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Introduction

ESPN began its tenure as the dominant sports television network in 1978. It has persisted, with no serious competition, until the 2013 launch of FS1. The existence of FS1 finally brings with it not only a legitimate challenger to ESPN, with the benefits that competing viewpoints and alternate forms of discourse bring to works of journalism, but a chance for thoughtful comparison of the sports television industry as a whole (Baysinger 2013). The ability of FS1 to get viewers to change the channel from ESPN is a significant focus of this work and will be examined as such, but the potential expansion of knowledge that can come from comparing ESPN to something other than its very own self must and will not be discounted. The results may end up being redundant, though, as similarity is a frequent byproduct of the processes of mass production that govern our present economy. In this light, the timeless words of Adorno and Horkheimer (1944, p. 188) may very well still ring true:

“The sociological theory that the loss of the support of objectively established religion, the dissolution of the last remnants of pre-capitalism, together with technological and social differentiation or specialisation, have led to cultural chaos is disproved every day; for culture now impresses the same stamp on everything.”

The primary purpose of this inquiry is to examine, through traditional scientific methods, theories of competition, and discourse in political economy, how the two networks compare to one another. This goal can also be described as finding the “why” of parent company FOX’s venture, bringing something concrete to the
discussion of FS1’s long-term viability. It may be that a sort of lengthy existence can persist as a sort of victory itself, especially when the goliath one is attempting to persist against stands on thirty-plus years of undisputed dominance and viewer loyalty.

The very logic of experimentation itself would dictate that the same, or very similar stimuli, contexts, and individual differences - as controlled by random assignment (Aronson, Brewer, & Carlsmith 1985) - and with the exception of dependent variables, will allow us to find the causes behind participant response. As such, if all of the attributes of two stimuli are very similar, for example, then that should lead us not to find differences among groups, but rather, we could predict that their responses would be the same. It is this same logic that forms the foundation of this thesis and the experimentation contained within it. Its goal is to distinguish between the competing models of ESPN and FOX Sports One by relying on the very logical basis of comparison itself, relying on longstanding scientific protocol to delineate the unspoken intentions of both networks as competitors filling the same knowledge base (Ho & Ganesan 2013).

The method of this comparison will be to examine the original programming of the two networks. Live sports, while an important element of interest for viewers, are controlled by television contracts which are subject to outside competition from powerhouses such as ABC and TBS (Bhandari 2013). They are, as such, outside the frame of direct comparison in which this thesis grounds itself. The two networks in question do not have control over these elements as they present themselves day-to-day, but they have full and direct control over the original programming they
choose to curate and broadcast. Contained in this thesis is a full analysis of every piece of original programming currently airing on the two networks, joined with an experiment that deeply examines the comparative nature of the flagship programs for each network, SportsCenter and Fox Sports Live. By relying upon the nature of experimentation both in the study itself and throughout this thesis, similar confines will be shown to yield similar results. This goes against traditional marketing theory for FS1, to which competition based displacement theory suggests that, “when several forms attempt to consume the same limited resources available in the environment, the use of resources by one species constrains the availability of resources to other forms.” (Kayany and Yelsma 2000, 217) This suggests that either FOX believes, perhaps mistakenly, that it has created a network unique and different to ESPN, or that it can simply persist long enough to take on the attributes of ESPN that have led to its longstanding success.

These questions will be evaluated primarily under the lens of political economy for two significant reasons. The first is that the fledgling nature of FS1 means that it still has a large chance of failing completely as a network due to its own performance, were it not backed by one of the largest media giants in the world. As its parent is FOX, the question of its survival could end up being purely economical. The second reason for leaning on political economy is that this branch of research lends itself closely to practices of criticality in that the critical tradition calls for a tying of the specific study to the larger society it fits within and an examination of how the moment in time of the study fits within the history of the larger issues (Horkheimer
1937). This criticality will primarily present itself in the thesis in the form of the experiment and statistical evaluations.

It is my hope that the reliance on the theory of political economy will provide the appropriate frame for the primary questions of this paper by emphasizing that the programming decisions made by FOX with their new network were likely made solely to ensure the survival of the network. The most logical way to address this point is to do so head on by construing these decisions in lenses of how they influence the sphere of domination FOX already has in place. Contrasting the structures of domination, primarily owned by ESPN in sports broadcasting, with FOX’s political and economic interest in shifting that balance, provides explanation for how the network may be planning its run at ESPN. As stated, this should blend well with a critical discussion of media effects by use of experimentation. A discussion of what constitutes a consumer belief will provide explanation for the tool used in said experimentation.

The key characteristics of beliefs are that they are not valenced and open the door for evaluative judgments to be made. They provide information about attributes of a given product that can then be measured on a scale between extremes. Descriptive beliefs, which relate to firsthand consumer experiences, will be the goal of experimentation here as they provide a direct reference to the presented stimuli (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975). The extreme scales that can be used in evaluations of consumer beliefs suits what I will be measuring directly, as it will allow for a differentiation between the two elements “similar” and “different” in regards to the programming of the two networks. The statistical measure of a Two One-Sided T Test
(TOST) will allow the belief questionnaires participants filled out in the experiment to be interpreted as empirical measures of equivalence. This method gives a stringent scientific backbone to the comparison within this thesis and allows for meaningful analysis to be conducted.

This work then, exists as a russian doll of sorts. Its experimental portion sits at the center and its outer pieces form a comprehensive picture of the competition between the two networks. FS1 has already turned the corner on its first year, standing as the fastest growing sports channel during prime time in television history. It beat out ESPN in prime time 75 times over the course of the year as well (ESPN 2015). Though it would seem nearly impossible to dethrone ESPN as the dominant competitor in sports television, there is no question that FS1 has the ability to carve out a secondary role behind it. The real question, of how FOX plans to proceed, is what I seek to answer within this project. It is also a question which deserves to be broken down further, a rare opportunity to diversify sports on television.

FOX in and of itself has pushed its FS1 brand as the “fun” alternative to the assumed “boredom” of ESPN. Yet, the FS1 programming exists largely within the standard, boring tropes that ESPN has established as the industry standard. Is this because these kinds of programming really are the standard for sports news? FS1 has the ability to emerge as a legitimate secondary option in this industry and thus is tasked with an important role in how coverage will evolve. There may be more than one way of discussing sports on television. Perhaps ESPN has been relaying this coverage to the viewers in a wholly ineffective and outdated day, but has had no other
significant force to push it towards innovation. Not only does FS1 have a legitimate opportunity to persevere as a network over time, but it has the opportunity to differentiate how sports news itself is fundamentally conducted. There is even reason to argue that FS1 has a responsibility to do so. In this lens, establishing if its early existence is truly different is a fundamental question for the rest of its history. As the network comes into its own, it will undoubtedly move beyond the confines of this thesis. However, the strategies employed in its first years will come to be emblematic of future patterns soon enough. If they are speaking one way and acting another by claiming difference and really operating under established ESPN procedures, the viewer deserves to be aware of this similarity.

Further, why would it be that FS1 flies in the face of conventional marketing strategy if it is really not seeking to differentiate itself from ESPN? Due to the immense economic and societal power of its parent FOX, there is certainly enough money to simply sustain FS1 and hope that loyal FOX viewers will get their sports from its subsidiary. Or, even still, perhaps FS1 is just hoping to successfully adopt the practices that ESPN has employed for so many decades of success. The consequences of similarity are more far-reaching than simply being like ESPN. The leaders of FS1 will undoubtedly continue to brand themselves as a differentiated alternative to the status quo. If they are doing so intentionally or unintentionally is beyond the scope of research, but the process of comparison can help illuminate what is actually happening as these two networks begin what could be a long history of competition. It is my hope that examining how this competition has begun and what the early similarities and
differences between the two are can help to explain the motivations of FS1’s future decisions. The discussion of sports television’s production, from its quality to its relevance, has effectively been kickstarted by the launch of FS1. As it and ESPN begin to both evolve and develop as products of each other’s actions, this work can serve as testimony of how this beginning period influenced the future of sports television.

Literature Review

The Use of Sports Television

Sports television research provides the societal context for the current existence of ESPN and FS1. Previous theory explains the role sports television occupies within television itself and that helps explain the differences between live sporting events and sports programming (Bernstein & Blain 2003). The history of sporting television paints it as a cultural currency. It has its own trade of information, its own set of hierarchies, and preferred models for distribution (B’erub’e 2009). Quality is not always thought to be a reachable aspect for sports television due to its very nature. Because it is news, there is a lack of artistic flexibility which garners critical appreciation within the medium and because the topic of the news is sports, there is a perceived lack of inherent importance to the programming (Feuer et al., 1984; McCabe & Akass, 2007). This can be summed as a lack of symbolic capital, the famous concept which, in this case, helps explain that sports programming’s lack of
societal value corresponds to a lack of societal importance (Bourdieu 1984). Much of the theoretical understanding of sports television comes on the side of broadcasting actual sporting events (Horne, Tomlinson, & Whannel 1999). There is a surprising lack of inquiry into the other half of the sports television equation, which is of course the primary focus of this very project. But, because sporting events are in and of themselves their own economic markets (whose profitability is immense) then it must be assumed that steps will be taken to further siphon profit from them in the form of secondary coverage (Szymanski 2006).

The massive amount of dollars it takes to purchase broadcast rights for sporting events is clear evidence of the massive economic potential of sporting television. Tremendous sums of money, measured in billions, stand as compelling reason for the existence and consumption of these programs (WIPO 2015). By 1984, ESPN reached over 24 million homes and was bringing in hundreds of millions of dollars annually, resoundingly answering the question of if viewers were interested in watching this secondary market (ESPN 2015). While the licensing deals of the major sports leagues have been met with a slew of fair play and monopolization concerns, there has been no such action when it comes to ESPN’s dominance (Johnson 2010). There was no monopoly, but rather a simple gap in competition. A gap which may explain the lack of research into ESPN’s viability, because with no major competitor to speak of, its identity remained unquestioned (Dauncey 2014).

There exists a sort of sporting nexus, which creates its own vortexual pull (Whannel 2002). Because sporting events have the capability of existing on such a
massive scale in society, they create an attracting force which generates built-in interest for the commentary and news that accompany them (Nicholson 2007). This vortexual movement generates constant momentum for the proliferation of sports television, a self-fulfilling cycle with events that recur and build upon themselves by their very nature. For example, it has been suggested that the media play a direct role in the creation of “sporting heroes” as byproducts of their coverage (Crame 1981). Those who watch sports television are more inclined to play recreationally, even (Famaey-Lamon 1978). It is an economic relationship, but mutually beneficial for both sports and the media that cover them. While the nature of sports does not change rapidly, the nature of media does, leading to a lack in awareness of the two’s symbiotic relationship (Greendorfer 1981). Evidence of the economic nature of this relationship can be evidenced by the commercialization of “amateurism” in NCAA sports that began so long ago and has started to reach critical mass in the last few years (Greendorfer 1983; Ross 2009; Learmonth 2010). Television has amplified the earning ability of sports. It has allowed its members, from owners to athletes, to increase their revenues and exposure while simultaneously allowing for increased television coverage (Harmond 1979). FS1 would seem to be a long overdue response to this increased economic viability, but pushing ESPN from its share of the market is a steep challenge indeed.
Competitive Marketing

Competition-based displacement theory essentially dictates that there is a limited scarcity of resources in any given competitive scenario and that the competitors who fulfill a similar niche must displace one another to win said resources (Kayany & Yelsema 2000). This theory and other research into competitive marketing shows that FS1 is operating outside of traditional theoretical bounds, which may be explained by its own self-perception (Evans 2015). There is no question that ESPN is the dominant competitor for our purposes (Barney 1986). As such, the common move for an emergent competitor would be to differentiate their product as clearly and substantially as possible (Baumol, Panzer, & Willig 1982). This creates a clear distinction and also provides an alternative for consumers who may have grown tired of or dislike the dominant competitor (Hamel, Doz, & Prahalad 1989). What may explain why a network may or may not proceed according to dominant marketing strategies is the organizational identity of the network. This self-characterization can distract an entity from understanding its actual place in the distribution of resources and lead it to pursue its own agenda (Albert & Whetten 1985). A network, or any sort of organization, may be led to conduct itself in relation to its own belief of place in the competitive framework rather than how outsiders, viewers in this case, believe it fits in (Evans 2015). Still, there are substantial theoretical gaps in explaining what may cause this gap in perception and reality, as well as how these gaps affect corporate marketing strategy (Tripsas 2009).
The concept of optimal distinctiveness can help explain why similar competitors end up thinking they are far more different than their own perception suggests. FS1 could believe that it shares the dominant features of ESPN, but that they have their own distinctive and unique qualities which, in their belief, uniquely differentiate the two as distinct entities (Brewer 1991). Yet, this type of thinking often leads competitors to seek out and embrace these unique qualities in order to amplify their distinctiveness (Foreman & Whetten 2012, Whetten 2006). Competition is thereby a fundamental process of comparison, with both equivalence and difference carrying unique and thorough consequences.

Political Economy

Political economy research can help explain why FS1 is operating outside of traditional marketing frameworks. For, while the hope of difference may be a popular marketing theory strategy, this branch of theory has warned of the similarity inherent in mass production, warning that “culture now impresses the same stamp on everything,” as a mere matter of process and progress (Horkheimer & Adorno 1944, 108). The omnipresent goal of political economy is to provide a full and complete look at the influences surrounding a given topic, introducing the important criticality privileged in this work. These tenants take stock of the full societal implications around what is being studied to assure that work is not being conducted within a vacuum, acknowledging that both production and distribution are fully controlled processes (Machlup 1962). Like most media products, it is clear that FS1 and ESPN
are not fully independent entities, so they must be considered in their full context to avoid diluting the results of this research (Garnham 1979). Political economy provides a lens which dictates that viewing any concept in a bubble without taking full account of its controlling structures of power and domination is an incomplete analysis (Gandy et. al. 1975). As the body of research suggests, this presents a total picture of the concept at hand, with full economic and societal concerns accounted for (Horkheimer 1937). This prevents an isolated account where significantly mediating factors (i.e. the ownership of the two networks in question being two of the world’s most powerful economic entities) are acknowledged. By examining the structures of dominance in a field, an understanding of their relation to each can be formed. Establishing this framework allows examination of how this relationship can be changed over time and provides a research trajectory which enables the criticality which is so clearly necessary in an examination of two dominant societal powers (Lazarsfeld 1941). An important observation lent by this nature of observation, for example, is that no matter how powerful the controlling agents in an industry are, the hegemonic nature of capitalism will always allow new competitors the ability to influence the field.

Further, as a continually incomplete process, the strength of backing an entity has directly controls its future ability to compete within that field (Lull 2011). Despite the switch from a production to service economy, information as a product can still be tracked (Fuchs & Garnham 2014). This means that despite the lack of physical product, the trails of viewership and money can still be tracked and analyzed as a cultural material (Garnham 1983). Media as a product, then, exists as a function of the
money it generates. Viewing the media industry as an oligopoly, it can be seen that approaching this project in this manner is not only sensible but necessary. The synergy which exists within the field is a constant product of economic and societal movement that must be continuously accounted for (Mosco 1988).

Beliefs and Attitudes

The use of beliefs as a scale of measurement in experimentation relies upon participant’s self-expression. Beliefs are explicit measures that can be simply stated as an individual’s perception of an event (Goos 1999). Changes in belief come about as results in the process of experiencing, processing, and self-reporting out the new information taken in by the mind. This process concerns itself chiefly with the mind’s ability to interpret similar stimulus in a rational and consistent manner (Bovens and Hartmann 2003). Using beliefs correctly, then, relies upon participant’s ability to interpret in a way that would be considered theoretically sound. The most straightforward way to engender this is to create an experimental framework which allows the mind to proceed in its normal way, unencumbered of special considerations (such as controversial subject matter) to present what should be a clean slate for possible belief change (Foley 1991).

To understand what could create a lack of reliability (and thus what the design of this experiment has been crafted to avoid) in self-reported measures of belief, attentions must fall to the foundation of belief itself. Specifically, how the manner in which a belief is formed will determine how it can be changed. The five dimensions of
epistemological belief from Schommer (1990) are outlined as: beliefs about the structure of knowledge, beliefs about the source of knowledge, beliefs about the stability of knowledge, beliefs about the speed of learning, and beliefs about the ability to learn. Schommer’s works (Schommer-Aikins et al. 2000; Schommer-Aikins 2002; Schommer-Aikins & Hutter 2002) set up the conditions which may come to affect belief change by placing these five types along a continuum. In their period of formation, they are relatively independent and thus able to travel along this continuum as the mind receives information. When established, beliefs make themselves distinct in three formats: descriptive, inferential, and informational (Haugtvedt, Herr, & Kardes 2008). The type used is dependent on the content being evaluated. Works reviewing media, due to the prevalence of research regarding audience receptions in the media effects tradition, typically and widely focuses upon inferential beliefs. This study is concerned with an evaluation of media in and of itself, though, and thus focuses upon the first-hand experience of descriptive beliefs (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975). Belief stands as the origin of all other evaluative judgements, then, an undistilled product of the basic measurable level of initial processing which is made clearly visible by the Fishbein Model shown below.
It is within this hierarchy that the importance of beliefs as the building blocks of evaluative judgments emerges (Fishbein 1980). They are not yet valenced, or non-evaluative. In this sense, they are unencumbered by the building process of an established attitude, which can come to be complicated by implicit mental processes (Dovidio & Fazio 1992). It is in this same sense, though, that the process of belief-collection eventually comes to constitute an attitude. At this point, the all-important implicit-explicit distinction arises (Allport 1935). There is a five part-distinction to check the appropriateness of an implicit or explicit measure as presented by Hofmann, Gschwendner, Nosek, and Schmitt (2005, 335) which proceeds as follows:

“Translation between implicit and explicit representations (e.g., representational strength, awareness), additional information integration for explicit representations (e.g., need for cognition), properties of explicit assessment (e.g., social desirability concerns), properties of implicit assessment (e.g., situational malleability), and research design factors (e.g., sampling bias, measurement correspondence).”
The study as constructed and executed fits squarely within the explicit criterion presented. When questions asked of participants touch on sensitive issues, there is concern that self-reported measures will be compromised from a person’s want to present an “ideal self” (Baumeister 1982). As reports on the characteristics of a sporting news program are very non-controversial, then, self-reported answers can be trusted as untainted. Because they track very simple responses on a standard Likert Scale, the belief measurements collected through this study fit within the parameters of sound science as properly controlled (Aronson, Carlsmith, & Brewer 1985). For the purposes of this study, the relatively simplistic nature of belief serves the advantage of control. Work done in both areas of belief and attitude as measurement prove that simple questioning is controlled by the more simple processes of mental perception (Nisbett & Wilson 1977). This same body of research suggests that preexisting mental labor affects current responses. As this study fits into its greater theoretical framework, though, it comes to represent how matching very basic forms of stimulus and questioning will yield strong and appropriate results. This is how explicit responses need to be treated, as they remove the possibilities for outside factors and loss of control that can come with more nuanced response mechanisms such as attitudes.

Experimental Design

There are some considerations that must be accounted for in a study such as this one. Areas of concern include the use of college students as a sample, the choice
of a self-reported mechanism such as belief, and the rhetoric of actually constructing the stimuli. Outside of these factors, the experiment itself has been designed to be completely controlled. Standard random sampling procedures guarantee validity of results and there was no room for outside influence on participant response (Aronson, Carlsmith, and Brewer 1985). The Aronson, Carlsmith, and Brewer primer on experimentation serves as a foundational document in the construction of this experiment and its contents have been used with incredible success in creating scientifically sound and valid results. In response to the possible and logical criticism of all college students as participants not fully and truly constituting a random sampling, it should be noted that the particular data in question is not demographically sensitive and that the ability for external control granted by the laboratory setting used effectively balances the potential for response bias (Kardes 1996). Using belief as a measure was largely covered in the review section on belief itself, but further justification can be found in experimental logic itself. As a comparative study, this experiment benefits from having as parallel of a structure as is possible (Aronson, Brewer, & Carlsmith 1985). There is no question that by their very nature beliefs exist as the simple normative judgment that allows participants to respond purely to only the stimulus. The use of attitudes as a measure would bring in a level of complexity (especially when implicit effects are considered) that is simply not warranted for the data being collected. There is no complex mental labor required of participants and, therefore, no reason to further complicate the results by accounting for the many potential implications of such processing (Allport 1935). By utilizing this simple
experimental design, a greater level of significance can be awarded to the results (Hershel 1980). Similarly constructing the stimuli, which are similar by their very nature, to be presented as similarly as possible (picture quality, pool of possible topics, audio quality, and so on) preserves the general structure of the entire work (Sacks 2014).

**Use of Two One-Sided \( t \)-Tests**

The One-Sided \( t \)-Test stands as one of the most prolific statistical tests in experimentation. The Two One-Sided \( t \)-Test (TOST) is its direct opposite. Where the one-sided measure calculates difference, the TOST deals with similarity as the effective inverse of its counterpart (DeMuth 1999). In the comparative study that follows later in this thesis, the TOST will be used to find empirical equivalence. As it comes directly from a procedure that is both sound and effective beyond any reasonable doubt, its own validity should not be in question provided its proper application (Blackwelder 1998). The TOST is a relatively new procedure, effectively invented in 1987 by Donald Schuirmann as a tool for measuring bioequivalence (Schuirmann 1987). It is for this purpose that the bulk of TOST application comes from the area of pharmaceuticals. Its application outside of the more traditionally regarded “complex” sciences is almost nonexistent, but there is no reason to believe this application would be improper as long as it were held to the same rigor of procedure (Aronson, Brewer, Carlsmith 1985). The lack of TOST usage in mass communications theory persists as more a lack of interest than a lack of utility. There
is clear potential in the process of using statistical differences to curate equivalence ("TOST in Bioequivalence Testing"). Successfully transporting the test to other areas of research relies upon its proper application, as there is nothing inherent in the TOST itself to suggest that it is merely a measure of bioequivalence testing (Phillips 1990). For now, the TOST gives the ability to test the following hypothesis.

The responses of SportsCenter group participants will differ from the responses of Fox Sports Live group participants to show a lack of equivalence between the two programs.

OR

The responses of SportsCenter group participants will not differ from the responses of Fox Sports Live group participants to show equivalence between the two programs.

Those who participated in the study will either come to showcase similar beliefs as to the attributes of each program, or to disagree that the two programs showcase similar attributes. That is to say, then, that response equivalence, if shown, will lead to similarity. If it is not shown, then the product of this testing will be difference between the two programs.
General Comparison of ESPN and FS1 Programming

The foundational aspect of this comparison is the original programming of these two networks. These shows are what the networks have direct organizational control over and the various components of each show are products of decisions made by the involved parties. In this they are unlike the sporting events which populate the remainder of each network’s programming. Control is dictated by the network itself, outside of bidding pressure from networks (such as CBS, TNT, and their ilk) which broadcast their respective sports occasionally and fill the rest of their time with various other forms of media. Further, these events are comparable only to themselves in that their value is dictated by their own intrinsic merits. It should be recognized, however, that the broadcast packaging can and may affect viewer reception of a sporting event. This effect is secondary to the event itself, though, and therefore beyond the scope of this current work. Later, the breadth and details of these various television contracts dictating what sports are shown on both ESPN and FS1 will be displayed. The purpose of this is to demonstrate how much time is left available for the programming being studied here and establish a frame of reference.

The plainest way to begin discussion around what similarities or differences may exist between the programming of these networks is to fully outline each program. Each network’s programming will be presented individually before comparison is made. The necessary elements of each show which can be purely measured are when it airs, how long it runs for, its format, and its personnel. I have
also singled out and specified recurring and particular segments which can be uniquely quantified. All observations come directly from the network’s respective viewing guides and the programs themselves. To avoid such subjectivity as my personal viewing could bring to such an analysis, I will remain in the realm of empirical observation. After lining out the details of each program, I will compile the necessary elements of all and present a comparison. The data collection of both personnel and segments can be found in the appendix of this work as a full account of the work done below.

**ESPN (All Times ET)**

**Baseball Tonight**

Airing on ESPN since 1990, this is the network’s dedicated Major League Baseball news show. During the MLB season, it runs nightly at 10 p.m. on the network. On Sunday, which acts as a recap show of sorts, it airs at 12:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., live. The show persists in the two-host format, with Adnan Virk and Karl Ravech at the helm. As a dedicated baseball program, its segments are delineated by parts of the game itself. Its most famous segment, “Web Gems,” displays the top defensive highlights of the day as chosen by fan “Web” voting and has become so popular that the phrase itself is commonly used in the sport. The show can run in any block of 20, 30, 40, 60, or 90 minutes, but the most frequent runtimes are 30 and 60 minutes.
Basketball College GameDay

Airing since 2005, the basketball edition of College GameDay is the companion program of NCAA Football’s College GameDay. As the name suggests, it airs on Saturdays, when the largest NCAA Basketball games take place, first at 11 a.m. and later at 8 p.m. The key feature of GameDay is that it takes place live at the location of ESPN’s “Game of the Week” which directly follows the broadcast of the 8 p.m. edition. It is in a four personality format, with a host, three analysts, and the occasional interlude from a reporter and primarily shot at a desk which all analysts occupy. The host guides the conversation about the games happening that day, while the analysts debate about college basketball storylines and make picks for who will win the day’s contests. The show is notable for its live broadcast at the on-site location, which is typically filled with fans who cheer in the background.

Football College GameDay

The well-known “big-brother” version of the basketball edition of GameDay debuted for ESPN in 1987. In 1993, the show adopted the live, on-site location format that it has become so notorious for in its tenure. The predictions portion of the show is its most notable element. GameDay runs for a full three hours on college football Saturdays, starting at 9 a.m. and concluding at 12 p.m.
**College Football Final**

College Football GameDay's night time recap show. Airing since 1999, it runs for one hour at midnight every saturday of the college football season. It is in the traditional ESPN format of one host and two analysts. The show is highlight-driven.

**College Football Live**

Airing since 2007, the program is the weekday college football show with a heavy emphasis on fan interactivity. It airs at 5 p.m. and runs for an hour, shot in ESPN’s side studio. The structure of the show varies by day, either proceeding by a two-interview structure or with some amalgam of highlights and debate. The show is meant as a mirror to ESPN’s NFL Live program.

**E:60**

Begun in 2007, E:60 is ESPN’s most in-depth journalistic program. It can be considered a sporting corollary to programs like *60 Minutes*. As its name suggests, the program runs for one hour. Its inclusion here focuses on its tendency to be broadcast on ESPN at some point during the week, although it now debuts on ESPN 2 at 7 p.m. on Tuesdays.
Monday Night Countdown

The preview show to Monday Night NFL Football has been airing on ESPN since 1993. It runs before the Monday Night game (broadcast on ESPN since 2006) for two hours, from 6:30 p.m. until kickoff at 8:30 p.m. It jumps between an in-studio crew and a crew that is on location of that week’s game. The program focuses on the night’s matchup most and also works as a sort of recap show for Sunday’s games, touching on the major stories as it goes along. Pre-2006, it is also notable as an indicator of cooperation between ESPN and ABC Sports.

NBA Countdown

This program has been shared with ABC as part of the ESPN on ABC arrangement since 2002. It did not make its way independently onto ESPN until 2012. The program airs for one half hour before every broadcast NBA game on the network. It is a simple preview show, running down the night’s expected action and highlighting major storylines in its remaining time. Through the use of sideline reporter Doris Burke, on-site look-ins are used to preview a night’s game.

NFL Insiders

A more recent addition to the ESPN lineup, first airing in 2013. NFL Insiders is a weekday NFL news show with an emphasis on the reporters ESPN dubs as “insiders” to a particular sport. It airs every weekday for a full hour at 3 p.m. The reporters riff through various items of news and rumor, giving their expert take.
show brings in many contributors dependent on what is being discussed and does a
good job of getting reporters who are well-credentialed for the topics of the day.

NFL Live

A studio show airing for a full hour each weekday, the program moved over
from ESPN 2 to ESPN in 2002 and has ran at 4 p.m. Monday through Friday ever
since. It is not, strictly speaking, a highlight show, as that and recap are generally
handled by the network’s other news programs throughout the weeks. Because of this,
the program is segment driven. It is notable, though, that the program runs in the NFL
offseason. It features Trey Wingo as host with a variable rotation of analysts (three per
airing).

NFL Matchup

An in-depth football analysis show running since 1993. It utilizes team-given
coaching footage used in NFL Film Rooms to take a more analytical view of coming
matchups. The program airs on Sundays at 3 a.m. and later re-airs at 7:30 a.m. The
show only airs during the NFL season. Suzy Kolber, who assumed host duties from
1993 to 2003, was the first female to host an NFL news show. The program proceeds
in the one host, two analyst format.
NFL Primetime

A SportsCenter for football, this program has run on ESPN since 1987. There are two airings of the show, the first at 4 p.m. and the second airing approximately ninety minutes after the Monday Night Football game ends. The show is broadcast from the Bristol studio. It is highlight-driven, but does not use them as frequently as most other ESPN shows and tends to focus its highlight use on narratives rather than just big plays. The late showing especially has an emphasis on analysis.

NBA Shootaround

The NBA pregame show for the network, airing since 2002. Airs for thirty minutes at 7:30 p.m. before the broadcast of ESPN’s Friday night NBA games and sometimes at the same time on Wednesday before ESPN’s games that night. It provides simple preview, highlights, and analysis to prime viewers for the coming games.

SportsCenter - A fully detailed breakdown has been provided in the experimental section of this work

Outside the Lines

An ESPN staple running since 1990, OTL is one of the network’s more serious programs. It focuses on analysis of issues that are often controversial, but still focuses on current sports stories. It runs for thirty minutes on weekdays at 5:30 p.m. and also
Sunday at 9 a.m. It is notable that ESPN backloads the commercials for OTL, running the show uninterrupted until its end and then running commercials. Heavy emphasis is placed on interviewing those involved in the stories covered. It does not utilize the host/analyst format of most ESPN news programs, rather focusing on host Bob Ley with a rotating, miscellaneous cast of contributors.

**Sunday NFL Countdown**

The Sunday NFL pregame show, occupying the majority of airtime on Sundays during the NFL season since 1985. The program begins at 10 a.m. and runs until the games themselves begin at 1 p.m., for a grand total of three hours. It features an extensive panel of analysts alongside host Chris Berman. These panelists are split up into two separate groups to allow for variability throughout the extensive show. It is unique in its use of a comedian, Frank Caliendo, to do impressions.

**Around the Horn**

A debate show utilizing on-screen block graphics to visibly separate its analysts, Around the Horn has aired since 2002. Rather than a host it utilizes a moderator, Tony Reali, who introduces topics, guides the debate, and assigns points to the analysts. Reali has discretion in awarding the points, which he uses to reward what is considered strong arguments and punish poor rhetoric. The points guide the analysts through the three “rounds” of the show, each of which covers various sporting topics
and ends with the elimination of the lowest scoring analyst. The show runs daily at 5 p.m. for thirty minutes.

**Pardon the Interruption**

A two-man debate show airing since 2001, starring Tony Kornheiser and Michael Wilbon. It utilizes a SportsCenter style rundown bar, but on the right hand of the screen, which ticks through various topics that the two hosts will discuss on the show. It airs at 5:30 p.m. for a half an hour on weekdays. The title phrase is used as an opening, with Michael Wilbon traditionally stating “Pardon the Interruption, but I’m…” and then beginning the show.

**The Sports Reporters**

This program follows a relatively standard host and three analysts format, but is notable in that, as its name suggests, all of the analysts are reporters. It has aired since 1988 and currently runs at 9:30 a.m. every Sunday. John Saunders serves as the host of the show, which runs for thirty minutes.

**30 for 30**

The network’s documentary series has run since 2009. It was launched to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the network and has since run well past its 30th film due to its popularity. Stories covered were meant to reflect once captivating stories that had, for some reason, fallen from popular memory over time. Bill
Simmons is primarily responsible for the creation of the project, which brings in independent directors and personnel for the documentaries. The normal running time for these programs is one hour, but some editions stretch all the way to two hours. There are no personnel or segments for this program due to its unique nature. This is also no set airing time due to the individuality of each project.

**IX for IX**

A specific spin off of the *30 for 30* programming which began airing in 2013 to celebrate the 40th anniversary of Title IX. The production and presentation of the two are incredibly similar (but of course dependent upon the particular director and personnel) with the notable exception that the *IX for IX* films focus specifically on the stories of women in sports. Also notable is the fact that all of these documentaries are directed by female filmmakers. Each documentary airs for one hour. Again, there are no specific personnel or segments.

**Grantland Basketball Hour**

The most recent addition to ESPN’s lineup, the program just aired its sixth episode. As its name suggests, it runs for an hour and is put on by the ESPN sports website Grantland. New episodes so far have a variable airtime, usually running around 7 or 8 p.m. The show focuses on basketball and is somewhat of a television port of various Grantland products (specifically podcasts). The show has large, episode-specific sections which usually revolve around one or two guests.
Fox Sports One (all times et)

The Mike Francesa Show

Mike Francesa’s sports radio talk show is broadcast on FS1 on weekdays from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m, unless there is a live sporting event being shown on the network during that time. The full runtime of the show is from 1 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. and in the event of another scheduled event, its showing on FS1 moves over to FS2, where it runs all the way through until 6:30 p.m. each weeknight.

America’s Pregame

Debuting in April of 2014, this program can be thought of as FS1’s generic pregame show for all sports. It runs for an hour weekdays at 6 p.m. The show frequently brings in guests to discuss the night’s events and is hosted by Mike Hill. It focuses mainly on establishing storylines for the sporting events of the night and is lighter on the analysis side of sporting news. It features the same right-side of screen timeline as Fox Sports Live and as such the show proceeds according to the content on the sidebar.

Fox NFL Kickoff

Airing Sundays at 11 a.m. since September of 2013, this program has a runtime of one hour. It airs at this time throughout the entirety of the NFL season. It
operates under the host and three analyst format. The show features frequent studio
movement from topic to topic, utilizing a variety of desks and settings.

**NASCAR Race Hub**

The weekly NASCAR news show, this program has aired since the channel’s
debut in August of 2013. It runs Monday through Thursday at 6 p.m. The show’s
primary function is to analyze the previous weekend’s race and then provide coverage
leading up to the next weekend’s race. It is hosted by Steve Byrnes and Danielle
Trotta with a rotating crew of analysts. Analysis of the races from the hosts and
interviews drive the show.

**FOX Sports 1 on 1**

As its name suggests, this is a one-on-one interview show. It has a variable
airtime (A Coach Mike Krzyzewski interview ran at 5:30 a.m. on a Tuesday and a
Coach Jay Wright interview aired the Thursday of that same week at 8:30 p.m.) but
always runs for a half an hour.

**NFL Films Presents**

Hosted by Joe Buck, this program features films produced by NFL
Films which are later presented on FS1 during the NFL season. The shows are
independent and unique, airing for different lengths and at different times.
Traditionally, there is one shown per week of the season. As such, the personnel depends on the particular film and there are no recurring segments.

**NASCAR RaceDay**

The NASCAR pregame show, it appears at a variable time on Saturday afternoon or Sunday morning, dependent on the time of that week’s race. It runs for an hour. It is only a FS1 program for the first half of the racing season, when it is then passed over to NBC. The show proceeds in a traditional game day format, with analysis and discussion of the upcoming race. The majority of the time is spent interviewing drivers and other NASCAR personnel, discussing current standings, and speculating on the race itself.

**FOX Sports 1 College Hoops Extra**

The college basketball wrapup show, it airs at variable times (including 4:30, 5:30, 9 10 p.m.) dependent on. it debuted on the channel in November of 2014. It runs for a half an hour and exists during the beginning parts of the NCAAB season as a general news show for college basketball action. Beginning in January and until the NCAA Tournament concludes, it shifts format to a preview show highlighting the upcoming games. It notably ramps up its live on-site presence at tournament games in March.
**Supercross: Behind the Dream**

A series of documentaries detailing the Supercross racing series, this program is in the midst of its second season after debuting in 2014. It has a variable airing time, with five episodes in the first season and eight coming in the second season. The show discusses the upcoming races and features a rider to watch each episode. The rider to watch is the focus of the show, delving into their backstory and preparation. In addition to variable airing times are variable run times, with the entirety of the first season running for three and a half hours.

**Inside the Big East**

Details the teams within the NCAAB’s Big East Conference as its name suggests. It is in its inaugural season, airing Sundays at 4 p.m. for a half hour. The program runs for the length of the Big East basketball season, finishing when the conference tournament begins at its tenth episode. It emphasizes interviews with personnel from a selected team each week and also features standard highlight analysis of recent action within the conference. The show utilizes a rotating group of personnel but persists in the one host, two analyst format.

**MLB Whiparound**

Airing weeknights during baseball season at 10 p.m. the program began its run in March of 2014. It runs for a full hour, and is moved to midnight if there is a scheduling conflict. Chris Meyers is the host and is joined by a co-host and either one
or two analysts. The show, as it airs during the playing of that night’s baseball games, focuses on providing quick highlights and analysis of the in-progress action.

**Comparison**

With the specific attributes of each current program laid out, the focus moves to comparing the two networks. Following is a chart which details the length of programs, type, location, sport, use of recurring segments, and use of personnel. I will note the interesting similarities and differences present, but the chart stands on its own as a comparative measure. Notes are to follow.

*Some explanations for the information in the chart -*

In the section “Type,” measures are defined as follows: Debate refers to programs which feature multiple personnel who routinely take opposite sides of an issue. Recap and Preview refer, respectively, to programs which discuss events just completed or just following their airing. News refers to the programs which do not analyze sports in such a time-sensitive manner as Recap or Preview types. The final category, Entertainment, refers mainly to the documentary-style undertakings of both networks.

The terms “rotating” and “static” are simply used as their traditional definition dictates. The implication of the three types of personnel, host, analyst, and reporter, must be discussed. As the networks use them, the “host” is the guiding force of a program. They exist to guide analysts and progress the show through topics. They can
be thought of to exist in a moderator-style capacity. “Analysts” are relied upon to
dialogue through their namesake, analysis. They respond to host prompts with a
mixture of opinion and fact, serving as the primary engines of dialogue for the show.
The hosts and the analysts are generally seated at the static desk of the program. The
“reporters” are often employed in the same capacity as normal journalists. They are
brought in, often by video feed, to discuss news updates and break news itself. It
should be noted that all personnel are technically reporters on these programs, as
members in a journalistic production, but the report is specifically used as a device for
delivering news the the remainder of the personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Comparison</th>
<th>Frequency in Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td><strong>ESPN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Minutes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Hour</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Hour +</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Length</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recap</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live On-Site</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASCAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MotoCross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Specific</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Use</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Non-Specific)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Use</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Host</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Host</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Hosts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating Hosts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Hosts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Analysts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Analyst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Analysts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Analysts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four + Analysts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating Analysts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Analysts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reporters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Reporter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Reporters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three + Reporters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating Reporters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Reporters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is important to note that the ESPN programs *Sunday NFL Pregame* and *Monday Night Countdown* utilize two fully distinct crews of personnel and are, as such, doubly represented in the data. The two program totals are for ESPN and FS1 respectively, 22 and 13. Also, for the ESPN show *The Sports Reporters*, personnel who are typically utilized as reporters are given the roles of host and analyst. Their presence is reflected as such above.*

As there does exists a large, near 50% gap in the total number of programs, the frequency of each aspect must be kept in mind. Avoiding rampant speculation is necessary, but it would seem logical to assume that the relative newness of FS1 would account for its lack of overall programming when compared to ESPN. Its shows are still largely in a trial-and-error period. We can also note, then, that because FS1 has a
full nine less shows, that these shows are repeated at greater frequency. I have stayed away from a numerical analysis of frequency in the chart above, though, because the use of live sports programming often repositions original programming and thus aligns frequency as an outside factor. This being an intrinsic comparison, frequency is thus off-limits for these purposes.

In this intrinsic comparison, we will begin with similarity. Both networks favor either half-hour or hour-long programming. They both rely on the general news “type” as their most frequent style of programming, and the vast majority of this programming is done solely within their various studios. The two networks may differ when it comes to the sports covered by their programming, but they both still rely on a large percentage of non-specific sport programs. This is a strong observation as it reflects the willingness to rely on programs that are independent of specific live sporting events carried on both networks.

We can see from the use of personnel that one host is the most preferred method of programming for both networks. Overwhelmingly, this one host is static to the show, perhaps as an effort to create a strong signifier of that host to their specific program. Beyond this, both networks most commonly deploy two analysts. This would mean that the most common alignment of personnel is the one host, two analyst format. Both networks are more comfortable rotating their analysts than hosts, also, but a static group is still the most popular option. These patterns carry over to the use of reporters, though it should be noted that this is only when shows even use a designated reporter role at all. The majority of programming does not involve a
reporter in any way, although this number does reflect the inclusion of
documentary-style entertainment programs.

We then come to the crossroads of difference in this comparison. The two
networks get along rather amiably in the spirit of program length, although ESPN
brings to the table a much greater volume of hour-plus shows than its competitor. The
large differences, though, begin to emerge in the types of offerings the two present.
Most glaring is FS1’s complete lack of debate and recap programs. The other types are
fairly consistent. For whatever reason, though, FS1 does not present any real reflective
options on the sports it covers. This may reflect a desire to avoid the tropes of opinion
that persist in such debate shows or something entirely different, admittedly. The lack
of recap can be largely attributed to FS1’s use of Fox Sports Live to cover a night’s
events, but does not fully explain the data because ESPN uses SportsCenter in a
similar capacity in addition to housing two independent recap programs. The other
area of greatest differences comes from the sports covered by each set of
programming. ESPN emphasizes its football programs tremendously, where FS1 does
not lean on any sport in so heavy a fashion. This may be because ESPN broadcasts
live football on its network whereas the greater FOX stations carry the events instead
of FS1. That both networks carry football is a fact, though, so FS1’s lack of
supplementary emphasis on the sport is interesting. The presence of two NASCAR
programs may help to explain this, though. As FS1 itself carries live races, it also
carries supplementary programming. A FOX ideology of this sort of programming on
the station that actually carries the events would go a long way towards explaining this
observation. Outside of these two large areas, the networks exist on a mostly similar plane. Their use of personnel is largely similar, as is their use of specific segments. It should be noted that FS1 is unique in its use of one analyst in two programs and its lack of any programs with four or more hosts, an area where ESPN claims three programs. FS1 also does not deviate from the host, analyst, reporter format where ESPN will bring in other roles, such as the use of a comedian, in some programs.

While there is difference, then, between the two networks, similarity is the larger part of the split. Their differences are likely a product of broadcasting rights outside influence and, in the lack of debate and recap shows, a product of newness or company philosophy. These are surface differences, similar to the kind of rhetoric FOX itself produces when emphasizing all the fun their network is, when under the surface, both networks align their products under similar formats. While the topical content of the two is certainly important to observe and consider, it is this similarity in operation that undergirds all the programming the two produce. They use their personnel in similar fashions, have similar frequencies in length of their programming and use of specific segments, and place their programs in similar locations. Despite how these programs may carry themselves when they are being broadcast, they come together in the same ways. When the ripples on the surface settle, it becomes clear that we are looking at very similar bodies of water in the first place.
Comparative Study of SportsCenter and Fox Sports Live

Methodology

Participation

This study divides participants into two groups, one who watches the SportsCenter stimulus and another who view the Fox Sports Live stimulus. Immediately after viewing either stimulus, participants were asked to complete a beliefs questionnaire and their responses form the data set used in the study.

The total number of participants in this study is 53. Of these, 27 participants were ran through the SportsCenter condition, while the remaining 26 were ran through the Fox Sports Live condition. Participants voluntarily signed up for participation in the study as drawn from the Scripps College of Communication Participant Pool. All students were at least 18 and college students enrolled at Ohio University. Their participation was contingent on their membership in the participant pool. In order to avoid incentivizing participation in the study, full credit (in the form of points awarded in the class a participant pool student is a member of) was awarded for simply showing up at the signed up-for time and signing their name and the date on a participant sheet. This avoids the implication that a participant can do “well” or “poorly” on the questionnaires, which are by definition impossible to score either way on as measures of belief and not empirical fact.

Participation in the study took no more than thirty minutes for each group of participants. Participants were ran in groups of one to four, dependant on signups. In
order to fully randomize participation, students signed up for a full hour time slot initially. Groups were then randomized and divided into two half hour timeslots and participants were notified of which time they would be asked to participate in the hour block. The SportsCenter group ran in the first half hour and the Fox Sports Live group in the second. This fact was only known to myself, the researcher.

Design

The design of the questionnaire is as follows: a standard Likert Scale questionnaire composed of 43 questions. Participants were asked to select an identification tag from a baggie in order to protect the anonymity and identifiability of their responses. This tag was the only method of identification on completed questionnaires. Participants were prompted and given time to ask any questions they may have prior to filling out the questionnaire and all questions except those which would compromise the integrity of the study were answered. The entirety of said questionnaire can be found as an attached appendix at the end of this work.

The stimuli for this experiment were controlled to be as exact as possible. They were both recorded through QuickTime Player and presented in the VIDS laboratory in the basement of the Scripps School of Journalism on its television. Both stimuli were taken from the first, live broadcast (from the given day) of each program to ensure that each version would be of the same production quality. Both stimuli were recorded from the same date to ensure each program would have the same possible set of sports stories and events to discuss and also to guarantee that information would be
current for each participant set. I pre-screened each stimuli to make sure that the two chosen broadcasts would be common representatives of each program. “Common” being that both were selected on days with no large, breaking story, or massive sporting event such as the Super Bowl to influence coverage decisions. Screening for these programs involved watching a multitude of programs and running them through the analyses conducted in the general program analysis portion of this work to further determine the two as common representatives. The two stimuli ran for approximately fifteen minutes each and were edited so as not to include commercials which may cloud participant’s responses. The reasoning for this time of stimuli was to make sure that common sections of each show would be chosen, specifically the introductory segments and the portion immediately following the first commercial break. This avoids potential problems in response that could arise from viewing the ending of a SportsCenter episode compared to the beginning of a Fox Sports Live episode. My study received IRB approval under #14X229 on November 14th, 2014.

Process

With the components of the study laid out, the process will now be explained in steps. Participants would arrive and take seats within the VIDS lab with clear view of the television. I would then enter, introduce myself, and notify them that they would be participating in a study analyzing media. They were then given and allowed to read the informed consent form with time for questions. After signing, it was explained to participants that they would be viewing either the SportsCenter or Fox Sports Live
stimuli and filling out a questionnaire after viewing. I would begin the stimuli at this point and leave the study room to wait in the viewing room, where there is a security camera feed to the participants. Upon completion of the stimuli, I would reenter and instruct the participants as to fill out the beliefs questionnaire. Upon all participants completion of the questionnaire, they would be debriefed and dismissed. This process was repeated until the total sample size of 53 participants was constructed.

Data Analysis

The forty-two belief assessment measures which composed the questionnaire were ran through a principal factor (or component) analysis with varimax rotation. By counting only the number of principal components with eigenvalues greater than one, common factors were identified and deployed for further analysis. Those factor loadings who had clustered responses greater than 0.6, with no other secondary loading equalling or exceeding 0.4, were then further examined in order to identify relevant clusters of measures (McCroskey & Young, 1979). These measures were then summed at equal weight to form an index. After being checked for internal consistency, these measures were used as independent variables to test the two proposed hypotheses of this work, with condition used as the dependent variable. The analyses were all $t$-tests, as the hypotheses are directional in nature. Traditional two-tailed $t$-tests were used as a benchmark of testing difference, with the running of two one-sided $t$-tests as a more in-depth measure of examining the equivalence within the common factors.
Results

The factor analysis of the forty-two dependent measures yielded twelve factors with eigenvalues greater than one. After running the varimax rotation, these twelve factors were ideally differentiated and accounted for a combined 74.45% of the total variance. Examination of the twelve factors saw the removal of seven of these measures from further analyses due to either being composed by only one item each, thus fitting below the required two item per factor threshold, or because of a secondary loading of 0.4 or greater was present (McCroskey & Young, 1979). The measures left which compose the five resultant indices had acceptable levels of internal consistency. A label was selected for each factor based on their components.

The labels, which will be shown in the table numbered A-E, are attitude composition (A), trends (B), op-ed (C), in-frame (D), and comprehensibility (E). Their numbered factors, respectively, are one, two, four, six, and eight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Great</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freq. High-Lights</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk W Friends</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Seg.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Subjective</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Setting</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Set</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Spec.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 1, labeled Attitude Composition, accounted for 14.39% of the variance. The index was formed by summing the following measures: I think the show is entertaining, Everything about the show is great, The program bored me, Overall, the program is very good, In general, the show is pretty horrible, and I would watch a complete, one-hour broadcast of this show. Factor 2, labeled Trends, accounted for 7.79% of the variance. It was formed by the following measures: The same highlights are used too often, I would use the information from this program to discuss sports with friends, and I would watch this show to keep up with the conversation about sports with friends. Factor 4, labeled Op-Ed, accounted for 5.65% of the variance. It was formed by the following measures: Special segments add depth to the show not provided within the show’s standard format, and The analysis on the program is too subjective. Factor 6, labeled On-Frame, accounted for 5.61% of the variance. It was formed by the following measures: The physical setting of the show adds to its appeal,
The setting of the program is distracting, and The program is more entertaining when the anchors were both speaking and shown on screen. Factor 8, labeled Comprehensibility, accounted for 5.39% of the variance. It was formed by the following measures: Too much time was spent on specific topics, and The way the anchors speak is easily understandable.

The Cronbach’s alpha value for each index were as follows: Attitude Composition, .64. Trends, .54. Op-Ed, .37. On-Frame, .25. Comprehensibility, .72.

All five indices were separately entered as dependent variables into a two-step series of $t$-testing composed of the one-sided and two one-sided $t$-tests with condition as the independent variable for all. Each of these tests can be found displayed in their entirety at the conclusion of this work in Appendix B. The final number for gathering these results was 52, with one subject being excluded as a clear and distinct outlier.

As the most impactful of the five factors, the Attitude Composition Index was also the place of greatest results significance. The splits for SportsCenter (M= -1.5, SD = 4.2) and Fox Sports Live (M= -1.7, SD = 3.6) give a main effect of $\{p = .92\}$ such that participants presented significant belief differences in the two networks as they will later come to compose attitudes of the same topic. The resultant TOST of the same factor lent a similarly powerful score of $\{p = .43\}$ which exists as the test’s version of near certainty in equivalence (Schuirmann 1987). This strongly supports H2 as not only does it nearly reject H1 outright by completely failing to show presence of difference, but by further giving concrete evidence of equivalence when reporting their beliefs.
The results of $t$-testing for the other four indices were not as pronounced, lending scores (one-sided listed first, two one-sided second) as follows: Trends, \{p = .09 , p = .36\} Op-Ed, \{p = .44 , p = .36\} In-Frame, \{p = .38 , p = .30\} and Comprehensibility \{p = .17 , p = .61\}. As products of the factor analysis with a significant (at least 50% for the Trends index and further falling with each additional index) reduction of variance explained for by each, the results of their testing do not lend as much weight to either H1 or H2 as the Attitude Composition index. This does not mean that their results are to be fully discounted, either.

The hypothesis received various levels of support, but there is strong reason to renounce the program’s difference and accept their similarity as primarily evidenced by the Attitude Composition index. As previously stated, there is no evidence of difference between the two programs yielded by this first factor. As this is a study of beliefs and the Attitude Composition index emerged as the only primary factor to directly gauge these measures, its utility is clear. Generally speaking, a lack of difference towards a directional hypothesis such as those in question eliminates a necessity for equivalence testing. However, as equivalence itself is the function of H2, it should be specifically tested for. That the TOST for the Attitude Composition index reflected the inverse of its one-sided $t$-test serves to further evidence the equivalence of beliefs about these two programs. The other four indices suggest that there are indeed some differences between the programs, but their content is not as material to the actual hypotheses in question as product of their placement by factor analyses.
Discussion

The goal of this study was to effectively chart a beliefs comparison of audience reception to SportsCenter and Fox Sports Live. The strength of effect towards both refuting program difference and accepting program equivalence has accomplished this principal goal. Lack of difference can and often is attributed to similarity, but the inclusion of the TOST as an equivalence measure has doubled down on this effect to further solidify the presence of equivalence between the two programs. As the building blocks of attitude, the composite belief measures which came together in the factor analyses to form the Attitude Composition index answers the primary research question of this thesis. In plain language, participants who viewed either SportsCenter or Fox Sports Live in this experiment had the same measured belief of the two program’s attributes. Where the statistic significance starts to unravel is in the other four indices.

These four indices present themselves as part of a largely diverse questionnaire, which was entirely composed of belief measures, but manifested themselves in more specific ways. The Trend index, for example, could have been a product of representative sampling, which is discussed in the limitations section following. It was also composed of only three out of forty-two response measures and with the parameters in place to ensure appropriate stimuli, is much more likely a product of how the response measures came to weigh together in the factor analysis. The Op-Ed index was only composed of two measures and its significance deals more in a fringe product of both programs, detailing the in-depth special reporting that
arises for more sensitive stories. The same goes for the On-Frame index, composed of three measures which could have seen FS1 moving about more than the largely static one-desk and highlight approach of SportsCenter. The Comprehensibility index, composed of two measures, also lacked in statistical significance. Their results all somewhat endorse difference while not doing much to reject equivalence and have the opposite effect through their respective TOSTs. The question then becomes if this lack of clarity comes to affect the impact the Attitude Composition index has. But, with at least double the variance accounted for when compared to each other index, it becomes clear that the results from this first index are the most significant. Combine this with the comparative lack of significance in the other four indices and it is hard to create a relationship where these elements have impactful bearing on the two networks.

What this means is that as viewers come to watch Fox Sports Live, they will begin to form similar attitudes towards the show as they will come to hold towards SportsCenter. They may perceive differences in how the shows go about assembling their components, but these differences will not come to a large enough sum as to effect their general attitude towards the two. Despite what differences may exist, then, viewers will place the two together. When Fox emphasizes the difference between how entertaining its product is compared to ESPN, then, they may indeed have grounds for such statements. Ultimately, though, this will not affect how viewers perceive each product. The work done in this experiment has shown, though, that the differences between the two programs are pronounced enough to create more than a
simple illusion of change. Specifically, that Fox Sports Live has a more dynamic setting than ESPN and that the two may tend to select their stories in a different manner.

These two observations of difference are important. They create a meaningful split between the two programs that could, over the course of additional years, widen into a gulf of program attitudes. Both of these differences are effortful programming decision consciously made by the runners of Fox Sports Live in areas of direct control. While the effects shown by the results here are not overwhelming, they are somewhat indicative, so the potential consequences of their truth becomes both interesting and important to consider. The dynamic set goes together with the fun edict from FS1. The manufactured movement and often standing personnel could be meant to engender energy and keep the viewers more occupied with frequent setting changes. They could also be a simple reaction to a SportsCenter set that works largely off of its main desk, an intentional measure intended to create difference.

Selection differences are a more intriguing difference, as they bring concerns of political economy to the forefront. While it is entirely possible that, when the topics are chosen for Fox Sports Live and SportsCenter, the two simply privilege different events as they see them arise. But, it is much more likely that the rostered programming on both networks influences their flagship shows to cover what each network owns. The ESPN programming emphasis on football would lead to an increased coverage on available football stories, for example, while the prevalence of NASCAR on FS1 would lead to more coverage of races. Creating this sort of
symbiotic relationship is not at all uncommon (Rajaratnam & Varadarajan 1986). Just as networks run advertising for their other programs, the events covered by both ESPN and FS1 benefit from this internal viewer stimulation. This is a clear indicator of the influence economic factors can have over programming decisions. That this is an area of difference is interesting, then, because it mirrors the different economic positions the two networks occupy.

As the dominant competitor, ESPN can rely more upon its own established role in the marketplace to attract viewers (Kayany & Yelsma 2000). FS1 stands at a stark contrast in its need to generate interest. Its infancy also brings with it a higher degree of variability, as networks commonly rotate programming at a greater frequency as they begin to identify what does and does not work for their viewers (Eastman 2000). The programming analysis conducted within this work shows this, with FS1 airing significantly less programs than ESPN. Reduction in type allows for a higher frequency of the shown programs, which directly leads to increased audience exposure. This creates a quicker identification process for the programs FS1 will wish to keep and provides faster opportunities to move on from its failures. ESPN exists in a position where it can survive almost any failed program and thus has the luxury of a greater program frequency. FS1, per these results, is performing as expected in its role as the minority competitor. This shows that the network does understand its position in relation to ESPN. It would seem, then, that FS1’s awareness of its place in the sports broadcasting hierarchy has not been met with the strategies that traditionally accompany such status. Curating difference is not an exact process, however, and it is
entirely possible that the lack of achieved difference in programming is despite their best efforts to follow competitive marketing strategies.

Simply persisting long enough to carve out a market share alongside ESPN is another possible explanation for the behavior of FS1. Remaining aware of the immense economic power of parent company FOX, the assertion that enough money could buy enough time to produce network success still stands as a possible explanation for these results. Under this scenario, the equivalence between viewer attitudes makes sense. ESPN, through its decades of dominance, has created a fully proven model of success. Given that FOX News’ Nielsen ratings at the end of 2014 show the network show nearly 3 million viewers a day, FS1 would only need to hope a portion of FOX News viewers someday decide they wish to get their sports news from a member of the FOX family (Wilstein 2014). Further, as ESPN is the king of cable viewership, leading all other cable networks with over 2 million daily viewers last year, following its practices is a sound strategy grounded in clear economic success (Kissell 2015) While it is important to examine these results as they exist solely within the sphere of these two networks, the recency of FS1’s launch combined with knowledge of the company that launched the network necessitates a broader viewing. Both companies are ultimately economic entities and must be treated as such.

These results show that, overall, the two programs are viewed with equivalent attitudes by viewers, despite some meaningful differences in their composition. Viewed through the specific lens of these two networks as competitors, this data comes to show that FS1 may have a developing problem. Viewers equating Fox Sports
Live to SportsCenter eliminates any need for Fox Sports Live. Competitive marketing theory suggests that there is no such market space for this sort of similarity. When viewed through the broader lens and accounting for the economic forces behind FS1, though, these results come to present a more hopeful future for the network. The component differences, while perhaps more overtly economic in nature, could come to create a meaningful split given time. Even if not, and viewers continue to perceive the programs as equivalent, FOX could engender success from FS1 in the same way that erosion slowly eats away at all it touches.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

There are many ways I wish I could have improved this study. Beyond the personal limitations of time and my relative lack of experience with work such as this are concrete ways and means of improving and then building upon these findings. This work is essentially an initial inquiry to the relationship between these two competitors. As such it is bound in many ways by its newness. There are two routes of improvement, then, both expansion-related and scientific in nature.

Logically extending this experiment would likely start with its replication amongst other ESPN and FS1 programs. Though SportsCenter and Fox Sports Live are the two network’s most notable pieces of programming, it would be foolhardy to reduce the entirety of these nuanced entities to two programs. Founding a scientific comparison this way is a sound starting place but ultimately an incomplete picture.
Beyond this would be an inquiry into the specific impact that live sporting events have on the two networks. I maintain my reasoning that due to their unflinching nature, live sports cannot be compared in and of themselves, but mere observational logic clearly shows that the presence (specifically the frequency and type) of specific live sporting events influences programming decision. Finding a way to account for this influence, or to measure the strength of that influence, would be a tremendously valuable addition to this body of research.

The true limitations of this study as it exists today are largely quantitative in nature. 53 is a strong number of participants, but increased participation will always increase the strength of a study. Though it could perhaps exceed attention span and harm response measures, showing the entirety of either program is the only true way to compare the two with full certainty. This avoids the possibility of a sample not fully representing the truth of the programs by leaving out possible key elements. This concern fits hand-in-hand with the selection of a representative episode in general. To perhaps show a multiple quantity of episodes could remove concerns around mistakenly selecting a misrepresentative stimulus.

From a theoretical perspective, the removal of commercials and the response restriction to belief measures are potential limitations. There does exist a robust body of research asserting that the context and use of commercials effect viewer repetition of a program. As I am just comparing the internal qualities of these programs through descriptive beliefs, the potential impact of commercials falls outside the scope of this study. Confirming this scientifically, though, is the only way to confirm for sure. The
belief limitation is a similar sort of restriction. For this initial inquiry, the simple utility and appropriateness of belief measures was the clear first step. But, as the building blocks of attitudes, it would be sensible to extend the research to account for the attitude formation taking place in the future. Along with this expansion comes the ability to include the vast body of implicit attitude research in future works. I have stated that there is no real reason to suspect inaccurate self-reports from this procedure, but as is thematic in this section, implicit association testing can provide a higher measure of certainty.

Personal Reflection

Writing this thesis has been, to use a tired saying, a labor of love. I am tired too, having just completed the largest and most exhaustive work of my young life. This work has accomplished its goal in a way I am pleased with. Yet, as my time with it comes to a close, it has become abundantly clear that there is so much more I wish to do. I have been warned about this feeling before - reminded that any singular project, specifically a bachelor’s thesis, must not strike too broad in order to retain any hope for impact. To manage this one must set boundaries of study which they can only hope do not end up standing starkly as boundaries of their own particular study. I can happily say, then, that this is the case for my thesis. To tie some sort of concrete evidence to such a broad notion as similarity has been a powerful experience. To tie some sort of actual result to a year and more of work has been even more intoxicating.
Learning that you can tie together such a massive project is a great time. To view it as an isolated year, however long that year may have felt, simply fails to capture the assortment of skills I needed to find the finish line. The process of learning to write academically began as my first year of college did. As a notoriously long-winded (and all of that being hot air, as many around me insist) talker and write, I believe that I have improved with every passing year. The same goes for my research skills, which were previously overjoyed to expand beyond a few google searches and now send me through oceans of data. Purely academic advances played a huge role in my ability to complete this project, but the lessons learned in a general life sense played the largest role. I have become a truly organized person, without which I honestly do not believe I would have been able to tackle a project of this magnitude. Most importantly, though, I am by far my worst critic. This is not uncommon, but I have learned not to hate or resent my work while holding myself accountable. To embrace such standards without becoming disparate has been a fundamental challenge of my very being.

My education, friends, and family are owed 100% of this work. Technical knowledge and support are all one can ask for and I have been blessed enough to receive both in abundance. The thesis, despite my awareness of it for my first three years of college, still seemed like such a foreign concept as I began it this year. Achieving a level of familiarity with the work and construction of my own routine was, by far, the hardest aspect of this process. Without a strong support system and great mentors, I have no doubt that this project would exist as a garbled wall of text. I
can only hope that somebody comes to find its contents useful. Even if not, I understand that my personal gains from completing this project have been immense enough to propel me to a life where I can rise to large challenges that do not seem possible at first.

The sports television world has been a largely inflexible arena covering such dynamic events for a very long time. Decades of singular coverage are where I place the blame. I do not view this as a failure or shortcoming of ESPN. Yes, I hate the Skip Baylesses and Stephen A. Smiths of the world screaming at each other for minutes on end without presence of objective fact on what is considered a “news” channel. But, the overall impact in popularizing the 24-hour news cycle for sports falls near squarely upon the network’s shoulders. ESPN could do much better, but it is increasingly hard to argue that it could do much more. It is my hope as a lay sports fan that FS1 can finally be the push that forces sports television viewership to become more dynamic.

There is a definite problem with those who watch their analyses on ESPN, follow ESPN reporters online, and read ESPN’s slew of mobile sites as their only source of input. It is a problem of bias, the age-old specter of journalistic doubt. While FS1 is unlikely to stop this problem, it at least provides the opportunity for those who do not wish to be inundated by one overwhelming viewpoint to change the channel and still hear about sports before they head to work at 7 a.m. I find no fault in FS1 following similar steps in program construction to ESPN. I view it as the breaking of a thirty-year cycle of stagnation. With the deep reserves of FOX, it seems likely that FS1 will stay around for quite some time. If the trends shown in this work continue
and equivalence becomes more pronounced, or if they reverse and the networks
become truly differentiated, it is the persistence of FS1 that matters most. We now
know that they have the tools to do so.
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Appendices

Appendix A - Beliefs Questionnaire

Please circle the answer that best describes how much you agree with each of the statements below.

\[ D = \text{Very Much Disagree} \quad d = \text{somewhat disagree} \quad u = \text{undecided} \quad a = \text{somewhat agree} \quad A = \text{Very Much Agree} \]

The anchors work well as a team
D    d    u    a    A

Sports highlights are used effectively.
D    d    u    a    A

I think the show is entertaining.
D    d    u    a    A

There same highlights are used too often.
D    d    u    a    A

Special segments add depth to the show not provided within the show’s standard format.
D    d    u    a    A

The physical setting of the show adds to its appeal.
D    d    u    a    A

The topics discussed on the show reflect major sports trends.
D    d    u    a    A
If the topics listed on the sidebar were not of interest to me, I would not watch this program.

D  d  u  a  A

Too much time was spent on specific topics.

D  d  u  a  A

The setting of the program is distracting.

D  d  u  a  A

Everything about the show is great.

D  d  u  a  A

Statistics are used well as an information source.

D  d  u  a  A

The program bored me.

D  d  u  a  A

On average, individual topics were covered in too little depth.

D  d  u  a  A

The program is the most effective way to be informed about what is going on in sports.

D  d  u  a  A

I only learned information about sporting events from watching this program.

D  d  u  a  A

This program has no impact on society.

D  d  u  a  A
Watching this program gave me useful information about things besides sports.

D d u a A

It was difficult to follow what was going on in the program.

D d u a A

I think the show is funny.

D d u a A

I would watch this program in order to be informed.

D d u a A

The anchors take up too much time on screen.

D d u a A

Watching this program often would keep me up-to-date about sports.

D d u a A

Overall, the program is very good.

D d u a A

The way the anchors speak is easily understandable.

D d u a A

The program is more informative when the anchors are shown discussing sports news.

D d u a A

The program is more entertaining when the anchors were both speaking and shown on screen.

D d u a A
It is more informative when the anchors are speaking over video highlights.

D  d  u  a  A

In general, the show is pretty horrible.

D  d  u  a  A

Watching this program infrequently would not keep me adequately informed about sports.

D  d  u  a  A

The topics listed on the sidebar reflect what is being discussed at the time.

D  d  u  a  A

It is more entertaining when the anchors are speaking over video highlights.

D  d  u  a  A

If I tuned in to the middle of the show, I would watch its next broadcast to see what I missed.

D  d  u  a  A

I would watch a complete, one-hour broadcast of this show.

D  d  u  a  A

If I switched to this program, I would decide to watch it based on the topics in the sidebar.

D  d  u  a  A

The program is informative.

D  d  u  a  A

I would watch this program regardless of what topics were listed on the sidebar.

D  d  u  a  A
The analysis on the program is too subjective.

D d u a A

The analyses on the program are driven by facts.

D d u a A

I would use the information from this program to discuss sports with friends.

D d u a A

I would watch this program to show I know more than my friends about sports.

D d u a A

I would watch this show to keep up with the conversation about sports with friends.

D d u a A

Generall, I would watch this show (please circle only one):

1) in the morning.
2) around midday.
3) in the afternoon.
4) in the evening.
5) late at night.
**Oneway Analysis of Factor 1 By Condition**

Excluded Rows: 1

**Means and Std Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-1.5385</td>
<td>4.16875</td>
<td>0.81756</td>
<td>-3.222</td>
<td>0.1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-1.6538</td>
<td>3.58823</td>
<td>0.70371</td>
<td>-3.103</td>
<td>-0.2045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t Test**

B-A

Assuming unequal variances

- Difference: -0.1154
- t Ratio: 0.10697
- Std Err: 1.0787 DF 48.91629

| Upper CL Dif | 2.0525 | Prob > |t| | 0.9153 |
| Lower CL Dif | -2.2832 | Prob > |t| | 0.5424 |
| Confidence   | 0.95   | Prob < |t| | 0.4576 |

**Practical Equivalence between B and A**

- Specified Practical Difference Threshold: 2
- Actual Difference in Means: -0.11538
- Std Error of Difference: 1.078707

**Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t Ratio</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Threshold</td>
<td>-1.96104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Threshold</td>
<td>1.747105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max over both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excluded Rows 1

Means and Std Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err Mean</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.23077</td>
<td>0.54436</td>
<td>0.1096</td>
<td>1.7532</td>
<td>2.3519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.34615</td>
<td>0.28792</td>
<td>0.4096</td>
<td>2.9391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t Test**

B-A

Assuming unequal variances

- Difference 1.1154
- Std Err Diff 0.6158
- Upper CL Diff 2.3621
- Lower CL Diff -0.1313
- Confidence 0.95

**Practical Equivalence between B and A**

- Specified Practical Difference Threshold 0.8
- Actual Difference in Means 1.115385
- Std Error of Difference 0.615817

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>t Ratio</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Threshold</td>
<td>0.51214</td>
<td>0.6946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Threshold</td>
<td>3.110314</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max over both</td>
<td>0.6946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Oneway Analysis of Factor 3 By Condition

Excluded Rows 1

Means and Std Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err Mean</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.615385</td>
<td>1.49872</td>
<td>0.29392</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>1.2207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.346154</td>
<td>0.97744</td>
<td>0.19169</td>
<td>-0.0486</td>
<td>0.7409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T Test

Assuming unequal variances
Difference -0.26923 t Ratio -0.76724
Std Err Dif 0.35091 DF 43.009
Upper CL Dif 0.43844 Prob > |t| 0.4471
Lower CL Dif -0.97690 Prob > t 0.7754
Confidence 0.95 Prob < t 0.2236

Practical Equivalence between B and A

Specified Practical Difference Threshold 0.4
Actual Difference in Means -0.26923
Std Error of Difference 0.350908

Test t Ratio p-Value
Upper Threshold -1.90714 0.0311*
Lower Threshold 0.37266 0.3555
Max over both 0.3555
Oneway Analysis of Factor 5 By Condition

Excluded Rows 1

Means and Std Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.26923</td>
<td>1.97094</td>
<td>0.38653</td>
<td>0.4731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.76923</td>
<td>2.12241</td>
<td>0.41624</td>
<td>-0.0880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t \text{ Test} \]

B-A
Assuming unequal variances
Difference -0.5000 t Ratio -0.88023
Std Err Dif 0.5680 DF 49.72839
Upper CL Dif 0.6411 Prob > |t| 0.3830
Lower CL Dif -1.6411 Prob < t 0.8085
Confidence 0.95 Prob < t 0.1915

Practical Equivalence between B and A
Specified Practical Difference Threshold 0.8
Actual Difference in Means -0.5
Std Error of Difference 0.568034

\[ t \text{ Test} \]

Upper Threshold -2.2886 p-Value 0.0132*
Lower Threshold 0.528137 0.2999
Max over both 0.2999
### Oneway Analysis of Factor 8 By Condition

Excluded Rows 1

#### Means and Std Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.34615</td>
<td>1.19808</td>
<td>0.23496</td>
<td>0.86224</td>
<td>1.8301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.84615</td>
<td>1.37673</td>
<td>0.27000</td>
<td>0.29008</td>
<td>1.4022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### t Test

Assuming unequal variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t Ratio</th>
<th>Std Err Dif</th>
<th>Upper CL Dif</th>
<th>Lower CL Dif</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.5000</td>
<td>-1.3996</td>
<td>0.3579</td>
<td>0.1687</td>
<td>-1.2192</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Practical Equivalence between B and A

Specified Practical Difference Threshold 0.4
Actual Difference in Means -0.5
Std Error of Difference 0.35792

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>t Ratio</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Threshold</td>
<td>-2.51453</td>
<td>0.0076*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Threshold</td>
<td>-0.27939</td>
<td>0.6095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max over both</td>
<td>0.6095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**ESPN (All Times ET)**

**Baseball Tonight**

Airing on ESPN since 1990, this is the network’s dedicated Major League Baseball news show. During the MLB season, it runs nightly at 10 p.m. on the network. On Sunday, which acts as a recap show of sorts, it airs at 12:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., live. The show persists in the two-host format, with Adnan Virk and Karl Ravech at the helm. As a dedicated baseball program, its segments are delineated by parts of the game itself. Its most famous segment, “Web Gems,” displays the top defensive highlights of the day as chosen by fan “Web” voting and has become so popular that the phrase itself is commonly used in the sport. The show can run in any block of 20, 30, 40, 60, or 90 minutes, but the most frequent runtimes are 30 and 60 minutes.

**Personnel**

- **Hosts** - Karl Ravech, Adnan Virk, Jon Sciambi (substitute)
- **Analysts** - Manny Acta, Dallas Braden, Aaron Boone, Jose Cruz, Jr.,
  Doug Glanville, John Kruk, Jessica Mendoza, Alex Cora, Ozzie Guillen, Barry Larkin, Curt Schilling, Chris Singleton, Rick Sutcliffe,
  Dave Winfield, Eric Wedge
- **Reporters** - Tim Kurkjian, Buster Olney, Jayson Stark, Keith Law

**Segments**

- **3 up, 3 down** - The hosts discuss topics, generally players or teams, which are on either an upswing or downswing. Each set of topics is presented in threes.
- **Best Seat in the House** - Only appearing in the live Sunday editions of the show, it features analyst John Kruk giving a guided tour of whichever stadium is playing host to the ESPN broadcast of Sunday Night Baseball that night.

- **Chatter Up** - The audience interaction element of the show. Viewers submit thoughts on pre selected topics through ESPN’s website which are later selected for presentation on the bottom line and sometimes discussed by the hosts.

- **Diamond Cuts** - A Sunday showing exclusive, takes the best highlights of the week and presents them over music.

- **Extra Bases** - Used to give additional analysis of a particular game after its highlights have been shown.

- **Going, Going, Gone** - Traditionally shown in the latter portion of the show, tracks the distance and shows highlights of the longest home runs hit within the day.

- **Inside Pitch** - A baseball reporter from ESPN is brought in to discuss whatever rumor or story is most relevant at the time.

- **Leading Off** - The leadoff segment of the show itself, packages the major stories from the day and highlights what will be covered in a particular episode.

- **The Week with Tim "Quirkjian"** - Tim Kurkijian, ESPN baseball reporter, gives unusual, or “quirky” statistics.

- **Most Important Thing** - Traditionally the final segment of the show, acts as a wrap up by the hosts.
• **On The Phone** - Live interviews with some significant MLB persons.

• **Out of the Box** - Essentially a companion segment to *Leading Off*, serving the same purpose.

• **Ridiculous Plays of the Week** - A mirror to SportsCenter’s *Not Top 10 Plays* segment, highlights the five most absurd and/or comical plays of the week.

• **Stat of the Night** - One statistic that is meant to represent the most interesting or relevant happening in baseball that day.

• **That's Nasty** - Shows the “nastiest,” or best, pitches of the night.

• **Touch ‘Em All** - The home run portion of the show.

• **Smash of the Night** - Companion segment to *Touch ‘Em All* which highlights the most impactful home run of the day.

• **Sport Science** - John Brenkus is brought in to bring a scientific angle to a specific player’s ability to do something extraordinary, often by enacting small-scale experiments which gauge a certain player’s ability through use of generated statistics.

• **Web Gems** - The flagship segment of the show. Details the five best defensive plays of the day, and on Sunday, the best plays of the week.

**Basketball College GameDay**

Airing since 2005, the basketball edition of College GameDay is the companion program of NCAA Football’s College GameDay. As the name suggests, it airs on Saturdays, when the largest NCAA Basketball games take place, first at 11 a.m. and later at 8 p.m. The key feature of GameDay is that it takes place live at the
location of ESPN’s “Game of the Week” which directly follows the broadcast of the 8 p.m. edition. It is in a four personality format, with a host, three analysts, and the occasional interlude from a reporter and primarily shot at a desk which all analysts occupy. The host guides the conversation about the games happening that day, while the analysts debate about college basketball storylines and make picks for who will win the day’s contests. The show is notable for its live broadcast at the on-site location, which is typically filled with fans who cheer in the background.

Personnel

- **Host** - Rece Davis
- **Analysts** - Jay Bilas, Seth Greenberg, Jay Williams.
- **Reporter** - Andy Katz

There are no segments to this show. It only alternates between discussion and analysis at the live location and reporter cut-ins at other game sites.

Football College GameDay

The well-known “big-brother” version of the basketball edition of GameDay debuted for ESPN in 1987. In 1993, the show adopted the live, on-site location format that it has become so notorious for in its tenure. The predictions portion of the show is its most notable element. GameDay runs for a full three hours on college football Saturdays, starting at 9 a.m. and concluding at 12 p.m.
Personnel

- *Host* - Chris Fowler
- *Analysts* - Lee Corso, Kirk Herbstreit, Desmond Howard
- *Reporters* - Samantha Ponder, David Pollack
- Often features celebrity guests as a “fifth” desk member

There are no segments to this show. Like its basketball counterpart, football GameDay is viewed entirely through on-location sites, either at the location of the broadcast desk or with reporters located where other games are being played that day. Its prediction portion should be noted as its most famous for analyst Lee Corso donning the mascot head of his prediction.

**College Football Final**

College Football GameDay's night time recap show. Airing since 1999, it runs for one hour at midnight every saturday of the college football season. It is in the traditional ESPN format of one host and two analysts. The show is highlight-driven.

**Personnel**

- *Host* - Rece Davis
- *Analysts* - Lou Holtz and Mark May

**Segments**
• **Game Changing Performance** - The analysts nominate one player from the day’s slate of games who had the most impactful individual performance and discuss.

• **Helmet Stickers** - College Football helmet stickers work similar to the archetypical “Gold Star” and the analysts each award one to a player from the day and discuss.

• **Highlight Lounge** - The hosts reign in their analysis over highlights to one featured game and do so from what is meant to resemble a traditional American family-room setup of a large television and large chairs.

• **Lasting Impressions** - Each broadcast member, including host, is given solo time to discuss their final opinions of the most important storylines from the day.

• **Garage** - The day’s “best” highlights set to music.

• **Poll Movements** - As the show runs after all of the week’s games have been played but before the official top 25 poll results for that week, the show members guess poll movements based on the results of the day.

• **The Big Play** - The analysts focus on a single play meant to be the most impactful of the day and conduct a more in-depth analysis of it than other highlights.
College Football Live

Airing since 2007, the program is the weekday college football show with a heavy emphasis on fan interactivity. It airs at 5 p.m. and runs for an hour, shot in ESPN’s side studio. The structure of the show varies by day, either proceeding by a two-interview structure or with some amalgam of highlights and debate. The show is meant as a mirror to ESPN’s NFL Live program.

Personnel

- **Hosts** - Ryan Burr, Chris Fowler, Brent Musburger, Rece Davis, Dari Nowkhah, Mike Yam, Jonathan Coachman, Erik Kuselias, Wendi Nix, John Saunders
- **Analysts** - Todd Blackledge, Lou Holtz, Desmond Howard, Mark May, Doug Flutie, Lee Corso, Craig James, Kirk Herbstreit, Trevor Matich, Ed Cunningham, Bob Griese, Jim Donnan, Chris Speilman, Jesse Palmer, Todd McShay, Brock Huard, Andre Ware, Danny Kanell
• **Reporters** - Joe Schad, Rachel Nichols, Robert Smith, Shelley Smith, Tom Luginbill, Mark Schlabach, Ivan Maisel, Rod Gilmore, Steve Cyphers, Pat Forde

**Segments**

• **The Insiders** - Monday’s segment which serves as a kickoff to the week. Discussion of the latest news and reaction to the games from the weekend, with some highlights of the best plays being shown.

• **Interviews** - The Tuesday segment typically featuring two live interviews with college coaches.

• **Conference Calls** - Interviews with reporters similar to the coaching interviews.

• **Recruiting Trail** - Reporter Tom Luginbill is brought in to discuss the latest news on high school recruiting for next year’s college class. Also includes a preview of the ESPN Thursday night game.

• **Picks** - The analysts preview and pick winners from the weekend slate of games on Friday. Then, an on-site preview of College Football GameDay with its crew and a preview of the ESPN Friday night game.
• **Senior Thesis** - The show follows multiple senior players throughout the year and asks them to keep video diaries, which are played at this point.

• **Sound off** - Viewer videos on storylines are played and then discussed.

• **Live Feedback** - Fans are prompted to comment, write in, tweet, throughout the program. This segment shows selected viewer input live on air.

• **Extra Points** - The final portion, analysts answer viewer questions directly with a countdown timer present.

• **Kickoff** - The opening of the show where the host guides the analysts through a discussion of the day’s top story before shifting to a reporter for their take.

• **EA Sports Simulator** - A key game is simulated on the EA Sports NCAA Football video game and its highlights and scores, meant as a rough predictive measure are shown.

---

**College Football Scoreboard**

A show which typically fills in the time between ESPN broadcast college football games. It began doing so in 2001 and typically runs for 30 or 45 minutes (whatever is available, except the 3 p.m. edition which is always 30 minutes). The show provides current scores and highlights of games both already played and in
progress. It is meant to allow viewers to remain on ESPN by bringing the vital
information of games broadcast on other networks to them. It is in the traditional
ESPN one host two analyst format. It airs on Saturdays during college football season
two times a day, at 3 p.m., and later at 7 p.m. as the lead-in to College Football
Primetime.

**Personnel**

- *Host* - Rece Davis
- *Analysts* - Lou Holtz and Mark Mary
- *Reporters* - Wendi Nix, Todd McShay, Robert Smith

There are no segments to this show, it proceeds according to the action
of the day with emphasis on the key elements of each game discusses to explain the
scoreboard as it has come to exist.

**E:60**

Begun in 2007, E:60 is ESPN’s most in-depth journalistic program. It can be
considered a sporting corollary to programs like 60 Minutes. As its name suggests, the
program runs for one hour. Its inclusion here focuses on its tendency to be broadcast
on ESPN at some point during the week, although it now debuts on ESPN 2 at 7 p.m.
on Tuesdays.

**Personnel**
Reporters involved in E:60 rotate greatly, but program mainstays include Rachel Nichols, Lisa Salters, Michael Smith, and Jeremy Schaap. The show is reporter-centric.

There are no specific segments in this program. Rather, the show is delineated by whatever stories are being discussed in a particular running.

**Monday Night Countdown**

The preview show to Monday Night NFL Football has been airing on ESPN since 1993. It runs before the Monday Night game (broadcast on ESPN since 2006) for two hours, from 6:30 p.m. until kickoff at 8:30 p.m. It jumps between an in-studio crew and a crew that is on location of that week’s game. The program focuses on the night’s matchup most and also works as a sort of recap show for Sunday’s games, touching on the major stories as it goes along. Pre-2006, it is also notable as an indicator of cooperation between ESPN and ABC Sports.

**Personnel**

- Host - Chris Berman (Studio)
- Analysts -
  - *Studio*: Cris Carter, Mike Ditka, Tom Jackson, Keyshawn Johnson
  - *On-site*: Steve Young, Trent Dilfer, Ray Lewis
- Reporters -
○ **Studio:** Suzy Kolber

○ **On-site:** Sal Paolantonio, Ed Werder, Rick Reilly, Lisa Salters

○ **General:** Chris Mortensen, Adam Schefter

---

**Segments**

- **Teams at 20** - At each 20 minutes passed in the program, reporters (usually Suzy Kolber) give an update from the teams playing that Monday night as they prepare for kickoff.

- **Playmaking Made Easy** - The host and analysts physically demonstrate certain aspects deemed to be particularly relevant to that week’s storylines.

- **The Mort Report** - Reporter Chris Mortensen is brought in to discuss the latest rumors around the NFL.

- **Sunday Drive** - A key drive, which often is a game-winning drive, from a Sunday game is analyzed from start to its completion.

- **In the Pocket** - An analysis of the week’s performance at the quarterback position.

- **C’Mon Man!** - The most notable segment, a comical portion where the analysts discuss puzzling and entertaining happenings from the week’s games.
○ **Former - Jacked Up** - Removed at request of the NFL due to concerns about player safety (concussions). Used to feature the largest hits of the week’s games. Notable for its former popularity celebrating the violence which is now admonished and avoided within the sport.

**NBA Countdown**

This program has been shared with ABC as part of the ESPN on ABC arrangement since 2002. It did not make its way independently onto ESPN until 2012. The program airs for one half hour before every broadcast NBA game on the network. It is a simple preview show, running down the night’s expected action and highlighting major storylines in its remaining time. Through the use of sideline reporter Doris Burke, on-site look-ins are used to preview a night’s game.

**Personnel**

- **Host** - Sage Steele
- **Analysts** - Jalen Rose, Doug Collins, Avery Johnson
- **Reporter** - Doris Burke

There are no real segments to this show. Just a free-flowing mix of analysis, highlights, and interviews.

**NFL Insiders**
A more recent addition to the ESPN lineup, first airing in 2013. NFL Insiders is a weekday NFL news show with an emphasis on the reporters ESPN dubs as “insiders” to a particular sport. It airs every weekday for a full hour at 3 p.m. The reporters riff through various items of news and rumor, giving their expert take. The show brings in many contributors dependent on what is being discussed and does a good job of getting reporters who are well-credentialed for the topics of the day.

**Personnel**

- **Main Reporters -** Suzy Kolber, Adam Schefter, Chris Mortensen, Bill Polian
- **Reporters -** John Clayton, Mel Kiper Jr., Todd McShay, Ed Werder, Adam Caplan, Jarrett Bell, Ashley Fox, Billy Devaney, Louis Riddick, Dan Graziano, Phil Savage, Field Yates, Mark Dominik, Jim Trotter

**Segments**

It makes the most sense to delineate this program by topic of news, rather than particular segments. There is, however, one specific segment to be noted.

- **Press Coverage -** Specific articles from papers and online news around the country are brought up and discussed.

**NFL Live**
A studio show airing for a full hour each weekday, the program moved over from ESPN 2 to ESPN in 2002 and has ran at 4 p.m. Monday through Friday ever since. It is not, strictly speaking, a highlight show, as that and recap are generally handled by the network’s other news programs throughout the weeks. Because of this, the program is segment driven. It is notable, though, that the program runs in the NFL offseason. It features Trey Wingo as host with a variable rotation of analysts (three per airing).

**Personnel**

- **Host** - Trey Wingo (main), Sara Walsh (primary substitute), Linda Cohn, Mike Hill, David Lloyd, Suzy Kolber, Chris McKendry, Wendi Nix (substitutes)
- **Analysts** - Eric Allen, Teddy Bruschi, Lomas Brown, John Clayton, Trent Dilfer, Herm Edwards, Mike Golic, Tim Hasselbeck, James Hasty, Merrill Hoge, Qadry Ismail, Matt Light, Tom Jackson, SHAun King, Eric Mangini, Dari Nowkhah, Antonio Pierce, Mark Schlereth, Marcellus Wiley, Darren Woodson
- **Reporters** - Chris Mortensen, Michael Smith

**Segments**

- **Opening Drive** - Opens the show with a specific discussion on a player, team, or storyline.
- **What Were They Thinking?** - Examines questionable and often comical plays from the week’s games.
• Drive of the Week - What is deemed to be the most impactful drive from the week’s games is broken down by its individual plays and analyzed.

• Fantasy Five - A Fantasy Football driven segment, the analysts each pick one player from each fantasy position (minus team defense) that they believe will deliver the best performance. Points are awarded and tracked in a mock competition over the year.

• Off the Mark - A weekly segment where Mark Schlereth is featured and gives a monologue on a certain topic, often in a ranting fashion.

• Hurry-Up Offense - Towards the end of the show a timer is placed on the screen and the analysts discuss the various topics rapidly

• Cover 2 - An insider and a player (current or former) are asked to analyze topics from their own perspective.

NFL Matchup

An in-depth football analysis show running since 1993. It utilizes team-given coaching footage used in NFL Film Rooms to take a more analytical view of coming matchups. The program airs on Sundays at 3 a.m. and later re-airs at 7:30 a.m. The show only airs during the NFL season. Suzy Kolber, who assumed host duties from 1993 to 2003, was the first female to host an NFL news show. The program proceeds in the one host, two analyst format.
Personnel

- Host - Sal Paolantonio
- Analysts - Merrill Hoge, Ron Jaworski

There are no clear segments to the show, just the review and analysis of game tape.

NFL Primetime

A SportsCenter for football, this program has run on ESPN since 1987. There are two airings of the show, the first at 4 p.m. and the second airing approximately ninety minutes after the Monday Night Football game ends. The show is broadcast from the Bristol studio. It is highlight-driven, but does not use them as frequently as most other ESPN shows and tends to focus its highlight use on narratives rather than just big plays. The late showing especially has an emphasis on analysis.

Personnel

- Hosts - Trey Wingo (regular season) and Chris Berman (playoffs)
- Analysts - Merrill Hoge, Tim Hasselbeck (regular season), Tom Jackson (playoffs), Steve Young (superbowl)

There are no major segments to the show. Structure mirrors that of SportsCenter, proceeding by topic.

NBA Shootaround
The NBA pregame show for the network, airing since 2002. Airs for thirty minutes at 7:30 p.m. before the broadcast of ESPN’s Friday night NBA games and sometimes at the same time on Wednesday before ESPN’s games that night. It provides simple preview, highlights, and analysis to prime viewers for the coming games.

**Personnel** -

- *Host* - Doris Burke, Sage Steele (alternate)
- *Analysts* - Jalen Rose, Avery Johnson, Bill Simmons (sometimes alternate)

The show proceeds in a simplistic fashion, with some live look-ins when possible and the occasional interview joining a host of non-specific analysis and analyst banter.

**SportsCenter** - A fully detailed breakdown has been provided in the experimental section of this work

**Outside the Lines**

An ESPN staple running since 1990, OTL is one of the network’s more serious programs. It focuses on analysis of issues that are often controversial, but still focuses
on current sports stories. It runs for thirty minutes on weekdays at 5:30 p.m. and also
Sunday at 9 a.m. It is notable that ESPN backloads the commercials for OTL, running
the show uninterrupted until its end and then running commercials. Heavy emphasis is
placed on interviewing those involved in the stories covered. It does not utilize the
host/analyst format of most ESPN news programs, rather focusing on host Bob Ley
with a rotating, miscellaneous cast of contributors.

Personnel

- **Host** - Bob Ley
- **Contributors** - Jeremy Schaap, Mark Schwarz, T.J. Quinn, Kelly Naqi

Segments

- **At This Hour** - Leads the program with a view of the latest stories going
  on in the sports world; not necessarily the stories which will be covered
  in that airing.
- **Center Piece** - A correspondent is responsible for delivering one of the
  main stories of the program.
- **Outside Opinion** - Viewer mail is read focusing on viewer opinions of
  the show’s covered stories
- **SportsNation Question of the Day** - A question, related to a covered
  story, to be answered by fans.

Sunday NFL Countdown
The Sunday NFL pregame show, occupying the majority of airtime on Sundays during the NFL season since 1985. The program begins at 10 a.m. and runs until the games themselves begin at 1 p.m., for a grand total of three hours. It features an extensive panel of analysts alongside host Chris Berman. These panelists are split up into two separate groups to allow for variability throughout the extensive show. It is unique in its use of a comedian, Frank Caliendo, to do impressions.

**Personnel**

- **Host** - Chris Berman (primary) Wendi Nix (secondary)
- **Analysts** - Tom Jackson, Mike Ditka, Keyshawn Johnson, Ray Lewis, Cris Carter (primary), Ron Jaworski, Merril Hoge (secondary)
- **Reporters** - Greg Garber, Ed Werder, Sal Paolantonio, Adam Schefter, Chris Mortensen, Matthew Berry
- **Comedian** - Frank Caliendo

**Segments**

- **Around the League** - Live reporting from stadiums focused on last-minute news such as lineup decisions and inactives.
- **Eye in the Sky** - Non-traditional camera views are used by the analysts to examine plays.
- **Fantasy Tips** - Matthew Berry is brought in to give a short discourse on fantasy football.
- **Field Pass** - Live look-ins at players warming up.
• **The Mort Report** - Chris Mortensen is brought in as an insider to break down the impact of injuries, other game day decisions, and current rumors.

• **Special Look** - The personnel draw up a specific play by hand on a replica football field and then proceed to, themselves, run through the play.

• **Sunday Drive** - Ron Jaworski breaks down a specific drive from start to finish.

• **Predictions** - The panelists are asked to pick winners for the games.

• **Gamebreakers** - At the ending of the show, the panelists predict a few players to have impactful performances that day.

• **Late Hits** - Chris Mortensen delivers a recap of the final news on the day at the end of the show.

• **Most Dependable Player** - As the title describes, one player is selected and analyzed.

• **Stop It!** - A more comedic segment where Mike Ditka is prompted by a question which he considers as an affront to football, responds, and then says “Stop It.!”

• **Where You At?** - A Cris Carter segment where he names players who have not performed to expectations and speculates as to why they have not done so.

• **NFL 32** - The NFL 32 crew is brought in for questions and analysis.
- **Cold Hard Facts** - A 12 question length question and answer period featuring Chris Mortensen and Adam Schefter.

- **Impressions** - Frank Caliendo is brought in and does NFL-related impressions.

---

**Around the Horn**

A debate show utilizing on-screen block graphics to visibly separate its analysts, Around the Horn has aired since 2002. Rather than a host it utilizes a moderator, Tony Reali, who introduces topics, guides the debate, and assigns points to the analysts. Reali has discretion in awarding the points, which he uses to reward what is considered strong arguments and punish poor rhetoric. The points guide the analysts through the three “rounds” of the show, each of which covers various sporting topics and ends with the elimination of the lowest scoring analyst. The show runs daily at 5 p.m. for thirty minutes.

**Personnel**

- **Moderator** - Tony Reali

- **Analysts** - Woody Paige, Bill Plaschke, Kevin Blackistone, Bob Ryan, J.A. Adande, Jackie MacMullan, Tim Cowlishaw, Kate Fagan, Frank Isola, Bomani Jones, Israel Gutierrez, Pablo S. Torre

**Segments**
• **Introduction** - The show’s beginning. Introduces the analysts and previews the debate topics.

• **The First Word** - Two debate prompts are issued and the analysts all discuss.

• **Buy or Sell** - Three topics are introduced and the analysts are asked to either endorse (buy) or reject (sell) them.

• **Out of Bounds** - An opportunity for more serious discussion, this segment alternates with **The Lightning Round**. Focuses on more controversial topics and proceeds with standard debate.

• **The Lightning Round** - Analysts must debate in a rapid manner upon two or three topics. Only a small amount of time is given to each analyst for their discourse.

• **Showdown** - The two remaining analysts are given two to three topics and take sides, each discussing them and being awarded the final points of the running depending on who “wins” the head-to-head argument.

• **Facetime** - The winner of the particular airing is given thirty or so seconds, dependent on how much time is left in the show, to monologue about a topic of interest to them.

• **Paper Toss** - The ending of the show. Tony Reali announces how many hours it will be until the next airing, crumples up his notes, and tosses them into the camera to end the show.
Pardon the Interruption

A two-man debate show airing since 2001, starring Tony Kornheiser and Michael Wilbon. It utilizes a SportsCenter style rundown bar, but on the right hand of the screen, which ticks through various topics that the two hosts will discuss on the show. It airs at 5:30 p.m. for a half an hour on weekdays. The title phrase is used as an opening, with Michael Wilbon traditionally stating “Pardon the Interruption, but I’m…” and then beginning the show.

Personnel

- Hosts - Tony Kornheiser, Michael Wilbon, Tony Reali (statistics and corrections)

Segments

The show primarily proceeds through topic rundown, but there are some recurring segments to be discussed.

- Five Good Minutes - Interview segment proceeding for roughly five minutes. Guests are usually brought in splitscreen.

- Mail Time - Formerly viewer mail read and response, the mail is now written by show staffers.

- Toss Up - A topic is announced and the two hosts choose sides to argue over.
- **Odds Makers** - Various hypothetical scenarios are introduced by Tony Reali and the hosts give predictions in the form of a percentage chance that the hypothetical takes place. Reali picks a winner based on the “strength” of the guesses.

- **Role Play** - The hosts hold cutout heads of athletes and sporting figures on sticks and act as them, speaking from that figures point of view.

- **What’s the Word** - A sentence is presented with an adjective missing within and the hosts are tasked with filling in the blank.

- **Report Card** - Tony Reali gives the hosts prompts which are then “graded” by the hosts.

- **Psychic Hotline** - Tony Kornheiser dresses up as a psychic with a crystal ball and makes predictions in response to pre-recorded phone call prompts.

- **Good Cop, Bad Cop** - Proceeds as the popular trope often does, with the two hosts donning police hats and picking opposite sides of a prompted issue in the “good cop, bad cop” style.

- **Happy Time** - A series of “happys” from happy birthday, happy anniversary, or happy trails are wished to various sporting figures.

- **Corrections** - If time allows, the show closes with Tony Reali correcting any inaccuracies stated by the hosts during the airing.

---

**The Sports Reporters**
This program follows a relatively standard host and three analysts format, but is notable in that, as its name suggests, all of the analysts are reporters. It has aired since 1988 and currently runs at 9:30 a.m. every Sunday. John Saunders serves as the host of the show, which runs for thirty minutes.

**Personnel**

- **Host** - John Saunders
- **Analysts/Reporters** - Mike Lupica, John Feinstein, Mitch Albom, Michael Wilbon, Bob Ryan, William Rhoden, Stephen A. Smith, Bryan Burwell, Selena Roberts, Jemele Hill

The show does not proceed in segments but rather by topic, with a roundtable discussion format.

**30 for 30**

The network’s documentary series has run since 2009. It was launched to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the network and has since run well past its 30th film due to its popularity. Stories covered were meant to reflect once captivating stories that had, for some reason, fallen from popular memory over time. Bill Simmons is primarily responsible for the creation of the project, which brings in independent directors and personnel for the documentaries. The normal running time for these programs is one hour, but some editions stretch all the way to two hours. There are no personnel or segments for this program due to its unique nature. This is also no set airing time due to the individuality of each project.
IX for IX

A specific spin off of the 30 for 30 programming which began airing in 2013 to celebrate the 40th anniversary of Title IX. The production and presentation of the two are incredibly similar (but of course dependent upon the particular director and personnel) with the notable exception that the IX for IX films focus specifically on the stories of women in sports. Also notable is the fact that all of these documentaries are directed by female filmmakers. Each documentary airs for one hour. Again, there are no specific personnel or segments.

Grantland Basketball Hour

The most recent addition to ESPN’s lineup, the program just aired its sixth episode. As its name suggests, it runs for an hour and is put on by the ESPN sports website Grantland. New episodes so far have a variable airtime, usually running around 7 or 8 p.m. The show focuses on basketball and is somewhat of a television port of various Grantland products (specifically podcasts). The show has large, episode-specific sections which usually revolve around one or two guests.

Personnel

- *Hosts* - Bill Simmons, Jalen Rose
- *Reporters* - Zach Lowe, Kirk Goldsberry

Segments
- **Guest Discussions** - Typically the opening portion of the program. A guest (examples from the small sample size include Michelle Beadle, Kobe Bryant) is brought in and discusses current NBA topics and storylines relevant to them.

- **Keeping it 100** - A reflection of the cultural phrase for being (sometimes brutally) honest, Jalen Rose gives blunt criticism of certain topics, usually underperforming players.

- **Mailbag** - A standard mailbag segment, with the hosts answering viewer questions.

**Fox Sports One (all times et)**

**The Mike Francesa Show**

Mike Francesa’s sports radio talk show is broadcast on FS1 on weekdays from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., unless there is a live sporting event being shown on the network during that time. The full runtime of the show is from 1 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. and in the event of another scheduled event, its showing on FS1 moves over to FS2, where it runs all the way through until 6:30 p.m. each weeknight.

**Personnel**

- **Host** - Mike Francesa

- **Reporter** - Julie Stewart-Binks
Segments

There are no major segments to the show. Francesa weighs in on the sports stories of the day and fields viewer calls throughout the show. He does this with the help of guests, from athletes to coaches and other various sporting figures who are brought in to help the discussion along. The only notable, specific portion of the show are the sporting news updates which come every twenty minutes and are delivered by Julie Stewart-Binks.

America’s Pregame

Debuting in April of 2014, this program can be thought of as FS1’s generic pregame show for all sports. It runs for an hour weekdays at 6 p.m. The show frequently brings in guests to discuss the night’s events and is hosted by Mike Hill. It focuses mainly on establishing storylines for the sporting events of the night and is lighter on the analysis side of sporting news. It features the same right-side of screen timeline as Fox Sports Live and as such the show proceeds according to the content on the sidebar.

Personnel

- *Host* - Mike Hill
- *Analyst* - Molly McGrath
- *Reporters* - Ken Rosenthal, Jon Morosi, Justin Kutcher, Kirk Morrison, Robert Lusetich

Segments
● **Main Event** - In the beginning of the program, this segment highlights the main story/event of the day.

● **1 to Watch** - Towards the end of the show one sporting event is previewed as the best of the night.

● **3 Things on FSL** - A kickover segment to Fox Sports Live, helps cross promote the shows as the FSL crew discuss and preview the titular three things.

● **What’s Happening** - Quick-hit segment that fills in the breaking developments of the day.

● **Interviews** - Traditional interview segments.

● **Special Segments** - There are sometimes longer, feature-style segments to the show. These vary greatly but share in common the length and showcase feel they bring when present.

**Fox NFL Kickoff**

Airring Sundays at 11 a.m. since September of 2013, this program has a runtime of one hour. It airs at this time throughout the entirety of the NFL season. It operates under the host and three analyst format. The show features frequent studio movement from topic to topic, utilizing a variety of desks and settings.

**Personnel**

● **Host** - Joel Klatt
• **Analysts** - Randy Moss, Donovan McNabb, Dave Wannstedt (main analysts), Ronde Barber, Eddie George, Brendon Ayanbadejo (replacements), Mike Pereira (rules analyst)

• **Reporters** - Jay Glazer, Mike Garofalo

**Segments**

• **Touchback with McNabb** - McNabb mirrors the app *Tinder* with NFL players. If he likes the player’s chances to perform well, he swipes their picture right. If he does not, he swipes the picture left.

• **Fantasy Picks** - The crew choose players who they believe will have a standout day in Fantasy Football.

• **Interview** - Standard interview segments, often multiple per show.

**NASCAR Race Hub**

The weekly NASCAR news show, this program has aired since the channel’s debut in August of 2013. It runs Monday through Thursday at 6 p.m. The show’s primary function is to analyze the previous weekend’s race and then provide coverage leading up to the next weekend’s race. It is hosted by Steve Byrnes and Danielle Trotta with a rotating crew of analysts. Analysis of the races from the hosts and interviews drive the show.

**Personnel**

• **Hosts** - Steve Byrnes, Danielle Trotta
• **Analysts** - Elliot Sadler, Larry McReynolds (Monday), Bob Dillner (Tuesday), Jeff Hammond (Wednesday), Matt Clark (Thursday), Jimmy Spencer (Tuesday and Thursday), Monica Palumbo (Monday)

**Segments**

• **Awards Mail** - Jimmy Spencer appears on Tuesdays and Thursdays to answer viewer mail and social media. He has a variety of unique “awards” he gives out in his responses.

• **Tweets of the Week** - On Mondays, Danielle Trotta and Monica Palumbo present and discuss tweets from NASCAR personnel.

• **Interviews** - Danielle Trotta handles the interviewing on the show.

**FOX Sports 1 on 1**

As its name suggests, this is a one-on-one interview show. It has a variable airtime (A Coach Mike Krzyzewski interview ran at 5:30 a.m. on a Tuesday and a Coach Jay Wright interview aired the Thursday of that same week at 8:30 p.m.) but always runs for a half an hour.

**Personnel**

• **Hosts** - Charissa Thompson, Curt Menefee

• **Interviewers** - Michael Strahan, Chris Meyers, John Lynch

There are no real segments to this program as the interview forms the entirety of the broadcast.
NFL Films Presents

Hosted by Joe Buck, this program features films produced by NFL Films which are later presented on FS1 during the NFL season. The shows are independent and unique, airing for different lengths and at different times. Traditionally, there is one shown per week of the season. As such, the personnel depends on the particular film and there are no recurring segments.

NASCAR RaceDay

The NASCAR pregame show, it appears at a variable time on Saturday afternoon or Sunday morning, dependent on the time of that week’s race. It runs for an hour. It is only a FS1 program for the first half of the racing season, when it is then passed over to NBC. The show proceeds in a traditional game day format, with analysis and discussion of the upcoming race. The majority of the time is spent interviewing drivers and other NASCAR personnel, discussing current standings, and speculating on the race itself.

Personnel

- Host - Danielle Trotta
- Analysts - Larry McReynolds, Kenny Wallace
- Reporter - Michael Waltrip

Segments
- *Grid Walk* - Reporter Michael Waltrip conducts interviews out on the track.

- *Special Reports* - Generally serious segments that focus on current NASCAR news. They often include video footage and can include tributes, thank yous, and the like.

- *Interviews* - Generic interviews by the panel.

**FOX Sports 1 College Hoops Extra**

The college basketball wrapup show, it airs at variable times (including 4:30, 5:30, 9-10 p.m.) dependent on. it debuted on the channel in November of 2014. It runs for a half an hour and exists during the beginning parts of the NCAAB season as a general news show for college basketball action. Beginning in January and until the NCAA Tournament concludes, it shifts format to a preview show highlighting the upcoming games. It notably ramps up its live on-site presence at tournament games in March.

**Personnel**

- *Host* - Rob Stone

- *Analysts* - Austin Croshere, Tarik Turner

The show, as a preview, does not proceed through segments but rather by discussion of the upcoming matchups.

**Supercross: Behind the Dream**
A series of documentaries detailing the Supercross racing series, this program is in the midst of its second season after debuting in 2014. It has a variable airing time, with five episodes in the first season and eight coming in the second season. The show discusses the upcoming races and features a rider to watch each episode. The rider to watch is the focus of the show, delving into their backstory and preparation. In addition to variable airing times are variable run times, with the entirety of the first season running for three and a half hours.

Inside the Big East

Details the teams within the NCAAB’s Big East Conference as its name suggests. It is in its inaugural season, airing Sundays at 4 p.m. for a half hour. The program runs for the length of the Big East basketball season, finishing when the conference tournament begins at its tenth episode. It emphasizes interviews with personnel from a selected team each week and also features standard highlight analysis of recent action within the conference. The show utilizes a rotating group of personnel but persists in the one host, two analyst format.

Personnel

- **Hosts** - Rob Stone, Kevin Burkhardt, Don Bell
- **Analysts** - Austin Croshere, Ben Howland, Donny Marshall, Kevin O’Neill
- **Reporter** - Bill Raftery
There show does not proceed through segments but rather through teams of the conference. One week each is dedicated to a member team and then proceeds to interview members of its organization and pursue extended feature pieces on the notable stories within the team itself.

**MLB Whiparound**

Airing weeknights during baseball season at 10 p.m. the program began its run in March of 2014. It runs for a full hour, and is moved to midnight if there is a scheduling conflict. Chris Meyers is the host and is joined by a co-host and either one or two analysts. The show, as it airs during the playing of that night’s baseball games, focuses on providing quick highlights and analysis of the in-progress action.

**Personnel**

- *Host* - Chris Meyers (main), Ryan Field, Greg Wolf (alternates)
- *Analysts* - C.J. Nitkowski, Frank Thomas, Eric Karros
- *Reporters* - John Paul Morosi, Ken Rosenthal

**Segments**

The show relies mostly upon live look-ins at currently underway games and, when this is not possible, proceeds by showing notable highlights of previous action. As such, it does not rely upon recurring segments.