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ABSTRACT

Color-blind: The Effects of a Reporter’s Race on Framing

Gregory A. Cranmer

Previous literature has established the widespread use of frames that contrast athletes’ physical (i.e., the “brawn” frame) and mental abilities (i.e., the “brain” frame) in mediated sports content, especially in verbal commentary. An athlete’s race has been extensively studied as a key variable that determines which frames are implemented by media institutions, as Black athletes are framed in the brawn frame and White athletes are framed in the brain frame. The current study analyzed the presence, salience, and valence of brawn and brain frames of Heisman finalists in newspaper articles. This study extended previous research by examining (a) written content, (b) journalists’ race as an antecedent condition of framing, and (c) patterns of salience and valence for each frame. Results of the current study suggest that “brawn” frames are used to describe Black athletes based on probability and in comparison to White athletes; however, “brain” frames are used to describe White athletes only in comparison to Black athletes. Further, reporter race was not found to be an antecedent condition of framing, as Black and White reporters used brawn and brain frames at the same rate. Findings from this study suggest that racially based framing exists in written content. Additionally, the lack of influence of reporter race (a finding that contradicts previously established patterns based on the examination of verbal commentary) suggests that there may be an institutional influence on frame use in mediated coverage of sports. Future studies should examine this further to determine if a media institution influences content through formal policies or informal social interactions and culture.
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Color-blind: The Effects of a Reporter’s Race on Framing

Despite a racial barrier that prevented Black athletes from winning the Heisman Trophy for the first 25 years of its existence (Pinto, 2010), the trophy is widely regarded as the most prestigious award in US college football. Today, Black college football players appear to have an equal chance of winning the Heisman as their White counterparts, as evidenced by a near-even distribution of winners between these two races (Starr, 2011). However, the manner in which sports media has traditionally framed the success or failures of athletes is anything but equal (Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). Sports media have utilized dichotomous frames that emphasize athletes’ physical or intellectual abilities to explain their successes or failures; colloquially referred to as brawn and brain frames (McDonald & Andrews, 2001; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). These frames are often conjoined with an athlete’s race, as White athletes are commonly framed as brainy, whereas Black athletes are framed as brawny (Buffington & Fraley, 2008; Fucillo, 2012; McDonald & Andrews, 2001; Mecurio & Filak, 2010). For example, the 2011 Heisman Trophy race was framed as a competition between the athletic, dual-threat Robert Griffin III (a Black quarterback from Baylor University), and the intelligent, heads-up Andrew Luck (a White quarterback from Stanford University; Fucillo, 2012). One reporter noted that Luck “is known primarily for his arm and his brain, but his athleticism is easily overlooked” (Fucillo, 2012). Interestingly in this same article, Fucillo disregarded Griffin’s intellectual accomplishments both in the classroom (e.g., a 3.67 cumulative grade point average, graduating a year early, and being admitted to graduate school) and on the football field (e.g., recording the second highest quarterback rating [189.5] in the country, one indicator of a quarterback’s decision-making ability) in favor for his athletic upside.

Similar patterns that emphasized the brawn of Black athletes and brain of White athletes
have been examined in numerous studies of verbal commentary (i.e., broadcasts that feature analysts commentating on events as they happen). The current study is a frame analysis that seeks to extend this literature by examining written text. D’Angelo (2002) suggested that a frame analysis should have at least one of four purposes: (a) to identify frames, (b) to investigate antecedent conditions of frames, (c) to determine the interaction between media frames and receivers, and (d) to examine how media frames affect larger cultural issues and social processes (e.g., legislation, public opinion). The current study examines the first two of D’Angelo’s purposes. First, the current study examines the presence and prevalence of brawn and brain frames in newspaper coverage of Heisman Trophy finalists – which breaks from extant literature that has mainly focused on verbal commentary from televised sports broadcasts (e.g., Angelini & Billings, 2010; Billings, 2004; Bruce, 2004; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Rada, 1996; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). The specific focus on framing in print journalism is not trivial, as it arguably reflects not just the individual who wrote the article, but also the institution that produced it. Second, the current study examines brawn and brain frames as functions of the antecedent conditions of athlete and reporter race. By examining reporter race, the current study will ultimately test whether the demographic factors of journalists (Billings, 2004) or the institution that produced the mediated content (Mecurio & Filak, 2010) foster racially-biased frames.

**Framing Theory**

Framing theory (Goffman, 1974) serves as the theoretical underpinning of the current study. A frame has been defined as the “[selection of] some aspects of a perceived reality [that] make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation” (Entman, 1993, p. 52). The function of a frame is to provide a cognitive shortcut to process
otherwise-complex information (Goffman, 1974). The use of frames is argued to be inevitable, unavoidable, and can be unintentional, as all individuals implicitly apply frames to everything in order to make sense of their experiences (Entman, 1993; Goffman, 1974). In a mediated context, frames often manifest through “words, images, phrases, and presentation styles” (Druckman, 2001, p. 227). Moreover, the salience (i.e., making a piece of information more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to audiences; Entman, 1993, p. 53) of a frame can be established through the placement, repetition, selection, exclusion, and emphasis of those words, images, phrases or presentation styles (Entman, 1993; Gitlin, 1980). Importantly, the salience given to a particular frame can help shape the definition of a problem, diagnose a cause, make a moral judgment, or suggest a remedy (Entman, 1993, 2007; Kensicki, 2004; Messner & Solomon, 1993). Finally, Framing Theory asserts that frames are partially created through processes shaped by a media organization’s ideology, attitudes, norms, pressures, and clients (Scheufele, 1999). This aspect of framing will become more salient throughout the study.

**Framing in Mediated Sports Content**

The current study examines framing of mediated sports content for multiple reasons. First, sports and the coverage of sports have an immense influence on social culture, and can be observed economically, socially, educationally, or politically (Washington & Karen, 2001). Thus, patterns we find in the coverage of sports reflect larger culture. Second, sports are infused with objective measures of success and failures that eliminate the need for inferences that foster racially-biased frames. Thus, any racially based patterns of frame use are not products of sport but a reflection of something larger. Additionally, sports require physical and intellectual skills (i.e., the subjects of the brawn and brain frames; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005), which makes sports coverage a suitable medium to study brawn and brain framing. Finally, mediated frames
have been suggested to affect consumers’ perceptions of athletes, sports, and larger society (Eastman & Billings, 1999; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Kobach, 2009). If this suggestion is true, it only increases the importance of understanding the existence and nature of these frames in mediated content.

**Sports are Culturally Relevant**

Washington and Karen (2001) have suggested that sports (a) reflect, (b) enforce, (c) change, and (d) comprise culture. First, sports have traditionally reflected cultural power struggles and carried social connotations, specifically between White and Black communities (Washington & Karen, 2001; Weber, 1981). For example, Tommie Smith and John Carlos will forever be remembered for their political demonstration (i.e., displaying the “Black power” sign) at the 1968 Summer Olympics in Mexico City – an iconic moment for the civil rights movement and a racially divided 1960’s America (Weber, 1981). Second, sports and their rituals have been suggested to be fused with racial and social messages that enforce the existing status quos of American culture (Foley, 1990). For example, Foley (1990) examined the football culture and rituals (e.g., pep rallies, powder puff games, and bonfires) of a Texas high school from a critical perspective, and found that these structures affected the culture of the school and town by promoting traditional social expectations and roles based on sex, race, and social status. Third, sports have been attributed with having the ability to change a culture (Washington & Karen, 2001). For example, Jackie Robinson, Arthur Ashe, and Tiger Woods have all been credited with changing American culture by breaking racial barriers and stereotypes through playing certain sports (Washington & Karen, 2001). Finally, sports themselves have been suggested to shape, and possibly be culture (Washington & Karen, 2001). For example, consider the economic, social, and cultural phenomenon that is the Super Bowl; the game has become a popular U.S.
cultural ritual (e.g., 111 million people viewed the 2012 Super Bowl; ESPN, 2012), that combines food, socialization, sport, and economics (e.g., a single time slot for a 30 second commercial cost $3.5 million dollars; ESPN, 2012). These cultural implications demonstrate the importance and influence that sports and the coverage of those sports have on society.

**Sports have an Objective Context**

Further, Rada and Wulfemeyer (2005) emphasized that sports are innately objective, as outcomes are unknown and unbiased measures for evaluating performances exist in every sport (e.g., shooting percentage, batting average, or goals scored). The objective evaluation of college football players begins during their recruitment while they are still in high school, as players are carefully evaluated on their vertical leap, 40 yard dash time, bench press, size, and potential to get bigger (Hansen, 2011). It is these measures, rather than an athlete’s race, that primarily determine whether an athlete plays collegiate football. In the context of sport, talent and the will to win usually trumps social bias. For example, the University of Alabama desegregated its football team and began to recruit Black players in 1970, not because desegregation was the right thing to do, but because Alabama wanted to win (Al-Khateeb, 2011). Once a football player gets to the collegiate level and gets on the field, they can be judged on yards gained, touchdowns scored, interceptions thrown or caught, and tackles made or broken. These objective measures are enough to describe an athlete’s performance, yet athletes are commonly framed in mediated sports based on other factors, including their sex, nationality, or race (Billings et al., 2008; Billings & Eastman, 2003). These objective measures provide an alternative way of analyzing or describing a performance by an athlete, but that does not stop the use of racially based framing in mediated sports content.

**Sports are Uniquely Brawn and Brain Contests**
Another reason for examining mediated sports content is because sports are inherently intellectual and physical activities. Thus, the existence of brawn and brain frames should be expected in the coverage of sports. Football is no exception, as it is both physical and intellectual in nature (Bowen, 2010; Hansen, 2011). Whereas it is common knowledge that football is a physical game, the intellectual demands of football are often downplayed (Munger, 2006). However, every single play incorporates hours of film study or game planning. Additionally, playing football at a high-level requires an awareness and ability to quickly comprehend and properly adjust oneself based on the opposing team’s formation in accordance to the scheme of one’s team (Bowen, 2010). Football is as much about strategy as it is about physicality. Meaning it should be expected for football players to be framed as brawny and brainy, as these characteristics are crucial to gameplay and determine game outcomes. However, the physical and intellectual nature of sports does not mean that the brawn and brain frames should be racially patterned, especially considering that biologically there are no physical or intellectual distinctions between races (Ayala, 1985). Thus, any racial patterns in the use of brawn and brain frames are likely the result of social construction, as they are not founded in science.

**Mediated Sports Frames Influence Audience Members**

Finally, the current study selected sports coverage because just as sports affect culture, they influence individual audience members’ perceptions of athletes on and off the field as well (Eastman & Billings, 1999, 2001). Rada and Wulfemeyer (2005) proposed audience members internalize frames through routine exposure to mediated sports content, and these frames are further enforced by sponsorship, advertisements, and revenue streams that are also infused with mediated frames (Eastman & Billings, 1999, 2001; Wonsek, 1992). Racially framed mediated sports content has been suggested to have effects on viewers, as audience members have used the
brawn and brain frames to describe athletes based on their race (Buffington & Fraley, 2008; Gonzalez, Jackson, & Regoli, 2006; Johnson, Hallinan, & Westerfield, 1999). For example, Buffington and Fraley (2008) suggested fans frame the successes of Black basketball players in the brawn frame (e.g., “African-Americans are usually fast runners” or “Black males usually have a lot of basketball talent” [p. 301]), and White players’ successes in a brain frame (e.g., “White players are generally point guards, a position that requires leadership” [p. 304]).

Additionally, audience members’ identity and self-esteem have been suggested to be especially vulnerable to frames of athletes that are of the same race (Washington & Karen, 2001). For example, Mercurio and Filak (2010) suggested the racial pattern in the brain and brawn frames used in mediated coverage could be detrimental to the next generation of Black Americans by discouraging intellectual pursuits in favor of athletic activities. Indeed, it is these “brawn” and “brain” frames that are central to the current study, and are explained in greater detail below.

**The Framing of Race in Mediated Sports Content**

Traditionally, sports media have utilized dichotomous frames that emphasize an athlete’s physical or intellectual abilities to explain their on-field success and failures. These frames are colloquially referred to as “brawn” and “brain” frames (McDonald & Andrews, 2001; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). There have been several conceptualizations of the brawn frame, but all have featured the central aspect of a perceived innate advantage in physical ability, as a result of genetics, physiology, or natural ability (Billings, 2004; Buffington & Fraley, 2008; Eagleman, 2011; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Gonzales et al., 2006; Mecurio & Filak, 2010; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005; Rasmussen et al., 2005). The current study conceptualized a *brawn frame* as a portrayal that depicts an athlete based on his/her physical ability, as a result of his/her genetics, biology, physiology, or natural ability. The brawn frame has been used almost exclusively to
describe Black athletes, as Johnson et al. (1999, p. 46) suggested Black athletes are conceived to be “genetically better equipped to participate in sports.” However, occasional exceptions do exist, as Angelini and Billings (2010) discovered that White athletes in the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympics were framed as physically superior to athletes of other races during broadcasts.

In contrast of the brawn frame, the brain frame places an emphasis on an athlete’s ability to use his/her intelligence, decision making, concentration, and other mental abilities to achieve success in sport (Eastman & Billings, 2001). The brain frame has been conceptualized in a variety of ways, such as “intelligence or mental effort” (Eastman & Billings, 2001, p. 186), “perceived superiority… in measures of intelligence” (Billings, 2004, p. 202), and “intellectual or cognitive descriptions” (Rade & Wulfemeyer, 2005). Additionally, Buffington and Fraley (2008) included the trait of leadership as a mental attribute, as it is the result of the cognitive ability to manage emotional intelligence (Bratton, Dodd, & Brown, 2011; Kerr, Garvin, Heaton, & Boyle, 2006). The current study conceptualized a brain frame as a portrayal that depicts an athlete based on his/her mental ability, as a result of his/her genetics, biology, or natural ability. The brain frame has largely been utilized to describe the success of White athletes (Billings, 2004; Buffington & Fraley, 2008; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Mercurio & Filak, 2010; Rada, 1996).

The context of the social construction of these frames has been uniquely comparative, as both frames share the same origin and were formed partially in contrast to each other (Schiebinger, 1990). The origins of these frames have been traced to the 18th and 19th centuries. The catalysts for the creation of these frames have been suggest to be Darwin’s Theory of Evolution and either biological determinism or the social Darwinist perspective that resulted from the theory’s assumptions (McDonald & Andrews, 2001). Early scientists of the time-period
believed that Black and White people were biologically and anatomically different, and readily compared their perceived abilities through an ethnocentric lens (Schiebinger, 1990). These early biologists concluded that Blacks have less natural intelligence when compared to White Europeans (Schiebinger, 1990). Alternatively, these biologists also implied that Blacks were a more primitive people that possess animalistic features and greater physical abilities (e.g., strength) in comparison to Whites (Lule, 1995; McDonald & Andrews, 2001). These perceptions of Blacks as physical brutes and Whites as intellectual superiors were popularized in American culture during the 19th century and served as the justification and defense of the institution of slavery (Miller, 1995; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). The fact that these frames share the same origin and were popularized during the same time period in American history, reinforces their dichotomous nature and demonstrates how deeply ingrained the racial stigmas attached to these frames are, as they have been etched in America’s culture for nearly 200 years.

**Prevalence of Brawn and Brain Frames**

The brawn and brain frames have been discovered in mediated coverage of multiple mainstream sports, such as track and field (Rasmussen et al., 2005), basketball (Buffington & Fraley, 2008; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Johnson et al., 1999; Wonsek, 1992), baseball (Eagleman, 2011; Gonzalez et al., 2006), and football (Billings, 2004; Rada, 1996; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). The racial distribution of these frames has been consistent with previously discussed patterns, as a Black athlete who plays these sports is most often described in terms of his/her muscle structure, speed, leaping ability, body fat, and physiology (Johnson et al., 1999; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005; Rasmussen et al., 2005), and a White athlete is most often described in terms of his/her concentration, intelligence, and leadership (Eastman & Billings, 2001; Rasmussen et al., 2005). These frames have been suggested to be the most prominent in the sport
of football (Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). For example, a White quarterback is often described as
an “intelligent signal-caller… [who makes] good decisions and rarely forces throws,” and a
Black quarterback is often portrayed as a “big guy with a rifle arm, good mobility, good feet,
[who] shows good overall toughness” (Mecurio & Filak, 2010, p. 67).

Additionally, brawn and brain frames are not only frequently found in the coverage of
multiple sports, but also in a variety of mediated content. Scholars have suggested magazines
(Eagleman, 2011), NFL draft websites (Mercurio & Filak, 2010), but most commonly, live
broadcasts of sporting events frequently use the brawn and brain frames along racial lines
(Angelini & Billings, 2010; Billings, 2004; Bruce, 2004; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Rada, 1996;
Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). Verbal commentary during media sports broadcasts has been
examined extensively, and has produced consistent results that suggest live verbal commentary is
associated with the use of these frames. The mechanism behind this pattern has been suggested
to be the very nature of verbal commentary (e.g., spontaneous, unscripted, stressful and a need to
avoid empty airtime), which prompts commentators to verbalize unfiltered, unconscious thoughts
that may be racially biased (Bruce, 2004; Devine, 2001; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). The
premier example of a commentator perpetuating these frames is Jimmy “The Greek” Synder (i.e.,
a former CBS sports analyst). Synder frequently framed Blacks as brawny by focusing on their
genetic composition (e.g., breeding practices of slave owners) or physiology (e.g., muscle or
bone structures; Billings, 2004; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). Although verbal commentary has
been extensively studied and has produced high frequencies of brawn frames and brain frames
(Bruce, 2004; Devine, 2001; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005), less research has been conducted on
the brawn and brain frames in written texts. Despite the uniqueness of newspapers, in
comparison to live commentary, and the lack of research on brawn and brain framing in written
content, the pervasiveness and comparative nature of the brawn and brain frames in forms of mediated sports content suggested that these frames should also exist in newspaper articles about Heisman Trophy finalists. The preponderance of evidence serves as the rationale for the first three hypotheses of the current study:

H1: When covering Black Heisman Trophy finalists, newspaper journalists will use the brawn frame to describe the athlete at a rate greater than the journalist would by probability.

H2: When covering White Heisman Trophy finalists, newspaper journalists will use the brain frame to describe the athlete at a greater rate than the journalist would by probability.

H3a: Black Heisman Trophy finalists will be more likely to be framed in the brawn frame than will White Heisman Trophy finalists.

H3b: White Heisman Trophy finalists will be more likely to be framed in the brain frame than will Black Heisman Trophy finalists.

Beyond the mere presence or absence of brawn and brain frames, we can also look at their salience as further evidence of their usage. Entman (1993) suggested that a frame’s ability to leave a lasting impression or evaluation is a function of a frame’s salience. Salience differs from measures of a frames presence because it examines the pervasiveness of a frame rather than its mere existence. Past research studying these frames has not extensively examined this aspect of framing separate from presence and absence. By examining salience the current study hopes to gain insight into the pervasiveness of these frames between and within athlete populations on an article level. Again, based on established patterns of the racial associations with these frames, the following hypothesis was forwarded:
H4a: Black Heisman Trophy finalists framed in the brawn frame will have higher salience scores than will White Heisman Trophy finalists in the brawn frame.

H4b: White Heisman Trophy finalists framed in the brain frame will have higher salience scores than will Black Heisman Trophy finalists in the brawn frame.

To this point, the current study has suggested that the brawn and brain frames are comparative in nature; this comparison not only leads to one group being perceived as inferior to the other but inferior in general. For example, Edwards (2001) and other sociologists have suggested that brawn frames applied to Black athletes have devalued their perceived intelligence, both on and off the athletic field, by others. This inverse relationship has also been found in mediated sports content, where verbal commentators have used the brawn frame to describe Black athletes’ success and simultaneously diminished their cognitive abilities on and off the field of play (Bruce, 2004; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Mercurio & Filak, 2010; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). Likewise, the brain frame’s emphasis on the mental abilities of White athletes simultaneously devalues their physical abilities, as evident in mediated content’s frequent suggestion that the failures of White athletes are due to a lack of athleticism (Billings, 2004; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Mercurio & Filak, 2010). For example, Billings (2004) demonstrated that when White quarterbacks failed to succeed, commentators suggested it was the result of not being able to control passes. The current study expects these negatively valenced frames to continue and predicts the following hypotheses:

H5: The brain frames of Black Heisman Trophy finalists will be significantly more negatively valenced than will the brain frames of White Heisman Trophy finalists.

H6: The brawn frames of White Heisman Trophy finalists will be significantly more negatively valenced than will the brawn frames of Black Heisman Trophy finalists.
**Reporter Race, Institutionalization of Print Journalism, and Framing**

Whereas the link between an athlete’s race and the frames used to describe his/her success in mediated sports content has received much empirical attention, comparatively little has been proposed about the significance of a reporter’s race for the frames they use. The current study addresses the dearth of research on this point by providing a logic to suggest how an individual reporter’s race might influence his/her coverage. The assumption that a reporter’s race would influence the use of frames is based on evidence that associates reporter race to the stories they are assigned to cover. However, another assumption the current study considers is that the institution, as well as the individual, influence the use of frames in mediated content.

**Influence of Reporter Race on Mediated Content**

The current study rationalized examining a reporter’s race as an antecedent condition for framing in mediated content because researchers have suggested that demographic factors, such as a reporter’s race or sex, could influence his or her production of news and frame selection (Eastman & Billings, 1999; Liebler, 1994). This idea was partially supported by Kian and Hardin (2009), who demonstrated that female reporters were less likely than male reporters to frame women collegiate basketball players as inferior to their male counterparts in written text. Additionally, previous research has suggested that a reporter’s race influences several aspects of the content (s)he produces (Eastman & Billings, 2001; Pritchard & Stonebely, 2007; Wu & Izard, 2008; Zeldes & Fico, 2005; Zeldes, Fico, & Diddi, 2007). For example, a reporter’s race has been suggested to affect the topics (s)he cover, as minority journalists cover minority issues and storylines more frequently than do White reporters (Poindexter, Smith, & Heider, 2003; Pritchard & Stonebely, 2007; Wu & Izard, 2008; Zeldes et al., 2007). Poindexter et al. (2003) demonstrated that Black reporters were three times more likely than White reporters to cover
minority stories on news programs in several major US cities: Birmingham, Cincinnati, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Greensboro, Jacksonville, Miami, Milwaukee, Phoenix, Pittsburgh, and Spokane. Of course, this correlation between a reporter’s race and the topics (s)he cover could be a result of minority journalists being assigned to write about minority issues or minority journalists having a stronger interest in covering minority issues than do White journalists. For example, one Black journalist for The Journal Sentinel explained “[she likes] being able to tell the stories of [her] people” through the paper (Pritchard & Stonebely, 2007, p. 238). No matter the cause of this relationship, it is important to point out that the topic of a news story has been distinguished as a different construct than a frame (Pan & Kosicki, 1993). Thus, the effect of a reporter’s race on the topic (s)he cover does not necessarily mean that the frame (s)he uses will differ from a reporter of a different race. Still, the phenomenon of the race of a reporter predicting topics of the content within media coverage demonstrates that a reporter’s race can influence content.

Another important aspect of news coverage that has been suggested to be affected by a reporter’s race is the selection of sources that are included in stories (Owens, 2008; Poindexter et al., 2003; Wu & Izard, 2008; Zeldes et al., 2007). Minority reporters have been found to use more minority sources than White reporters (Owens, 2008; Poindexter et al., 2003; Zeldes & Fico, 2005; Wu & Izard, 2008; Zeldes et al., 2007). For example, Owens (2008) demonstrated that Black reporters were more than twice as likely to use minority sources as on-camera sources, as demonstrated by minority sources appearing in 45.1% of Black reporters’ stories but only 25.2% of White reporters’ segments. Again, the influence of a reporter’s race on his/her selection of sources does not mean the frames within the content will vary based on the race of a reporter, but it does demonstrate that a reporter’s race influences how stories are constructed.
While the majority of studies have examined the role of a reporter’s race on factors surrounding content (e.g., topics and sources), few studies have examined the role of a reporter’s race on the actual frames used in that content (Billings, 2004; Eastman & Bullings, 2001). Billings (2004) examined how the race of live commentators of college and professional football affected the use of the brawn frame to describe Black quarterbacks. Results suggested that White commentators framed Black quarterbacks’ successes in the brawn frame, but Black commentators did not, which supported the belief that demographic factors can serve as an antecedent condition for brawn and brain frames, at least in verbal commentary. However, a key element of the current study, as mentioned earlier, is the examination of print journalism, which has been suggested to be institutionalized (Gerbner, 1966; Mecurio & Filak, 2010). Ultimately, this may render demographic factors of individual journalists inconsequential.

Influence of Institutions that Produce Media Content

As previously stated, written content produced by news organizations is different from live, verbal commentary. In the current study, institutionalization refers to the organization or media institution’s formal and informal processes that influence the shape of content. For example, one key difference between written and live, verbal commentary is that most written content goes through an editorial process of some sort; meaning that material is viewed by somebody before it reaches the audience. However, live-commentary is spontaneous, unscripted, and often uncensored, as it requires an analyst to produce a steady stream of content to avoid empty air-time (Bruce, 2004; Devine, 2001; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). A commentator’s quick reactions to actions or events have been suggested to be the mechanism behind racially based framing, as a commentator’s experiences, knowledge, and bias leak from his/her subconscious to audience members’ ears (Bruce, 2004; Devine, 2001; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005). While it is
likely that commentators attempt to self-censor because they are conscious of the fact they are on-air and are accountable for what they say, the lack of gatekeepers and the role of the subconscious in commentary makes this medium unique in comparison to written commentary.

Comparatively, a single reporter’s subconscious is more difficult to identify as the mechanism behind written frames because written content is often assigned, carefully constructed, edited by either the writer or editor, and reviewed by multiple people before it reaches the public (Hoey, 2008). Thus, it has been suggested that the existence of frames in a newspaper article demonstrates not only that these frames are widely held by individuals, but that collectively the media institution that produced the article deemed the use of those frames as permissible (Gerbner, 1966). While traditionally the mechanism behind written content has been suggested to be a result of formal institutional processes (Gerbner, 1966), some researchers have suggested that the use of racially-based frames in mediated content are informally and socially learned in the workplace (Mcurio & Filak, 2010). It has been suggested that racially-based frames are passed down from one media generation to the next, as younger announcers and journalists learn from their older co-workers. The mechanism behind this belief is that older journalists are usually in positions of power (e.g., editor or chief editor), therefore, out of self-interest, younger journalists must conform to the way the older generation approaches coverage (Mcurio & Filak, 2010). Those who conform are rewarded with publications, superior assignments, and better locations in the newspaper, which only further reinforce the older generation’s approach. In this manner, each generation learned the same coverage techniques, including uses of frames, from the previous generation; just as that generation learned from the generation before them, and so-on, and so-forth (Mcurio & Filak, 2010). This rationale is backed by framing theory research, which suggests frames are persistent over time and socially
shared, even within a media organization (Reese, 2001; Scheufele, 1999).

Finally, the empirical record suggests that race may not influence frame use. For example, qualitative interviews with seven reporters produced a uniformed response that “a good reporter, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, will be able to cover a story as well as anybody else” (Pritchard & Stonebely, 2007, p. 237). However, these interviews are subject to a desirability effect, as the objectivity of reporters may have been called into question by assuming demographic factors affect news production. As well, Eastman and Billings (2001) provided quantitative empirical evidence that suggested that race plays a marginal role in framing in verbal commentary, as commentator race was not found to be predictor of brain and brawn frames. However, these results only analyzed White commentators use of the brain frame and Black commentators use of the brawn frame.

With some literature supporting a reporter’s race and others supporting a reporter’s institution as the cause of racially based framing, a hypothesis about the influence of a reporter’s race on the use of both the brawn and brain frames was not put forth. The literature advocating the influence of a reporter’s race is small and contradicts theoretically grounded assumptions about how reporters learn to cover news. Additionally, both perspectives have little empirical data to support their claims. Therefore, the current study asked research questions that would exhaustively examine the role of a reporter’s race and the interaction between reporter and athlete race in producing brawn and brain frames in written news coverage.

RQ1: Does the race of a reporter affect the brawn and brain frames used when covering Heisman Trophy finalists?

RQ2: Is there an interaction between reporter and athlete race on the use of brawn and brain frames when covering Heisman Trophy finalists?
Method

The current study is a content analysis of print newspaper articles that covered Heisman finalists from 2000-2011. A frame analysis was conducted for the presence, salience, and valence of brawn and brain frames as a function of athlete and reporter race.

Sample

The study examined print newspaper articles written about Heisman finalists. A Heisman Trophy finalist was conceptualized as an athlete who was invited to New York City for the presentation of the award. Heisman Trophy finalists were chosen as the topic of the study’s sample because finalists are (a) the most high-profile athletes in college football, (b) the most successful and talented athletes in college football, and (c) provide a unique sample where arguably all members are relatively equal in skill. In total, the 43 Heisman Trophy finalists from 2000-2011 were selected – 21 of which were Black (49%) and 22 of which were White (51%) – as the topics of coverage for the current study (See Appendix A for a full list of the names and race of each finalist). The names of the 43 finalists were used in separate Lexis-Nexis Academic database searches in conjunction with the word Heisman to procure the newspaper articles that comprise the current study’s sample. This original search yielded 5,718 newspaper articles, which was reduced to 468 articles based on the current study’s inclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria for this sample were: (a) each article had to be written about a Heisman finalist from 2000-2011, (b) each article had to be written during the college football season (i.e., August 1 to the day the Heisman was awarded) in which the finalist received his first invitation to the award’s presentation, (c) each article had only one identifiable author who was either Black or White and (d) each article had to be produced by a daily newspaper. Additionally, any duplicate copies (i.e., articles that appeared in more than one of the 43 Lexis-Nexis searches) of articles
were removed to insure each article in the sample was only represented once. The remaining 468 articles were authored by a total of 223 reporters. Of these reporters, 205 were White (92%) and 18 were Black (8%), and the 18 Black journalists wrote 23 (5%) of the 468 articles. Because of the low number of Black reporters, for comparative purposes, the current study retained the population of Black reporters and procured a stratified random sample of 23 articles written by White journalists, which was drawn from the remaining 445 articles, giving the current study a final sample size of 46 articles. The 46 articles of the sample were written by 18 Black reporters (i.e., 14 male and 4 female) and 21 White reporters (i.e., 20 male and 1 female). None of these journalists held editorial positions (i.e. editor or similar).

Of these 46 articles, 34 (74%) ranked within the top 100 daily newspapers based on circulation. The remaining 12 newspaper articles (26%) were from smaller daily newspapers based on circulation. It is important to note that the unit of analysis for the current study was not articles, with the exception of salience, but was frames. Prior to coding, an independent research assistant, blind to the study’s hypotheses, read through each of the 46 articles of analysis and identified all frames that could be construed as brawn or brain frames, based on the conceptualizations of the current study. Within the 46 articles, 146 frames were identified and coded in the current study.

**Procedure**

Three independent female coders from a large Mid-Atlantic university performed a content analysis on the 146 frames of Heisman Trophy finalists, dating from 2000 to 2011. This analysis focused on the use of brawn and brain frames in reference to each athlete, and compared the distribution of these frames as a function of an athlete and reporter’s race. The content analysis was performed utilizing text only versions of the 46 articles. These files were formatted
in Microsoft Word to be consistent in font size, style, and spacing. All disagreements during coding were resolved by a majority rule decision (i.e., two coders in agreement). In all cases, at least two of the three coders agreed.

**Coder Training and Reliability.** Prior to data collection, the three coders were trained for six hours on 20 sample articles, which were taken from articles that were collected during the Lexis-Nexis search but not used for the sample. To assist the coders, a codebook created for this study was utilized during the coding of training and sample materials (See Appendix B). Coders were asked to record (a) the presence of a brawn or brain frame in an article, (b) the race of the athlete being referred to in the frame, (c) the race of the reporter who wrote the frame, (d) the year the article was published, and (f) whether the frame was positively or negatively valenced. The race of each athlete and the race of each reporter included in the sample were provided to the coders in additional appendices to aid in the coding of the sample (see Appendix C and D). For the current study, the conservative Krippendorff’s alpha statistic was utilized as the index of intercoder reliability. This index was chosen because it can be used with multiple coders, different levels of measurement, and it accounts for the possibility of agreement by chance (Lombard, Synder-Duch, & Bracken, 2010). Coder training ceased when coders reached a Krippendorff’s alpha of .75 or higher for each category.

**Units of Analysis and Variables**

**Presence of the Brawn and Brain Frames.** The brawn frame was conceptualized as a portrayal that depicts an athlete based on his/her physical ability, as a result of his/her genetics, biology, physiology, or natural ability. The brawn frame was operationalized as words or frames that attributed success or skills of an athlete to his/her physiology (e.g., size, limbs, muscle mass, quick twitch muscle, hand size, height, weight, physical specimen etc.), genetics (e.g., references
to family members who were athletes), general biological skills advantage (e.g., speed, strength, quick feet, mobility, agility, athleticism, etc.), and game-specific skills advantage (e.g., arm strength, big hitter, touch, footwork, ability to break tackles, etc.).

The brain frame was conceptualized as a portrayal that depicts an athlete based on his/her mental ability, as a result of his/her genetics, biology, or natural ability. The brain frame was operationalized as frames that attributed success or skills of an athlete to his/her leadership (e.g., leadership, making players around them better, team player, etc.), academic intelligence (e.g., GPA, SAT, ACT, honor roll, impressive major, good student etc.), general biological skills advantage (e.g., smart, quick thinker, intelligent, concentration, composure, etc.), and game-specific skills advantage (e.g., reads the defense/offense, finds the hole, high football IQ, good vision, smart play, knows playbook, does not force throws, stepped up in the pocket etc.). For each frame identified in the sample, coders coded the frame as either brain (“0”) or brawn (“1”). Ninety-six (66%) of these frames were identified as brawn and 50 were identified as brain (34%). Coders reached an acceptable reliability for this category (Krippendorff’s α = .92).

Salience of Brawn and Brain Frames. The current study used Entman’s (1993) conceptualization of salience as “making a piece of information more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to audiences” (p. 53). Salience was operationalized in the current study as the repetition of phrases that qualify as fitting the brawn or brain frames. For each article, a coder identified a number of discrete references as brawn or brain frames. Salience was then calculated by the researcher ($M = 3.17, SD = 3.05$, Kurtosis = 1.40, Skewness = 1.32) on the article level in a continuous measure, with a score of “0” representing the absence of a frame.

Valence of Brawn and Brain Frames. Valence was conceptualized as the manner in which an athlete was portrayed. For example, a brain frame of a finalist that asserted the finalist
cheated on multiple exams during their tenure in college would be considered a negatively valenced frame (i.e., a knock on their intelligence), but if a brain frame praises a finalist for his/her college major the frame would be coded as positively valenced. For each frame, a coder identified a frame as positive (“1”), negative (“2”), or neutral (“0”) in valence. Of the 146 coded frames, 133 were positive (91%), 11 were negative (8%), and two were neutral (1%). Coders reached an acceptable reliability for this category (Krippendorff’s $\alpha = .75$).

**Athlete Race.** The current study conceptualized race as “the social meaning of the geographically marked body, familiar markers being skin color, hair type, eye shape, [and] physique” (Haslanger, 2000, p. 44). This conceptualization views race as a social construction without biological determination, as previous research has suggested (Ayala, 1985; Haslanger, 2000; Lopez, 1994). In simplest terms, race is the social meaning attached to visible differences between people; in the current study between people who are visibly of White or Black heritage. The current study purposefully selected the terms of Black and White because they are dichotomous, visually-based, socially-constructed, and are not rooted in nationality or geographic heritage (such as the terms African-American and Caucasian). For each frame identified in the sample, coders coded the athlete referenced as either White (“1”) or Black (“2”). Of the 146 frames, 77 (53%) were in reference to Black athletes and 69 (47%) were in reference to White athletes.

**Reporter Race.** The current study conceptualized the race of a reporter with the same definition and approach used for athlete race (see above). For each frame identified in the sample, coders coded the reporter who authored the frame as either White (“1”) or Black (“2”). Eighty (55%) of these frames were written by Black reporters and 66 of these frames (45%) were written by White reporters. No reporters that wrote article in the sample fell outside of these
categories because of the study’s inclusion criteria. Reporters’ race was determined through visual identification gathered from their newspaper’s website or social media accounts.

**Year of the Article.** For each frame identified in the sample, coders identified the year in which the frame was published. Frames were coded as follows: 2000 (“1”), 2001 ( “2”), 2002 (“3”), 2003 (“4”), 2004 (“5”), 2005 (“6”), 2006 (“7”), 2007 (“8”), 2008 (“9”), 2009 (“10”), 2010 (i.e., “11”), or 2011 (“12”). Of these frames, the years in which they were published was as follows: 2000 ($n = 17, 12\%$), 2001($n = 10, 7\%$), 2002($n = 2, 1\%$), 2003 ($n = 24, 16\%$), 2004 ($n = 17, 12\%$), 2005 ($n = 5, 3\%$), 2006 ($n = 6, 4\%$), 2007 ($n = 17, 12\%$), 2008 ($n = 16, 11\%$), 2009 ($n = 19, 13\%$), 2010 ($n = 5, 3\%$), and 2011 ($n = 8, 6\%$). Given small cell counts, the year of publication was collapsed into two groups (2000-2005 and 2006-2011). The two groups produced near even distribution of frames as 2000-2005 contained 75 (51\%) of the frames and 2006-2011 contained 71 (49\%) of the frames identified in the sample.

**Newspaper Location.** Each article was coded for the region of the country it was produced in. The rationale behind this was that the brawn and brain frames’ popularity has been traced backed to antebellum America. This fact, in addition to the suggestion that framing is something that is persistent over time and socially shared (Reese, 2001), suggests that there may be a regional bias in applying these racially based frames. Regions were operationalized as the same regions the Heisman Trust created for the balloting system that determines the award’s winner annually. The Heisman Trophy is decided based on votes from six regions: the Far-West (i.e., AZ, CA, HI, ID, MT, ND, NV, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY), the Midwest (i.e., IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI), the Northeast (i.e., CT, MA, ME, NH, NY, RI, VT), the Southwest (i.e., AR, CO, KS, MO, NE, NM, OK, TX), the Mid-Atlantic (i.e., DC, DE, MD, NC, NJ, PA, SC, VA, WV), and the South (i.e., FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, TN). Thus, coders coded articles into one of six
regions: the Far-West (“1”), Midwest (“2”), Northeast (“3”), Southwest (“4”), Mid-Atlantic (“5”), or South (“6”). Of the 146 frames, the location of the newspapers that published them were as follows: 11 (7%) Far-West, 32 (22%) Midwest, 29 (20%) Northeast, 38 (26%) Southwest, 23 (16%) Mid-Atlantic, 13 (9%) South.

Results

Hypothesis 1 predicted that when covering Black Heisman Trophy candidates, journalists would use the brawn frame to explain their athletic success at a rate greater than they would by chance. Results of a binomial distribution analysis supported this hypothesis, as 62 (81%) of frames involving Black finalists were brawn frames ($p < .001$). Hypothesis 1 was supported; see Table 1.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that when covering White Heisman Trophy finalists, newspaper journalists would use the brain frame to describe the athlete at a greater rate than they would by chance. Results of a binomial distribution analysis did not support this hypothesis, as 35 (51%) of frames involving White finalists were brain frames ($p = ~1.00$). Hypothesis 2 was not supported; see Table 1.

Table 1. Presence and absence of brawn and brain frames for Black and White Heisman Trophy finalists, respectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Absence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brawn frame, Black</td>
<td>62 (81%)</td>
<td>15 (19%)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athletes(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain frame, White</td>
<td>35 (51%)</td>
<td>34 (49%)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athletes(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)binomial distribution significant at $p < .001$ level
\(^b\)binomial distribution not significant ($p = ~1.00$)

Hypothesis 3a predicted that Black Heisman finalists would be more likely to be framed in the brawn frame than would White finalists. Similarly, hypothesis 3b predicted that White Heisman Trophy finalists would be more likely to be framed in the brain frame than would Black
Heisman Trophy finalists. Results of a chi-square analysis support that the distribution of frames in the 2x2 design (athlete race x frame) was significantly different than the expected distribution \( \chi^2(1) = 15.78, p < .001 \); with Black finalists being framed as brawny \( n = 62, 65\% \) more than White finalists \( n = 34, 35\% \), and White finalists being framed as brainy \( n = 35, 70\% \) more than Black finalists \( n = 15, 30\% \). However, because a chi-square analyses only provides insight into the entire 2x2 design and hypotheses 3a and 3b inquire about two different halves of the 2x2, a post-hoc analyses using binomial distribution tests was used to compare the racial distribution of the brawn and brain frames separately. Results of the binomial distribution tests within each frame demonstrated that both distributions differed significantly from each other \( \chi^2(1) = 15.78, p < .001 \) (brawn frame, \( p = .006 \); brain frame, \( p = .007 \)). Hypotheses 3a and 3b were supported, see Table 2.

**Table 2. Distribution of brawn and brain frames across Heisman Trophy finalists’ race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brawn(^a)</th>
<th>Brain(^b)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black athletes</td>
<td>62 (65%)</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White athletes</td>
<td>34 (35%)</td>
<td>35 (70%)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2(1) = 15.78, p < .001 \)

\(^a\)binomial distribution significant, \( p = .006 \)

\(^b\)binomial distribution significant, \( p = .007 \)

Hypothesis 4a predicted that Black Heisman finalists framed in the brawn frame would have higher salience scores than White finalists in the brawn frame. A paired samples \( t \)-test did not support this hypothesis \( t(40) = 1.24, p = .22 \) with Black brawn frames not having a higher salience score \( M = 1.55, SD = .44 \) than White brawn frames \( M = .85, SD = .25 \). Similarly, hypothesis 4b predicted that White Heisman finalists framed in the brain frame would have higher salience scores than Black finalists in the brawn frame. A paired samples \( t \)-test did not support this hypothesis \( t(40) = -2.00, p = .053 \) with White brain frames not having a higher salience score \( M = .88, SD = 1.16 \) than Black brain frames \( M = .38, SD = .74 \). Hypothesis 4a
and 4b were not supported, but the statistical patterns were in the predicted direction; see Table 3.

Table 3. Mean salience scores between Black and White Heisman Trophy finalists for brawn and brain frames.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brawn&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Brain&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black athletes</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White athletes</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> t(40) = 1.24, p = .22  
<sup>b</sup> t(40) = -2.00, p = .053

Hypothesis 5 predicted that the brawn frames of White Heisman finalists would be more negatively valenced when compared to brawn frames of Black finalists. A chi-square analysis comparing the distribution of brawn frame valence for White athletes (2 neutral, 5 negative, and 27 positive) and for Black athletes (0 neutral, 1 negative, 61 positive) found differences, χ²(2) = 10.53, p = .005. However, the analysis’ significance is the likely the result of the overwhelming distribution of positively valenced frames in comparison to the other valence categories. A closer examination of the ratio between the distribution of observed and expected frame valence frequencies between both races failed to show differences (White, .7 expected for neutral, 2.1 for negative, and 31.2 for positive; Black, 1.3 for neutral, 3.9 for negative, and 56.8 for positive).

Hypothesis 5 was not supported, see Table 4.

Table 4. Observed and expected valenced distribution of brawn frames between Black and White Heisman Trophy finalists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black finalists</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White finalists</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²(2) = 10.53, p = .005

Hypothesis 6 predicted that the brain frames used to describe Black Heisman finalists would be negatively valenced when compared to brain frames of White finalists. A chi-square
analysis comparing the distribution of brain frame valence for White athletes (0 neutral, 0 negative, and 35 positive) and for Black athletes (0 neutral, 5 negative, 10 positive) showed differences, $\chi^2(2) = 12.96, p < .001$. However, the analysis’ significance is the likely the result of the overwhelming distribution of positively valenced frames in comparison to the other valence categories. A closer examination of the ratio between the distribution of observed and expected frame valence frequencies between both races failed to show differences (White, 0 expected for neutral, 3.5 for negative, and 31.5 for positive; Black, 0 for neutral, 1.5 for negative, and 13.5 for positive). Hypothesis 6 was not supported, see Table 5.

Table 5. Observed and expected valenced distribution of brain frames between Black and White Heisman Trophy finalists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black athletes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White athletes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(2) = 12.96, p < .001.$

Research Question 1 investigated whether the race of a reporter affected the frames used when covering Heisman Trophy finalists. Results of a chi-square analysis suggested that ($\chi^2(1) = .045, p = .833$) Black journalists did not use brawn ($n = 52, 54\%$) or brain frames ($n = 28, 56\%$) more than White journalists used brawn ($n = 44, 46\%$) or brain frames ($n = 22, 44\%$); see Table 6.

Table 2. Distribution of brawn and brain frames of Heisman Trophy finalists as a function of reporter race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brawn</th>
<th>Brain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black reporters</td>
<td>52 (54%)</td>
<td>28 (56%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White reporters</td>
<td>44 (46%)</td>
<td>22 (44%)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(1) = .045, p = .833$

Research Question 2 examined the potential for an interaction of reporter and athlete race
on the use of brawn and brain frames. Results of a chi-square analysis suggested that \( \chi^2(1) = .16, p = .691 \) there was no interaction effect of reporter and athlete race on frame use.

**Control Analysis**

For all tests completed, control variables of location and year were examined in separate analyses. However, none of these control variables changed the trends or statistically significance of any findings.

**Discussion**

The results of the current study provide several insights into the existence of brawn and brain frames in print journalism. In particular, data from this study suggests that (a) patterns of brawn and brain frames used to describe Black and White athletes, respectively, in print journalism largely follow what has been reported on framing in live commentary, (b) that the current study expanded the empirical record of both frames to include the salience and valence of each frame to give a more detailed account of the usage of said frames, and (c) that the current study breaks from extant literature by suggested reporter race is not an antecedent condition of framing. This may be explained by the possible existence of some formal or informal institutionalization processes that trump the influence of reporter race on the usage of both frames. Each of these main findings is discussed in detail below.

**Brawn and Brain Frames in Print Journalism**

Data supported extant literature by establishing the existence of racially-biased brawn frames in a new context – print journalism – by associating usage of the brawn frame with Black Heisman finalists in newspaper coverage. The brawn frame was related to a Black athlete’s race based on probability and in comparison with White athletes. These results suggest that even in print journalism Black athletes are viewed in terms of their physical abilities and qualities in
general and when compared to other athletes. Likewise, the results of the current study supported previous literature on brain frames and extended that literature to print journalism. Additionally, the current study gave further insight into the complex association between White Heisman Trophy finalists and the brain frame. As a whole, Whites were no more likely to be framed as brainy or brawny, as the probability (i.e., chance) measure suggests that brawn and brain frames were used at random to describe White athletes. However, Whites were framed in the brain frame, more frequently in comparison to Black athletes. This comparative measure between the two races supports previous research (e.g., Angelini & Billings, 2010; Billings, 2004; Bruce, 2004; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Rada, 1996; Rada & Wulfemeyer, 2005), but the comparative pattern’s significance is most likely a reflection of the overwhelming brawn framing of Blacks. In essence, it is not that Whites are prodigiously framed in the brain frame, but the fact that Blacks are rarely framed as such which creates the significant relationships between being a White athlete and being framed as brainy.

Salience and Valence of Frames

The racial associations with the brawn and brain frames become less clear when frame salience and valence were considered. Even though frame salience was not significant, the trend in the data suggested that articles that utilized brawn frames for Black athletes made those frames more salient by using them more frequently \( (p = .22) \). The same pattern was observed for White finalists and the brain frame, which was on the verge of being statistically significant \( (p = .053) \). The lack of findings could possibly be explained by small sample sizes, as salience was calculated on the article level \( (n = 46) \). Given the small sample size, the near statistical significance of the results suggests there may be an underlying pattern of increased salience for Black brawn and White brain frames may exist. However, this is a mere suggestion as more
research needs to be conducted to support such a claim. Further, the measurement of salience provides insight into the prevalence of these frames on the article level and demonstrates that when these frames are used, they are used multiple times.

Similarly, despite the current study’s findings not supporting the predicted hypotheses for valence, some insight into how the brawn and brain frames are used can be obtained from this data. Again, the lack of support for the study’s hypotheses may be due to small sample sizes and the lack of negatively \((n =11)\) and neutrally valenced frames \((n =2)\). Even though the chi-square tests were significant, the hypotheses were not supported because the findings were the result of the overwhelming representation of positively valence frames compared to insufficient representation of the other valence categories. The pattern of a frame valence being overly positive makes logical sense considering Heisman Trophy finalists are the best players in the country.

However, the trends in the data regarding frame valence are revealing and coincide with the current study’s predictions. For example, all five of the negatively valenced brain frames were used to describe Black athletes – the brain frame was only used 15 times total for Black finalists, meaning 33\% of the Black brain frames were negatively valenced. However, all of the 35 brain frames used to describe White finalists were positively valenced. Similarly, of the 62 brawn frames used to describe Black finalists, only one was negatively valenced, but of the 34 brawn frames used to describe White finalists, five were negatively valenced and two were neutrally valenced.

The positive valence of brawn frames used to describe Black finalists in comparison to Whites may suggest that physical stereotypes of Black athletes (e.g., “African-Americans are usually fast runners” or “Black males usually have a lot of basketball talent” [Buffington &
Fraley, 2008, p. 301]) are still deeply ingrained within American culture. Likewise, the valence of brain frames followed a similar pattern, as it demonstrates Black Heisman finalists are portrayed in negatively valenced brain frames frequently but White finalists are rarely portrayed in negatively valenced brain frames. This suggests that the belief in Black physical prowess is coupled with a belief in their mental inferiority. Even though this is concerning, it is not shocking, as several researchers (e.g., Edwards, 1983, 2001; Moore, 1992; Wonsek, 1992) have suggested Black athletes are expected to succeed on the playing field but fail in the classroom by the very institutions that provide them with education. For example, the University of Georgia’s athletic department’s unofficial mission statement (i.e., as described by their lawyer Hal Almand) was previously suggested as “we may not make a university student out of [an athlete]. But if we can teach him to read and write, maybe he can work at the post office rather than as a garbage man” (Wonsek, 1992, p. 459).

**Institutionalization of Print Journalists’ Reporting Practices**

The key contribution of the current study is the lack of influence of a reporter’s race on the usage of brawn or brain frames to describe Heisman finalists – a finding that contradicts previous research that asserted reporter race is an antecedent condition of frame use in verbal commentary (e.g., Billings, 2004). The current study explains this disparity as a function of the medium analyzed (print compared to live broadcast), and acknowledges these results do not necessarily nullify previous findings that suggest race is an antecedent condition for utilizing brawn and brain frames. I, however, suggest that the institutions that produce the news are more influential than an individual’s race. This is suggested given that live commentary is more of a reflection of the individual commentator and written content is a reflection of the individual writer and the institution (Mecurio & Filak, 2010). However, the current study cannot provide
insight into what factors associated with the institutions that produce written content cause this disparity. Gerbner (1966) would suggest that the formal institutional processes of producing written content may shape frame use. Meanwhile, Mecurio & Filak (2010) would suggest informal processes of socially learned behaviors of reporting could explain this pattern. It is also possible that a reporter’s consciousness of the audience has some effect on how they write.

**Limitations and Future Research**

While compelling, the results of the current study should be interpreted in light of the study’s limitations, which include (a) a relatively small sample size, (b) a sole focus on socially-constructed Black and White races, (c) the examination of only print journalism, and (d) a rudimentary measurement of salience.

The small sample size used in final analyses was a limitation as it likely negated the ability of the current study to find statistically significant results for valence and salience measurements. When conducting chi-square analyses, small sample sizes are statistically limiting. Additionally, the small sample size did make examining reporter job position (i.e., whether the writer was an editor or reporter) and reporter sex impossible, as none of the reporters included in the current study were editors and the number of female reporters ($n = 5$) in the sample were too small to analyze. The inability to examine these variables can be considered a limitation because position and sex of an employee could influence his/her autonomy, and with it his/her ability to resist institutionalized processes (Demers, 1995; Liebler, 1994). Future studies should address this limitation by collecting a sample with more diverse samples regarding sex, job title, and other demographic variables.

However, this limitation was justified, as it is noted that the current study used the population of Black reporters ($n = 18$) who wrote articles about Heisman finalists for the
previous 11 college football seasons. The disproportionately small number of articles written by Black reporters justified the use of a stratified random sample of an equal number of articles written by White reporters in order to ensure equal distributions for all hypothesis tests. Additionally, the small sample size could be a point of strength given that despite the small sample size, the current study found results in line with predictions, which suggest that the trends identified here are profound.

Another possible limitation for the current study was that race was operationalized in dichotomous categories of Black and White, with other races being discarded; limiting the current study from accounting for those other races. This is a limitation because it is possible the comparative differences between frames used for Black and White athletes could diminish when other races are included. However, all of the Heisman Trophy finalists from 2000-2011 were Black or White. Additionally, considering, the brawn and brain frames that have been exclusively associated with Black and White races, and little data – empirical or anecdotal – currently exist with which to study other races and racial constructions the current study was justified in its dichotomous approach. Future studies should consider expanding framing research beyond these two categories to develop a better understanding of the role and differences between races in framing, but must do so with appropriate rationale.

The current study’s examination of only print newspapers could also be considered a limitation because the larger daily newspapers, which comprised 81% of the current study’s sample, likely have more institutionalized processes of news production than smaller or nontraditional newspapers. It may be possible that online newspapers, print papers produced by smaller organizations, or blogs would be less institutionalized, as they are likely more informal outlets. Future studies should attempt to isolate the influences within the news organization –
large and small – that would produce a uniformed way of reporting news in written content. Those studies should consider whether these influences are socially learned, as some have suggested (Mecurio & Filak, 2010) or are formally created. Further, future studies should determine if journalists are conscious of these processes.

While the current study did increase the understanding and importance of the salience of brawn and brain frames, the manner in which salience was calculated was rudimentary. By only focusing on repetition of frames on the article level, the current study did not include font size, location, or pictures as salience increasing variables; which they clearly would influence a frames salience. This limitation may be a moot point given that the articles were uniformly formatted in a word document to prevent other salience related variables from skewing the single coder’s identification of brawn and brain frames. Finally, the current study only examined the presence of frames, which limited its understanding of the effects of these frames. Future studies should attempt to gather empirical support for the effects of the exposure to these frames to build on the empirical and theoretical record.

Conclusion

The current study demonstrated an uneven distribution of brawn and brain frames as a function of athlete, but not reporter, race. These patterns were discovered in a new context, print journalism, where institutional processes serve as a possible explanation for the lack of influence of reporter race on frames; a finding that contradicts previous research (Billings, 2004). Additionally, these results support previous findings that these frames are dichotomous and comparative, but given the cultural relevance of sports, these frames may carry serious social consequences. For example, it has been suggested that audience members’ self-esteem and identities may be vulnerable to frames of people of similar ethnicities (Washington & Karen,
Mercurio and Filak (2010) proposed that brawn and brain frames could be detrimental to the next generation of Black Americans by discouraging intellectual pursuits in favor of athletic activities. With social and cultural implications at stake it is important to continue to understand the use and effects of brawn and brain frames.
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Appendix A

Color-blind: The Effects of a Reporter’s Race on Framing
Heisman Finalist List: 2000 to 2011

Griffin, Robert. (Black, 2011)
Luck, Andrew. (White, 2011-2010)
Richardson, Trent. (Black, 2011)
Ball, Montee. (Black, 2011)
Mathieu, Tyrann. (Black, 2011)
Newton, Cameron. (Black, 2010)
James, LaMichael. (Black, 2010)
Moore, Kellen. (White, 2010)
Ingram, Mark. (Black, 2009)
Gerhart, Toby. (White, 2009)
McCoy, Colt. (White, 2009-2008)
Suh, Ndamukong. (Black, 2009)
Tebow, Tim. (White, 2009-2008-2007)
Bradford, Sam. (White, 2008)
Harrell, Graham. (White, 2008)
Greene, Shonn. (Black, 2008)
McFadden, Darren. (Black, 2007)
Brennan, Colt. (White, 2007)
Daniel, Chase. (White, 2007)
Smith, Troy. (Black, 2006)
Quinn, Brady. (White, 2006)
Young, Vince. (Black, 2005)
Peterson, Adrian. (Black, 2004)
Smith, Alex. (White, 2004)
Fitzgerald, Larry. (Black, 2003)
Manning, Eli. (White, 2003)
Perry, Chris. (Black, 2003)
Palmer, Carson. (White, 2002)
Banks, Brad. (Black, 2002)
Johnson, Larry. (Black, 2002)
McGahee, Willis. (Black, 2002)
Dorsey, Ken. (White, 2002-2001)
Crouch, Eric. (White, 2001)
Grossman, Rex. (White, 2001)
Harrington, Joey. (White, 2001)
Weinke, Chris. (White, 2000)
Heupel, Josh. (White, 2000)
Brees, Drew. (White, 2000)
Tomlinson, LaDainian. (Black, 2000)
Anderson, Damien. (Black, 2000)
Appendix B

Color-blind: The Effects of a Reporter’s Race on Framing
2012 Content Analysis Codebook

For each newspaper article, you will be asked to code the presented text using this codebook. You will be coding for the presence of frames, salience, and a series of demographic sections.

It is vital that this codebook is followed when completing the analysis of each Article. In each category, mark the codebook based on the written directions for that sections. Do not overthink the categories, but FOLLOW THE DIRECTIONS IN THE CODEBOOK AND DO NOT IMPROVISE. Finally, take your time completing the book.

Coder Initials: Enter your initials in this box, lower case, first-middle-last (e.g., gac).

Reporter’s Race:
• Category 1: For each article, cross-reference the author of the article with the Microsoft Word file on your desktop. The Microsoft Word file on your desktop will include a list of author’s name and race. Please insert the number that fits each author’s race in this category. Thus, an author’s race as one of the following: White (“1”) or Black (“2”).

News Paper Size:
• Category 2: For each article, cross-reference the paper of the article with the Microsoft Word file on your desktop labeled “newspaper list”. The Microsoft Word file on your desktop will include a list of the top 100 new papers by circulation. If the newspaper that published the current article is not on the list code it “0”, if its ranked 100-76 code it as (“1”), 75-51 code it as (“2”), 50-26 code it as (“3”), and 25-1 code it as (“4”).

Geographic Region:
• Category 3: For each article, code for the region of the country the article was produced in. Regions will be categorized as the following the Far-West (i.e., AZ, CA, HI, ID, MT, ND, NV, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY), the Midwest (i.e., IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI), the Northeast (i.e., CT, MA, ME, NH, NY, RI, VT), the Southwest (i.e., AR, CO, KS, MO, NE, NM, OK, TX), the Mid-Atlantic (i.e., DC, DE, MD, NC, NJ, PA, SC, VA, WV), and the South (i.e., AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, TN). Additionally, online articles that do not have a region of origin will be coded as (“0”). Thus, coders will code articles into one of seven regions: no location (“0”), the Far-West (“1”), Midwest (“2”), Northeast (“3”), Southwest (“4”), Mid-Atlantic (“5”), or South (“6”).

Year of the Article:

Athlete’s Race:
- **Category 5:** For each article, cross-reference the athlete of the article with the Microsoft Word file on your desktop. The Microsoft Word file on your desktop will include a list of athletes with a race next to each athlete’s name. Please insert the race next to each athlete’s name in this category. Thus, coders will code an athlete’s race as one of the following: White (“1”) or Black (“2”).

**Brawn or Brain Frame**
- **Category 6:** For each frame, code whether the brain frame is used to describe an athlete. The brain frame was operationalized as words or frames that attributed an outcome to an athlete’s to leadership (e.g., leadership, making players around them better, team player, poise, perseverance, etc.), academic intelligence (e.g., GPA, SAT, ACT, honor roll, impressive major, good student etc.), general biological skills advantage (e.g., smart, quick thinker, intelligent, concentration, composure, etc.), or game-specific skills advantage (e.g., reads the defense/offense, finds the hole, high football IQ, good vision, smart play, knows playbook, does not force throws, stepped up in the pocket, has a high quarterback efficiency, etc.).

  For each frame, code whether the brawn frame is used to describe an athlete. The brawn frame was operationalized as words or frames that attribute an outcome to an athlete’s physiology (e.g., size, limbs, muscle mass, quick twitch muscle, hand size, height, weight, physical specimen etc.), genetics (e.g., references to family members who were athletes), general biological skills advantage (e.g., speed, strength, quick feet, mobility, agility, athleticism, etc.), or game-specific skills advantage (e.g., arm strength, big hitter, touch, footwork, ability to break tackles, etc.). Thus, for each frame, determine if the frame is a brawn frame (“0”) or brain frame (“1”).

**Valence**
- **Category 7:** Determine if the selected frame is positively, negatively, or neutrally valenced. Positively valenced frames will be coded as (“1”) and will depict the athlete in question in a positive light (e.g., Nick is really smart, he gets published daily). A negative valenced frame will be coded (“2”) and will depict the athlete in question in a negative light (e.g., Nick Bowman is not really smart, he cannot publish to save his life). If a frame is neither positive or negative, code it as neutral (“0”).
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**Color-blind: The Effects of a Reporter’s Race on Framing**

List of White Reporters

Jason Kelly  
Mike Lopresti  
Neil Hohlfeld  
Tony Barhart  
Phillip Orchard  
Kevin Robbins  
Chip Brown  
Randy Youngman  
David Barron  
Stephen Hawkins  
Beano Cook  
Chuck Schoffner  
Pete Thamel  
Suzanne Halliburton  
Eric Prisbell  
Joe Lapointe  
Dave Newhouse  
Adam Thompson  
Lindsey Willhite  
Tom Mulhern  
Mark Viera  
Lenn Robbins  
Ralph D. Russo  
Brett Martel  
Chip Malafrone  
Tom Jones  
James Yodice  
Mike Gross  
Mel Bracht  
Bill Haisten  
Pete DiPrimio  
Jim Coleman  
Rusty Miller  
Jon Wilner  
Adam Kilgore  
Bob Holt  
Chuck Carlton  
Doug Harris  
Ron Cook  
Bill Pennington  
Scott Schmeltzer

Michael Casagrande  
Cary Estes  
Andy Baggot  
Gary Klein  
Karen Crouse  
Josh Dubow  
Thayer Evans  
Dick Weiss  
Mike Finger  
Jeff Latzke  
Ben Volin  
Lindsay Jones  
Joey Johnston  
Andy Staples  
Michael Dorrocco  
Jim Thomas  
Sam Borden  
Brian Landman  
Jeff Gordon  
David Paschell  
Tom Murphy  
R.B. Fallstrom  
Ryan Young  
John E. Hoover  
Dave Sittler  
Jake Trotter  
Al Neuharth  
Berry tramel  
Patrick Stevens  
Dave Matter  
Jay Drew  
Mike Forman  
Joseph Duarte  
Evan Drexler  
Alan Trubow  
Jimmy Burch  
Richard Justice  
Jimmie Tramel  
Scott Pierce  
Steve Kroner  
Tom Hoffarth

Jon Gallo  
Allan Taylor  
David Haugh  
Lee Barfknecht  
Charles Elmore  
Dirk Facer  
Scott Wolf  
Todd Harmonson  
Joe Doyle  
Matt Doyle  
Michael Lewis  
Brian Costello  
Herb Gould  
David Little  
Michelle Smith  
Bob Thomas  
Mark Whicker  
Patrick Kinmartin  
Ray Glier  
Parrish Alford  
Andy Bitter  
Carol Costello  
Frank Bodani  
Chip Scoggins  
Charley Walters  
Ken Denlinger  
Mike Cherry  
JIM FENNELL  
MILAN SIMONICH  
Gene Frenette,  
Tom D'Angelo  
Vince Grippi  
Charles Bennett  
Matt Murschel  
Kelly Whiteside  
Joe Frisaro  
Jay Heater  
Michael Murphy  
Tracee Hamilton  
Vahé Gregorian  
Joe Crowley
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List of Black Reporters

John Niyo
Brian Burwell
Graham Watson
La Velle E. Neal III
Jerome Solomon
Jorge Millian
John Jackson
Daniel Lyght
Paul Zeise
Clifton Brown
Cheryl Johnson
Damon Hack
Fred Goodall
Camille Powell
Terry Foster
Matt Franklin
Antonya English
Vaughn McClure