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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Proposals to develop new Major League Baseball stadiums have almost reached the billion dollar mark as the “New Yankee Stadium” original projections totaled 800 million dollars (USA Today [New York], 24 June 2005). The sports industry has grown from 50.2 billion dollars in 1987 to an estimated 200 billion today (Pederson, Miloch and Laucella, 2007). The sports industry is shown as twice the size of the auto industry and seven times the size of the movie industry. Even with this rapid growth, Major League Baseball and sports in general still do not receive much attention in regard to academic analysis.

As a result of these increases in expenses and popularity and the need for increased attendance and revenues, Major League Baseball franchises and the sporting industry in general must become more cognizant of the coverage they receive from media. With that said, very little has been done to gauge this content and gain an understanding of sports writing through the lens of academic inquiry. This lack of analysis leaves owners,
managers, and other members of an organization ignorant of what the real media climate is for their team and how the coverage could impact their publics.

Anderson (2001) claims academic researchers ignore sporting events and the resulting news in sports sections, even though that section accounts for more than twenty percent of editorial content—more than any other section of the news. In one of the top circulating national daily newspapers, The Chicago Tribune, the sports page doubled in size from 1900 to 1975, increasing each quarter century between those years (Lever and Wheeler 1984). More recently, the ratio of sports news to other news has increased from 1:7 to 1:2. Also, the mean length for sports stories has increased two column inches since from 1900. In addition to growth of sports coverage in newspapers, Gamst and Sutherland (1993) contend that an increase in the interest of human relations and the relation to sport has become apparent in the last couple decades.

Public interest in sports and the subsequent media coverage has seen significant growth recently, but interest in the content and authors has not seen the same increase in attention. According to Anderson (2001) this stems from
the idea that sportswriters are often viewed as cheerleaders whose writings are of lesser journalistic value than other beat writers.

These claims are not based on quantitative analysis, but are founded in opinions about sportswriters by other members of the journalistic world. Without an inspection of the writings of sportswriters this statement remains unfounded and perhaps inaccurate. Hence, this paper will fill the research gaps noted above: 1) the lack of analysis currently being performed in the sporting industry and 2) a quantitative analysis of articles published by sportswriters.

This study will accomplish this through an analysis of content in *The Chicago Sun Times* and *Chicago Tribune* regarding their coverage of both the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox in the years 2004 and 2008. Examining content and gaining knowledge about the way in which each team garners coverage in the local news will provide insight into how sportswriters cover particular teams and why that may influence fans to feel a particular way toward one team over the other.

Agenda-setting and framing with regard to salience provide the theoretical basis for this study. The theories
of agenda-setting and framing analysis will provide insight into the decision making process of sportswriters as to: 1) how the information is presented, 2) how much information on each subject is being presented, 3) which subject is presented as more prominent, and 4) how the story is being representative of the subject, in this case the Cubs or the White Sox.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The collection of literature reviewed for this study has been organized into four sections: 1) a look at relevant media effects research in the sports industry, 2) a discussion of agenda-setting, 3) framing/framing effects, and 4) salience. Agenda-setting and framing fall underneath the umbrella of media effects research, whereas salience is a term utilized by researchers to measure, define and discuss media effects research. Before delving into these theories, their components, and their applications to the current study, it is necessary to first briefly review the roots of media effects research.

Lippmann (1922) was the first to link media and its direct impact on the way in which society views reality. He theorized that media help shape the images in society’s head through a lens, thus influencing the way society thinks and what they think about. His book, Public Opinion, triggered much discourse about linking media and their depictions to societal views. Lippman argued that public opinion responds not to an actual environment, but to a pseudo environment created mostly by the news media.
His statements were qualitative in nature, but opened the door for further research.

McCombs and Shaw (1972) are credited with the first quantitative study of media effects research. In their study about the 1968 presidential election they found strong correlations between coverage on particular candidate issues and the publics’ identification of those issues as important. Therefore, the media sets the agenda for what the public views as important in this pseudo environment. Decades later, Entman (1993) expounded on this view by claiming that not only do the media decide what we talk or read about, but how we think and read about it, spawning a new way of thinking about media effects research, often referred to as either framing or second level agenda setting. These two theories (agenda-setting and framing) which resulted from Lippmann’s observations, McCombs and Shaw’s original study, and Entman’s statements about a “fractured paradigm” are, by far, the most popular and have accounted for the broadest reaching research (Weaver, 2007). It is for these reasons that the current research utilizes these theories of media effects research to explore their role in sports coverage.
Relevant Research in Sports

Many studies have been completed regarding agenda-setting, framing and general media effects research and their place in the political world (McCombs, 2005). This could be a result of the ease of replication to the original study by McCombs and Shaw, the ease of access to political communications or perceived prominence of politics in society, among other reasons. However, McCombs, Llamas, Lopez-Escobar and Rey (1997) assert that communication is process oriented and agendas can be about any set of objects competing for attention among communicators and audiences. Therefore, potential subjects to study are endless in the arena of media effects research.

Gamst and Sutherland (1993) argue that too few studies have probed sports media and their coverage of subjects and that more research is necessary to examine the influence of sports media on public perception. McCombs (2005) claims:

In professional sports, the media agenda is defined by sports news and by broadcasts of actual sports events. Both have long been staples of the mass media, even more so with the advent of cable and specialized sports channels. (553).
Research is somewhat limited as far as media effects in sports, as compared to political research. Work has already been done in the world of sports with regard to the theories of agenda-setting and framing. The purpose of this section is to become acclimated to research in sports and familiar with the concepts of agenda-setting, framing and content analysis and how they have been applied to sports research.

Washburn (1981) conducted a content analysis of New York City news coverage of Jackie Robinson’s first Major League season in 1947. The author found The Herald Tribune did not mention Robinson’s name in 34 percent of their articles about the Brooklyn Dodgers. The other two New York papers excluded Robinson from articles at a lesser rate, 21 and 24 percent of their stories, respectively. This disproportional coverage asserts that newspapers had varying levels of agenda-setting when it came to Jackie Robinson insofar as they were all covering the same events, but doing so focusing on different persons.

Further work has been done in regard to race issues, framing and sports. Hungenberg, McClain and Bodenhausen (2006) conducted a study wherein participants were given a list of 40 names containing 20 European American names and
20 African American names and asked to circle which ones were professional basketball players. The findings suggest, “individuals low in basketball expertise tended to retain more African Americans than European Americans in the final choice set” (1025). Thus, the framing of names as African American had a greater impact on the less knowledgeable sports participant.

Race is not the only determining factor as to whether or not an athlete is included or excluded in sports coverage. In his study of 43 Florida newspapers, Pederson (2002), found that of the study’s 1792 articles only 31.4 percent were devoted to female athletes and 58.3 percent to males. Of these articles only 27 percent of the female articles made the front page with 33.4 percent of male articles making the front page. Sports sections in Florida newspapers, in turn, set the agenda that not only are male sports more readily covered, but are also given prominence over females sports by their location on the page.

The Olympic games have received much attention and criticism of their media coverage efforts, especially when considering gender representation. Hardin et al. (2002) analyzed editorial photos in issues of *Sports Illustrated for Kids* from July 1996 to June 1999 to see if the “gender
equity” Olympic Games in Atlanta had any impact on the framing of athletes. Men were depicted in 76.3 percent of all editorial photos. Additionally, men were depicted as “dominant” more than three times the amount of females.

Billings and Eastman (2003) also studied the Olympics through analyzing 53 prime-time hours of television coverage of the 2002 Salt Lake City Olympics. The researchers coded 10,670 descriptors as either successes or failures for either male or female athletes. Men had almost a two to one ratio as far as frequencies of mention. However, women had a higher success/failure ratio of 3.7 to one ratio as opposed to men who had a 3.1 to one ratio. Male athletes received more coverage, but the coverage of women athletes had a higher probability of being positive. This is important to note because it illustrates the basic differences between agenda-setting and framing.

More recently, Zaharipoulos (2007) sought to define how the 2004 Summer Olympic in Greece games were framed over time. One of the researcher’s findings was that the pattern of coverage in regard to positive, negative and neutral coverage remained consistent for the 12 months leading up to the games. However, during the month of August 2004 positive frames, defined as “excitement about
the games” and “games coming home”, were much more prevalent during this time period. 73 percent of the positively framed articles for an entire year were concentrated in this month of coverage, showing that coverage surrounding an event is more positive during the event than before or after an event.

Messner and Solomon (1993) conducted a study of newspaper coverage of Sugar Ray Leonard’s wife abuse story in 1991. The findings support a potential “cheerleading” or portrayal of athletes and athletics in a particular way as suggested by Anderson (2001). Messner and Solomon reviewed three different newspapers for nine days after the story broke. The authors found that almost all mentions of Sugar Ray Leonard’s acts of violence were preceded by mention of drug and alcohol abuse and that the violence was presented in a neutralizing fashion (127). Additionally, five percent of the articles did not even make mention of domestic abuse.

Anderson (2001) conducted a comparative analysis of newspaper coverage of Major League Baseball labor situation in 1890 and 1975-1976. The conclusions, although qualitative, lend significance to the current study.

“Sports journalists who wanted to gain and maintain professional credibility had to do so while sustaining
a close relationship with the source of information” (364).

Conversely, not all sports reporters glorify or make excuses for the athletes they cover, as the findings by both Messner and Solomon (1993) and Anderson (2001) suggest. Schell and Duncan (1999) examined the first American television coverage of the Paralympics Games of 1996. In their analysis of the four hour segment on the Games, the researchers sought to answer the question: how are athletes with disabilities portrayed in this televised coverage. The most commonly framed comment referred to the athletes as transcending human limitations. The researchers defined this frame as comments falling into the categories of “against all odds”, “even with their disability” and “even broken they can do this.” Schell and Duncan agreed that the coverage was a landmark in Paralympics history, but the commentator’s framed message of the athletes as different could go a long way in perpetuating the theme that Paralympics athletes are different.

Agenda-setting, framing and salience have been explored here briefly as it pertains to sport. The next three sections will delve deeper in the theories and how they have evolved and interchanged over the years. This
will provide the foundation for the theoretical framework of the current research, leading to furthering the body of work in sports media effects research.

**Agenda-setting**

As noted above, agenda-setting fits into a category of media effects as first identified by Lippmann (1922). Concurrently, agenda-setting has been defined as the offspring theory of Lippmann’s work (McCombs, Llamas, Lopez-Escobar and Rey (1997).

McCombs and Shaw (1972) are credited as being the first to implement the title agenda-setting in their study of the 1968 election. The authors stated, “the mass media set the agenda for each political campaign, influencing the salience of attitudes toward the political issues” (177). Kiousis and McCombs (2004) furthered this definition of agenda-setting in writing, “the more coverage an issue receives, the more concern individuals have with the issue. In other words, individuals learn how concerned they should be through the amount of coverage the issues receives” (39). This has been deemed agenda-setting, because newspapers and their coverage of issues set the agenda by which people assign importance. Meaning, the more often a
person sees an issue covered the more importance they give to that issue. McCombs (2005) asserts that agenda-setting is the transfer of salience from the media agenda to the public agenda (533).

This type of agenda-setting research has been labeled and defined as traditional. Hester and Gibson (2003) claim, “traditional agenda-setting research has focused on amount and placement of news coverage” (74). They further contend that the root hypothesis of the agenda-setting theory results from an understanding that the degree of emphasis placed on issues or subject matter in the news influence the priority these issues are given by the general public. Wanta, Golan and Lee (2004) provide a working definition of agenda-setting, encompassing the ideas noted above, in stating, “the public learns the importance of issues based on the amount of coverage that those issues receive” (367).

With the definition in mind, agenda-setting must be discussed with examples of previous studies detailing how this theory is applicable, where it has been applied, and the theories importance to the current research.

The majority of studies up to this point with regard to agenda-setting have focused on political candidates.
The goal of these studies was to determine how newspapers covered candidates before elections, during, or after elections.

In the seminal study on agenda-setting, McCombs and Shaw (1972) analyzed content surrounding the 1968 presidential campaign from Chapel Hill newspapers, national newspapers, and television stations CBS and NBC. Their basic findings identified that, “the data suggests a very strong relationships between the emphasis placed on different campaign issues by the media and the judgment of voters as to the salience and importance of various campaign topics” (181). In summation, there was a direct correlation as to what the public identified as the most important topics in the election and what was most represented in the media. McCombs (2005) claims that transfer of salience as identified above is a critical early step in formations of public opinion toward an object. There is no empirical evidence that this decided the election, but the strong correlation suggests it impacted the voter’s views.

Shaw and Martin (1992) completed a follow-up study of the original in hopes to further define agenda-setting. In their study based on the original McCombs and Shaw (1972)
the authors state, “the press may do something more important than set the agenda. The press may, unconsciously, provide a limited and rotating set of public issues, around which the political and social system can engage in dialogue” (903). Of importance is the acknowledgement that not only does the amount of news coverage an issue receives set an agenda, but the media set the agenda of what people talk about as well. For example, not only can the media set the agenda for what is most important out of a list of topics; they also can decide what topics to include in that discussion through access, or lack thereof, to that topic in their coverage (inclusion vs. omission). The amount and inclusion inherently increase the salience of a topic.

More recently, in their study about the 2000 New Hampshire presidential primary, Golan and Wanta (2001) furthered the strength of agenda-setting. They conducted a content analysis of newspaper coverage and compared it to readers’ perceptions about George W. Bush and John McCain. Their findings support the idea of agenda-setting by the media; “the public linked factual information about candidates and personal characteristics to candidates based on media coverage” (255). This perpetuates the theory by
suggesting the agenda set forth through the media not only informs the public as to what the important issues are, but influences their attitudes toward the objects included in the content. So, the facts as presented by the media became facts in the minds of the public.

Also, in recent studies, agenda-setting has been proven to determine recognition. Kiousis and McCombs (2004) hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between media attention to political figures and public recognition of those figures. To test this they compared data on media content in multiple media channels (national daily’s, magazines and television coverage) and compared that to opinion polls surrounding 11 major political figures. They found that, “more respondents recognized public figures as media coverage of those public figures increased” (47). Therefore, objects or people became more recognizable, or salient, as their images were portrayed more often. This was also deemed true in a change from individuals to countries. In analyzing content from network newscasts, Wanta, Golan and Lee (2004) were able to ascertain that, “the more media coverage a nation received, the more vital to U.S. interests the country was seen to be” (371). Therefore, the more a country was shown
to the public by the networks, the more salient or prominent that country became in the eyes of the public.

Agenda-setting has also enabled researchers to note differing trends between local and national media. In their study of same-sex marriage coverage, Hester and Gibson (2007) found that there was not a strong correlation between amount of coverage for same-sex marriages in locations where a constitutional ban on same-sex was pending (Atlanta) and the national media (New York). “This suggests that local events and issues, such as a proposed amendment to a state constitution, can alter media coverage patterns” (313). The current study, in looking at two local newspapers, will isolate some of the same cultural differences as Hester and Gibson.

The theory of agenda-setting, and its roots of media effects research, provides broad brush-strokes of what its true meaning is. Even with these broad claims, research in agenda-setting has been focused on political or economical studies.

There have been many studies in the history of communication research that prove the worth of the agenda-setting theory. Recent studies have moved the theory along
in its development. McCombs, Llamas, Lopez-Escobar and Rey (1997) contend:

One of the strengths of agenda-setting theory that has prompted its continuing growth has been its compatibility and complementarity with a variety of other social science concepts and theories, including gatekeeping, status conferral, and the spiral of silence. Discussion of a second level of agenda setting links the theory to another prominent contemporary concept, framing. (704).

The current study will not include an analysis of second level agenda-setting, as the combination of agenda-setting and framing provides ample evidence of its existence. Even so, it is important to define the theory as an aspect of agenda-setting. Golan and Wanta (2001) suggest that second level agenda-setting is focused on an agenda of attributes as opposed to a public’s issue agenda (247). The aim is to analyze the content of media and how they position characteristics associated to individuals or organizations and how the public, by way of polling or surveys, feels toward the candidates. They found a strong correlation between the characteristics associated by the news to George W. Bush and John McCain in the 2000 New Hampshire Primary and the public’s feelings toward the candidates (255).
Chyi and McCombs (2004) further suggest that in recent years, the agenda-setting theory has expanded to include this second level where the unit of analysis has shifted from an object (a person, team, issue, etc.) to aspects or attributes of that object. Meaning, agenda-setting studies are now focused on not only what is being presented, but also the context in which it is being presented. Johnson, Davis and Cronin (2009) state that frames are a collection of attributes that comprise and communicate a main theme. Moreover, the way in which information is framed leads to an association of the object to that attribute.

Framing

Framing, sometimes confused with the agenda-setting theory and often coupled with a second level of agenda setting, falls under the media effects umbrella. Scheufele (1999) asserts that framing is in fact an extension of agenda setting (103). Price, Tewksbury and Powers (1997) offer a good explanation of the differences in stating, agenda-setting is the selection and publication of certain newsworthy issues and events, out of all the potential topics from which a writer has to choose, which sets the agenda. Framing is concerned with how these events and
issues are packaged by the journalist and how this packaging can affect how the reader/viewer consumes the information.

Gamson (1989) defines a frame as “a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and suggesting what is at issue” (157). Entman (1993) defines framing:

To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, casual interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described (52).

Scheufele (1999) suggests that there are two categories of frames: media and individual and that frames have to be considered schemes for both presenting (media frames) and understanding (individual frames) news. Shen (2004) echoes this sentiment by claiming “news frames are aspects and attributes of issues carried in the media, individual frames are schemas or knowledge structures that guide individual’s information processing” (402).

Valkenburg, Semetko and de Vreese (1999) further expound that a media frame is a particular way in which journalists compose their news story to optimize audience accessibility. The current research is interested only in media frames to determine whether or not framing effects
exist within the identified content, creating heightened salience toward a particular topic. This is not to suggest individual frames are not important as Tewksbury, et. al (805) suggests media frames ultimate power lies in the potential to alter individual frames. Individual frame analysis would be consulted if second level agenda-setting were a component of the current research.

With the above definition of frames in mind, one must explore examples of previous studies testing and utilizing media frames as an agenda-setting function.

Jasperon et al. (1998) studied the climate of people considering the budget to be the most important problem facing the country from November 1994 through April 1996. Through content analysis of the media produced and polling, the authors discovered that, "considering both the way in which an issue is framed and the frequency of coverage add to the ability to predict issue importance in the mind of the public" (217). Their results suggested that when content suggested the budget as a problem, the public viewed it as such. This provides an example of applied research in the field.

Framing can also be legitimized through experimental methods as well for theoretical applications. Tewksbury,
et. al (2000) composed a two-wave experimental design to examine how similar story content expressed with differing frames influence audience perceptions of a local hog-farm issue. Each subject was randomly assigned a condition or framed news story and three weeks later were asked to complete a questionnaire with regard to the story and issue. They concluded that data from all frames or conditions had a substantial short-term effect of the article manipulation. Further, open-ended explanations (second-wave) of the large-scale hog farm issue were influenced by changes in the journalistic frame.

There is also a strong case for framing of messages and their determination for inclusion in the media. Andsager (2000) studied the effects of interest group news releases and their frames with regard to either pro-life or pro-choice verbiage in six major newspapers from June 1995 to December 1996. A total of 100 news articles were included in the study. The author found, “that pro-life groups were more likely to influence newspaper, however, with more frequent incorporation of their rhetoric in the news stories and a closer association of their rhetoric with the late term abortion issue itself” (589). These studies show the versatility of the theory of framing and
its importance across differing areas of study within agenda-setting theories.

Another important distinction to be made regarding framing is the distinction between thematic and episodic frames. In an analysis of television coverage during the Gulf War, Iyengar and Simon (1993) explored these two different frames. They defined an episodic frame as depicting public issues as concrete instances or specific events and thematic frames as placing issues in abstract contexts. Episodic events are generally presented live and with a certain level of drama, whereas thematic frames generally have a back-story and research. Thus, newspaper content, as this study will investigate, lends itself to thematic frames.

The above examples do have one thing in common, the “frame” as the independent variable. Iyengar and Simon (1993) grouped messages into two frames, episodic and thematic, and measured their impact on the viewers support for the military. Tewsbury, et al. (2000) composed stories to reflect a particular frame and then measured respondent’s reactions and feelings to those frames. Andsager (2000) looked at interest groups framing of their
own news releases to see how prevalent those frames were in major newspapers.

Researchers can also look at framing as the dependent variable, as the current research will do. In a study about effects of political news frames and issue salience, de Vreese (2004) states:

Frames can be investigated as both independent and dependent variables. In framing effects research, the independent variable is typically the news frame, itself conceptualized and utilized differently in previous studies. Some studies document the validity and real-life occurrences of the frames as investigated through data base word searches, literature reviews or content analyses (38).

De Vreese further contends that only when we look at frames observed in journalistic practice do we increase the external validity of framing effects research. Hester and Gibson (2003) tested frames as dependent variables in their content analysis of framing in print and broadcast news coverage for 48 months. They found that 42.7 percent of economic news coverage was framed as negative, whereas 30.7 percent was framed as positive. This negative coverage was one of several significant predictors of consumers’ expectations about the economy. Golan and Wanta (2001) noted that in the 2000 New Hampshire primary McCain received positive issue coverage in 125 paragraphs to
George W. Bush’s 71. When coupled with polling information that suggested 68 percent of the people in New Hampshire thought Bush would win, one can see the impact of positive news frames and their amount.

Kiousis and Shields (2008) found that positive, neutral, and negative tone present in presidential news coverage was a vital part of affective media salience. That is to say, that presenting information as positive, neutral, or negative can lead to successful transfer of media salience to public salience for that issue, object, or event.

Johnson, Davis and Cronin (2009) found that United States coverage of the 2006 Mexican presidential election revealed that the dominant frame for coverage was “the leftist or populist shift throughout Latin America which was referred to 44.7 percent of the time” (12-13).

In these instances the researchers utilized real-life content and were able to determine that framing existed and could be coded into categories as simple as positive, negative, or neutral to more complicated frames about individual issues. This illustrates the versatility of frames, perhaps leading to its growing popularity. McCombs states, “a frame is an attribute of the object under
consideration because it describes the object” (547). Reese (2007) contends framing analysis should concern itself with the way that certain attributes come to be associated with particular issues. Chyi and McCombs (2004) suggest that this “way” can be measured through four different dimensions: 1) the topic of news items (what content is included), 2) presentation (size and placement), 3) cognitive attributes (details of what is included in the frame) and 4) affective attributes (tone).

The first two of these dimensions are seen as agenda-setting (Kiousis and McCombs 2004, Hester and Gibson 2003, Wanta, Golan and Lee 2004), that the amount and placement of news set the media’s agenda. The third dimension seeks to place messages into categories (Johnson, Davis, and Cronin 2009). The fourth dimension, the dimension the current research is applying, explores the package the information is put into for the public’s consumption in terms of positive, neutral, or negative tone.

This discussion perhaps highlights some of the cloudiness surrounding agenda-setting and framing research. Where does one stop and the other begin? This will become clearer through the next chapter, Salience. Muschert and Carr (2006) state:
“Studies of salience fit into three groups: those highlighting the issue-attention cycle, attribute agenda-setting, and framing. In recent years, scholars have also begun to make connections between the latter two approaches (748).

Group one can be seen as agenda-setting in the sense that increased coverage and prominence lead to attention to an issue, object, or event. The review of literature has linked framing to attribute communication. Therefore, through all of the discourse about agenda-setting and framing one thing remains clear, both impact the idea of salience.

Salience

Salience is the key result in agenda-setting and framing research that must be defined, explored in practice, and operationalized for the current study. Entman (1993) defines salience as making a piece of information more noticeable, meaningful, and more memorable to audiences. Kim, Scheufele and Shanahan (2002) state: “by emphasizing or frequently mentioning particular issues, the media increase the salience of these issues among the public” (11). Framing is concerned with how the information is packaged, which, depending on the frame can influence salience. Remembering that media effects research is
concerned with a transfer of salience from the media agenda to the public agenda (McCombs 2005).

Salience can also be directly impacted by the selection of what news is included and what news is not. Wanta, Golan and Lee (2004) contend, “issues that fail to pass through the gatekeepers of the news also fail to give salience cues regarding the relative importance of the issues” (365). Meaning, that if the information is not presented to the audience, salience of that information cannot be measured. As a result all content analysis, especially when looking at agenda-setting and framing, are identifying trends that impact salience of an object, issue, or event.

It is important to note that there are two different types of salience, object and attribute salience. These two terms have been explored through the previous sections, but further discussion is needed. Kiousis and McCombs (2004) assert that traditional agenda-setting research focuses on object salience to answer the question, is the media setting the agenda by offering information about an entity? In their study of the Columbine school shootings, Chyi and McCombs (2004) found, “the dominant predictor of public salience for an object is the cumulative volume that
it had received in the news during the preceding month” (30). Public salience of the event was heightened when more articles were being produced about the events and salience continued over the course of the nine month study even as the frames changed.

Attribute salience, as studied in second level agenda-setting and framing is concerned with how these objects are presented and whether these match public opinion levels of knowledge with salience provided by the media messages. How do the frames that contain attributes influence public perception? Kiousis and Shields contend, “an attribute can be thought of as a property, characteristic, or trait that describes an object” (326). Many studies have attempted to legitimize and prove that attributes associated with messages impact salience of public opinion of that object in regard to that attribute. Tedesco, McKinney and Kaid (2007) conducted pre- and post-tests of young voters to see if issue salience was transferred to young voters impacting their polling decisions. The pre-test and post-test correlations approached a perfect 1.0, meaning the exposure to debates and campaign media had little to no affect on individuals (1294). Hester and Gibson (2003) found that there was a strong correlation between the amount of
negative news frames surrounding the economy and the public’s negative perception about the economy. So, the question remains, why study agenda-setting and framing and its consequent impact on public salience?

McCombs (2005) asserts that agenda-setting effects—the transmission of object and attribute salience from the press to the public about issues, political figures and other topics—have significant consequences for people’s attitudes and opinions. Entman (2007) argues that this power and shift of salience can be detrimental if the media is producing biased reports. Entman identifies three types of bias: 1) decision-making bias, 2) distortion bias and 3) content bias. The current research is interested in the latter. “To reveal content biases, we must show patterns of slant that regularly prime audiences, consciously or unconsciously, to support the interests of particular holders or seekers of political power” (166). This biased presentation can be accomplished through an unequal amount of coverage for a particular issue, object, or event, compared to another. Content bias can also be measured through framing analysis revealing consistent differences in the way in which a particular issue, object, or event is treated. The potential for bias will be reviewed by the
current research, as it could have implications on public salience.

The current research addresses the issues raised by de Vreese (2004) by examining salient factors through agenda-setting and framing as the dependent variables for study. Coupling this with assessments by Jasperson et al. (1998) as put into study by Billings and Eastman (2003) that the amount of coverage and way in which the coverage is framed are both indicators of potential impact on public opinion and salience. Due to the lack of sports related study in regard to agenda-setting and framing, the current research addresses whether these factors are present in sportswriting as can be found in political communication. Also, the content analyzed provides insight as to whether or not biased views of objects (Cubs and White Sox in this case) can be found in media coverage (Entman 2007). Lastly, the current research addressed the need for quantitative research to determine the climate of sportswriters (Anderson 2001). All of these aspects assisted in identifying the following four research questions driving the current research:
R1: What is the relationship in the amount of news coverage between the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox in their two major dailies during the 2004 and 2008 Major League Baseball seasons?

R2: Are there significant differences between the amount of coverage between the Chicago Cubs and White Sox during the 2004 vs. 2008 seasons?

R3: Is there a relationship between the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox with regard to how they are portrayed with positive, negative or neutral frames in their two major dailies during the 2004 and 2008 Major League Baseball seasons?

R4: Are there significant differences between the tone of coverage of the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox comparing 2004 to 2008?
CHAPTER III

METHOD

The method employed in this research study was a quantitative content analysis. Content analysis was chosen because of its systematic and objective nature, ease to conduct, and ability for results to be applied to a greater population (Stacks, 2002). By utilizing this straightforward method, the researcher looked directly at amount of text and text frames to see if there were any common themes in local coverage of the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox during the 2004 and 2008 Major League Baseball seasons. This study was designed to compare media amount (agenda-setting) and framed messages (framing) as media effects, suggesting increased object and attribute salience. This was accomplished by doing cross-section analysis of two different papers, The Chicago Tribune and Chicago Sun Times across two different Major League Baseball seasons, 2004 and 2008.

The teams, newspaper sources, and years were carefully researched to provide the optimal situation. First, both teams finished with similar records in 2004 and 2008. Second, both teams missed the playoffs in 2004 and made the
playoffs in 2008. Therefore, their seasons were the same length each season. This created an equivalent time frame from which the researcher could select composite weeks. Third, through 2004 both teams had storied historic failures with no World Series titles between the two of them since 1917. Therefore, there were no lasting effects of past successes upon the first season under study. The White Sox did win the World Championship in 2005; hence research question four sought to determine if that success had any lasting affects. Lastly, the Cubs are often times revered as “America’s team” or “loveable losers” and often times the White Sox are said to take a back-seat to the Cubs in Chicago. All of these factors were important to this study because both of these teams in 2004 and 2008 are close in proximity (same city), record, and expectations. Therefore, significant correlations with regard to agenda-setting or framing are relevant because the external factors that could shape or influence the findings were very limited.

The Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox were the independent variables in this study, while the amount and measurement of the frames acted as the dependent variables.
The study took the relationship between the variables one step further, by looking at two different newspapers. The newspapers being analyzed—The Chicago Tribune and Chicago Sun Times—are the only two daily’s in the city of Chicago, each offering a 2004 weekday circulation of 609,206 and 477,354 respectively (Burelle’s 2004).

A composite week sampling method was the most time-effective and representative method to identify the sample. The time frame for content was April 1, 2004 to September 30, 2004 and March 30, 2008 to October 1, 2008 (thus encompassing the entire regular season). Due to the large comparative 2X2X2 analysis the content studied was comprised of articles in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 Tribune</th>
<th>2004 Sun Times</th>
<th>2008 Tribune</th>
<th>2008 Sun Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cubs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sox</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each X represents data collected during composite weeks, selected by stratified random sampling. As a result, the following process selected a composite week from two different papers (same week) to analyze. This process created four sample groups to analyze.
The dates were stratified by day of the week so that adequate representations of all paper types by date were included. This process was replicated for both composite weeks necessary for the study. Each composite week was studied in both papers, The Chicago Tribune and Chicago Sun Times.

All articles from the sports section of the papers on the selected dates were reviewed. If the headline or lead paragraph mentioned “Chicago Cubs” or “Chicago White Sox” it was reviewed for: paragraph count, presence or absence of photograph(s), and which team it targeted to determine if agenda-setting is present. The article was then coded based on thirteen pre-determined frames. The frames focused on players, coaches, ownership, impact on community, and impact on economy. For the purposes of this study, the frames were then categorized as either: (1) positive—presenting news as a positive or desired outcome, including congratulatory remarks, (2) negative—presenting news as a negative or undesired outcome, including disparaging remarks, or (3) neutral—presenting facts, including remarks void of congratulatory or disparaging tone.
The coding structure followed in this study was adapted from a model used by Hester and Gibson (2003) in their content analysis of news coverage of the economy across differing media. The individual thematic frames can be found on the coding sheet in the appendices on pages 54 and 55.

The researcher and a trained coder were selected to complete the content analysis, which consisted of 167 articles. The coder was trained, prior to coding the dates included in this study, by using articles from both sources on alternative dates during the seasons in study. The intent was to resolve any coding issues with the instrument and for the coders to familiarize themselves with analyzing sports content.

The researcher and trained coder coded 17 articles to ensure inter-coder reliability. Based on Holstí’s formula the coefficient of reliability was accepted at 86.7 percent. The researcher utilized cross tabs and chi square analysis using SPSS software to determine if significant differences exist between the Cubs and White Sox in the determined sources and years.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

A total of 2,777 paragraphs from 167 articles were tallied in one of the 13 pre-determined frames. Each of these frames was under a broader category of: positive, negative or neutral. After analyzing sports sections of *The Chicago Tribune* and *Chicago Sun Times*, Table 1 represents the amount of coverage each team, Cubs and White Sox, received during the years in study.

Table 1. Amount of Coverage of the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox in *The Chicago Tribune* and *Chicago Sun Times* in 2004 and 2008. Paragraphs and (articles) are denoted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Cubs</td>
<td>756 (47)</td>
<td>714 (41)</td>
<td>1470 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago White Sox</td>
<td>712 (42)</td>
<td>564 (35)</td>
<td>1276 (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>31 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>2777 (167)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chicago Cubs had 1,470 paragraphs dedicated to them in *The Chicago Tribune* and *Chicago Sun Times*, while the Chicago White Sox had 1,276 paragraphs within the same texts. In percentages this means that the Cubs received 52.93 percent of baseball sports coverage, whereas the White Sox received 45.95 percent with the balance
determined as both teams representing 1.12 percent. Both teams received more coverage in 2004 as opposed to 2008, receiving over 200 less dedicated paragraphs to Major League Baseball coverage in 2008 across the two newspapers studied.

Research question #1 asked:

*What is the relationship in the amount of news coverage between the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox in their two major dailies during the 2004 and 2008 Major League Baseball seasons?*

This study showed that the Cubs received more coverage than that of their geographic counterpart, the White Sox. The Cubs received almost 53 percent of the coverage coded, where the White Sox received almost 46 percent of the coverage.

Research question #2 asked:

*Are there significant differences between the amount of coverage between the Chicago Cubs and White Sox during the 2004 vs. 2008 seasons?*

Both the Cubs and White Sox saw their overall coverage decline from 2004 to 2008. The Cubs decreased from 756 paragraphs of coverage in 2004 to 714 paragraphs of coverage in 2008. This equates to a 6.67 percent decrease in total coverage [$100 - (714/756)]$. Conversely, the White
Sox decreased from 712 paragraphs of coverage in 2004 to 564 paragraphs of coverage in 2008. This equates to a 20.89 percent decrease \( [100 - (564/712)] \).

The identified content was also coded as to whether or not the paragraphs presented the team in a positive, negative, or neutral light. Tables 2 and 3 illustrate the differences in frames between the two teams.
Table 2. Distribution of Frames for the Chicago Cubs found in *The Chicago Sun Times* and *Chicago Tribune* in 2004 and 2008 (percentage in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of team</td>
<td>254 (17.28)</td>
<td>Statements congratulating team</td>
<td>458 (31.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of ownership</td>
<td>37 (2.52)</td>
<td>Statements agreeing with ownership</td>
<td>19 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of community efforts</td>
<td>8 (.54)</td>
<td>Statements encouraging of community efforts</td>
<td>14 (.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of economic impact</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>Statements encouraging of economic impact</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of coaches</td>
<td>52 (3.54)</td>
<td>Statements complimentary of coaches</td>
<td>39 (2.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>351 (23.88)</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>544 (37.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Neutral                                       |         |                                              |         |
| Statements of fact                           | 459 (31.22) |                                              |         |
| Focus on opposition                          | 77 (5.24)     |                                              |         |
| Misc.                                         | 39 (2.65)     |                                              |         |
| **Total**                                     | 575 (39.12) |                                              |         |
Table 3. Distribution of Frames for the Chicago White Sox found in *The Chicago Sun Times* and *Chicago Tribune* in 2004 and 2008 (percentage in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of</td>
<td>229 (17.95)</td>
<td>Statements congratulating team</td>
<td>338 (26.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statements agreeing with ownership</td>
<td>26 (2.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of</td>
<td>50 (3.92)</td>
<td>Statements encouraging of</td>
<td>12 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td>community efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>Statements encouraging of</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>community efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>Statements encouraging of</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>economic impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of</td>
<td>47 (3.68)</td>
<td>Statements complimentary of</td>
<td>83 (6.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>coaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>326 (25.55)</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>459 (35.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of fact</td>
<td>384 (30.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on opposition</td>
<td>82 (6.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>25 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>491 (38.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox were presented with a neutral tone most frequently in the news sources studies, 39.12 and 38.48 percent respectively. The Cubs had a slightly higher percentage of coverage that was determined by the coders to have positive tone, 37.01
percent to the White Sox at 35.97 percent. Conversely, the White Sox were presented in a negative light, as determined by the coders, at a slightly higher rate than the Cubs, 25.55 percent to 23.88 percent, respectfully.

In their positively coded paragraphs, the White Sox did receive more focus on "statements complementary of coaching" at 83 paragraphs, or 6.50 percent. As opposed to the Cubs who received only 39 paragraphs coded as "statements complementary of coaching", or 2.65 percent.

Perhaps as a result of this increased focus on coaching for the White Sox, the number of paragraphs coded as "statements congratulating the team" decreased. The White Sox had 338 paragraphs coded as such, 26.49 percent versus the Cubs who had 458 paragraphs for this frame, and representing 31.16 percent of their total coverage.

Research Question #3 asked:

Is there a relationship between the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox with regard to how they are portrayed with positive, negative, or neutral frames in their two major dailies during the 2004 and 2008 Major League Baseball seasons?

As suggested by Tables 2 and 3 with the observations made above, the relationship between the Cubs and White Sox in The Chicago Tribune and Chicago Sun Times during the 2004 and 2008 seasons is very similar. Both teams were
coded most frequently as presented in a neutral tone, with very slight variations across frame categories.

Research question #3 looked at tone of each object, Cubs and White Sox across both years of the study. It is also important to track if there were main differences between coverage of 2004 and 2008.

Research Question #4 asked:

*Are there significant differences between the tone of coverage of the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox comparing 2004 to 2008?*

To answer this question the researcher performed a chi-square contingency analysis for both teams in terms of article tone for each year, 2004 and 2008. In 2008, a correlation of .012 favoring positive news coverage of the Chicago Cubs was determined. Therefore, the Cubs received a significantly higher amount of positive news coverage as compared to the previous year of 2004. The chi-square showed no significant results for the Chicago White Sox.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Media effects research has evolved over time to not only look at what the media is telling us to think about but how to think about it, and whether or not there is a marriage between individual opinion and news frames. With this evolution comes an understanding of the power that newspapers and other media have in terms of shaping the world around us.

Much research has been done in the field of media effects research. Additionally, much research with differing objects and subsequent news coverage of these objects (mostly surrounding political candidates and their message) has been performed. This study aimed to adopt strategies and lessons learned from these well-documented studies (McCombs and Shaw, 1972: Golan and Wanta, 2001: Kiousus and McCombs, 2004), and apply them to an area of study that does not receive that much academic attention, sporting news.

The current research found that there were few significant differences between the amount and tonality of coverage of the Chicago Cubs and Chicago White Sox in their
local newspaper sport sections, *The Chicago Tribune* and *Chicago Sun Times* during the 2004 and 2008 Major League Baseball Seasons.

Perhaps this equality in coverage is a significant finding. In one of the articles examined, Ozzie Guillen, current manager of the Chicago White Sox and manager during both of the 2004 and 2008 seasons, was quoted as saying,

> We have our home opener, my first one in my hometown as a manager, and we have one or two pages in the paper. And the Cubs lose the game, and it’s 45 pages.”

Guillen went on to say that Chicago is a Cubs town and the media favors them. With only a slight seven percent more coverage for the Cubs in the stories included in this study, one would have to disagree with Guillen.

One of the other significant findings in this study could very well be a result of the oft-boisterous Guillen. The White Sox manager did receive a significant amount more congratulatory marks than his counterparts, 83 to 39 paragraphs.

Anderson (2001) suggested that sports writers often times present their teams more favorably, due to their connection as a fan. The current research found that the most prevalent frame tone of the coverage included in the
study could contradict this claim. Neutral frames represented 1079 individual paragraphs, 38.85 percent of all coverage. Additionally, there were not significant differences between the percentages of the Cubs and White Sox across all three tone groups: positive, negative and neutral.

It was surprising to see the decline in total coverage from 2004 to 2008, especially when considering the disproportionate amount of decrease for the White Sox, 20.89 percent, versus the Cubs, 6.67 percent decrease—this coming off of a 2005 World Series victory for the White Sox. Conventional wisdom would suggest the more successful team would have continued support, but this was not the case in this particular study. Perhaps the novelty of “lovable losers” was lost on the White Sox when they were successful in winning and it was bestowed on the Cubs.

Concurrently, the Chi-square results showed a significant shift in positive coverage for the Cubs in 2008 as opposed to 2004. One would have expected with the success of the White Sox, they would be the organization portrayed more positively.

Even so, as a total study, the research suggests both teams were reported on with the majority of neutral frames.
Although newspapers are expected to be objective, much literature exists that reporters often frame their stories to match the views of their publics to gain more appeal. This study examined the role of media in framing their news for public consumption by selecting some aspects of a perceived reality and ignoring others. Even with the neutral result, the newspapers still shaped audience interpretation of the Cubs and White Sox. The question remains, how much?

Future Research

Future research could examine this second-level of agenda setting to determine if sportswriter’s inclusion shapes the public’s perceptions and salience of particular objects. This could be accomplished through surveys, the use of polls or interviews with the Chicago public. Additionally, research could be collected from different regions to see if agenda-setting and framing functions differ for the Cubs and White Sox when they are not as prominent an object. Lastly, research in other relevant sports related industries could only help move the theories employed in the current research forward, and illustrate the versatility of media effects research.
Limitations of this Study

There were some limitations to this study. The paragraphs could have been coded sequentially, as the first paragraphs are usually the most salient and read. Additionally, page placement, photo inclusion and size and location in the paper could have been reviewed to determine whether or not prominence was given to one team or the other. Finally, more articles could have been included in the study and perhaps at differing times during the course of the year(s) to get an even more accurate gauge of the media climate for the Cubs and the White Sox during a long season.

Conclusion

Although this study to not reveal any significant differences in attribute frames between the two objects (Cubs and White) it did draw some important conclusion that move the theories of agenda-setting and framing along. First, there was a significant difference in the tonality in coverage of the Cubs from 2004 to 2008. This “frame changing” as explored by, Chyi and McCombs (2004) and Hester and Gibson (2007), in both space and time is a new
area of framing research. In so much, that frames are altered with respect to space and time. In the current study, time was a determining factor into tonality of coverage in regard to the Cubs. Second, this study adopted many of the quantitative studies found in public issue or political coverage and showed media effects’ research versatility in the sporting arena. Research like this will hopefully lead to expanded frontiers as suggested by McCombs (2004) when he said, “looking to the future, creative scholars will continue to apply the core ideas of agenda-setting theory in more and more new arenas” (554). Third, in this ever-changing media world, content in print media could be seen as more competitive due to increased reliance on Internet and other emerging news sources. In this study, as total media produced declined in 2008, the Cubs received a higher proportion of coverage. This is especially important given the recent successes of the White Sox, with their 2005 World Series championship. In this study when overall content was decreased or, perhaps more competitive, the media set the agenda that the Cubs were more important that their counterpart, the White Sox. Perhaps with the decreased inclusion of articles,
sportswriters shifted their focus to the more popular team, or team that could sell more copies.
APPENDIX A

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

Unit of Analysis:
Paragraph

General Procedure:
Included in this packet you will find a copy of the coding sheet, a page of frame descriptions intended to guide you in your coding analysis, and the articles to code. Please familiarize yourself with the coding sheet by reading the coding sheet and the instructions prior to review of the articles. Once you understand the coding parameters, read each story once before you begin coding; it is not necessary to make notes on the first reading as you are simply familiarizing yourself with the text. After the first reading, denote the date of publication, headline, count the number of paragraphs, note whether or not there is a picture associated with the article and what page number the article is found on.

On subsequent readings, go paragraph by paragraph, determining which one of the outlined frames is present. If you find that more than one frame is present in each paragraph pick the one that best fits the paragraph being analyzed. If you find that a paragraph does not match any of the outline frames, mark a tally under the miscellaneous category. Include these in the running tally of frames on the coding sheet provided.

After you have read the entire newspaper story and competed the coding sheet, double check to make sure that the tally marks coded to the individual frames equal the number of total paragraphs in the story.

Make sure you have a one coding sheet for each newspaper story.
APPENDIX B
CODING SHEET

Date of Publication_________________ Page # _____

Article Title__________________________________________________________________________

Cubs_______ White Sox_______ Both_______

News Source____ Picture (Y/N)___ # of Paragraphs____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of team (making miscues, bad decisions, team dissent)</td>
<td>Statements congratulating team (good plays, good decisions, unity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of ownership (paying too much, incorrect trades, etc)</td>
<td>Statements in agreement with ownership (good transactional moves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements criticizing team community efforts</td>
<td>Statements encouraging team community efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements criticizing economic impact of team</td>
<td>Statements encouraging economic impact of team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements critical of coaches/coaching decisions</td>
<td>Statements complementary of coaches/coaching decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neutral

| Statements of fact | |
| Focus on opposition | |
| Miscellaneous | |

Article Content Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

### FRAME DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example Sentences</th>
<th>Associated Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Positive Frames:** Presenting team and organizational news as a positive or desired outcome. Positive texts will discuss successes on and off the field, focus on positive aspects of games, players and management. The text will include congratulatory remarks about these objects. | 1. Jenks has the credentials for his third consecutive All-Star game appearance with a 1.95 ERA and 18 saves.  
   2. That’s what you have to like of what Cubs GM Jim Henry liked when he took a chance this spring about Rusch. | 1. Statements congratulating the team.  
   2. Statements in agreement with ownership. |
| **Negative Frames:** Presenting team and organizational news as a negative or undesired outcome. Negative texts will discuss failures on and off the field, focus on negative aspects of games, players and management. The text will include disparaging remarks about these objects. | 1. It apparently wasn’t a time for Carlos Zambrano to reflect on his emotional outbursts.  
   2. Common sense lets you know that obviously if they want you back, they would have already picked your option up. | 1. Statements critical of the team.  
   2. Statements critical of ownership. |
| **Neutral Frames:** Presenting facts about the team and organization. Neutral texts will report information in neither congratulatory nor disparaging fashion. Null of tone. | 1. The White Sox scored three runs in the third inning to pull within one run.  
   2. The Cardinals took advantage and won their third game in a row. | 1. Statements of fact  
   2. Focus on opposition |
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