

# Comparing Flagship News Programs: Women's Sport Coverage in ESPN's *SportsCenter* and FOX Sports 1's *FOX Sports Live*

Electronic News  
2015, Vol. 9(1) 3-16  
© The Author(s) 2015  
Reprints and permission:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1931243115572824  
enx.sagepub.com



Andrew C. Billings<sup>1</sup> and Brittany D. Young<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

A total of 118 hr of sports news broadcast programming was subject to gender clock-time analysis, half from Entertainment and Sports Programming Network (ESPN's) *SportsCenter* and half from 2013 startup network Fox Sports 1's *Fox Sports Live*. Results showed that both programs featured women's sports less than 1% of the time, with only modest gains found in an Olympic month (February 2014) of presumed heavy women's sports exposure compared to a fall (October/November 2013) coding period. Moreover, both programs featured the same top five sports in nearly identical proportionality and story lengths of women's spots were consistently 70% of a men's spot regardless of program. Results indicate that *Fox Sports Live* is replicating *SportsCenter*'s programming choices far more than challenging them from a gender perspective.

## Keywords

broadcast, news format, sports, news topic, gender, dimensions of journalism

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Andrew C. Billings, University of Alabama, PO Box 870152, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, USA.  
Email: acbillings@ua.edu

Amidst considerable progress since the 1972 passing of Title IX legislation that ensured equal opportunities for women to participate in sports, sports media coverage (or lack thereof) surrounding women athletes has been adjudicated to be highly problematic by the majority of scholars examining the renderings. Studies have uncovered inequalities relating to overall exposure (Coche, 2013), production qualities (Greer, Hardin, & Homan, 2009), and differing dialogues (Angelini, MacArthur, & Billings, 2012) when compared to male athletes in similar sports. Such trends differ depending on sport, season, and nation rendering sports coverage (see Billings, 2011), yet the influence of one media entity in the United States has received considerable attention: the wide-reaching media conglomerate, ESPN.

Many analyses have been conducted relating to the myriad sports offerings provided by ESPN, but perhaps the most impactful has been an examination of the flagship program for the network, *SportsCenter*. Cooky, Messner, and Hextrum (2013) recently advanced a new report from a longitudinal study of the program, finding that women's sports received just 1.4% of all coverage, an all-time low since the research first began in the 1980s. As such, ESPN has been the subject of considerable ire for its lack of focus on women athletes and the sports they play (see Kane, 2013). However, questions remain pertaining to whether ESPN is a representation of gendered sports media offerings as a whole, or whether analyses such as *SportsCenter* are instead an outlier of a more progressive overarching sports media in the United States.

The opportunity to draw a pertinent cross-platform comparison arose in 2013, with the addition of a new major sports network, FOX Sports 1. The fledgling network certainly does not rival ESPN in terms of overall viewers (Ourand, 2014), yet it is offered in a majority of media markets and features a *SportsCenter*-like central program, *FOX Sports Live*. Given that both *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports Live* are offered on a daily basis (*SportsCenter* is so ubiquitous that it is shown more than 24 hr per day when counting ancillary networks such as ESPNews), a direct comparison between the two programs is warranted. Doing so would provide direct contrasts between two sports news programs purportedly offering the most timely and relevant news of the day. Two time periods are examined, one from late October to late November 2013 (a peak time for men's sports, particularly National Football League [NFL], college football, and National Basketball Association [NBA]) and the other from February, 2014 (a peak time for women's sports with the inclusion of the Sochi Winter Olympics). In doing so, the aim is not to offer these two time periods as a full representative sample of all seasonal programming periods; rather, this study will interrogate the degree in which such pertinent daily news includes women's sports, comparing times where one would predict peak coverage for men's sports to times where one would predict peak coverage for women's sports.

## Related Literature

Analyses of sports media by gender have been undergirded in many theoretical communication traditions ranging from framing to cultivation theories, yet the study of

overall media exposure of women athletes and sports within televised news programs nonetheless remains most pertinent within the area of agenda-setting scholarship (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Adopting the sentiments of Cohen (1963), who maintained media outlets “may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but [are] stunningly successful in telling its [audience] what to think *about*” (p. 13).

However, while a selection function is explained in agenda-setting, sports news more aptly is described by the frames of emphasis and exclusion along with this selection, embodied within framing theory (Goffman, 1974) and expanded by Gitlin (1980). More specifically, Gitlin (1980) writes of framing in regard to “tacit theories about what exists, what happens, and what matters” (p. 6). Within the role of sports news, this is not only about the topic at hand—such as which sports and events to cover—but also pertaining to the overall frameworks influencing each decision, which seemingly includes the accessibility and presumed interest an audience has about women’s athletics. The ramifications of these decisions echo far beyond the sporting arena; Davis and Tuggle (2012) contend that “the degree to which the media covers female athletes helps mold society’s view of female athletes and its perceptions of women in general” (p. 55).

ESPN’s role in shaping such views has been seen as integral for quite some time, with Eastman and Billings (2000) finding that coverage of women’s sport within *SportsCenter* was so meager that 1 week in May featured more coverage of the National Spelling Bee than all other women’s sports combined. Later, Messner, Duncan, and Willms (2006) concluded that when it comes to women’s sports, “this revolution is not being televised” (p. 34).

The degree of the gender gaps vary by sport, with events such as the Summer Olympics yielding near 50/50 gender splits (Davis & Tuggle, 2012) far greater than the Winter Olympics with a nearly 2:1 ratio of men’s to women’s sports coverage (Angelini et al., 2012), which was still better representation of women’s athletics than any other media offering. Vincent and Crossman (2012) found more than a 2:1 ratio favoring men within newspaper coverage of Olympic ice hockey; Coche (2012) found ESPN’s internet coverage of the Australian Open yielded more than triple the hours for men’s tennis than women’s tennis; Turner (2014) studied *SportsCenter*, finding not only an “almost complete lack of coverage” of women’s sports (pp. 16–17) but also that women were no more likely to occupy host, reporter, or coaching roles in 2009 than they were in 1999. The overarching conclusion appeared to be one that Cooky et al. (2013) summarized: that sport continues to be by, for, and about men.

Many reasons have been explored for such gender gaps. DeLorme (2014) uses metrics such as overall number of participants in global events like the Olympics to argue that women are not as underrepresented in such venues as one would initially surmise, yet such justifications cannot be applied to most other sports discrepancies that are exponentially larger. One interesting argument pertains to the role of overall media space. For instance, agenda-setting is often predicated on the notion that choices must be made regarding whether something is shown or not shown, discussed

or not discussed. However, because of the growth of ancillary networks and particularly the internet, such debates change to whether a sport receives primacy (shown on ESPN's main channel rather than ESPNU) and the ease in which content can be found. Coche (2013) noted the potential role the internet could be playing in gender biases surrounding sport. Indeed, such contentions could be quite accurate, as online outlets such as ESPNW may seemingly have good intentions (to promote sports for women) but unintended consequences (less need to show women's sports if ESPNW is perceived to serve this presumably niche market).

What is known is that most traditional outlets are at all-time lows in featuring women athletes. Weber and Carini (2013) found that women athletes received more *Sports Illustrated* covers in the 12 years from 1954–1965 than from 2000–2011, as less than 5% of the covers featured women in the latter time period. The year 2013 brought two covers featuring the same woman, which could be seen as progress until one is told the doubly covered woman was a nonathlete: swimsuit model Kate Upton. At a time when women's athletics is reaping the harvest of multiple generations of Title IX support, Kane (2013) nonetheless concludes that “the better sportswomen get, the more the media ignore them” (p. 231).

The gaps in exposure and framing differ from nation to nation, but not in the overarching trend underscoring the male athlete while diminishing the female athlete in the process. Galily, Cohen, and Levy (2011) found differential treatment favoring men athletes in Israeli media; Licen and Billings (2013) uncovered divergences by gender in Slovenian sports broadcasts. Even reports of gender progress seems to be tinged with negative associations: Poniatowski and Hardin (2012) find that women athletes are just as likely to serve as role models for young women as men, yet found reinforcement of sexual difference in media commentary. They concluded that women's athletics continues to make progress in virtually any measure one could apply, but ultimately they are “striving to catch up, but never can” (p. 636). Meanwhile, Billings, Angelini, MacArthur, Bissell, and Smith (2014) found that women athletes received the majority of National Broadcasting Company (NBC's) primetime London Olympic coverage in 2012, but noted that this most likely was a function of national pride (American women winning more medals than American men) rather than a holistic shift in sports media content.

## Research Questions

Within this context, the role of a new sports outlet such as FOX Sports 1 becomes particularly intriguing as it represents “the stiffest competition for ESPN” in a long time (“FS1 ready to take on ESPN, 2013, ¶ 1). FOX Sports 1 features some different programming choices (showing more Mixed-Martial Arts and National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing [NASCAR], but no live professional football) yet the centerpiece show, *FOX Sports Live*, is clearly seen as being formed to firmly rival the ESPN flagship, *SportsCenter*. Given the focus on daily news that both flagship entities purport to be—essentially one-stop shopping for those who wish to be informed on the

most pertinent sports items of the day—direct comparisons between the two offerings can yield insights about the role women’s athletics plays in one program compared to another. Cooky et al. (2013) found that women’s sports received just 1.4% of all *SportsCenter* coverage and never exceeded 5% of the coverage at any of the three seasonal time periods.

Such trends inform the two hypotheses, while such new direct comparisons between the two sportscasts are at the core of the formulation of the three research questions:

**Hypothesis 1:** *SportsCenter* will feature women’s sports less than 5% of the time.

**Hypothesis 2:** *FOX Sports Live* will feature women’s sports less than 5% of the time.

**Research Question 1:** Will *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports Live* feature significantly different proportions of coverage of women’s sports?

**Research Question 2:** Will *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports Live* differ significantly in the type of sports shown on each program?

**Research Question 3:** Will both sports news programs feature significantly higher coverage of women’s sports in the Winter (February) coding period than in the Fall (October/November) coding period?

## Method

In all, 118 hr were recorded for this analysis: 59 hr from ESPN’s *SportsCenter* and 59 from FOX Sports 1’s flagship sports news program, *FOX Sports Live*. Two time periods were utilized. The first occurred from October 21, 2013–November 20, 2013, representing a fall/autumn month in which men’s sports are arguably at peak exposure (considering the overlap between football and basketball seasons). The second time period constituted the entire month of February (February 1, 2014–February 28, 2014) representing a winter season in which women’s sports are arguably at peak exposure (Olympics, coupled with conference games in women’s college basketball and opening tournaments for professional tennis and golf). The first airing of each program occurring at 10:00 pm Eastern Time (ET) or later was the version of each program that was subject to nightly analysis.

For all recorded programs, a single researcher coded all content for the following: (a) date, (b) program type (*SportsCenter* or *FOX Sports Live*), (c) type of sport (subject), (d) gender of sport (women’s, men’s or mixed/pairs), (e) content overview of segment (for cross-referencing/cataloguing purposes only), and (f) length of segment (in seconds). Promotions or commercials featuring sports content were not included in

**Table 1.** Clock-time by Program (in seconds).

	Men	Women	Mixed	Total
ESPN	144,989 (97.5%)	1,445 (1.0%)	2,308 (1.5%)	148,742
FOX I	168,885 (97.4%)	970 (0.6%)	3,498 (2.0%)	173,353
Total	313,874 (97.4%)	2,415 (0.8%)	5,806 (1.8%)	322,095

Note. ESPN = Entertainment and Sports Programming Network.

the analysis, but on-site programming (mostly postgame analysis or interviews) was included. Consistent with other sports media content analytic works that coded at least 10% of the sample a second time (e.g., Angelini et al., 2012; Cooky, Messner, & Hextrum, 2013), a second researcher coded 12.5% of all programs (15 hr) to establish intercoder reliability. Using Cohen's (1960) formula, the following reliabilities were established: (a) date ( $K = 1.00$ ), (b) program type ( $K = 1.00$ ), (c) type of sport ( $K = 1.00$ ), (d) gender of sport ( $K = 1.00$ ), and (e) length of segment ( $K = .93$ ).

## Results

When commercials, other nonprogram segments, and nonsport related banter were removed, 89.5 hr of sports news-specific clock-time remained for analysis. The unit of analysis was the story with opening montages and other in-program promotions being coded as single hybrid stories. In all, 3,907 stories were subject to analysis, 1,678 from *SportsCenter*, and 2,229 from *FOX Sports Live*. In all, 2,096 (53.6%) were from the October/November time period while 1,811 (46.4%) were from the February time period.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 predicted that ESPN's *SportsCenter* and FOX Sports 1's *FOX Sports Live* would each, respectively, feature women's sports less than 5% of the time. Table 1 reports the amount of clock-time (in seconds) devoted to men's, women's, and mixed sports.

As Table 1 shows, both programs almost exclusively focused on men's sports. *SportsCenter* reported on men's sports 97.5% of the time while *FOX Sports Live* was nearly identical, highlighting men's sports 97.4% of the time. *FOX Sports Live* featured more mixed-gender stories, which then meant that *SportsCenter* nearly doubled the proportion of coverage of women's sports when compared to its *FOX Sports 1* counterpart. Nonetheless, the proportions were meager, with just 1.0% of all coverage on *SportsCenter* devoted to women's sports, while *FOX Sports Live* had even less: 0.6% of all programming content. ESPN's flagship reported on women's sports slightly more than 24 min during the 2 months of analyzed programs, while FOX Sports 1's flagship had slightly more than 16 min within the 2-month composite. As a result, both Hypotheses 1 and 2 are supported, as neither program approached the 5% barrier.

**Table 2.** Average Length of Story by Program (in minutes: seconds).

	Men	Women	Mixed	Total
ESPN	0.062210648	0.044016204	1:32:32	0.061851852
FOX I	0.054305556	53:89	1:32:05	0.054363426
Total	1:22:53	58:90	1:32:16	1:22:44

Note. ESPN = Entertainment and Sports Programming Network.

**Table 3.** Number of Stories by Program.

	Men	Women	Mixed	Total
ESPN	1,630 (97.1%)	23 (1.4%)	25 (1.5%)	1,678
FOX I	2,173 (97.4%)	18 (0.8%)	38 (1.8%)	2,229
Total	3,803 (97.3%)	41 (1.0)	63 (1.7%)	3,907

Note. ESPN = Entertainment and Sports Programming Network.

Research Question 1 queried whether the two programs would differ significantly in the proportion of coverage dedicated to women's sports. The aforementioned Table 1 provides one measure offering insight to answer this research question, finding that, when using the minute as the unit of analysis, the two networks were significantly more likely to feature men's sports ( $t = 133.4$ ;  $df = 1$ ;  $p < .05$ ) but not significantly different in the amount of coverage dedicated to women's sports. Meanwhile, Tables 2 and 3 provide additional context for these comparisons, with the former reporting on the average length of story by gender and the latter reporting the total number of stories by gender.

First, as illuminated in Table 2, both networks were significantly more likely to devote more seconds for a men's sports story than a women's sports story ( $t = 110.94$ ;  $df = 1$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Moreover, the proportionality was quite similar between the two networks. On ESPN, a women's story was, on average, 70.6% of the length of the average men's story; on FOX Sports 1, a women's story was, on average, 69.4% of the length of the average men's story, a statistically insignificant difference ( $p > .05$ ).

Additionally, as highlighted in Table 3, the overall number of stories devoted to women's sports was not significant ( $p > .05$ ) between the two groups. Although *SportsCenter* did feature five more stories than did *FOX Sports Live*, even when accounting for the differences in overall story frequencies within the two programs, the gap was not substantial. When accounting for all of the information in the first three tables, Research Question 1 is answered in that both networks were more likely to show men's sports and were also more likely to extend stories about men's sports, but that they also exhibited no statistically significant different deviations in regard to the amount of coverage devoted to women's sports, as both offered such reporting in very low frequencies and magnitudes.

**Table 4.** Top Five Sports Reported by Program.

Sport/League	<i>SportsCenter</i>	<i>FOX Sports Live</i>	Total
Men's Basketball (NBA)	358 (30.6%)	442 (31.0%)	800 (30.8%)
Pro Football (NFL)	272 (23.3%)	336 (23.6%)	608 (23.5%)
NCAA Men's Basketball	254 (21.8%)	299 (21.0%)	553 (21.3%)
NCAA Football	182 (15.6%)	193 (13.5%)	375 (14.7%)
Pro Baseball (MLB)	101 (8.6%)	155 (10.8%)	256 (9.9%)
Total	1,167 (100.0%)	1,425 (100.0%)	2,592 (100.0%)

Note. NBA = National Basketball Association; NFL = National Football League; NCAA = National Collegiate Athletic Association; MLB = Major League Baseball.

Table excludes hybrid stories such as opening sequences.

Research Question 2 queried whether the networks would highlight given sports and leagues in similar or different frequencies. Table 4 reports story frequencies among the top five most highlighted sports.

As witnessed in Table 4, all five of the most-featured sports were from professional or college divisions of the “big three” men’s sports: basketball, football, and baseball. A total of 2,592 (66.3%) stories were directly and solely devoted to these sports. When taking into account that an additional 612 stories were hybrid montages focused solely on these three sports, the total percentage of stories dedicated exclusively to basketball, football, and baseball is 82.0%. No direct correlations should be drawn because of the seasonal nature of the composite—baseball, for instance, would obviously rank much higher in a summer analysis. However, the actual sports highlighted are not relevant to answering Research Question 2; rather, relevance lies in the similarities between the two networks within each of these two time periods. Both *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports Live* offered these five sports in the exact same rank order of salience; moreover, the percentage of time devoted to each sport was always within two percentage points of each other with no significant differences between coverage of any of the top five most-reported sports ( $p > .05$ ). Thus, Research Question 2 is answered in that the two programs appeared to offer virtual mirror images of what was considered the most important sports of the day as the same five sports were offered in the same order by virtual identical levels of proportionality.

The final research question pertained to differences potentially arising from the two time periods, with the October/November time period presumed to heighten men’s sports (when compared to other times of year) and the February time period presumed to heighten women’s sports (when compared to other times of year). The first way of measuring these potential differences is highlighted in Table 5, focusing on overall clock-time (*SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports Live* combined) divided within these two time periods.

As shown in Table 5, both time periods feature heavy focus on men’s sports, yet the very small amount of coverage for women’s sports in the October/November time period is significantly heightened in the February time period ( $t = 32.92$ ;  $df = 1$ ;

**Table 5.** Total Clock-time by Month (in seconds).

	Men	Women	Mixed	Total
October/November	177,908 (99.7%)	253 (0.2%)	209 (.1%)	178,370
February	135,966 (94.6%)	2,162 (1.5%)	5,597 (3.9%)	143,715
Total	313,874 (97.4%)	2,415 (0.8%)	5,806 (1.8%)	322,095

**Table 6.** Average Length of Story (in minutes: seconds).

	Men	Women	Mixed	Total
October/November	1:25:28	36:28:00	0.04869213	1:25:10
February	1:19:18	1:03:59	1:33:28	1:19:36
Total	1:22:53	58:90	01:33.1	82:44:00

**Table 7.** Number of Stories by Month.

	Men	Women	Mixed	Total
October/November	2,086 (99.5%)	7 (0.3%)	3 (0.2%)	2,096
February	1,717 (94.8%)	34 (1.9%)	60 (3.3%)	1,811
Total	3,803 (97.3%)	41 (1.0%)	63 (1.7%)	3,907

$p < .05$ ). To wit, women's sports received just 4.2 min of coverage when combining both programs during the entire October/November time period, increasing to 36.0 min of coverage in the February time period, an 854% rise. Although the 36 combined min in February is still far lower than the 37.7 hr of coverage dedicated to men's sports in the February time period, such an increase depending on season (particularly the Olympics) is noteworthy.

Two additional ways to determine differences between the two time periods are highlighted in Tables 6 and 7, with the former reporting on the average length of story by gender in each time period and the latter reporting the total number of stories by gender in each time period.

As witnessed in Table 6, women's sports received more story time in the second time period than in the first (increasing from a mean of 36 s to 1 min and 4 s), a significant difference ( $t = 13.50$ ;  $df = 1$ ;  $p < .05$ ). In addition, the number of stories pertaining to women's sports in the fall time period was just seven, while that number increased nearly five-fold in the winter time period, again a significant difference ( $t = 16.25$ ;  $df = 1$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Taken collectively, Tables 5–7 provide a three-pronged answer to Research Question 3, as women received significantly more clock-time, significantly longer stories, and significantly more stories in the February time period than in the October/November time period.

## Discussion

This study illuminated many aspects of the manner in which women's sports are shown (or, more aptly, not shown) within sports media. The work of Cooky et al. (2013) found that women were shown 1.4% of the time within their various time-period composites; this study found that, within both seasonal measures, both *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports Live* featured women in lesser amounts than even the 1.4% all-time low.

However, the primary aim of this study was not to replicate or retest the postulates present in Cooky et al. (2013) design; rather, it was to help to discern two key issues stemming from such works. First, the study was designed to determine whether such meager amounts of exposure to women's sports within broadcast news programs was specifically an ESPN tendency or, conversely, a trend found within other prominent sports news outlets. The results seemingly affirmed that FOX Sports 1 highlighted women's sports at even lower levels than ESPN, substantiating the claim that lack of women's coverage is not an ESPN-specific phenomenon. Second, the study was formulated to discern the degree in which gendered clock-time fluctuates depending on seasons—comparing a season of men's sports peak interest with a season of women's sports peak interest. The contrast between what is found on the two networks was particularly insightful, offering avenues for future research in the process.

From a theoretical standpoint, women's sports were shown in such small proportions, any notion of frames of selection and emphasis are cognitively trumped by frames of exclusion (see Tankard, 2001). Thus, the discussion of women in sports news programming choices become a matter of framing (see Goffman, 1974), with clock-time a foundational measure in which all other things heuristically unfold. The focus becomes not only what is shown, but what is excluded. The argument that women's sports could have been in relatively dormant seasonal periods is negated by the following women's sports events that could have been covered during these time periods: U.S. Women's National Soccer team (multiple games), National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) women's college basketball, NCAA women's soccer (regular season and tournaments), Ladies Professional Golf Association (LPGA) tournaments (seven), the first round of women's tennis' Federation Cup, and, of course, the Winter Olympics that featured women winning the same proportion of medals as the men. Cooky et al. (2013) found that 72% of all stories within *SportsCenter* were focused on the NFL, NBA, or Major League Baseball (MLB). This study found that 82% solely included these three men's professional team sports along with their men's college ancillaries.

Thus, the exclusion within both flagship programs becomes one not merely of women's sports, but of all men's sports that are not football, basketball, or baseball. This includes men's team sports such as hockey and soccer, but also all men's individuals sports, as tennis, golf, boxing, and more are shunted to secondary (or arguably even tertiary) frames. Such focus on the three major men's teams sports could certainly be viewed as exclusionary, but also has a pragmatic side to the argument as

well, as these sports offer considerably more inventory from a highlight-driven perspective. Although other sports enjoy high ratings, many are relatively isolated events. Mixed-martial arts ratings are high and growing, yet are largely relegated to Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) events that occur, at most, twice in a given month; NASCAR still enjoys ratings worthy of flagship sports news inclusion, yet the main focus is primarily on a single-high profile race each week. In contrast, when accounting for college and professional teams in the major three men's sports, hundreds of events are televised each month, meaning each has highlights that bolster a sports news programs lifeblood: its video inventory.

At the macro-level, this study shows that both networks promote frames in which men's sports are amplified while women's sports are negated. Such a claim does not imply overt sexism nearly as much as the dwindling number of sports (both for men and for women) that are seen as worthy of major flagship airtime. In an age where there has never been more sports programming options via both broadcast channels and internet streams, the result has not been an increase in the breadth of coverage where programs such as *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports Live* render a true "wide world of sports." Instead, breadth has been thwarted by depth in coverage of the most popular sports; airtime that used to be devoted to women's sports or even secondary men's sports (tennis, NASCAR, and golf) is now more likely to be devoted to discussion of deeper levels of men's football, basketball, and baseball—ranging from months of draft coverage to pontification on pending free agency to NCAA March Madness "Bubble Watch." Cooky et al. (2013) found that nearly three-quarters of all coverage was devoted to the "big three" sports; even higher proportions were found in this composite, even when including an Olympic-laden second time period. Thus, it is not just women's sports that have been relegated to secondary options, it is also many other secondary men's sports that find places like online-only ESPN3, ESPNW, or FOX Sports regional are now their likely programming destination. When it comes to sports media, the landscape may be flatter than ever before, yet a hierarchy of sports interests has never been more entrenched.

Pertaining to the specific hypotheses, both networks featured men's sports over 95% of the time (usually even 99% of the time), yet the core takeaways regarding these percentages is that this gap is not an ESPN-specific gap, as the gender gap was even slightly wider on *FOX Sports Live* than on *SportsCenter*. Regardless of network, women's sports were shown approximately 1% of the time and, when shown, women's sports stories were approximately 70% of the length of a men's story. Despite the presence of the Winter Olympics, in which NBC won 18 consecutive nights in the ratings with an average of 21.4 million viewers per night (Kissell, 2014), women's sports still received less than 2% of coverage, despite winning half of the medals for Team USA in this highly-viewed megasporting (see Eastman, Newton, & Pack, 1996) event.

Collectively referencing the research questions, the uniformity of results is perhaps the most telling insight to be gleaned from this analysis. Consider the similarities:

- Both *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports 1* featured women's sports less than 2% of the time, regardless of time period.
- Both *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports 1* devoted less than 2% of stories to women's sports.
- Both *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports 1* spent significantly less time on each women's sports story than on each men's sports story.
- Both *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports 1* significantly increased coverage of women's sports in the February (Olympic-laden) period compared to the October/November (NFL/basketball-laden) period, but still not beyond the 2% barrier.
- Both *SportsCenter* and *FOX Sports 1* highlighted the same five most popular sports in precisely the same hierarchical order: NBA, NFL, Men's NCAA basketball, NCAA football, MLB.

In sum, the most fitting conclusion appears to be that the addition of FOX Sports 1, dubbed as an attempt to “raise the bar for sports programming” (Rudnitsky, 2013, ¶ 2) is more aptly described with the “game of clones” moniker offered by Deitsch (2013, ¶ 1). The approaches are different, the graphics fonts are dissimilar, and the joke to commentary ratios may skew, yet—at the core—the same sports are being offered in near-identical measure within both sports news programs. One should note the potential mitigating role of ESPN and FOX Sports partnerships with major men's leagues, where business interests align to promote men's sports in which the networks already hold contracts with high financial stakes.

It is unwise to underestimate the power of a single sports news program, because even while each individual rating may seem relatively small, the aggregate ratings over the course of any given day is not. At the time of this writing, *FOX Sports Live* is airing 6 times per day; meanwhile, *SportsCenter* is shown on so many platforms in a plethora of time slots that it is shown for over 8,800 hr each year (Dickey, 2014), calculating to slightly more than 24 hr per day (because of overlapped airings on multiple networks). This analysis reveals the masculine nature of news coverage embedded in these oft-repeated programs, finding that—at least from the perspective of gendered clock-time—the introduction of FOX Sports 1 is more entrenchment than revolution.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## References

- Angelini, J. R., MacArthur, P. J., & Billings, A. C. (2012). What's the gendered story? Vancouver's primetime Olympic glory on NBC. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *56*, 261–279.
- Billings, A. C. (2008). *Olympic media: Inside the biggest show on television*. London, England: Routledge.
- Billings, A. C. (Ed.). (2011). *Sports media: Transformation, integration, consumption*. London, England: Routledge.
- Billings, A. C., Angelini, J. R., MacArthur, P. J., Bissell, K., & Smith, L. R. (2014). (Re)calling London: The gender frame agenda within NBC's primetime broadcast of the 2012 Olympiad. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *91*, 38–58.
- Coche, R. (2013). Is ESPN really the women's sports network? A content analysis of ESPN's internet coverage of the Australian open. *Electronic News*, *7*, 72–88.
- Cohen, B. C. (1963). *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *41*, 687–699.
- Cooley, C., Messner, M. A., & Hextrum, R. H. (2013). Women play sport but not on TV: A longitudinal study of televised media. *Communication and Sport*, *1*, 203–230.
- Davis, K. K., & Tuggle, C. A. (2012). A gender analysis of NBC's coverage of the 2008 summer Olympics. *Electronic News*, *6*, 51–66.
- Deitsch, R. (2013, Apr. 1). Game of clones: SportsCenter vs. FOX Sports 1; Ware's break. *Sports Illustrated*. Retrieved from <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/more/news/20130331/fox-sports-sportscenter-sunday-night-baseball-media-circus/>
- Delorme, N. (2014). Were women really underrepresented in media coverage in summer Olympic games (1984-2008)? An invitation to open a methodological discussion regarding sex equity in sports media. *Mass Communication and Society*, *17*, 121–147.
- Dickey, J. (2014, March 17). Hey sports fans, it's time for math class. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/13804/hey-sports-fans-its-time-for-math-class/>
- Eastman, S. T., & Billings, A. C. (2000). Sportscasting and sports reporting: The power of gender bias. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *24*, 192–212.
- Eastman, S. T., Newton, G. D., & Pack, L. (1996). Promoting prime-time programs in mega-sporting events. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *40*, 366–388.
- “FS1 ready to take on ESPN, though FOX execs know the battle could take a while.” (2013, August 16). *Sports Business Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Daily/Issues/2013/08/16/Media/FS1.aspx>
- Galily, Y., Cohen, N., & Levy, M. (2011). (Not) stronger, higher, or swifter: Representation of female Olympic athletes in the Israeli press. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, *12*, 57–78.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media and the making & unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York, NY: Harper Row.

- Greer, J. D., Hardin, M., & Homan, C. (2009). 'Naturally' less exciting? Visual production of men's and women's track and field coverage during the 2004 Olympics. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 53, 173–189.
- Kane, M. J. (2013). The better sportswomen get, the more the media ignore them. *Communication & Sport*, 1, 231–236.
- Kissell, R. (2014, Feb. 24). NBC averages 24.1 million viewers for Sochi Olympics, down from Vancouver. *Variety*. Retrieved from <http://variety.com/2014/tv/news/nbc-averages-21-4-million-for-sochi-olympics-down-from-vancouver-but-up-from-torino-1201118839/>
- Licen, S., & Billings, A. C. (2013). Cheering for 'our' champs while watching 'sexy' female throwers: Representation of nationality and gender in Slovenian 2008 summer Olympic television coverage. *European Journal of Communication*, 28, 379–396.
- McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176–187.
- Messner, M. A., Duncan, M. C., & Willms, N. (2006). This revolution is not being televised. *Contexts: Understanding People in Their Social Worlds*, 5, 34–38.
- Ourland, J. (2014, March 3). FOX sports execs like the trends at FS1. *Sports Business Daily*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2014/03/03/Media/Fox-Sports-1.aspx>
- Poniatowski, K., & Hardin, M. (2012). The more things change, the more they . . . : Commentary during women's ice hockey at the Olympic Games. *Mass Communication and Society*, 15, 622–641.
- Rudnitsky, M. (2013, Aug. 20). Shut up, SportsCenter. FOX Sports Live is going to kill you. *SportsGrid*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsgrid.com/shut-up-2/shut-up-sportscenter-fox-sports-live-better-jay-onrait-dan-otoole-espn-fs1/>
- Tankard, J. W. (2001). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy, & A. E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life* (pp. 95–106). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Turner, J. S. (2014). A longitudinal content analysis of gender and ethnicity portrayals on ESPN's SportsCenter from 1999–2009. *Communication and Sport*, 2(4), 303–327.
- Vincent, J., & Crossman, J. (2012) Patriots at play: Analysis of newspaper coverage of the gold medal contenders in men's and women's ice hockey at the 2010 winter Olympic Games, *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 5, 87–108.
- Weber, J. D., & Carini, R. M. (2013). Where are the female athletes in sports illustrated? A content analysis of covers (2000–2011). *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 48, 196–203.

## Author Biographies

**Andrew C. Billings** is the Ronald Reagan Chair of Broadcasting and Director of the Alabama Program in Sports Communication at the University of Alabama. His research interests lie in the intersection of sport, media, and issues of identity.

**Brittany D. Young** is a Masters student in the Department of Telecommunication & Film at the University of Alabama. Her research interests involve sport, women, and media representations.