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PICTURING RACE IN LOCAL NEWSPAPERS

Peter Huoppi

Dr. Keith Greenwood, Thesis Supervisor

ABSTRACT

The American news media has been criticized for failing to accurately reflect the country's racial diversity. Previous research has found that large broadcast and print news outlets overrepresent the White population, while minority populations are underrepresented and largely confined to stereotypical roles. The purpose of this study is to assess whether smaller local newspapers, which remain an important source of news and information to the communities they cover, accurately reflect the racial diversity of those communities, and whether the inclusion and portrayal of different races have changed over time. Using samples of four constructed weeks from five one-year periods between 1980 and 2016, a content analysis of local news photographs was conducted for six daily newspapers. The population appearing in each newspaper was compared with the local population as measured by the U.S. Census. Additionally, inter-group comparisons were made to determine whether members of certain races were overrepresented in the stereotypical roles of athlete, criminal, and entertainer. Results showed that White subjects were generally overrepresented, while members of other races were underrepresented. At some publications, representation of Black subjects has become more accurate over time, while the underrepresentation gap for Hispanic subjects has widened. Results for representation in stereotypical roles were more mixed, with Black subjects overrepresented in the role of athlete.
Chapter 1: Introduction

The American news media has a diversity problem. When people look to the pages and screens of the news media for information about the world around them, the faces they see there are not an accurate representation of all the people in the population. The percentage of White employees in U.S. newsrooms (77%) is greater than in the overall U.S. workforce (65%) (Grieco, 2018) and is 25 percentage points greater, on average in newsrooms than in the communities they cover (American Society of News Editors, 2017). News coverage of people of color has been “consistently inadequate,” (Heider, 2000, p. 82) underrepresenting minority subjects (DeLouth, Person, Hitchcock & Rienzi, 1995; Entman & Rojecki, 2000) and reinforcing stereotypes (Hardin, Chance & Walsdorf, 2004; Kahle, Nan & Whiteside, 2007; Lester, 1994).

In an industry that prizes accuracy, the depiction of race has been far from accurate. Fifty years ago, a U.S. government commission suggested that the news media should work to include more racially diverse subjects in its reporting. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders was established by President Lyndon Johnson in the wake of violent, racially charged riots that took place in cities across the United States during the summer of 1967. The 11-member group, informally known as the Kerner Commission for its chair, Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner Jr., was tasked with explaining the causes of the riots and determining how to prevent future reoccurrences. The commission determined that the mostly White news media was not adequately covering Black Americans. They suggested expanding coverage of Black communities and the issues they face, and making sure Black subjects are integrated into all aspects of
news coverage. Specifically, the news media should “recognize the existence and activities of Negroes as a group within the community and as a part of the larger community” (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968, p. 18). This echoed a report issued 21 years earlier by the Commission on Freedom of the Press (1947), which recommended “the projection of a representative picture of the constituent groups in the society” (p. 26). The report noted that favorable and unfavorable visual depictions can influence people’s decision making. The authors suggested that it is the duty of the press to represent different social groups responsibly by fairly depicting both positive and negative aspects. By doing so, the press will facilitate the audience’s respect and understanding of these groups. A 2010 study of more than 67,000 national news stories found that only less than 5% were significantly related to minority groups (Guskin, Khan & Mitchell, 2010), suggesting that much progress has been made toward the Kerner Commission’s goal.

*The Day*, a daily newspaper covering Connecticut’s New London County, has been criticized for failing to adequately cover the region’s racial diversity. One example was *The Day*’s 2017 coverage of the New London Youth Talent Show, an annual event that aims to highlight “the richness of diversity sometimes overlooked in the community” (Smith, 2016). The performers and organizers of the show are a racially diverse group, but on two separate occasions *The Day* published photographs of the show’s rehearsals that included only White performers (Jensen, 2017, Cook, 2017). Some readers noticed and complained, with one reader accusing *The Day* of intentionally avoiding publishing positive depictions of Black people on the front page, according to the editor who received the complaint (M. DiMauro, personal communication, January 31, 2018). Two
incidents do not necessarily indicate a trend, but the community’s perception of inadequate coverage of non-White subjects suggests that further study is worthwhile.

Local newspapers remain one of the most important sources for people who want information about their community, even though the number of Americans who say they get their news from television outlets is more than twice the number who say they get their news from newspapers, (Gottfried & Shearer, 2017). Respondents to a 2011 Pew Research Center study identified newspapers as the most relied upon source for 11 out of 16 subjects, including crime, local government, schools, and local politics (Rosenstiel, Mitchell, Purcell, & Rainie, 2011). Radcliffe and Ali (2017) reported that a majority of American newspapers (6,851 out of 7,071) have circulations of less than 50,000, many of which are the only substantial source of original reporting for their communities. Heather Goodwin Henline, publisher and general manager of the Inter-Mountain in Elkins, WV, told Editor & Publisher “perhaps our greatest advantage is we have content no one else does” (Knolle, 2016). In a Reynolds Journalism Institute poll of residents of small U.S. towns and cities, 71% of respondents reported reading their community newspaper at least once per week (Fleming & Schwartz, 2014).

The newspaper industry has faced declining circulation and revenue in recent years, but small-market papers have been more resilient thanks to their exclusive content and proximity to their audiences (Radcliffe & Ali, 2017). Newspaper circulation declined for the 28th consecutive year in 2016, while total revenue fell from a high of nearly 50 million dollars in 2005 to just 18 million dollars in 2016 (Barthel, 2017). Small-market newspapers weathered the recent recession better than their large market counterparts, losing only 2% of their revenue, compared to 15% at larger papers (Edge, 2017).
Through their reporting, local newspapers help to set a community’s agenda, tell their
audience what is important and “reflect the community dynamic” (Martin & Copeland,
2003, p. 140). This metaphor of a newspaper as a mirror comes up repeatedly in
descriptions of the role of print journalism in the community.

Newspaper photojournalism is meant to be a literal reflection of the community
that a publication covers. Photojournalist Mary Calvert embodied the ideals of her
profession when she said, "I became a photojournalist so I could tell the stories of those
with no voice and to provide a mirror for society to examine itself” (Colton, 2015).
Indeed, this is not just the belief of a single visual journalist, as it is codified in the
National Press Photographers Association’s Code of Ethics. The code emphasizes
inclusiveness and accuracy, stating that visual journalists should “be accurate and
comprehensive in the representation of subjects…avoid stereotyping individuals and
groups” (National Press Photographers Association, n.d.).

Stories and images that appear in the news are not simply isolated depictions of
individual people and events. They combine in the minds of the audience to form a
mosaic representing the reality of the world around them. Limits on time and resources
dictate that a news outlet cannot cover every individual in a community, so journalists
must make choices about who is included and who is not. The individual subjects
selected by reporters and photographers can become symbols that represent those
subjects’ race or profession in the minds of the audience (Epstein, 1973). Viewers assign
authenticity and credibility to photographs because photographs seem to be more
representative of reality than writing, but the choices made during the capturing and
selection of photographs for publication represent an interpretation of reality that can go
unnoticed by the viewer (Sontag, 1977). Newspapers are central in informing the members of the public, as well as decision makers in the government. If their selection of who and what is newsworthy is systematically misrepresenting reality, they present “a distorted image of the world” (Peterson, 1979, p. 116).

Fifty years have passed since the publication of the Kerner Commission’s report. Are newspapers, important sources of information about the local community, providing their audience an accurate depiction of the racial diversity of the population they cover? This question is important not just in the context of some journalistic ideal or ethical code. Inaccurate depictions can have real-world consequences. As Bobo (1997) put it: “Images of racial minority groups in the media at once reflect and shape the attitudes and beliefs others will hold toward those groups” (p. 7). Symbolic annihilation describes how certain groups, and racial minorities in particular, are not fully represented in mass media (Gerbner, 1972). Framing theory describes how the images seen in the news media can affect people’s mental images of the world. It is on these mental images that people base their beliefs and priorities (Lippmann, 1922). This research will attempt to measure how accurately small-market newspapers depict the racial diversity of the communities they cover, using symbolic annihilation to look at how often members of various racial groups are depicted, and using framing theory as a lens through which to examine how they are visually depicted. Past research will show that news outlets in both broadcast and print media have continued to underrepresent racial minorities and depict them in stereotypical roles. While there has been a good deal of research in this area looking at television news broadcasts and national newspapers, smaller local newspapers have largely been ignored.
The purpose of this research is to identify, through content analysis, areas of deficiency with regard to race in small-market newspapers’ photographic coverage of their communities, and how this coverage has changed over time. In order to make an objective measure of how accurately newspapers depict race, the research will compare the racial breakdown of the subjects of published news photographs with the U.S. Census figures for the counties and cities in which the newspapers are located. By taking a longitudinal look at data from each decennial Census year going back to 1980, the research will attempt to describe how depictions have changed over time and whether the goals of the Kerner Commission are being achieved. It will also examine whether racial minorities are pictured in stereotypical roles more frequently than White subjects. The second chapter will present a theoretical basis for this research through the concepts of symbolic annihilation and framing theory, looking to prior research in order to develop specific research questions. The third chapter will define terms and explain the methods used for data collection and quantitative content analysis. The results of this analysis are presented in the fourth chapter, followed by a discussion in the fifth chapter of the results in the context of theory and existing research.
Chapter 2: Theory and Literature Review

Symbolic Annihilation

Symbolic annihilation is “the way cultural production and media representations ignore, exclude, marginalize, or trivialize a particular group” (Merskin, 1998, p. 335). In a study of the depiction of violence on television dramas, Gerbner (1972) coined the term to describe the way certain groups were not represented on the television screen. He argued that this lack of representation is used by the class of people in power to maintain social inequality, writing “representation in the fictional world signifies social existence; absence means symbolic annihilation” (Gerbner, 1972, p. 43). The images transmitted to the audience help define what is normal and important to society, though what gets portrayed in the media is not an actual reflection of real life (Gerbner, 1978). In a later study, Gerbner and Gross (1976) expanded on the idea of symbolic annihilation to include not just the amount of representation, but also the manner in which different groups are depicted. They found that most leading roles on television were middle- to upper-class American males, while characters of other types were less fully represented. Women were mostly seen as love interests or family members, while younger and older characters were not seen as often as adults in the primes of their lives. Groups that are largely absent from the screen or confined to a few stereotypical roles are symbolically annihilated in the public conscience and devalued in real life. While early work on symbolic annihilation focused on dramatic portrayals in works of fiction, this research extends the idea to the news media and the frequency with which certain groups are included or excluded.
The mass media transmits the same message to all the members of its audience, but if that message is based on stereotypes, it presents an inaccurate image of the world to that mass audience (Tuchman, 1978). A stereotype is “an exaggerated belief associated with a category” (Allport, 1954, p. 191) that is based on widely-held, over-simplified concepts or opinions (Means Coleman & Chivers Yochim, 2008) and is used to rationalize prejudicial behavior towards certain categories of people (Allport, 1954). The act of stereotyping is to attribute to an individual, certain characteristics that are broadly applied to all members of a group or category (Brown, 2010). Stereotypes are established early in children’s development, before they can evaluate their validity and before they are mature enough to develop their own personal beliefs (Devine, 1989). They are embedded in our culture and transmitted socially through our first sources of learning: our families and schools. They are then reinforced by images seen in the media (Brown, 2010). The mass media, with its ability to reach and connect people across great distances and from all walks of life, acts as our society’s common culture, reinforcing, rather than challenging, generally accepted and established views (Gerbner, 1978).

Stereotypes are products of our natural tendency to generalize and sort our experiences into categories. Categorization allows people to easily classify the things they encounter in life and to simplify the way they experience the world (Allport, 1954). People quickly and automatically categorize other people into groups, seeing members of those groups as like each other and different from other groups (Fiske, 1998). This oversimplification combined with learned cultural values can lead to prejudice: an unwarranted perception of “a category concerning a group of people, not based on defining attributes…leading to disparagement of the group as a whole” (Allport, 1954, p.
Stereotypical depictions perpetuated by the mass media can be based on national origin – Germans seen as hardworking and ambitious, British perceived as boring and arrogant (Brown, 2010). They may be based on gender, confining women to the roles of homemaker and sex object, leaving them condemned or trivialized while men are depicted in a broad range of roles (Tuchman, 1978). Stereotypes based on race and ethnicity are found often in the mass media. Native Americans are homogenized without regard to differences between tribes and are depicted as simple, unintelligent heathens, (Merskin, 1998) while Blacks have been ignored and demeaned by cultural images that reinforce their low social status (Pescosolido, Grauerholz, & Milkie, 1997).

Stereotyping exerts control through prejudice and discrimination, limiting people’s freedom and constraining the outcomes that they can achieve, maintaining the status quo and reinforcing the majority group’s position of power (Fiske, 1993, Brown, 2010). From this position of power, the mass media shows the audience how they should act and what they should look like. Groups that are subject to stereotypical portrayals get defined as out-groups and are subject to symbolic annihilation, which “presents people with implied messages about what it means to be a member of a culturally valued group versus a member of a socially disenfranchised group” (Klein & Shiffman, 2009, p. 57). In the news media, the people in power are predominantly White men, and the news reported by White men and about White men leaves others – women and minorities – trivialized, ignored, and stereotyped (Gallagher, 2001). These depictions in the media influence public perception of out-groups and can have real world consequences, affecting how people act, what they believe, and how they vote. Hall (1986) argued that “it matters profoundly what and who gets represented, what and who regularly and
routinely gets left out; and how things, people, events and relationships are represented. What we know of society depends on how things are represented to us and that knowledge in turn informs what we do and what policies we are prepared to accept” (p. 9).

**Framing Theory**

The idea that choices made by the news media can affect the general public’s view of the world goes back as far as Lippmann, (1922) who described stereotypes as “pictures in our heads” (p. 3). He wrote that people base their opinions not on what they see for themselves, but on mental pictures that they form based on what they see in the media. The accuracy of these mental pictures is affected by the accuracy of the pictures presented by the media. Lippmann blamed newspapers for intensifying what he called “the defective organization of public opinion” (p. 32). Framing theory attempts to explain how the choices made by members of the media can affect the views of their audience. Goffman (1974) described frames as a set of expectations that people use to make sense of everyday experiences. He used the metaphor of a picture frame within which people organize what is important in a given situation and filter out what is unimportant. Over time, people construct mental frames to organize and simplify their complex experiences (Reese, 2001). Journalists, as humans, are not immune from this tendency to construct frames in order to make sense of their own experiences. Many social scientists argue that framing is a necessary part of journalistic reporting. Entman (1993) describes the act of framing as selecting some aspects of reality and making them more salient. Journalists, by the selection of certain details to include in their reports, elevate these details in importance. Entman points out a disconnect between journalist and reader wherein the
audience does not necessarily perceive what the journalist intends. Journalists think they are abiding by the norm of objectivity, but they are really making framing choices that can prevent the audience from correctly assessing reality. D’Angelo (2002) suggests three paradigms for research into news framing: cognitive, critical and constructionist. The cognitive paradigm is concerned with the relationship between news frames and individuals’ prior knowledge. Critical research focuses on how journalists’ routines and the values of elites result in frames that dominate public opinion. The constructionist perspective describes how journalists process and package the positions of their sources into frames on which members of the public should base their opinions (Baresch, Shu, & Reese, 2010).

Other discussions of framing also take aim at the idea that journalists can be objective. Broersma (2010) calls framing “inevitable and necessary” (p. 29) as a way to help the audience understand the unfamiliar by relating it to something they know. Because of this act of framing, journalism represents a social construction of truth rather than a mirror of reality. Cues that the audience receives from news coverage prime them to react to real world situations in certain ways. A journalist will create frames in order to produce focused stories out of ambiguous events, and then members of the audience will learn these frames and apply them to their own realities. All of these micro interactions add up to long-term social, cultural, and political effects. The concept of framing directly challenges the idea that news stories should and can be objective (Baran & Davis, 2011).

Many journalists agree that they play a gatekeeping role by selecting what to include and filtering out what they do not deem newsworthy. These same journalists may take offense when social scientists suggest that they do not merely select, but also construct, the
reality that people experience through their reports (Schudson, 1989). Journalists who prize the ideal of objectivity may dispute this idea that they construct frames in a way that can influence their audience’s perception of reality. They see framing as something to avoid rather than an everyday practice that should be studied and understood in order to minimize unintended effects on the audience (Boesman & Van Gorp, 2017).

In the context of news, the author creates frames through the choice of which words to use and which sources to include (Baresch, Shu, & Reese, 2010). Photographers make similar choices about what to include in news photographs, and Messaris and Abraham (2001) argue that images are more effective tools for framing than text. Words derive their meanings because of social conventions, whereas images have meaning based on their visual similarity to what they represent. This indexical nature of photographs has led to “the notion that photographic images are ‘objective’ records of reality” (Messaris, 2000, p. 182). This aligns with the journalistic ideal of objectivity, but risks underestimating the power of photographs as framing devices. Photographs are more attractive, more easily processed, and better remembered than text alone, and they tend to have a greater emotional impact on the viewer than text (Coleman, 2006). “Pictorial framing is worthy of investigation not only because images are capable of conveying unverbalized meanings, but also because awareness of those meanings may be particularly elusive” (Messaris & Abraham, 2001, p. 225). Even though visuals may be more effective vehicles for framing, they have not been studied as frequently as text (Coleman, 2010). That photographs are effective, yet underappreciated and understudied as vehicles for framing suggests that further study is warranted.
Framing can be applied literally to photojournalism, where the viewfinder of the camera and the borders of a published photograph constitute actual, physical frames. These frames bound what one or more people, including the photographer, any number of editors, and a page designer, have decided is important. The photographer makes choices about composition, exposure, and what to include or not include in the photo, an editor may select which photographs to publish, and a page designer decides where and how large a photograph will be printed (Bock, 2015). Schwalbe (2006) describes visual framing as “a continuous winnowing process” (p. 269) that starts when journalists decide which events and topics are important enough to cover. The framing process continues when a photographer chooses which aspects of the story to photograph, which angle and view to use, and how to crop and edit the photographs (Coleman, 2010). “The process continues in the newsroom with decisions about which images to publish, what size to make them, and where to position them on the page” (Schwalbe, 2006, p. 269). Something as simple as the location in the newspaper or on the page can convey meaning to the reader (Coleman, 2010). While journalists would like to believe that these choices are based solely on professional standards, the identity of the journalist can affect the choices he or she makes (O’Connell & Mills, 2003). An inherent preference for interactions with people more like ourselves can cause journalists to select sources and subjects from similar backgrounds (Peterson, 1979). Repeated over time in a newsroom that lacks racial diversity, these choices could skew the representation of certain groups in news coverage.

Just as the reader of a news report may receive a different message than the one intended by the author (Entman, 1993), the viewer of a photograph may interpret
something different than what was intended by the photographer. Photographs often trigger an emotional response and can have a greater effect than written text on the attitudes of the audience. (Pfau et al., 2006) This emotional response is stronger when viewers perceive the photograph as depiction of a real event, as in the context of a news report, and not as a work of fiction (Mendelson & Papacharissi, 2007). While the content of a news photograph depicts a real event, it is also full of connotations that a viewer must read and process (Barthes, 1977). The camera is a device that captures a representation of reality, but the choices made by the person who operates the camera represent a form of interpretation (Sontag, 1977). Over time, the framing choices made in the publication of news photographs can have a cumulative effect on the audience. When certain images and ideas are repeated, and others are not, those repeated visuals become more salient and memorable to the viewer. The choices that news outlets make over time can reinforce certain views about society (Fahmy, 2005). An accurate representation of society was one of the fundamental principles established by a journalism advocacy group concerned about their profession.

In 1997, The Committee of Concerned Journalists formed in response to what its members saw as decreasing trust in journalism and news outlets’ continuing failure to serve the public interest. The committee developed a set of principles, based on years of research and interviews with journalists and members of the public, that they believed should guide journalism and as a result strengthen democracy (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007). Among those principles is that “journalism should present a representative picture of all constituent groups in society. Ignoring certain citizens has the effect of disenfranchising them” (Principles of Journalism, n.d.). Kovach and Rosenstiel (2007)
state that as economic conditions began to hurt the news business, media outlets, and newspapers in particular, started to target their coverage to more affluent readers in order to be more attractive to advertisers. They write that this goes against the principle that news should be comprehensive. Citizens should look at their local newspaper and ask “can we see the whole community in the coverage? Do I see myself?” (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007, p. 209) If the answer is no, the result is a poorly informed audience that risks making poor decisions.

If a newspaper, through the choices of photographs that they publish, inaccurately represents the community it covers, it may lead the audience to make incorrect conclusions about their community. Underrepresenting certain racial groups could lead to that group being diminished in importance in the minds of the audience. Depicting underrepresented groups in stereotypical frames could establish or reinforce negative stereotypes in the minds of audience members. Citizens look to their local newspapers for accurate reporting on the community where they work and live. The journalists who report on the community make a series of choices that affect how the community is framed. They choose which stories will be covered each day, which people will be the subjects of those stories, which of those subjects will be photographed, and which of those photographs will be published. Framing theory holds that, in aggregate, these choices contribute to a mosaic from which readers form their mental image of the community around them. If journalists prize accuracy, they should be aware of any trends in the framing choices they make when reporting the news and they should ask themselves whether their framing choices perpetuate stereotypes or symbolically annihilate certain groups.
Prior Research

The Kerner Commission called for expanded coverage of African American communities and their integration into all aspects of news coverage (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968). In the years since the commission’s report was published, studies looking at depictions of racial minorities in the news media, including magazines, newspapers, and television newscasts, have found that African Americans and other minorities continue to be underrepresented when compared to their actual proportion within the population. When racial minorities are depicted, it tends to be in stereotypical roles like those of criminal or athlete. In television newscasts, African American subjects tend to be shown in a negative light while depictions of White subjects are more varied and more often positive. Entman (1994) found that network newscasts showed African American subjects in fewer positive roles. Nearly half the African American subjects of televised stories were criminals or victims of crime and other social ills. While stereotyping is present in national newscasts, it is even more apparent at the local level. Entman (1994) suggests that network news stories focus more generally on issues of national importance and therefore may not be as dramatically racially skewed as local newscasts. Dixon and Linz (2000a) studied Los Angeles area newscasts and compared depictions in crime stories to real world law enforcement data. This so-called “interreality” measure is important, as it determines whether the percentage of depictions on the news are representative of reality. Minorities could appear in more crime stories simply because they are the ones committing more crimes. The authors found that this is not the case. African Americans were shown as the perpetrators of crimes at higher rates than they were being arrested in real life. African Americans made up 21% of all Los
Angeles area arrests but were 37% of the perpetrators seen on television newscasts. The gap was greater when only felonies were considered. Whites and Latinos were underrepresented as perpetrators. Whites were overrepresented in law defender roles like police, lawyers and judges. In a study of victim portrayals, Dixon and Linz (2000b) found that 43% of victims in televised stories were White, compared to 13% of victims in local crime data. These skewed depictions on local television news, the most popular news source in the U.S., (Poindexter, Smith, & Heider, 2003, Gottfried, & Shearer, 2017) can reinforce audience members’ mental images of African Americans as criminals and Whites as both victims and defenders of the law. Dixon (2017) updated these studies 17 years later and the portrayals of race in crime coverage were somewhat more accurate. Depictions of White, African American and Latino perpetrators were within the margin of error when compared to Los Angeles County crime statistics from the Department of Justice. White subjects were still overrepresented as victims and as members of law enforcement.

Stereotypical depictions in the news media can affect the audience’s perceptions and beliefs. Gilliam, Iyengar, Simon and Wright (1996) found that television news reports in Los Angeles exaggerated the African American crime rate, underrepresenting non-violent crimes and overrepresenting violent crimes by African American suspects. “Racial imagery triggered fear of crime and a willingness to hold Black people responsible for crime” (Gilliam, Iyengar, Simon and Wright, 1996, p. 19). Exposure to the race of a suspect in a crime story tended to reinforce already held stereotypes, and to increase both concern about crime and the willingness to blame a racial group as a whole for crimes committed by the individual. In a later study, Gillam and Iyengar (2000) found
that viewers of stories that were framed with the suspect’s race were more supportive of deterrent solutions like capital punishment and mandatory sentencing. The effect was greatest when the suspect was Black.

While there is some evidence that the depictions of African Americans in television newscasts are more accurate than they were in the past, smaller news outlets continue to lag behind on issues of diversity. Local television newscasts remain the most popular source of news and can have a strong influence on how audience members perceive issues of race. Images in local news “help to shape the audience’s emotional and cognitive responses to community conditions in a way that national news cannot” (Entman, 1992, p. 348). Poindexter, Smith, and Heider (2003) studied newscasts from 12 American cities and found that the majority of reporters and anchors that appeared on air were White, while racial minorities like Latinos, Asian Americans and Native Americans, both as journalists and as subjects, were largely invisible. Minorities make up 35% of the U.S. adult population but comprise only 22% of local television newsroom employees and only 13% of employees in the newsrooms of daily newspapers. At the smaller local papers that readers rely on for coverage of their communities, that percentage drops to the single digits. At daily newspapers with circulations of 5,000 or less, only 6% of employees are minorities (Barthel, 2015). The percentage of minority employees in newspaper newsrooms of all sizes has barely changed in over 20 years, increasing from 11% in 1995 to 13% in 2015. The percentage is even lower for supervisory positions, of which only 10% were held by minorities in 2015 (American Society of News Editors, 2016). In addition to factors like gender, age, and politics, the race of individuals in the
newsroom may affect their decision making with regard to who will be the subjects of news coverage, and how these subjects get presented (Bissell, 2000).

DeLouth, Person, Hitchcock and Rienzi (1995) quantified photographic depictions of race and gender in three California newspapers and compared their findings with state population data. White subjects were overrepresented and Latino subjects were underrepresented compared to their actual proportions in the state population. Depictions of African Americans were concentrated in sports and crime coverage. Over 70% of African American subjects appeared in sports photos, and half of the accused or convicted criminals pictured were African American. In an extensive study of two news stations in New Mexico and Hawaii, Heider (2000) found that journalists and viewers both noticed that people of color were most often covered in the context of cultural festivals and crime. Allport (1954) noted that newspaper coverage of Black subjects focused on crime and not on achievement. Lester (1994) found that photographic depictions of African Americans in four major American newspapers had increased over a 53-year period, but that increase came largely in stereotypical categories of sports, crime, and entertainment. Photographs are particularly effective vehicles for the propagation of stereotypes, which are oversimplified representations of certain categories of people (Fahmy, 2004). Stereotypes have more impact when conveyed visually than when conveyed through words (Fiske, 1998). The simplicity that makes photographs effective communicators of information also gives them the power to legitimize these oversimplified and inaccurate representations of a group. “Stereotypes allow people to think of others as members of a group rather than as individuals,” (Barnett, 2003, p.115) and as a result the audience will tend to generalize, believing that all members of a group
are alike and ignoring any individual differences that may exist. While the words in a written story take time to parse and can provide deeper context, a viewer can read a photograph rather quickly and come away with the salient points. A viewer may look at a photograph of a suspect accompanying a crime story and quickly read “black” and “criminal.” The perceived truth of the photograph then lends truth to a stereotype (Batziou, 2011). For this reason, newsrooms need to subject photographs to the same scrutiny that text receives. “Ordinary news events include the stereotypical visuals laced with racial and gender stereotypes that would never pass newsroom muster if communicated in words” (Coleman, 2010, p. 235).

Stereotypical depictions can be found throughout the news media. Journalists condense and simplify complex information to make news stories more easily understood by a wide audience (Campbell, 1997). Simplification may be necessary in order to comply with time and space constraints of newscasts and printed periodicals, but it may also cause journalists to rely on unconscious biases when choosing who to include in their stories and how to depict them (Gordon, Kittross, Dorsher, Merrill & Babcock, 2011). These simplified depictions can be the products of society’s stereotypes, and they can also perpetuate them. In a content analysis of four Connecticut newspapers, Luebke (1989) found that published photographs perpetuated common gender stereotypes by depicting men more often than women overall, and frequently showing men and women in traditional gender roles. Men greatly outnumbered women in sports, business, and entertainment photos. While women at the time of the study held a majority of professional jobs according to U.S. Department of Labor statistics, only 17% of the professionals in newspaper photos were women. The only place where women
outnumbered men was in lifestyle photos. DeLouth, Person, Hitchcock and Rienzi (1995) found that newspapers pictured women as victims more often than men, while men were presented as experts or rescuers more often than women. Kim, Kim, Frear and Oh (2016) studied the gender and race of scientists portrayed in photographs in *The Science Times*. While men were depicted more often than women, the percentages were in line with data from a national survey of scientists. Depictions of race, however, were skewed. The percentage of White scientists in published photographs was much greater than the actual percentage of American scientists who were White, while non-White scientists were comparatively underrepresented.

Visual portrayals in the news media can reinforce negative stereotypes by repeatedly framing certain groups in roles with negative connotations. Kahle, Nan and Whiteside (2007) studied photographs in four major American newspapers during their coverage of Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and found that African Americans were more often shown in the passive roles of victims, evacuees, and people needing assistance. White subjects were more often shown in the active roles of rescuers and volunteers. These two contrasting depictions reinforced the stereotypical image of African Americans as lazy and needing help from White people in positions of power. News photographs can also reinforce seemingly positive connotations. Hardin, Chance and Walsdor (2004) analyzed American newspaper photos of athletes during the 2000 Olympics. They used medal counts as a baseline of reality and found that while African American athletes won 26% of their country’s medals, they appeared in more than 38% of the published photographs. While pictures of Olympic athletes represent mostly positive depictions, the lack of accurate depictions in other aspects of news coverage
could lead the viewer to believe that the only way minorities can contribute positively to society is through their athletic prowess.

One of the most prominent places where people see news photos is on the covers of national magazines. Well-known public figures appearing on magazine covers can help frame who is important in society. While more African American athletes than European American athletes appeared on the cover of *Sports Illustrated* during the 1990s, their proportions did not reflect their actual levels of participation in the most popular professional sports, suggesting an editorial bias toward celebrating the achievements of European Americans, despite their lower levels of participation (Lumpkin, 2007). Magazine covers can also help frame what constitutes “normal” in society. Photos on 30 *Time* covers between 1996 and 1999 depicted some sort of typical American child or adult. In every one of these images, the person was White. *Newsweek* published ten covers from September 1998 to September 1999 featuring a representation of a typical American. Again, every one of these people was White. This repeated framing of the average American as White reinforces the idea of White as normal and frames anyone who is not White as the other (Entman & Rojecki, 2000). As a result, “blackness has become a conventional notation symbolizing abnormality” (Messaris & Abraham, 2001, p. 222). Despite their basis in reality, news photos can be powerful vehicles for the symbolic annihilation of people of color, much like the television dramas that Gerbner (1972) criticized.

Photographs can have a profound effect on public opinion. Pfau et al. (2006) found that photographs had a greater effect on people’s beliefs about the Iraq war than text did. Photographic depictions that reinforce stereotypes and do not reflect reality can
cause people to hold inaccurate beliefs. Clawson and Trice (2000) studied magazine
photos of the poor and found that 49% of poor people in magazine photos were African
American. Gilens (1996) found that 62% of the poor depicted in news magazine photos
were African American. The magazines studied greatly exaggerated the number of
African American poor and may have contributed to inaccurate public opinion.
According to the 1990 Census, only 29% of American poor were African American,
while Americans who were surveyed estimated that number to be 50% (Gilens, 1996).
Viewers believe what they see in photographs. Repeated exposure to news photos that
purport to represent reality, but cumulatively misrepresent it, will leave viewers with an
inaccurate mental picture of the world around them. It is on this distorted picture that
people will base their individual beliefs. “Over time, the specific realities depicted in
single stories may accumulate to form a summary message that distorts social reality”
(Entman, 1994, p. 509). This perpetuates racial stereotypes and leads to opposition to
social programs like welfare that are designed to help the poor, because the primarily
White audience incorrectly sees the recipients of such programs as overwhelmingly
unlike themselves (Gilens, 1996).

Research questions

Depictions of race in television news and in national print publications have been
well-studied, but few, if any, studies have looked at the depiction of race in local
newspapers, which remain an important and trusted source of news and information even
as print circulation across the country continues to decline. Local newspapers have a
defined geographical area of coverage and distribution, making a comparison with
Census data more relevant than for a large publication that covers regional, national, and
international issues. Prior research shows that racial minorities are consistently underrepresented across television news markets, suggesting the question: Do photographs in small-market newspapers accurately reflect that market’s population, or are certain racial groups being symbolically annihilated through infrequent representation?

RQ1a: How accurately do photographs in small-market newspapers reflect the racial breakdown of the population in the markets they cover?

RQ1b: How have these comparisons changed over time?

This research will compare the populations appearing in photographs published in six local newspapers with the U.S. Census figures for the communities those newspapers cover. These comparisons will provide a baseline measure of representation to show how often members of minority groups, such as African Americans, appear in print compared to what proportion of the population they represent. If newspapers are truly trying to mirror society, then the proportions should be similar. If minorities are underrepresented, then majority groups may be given undue importance in the eyes of the public, while issues facing minority groups are downplayed or even ignored. Prior research has found that White subjects are overrepresented in the news media while minority subjects are underrepresented, suggesting the following hypotheses:

H1a: The percentage of White subjects in local newspaper photos will be greater than the percentage of White people in the local population

H1b: The percentage of subjects from minority groups in local newspaper photos will be less than their percentages in the local population.
Prior research has also found that visual portrayals in the news can perpetuate negative stereotypes by framing members of minority groups more frequently in certain roles, which leads to a second set of research questions:

RQ2a: To what extent are certain races overrepresented or underrepresented in certain kinds of photographs?

RQ2b: How has this representation changed over time?

Print and broadcast outlets have a history of showing African Americans in stereotypical roles like athlete, criminal, and entertainer. The findings of previous studies suggest a second set of hypotheses:

H2a: Minority subjects in local news photos will appear in greater proportions in the role of athlete.

H2b: Minority subjects in local news photos will appear in greater proportions in the role of criminal.

H2c: Minority subjects in local news photos will appear in greater proportions in the role of entertainer.

The Kerner Commission suggested the need for better integration in all aspects of news reporting. If this has been successfully achieved, then minority subjects would not be confined to traditional stereotypical roles, but would instead be pictured in proportions similar to those of White subjects.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This research seeks to answer whether photographs published in *The Day* and other small-market newspapers accurately reflect the populations in their respective coverage areas. Quantitative content analysis was used to compare the population depicted in published photographs with the actual local population as measured by the United States Census. Individuals appearing in local news photographs were coded for race and location, and the racial breakdown of these subjects was compared with the Census data for race and ethnicity for the city and county where each newspaper is located. Individuals were also coded for stereotypical roles identified in prior research, and a comparison of proportions by race was made for each newspaper in each year. Individuals that did not fall into previously identified roles were coded descriptively to determine if any other trends were present.

**Content analysis**

Content analysis is “a systematic reading of a body of texts, images, and symbolic matter” (Krippendorf, 2004, p. 3). It “is specifically appropriate and necessary for (arguably) the central work of communication scholars, in particular those who study mass communication” (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, & Brennan, 2002, p. 587) and “has long been associated with investigations of the way social issues are represented in the mass media” (van Leeuwen & Jewitt, 2001, p. 1). As a research method, content analysis is useful for making generalizations about the frequency of visual representations of certain classes of people. It is an appropriate method for framing analysis because it “shows what is given priority or salience and what is not” (Bell, 2001, p. 26). Wimmer and Dominick
identify three types of framing analysis: frame building, frame description and comparison, and framing effects. According to the authors, content analysis is used in research into description and comparison of frames to “identify and describe how news media frame general and specific issues” (p. 162). This research fits into the second category of framing analysis - describing and comparing framing in published news photographs - and did not attempt to consider the reasons journalists create frames or the effects those frames have on the audience. “Many content analyses are reality checks in which the portrayal of a certain group, phenomenon, trait, or characteristic is assessed against a standard taken from real life” (Wimmer & Dominick, 2014, p. 161). According to Bell (2001), in order to make a generalization about media content, one needs evidence that is both observable and objective. Content analysis satisfies both of these requirements. The analysis should be systematic, following explicit rules and procedures so that all content being studied is treated the same way using a method that could be repeated by other researchers. It should also be objective and quantitative, remaining free of any researchers’ personal biases and reporting precise results that can be easily understood (Wimmer & Dominick, 2014). Finally, content analysis is widely accepted and understood among both researchers and journalists (van Leeuwen & Jewitt, 2001).

**Sample selection**

The sample to be studied was taken from six small daily newspapers. The American Society of Newspaper Editors’ (2016) annual survey of newsrooms defines small newspapers as those with a circulation of 50,000 or less. *The Day* of New London, CT, a daily newspaper with a weekday circulation of 23,197 (Alliance for Audited Media, n.d.) was selected for study because it is the author’s local newspaper and would
provide convenient access to a complete archive. In order to identify other newspapers with a similar circulation to The Day’s, a list of daily newspapers with weekday circulations below 30,000 was compiled. From this list, 18 newspapers with readily available online digital archives of their printed pages were identified. When two or more newspapers were located in close geographical proximity to one another, or were owned by the same company, publications with less-complete archives were eliminated in order to ensure that images could be reliably coded, and publications with smaller minority population proportions in their home counties were eliminated in order to ensure a racially diverse sample. This left 10 newspapers from a range of different regions of the United States, with varied forms of ownership and located in counties with varied levels of racial diversity in their populations. During reliability testing, four more newspapers were eliminated due to incomplete or poorly reproduced archives, leaving a sample of six newspapers to be studied. The newspapers selected for analysis were the Alamogordo Daily News of Alamogordo, NM, the Daily Journal of Franklin IN, the Great Falls Tribune of Great Falls, MT, the Longview News-Journal of Longview, TX, the Montgomery Advertiser of Montgomery AL, and The Day of New London, CT. All six are daily publications with weekday circulations under 25,000 according to the Alliance for Audited Media (n.d.).

Issues of The Day were obtained on microfilm from the Public Library of New London. Issues of the Daily Journal, the Great Falls Tribune, the Longview News-Journal and the Montgomery Advertiser were obtained from digital archives available at www.newspapers.com. Issues of the Alamogordo Daily News were obtained from a digital archive available at www.newspaperarchive.com. Three months of issues of the
Alamogordo Daily News that were missing from the digital archive were obtained on microfilm from the New Mexico State Library.

**Sampling**

In order to compare the population in local news photos to the real-world population, this research considered photographs published in the decennial Census years of 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010. 1980 was selected as a starting point because the Census has used the same basic set of categories for race and ethnicity since 1980. Hispanic origin was not an option on Census short forms before 1980 (Cohn, 2010). Photographs from 2016 also were included in order to make a comparison with the most recent available Census estimates. Cataloging every single photograph published in a year would be inefficient. Instead, this research used constructed week sampling as suggested by Riffe and Aust, (1993) Lacy, Riffe, Stoddard, Martin, and Chang, (2001) Hester and Dougall, (2007) and Luke, Caburnay and Cohen (2011). “The overall goal of constructed week sampling is to create maximum sampling efficiency while controlling for cyclical biases” (Luke et al., p. 78).

Establishing an appropriate sample size helps to achieve a balance between accuracy and efficiency. Studying too large a sample would be a waste of resources, while studying a sample that is too small risks creating a data set that is unreliable. In a study of newspapers, a simple random sample does not account for the cyclical pattern of newspapers in which issues published on certain days, like Sundays, contain more content. Sampling a week’s worth of consecutive days does not account for week-to-week and month-to-month variations. Riffe and Aust (1993) found that a constructed week sample that includes a randomly selected Monday, a randomly selected Tuesday,
and so on for each day of the week, provides a better estimate of the overall population of newspaper editions and is a more efficient use of a researcher’s time. The authors determined that one constructed week was sufficient to represent six months of content in a daily newspaper. Lacy et al. looked at five years of newspaper editions and found that nine constructed weeks provided the best combination of efficiency and accuracy. Both of these studies counted the number of stories per newspaper edition. Lester (1994) argues that smaller samples are insufficient for studies of race in the news, as coverage of minorities can be clustered around significant events. Hester and Dougall (2007) looked at sampling for a number of online newspaper content categories, including photographs, and found that at least two constructed weeks was the ideal sample size for six months of content. Based on these findings, a sample of four constructed weeks was created for each of the five years studied. For each year, a random date was selected using a random number generator. Four constructed weeks were then created by identifying dates at 13-day intervals before and after the randomly selected date, yielding four Sundays, four Mondays, four Tuesdays, etc. at even intervals throughout each year.

**Definition of terms**

This research focuses on diversity as it pertains to the race and ethnicity of individuals. When studying a population, the term "diversity" can take on many meanings. Measures of diversity may be based on race and ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, religion, sexual orientation, or political views. Race can be an equally cloudy term whose definitions can change over time and vary based on location. Race is way to divide and categorize the people of the world based on many characteristics including skin color, body shape, hairstyle, facial features, clothing,
beliefs, and language (Heider, 2000). It can be biologically determined on the basis of physical characteristics or ancestry, or it can be socially constructed (Peery, 2017). This research emphasizes the biological definition by primarily considering physical appearance as evidenced by skin tone, facial features, and hair type, but also looks to social cues like the individual’s name to confirm or clarify the individual’s race, as Dixon and Linz (2000a) did in their study of television news.

In discussions of diversity, race, and ethnicity, "stereotype" is a weighted term. Stereotypes are oversimplified representations of groups in society (Fahmy, 2004). While often used in a negative sense, stereotypes can have both positive and negative connotations. While broadly depicting members of a certain race as "criminal" represents a negative stereotype, there may be some disagreement as to whether depicting a certain race as "athletic" is positive or negative. In the news media, where a generally accepted goal is an accurate understanding of the individual and community being depicted, stereotypes detract from that goal. Lester (1994) identified the stereotypical roles of athlete, criminal, and entertainer as roles in which minorities are overrepresented in newspaper photos. Dixon (2017) and Dixon and Linz (2000a and 2000b) also found minorities overrepresented in the role of criminal, and Harden, Chance and Walsdorf (2004) found minorities overrepresented as athletes. Individuals were coded for the roles of criminal, athlete or entertainer based on appearance and accompanying text. Criminals were considered anyone accused or convicted of a crime. Athletes were defined as participants in physical sport for the purpose of competition or fitness. Any artist or performer who entertains an audience was coded as an entertainer (see full coding instructions in Appendix A). An additional variable for other roles was coded
descriptively, in order to evaluate whether any other trends or patterns emerged that were not suggested by previous research.

For this research, photographs were defined as images that were created with a camera and that depict a real-world scene. Maps, drawings, cartoons, illustrations and graphics were excluded from analysis. News photographs were defined as any photograph that acts as a piece of visual reporting in which one or more journalists, including photographers, editors, reporters, and designers, made a decision about how and whether to publish the photograph. Newsroom staff are constantly making news framing choices of what stories to cover, whom to include in photographs, and which photographs to select for publication (Bock, 2015, Coleman, 2010). Photographs may be paired with a written story, or may be standalone photographs that are published without a related story. For this research, news photos need not be limited to the news section, but also include sports, arts, business, and feature photos, and any other type of photograph that contributes to the newspaper’s local reporting. News photographs may come from news staff, freelancers or wire services, or they may be submitted by some outside entity for inclusion with a story. News photos from any of these sources were included if they met the definition of local described below. Photographs in advertisements were not included in this definition of news photos as advertisements are paid placements that are not generated by journalists in the newsroom. Submitted photos for birth, death, engagement, wedding, and anniversary announcements were also excluded, as these may be paid placements, and they often appear in their own sections separate from news coverage. Also excluded from analysis were photographs of reporters and columnists that
sometimes appear along with the byline of a story or column, as these individuals are the creators, not the subjects of the reporting.

When considering the “subject” of a photograph, the term “subject” may refer to the person or activity depicted, or to a theme suggested by the image. In a photograph from the sports page of a high school basketball game, one may interpret the “subject” as the individual athlete, the school he or she attends, the sport of basketball, or themes like competition, victory or school spirit. This research will focus on a narrow definition of subject as the individual person or people who are the most prominent in the photograph.

**Unit of analysis**

The population studied was individuals appearing in local news photographs in each of the six daily newspapers, published from 1980 to present. The unit of analysis was the individual subjects of local news photos. The number of individuals was used instead of the number of photos in order to facilitate a more valid comparison with U.S. Census figures on race and ethnicity. When more than one person appeared in a news photo, a determination had to be made about which specific people were the subjects of the photos. Kahle, Yu, and Whiteside (2007) used individuals as the unit of analysis and defined the individual subjects of photos as the three most prominent people in the photo – the three that catch the viewer’s eye first, or who are most dominant, largest, centered, active or most visible. The same standards of prominence were used for this research, but in order to provide a more complete accounting of the people included in local coverage, the number of subjects that could be coded in a photo was increased to eight. A preliminary study of newspaper issues not included in the final sample found examples of local news photographs with up to eight equally prominent and identifiable individuals.
that were able to be coded reliably. This analysis coded up to the eight most prominent individuals in a photograph. Photographs of large groups with more than eight equally prominent subjects were excluded, as the individuals in those images may be difficult to code.

The newspapers studied did not explicitly provide their readers with a definition of their local coverage areas, so a definition of “local” for use by coders had to be developed. Photos were coded if they were taken by a staff photographer or published alongside a story written by a staff reporter or an uncredited brief that appears to be part of the local news reporting. When it was unclear if the photograph met the definition of “local,” the photo was coded, and could be excluded later based on location information. Photos from outside news sources, including wire services or other publications, were not coded unless the subjects were clearly identified as being from a local town or city (see Appendix A for full coding instructions). After initial coding was completed, two additional binary fields were added to indicate whether the individual’s location was in the city and county where the newspaper is located.

**Coding**

Categories for coding of an individual’s race were established based on previous research and the definitions used on the U.S. Census questionnaire. Previous studies have coded race as Black and non-Black, (Gilens, 1996) Black and White, (Hardin, Dodd, Chance & Waldorf, 2004, Kahle, Nan & Whiteside, 2007) African American, White and Latino, (Dixon, 2017) Black, White, Hispanic and Asian, (Clawson & Trice, 2000) and White, African American, Latino/a, Asian American, Native American. (Poindexter, 2003) Because this study used U.S. Census data for comparison, race/ethnicity was coded
based on the categories used in the most recent Census. Hispanic/Latino is considered an ethnicity separate from race, (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-a) but to keep the results of this research in line with previous studies, categories of White (not Hispanic/Latino), Black (not Hispanic/Latino) and Hispanic/Latino (any race) were used, along with the additional census categories of American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander and Other. Starting with the 2000 Census, respondents could select more than one race, (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-b) but individuals’ mixed racial backgrounds may not be visually apparent in photographs, and this categorization was not used in previous Census years, so coding of multiple races for one individual was not attempted. Instead, the Census category “more than one race” was combined with the Census category “other” when comparing findings to Census data from 2010 and estimates from 2016. The visual cues of skin tone, facial features, and hair type were used to infer an individual’s race (Dixon, 2017; Lopez, 2018). In instances when visual appearance is insufficient to determine an individual’s race, Lumpkin (2007) suggests the coder refer to the article text to make a determination, so appearance in the photograph, caption text and article text were used as a basis for coding race.

Once definitions were established, a codebook was created, and a second coder was trained in order to test reliability. After initial tests of one issue, two issues, and five issues, definitions and instructions were refined and clarified. A random sample of 68 issues from across the set of papers in years not included in the main sample was examined by both coders. The number of individuals coded was 1,402, or 10.3% of the main sample of 13,658 individuals. Intercoder reliability was calculated using Krippendorff’s alpha. All kalpha values were greater than 0.8, which Krippendorff (2004)
suggests is the threshold for acceptability (see Table 1). After reliability testing was completed, coding was conducted by the author on a sample consisting of four constructed weeks (28 days) from each of the six selected newspapers in each of the five sample years. Coding of the main sample was completed over a period of six weeks in June, July, and August 2018.

Data Analysis

To answer RQ1a and RQ1b, the races of individuals appearing in the sampled photographs were compared with the race of the actual population as measured by the U.S. Census. Dixon and Linz (2000a and 2000b) argue that this kind of “interreality” comparison between the percentage of each race appearing in the news and the percentage of each race appearing in the real world is a more useful way to study depictions of race in the news media than simply comparing groups and roles within news content. In three studies of crime stories in Los Angeles television news, Dixon (2017) and Dixon and Linz (2000a & 200b) compared the proportions of each race among criminals shown on television with the actual percentages of individuals that were arrested in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. The authors calculated a 95% confidence interval for each sample estimate of a population proportion, and when the difference between the sample proportion and the actual proportion exceeded the confidence interval the result was found to be statistically significant.

A similar method of comparison was used in this study to compare the racial breakdown of the population that appears in the newspaper with the population of the county where each newspaper is located. Following the method laid out by Dixon (2017) and Dixon and Linz (2000a & 200b), an alpha value of 0.05 was used for all statistical
analysis. Once individuals were coded for race, role, and location, they were filtered to include only individuals that live in, or were located in, the newspaper’s home county. For each year sampled, the proportion of each race in the sample was compared with the proportion of that race in the county’s actual population. The difference between the actual population proportion and the observed proportion was calculated, then a 95% confidence interval was calculated around each sample proportion to account for any sampling error. Any difference, measured in percentage points, that fell within the 95% confidence interval was not large enough to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the sample proportion and the actual population proportion, as the measured difference could be explained by random variation of the sample (LeBlanc, 2004). If the difference of proportions was greater than the 95% confidence interval, the difference was considered statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected, except in categories of race where the sample size was too small to assume a normal sampling distribution. In order to assume a normal sampling distribution, the sample size must be sufficiently large that the conditions \( nP \geq 10 \) and \( n(P - 1) \geq 10 \) are met (LeBlanc, 2004). If a category of race did not meet these conditions, the result for that race category was excluded. Individuals were then filtered by town, and the same analysis was performed for individuals that live in, or were located in, the town or city where the newspaper is located. A statistically significant difference indicated that individuals of that race appeared more or less often in local news photographs than they do in the overall local population.

To answer RQ2a and RQ2b, the proportions of each race category within stereotypical roles were compared. Individuals were not filtered by location, as no
comparison to real-world numbers was being made. Instead, all individuals that met the
definition of “local” laid out in the coding instructions were included in the analysis. A
$\chi^2$ test of homogeneity was performed in SPSS to test the null hypothesis that for each
category of race, the proportions of individuals are equal in each stereotypical role. A $\chi^2$
value was calculated for the total sample of all newspapers in all years, for the combined
sample of all newspapers in each discrete year, for all years combined within each
newspaper, and finally for each individual newspaper in each individual year. The larger
the value of $\chi^2$, the less likely it is that the difference between the observed frequencies
and the expected frequencies are due to random sampling variation, and the less evidence
there is to support the null hypothesis. A $\chi^2$ value where $p \leq 0.05$ was considered to be
statistically significant (LeBlanc, 2004). One of the assumptions for a $\chi^2$ test is that at
least 80% of the expected frequencies are 5 or greater (Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner &
Barrett, 2013). When this assumption was not met, rows and columns of the contingency
table with the lowest observed frequencies were collapsed by combining them into the
“other” category until this assumption was met. If the contingency table was collapsed to
a 2x2 table and least one of the expected frequencies was still less than 5, Fisher’s exact
test was used instead (Morgan et al., 2013). A $\chi^2$ value can only indicate the likelihood
that there are differences among the observed proportions. It does not indicate which
specific populations in which categories differ. (LeBlanc, 2004) To find out which
observed proportions were significantly different from their expected proportions, post
hoc testing was performed in SPSS to calculate a $\chi^2$ value for each individual proportion.
The corresponding $p$-value was compared to an adjusted alpha based on the number of
cells in the contingency table (Beasley & Schumacker, 1995). If the $p$-value is smaller
than the adjusted alpha, the proportion was considered statistically significant, meaning that individuals of that race appeared more frequently in that role than they would if the population in each role was divided evenly according to their proportions in the overall sample.
Chapter 4: Results

Overview

Looking at the sample as a whole, evidence was found to support the hypotheses that newspapers overrepresent White subjects and underrepresent most categories of non-White subjects. Results were more mixed when considering individual newspapers. Five of six newspapers overrepresented White subjects. Two newspapers underrepresented Black subjects, while Black subjects were overrepresented in two others. Hispanic and Asian subjects were underrepresented in all six newspapers, and American Indian subjects were underrepresented in the two newspapers in which the sample was large enough to make a valid comparison. For racial groups that make up smaller proportions of the population, especially Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, a larger sample would be needed to determine whether they are accurately represented.

Evidence was also found to support the hypotheses that non-White subjects were more likely to be pictured in certain stereotypical roles. In the overall sample, significant differences were found between the portrayals of White and Black subjects in the roles of criminal and athlete. Similar results were found in some individual newspapers and in some years, but these results were more mixed. There was little evidence supporting unequal representation in the role of entertainer on either the overall or individual newspaper levels of analysis.

RQ1a: How accurately do photographs in small-market newspapers reflect the racial breakdown of the population in the markets they cover?
In order to make an “interreality” comparison for the entire sample, the populations of Otero (NM), Johnson (IN), Cascade (MT), Gregg (TX), Montgomery (AL), and New London (CT) counties were combined and the proportion of each race category in that combined population was calculated. 2010 issues of the Longview News-Journal were not coded due to poor photo reproduction. Instead, a sample of News-Journal issues from 2011 was coded, and 2011 Gregg County population estimates from the American Community Survey were used in place of 2010 Census figures. The population proportion for each race was compared to the corresponding proportion in the overall newspaper sample with individuals filtered to include only those living in or located in the newspapers’ home counties. (See Table 2). The proportion of White subjects in local news photos was 10 percentage points greater than the actual local population proportion, supporting H1a. Black subjects were underrepresented by 5 percentage points, and statistically significant underrepresentation was also found in the Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian categories, supporting H1b. The sample size was too small to make a comparison in the Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander category. Comparisons are reported for the “other” category, though it is not clear that this is a valid comparison since the category has no clear definition of what it is, only what it is not.

There was some variation to be seen among individual newspapers. In Otero County, which has a large Hispanic population, the Alamogordo Daily News underrepresented Hispanic subjects by 16 percentage points, supporting H1b, while overrepresenting White subjects by 21 percentage points, supporting H1a. Otero County was one of two counties in the sample with a large enough American Indian population to
make a comparison. This population was barely visible in local news photos in the *Daily News* (see Table 3).

Johnson County had the highest proportion of White residents of the six counties studied. A statistically significant overrepresentation of White subjects was found in the *Daily Journal*’s news photos, while the underrepresentation of Hispanic and Asian subjects was also significant. H1b was not supported for Black subjects in the *Daily Journal*, for whom the proportion difference was within the 95% confidence interval (see Table 4).

In Cascade County, the H1a was supported, as White subjects were overrepresented by five percentage points in the *Great Falls Tribune*. H1b was supported for Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian subjects. H1b was not supported for Black subjects, for whom the proportion difference was within the 95% confidence interval (see Table 5).

In Gregg County, the H1a was supported, while H1b was supported for Black, Hispanic, and Asian subjects in the *Longview News-Journal*. White subjects were overrepresented by 14 percentage points, while Black, Hispanic, and Asian subjects were all significantly underrepresented. Hispanic subjects had the greatest proportion difference of nearly eight percentage points, followed by Black subjects at five percentage points (see Table 6).

While Montgomery County had the smallest proportion of White residents and the largest proportion of Black residents, the *Montgomery Advertiser* showed the second greatest overrepresentation of White subjects (18 percentage points) among the six newspapers studied, and the greatest underrepresentation of Black subjects (15
percentage points). Underrepresentation of Hispanic and Asian subjects was also statistically significant, so H1a and H1b were both supported (see Table 7).

New London County was the only county where support was not found for H1a, as the proportion difference for the White population was within the 95% confidence interval, indicating that the population was depicted accurately in local news photos. The Day was one of two newspapers that significantly overrepresented the Black population of the county, in this case by three percentage points. Statistically significant underrepresentation was found for Hispanic and Asian subjects (see Table 8).

The same comparisons were made at the city level, filtering subjects of news photos to only include those who live in, or were located in, the newspaper’s home city. In Longview and Montgomery, the observed overrepresentation and underrepresentation matched the results seen in the corresponding counties. In Alamogordo and Great Falls, small differences were seen in the representation of the Black population, while the findings were unchanged for all other categories of race. In Franklin the sample was too small to compare any category of race other than White, which was overrepresented at both the county and city level. The most noticeable difference between the results at the county and city levels was in New London. While the proportion difference for White subjects in New London County was within the confidence interval, White subjects were overrepresented by 16 percentage points in the city of New London. Black subjects were overrepresented at the county level, but the difference was within the confidence interval in the city of New London. Finally, Hispanic subjects were underrepresented by two percentage points at the county level but were underrepresented by 16 percentage points at the city level (see Tables 9-14).
H1a: The percentage of White subjects in local newspaper photos will be greater than the percentage of White people in the local population.

H1b: the percentage of subjects from minority groups in local newspaper photos will be less than their percentages in the local population.

The results support these hypotheses for White, Black, Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian subjects in the overall combined population. The sample size was not large enough to support or reject the hypothesis for Pacific Islander subjects. The results support the hypothesis for Hispanic and Asian subjects in all six newspapers, for White subjects in five out of six newspapers, for Black subjects in two out of six newspapers, and for American Indian subjects in the two newspapers in which there were enough individuals to make a comparison. When considering the population of the newspaper’s home city instead of the county, similar support for the hypothesis was found.

RQ1b: How have these comparisons changed over time?

The results above combine population figures for all years studied. The tables in Appendix B break out population figures by year, both overall and at individual newspapers, to determine whether any trends in representation occurred over time. Table 15 summarizes the results from each year comparing the actual county population proportions with the population observed in the sample of local news photos. White subjects were overrepresented in all years. The difference fluctuated from year to year, but there was no obvious trend of an increase or decrease over the 36-year period studied. Black subjects were the most underrepresented in 1980, but the proportion difference narrowed over time, getting closer to zero than the previous sampled year in three of four sampled years. In 2016, the difference was not statistically significant, suggesting that
Black subjects, who were significantly underrepresented in the past, were accurately represented in the most recent year studied. Hispanic subjects were slightly overrepresented in 1980, and were accurately represented in 1990 with a difference within the confidence interval, but the difference was more negative in each of the next three sample years. The proportion difference for Asian subjects was more negative than the previous sample year in three of four sample years. The difference was negative in the first four sample years for American Indian subjects, and the sample was not large enough to make comparisons for Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subjects (see Table 15).

The trends seen in the overall sample – relatively constant overrepresentation of White subjects, narrowing underrepresentation of Black subjects, and widening underrepresentation of Hispanic subjects – were not seen similarly in all newspapers. Additionally, differences were seen within individual newspapers when comparing proportion differences at the county and city levels. Changes seen in the Alamogordo Daily News did seem to reflect the overall trend. A positive difference was found for White subjects in all years at both the county and city levels. The proportion difference for Black subjects was negative in 1980 and then became greater in three of the following four sample years at the county level. The sample size was too small at the city level to make valid comparisons in the final two sample years. The proportion difference for Hispanic subjects was significantly negative in all five sample years, and the gap grew greater in three of four sample years at the county level and two of four sample years at the city level (see Tables 16 and 17).
A large White population with other race categories in relatively small proportions in Johnson County meant significance could not be tested in most years for the *Daily Journal* (see Tables 18 and 19).

In the *Great Falls Tribune*, overrepresentation of White subjects increased in three of four sample years at both the county and city levels. The proportion difference for Black subjects in the city of Great Falls was within the confidence interval in the most recent four sample years, while the sample size was too small to make a comparison at the county level in any of the five sample years. At the city level, the proportion differences for Hispanic and American Indian subjects started within the confidence interval in 1980 and 1990, but then were both significantly negative by 2016 (see Tables 20 and 21).

Results from the *Longview News-Journal* more closely follow the overall trends of fluctuating overrepresentation of White subjects, narrowing underrepresentation of Black subjects, and widening underrepresentation of Hispanic subjects. The proportion difference for Black subjects gets less negative and then more positive in all four sample periods at both the city and county levels, resulting in a significant overrepresentation in 2016. The proportion difference grows more negative for Hispanic subjects in all four sample periods at the county level and three of four at the city level. The sample size was too small to make comparisons for the other four race categories (see Tables 22 and 23).

The *Montgomery Advertiser* follows some of the same trends as the overall sample. White subjects are significantly overrepresented in every year at both the county and city levels, but differences decrease in three of the four sample years. Black subjects are significantly underrepresented in all years, but the difference gets less negative in the
same three periods in which the difference for White subjects gets less positive. The changes seen at the county and city levels are not of the same magnitude, as there is greater change from 1980 to 2016 in the county comparisons than in the city comparisons (see Tables 24 and 25).

*The Day* only partially followed the overall trend and had more noticeable differences between the county and city levels. At the county level, the proportion difference for White subjects was within the confidence interval for every year at the county level, while there was significant overrepresentation at the city level in three of five years. The proportion difference for Black subjects in New London County increased in three of four sample periods, with significant overrepresentation in the most recent three years. Underrepresentation of Hispanic subjects fluctuated in the county results but was significantly negative in all five years in the city results, growing more negative in three of the four sample periods (see Tables 26 and 27).

**RQ2a: To what extent are certain races overrepresented or underrepresented in certain kinds of photographs?**

While the proportion of each race category in the sample was compared to Census figures, similar real-world comparisons were not possible for stereotypical roles. Some data on crime and race do exist, but they are not necessarily consistent between municipalities (this is discussed further in Chapter 5). Instead, contingency tables were used to test the null hypothesis that the proportion of each role within each category of race would not differ from that role’s proportion in the overall sample population. Of the three previously identified stereotypical roles, differences in representation along racial lines were seen most often in the role of athlete. Some differences were seen in the role of
criminal, while very few significant differences were seen in the role of entertainer. In the
overall combined sample from all newspapers and all years, the portrayal of individual in
stereotypical roles varied significantly by race \( (\chi^2 (df = 9, N = 13,132) = 418.886, p <
.001) \). White subjects were significantly underrepresented as criminals and athletes, and
overrepresented in other roles, compared to those roles’ proportions in the overall sample
population. The opposite was true of Black subjects. In the overall sample population,
2.5% of subjects were depicted as criminals. Only 1.8 of White subjects were depicted as
criminals, while 6.9% of Black subjects were. Athletes accounted for 19.6% of the White
subjects in local news photos, while 35.1% of Black subjects were depicted as athletes.
Both of these proportions were significantly different form the overall proportion of
athletes in the sample (21.7%). There was no significant difference indicated for the other
categories of race, and no significant difference for the role of entertainer (see Table 28).

Depictions of stereotypical roles also varied significantly by race at all six of the
individual newspapers. In the Alamogordo Daily News, \( (\chi^2 (df = 6, N = 2,109) = 91.905,
p < .001) \) White subjects were underrepresented as criminals and overrepresented in other
roles, while the opposite was true for Black and Hispanic subjects. 17.6% of White
subjects were depicted as athletes, while 51.8% of Black subjects and 27.2% of Hispanic
subjects appeared in the role of athlete (see Table 29). Role also varied significantly by
race at the Daily Journal, \( (\chi^2 (df = 2, N = 1600) = X, p = .001) \), but the only significant
difference was in the collapsed other roles category where White subjects were
overrepresented and non-White subjects were underrepresented (see Table 30).

In the Great Falls Tribune, \( (\chi^2 (df = 2, N = 2,154) = 45.767, p < .001) \) White
subjects were underrepresented in the role of athlete and overrepresented in all other roles
combined, while the opposite was true for Black subjects. 69.4% of black subjects were depicted as athletes, while just 22.3% of White subjects were depicted as athletes (see Table 31). In the *Longview News-Journal*, \(\chi^2(df = 6, N = 2,809) = 288.496, p < .001\) significant differences were indicated for White and Black subjects in all three identified roles. White subjects were underrepresented in the roles of criminal and athlete and overrepresented in the role of entertainer and in the other roles category. The opposite was true of Black subjects, of whom 48.2% were depicted as athletes and 3.3% as criminals, compared to 14.8% and 0.8%, respectively, for White subjects (see Table 32).

In the *Montgomery Advertiser*, \(\chi^2(df = 6, N = 2,749) = 158.474, p < .001\) White subjects were underrepresented as criminals and athletes and overrepresented in the other roles category, while the opposite was true for Black subjects. 10.2% of Black subjects were pictured as criminals, while 1.8% of White subjects were pictured as criminals. Black subjects were pictured as athletes in 24.9% of the representations, compared to 15.5% of White subjects (see Table 33). In *The Day*, \(\chi^2(df = 6, N = 1,711) = 25.440, p < .001\) White subjects were underrepresented as athletes and Black subjects were overrepresented as athletes and underrepresented in other roles (see Table 34).

**H2a**: Minority subjects in local news photos will appear in greater proportions in the role of athlete.

**H2b**: Minority subjects in local news photos will appear in greater proportions in the role of criminal.

**H2c**: Minority subjects in local news photos will appear in greater proportions in the role of entertainer.
There was mixed support for these hypotheses. The results supported the H2a for
the role of athlete both in the overall combined sample and in five of the six newspapers.
In all newspapers except for the *Daily Journal*, Black subjects were pictured significantly
more often as athletes than White subjects. In one newspaper, the *Alamogordo Daily
News*, Hispanic subjects were also pictured more frequently as athletes. Support for the
H2b regarding the role of criminal was mixed. There was a significant difference between
White and Black subjects in the overall sample, with Black subjects pictured more
frequently as criminals, but there was evidence for this disparity at only two of the six
newspapers. There was no support for H2c when considering the role of entertainer. The
only newspaper with a significant difference in the role of entertainer was the *Longview
News-Journal*, in which White subjects appeared more often and Black subjects appeared
less often as entertainers.

**RQ2b: How has this representation changed over time?**

In the overall sample, role depictions differed significantly by race in four out of
five sample years. The difference was not significant in 2000. In each of the four other
sample years, White subjects were underrepresented in the role of athletes and
overrepresented in the other roles category compared to those roles’ proportions in the
overall sample population. In those same years, non-White subjects were overrepresented
as athletes and underrepresented in the other roles category, compared to the proportions
in the overall sample population. In 2016, the only year with a significant difference in
the depiction of criminals, White subjects were underrepresented and Black subjects were
overrepresented as criminals (see Tables 35-39).
In individual newspapers, whenever there was a significant difference in depiction of athletes or criminals, White subjects were underrepresented and either Black or Hispanic subjects were overrepresented. A significant difference in the role of entertainer was seen in only one year in one newspaper. In the Alamogordo Daily News, no significant differences were found in the first three sample years. In 2000 and 2016, significant differences were seen for the role of athlete (see Tables 40-44). In the Daily Journal, there were significant results in the years 1990 and 2016 only. In 1990, depictions were significantly different for the role of athlete. In 2016, an overall difference was seen, but none of the differences in individual race/role combinations were statistically significant (see Tables 45-49). Similarly, at the Great Falls Tribune, a significant difference for athletes was seen in 1980, and only an overall difference was seen in 2010. All three other sample years had no significant difference (see Tables 50-54).

In the Longview News-Journal, the results showed significant differences in all five sample years. In each year, there was a significant difference in the role of athlete, and in 2011 White subjects were seen significantly more often in the role of entertainer (see Tables 55-59). Significant differences were also found in every sample year in the Montgomery Advertiser. In 1980, 1990, 2010 and 2016, differences were significant for the role of athlete, and in 2010 and 2016, differences were significant in the role of criminal (see tables 60-64). Finally, in The Day, there was no significant difference in four out of five years. The only significant difference seen was for Black subjects in the role of athlete in 2010 (see tables 65-69).

Other roles
News photo subjects that were not pictured as one of the three previously identified stereotypical roles, (coded as “other”) were given a descriptive identification of the role in which they were pictured. No statistical tests were performed as no specific coding scheme was formulated for this category. The most frequent other role in the overall sample (N = 13,132) was student, which accounted for 11.6% of all local news photo subjects. Student was also the top other role for White (11.4% of subjects within race category), Black (10.3%), Hispanic (16.8%) and Asian (25%) subjects. The most frequent other role among all American Indian subjects (N = 71) was event participant (33.8%). White subjects appeared more frequently in the role of businessperson (8%) than Black subjects (1.6%) or Hispanic subjects (2%). White (8%) and Hispanic (7.2%) subjects were pictured more frequently than Black subjects (1.8%) as members of social, fraternal, or other organizations. Black subjects were pictured more frequently in religious roles like clergy and worshipper (3.6%) than White (2.2%) and Hispanic (2.5%) subjects. Hispanic subjects were pictured more frequently in the role of worker (7.1%) than Black (1.3%) or White (1.7%) (see Tables 70-72). Descriptions for these roles were developed during coding and may be imprecise. Specific definitions for other roles would have to be developed and individuals would have to be re-coded before statistical analysis could be performed.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

This research aimed to examine whether racial minorities are symbolically annihilated through exclusion from local newspapers, and whether those minorities that do appear in local newspaper photographs are framed more frequently in stereotypical roles. The main findings of this research are:

- White subjects appear more frequently in local newspaper photos than they do in the local population, while non-White subjects appear less frequently.
- While overrepresentation of White subjects was apparent at five of six newspapers, underrepresentation of Black subjects was only found at two newspapers.
- Proportional representation of Black subjects appears to have improved over time, while the underrepresentation gap for Hispanic subjects has grown.
- Black subjects are overrepresented in the role of athlete, while White subjects are overrepresented in other (not athlete, criminal or entertainer) roles.
- Black subjects are overall overrepresented in the role of criminal, but only at two of six newspapers.

Unequal and stereotype-laden news coverage of racial groups in the United States has been recognized as a problem since at least the 1940s, when the Commission on Freedom of the Press (1947) described newspapers and other mass media as the “principal agents in creating and perpetuating these conventional conceptions” (p. 26). This study finds that, to an extent, this is still true. Overall, the evidence supports H1a: the percentage of White subjects in local newspaper photos is greater than the percentage
of White people in the local population, and H1b: the percentage of subjects from minority groups in local newspaper photos is less than their percentages in the local population. The evidence supports H2a and H2b: minority subjects in local news photos appear in greater proportions in the role of athlete and criminal, but does not support H2c: that minority subjects appear in greater proportions in the role of entertainer. The findings were more mixed when considering individual publications or individual years.

Black subjects were depicted as criminals and athletes with greater frequency than that with which they appeared in the overall sample of local news photos, while the opposite was true for White subjects. These findings support the idea that racial minorities in local newspapers are subject to symbolic annihilation: they are represented less frequently than White subjects, and when they are represented, they are more often confined to stereotypical roles. The Commission on Freedom of the Press wrote that “responsible performance here simply means that the images repeated and emphasized be such as are in total representative of the social group as it is” (p. 26). This study finds that the images that readers see in the local newspaper are not representative. Framing theory describes how images presented in the mass media inform people’s mental pictures of reality. People make decisions based upon these mental images, and not upon reality itself, so framing that is inaccurate or not representative of reality may have negative effects on society. The Commission on Freedom of the Press (1947) echoed this idea, writing “when the images they portray fail to present the social group truly, they tend to pervert judgment” (p. 26). Stereotypes that are conveyed visually have more impact than those conveyed through words (Fiske, 1998) and the results suggest that local newspaper photographs do, to an extent, perpetuate racial stereotypes. On an individual level, these
stereotypical portrayals may cause the viewer, when he or she encounters a member of the stereotyped group, to assign the groups’ assumed characteristics to that person (Brown, 2010). So, a newspaper reader who repeatedly encounters visual representations of Black criminals may encounter a Black person in real life and assume that person is likely to be a criminal. More broadly though, these stereotypical depictions can reinforce society’s unequal power structure, reinforcing low social status for racial minority groups while maintaining the positions of power for the White majority (Pescosolido, Grauerholz & Milkie, 1997; Fiske, 1998; Brown, 2010). Black subjects’ overrepresentation as athletes represents an “enlightened racist view” (Hardin, Chance & Waldorf, 2004, p. 223) that athletic pursuits are the only way in which a Black person can excel. This again may reinforce an unequal power dynamic in which White people in positions of power deny opportunities to Black people, and Black children grow up with the perception that they have limited opportunities for advancement outside the realm of athletics (Harrison, 2001).

This study employed the “interreality” comparison used by Dixon (2017) and Dixon and Linz (2000a & 2000b) to compare overall representation of race, but not for representation in stereotypical roles. The chi-square tests in this study compare the results against the null hypothesis that there is no difference along racial lines in depictions of the stereotypical roles of criminal, athlete and entertainer. The test assumes that accurate representation means that categories of race would be distributed within each role category in the same proportion in which they appear in the overall sample population of photographic subjects. In reality, this may not be the case. For example, Dixon (2017) found that Black and Latino suspects made up a higher proportion of total arrests than
White suspects did. So, it is possible that the overrepresentation of Black photo subjects as criminals is an accurate reflection of reality. Dixon (2017) used crime statistics from the California Department of Justice that listed Hispanic as an ethnicity mutually exclusive from the categories of White, Black, and Other. But reporting of offenders’ race and ethnicity is not uniform across the country (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2017). Connecticut, for example, reports offenders’ races in the categories of White, Black, Asian, Indian and Unknown, with no accounting for Hispanic Ethnicity (Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection, 2017). Alabama’s annual crime report breaks down the race of offenders by type of crime, but not by county (Alabama Law Enforcement Agency, 2017). In order to make a valid “interreality” comparison, raw data from each municipality to be studied would have to be acquired, and a separate coding scheme that matched the categories reported in each state or county would need to be developed. For the roles of athlete and entertainer, no available data was found for real-world measures of participation in these roles at the local level by category of race. This lack of a real-world basis for comparison does not necessarily invalidate the argument that Black subjects are being symbolically annihilated when their depictions are confined to a few stereotypical roles. Of all Black subjects appearing in local newspaper photos, 42% were pictured as either a criminal or an athlete, a significantly greater proportion than the 21.4% of White subjects in those two categories ($\chi^2(df = 1, N = 12,454) = 336.653, p < .001$).

The overall findings are in line with previous studies of the news media that found that non-White subjects are underrepresented in news coverage (DeLouth, Person, Hitchcock & Rienzi, 1995), Black subjects are overrepresented as athletes (Hardin, Dodd,
Chance, & Walsdorf, 2004), and as criminals (Dixon, 2017; Dixon & Linz, 2000a & 2000b). However, these findings differed from newspaper to newspaper. The stereotype of the Black athlete is the one that is most frequently perpetuated. Athlete was the most common role for White, Black and Hispanic subjects, but Black subjects appeared as athletes 35% of the time, the greatest frequency for any category of race. This was found in most newspapers and in most years. Overrepresentation of Black subjects in the role of criminal was significant in the overall sample, but was significant in the combined sample at only two of six newspapers. This can perhaps be explained by the difference in visual emphasis on crime reporting between newspapers and television news. Dixon (2017) found that crime was the subject of about 30% of television news stories in the Los Angeles market. In this study, only 2.5% of the subjects of local news photos were criminals, so in many cases the number of individuals in the category of criminal was too small to determine statistical significance. Further research with a larger sample focusing specifically on photographic depictions of criminals would be needed to make valid comparisons at the individual newspaper level. Lester (1994) identified entertainer as one of the stereotypical roles in which Black subjects were portrayed in a long-term study of four U.S. newspapers. This study found no evidence to support the overrepresentation of any race in the role of entertainer, with the exception of White subjects in one year at one newspaper. Overall, Black subjects were depicted as entertainers slightly more frequently than White subjects (see Tables 70 and 71), but this difference was not statistically significant. In many years, the number of individuals in the role of entertainer was too small to determine statistical significance. Lester’s study spanned 55 years, so it is possible that a larger sample size would yield different results.
The Kerner Commission’s goal of expanded coverage of Black subjects in the community seems to have been met to some extent at five of the studied newspapers, where by 2016 no significant underrepresentation of Black subjects was found. Three newspapers – the Alamogordo Daily News, the Longview News-Journal, and The Day – overrepresented their counties’ Black population in 2016. Only the Montgomery Advertiser showed significant underrepresentation of Black subjects. Underrepresentation appears to be a greater issue with Hispanic subjects. In all six of the counties that were studied, the population proportion of Hispanic subjects grew from 1980 to 2016. This population growth was not reflected in most of the newspapers studied. The underrepresentation gaps for Hispanic subjects grew by 13.8 percentage points during that time period in the Alamogordo Daily News coverage of Otero County (see Table 16) and by 11.2 percentage points in the Longview News-Journal coverage of Gregg County (see Table 22). The Day’s representation of Hispanic subjects in New London County was within the confidence interval in the years 2000 and 2016 (see Table 26). But underrepresentation of Hispanic subjects in the city of New London, where Hispanic residents were estimated at 32.1% of the population in 2016 (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c), grew by nine percentage points between 1980 and 2016 (see Table 27). In terms of overall representation, it seems that some progress has been made in the depiction of Black subjects at some newspapers, but White subjects continue to be overrepresented and Hispanic subjects are becoming more underrepresented.

The results raise several questions about the differences among the six newspapers studied. Why, for instance, is The Day the only newspaper that depicted the White population of the county accurately and overrepresented the Black population
while the *Montgomery Advertiser* is the only newspaper that significantly
underrepresented the Black population in the county? There are a number of differences
between the two publications. *The Day* is independently owned, while the *Montgomery
Advertiser* is part of a chain of newspapers owned by the Gannett corporation. It is
possible that an independent newsroom has more freedom to adapt its coverage while a
corporate newsroom has chain-wide structures in place that make changes more difficult
to accomplish. If this were true, similar results might have been seen at the *Alamogordo
Daily News* and the *Great Falls Tribune*, both of which are owned by Gannett. Kovach
and Rosenstiel (2007) criticized news organizations for targeting their coverage toward
more affluent subscribers. The influence of the business side of the company could be a
factor in how race gets depicted. It is also possible that location is a factor. The
population of New London County is spread across many towns with only 10% in the
small city of New London, while 89% of Montgomery County’s population is clustered
in the city of Montgomery, the state capital. Differences in local politics or the
newspapers’ editorial positions could also be a factor.

The makeup of newsroom staffs could also play a role in the way newspapers
depict race in the communities they cover. In a time of shrinking staff sizes, it is possible
that certain newsrooms have fewer reporters available to cover the kind of stories that
would present a more representative picture of the community. Bissell (2000) suggested
that news coverage could be influenced by inherent biases like a preference for
interactions with people more like ourselves. So, the content of the news, and of news
photographs specifically, may end up reflecting the people creating the content instead of
the community being covered. A survey by the American Society of News Editors (2017)
found that the newsroom staff of the *Montgomery Advertiser* is 84% White, 50 percentage points greater than the proportion of White residents in the city of Montgomery. The proportion of White newsroom employees at the *Longview News-Journal* is 46 percentage points greater than in the local population, while there is only one percentage point difference at the *Great Falls Tribune*. At the *Alamogordo Daily News*, the proportion of White newsroom employees is 30 percentage points below the proportion in the local population. The *Daily Journal* and *The Day* were not included in the survey. Combining the ASME survey with the method used in this study could determine whether there is a correlation between newsroom diversity and the accuracy of photographic depictions of race.

**Limitations and further research**

Race in the United States Census is self-identified. It is not determined by an outside observer. While the U.S. Census Bureau defines categories of race based on people’s origins in specific geographical regions, individuals are not required to follow the definitions laid out by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-b). Hispanic origin further complicates study of race and ethnicity. Past research considered Hispanic/Latino to be a distinct category of race (Clawson & Trice, 2000; Dixon, 2017; Poindexter, 2003), but the Census Bureau considers Hispanic origin to be an ethnicity that can encompass any category of race (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-a). The Census asks respondents to identify their race and to indicate whether or not they are of Hispanic origin. In doing so, the Census makes an attempt to more accurately describe people’s racial and ethnic backgrounds, but it risks confusing respondents and failing to differentiate between ancestral origin and street race – the race people assume you belong
to based on visible characteristics (Lopez, 2018). For example, Barack Obama, who has a White mother and Black father, famously selected only Black on his 2010 census questionnaire, when he could have selected White, Black and White, or the category “some other race” (Roberts & Baker, 2010). Some also argue that the categories of race as laid out by the Census Bureau are wholly deficient and have not kept up with modern society in a time of diversifying immigration and intermarriage (National Research Council, 1995). The current questionnaire fails to accurately portray the growing number of families that form across racial and ethnic lines (Alba, 2018), and it lumps together a range of ethnicities under the category of Asian (Fiske, 1998). This study relies mostly on visual information, assigning a street race to individuals pictured in newspaper photos. This method may not accurately reflect individuals’ geographic, ancestral or ethnic heritage. A more accurate method would be a survey, or series of interviews, asking individuals to self-identify their race, but this would pose logistical difficulties. It would likely be impossible to study a sample of over 13,000 subjects across 36 years and six disparate locations, and a subject’s self-identified race would not necessarily come across in a newspaper photograph. The visual information used in this study is the same information that a newspaper reader would be exposed to and upon which they would base their judgements.

The six newspapers in this study were selected based on differences in geography, ownership and the racial makeup of the local population. The corresponding six counties are not necessarily representative of the overall United States population. In particular, Hispanic residents made up an estimated 11% of the U.S. population in 2016 (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c), but were only 6.3% of the combined population of the six
counties studied. Asian residents made up an estimated 6.2% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c), but only 1% of the population in the study. Including newspapers that report on communities with larger Hispanic and Asian populations would make the results more generalizable to the overall U.S. population. The low population proportions of the American Indian and Pacific Islander prevented statistical comparisons in many cases. A larger sample size would be required in order to generate valid results for these smaller populations.

Content analysis can only describe and compare news frames. It cannot assess the reasons behind framing choices or the effects of framing on the audience (Bell, 2001). Instead, causes and effects can only be inferred (Entman, 1994). This study describes the inaccurate framing of race in local newspaper photographs but does not answer questions of how or why news framing decisions are made, or what their effects on the audience are. Qualitative analysis, like surveys and interviews with journalists and audience members could help answer some of these questions. A broader study of more local newspapers could determine whether there is a correlation between any of the factors mentioned above – ownership, location, the diversity of the newsroom staff, the political leanings of the editorial page – and the inaccurate representation of certain racial groups. If journalists are truly interested in presenting an accurate reflection of their community, examining the reasons why some news outlets are more successful than others could provide valuable insight.

A journalist confronted with an accounting of inequity in their publication’s reporting might respond by claiming that they can’t control the race of the person in the news – the president, the mayor, the accused criminal – whom they are assigned to cover
(Gallagher, 2001). It could be informative to develop a coding scheme that attempts to quantify the degree of choice that a journalist has in selecting who appears in the newspaper. One category could be developed for subjects whose inclusion is dictated by their position in society or the events of the day: the politician running for office, the first responder rescuing a child from a house fire, the suspect being arraigned for a homicide, or the athlete who scored the game-winning goal. A second category would encompass subjects where the photographer, reporter or editor was mostly responsible for the decision of whom to include: the artist or business owner profiled in a feature story, or the child attending an event among hundreds of others. Such a coding scheme, combined with qualitative interviews with newsroom staff that explore the reasons behind the choices they make, might help better measure and explain the choices made by journalists with regard to racial representation.

This quantitative measure of newspaper photo depictions of race looked at three broad categories of stereotypical depictions but did not attempt to make qualitative judgements about the depictions of race. Further qualitative measures of photographic representation could also be made. Allport (1954) criticized newspapers for focusing only on crimes committed by Black suspects and not on the achievements of Black members of the community. Clawson and Trice (2000) studied depictions of Black poverty and Kahle, Nan, and Whiteside, (2007) studied depictions of Black victimhood. The question of “in what role is the subject depicted?” could be rephrased as “is the subject depicted for a positive or negative reason?” Race could also be considered as a reason for inclusion in the newspaper. Heider (2000) found that coverage of minority subjects was often focused around cultural events. While this was not part of the original coding
scheme, images of American Indian subjects at tribal celebrations, Black subjects at civil rights memorials, and Asian subjects in stories about immigrants appeared often enough to suggest that more rigorous study is warranted.

**Conclusion**

Gerbner’s (1972) initial criticism about symbolic annihilation of certain groups in the mass media focused on depictions in television drama, a medium that makes no claim to accurately represent reality. The news media, on the other hand, holds accuracy and inclusion among its basic responsibilities to the communities it serves. Tuchman (1978) argued that compared to outlets that produce drama and fiction, newspapers specifically should be more responsive to societal changes given their proximity to a smaller local population. Kovach and Rosenstiel (2007) wrote that citizens should be able see themselves in the pages of their local newspaper, but this study suggests that is not always true. Hall (1986) argued that this is a problem for our society, as some people are left on the margin, while others are always represented in the news media, giving them the ability to define the political and social agenda and set the terms of the public conversation:

> If you are white, male, a businessman or a politician or a professional or a celebrity, your chances of getting represented will be very high. If you are black, or a woman without social status, or poor or working class or gay or powerless because you are marginal you will always have to fight to get heard or seen. (p. 9)

Even though outside groups, from academic researchers to government commissions, have identified unequal coverage of race as a problem facing the American news media,
Martindale and Dunlop suggest that stereotypes still control much of the decision making in newsrooms:

The staggeringly tenacious hold that stereotypes of African Americans have on white perceptions still controls coverage to a large extent. Until these stereotypes are abandoned, white-owned media cannot begin to provide accurate coverage that will help interpret the various segments of American society to each other and help close the widening black-white schism in this nation. (p.131)

If it is the duty of the press to present a fair and accurate picture of all members of society (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968), and to ensure that “if people are exposed to the inner truth of the life of a particular group, they will gradually build up respect for and understanding of it” (Commission on Freedom of the Press, 1947, p. 27), then perhaps journalists need to reexamine their biases and the structures and decision-making processes of news organizations. Gallagher (2001) suggests that the journalist who claims that he or she has no control over the race of a newsmaker ought to reexamine the standard of newsworthiness, providing less of a voice to politicians and others in power, and more of a voice to ordinary citizens. “The structure of access is systematically skewed in relation to certain social categories” (Hall, 1986, p. 9), so the White politicians, business owners and social club presidents, who are frequently in touch with members of the newsroom, continue to dominate the pages of local newspapers, while the growing populations of Black and Hispanic residents in the community continue to be underrepresented or ignored. There is no tenet of journalism that requires a newspaper to publish a headshot of the mayor every time he is quoted in a story, or to publish a mugshot of every suspect arrested by the local police department. While each
individual photograph is a depiction of some piece of reality, the overall mosaic formed
journalists rely on stereotypes is not an accurate reflection of the whole picture. The
history of the mass media symbolically annihilating certain groups has been well
established. The news media has been complicit in portraying certain social groups as the
other and “rendering them speechless” (Cottle, 2007, p.46), but it also offers a platform
the by which the “‘other’ can be symbolically rehabilitated” (Cottle, 2007, p.46) by
allowing them to be recognized and giving them a voice.
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Appendix A

Coding instructions

Code every individual human subject of a local news photograph. For this study, photographs are defined as images created with a camera depicting a real-world scene. Maps, drawings, cartoons, illustrations and graphics should not be coded. Exclude photos with no human subject.

News photographs are defined as any photograph that acts as a piece of visual reporting in which one or more journalists, including photographers, editors, reporters and designers, made a decision about how and whether to publish the photograph. These could include photographs that are paired with a written story, or “standalone” photographs that are published without a related story. For this research, news photos need not be limited to the news section, but will also include sports, arts, business and features photos. News photographs may come from news staff, freelancers or wire services, or they may be submitted by some outside entity for inclusion in a story.

Photographs in advertisements and obituaries should not be coded, as they are paid placements that are not generated by journalists in the newsroom. Photographs included with news obituaries should be coded if the obituary story has a byline from a member of the news staff and the story is clearly separate from the paid obituaries section.

News photographs will be defined as “local” and should be coded if any of the following conditions are met:

- photo has a staff byline
- photo has no byline, freelance byline, contributed byline or other non-wire service byline, but appears with an article that has a staff byline, or a local
brief with no byline, (these may include “headshots” of the people in a story or brief including but not limited to local officials, police mugshots and business profiles) with the following exceptions:

- Do not code contributed photos of performers or speakers that accompany a preview article unless the people in the photo are clearly described as local.

- Do not code uncredited “headshots” of elected officials at the level of statewide office or national office (governor, U.S. representative, U.S. senator, president)

If the photograph is obviously not local, like a wire photo from another state or country, it should be excluded. Photographs from outside the local coverage area that include a local person, such as a local resident serving overseas, should be coded.

Do not code:

- photos with a wire service byline (unless the subject of the photo is clearly identified as local)

- photos with a byline from another publication (unless the subject of the photo is clearly identified as local)

- photos with a story that has a byline from a wire service or another publication, unless the photo has a staff byline or the subjects are clearly described as local

- photos in national magazine sections like *Parade* or *USA Weekend*

- photos in advertising or marketing sections that are not produced by the newsroom
For this research the subject of the photograph is defined as the individual or individuals who are most prominent, dominant, largest, centered, active, in focus, on most visible. For photographs with groups of people, the coder should identify the most prominent subjects, up to eight individuals of equal prominence. For large groups in which no individual is the focus of the image or is more prominent than the others, location and role should not be coded and 99 for “not coded/unable to determine” should be entered in the race/ethnicity field (10), with an explanation entered in the other role field (12). The coder should first identify the individual subjects of the photograph and then fill out data for each subject. Do not code location or role for photographs in which the race of all individuals is undeterminable due to size of photo, size of individuals within photo, lighting, or other issue of quality. Enter 99 in race/ethnicity field (10) and explanation in other field (12). Exclude historical photos or artwork that appears in photos.

In each newspaper issue, the coder will start on the front page, moving from top to bottom, and code individuals in each photo from left to right, moving through subsequent pages in order.

**Category-specific instructions**

1: **Coder.** Enter first and last initials of the coder.

2: **Newspaper name.** The name of the newspaper, found at the top of the front page of the issue.

   1= *Alamogordo Daily News*

   2= *Daily Journal* (Franklin, IN)

   3= *Great Falls Tribune*
4= Longview News-Journal

5= Montgomery Advertiser

6= The Day (New London, CT)


4: Newspaper month. (1-12) Found at the top of the front page or the top corner of inside pages.

5: Newspaper day. (1-31) Found at the top of the front page or the top corner of inside pages.

6: Newspaper day of week.

7: Newspaper section.

8: Newspaper page number.

9: Town. If geographic information is not apparent in the caption of the photo, look to accompanying story for the information. Coder should enter the individual’s town of residence. If residence is not indicated, coder should attempt to determine an associated town based on place of work or school if such information is apparent. If no geographical information specific to the individual is apparent, use the location where the photos was taken, or the location where the story was reported. For older newspaper issues where the individual’s address is given but the town is not, assume that the location is the city or town where the newspaper is located (New London for The Day, Franklin for the Daily Journal, etc.). If the individual is an out of town visitor, speaker, or performer, or is otherwise clearly not local, use “not local.” If the individual is from a major college outside the newspaper’s local coverage area, (University of Connecticut, University of
Alabama, Auburn University, etc.) use “college.” If no geographical information is present, use “unable to determine.”


1= Alamogordo
2= Franklin
3= Great Falls
4= Longview
5= Montgomery
6= New London
7= Other local
99= Unable to determine/not local/college/otherwise excluded.

11: County. Enter text for the county in which town in field 9 is located. Leave blank if county is unknown at time of initial coding. County information will be added all at once based on locations listed in Census reports.

12: County code. Enter 1-2 digit code for county in field 11.

1= Otero
2= Johnson
3= Cascade
4= Gregg
5= Montgomery
6= New London
7= Other local
99= Not local/otherwise excluded
13: **Race/ethnicity.** If visual appearance is insufficient to identify subject’s race, refer to caption or article text for mention of subject’s race. If subject’s facial features are visible, but the coder cannot confidently determine race, use “other.” If the race of one of the dominant subjects is not apparent because of lighting, clothing or some other reason obscuring the subject’s features, use 99 for “not coded/unable to determine.” If the photo is of a large group with more than eight equally prominent subjects, use 99 for “not coded/unable to determine.” If 99 is entered, enter reason for not coding race in field 14.

1=White (not Hispanic/Latino)
2=Black or African American (not Hispanic/Latino)
3=Hispanic/Latino
4=American Indian and Alaska Native
5=Asian
6=Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
7= Other
99=Not coded/unable to determine.

14: **Reason for not coding race.** If 99 was entered in field 13, enter reason for not coding race (dark reproduction, face obscured, group, etc.)

15: **Role.** Criminal includes suspect of crime, arrested individual, court defendant, and prisoner. Athlete includes current athlete, former athlete, and coach. Athletes may be involved in physical competitions, or in physical fitness activities. Entertainer includes any artist or performer whose role is to entertain an audience.

1=Criminal
2=Athlete
3=Entertainer

99=Other/None of the above

**16: Other role.** If the individual does not fit into one of the roles in field number 15, coder should enter a one- to two-word description of the role in which the individual is depicted.
Coding Sheet

1. Coder (two-letter initials) ________
2. Newspaper name (one-digit code) _______
   1= Alamogordo Daily News
   2= Daily Journal (Franklin, IN)
   3= Great Falls Tribune
   4= Longview News-Journal
   5= Montgomery Advertiser
   6= The Day (New London, CT)
3. Newspaper year (four-digit numeral) _________________
4. Newspaper month (two-digit numeral) ________________
5. Newspaper day (two-digit numeral) ________________
6. Newspaper day of week (text) ______________
7. Newspaper section (letter of section, if no letter is present enter name of section, if a one-section paper, enter “main”) ___________
8. Page number (two-digit numeral) __________
9. Town (enter text of town name, or “not local,” “college,” or 99 if unable to determine) __________________________
10. Town code_______
    1= Alamogordo
    2= Franklin
    3= Great Falls
    4= Longview
5= Montgomery
6= New London
7= Other local
99= Not local/college/otherwise excluded

11. County (enter text based on list of locations from Census)

____________________________________

12. County code

1= Otero
2= Johnson
3= Cascade
4= Gregg
5= Montgomery
6= New London
7= Other local
99= Not local/otherwise excluded

13. Individual’s race/ethnicity

1= White (not Hispanic/Latino)
2= Black or African American (not Hispanic/Latino)
3= Hispanic/Latino
4= American Indian and Alaska Native
5= Asian
6= Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
7= Other
99=Not coded/unable to determine. Enter the reason for not coding in field 14

14. Reason for not coding race (text description: face obscured, large group, too small, poor reproduction, etc.) ______________

15. Role________
   1=Criminal
   2=Athlete
   3=Entertainer
   99=Other/None of the above (enter other role in field 16)

16. Other role (text description) __________________________________________
Appendix B

Table 1

*Intercoder Reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>kalpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper name</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper year</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper month</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper day</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper section</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper page</td>
<td>0.9907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>0.9896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>0.9606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>0.8472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>0.9417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Comparison of County Population Proportions in All Newspapers, All Years Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>10.3*</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>-5.2*</td>
<td>±0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-2.6*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-0.7*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-1.1*</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-0.6*</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 11,279. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. 2011 figures used in place of 2010 for Gregg County and the *Longview News-Journal* due to poor photo reproduction in 2010.


<sup>b</sup> Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Otero, Johnson, Cascade, Gregg, Montgomery and New London counties in all sample years.

<sup>c</sup> Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

<sup>d</sup> Sample too small to assume normal distribution

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval
Table 3

*Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Alamogordo Daily News, All Years Combined*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>21.8*</td>
<td>±1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>±1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>-16.4*</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-5.1*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-1.2*</td>
<td>±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Note</sup>. N = 2,050. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.

<sup>a</sup> Percentage of each race category living in Otero County in all sample years. (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982e, 1992e, 2002e, and 2012e).

<sup>b</sup> Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Otero County in all sample years.

<sup>c</sup> Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

<sup>d</sup> Sample too small to assume normal distribution

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-2.0*</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-1.0*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-0.4*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 1,476. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.*

*a* Percentage of each race category living in Johnson County in all sample years. (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982c, 1992c, 2002c, and 2012c).

*b* Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Johnson County in all sample years.

*c* Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*d* Sample too small to assume normal distribution

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval*
Table 5

Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Great Falls Tribune, All Years

Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %(^a)</th>
<th>News %(^b)</th>
<th>Difference(^c)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>5.3*</td>
<td>±1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-2.0*</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-2.7*</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-0.5*</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander(^d)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-0.7*</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 1,689\). CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.

\(^a\) Percentage of each race category living in Cascade County in all sample years. (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982d, 1992d, 2002d, and 2012d).

\(^b\) Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Cascade County in all sample years.

\(^c\) Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

\(^d\) Sample too small to assume normal distribution

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval
Table 6

Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Longview News-Journal, All Years Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %a</th>
<th>News %b</th>
<th>Difference c</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>14.2*</td>
<td>±1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>-5.4*</td>
<td>±1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-7.9*</td>
<td>±0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indiand</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-0.5*</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islanderd</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 2,271. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. 2011 figures used in place of 2010 for Gregg County and the Longview News-Journal due to poor reproduction in 2010.

a Percentage of each race category living in combined population of Gregg County in all sample years (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982f, 1992f, 2002f, and 2012f).

b Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Gregg County in all sample years.

c Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

d Sample too small to assume normal distribution

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval
Table 7

Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Montgomery Advertiser, All Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>18.2*</td>
<td>±2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>-15.5*</td>
<td>±2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-1.8*</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-0.6*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 2,203. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.*

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of each race category living in combined population of Montgomery County in all sample years (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982f, 1992f, 2002f, and 2012f).

<sup>b</sup>Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Montgomery County in all sample years.

<sup>c</sup>Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

<sup>d</sup>Sample too small to assume normal distribution

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval
Table 8  

*Comparison of County Population Proportions in The Day, All Years Combined*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>±1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td>±1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>-2.6*</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-1.0*</td>
<td>±0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-1.4*</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 1,590. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.*

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of each race category living in combined population New London County in all sample years (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982f, 1992f, 2002f, and 2012f).

<sup>b</sup>Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in New London County in all sample years.

<sup>c</sup>Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

<sup>d</sup>Sample too small to assume normal distribution.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 9

Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Alamogordo Daily News, All Years

Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %a</th>
<th>News %b</th>
<th>Differencec</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>17.9*</td>
<td>±2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>±1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>-15.7*</td>
<td>±1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.8*</td>
<td>±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-1.5*</td>
<td>±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-0.7*</td>
<td>±0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 1,450. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.

a Percentage of each race category living in Alamogordo in all sample years. (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982e, 1992e, 2002e, and 2012e).
b Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Alamogordo in all sample years.
c Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.
d Sample too small to assume normal distribution
*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval
Table 10

Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Daily Journal, All Years Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>2.1*</td>
<td>±1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 575. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.

<sup>a</sup> Percentage of each race category living in Franklin in all sample years. (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982c, 1992c, 2002c, and 2012c).

<sup>b</sup> Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Franklin in all sample years.

<sup>c</sup> Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

<sup>d</sup> Sample too small to assume normal distribution.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 11

Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Great Falls Tribune, All Years

Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %(^a)</th>
<th>News %(^b)</th>
<th>Difference(^c)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>6.0*</td>
<td>±1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-1.9*</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-3.7*</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-0.5*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander(^d)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-0.9*</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 1,469. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.*

\(^a\)Percentage of each race category living in Great Falls in all sample years. (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982d, 1992d, 2002d, and 2012d).

\(^b\)Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Great Falls in all sample years.

\(^c\)Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

\(^d\)Sample too small to assume normal distribution

\(*\)Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval
Table 12

*Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Longview News-Journal, All Years*

**Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>16.4*</td>
<td>±1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>-6.8*</td>
<td>±1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>-8.3*</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.6*</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 1,854. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. 2011 figures used in place of 2010 for Longview and the Longview News-Journal due to poor reproduction in 2010.*

<sup>a</sup> Percentage of each race category living in combined population of Longview in all sample years (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982f, 1992f, and 2002f).

<sup>b</sup> Percentage of each race category in local news photos in Longview in all sample years.

<sup>c</sup> Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

<sup>d</sup> Sample too small to assume normal distribution

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval*
Table 13

*Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Montgomery Advertiser, All Years*

**Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>21.1*</td>
<td>±2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>-18.0*</td>
<td>±2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-1.9*</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-0.7*</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.4*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 1,421. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.*

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of each race category living in combined population of Montgomery in all sample years (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982a, 1992a, 2002a, and 2012a).

<sup>b</sup>Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Montgomery in all sample years.

<sup>c</sup>Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

<sup>d</sup>Sample too small to assume normal distribution

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval
Table 14

Comparison of City Population Proportions in The Day, All Years Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>16.6*</td>
<td>±3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>±3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>-13.0*</td>
<td>±2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-2.2*</td>
<td>±0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 446. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding.

<sup>a</sup> Percentage of each race category living in combined population New London in all sample years (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982b, 1992b, 2002b, and 2012b).

<sup>b</sup> Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in New London in all sample years.

<sup>c</sup> Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

<sup>d</sup> Sample too small to assume normal distribution.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 15

Comparison of County Population Proportions in All Newspapers Combined, Year by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>9.9*</td>
<td>6.6*</td>
<td>7.4*</td>
<td>11.7*</td>
<td>11.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±1.1</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
<td>±1.8</td>
<td>±1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-10.2*</td>
<td>-5.7*</td>
<td>-2.0*</td>
<td>-4.4*</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
<td>±1.3</td>
<td>±1.4</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
<td>±1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-2.8*</td>
<td>-3.7*</td>
<td>-6.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
<td>±1.0</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.7*</td>
<td>-0.9*</td>
<td>-0.8*</td>
<td>-0.8*</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.1</td>
<td>±0.0</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.6*</td>
<td>-0.8*</td>
<td>-1.7*</td>
<td>-1.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.9*</td>
<td>-1.1*</td>
<td>-1.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 11,279. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution. 2011 figures used in place of 2010 for Gregg County and the Longview News-Journal due to poor photo reproduction in 2010.


\( b \) Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Otero, Johnson, Cascade, Gregg, Montgomery and New London counties.

\( c \) Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

* Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
### Table 16

**Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Alamogordo Daily News, Year by Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differencec</td>
<td>16.8*</td>
<td>14.6*</td>
<td>23.2*</td>
<td>20.3*</td>
<td>18.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±2.7</td>
<td>±3.7</td>
<td>±3.8</td>
<td>±5.3</td>
<td>±7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differencec</td>
<td>-3.1*</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±1</td>
<td>±2</td>
<td>±2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differencec</td>
<td>-8.4*</td>
<td>-9.3*</td>
<td>-20.0*</td>
<td>-15.4*</td>
<td>-22.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±2.5</td>
<td>±3.2</td>
<td>±3.1</td>
<td>±4.7</td>
<td>±5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differencec</td>
<td>-4.7*</td>
<td>-5.0*</td>
<td>-4.1*</td>
<td>-5.9*</td>
<td>-5.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0</td>
<td>±1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differencec</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differencec</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differencec</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 2,050. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.

a Percentage of each race category living in Otero County (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982e, 1992e, 2002e, 2012e).

b Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Otero County.

c Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 17

Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Alamogordo Daily News, Year by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Year 1980</th>
<th>Year 1990</th>
<th>Year 2000</th>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Year 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>15.7*</td>
<td>10.7*</td>
<td>22.0*</td>
<td>12.4*</td>
<td>11.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±3</td>
<td>±4.8</td>
<td>±4.8</td>
<td>±6.6</td>
<td>±8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-3.3*</td>
<td>1.7*</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±1.1</td>
<td>±3</td>
<td>±3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-11.5*</td>
<td>-10.4*</td>
<td>-21.0*</td>
<td>-10.6*</td>
<td>-18.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±2.7</td>
<td>±4</td>
<td>±3.7</td>
<td>±5.8</td>
<td>±6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 1,450. \) CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.

\(^a\) Percentage of each race category living in Alamogordo (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982e, 1992e, 2002e, 2012e).

\(^b\) Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Alamogordo.

\(^c\) Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

\(*\) Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
## Table 18

Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Daily Journal, Year by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Year 1980</th>
<th>Year 1990</th>
<th>Year 2000</th>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Year 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.8*</td>
<td>6.1*</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±1.7</td>
<td>±1.6</td>
<td>±2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-3.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 1,476\). CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.

*Percentage of each race category living in Johnson County (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982c, 1992c, 2002c, 2012c).

b Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Johnson County.

c Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
### Table 19

**Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Daily Journal, Year by Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 575. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of each race category living in Franklin (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982c, 1992c, 2002c, 2012c).

<sup>b</sup>Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Franklin.

<sup>c</sup>Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.*
### Table 20

*Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Great Falls Tribune, Year by Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3*</td>
<td>7.4*</td>
<td>6.3*</td>
<td>7.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±2.9</td>
<td>±2.8</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
<td>±2.7</td>
<td>±2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-1.6*</td>
<td>-2.4*</td>
<td>-3.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
<td>±1.1</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>-3.2*</td>
<td>-2.1*</td>
<td>-2.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
<td>±1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-1.4*</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
<td>±1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 1,689. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.*

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of each race category living in Cascade County (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982d, 1992d, 2002d, 2012d).

<sup>b</sup>Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Cascade County.

<sup>c</sup>Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 21
Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Great Falls Tribune, Year by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %(^a)</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %(^b)</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference(^c)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.1*</td>
<td>6.8*</td>
<td>9.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±2.9</td>
<td>±3.1</td>
<td>±1.7</td>
<td>±2.8</td>
<td>±2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %(^a)</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %(^b)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference(^c)</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %(^a)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %(^b)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference(^c)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.7*</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-3.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %(^a)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %(^b)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference(^c)</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-3.9*</td>
<td>-3.0*</td>
<td>-4.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
<td>±1.0</td>
<td>±0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %(^a)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %(^b)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference(^c)</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %(^a)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %(^b)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference(^c)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.1</td>
<td>±0.1</td>
<td>±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %(^a)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %(^b)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference(^c)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 1,469\). CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.

\(^a\)Percentage of each race category living in Great Falls (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982d, 1992d, 2002d, 2012d).

\(^b\)Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Great Falls.

\(^c\)Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 22

Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Longview News-Journal, Year by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>±1.6</td>
<td>±3.3</td>
<td>±3.9</td>
<td>±4.7</td>
<td>±5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±1.6</td>
<td>±3.3</td>
<td>±3.9</td>
<td>±4.7</td>
<td>±5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-12.8*</td>
<td>-5.5*</td>
<td>-5.4*</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
<td>±3.2</td>
<td>±3.6</td>
<td>±4.2</td>
<td>±4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.9*</td>
<td>-3.4*</td>
<td>-7.5*</td>
<td>-8.0*</td>
<td>-13.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±1.3</td>
<td>±2.7</td>
<td>±1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 2,271. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution. 2011 figures used in place of 2010 for Gregg County and the Longview News-Journal due to poor photo reproduction in 2010.

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of each race category living in Gregg County (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982f, 1992f, 2002f, 2012f).

<sup>b</sup>Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Gregg County.

<sup>c</sup>Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 23  
Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Longview News-Journal, Year by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %(^a)</th>
<th>News %(^b)</th>
<th>Difference(^c)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>15.5*</td>
<td>±2.0</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>-13.0*</td>
<td>±1.9</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-2.1*</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>±0.1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>±0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>±0.1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 1,854\). CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution. 2011 figures used in place of 2010 for Gregg County and the Longview News-Journal due to poor photo reproduction in 2010.

\(^a\) Percentage of each race category living in Gregg County (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982f, 1992f, 2002f, 2012f).

\(^b\) Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Gregg County.

\(^c\) Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 24

Comparison of County Population Proportions in the Montgomery Advertiser, Year by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>24.2*</td>
<td>18.5*</td>
<td>13.1*</td>
<td>30.7*</td>
<td>16.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±5.0</td>
<td>±4.5</td>
<td>±3.6</td>
<td>±4.1</td>
<td>±4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-22.6*</td>
<td>-17.1*</td>
<td>-10.6*</td>
<td>-25.4*</td>
<td>-12.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±5.0</td>
<td>±4.5</td>
<td>±3.6</td>
<td>±4.0</td>
<td>±4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-3.4*</td>
<td>-2.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-1.1*</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %a</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %b</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 2,203. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.

a Percentage of each race category living in Montgomery County (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982a, 1992a, 2002a, 2012a).

b Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Montgomery County.

c Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
**Table 25**

*Comparison of City Population Proportions in the Montgomery Advertiser, Year by Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23.9*</td>
<td>19.1*</td>
<td>14.6*</td>
<td>32.6*</td>
<td>24.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±5.0</td>
<td>±4.5</td>
<td>±3.6</td>
<td>±4.1</td>
<td>±5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-22.4*</td>
<td>-17.6*</td>
<td>-11.9*</td>
<td>-26.9*</td>
<td>-20.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±5.0</td>
<td>±4.5</td>
<td>±3.6</td>
<td>±4.1</td>
<td>±5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-3.7*</td>
<td>-2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian</strong></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.2*</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 2,121. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution. *

<sup>a</sup> Percentage of each race category living in Montgomery (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982a, 1992a, 2002a, 2012a).

<sup>b</sup> Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in Montgomery.

<sup>c</sup> Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Census %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News %&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 1,590. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.

<sup>a</sup>Percentage of each race category living in New London County (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.-c, 1982b, 1992b, 2002b, 2012b).

<sup>b</sup>Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in New London County.

<sup>c</sup>Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.

*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
Table 27
Comparison of City Population Proportions in The Day, Year by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>17.6*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>13.3*</td>
<td>22.8*</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±3.4</td>
<td>±9.8</td>
<td>±11.5</td>
<td>±11.4</td>
<td>±10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-10.1*</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>9.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>±3.2</td>
<td>±9.2</td>
<td>±9.8</td>
<td>±9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-6.3*</td>
<td>-9.7*</td>
<td>-10.0*</td>
<td>-16.6*</td>
<td>-15.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>±3.3</td>
<td>±7.4</td>
<td>±8.1</td>
<td>±8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census %</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 446. CI = confidence interval. Some percentage point differences may appear to be incorrect due to rounding. Confidence interval left blank when sample size was too small to assume normal distribution.

b Percentage of each race category appearing in local news photos in New London.
c Percentage point difference between Census % and News %.
*Percentage point difference outside the 95% confidence interval.
### Table 28

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in All Newspapers, All Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>265.8</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-10.97*</td>
<td>12.56*</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>2342.4</td>
<td>365.2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-12.48*</td>
<td>14.24*</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8006</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>9385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>7699.8</td>
<td>1200.6</td>
<td>318.7</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>15.42*</td>
<td>-17.91*</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10774</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>13132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 9, N = 13,132) = 418.886, p < .001$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0031

<sup>a</sup> combines Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
Table 29

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Alamogordo Daily News in All Years Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>345.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-7.14*</td>
<td>8.21*</td>
<td>2.95*</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1261.8</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>232.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>7.25*</td>
<td>-7.76*</td>
<td>-2.94*</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (df = 6, N = 2,109) = 91.905, p < .001$
* significant at adjusted alpha = .0042

<sup>a</sup> combines Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal and Other role categories.
Table 30

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Daily Journal in All Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>467.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1000.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>3.35*</td>
<td>-3.35*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(\chi^2(df = 2, N = 1600) = 14.010, p = .001\)

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0083

\(^a\) combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

\(^b\) combines Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 31

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Great Falls Tribune in All Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>463.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.7*</td>
<td>6.71*</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1561.53</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>71.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
<td>-6.71*</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(\chi^2(df = 2, N = 2,154) = 45.767, p < .001\)

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0083

\(^a\) combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 32

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Longview News-Journal in All Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-4.23*</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>456.91</td>
<td>84.97</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-14.3*</td>
<td>15.93*</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>144.67</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>4.08*</td>
<td>-3.22*</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>1665.81</td>
<td>309.8</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>11.62*</td>
<td>-13.52*</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $\chi^2(df = 6, N = 2,809) = 288.496, p < .001

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0042

*a combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.*
Table 33

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Montgomery Advertiser in All Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-9.68*</td>
<td>9.56*</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>330.51</td>
<td>171.27</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-5.61*</td>
<td>6.10*</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1268.79</td>
<td>657.49</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>10.33*</td>
<td>-10.73*</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 (df = 6, N = 2,749) = 158.474, p < .001$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0042

* combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
Table 34

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in The Day in All Years Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>316.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-3.03*</td>
<td>4.73*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1086.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-3.67*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( \chi^2(df = 6, N = 1,711) = 25.440, p < .001 \)
* significant at adjusted alpha = .0042
<sup>a</sup> combines Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal and Other role categories.
Table 35

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in All Newspapers in 1980*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>432.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-8.97*</td>
<td>11.69*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>122.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>2084.8</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>8.41*</td>
<td>-10.43*</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $\chi^2(df = 6, N = 2933) = 147.809, p < .001$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0042

<sup>a</sup> combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
Table 36

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in All Newspapers in 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>478.5</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-8.16*</td>
<td>8.82*</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1412.2</td>
<td>199.8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>7.3*</td>
<td>-8.46*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(\chi^2(df = 4, N = 2353) = 85.285, p < .001\)
* significant at adjusted alpha = .0056
\(^a\) combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
\(^b\) combines Criminal and Other role categories
Table 37

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in All Newspapers in 2000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>401.5</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1838.5</td>
<td>354.5</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $\chi^2(df = 6, N = 2951) = 9.905, p = .129*

*a combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.*
Table 38

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in All Newspapers in 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Othera</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>569.5</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-5.09*</td>
<td>7.07*</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1276.4</td>
<td>243.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>5.84*</td>
<td>-7.87*</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 9, N = 2522) = 76.855, p < .001$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0031

*a combines Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
### Table 39

**Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in All Newspapers in 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Other*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-8.48*</td>
<td>11.05*</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>441.4</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-3.41*</td>
<td>3.25*</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1135.9</td>
<td>258.1</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>8.1*</td>
<td>-9.55*</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $\chi^2(df = 9, \, N = 2373) = 158.222, \, p < .001$

* *significant at adjusted alpha = .0031

* combines Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
Table 40

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in Alamogordo Daily News in 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>525.67</td>
<td>83.97</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(\chi^2(df = 2, N = 718) = 2.739, p = .254\)

\(^a\) combines Black, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

Table 41

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Alamogordo Daily News in 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>2.85*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>267.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-2.85*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(\chi^2(df = 2, N = 482) = 8.137, p = 0.17\)

* significant at adjusted alpha = .X

\(^a\) combines Black, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 42

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Alamogordo Daily News in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>277.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 443) = 4.878, p = .087$

<sup>a</sup> combines Black, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

Table 43

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Alamogordo Daily News in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-4.82*</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.54*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>161.54</td>
<td>44.27</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>4.82*</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>-4.54*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 291) = 29.333, p < .001$

<sup>*</sup> significant at adjusted alpha = .0083

<sup>a</sup> combines Black, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 44

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Alamogordo Daily News in 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-5.61*</td>
<td>3.02*</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Count</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>5.61*</td>
<td>-3.02*</td>
<td>-4.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (df = 2, N = 175) = 32.046, p < .001$
* significant at adjusted alpha = .0083
a combines Black, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

Table 45

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Daily Journal in 1980*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Count</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera Count</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>234.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Fisher’s exact test used instead of $\chi^2$ test. N=356, $p = .041$
a combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 46

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Daily Journal in 1990*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other$^a$</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.96*</td>
<td>2.96*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other$^b$ Count</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>189.78</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>2.96*</td>
<td>-2.96*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Fisher’s exact test used instead of $\chi^2$ test. N=259, $p = .008$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .013

$^a$ combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

$^b$ combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

Table 47

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Daily Journal in 2000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other$^a$</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Count</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other$^b$ Count</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>210.15</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Fisher’s exact test used instead of $\chi^2$ test. N=278, $p = .325$

$^a$ combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

$^b$ combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 48

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Daily Journal in 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b) Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>158.27</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(\chi^2(df = 1, N = 279) = 1.718, p = .19\)

\(^a\) combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

Table 49

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Daily Journal in 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>124.29</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b) Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>231.63</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(\chi^2(df = 2, N = 428) = 6.301, p = .043\)

\(^a\) combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

\(^b\) combines Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 50

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Great Falls Tribune in 1980*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-6.52*</td>
<td>6.52*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>225.05</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>6.52*</td>
<td>-6.52*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Fisher’s exact test used instead of $\chi^2$ test. N=294, $p < .001$

<sup>*</sup> significant at adjusted alpha = .013

<sup>a</sup> combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

---

Table 51

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Great Falls Tribune in 1990*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>194.33</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Fisher’s exact test used instead of $\chi^2$ test. N=269, $p = .106$

<sup>a</sup> combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 52

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Great Falls Tribune in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>516.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Fisher’s exact test used instead of $\chi^2$ test. N=632, $p = .604$

\(^a\) combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

Table 53

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Great Falls Tribune in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>275.02</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $\chi^2(\text{df} = 2, N = 440) = 8.502, p = .014$

\(^a\) combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 54

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Great Falls Tribune in 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Athlete Count</th>
<th>Expected Count</th>
<th>% within Race</th>
<th>Adjusted Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherb</td>
<td></td>
<td>353</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>351.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Count 479 9 31 519

*Note. χ²(df = 2, N = 519) = 4.144, p = .126

a combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

b combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

Table 55

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Longview News-Journal in 1980*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Athlete Count</th>
<th>Expected Count</th>
<th>% within Race</th>
<th>Adjusted Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.69*</td>
<td>9.36*</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherb</td>
<td></td>
<td>701</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>678.4</td>
<td>54.34</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.69*</td>
<td>-9.36*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Count 774 62 6 842

*Note. χ²(df = 2, N = 842) = 88.116, p < .001

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0083

a combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

b combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 56

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Longview News-Journal in 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Othera</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-8.36*</td>
<td>8.76*</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherb</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>367.08</td>
<td>70.44</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>8.36*</td>
<td>-8.76*</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 566) = 76.793, p < .001$
* significant at adjusted alpha = .0083
a combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
b combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

Table 57

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Longview News-Journal in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Othera</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>2.66*</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherb</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>291.24</td>
<td>54.31</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>-2.66*</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 451) = 7.915, p = .019$
* significant at adjusted alpha = .0083
a combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
b combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
### Table 58

**Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Longview News-Journal in 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athlete</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-5.60*</td>
<td>7.24*</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entertainer</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>32.45</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>3.06*</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>245.57</td>
<td>62.36</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
<td>-5.49*</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $\chi^2(df = 4, N = 518) = 58.866, p < .001$  
* significant at adjusted alpha = .0056  
<sup>a</sup> combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.  
<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal and Other role categories.
Table 59

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Longview News-Journal in 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-5.36*</td>
<td>5.89*</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>234.81</td>
<td>85.03</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>5.36*</td>
<td>-5.89*</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: \(\chi^2(df = 2, N = 432) = 34.839, p < .001\)
* *significant at adjusted alpha = .0083
\(^a\) combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.*
Table 60
Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Montgomery Advertiser in 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-5.19*</td>
<td>5.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>4.97*</td>
<td>-4.97*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 259) = 27.829, p < .001$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0083

*a combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 61

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Montgomery Advertiser in 1990*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-4.2*</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>255.06</td>
<td>99.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td>-4.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $\chi^2(df = 1, N = 444) = 17.661, p < .001$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .013

<sup>a</sup> combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 62

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Montgomery Advertiser in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>63.37</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>430.64</td>
<td>269.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>3.09*</td>
<td>-3.09*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: $\chi^2(df = 3, N = 842) = 13.410, p = .004$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0063

* combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
Table 63

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Montgomery Advertiser in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.81*</td>
<td>2.81*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>103.88</td>
<td>53.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-3.45*</td>
<td>3.45*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>303.71</td>
<td>155.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>5.17*</td>
<td>-5.17*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 3, N = 668) = 30.982, p < .001$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0063

* combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
Table 64

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in the Montgomery Advertiser in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-7.35*</td>
<td>7.35*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>162.36</td>
<td>133.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>6.74*</td>
<td>-6.74*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(\chi^2(df=3, N=536)=65.123, p < .001\)

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0063

\(^a\) combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
Table 65

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in The Day in 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>42.93</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>390.07</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Fisher’s exact test used instead of \(\chi^2\) test. N=464, \(p = .217\)
\(^a\) combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.

Table 66

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in The Day in 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other(^a)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>218.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(\chi^2(df = 1, N = 333) = 2.100, p = .147\)
\(^a\) combines Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.
\(^b\) combines Criminal, Entertainer and Other role categories.
Table 67

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in The Day in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other⁴</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>205.7</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 305) = 1.851, p = .396$

⁴ combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

Table 68

Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in The Day in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other⁴</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>84.48</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
<td>3.44*</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>185.52</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>-3.44*</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 326) = 11.860, p = .003$

* significant at adjusted alpha = .0083

⁴ combines Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

⁶ combines Criminal, Entertainer, and Other role categories.
### Table 69

*Results of Chi-square and Post Hoc Tests for Role and Race in The Day in 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>52.93</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>161.07</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Race</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $\chi^2(df = 3, N = 283) = 1.907, p = .592$

<sup>a</sup> combines Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and Other race categories.

<sup>b</sup> combines Criminal, Entertainer, and Other role categories.

### Table 70

*Most Frequent Roles for White Subjects in All Newspapers, All Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Proportion of all White subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 10,774.$
Table 71

*Most Frequent Roles for Black Subjects in All Newspapers, All Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Proportion of all Black subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 1,680.

Table 72

*Most Frequent Roles for Hispanic Subjects in All Newspapers, All Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Proportion of all Hispanic subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 446.