantly discussed by men on television. Previous research backs this observation, as press coverage surrounding reproductive rights in the *New York Times* and *Los Angeles Times* between 2000 and 2013 was predominantly covered by men (Gardner & Mendez, 2014). Furthermore, past studies have found that male politicians' voices dominated the narrative of women's reproductive rights in media coverage, particularly in the United States (Kempton, 2024). Additionally, this study found that the guest pool was dominated by journalists, reporters, political analysts, and politicians, with a very minimal amount of healthcare professionals being featured. One particular study that analyzed news coverage found that 31% of segments analyzed provided any medical input, and healthcare professionals were featured in a small minority (4%) of stories (Patton et al., 2017). This uneven representation ultimately leads people to believe that reproductive rights must be discussed as a political or ideological matter as opposed to a medical concern. The lack of healthcare professionals in the news media coverage is worrisome, as the public is then stripped of scientific, evidence-based perspectives on healthcare policies. The prevalence of politicians over healthcare professionals furthers the narrative that reproductive rights are framed in a political way as opposed to healthcare-related, leading to the deepened politicization and polarization of an individual decision. Furthermore, the public is robbed of a scholarly discussion that is informative and factual, potentially impacting their views and beliefs.

### **Language and Word Choice**

By analyzing language and word choice, I aimed to show how rhetoric can shape the public outlook of reproductive rights. Both FOX News and MSNBC frequently used emotionally charged words, though the politicization of them varied on both sides. The results indicated that FOX News used words such as "murder" and "unborn child" more than MSNBC, while MSNBC

used words such as “healthcare” and “anti-choice” more than FOX News, supporting a previous study that found that conservative outlets tend to go on the offensive when discussing reproductive rights, while liberal outlets tend to go on the defensive (Jensen, 2009). Though most of these differences only trended toward significance, examples such as these pose a distinct directive, indicating that the harsh polarization of language choices aligns with the network’s ideological perspective. FOX News used more conservative, right-leaning rhetoric, while MSNBC used more liberal, left-leaning rhetoric. However, both networks used terminology that shaped reproductive rights as a political problem, presenting a skewed and potentially problematic image to the public. Instead of using language that describes reproductive rights in a healthcare manner, both FOX News and MSNBC focused more on the legislative, criminal, and constitutional side of it. Previous studies found that word and phrasing choices significantly impacted aggregate levels of support for policies (Hansen, 2025). Furthermore, the statement framing approach significantly influences support for women’s reproductive policies (Hansen, 2025). These decisions could have a dramatic impact on the way that individuals perceive and interpret reproductive rights information.

### **Framing**

The predominant frame for news stories about reproductive rights was political, rather than focusing on social, economic, healthcare, or criminal aspects of the topic. This result indicates that both FOX News and MSNBC used their platforms to push certain political agendas, focusing on reproductive rights in the context of propaganda and campaigns rather than as a medicinal matter. Other findings have backed this observation, consistently showing that existing abortion narratives are utilized by different sides in order to further certain political agendas (Schmid et al., 2023). This indicates that news coverage tends to stray away from the

concept of anatomical reproductive rights, potentially causing problematic outcomes for the public. Not only do news stories choose not to mention healthcare, but it is almost completely disregarded from the conversation. If news segments choose to narrow in on legal policies, political movements, and shifts in power dynamics when discussing reproductive rights, that could disproportionately impact the overall healthcare narrative. When news coverage of reproductive rights is frequently worded in political and social terms, and nonmedical figures such as politicians and church leaders are used as sources, that can disproportionally impact how people perceive that information (Patton et al., 2017). Knowing this, is the education surrounding contraception, abortion, and bodily autonomy skewed in the eyes of the public?

None of the news stories were categorized in the other areas, indicating that reproductive rights were not discussed regarding social norms, financial implications, or criminal charges. However, the gap in these results further strengthens the previous notion that politicization is not only present but also *predominant* in news story coverage. It gives the appearance that a reproductive rights news story cannot be framed in any way *but* politically. Previous studies have also found that news coverage communicates to the public that political aspects of abortion are more important than personal ones (Goldfish, 2023). Ideally, reproductive rights should be talked about from an educational and inclusive perspective; however, it is often melded in with hard-hitting narratives and polarized media strategies, as proven by the prevalence of politically charged news stories.

### **Appeal**

An emotional appeal was attached to a large majority of news stories concerning reproductive rights. In a small minority of stories, a logical appeal was used. This result indicates that news stories focused on fervent language, moving dialogue, and personal anecdotes rather

than the matter-of-fact healthcare side of reproductive rights. Across both news channels, there seemed to be a set standard: Connecting with the audience was a higher priority than presenting the audience with concrete information about a medical decision. This imbalance in appeal style implies that reproductive rights are a concept designed to evoke emotional reactions rather than a medicinal matter that deserves rational decision-making and deliberation. The emotional façade could be a hindrance to the general public, as news coverage does not contribute to public understanding that abortions are common, safe reproductive healthcare services (Woodruff, 2019). When news stories are used as a way to tug at heartstrings rather than educate the public on available options, how does that affect the way that people perceive contraception and abortion access? One study suggested that some respondents were influenced by the statement framing of news media coverage without consciously associating the language with broader movement narratives (Hansen, 2025). Essentially, involving feelings manipulates perception, impacting the way that people view decisions regarding reproduction.

### **Implications and Recommendations**

Given the results that were found in this study, it is safe to recommend that media organizations should consider adopting a more healthcare-focused approach when covering reproductive rights. This is especially the case for progressive networks that already tend to emphasize the importance of healthcare accessibility and individual liberties. By including healthcare professionals in news media coverage, networks create a well-versed, educated discussion that promotes individual thought and freedom. This decision could provide the public with a stronger understanding of reproductive policies, particularly in the context of healthcare and medical decisions. When journalists, reporters, and politicians dominate reproductive discourse, the audience is left with a concerning informational gap about what reproductive



rights really are. Additionally, news coverage could strive to feature more women when discussing reproductive rights. Networks should aim to amplify women's voices, especially those of healthcare professionals or individuals who have been directly affected by changes in reproductive policies. By allowing women's voices to be heard and projected, networks can build an educated and informed atmosphere, reflecting back to their audience. Furthermore, featured guests and network hosts should strive to use more precise, medically accurate language. Many of the words used when discussing reproductive rights are politically charged, potentially swaying the opinions of those absorbing their content. Remaining neutral during discussion paves the way for a professional, enlightening conversation.

### **Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

This study offers insight into the choices and influences behind reproductive rights news coverage, but it comes with several limitations. First, the sample of shows was limited to a relatively small number. A total of 18 shows (nine for MSNBC, nine for FOX News) were examined in this study, but a larger sample size would better encapsulate the rhetoric and discourse surrounding reproductive rights. It is likely that I did not detect significant differences in several of the tests I conducted because of the small sample size and lack of statistical power. For example, the difference between FOX and MSNBC's use of the word fetus trended towards statistically significant ( $p = 0.08$ ). If I had a bigger sample size, a statistical significance would likely be identified there. Second, this study was hindered by the time in which the segments aired. A consistent string of FOX News Sunday morning shows were analyzed and compared to a consistent string of MSNBC weekday evening shows. These segments were selected because of their public availability, but it is possible that morning and evening shows differ in their coverage or political narratives. However, the news segments may not have been comparable in

certain ways, particularly when considering audience demographics, segment formats, and prevalence in news stories. Additionally, this study focused solely on FOX News and MSNBC, which are considered to be on polar opposite sides of the political spectrum. This study did not take into account other major news channels or digital news sources, which may be able to provide a broader understanding in media representation of reproductive rights.

In order to expand on this study, future research should be conducted in several other ways. For one, it would be beneficial to compare these news segments to public opinion data. This comparison would further assess how media coverage influences attitudes, beliefs, and values in relation to reproductive rights. Furthermore, future studies could broaden their analysis to include all news programs on FOX News and MSNBC rather than a small sample, broadening the scope and understanding of bipartisan reproductive rights news coverage and increasing the sample size. Furthermore, by expanding this study to multiple networks (such as CNN or CBS), analysis could uncover more nuances and variations to language, framing, or appeal choices. Overall, there would be a stronger and more concrete view on how different networks shape reproductive rights coverage. Further research could also implement digital news sources, such as social media, to investigate how certain narratives are spread or reshaped amongst the public.

## PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

19

**Table 1***Total Uses, Means, and Standard Deviations for Abortion-Related Language*

	<u><b>Total</b></u>			<u><b>FOX</b></u>			<u><b>MSNBC</b></u>			<u><b>t-test</b></u>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Abortion	200	11.11	14.38	139	15.44	16.70	61	6.78	10.88	1.31	.11
Pro-choice	14	.78	1.22	9	1.00	1.32	5	0.56	1.13	0.77	.23
Pro-life	33	1.83	4.71	29	3.22	6.46	4	0.44	1.01	1.28	.11
Fetus	2	.11	.32	0	0.00	0.00	2	0.22	0.44	-1.51	.08
Baby	15	.83	3.07	15	1.67	4.30	0	.00	.00	1.16	.13
Murder	2	.11	.47	2	.22	.67	0	.00	.00	1.00	.17
Infant	1	.06	.24	0	.00	.00	1	.11	.33	-1.00	.17
Infanticide	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00		
Healthcare	9	.50	1.65	1	.11	.33	8	.89	2.32	-1.00	.17
Heartbeat	2	.11	.47	0	.00	.00	2	.22	.67	-1.00	.17
Life	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00		
Threatening											
Anti-choice	3	.17	.38	0	.00	.00	3	.33	.50	-2.00	.03
Pro-abortion	1	.06	.24	1	.11	.33	0	.00	.00	1.00	.17
Pregnant	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00	0	.00	.00		
Person											
Unborn Child	12	.67	2.35	11	1.22	3.31	1	.11	.33	1.00	.17
Mother	8	.44	1.65	7	.78	2.33	1	.11	.33	.85	.20
Rape	6	.33	1.41	6	.67	2.00	0	.00	.00	1.00	.17
Incest	6	.33	1.19	5	.56	1.67	1	.11	.33	.78	.22
Rights	53	2.94	4.02	28	3.11	3.30	25	2.78	4.84	.17	.43
Autonomy	1	.06	.24	1	.11	.33	0	.00	.00	1.00	.17

*Note.* degrees of freedom for all *t*-tests = 16

## PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

20

Table 2

*Guest Credentials*

<b>Credentials</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>FOX</b>		<b>MSNBC</b>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Healthcare provider	1	2.7%	0	0.0%	1	100%
Religious figure	1	2.7%	0	0.0%	1	100%
Politician	6	16.2%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
Celebrity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Person who has given birth or had an abortion	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Journalist	21	56.8%	17	81.0%	4	19.0%
Professor	1	2.7%	0	0.0%	1	100%
Political analyst	3	8.1%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
DNC/RNC representative	2	5.4%	2	100%	0	0.0%
Other	2	5.4%	2	100%	0	0.0%

## PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

21

Table 3

*T-Test Results Comparing Guest Credentials on FOX and MSNBC*

<b>Credentials</b>	<b>FOX</b>		<b>MSNBC</b>		<b>t-test</b>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Healthcare provider	0	0	.11	.33	-1.00	.17
Religious figure	0	0	.11	.33	-1.00	.17
Politician	.44	.72	.22	.44	.78	.22
Celebrity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Person who has given birth or had an abortion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Journalist	1.67	1.58	.44	.53	2.2	.02
Professor	0	0	.11	.33	-1.00	.17
Political analyst	.33	.50	.22	.44	.50	.31
DNC/RNC representative	.22	.44	0	0	1.51	.08
Other	.22	.44	0	0	1.51	.08

*Note:* degrees of freedom for all t-tests is 16

### References

- DeWees, M.A. & Miller, A. C. (2022). Managing COVID-19 (and gender): An analysis of US news coverage on reported menstrual disruptions and vaccines. In J. M. Ryan (Ed.), *COVID-19: Surviving a pandemic*. Taylor & Francis.
- Garner, A. C., & Mendez, E. (2016). The never-ending struggle: US press coverage of contraception 2000–2013. *Journalism*, 17(3), 382-398.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884914558912>
- Goldfish, J. (2023). *Abortion! abortion! read all about it!: News coverage of abortion after the Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization decision*. University of Michigan Library. <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/191189>
- Haines, J. (2024). Where state abortion laws stand without Roe. *U.S. News*.  
<https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/articles/a-guide-to-abortion-laws-by-state>
- Hansen, M. A. (2025). Wording matters: Support for women's reproductive policies in the US. *Politics & Gender*, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X25000145>
- Howard University School of Law (2023). *A brief history of civil service rights: Women's reproductive rights*.  
<https://library.law.howard.edu/civilrightshistory/women/reproductiverights>
- Jensen, M. (2013). *Broadcast news and abortion: The effects of conservative narratives on the reproductive health debate*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 72-77.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/84848>
- Kempton, S. E. (2024). My body, my voice: Analyzing news sources in the Roe v. Wade reversal. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 45(3), 299-310.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/07395329241248755>

- Lissner, E., & Brent, L. (2017). The ongoing search for long-acting, reversible male contraceptives. *Our Bodies Ourselves Today*. <https://ourbodiesourselves.org/blog/the-ongoing-search-for-long-acting-reversible-male-contraceptives>
- McCann, A. & Walker, A. S. (2024). Tracking abortion bans across the country. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2024/us/abortion-laws-roe-v-wade.html>
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2747787>
- Patton, E. W., Moniz, M. H., Hughes, L. S., Buis, L., & Howell, J. (2017). National network television news coverage of contraception: A content analysis. *The Official Journal of the Society of Family Planning*, 95(1): 98-104.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2016.07.005>
- Pew Research Center (2022). *2022 Pew Research Center's American trends panel*.  
<https://www.pewresearch.org/the-american-trends-panel/>
- Pew Research Center (2022). *Majority of public disapproves of Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2022/07/06/majority-of-public-disapproves-of-supreme-courts-decision-to-overturn-roe-v-wade/>
- Pew Research Center (2024). *2024 Pew Research Center's American Trends panel*.  
<https://www.pewresearch.org/the-american-trends-panel/>
- Pew Research Center (2024). *Broad public support for legal abortion persists 2 years after Dobbs*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2024/05/13/broad-public-support-for-legal-abortion-persists-2-years-after-dobbs/>

Schmid, A. T., Veldhouse, A., & Payam, S. (2023). A press(ing) issue: Analysing local news coverage of abortion in the US South during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 25(11), 1515–1529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2022.2164064>

Woodruff, K. & Krasnow, I. D. (2015). *Politics over science: U.S. newspaper coverage of emergency contraception*. Berkeley Media Studies Group.  
<https://www.bmsg.org/resources/publications/politics-over-science-u-s-newspaper-coverage-of-emergency-contraception/>

Woodruff, K. (2019). Coverage of abortion in select U.S. newspapers. *Women's Health Issues*. 29(1), 80–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2018.08.008>