Framing of nationality in commentary on a globalized sport; Formula One

A quantitative content analysis into British Sky Sports commentary on Formula One

Student Name: Marte Boudestein

Student Number: 663060

Supervisor: Dr. Anouk van Drunen

MA Media, Culture & Society

Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master Thesis

June 24, 2024

Word Count: 14076

FRAMING OF NATIONALITY IN COMMENTARY ON A GLOBALIZED SPORT; FORMULA ONE

Abstract

This thesis examines the tendencies of framing nationality within the British Sky Sports commentary on Formula One. At this point in time, international sporting events are often defined as important processes of globalization, as they bring people together beyond a nation's border. However, international sporting events cannot be seen without nationalistic influences. In that sense, several scholars argue that the "banal" forms of nationalism are often "forgotten" or are disregarded as something that is fading within sociological studies. While these "banal" forms are precisely the forms of nationalism that are involved within international sporting events. All the while, broadcasters are faced with the need to attract the biggest, paying audience, in order to keep broadcasting rights and attract sponsors. By analysing the commentary on six grand prix (races) between the years 2019 and 2023, this study argues that, despite growing global audiences, nationalistic stereotypes and framing tendencies are very much still existent within sports commentary and do not seem to be decreasing.

KEYWORDS: *Globalization, Nationalism, Framing, Sports/Media Complex, Formula One*

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

Over the years, sports have been defined as an important process of globalization, as it reaches people from across the world, connecting them through a shared sense of pleasure, passion, obsession, and desire. As Miller et al. (2001) emphasized "sport is probably the most universal aspect of popular culture. It crosses languages and countries to captivate spectators and participants, as both a professional business and a pastime" (p. 1). In more recent years, it has not gone unnoticed that the uprise of digital media had played its part in the global popularity of sports, with sporting events such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup reaching billions of television audiences (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2013, p. 41). Poli (2007, pp. 657-658) even went as far as to state that international sporting events are promoting denationalization. He argued that, due to the technical developments, people are no longer feeling the need to support their nations' athlete or team, as they are no longer limited to regional or national recourses. Although the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup are great examples of globalization, the world of Formula One (F1) has not stayed behind. In recent years, F1 was seen to have an exponential growth in spectators, live and from home. This growth can be attributed to the Netflix series Drive to Survive (DTS), which first aired in 2019 and is currently counting six seasons of behind-the-scenes footage of the F1 world. Since the first season of DTS, the F1 social media accounts saw a 99% increase in engagement between 2019 and 2020 alone, and saw an audience growth in the United States, Asia-Pacific, Africa, and Middel-East regions (Guha, 2023).

That international sporting events are of global significance can not be denied, however this does not mean that the nationalistic influences can be removed from the discussion. In his book *Nations Matter*, Calhoun (2007, p. 4) argued that the rise of globalized world has made belonging to a nation-state arguably more important, emphasizing that nationalism is a recurring source of solidarity and should therefore not be disregarded. More recently, in terms of sports, Seippel (2017, p. 45) has argued that international sporting events are central symbols of nationalism in modern societies, seeing that they are activating stories about who we are as citizens of a nation, as teams and athletes are representing their nation on a global level. In that sense, Beck (2017, p. 2) notes that sport spectatorship is strongly linked to regional and national identities and thus form an interesting field for analysing national stereotypes. Moreover, several studies have shown that sport commentators of international sporting events are actively choosing to utilize

frameworks that are incorporating nationalistic stereotypes, as a way to attract the biggest audience (Beck, 2017, pp. 1-8; Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 569-584; Scott et al., 2014, pp. 729-741). All the while, Billig (1995, pp. 43-46) argued that there seems to be a double neglect within sociological studies when it comes to nationalism. He notes that the standard definitions of nationalism are those of "hot" outings, stating "nationalism, thus, is typically seen as the force which threatens the stability of existing states" (Billig, 1995, p. 43). By using only such definitions of nationalism, Billig (1995, p. 43) argues that nationalism can be seen as developmental, something which nations outgrow once they are established. In this sense, Billig (1995, p. 44) notes that if nationalism is only applied to forceful social movements, a gap forms within the theoretical awareness where the "banal" forms of nationalism, the routinely waved flags outside of police stations, for example, are rarely discussed. Meaning, if only the "hot" forms are discussed, the established nation-state is reduced to something natural, which is simply not true, as the "banal" forms are actively being ignored and forgotten (Billig, 1995, pp. 44-50). In that sense, international sporting events being defined as forms of globalization and denationalization (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2013, pp. 41-56; Poli, 2007, pp. 657-658), in relation to the increasing global interest in F1, while taking the banal forms of nationalism into account, sparked the interest for this study.

Aside from the topic being of interest, it is also believed that this study is of great societal and scientific relevance for several reasons. To start, although the framing of nationality within sports commentary has been researched plentiful, there seems to be a lack in diversity as they mainly focused on American broadcasts of the Olympics (Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 569-584; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 95-109; Billings et al., 2011, pp. 251-264). All the while, more recent studies have strayed away from researching framing of nationality, to focus on the effect that framing of nationalistic sentiments might have on consumers (Lee et al., 2015, pp. 235-244; Seippel, 2017, pp. 43-59). Therefore, a gap is being exposed within scientific research, as the more recent studies assume that nationalistic sentiments are a part of sporting events, in contrast to the arguments made by Giulianotti and Robertson (2013, p. 41) and Poli (2007, pp. 657-658), who stated that nationalism in sports is decreasing due to the world becoming more globalized. As for societal relevance, Seippel (2017, p. 44) emphasizes that studying nationalism through sports shows how people, in this case the commentators, give meaning to their country and other countries, in

consideration of a fairly regular phenomena. While Beck (2017, p. 2) notes that international competitions are described by the media from their own country's perspective, therefore creating an interesting field for analysis. Additionally, Billig (1995, p. 6) emphasizes that the "forgetting" of nationalism within research is rarely innocent, by actively ignoring or forgetting nationalism it becomes a problem, as it is only reported in the "hot" outings. Therefore, it becomes something to be weary of, as it is only discussed when something is actively threatening an established nation, while Billig (1995) states "nationalism, far from being an intermittent mood in established nations, is the endemic condition" (p. 6).

Accordingly, this study chose to stray away from studying the Olympics and shifted its focus onto the framing of nationality within media representations of F1, using the following research question; To what extent is there a change in framing nationality in the British Sky Sports commentating on Formula One, between 2019 and 2023? To answer the research question, this thesis utilized an in-depth quantitative content analysis (QCA) on audiovisual (AV) data. Due to the increase of the global audience of F1, starting from 2019, and the fact that there were two different World Driver Champions (WDC) from two different nations, this study focused on detecting a change in nationalistic framing tendencies by comparing three grand prix from 2019 and 2023. Therefore, by studying what Billig (1995, pp. 1-177) refers to as banal forms of nationalism in relation to F1, this study aimed to bring a new light to the scientific and societal conversation of nationalism within the media representation of globalized sporting events.

2 Theoretical framework

This chapter delves into the theory that form the foundation of this thesis and were deemed necessary to answer the research question. This chapter discusses framing theory, the sports/media complex, nationality within globalized sporting events, the framing of nationality, and the framing of nationality in the context of F1. The different sections aimed to discuss the most important aspects of the theory, while connecting them to the topics of the previous sections.

2.1 Framing theory

When delving into the topic of framing, it is important to note that scholars have yet to find one clear definition of the concept. Entman (1993, p. 51) talks about framing as having a "scattered conceptualization", noting that, although framing has an omnipresence, there is not one statement that portrays how frames manifest in a text, or how framing can influence thought processes. Additionally, Scheufele (1999, p. 103) notes that due to "vague conceptualizations", framing has been used to name slightly similar, yet significantly different approaches. Moreover, Scheufele (1999, p. 104) argues that research should address framing processes from a metatheoretical point of view, shifting framing to framing effects. However, over a decade earlier, Gitlin (1980, p. 14) was critical of such shifts, noting that there must be an understanding of the symbolic content of media texts before asking the question of effects, "since the media aim at least to influence, condition, and reproduce the activity of audiences by reaching into the symbolic organization of thought" (Gitlin, 1980, p. 14).

To bring some clarity, Entman (1993, p. 52) created a working definition that he defined as follows; "to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described". Therefore, in essence, framing is a combination of selection and salience (Entman, 1993, p. 52), turning otherwise meaningless occurrences into something that is meaningful. What Entman (1993, p. 52) described, is what Gofman (1974, p. 21) called a primary framework. In his work, Goffman (1974, pp. 21-23) made the distinction between two primary frameworks: neutral and social. The neutral framework refers to occurrences

that can be seen as undirected, unoriented, unanimated, unguided, as something that is "purely physical," where no wilful agency intentionally or casually interferes (Goffman, 1974, p. 22). According to Goffman (1974, p. 22-23), the neutral framework is most likely to be found in the physical and biological sciences. In contrast to the social framework, which provides a background understanding for events "that incorporate the will, aim, and controlling effort of an intelligence, a live agency, the chief one being the human being" (Goffman, 1974, p. 22). Accordingly, the social framework can be found within newscast reporting (Goffman, 1974, pp. 22-23), in this sense, sports commentary can be dubbed as a social framework.

Although the likes of Goffman (1974, pp. 21-39) and Entman (1993, pp. 51-58) provided significant definitions for framing, Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, p. 94) argued that there were no analytic indicators that could reliably measure the existence of frames within news media. In their study, Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, pp. 93-101) investigated established frames in terms of their occurrence in different bodies of news media and found significant evidence of the existence of a myriad of frames, all the while creating analytic indicators to measure the found frames. Although Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, pp. 93-109) focused their research on frames within news media, this does not mean that their research becomes irrelevant when discussing the existence of frames within other bodies of media, as they researched what Goffman (1974, pp. 22-23) calls a social framework. Therefore, the analytic indicators as created by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, pp. 93-109) in combination with Entman's (1993, p. 52) working definition of framing and Goffman's (1974, pp. 21-39) idea of social frameworks, was used to analyse the framing of nationality within F1 sports commentating.

2.2 The Sports/Media Complex

Having an understanding of framing does not explain why sport commentators might utilize such strategies. Therefore, it is important to get an understanding of the general role of sports commentators, in what is called the Sports/Media Complex (Miller et al., 2001, pp. 1-41; Rowe, 2013, pp. 61-74). Although sports have been around for a long time, Rowe (2013, p. 64) argues that newspapers, magazines, and later on radio, newsreels, and television allowed for potential sport spectators to become connected with sporting events

through the use of mass advertising. This was a welcomed development for sponsors who could use the growing appeal to advertise their products, and by doing so enhancing their brand image (Rowe, 2013, p. 64). Moreover, the growing media interest became of beneficial importance for both the sports and media party, with sports benefiting from the exposure, while the media could consult them for all sorts of information about teams, athletes, events, etc. allowing them to benefit their audience (Rowe, 2013, p. 64). However, Rowe (2013, p. 64) notes an important shift caused by this relationship, where sports used to be a subject for the media, sports have become scheduled media content. By becoming scheduled media content so-called "tele-presence" is created, meaning that television spectators, in essence, get the same experience as stadium spectators through scheduled live broadcasts with the commentary to keep them interested (Rowe, 2013, p. 64). Most importantly, Rowe (2013, p. 65) emphasizes that "tele-presence" can only be obtained when the audience is willing to pay the corresponding broadcaster. Accordingly, Beck (2017, p. 3) therefore notes that broadcasters who hold the rights to big sporting events, main interests are with creating a program that is attractive for their biggest, paying audience. In that sense, Scott et al. (2014, p. 732) state that the importance for media networks lies with ensuring that viewers keep returning in large numbers, so that they can commodify and sell the audience to sponsors. Additionally, Beck (2017) emphasises the importance of the audience, stating "the public is an important factor in the sports-media complex, since audience rates are the currency that determines the value of a sports event and thus the upper limit of license fees and prices for advertisement" (p. 3). However, Beck (2017, pp. 1-8) and Rowe (2013, pp. 61-74) are not describing a new phenomenon, as Miller et al. (2001, p. 11) already argued the increasing importance of continued revenue, noting that television coverage is a prime unit of currency within the cultural economy of national and international sports.

This Sports/Media Complex can be directly related to framing theory, as Gamson and Modigliani (1989, pp. 6-7) argued that the creation of certain frames within media are linked to the interaction between journalists' actions and the influence of interest groups, such as sponsors. In the case of sport commentating, it can be argued, and it has been argued, that commentators actively chose to utilize framing strategies to play into the preferences of their biggest audience, in order to account for licensing and recruit more sponsors (e.g. Beck, 2017, pp. 1-9; Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 569-586). The use of such framing strategies

within the commentary can be done through or be based on a myriad of things. In his work, Beck (2017, pp. 1-2) argued that sports belong within the entertainment media category, due to the high levels of suspense to which the accompanying commentary can add by choosing to present rivalries as between "heroes and villains". In that sense, sports commentators are choosing to actively focus on the rivalry instead of on the competition at hand, choosing to make aspects more salient to promote another aspect of perceived reality, which is in line with Entman's (1993, p. 52) definition of framing. Aside from framing rivalries as discussed by Beck (2017, p. 2), Billings and Eastman (2003, pp. 571-573) argued that framing theory substantiates the claims that gender, ethnicity, and nationality are portrayed through network-controlled shaping, in which discourse is manipulated in order to attract the desired audience. Therefore, the world of broadcasted sports provides a notable space for the existence and creation of frames, due to their complex relationship with the world of media; where increasing revenues, sponsorships, licensing fees, etc. are of great importance.

2.3 Nationalism in globalized sporting events

Aside from the concept of framing and understanding the role of sports commentators, it is seemingly important to also understand the role of nationalism within globalized sporting events in order to sufficiently answer the research question. For this research, Scholte's (2008, p. 1478) definition of globalization was used as the overarching interpretation of globalization. He argued that globalization entails the spread of transplanetary links between people, regardless of where they might be. Therefore, globalization can be seen as the process of exchanging cultural symbols on a global level, where the process is no longer relying on social geography. In relation to sports, Giulianotti and Robertson (2013, p. 41) describe sporting events as "one of the most important cultural forces of globalization". Emphasizing that sports, as a process of globalization, date back to the ancient civilizations of Rome, Greece, and Egypt (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2013, p. 41-45). Additionally, Giulianotti and Robertson (2013, pp. 41-45) touched upon international conflicts, such as World War II and the Cold War, as an explanation for the exponential growth of both participating nations at the Olympics and FIFA memberships, both increasing with more than a hundred percent. In this sense, globalization processes are portrayed as

celebratory, and raises the question as to why this study deems nationalism as important. Therefore, globalization needs to be approached from a more critical perspective. A perspective taken by Lecler (2019, p. 369) who questioned whether globalization processes form a threat to cultural diversity, as globalization can lead to a convergence of a single global culture.

This is where the importance of discourse on nationalism comes in, as Calhoun (2007) states "nationalism is easily underestimated" (p. 27). It is mostly seen as eruptions of violence, rather than the everyday occurrences of nationalism that plays into people's sense of belonging in the world (Calhoun, 2007, p. 27). Moreover, Calhoun (2007, p. 165) emphasizes that nationalism mediates between the production of internal solidarity and the need for external recognition. The rhetoric of nationalism helps to voice a sense of belonging that is formed through a shared culture and social relations (Calhoun, 2007, p. 165). Nonetheless, Calhoun's research did not withheld researchers such as Poli (2007, p. 655) from arguing that, due to the commercial developments, there is no longer a need for identification or the feeling of belonging that is related to state borders and territorial criteria. Additionally, Poli (2007, pp. 657-658) even went as far as to state that sports are actively promoting denationalization, in terms of the integration of athletes from foreign origin into the national teams and in terms of the worldwide diffusion of sports. Over a decade earlier, Billig (1995, pp. 49-51) was critical of such statements, he argued that the banal, everyday forms of nationalism are seemingly forgotten by academics from "established nations", noting that the routinely waved flags are not seen as outings of nationalism and are therefore being disregarded. Moreover, Billig (1995, p.8) notes that national identity encompasses all the forgotten reminders that nationalism in its banal forms exists. Therefore, the fact that researchers such as Poli (2007, pp. 657-658) utilize the term "national teams", proves that nationalism is very much a part of sports. Moreso, even though international sporting events are being defined and can be seen as important processes of globalization for a myriad of reasons (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2013, pp. 41-56), they are hard to imagine without national flags, national anthems, and athletes wearing the national uniform (Miller et al., 2001, p. 3).

Aside from the fact that nationalism clearly cannot be disregarded when discussing international sporting events, Kim and Billings (2017) stated "nationalism appears to matter most in the international sporting arena" (p. 197). They emphasize that when international

competitions are won, the athletes/teams and their results are perceived as a show national strength and power and found that countries actively invest in their nations athletes/teams in order to bolster success (Kim & Billings, 2017, p. 198). Moreover, Beck (2017, p.2) notes that rooting for teams or athletes is strongly linked to existence of national identity, as they are seen as representatives of the home country. Altogether, the current study further highlights sports commentators' tendencies of framing nationality.

2.4 Framing nationality in sports commentary

Based on the previous sections, it can be argued that sports commentators could use and are using framing of nationality to attract the biggest audience, in order to keep broadcasting rights and licensing fees. Over the years, several studies have focused on the existence of framing of nationality in the commentary of international sporting events in general and on the effects this might have on consumers (e.g. Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 569-584; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 95-109; Billings et al., 2011, pp. 251-264; Lee et al., 2015, pp. 235-244; Sabo et al., 1996, pp. 7-21). Within their research, Lee at al. (2015, pp. 236-237) argued that specific situations within international competitions are delivered to the audience through nationalistic biased justifications or interpretations, where the commentators are more critical towards athletes or teams from a different nation. Additionally, Wann and Grieve (2005, p. 540) found that favouritism, in terms of the in-group, is significantly more present when "their" team wins. While Billings and Angelini (2007, p. 109) found that sports commentators are likely to portray athletes or teams from their nations in a more positive, favourable way, in contrast to the descriptions for the opposing team or athlete. Furthermore, Billings and Eastman (2003, pp. 581-584) showed that, during the 2002 Winter Olympics, the American broadcast showed clear favouritism towards the American athletes, despite of the seventy-seven participating countries. The American athletes were more likely to be portrayed as being more composed and courageous, while also being the most mentioned, profiled, and promoted athletes (Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 581-584). Both studies found that commentators are significantly more positive towards athletes from their own nations based on what kind of descriptors they use to describe Success/Failure and Personality/Physicality (Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 576-584; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 102-109). Nonetheless, it has to be noted that

both studies suggested that their findings might be linked to the political landscape, aside from commentators' bias regarding their own nationality. Billings and Eastman (2003, p. 584) noted that the 2002 Winter Olympics were hosted in Salt Lake City only a few months after the events of September 11th of 2001. Meanwhile, Billings and Angelini (2007, p. 109) noted that their found differences could be attributed to "a country at war", referring to the Iraqis war in 2007. It is interesting to point out that Billings and Eastman (2003, p. 584) and Billings and Angelini (2007, p. 109) took international conflicts as a possible reason for the increase in nationalistic bias, while Giulianotti and Robertson (2013, pp. 41-45) used international conflicts as a reason for the globalization of sports.

Additionally, other studies have shown that sports create a place for "othering" and creating an "us vs. them" narrative (Billings et al., 2011, p. 263; Butterworth, 2010, p. 148; Sabo et al., 1996, p. 18). Butterworth's (2010, p. 148) research identified the need of creating a so-called "scapegoat," where the opposing team or athlete is framed in an unfavourable way to require redemption or an explanation for the misfortune of the in-group. Meanwhile, when the in-group starts having more success, they are framed as a "hero," while the successes of the opposing team are disregarded or are attributed to the in-group's misfortune (Butterworth, 2010, p. 148). However, Butterworth (2010, p. 148) notes that aside from looking for a "scapegoat" to explain the in-group's misfortune, commentators might opt to look inwardly to find a corrective, an explanation as to why the home nations athlete or team is able to be threatened. Additionally, Sabo et al. (1996, pp. 18-19) found that, in their research on American broadcasts of international sporting events, to create an "us vs. them" narrative the athletes from the corresponding nation are more likely to be referred to by their name, creating a sense of familiarity. This could be attributed to the fact that the predominantly White, English-speaking commentators are simply more familiar with English names, and to the fact that many of the commentators were former athletes themselves and were therefore more familiar with the athletes from the United States (Sabo et al., 1996, pp. 18-19). Moreover, in line with the discourse on the Sports/Media Complex and on nationalism in globalized sporting events, Sabo et al. (1996, pp. 18-19) argued that while the international audience of American broadcasts was increasing, the American based audience remained the primary one, meaning that the commentators would fit their commentary to the dominant audience. In turn, Billings et al. (2011, pp. 262-263) emphasised that familiarity with the athletes is directly linked to the

depth of the commentary, they argued that there is a tendency to portray the opposition as the one-dimensional "other", when commentators are largely unfamiliar with the athlete, while the "home" athletes are described in more flourishing and more detailed language.

2.5 Framing nationality in the context of F1

Although the previous studies mainly focussed on American broadcasts and audiences (e.g. Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 569-584; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 95-109; Sabo et al., 1996, pp. 7-21), this does not mean that such examples do not or cannot apply to British broadcasts or audiences as there are some similarities. Mainly, Sabo et al. (1996, pp. 18-19) noted that the commentators were White, English-speaking, and sometimes former athletes themselves, such is the case for the British Sky Sports commentators, where the main pundits are White and English-speaking, and two were former F1 drivers themselves. Moreover, both the American and British broadcasters are dealing with the Sports/Media Complex. Although Sky Sports commentary is accessible for the global audience through the F1TV broadcasting platform, a Sky Sports subscription is only promoted in Pounds and can only be accessed by providing a valid UK located postcode. Furthermore, similar to the broadcasters researched by Billings and Eastman (2003, pp. 569-584), Sky Sports provides more programs than just the F1 broadcast. Therefore, it can be argued that, although the global audience of F1 is growing, the biggest paying audience for Sky Sports in general remains the British audience. That being said, based on the similarities, the previous studies provide a gap for the current study to fit into. To do so, this study provided an extensive list of hypotheses focusing on analysing the tendency to frame nationality within British commentary on F1, delivered by Sky Sports in 2019 and 2023.

Before going into the hypotheses, some context might be needed. To start, it is important to note that both years saw two different WDCs. Namely, in 2019 the WDC was of British nationality and had also won the Championship in 2017 and in 2018. While in 2023, the WDC was of Dutch nationality and had also won the previous two years. In line with findings from Wann and Grieve (2005, p. 540) it could therefore be predicted that comments were more negative and unfavourable towards Non-British drivers in 2023 than in 2019, as an athlete from a different nation is seen to be victorious. Together with Billings and Eastman's (2003, pp. 576-584) results, it can be argued that this lack of favouritism towards

Non-British drivers can be found in comments regarding drivers' success, failure, and Personality/Physicality. Therefore, the following hypotheses were tested;

H1a: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding achievements will flatter British drivers but diminish those of Non-British drivers in terms of success.

H1b: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding achievements will flatter British drivers but diminish those of Non-British drivers in terms of failure.

H1c: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding achievements will flatter British drivers but diminish those of Non-British drivers more in 2023 than in 2019, in terms of success.

H1d: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding achievements will flatter British drivers but diminish those of Non-British drivers more in 2023 than in 2019, in terms of failure.

H2a: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding Personality/Physicality will be more flattering for British drivers than for Non-British drivers.

H2b: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding Personality/Physicality will be more flattering for British drivers than for Non-British drivers in 2023 than 2019.

Furthermore, based on Butterworth's (2010, p. 148) idea of utilizing a "scapegoat" or "hero," it could be predicted that British commentary will frame Non-British drivers as the "scapegoat", while the British drivers will be framed as the "hero". Due to the difference in WDCs, it can be argued that this is more likely to be the case in 2023 than in 2019, as Butterworth (2010, p. 148) pointed out that commentary is more likely to search for a "scapegoat" or a corrective when the in-group is losing out. Similar to results by Wann and

Grieve (2005, pp. 540-541) who reported that in-group favouritism is a coping mechanism that is used to better cope with threats to the perceived social identity that is related to the in-group's successes or failures. Moreover, the use of using such frames links back to the discourse on the Sports/Media Complex, for which Beck (2017, p. 2) argued that commentary utilizing such frames can add to the high levels of suspense, making the audience more engaged. Basically, using Scapegoat/Hero frames allows for the audience to be more engaged, therefore the broadcast is becoming more attractive for the biggest paying audience, in the case the British viewers. Therefore, the following hypotheses were tested;

H3a: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, Non-British drivers are more likely to be framed as the "scapegoat", while British drivers are more likely to be framed as the "hero".

H3b: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, non-British drivers are more likely to be framed as the "scapegoat", while British drivers are more likely to be framed as the "hero", more so in 2023 than in 2019.

Last but not least, building on the results from Sabo et al. (1996, pp. 18-19) and Billings et al. (2011, pp. 262-263), it could be predicted that British drivers and teams with British drivers are more likely to be referred to by their name. This can be coined to the idea that the commentators are fitting their content to their primary audience, while also being White and English-speaking, which were the main factors Sabo et al. (1996, pp. 18-19) found to be contributing to creating an "us vs. them" narrative. Additionally, Billings and Eastman (2003, p. 579) and Billings and Angelini (2007, p. 106) found that the American athletes were the majority of the top 20 mentioned athletes in the American broadcasts of the 2002 Winter Olympics and 2004 Summer Olympics. As these factors do not seem to be directly related to winners or losers, no predictions in terms of the years could be made, keeping the same prediction for both years. Therefore, the following hypotheses were tested;

H4: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, the majority of the mentions of the drivers' full name will be of British drivers in 2019 as well as in 2023.

H5: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary of F1, the majority of the mentions of teams will be of teams with a British driver in 2019 as well as in 2023.

3 Methodology

The following chapter offers an explanation for the methodological choices that were made in order to test the stated hypotheses. To start, the selected research design is explained and justified in relation to the aim of this study. Further, the data collection and sampling process are presented, followed by the operationalization of the variables and the creation of the used coding scheme. Additionally, the data processing and how the data was analysed will be presented within this chapter. Lastly, this chapter addresses the questions of reliability and validity.

3.1 Research design

As discussed, this research aims to determine whether sports commentators are framing their commentary based on nationality preferences. To do so, this research uses a QCA design, laying its focus on frame analysis of AV accounts of sports commentary. QCA was deemed a suitable method for this research for several reasons. First, QCA can be used to analyse all kinds of data such as signs, symbols, sounds, images, art – these accounts are considered as "texts" (Krippendorff, 2019, p. 24). Within QCA, these texts are deemed important as every form of a text is produced by someone, with the intent of having a meaning for someone else (Krippendorff, 2019, p. 25). Second, Real (1989, p. 91) argues that QCA reveals the frequency and distribution of different themes such as news bias, race, class, and occupation, within different types of broadcasted media. Moreover, QCA offers a relative reliable technique for identifying tendencies and tracing trends within mass communication (Real, 1989, p. 91). Third, in its nature QCA is a relatively unobtrusive method (Babbie, 2017, p. 332), meaning that this research did not directly affect any social behaviour, nor did it harm or danger any possible actors, as only existing data has been researched. Finally, QCA was deemed fitting as AV data tends to be archived over longer periods of time, allowing for a longitudinal, comparative research design (Babbie, 2017, p. 107), which fits the comparative nature of this study.

Additionally, according to Matthes and Kohring (2008, pp. 258-279), there are several approaches to QCA in relation to researching media frames, most of which take an inductive approach. However, they can also be researched in a deductive manner, where established frames are coded in a standard, existing form (Matthes & Kohring, 2008, p. 262). Although,

Matthes and Kohring (2008, pp. 262-263) emphasise that using a deductive approach has its limits, as they are inflexible to possible identification of newly emerging frames and need to be fitting the research topic under investigation, utilizing a deductive approach allowed for this research to build upon studies that focused on the occurrence of different frames (e.g. Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000, pp. 93-109) and on framing of nationality within sports commentating (e.g. Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 569-586; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 95-111; Billings et al., 2011, pp. 251-266).

3.2 Data collection and sampling

To collect the data, grand prix were derived from the F1TV platform. This platform allows for users to watch the grand prix live and rewatch old grand prix, where the grand prix from 2018 onwards are provided with commentary from different countries. Although this could allow for a comparable study between years and countries, this study chose to focus solely on the commentary provided by Sky Sports in order to avoid an overload of relevant data. Furthermore, three grand prix from 2019 and three grand prix from 2023 were selected, taking a grand prix from the beginning, halfway point, and ending of the season, resulting in a total of 648 minutes of data. Moreover, to gather all the comments, the selected grand prix were transcribed using the Microsoft Word transcribe function and were afterwards checked for errors. As this research focussed on analysing comments, a decision was made as to what would qualify as a comment. Therefore, a comment had to be spoken by one commentator and could exist of more than one sentence, as long as it was not interrupted by others. This resulted in a total of 3911 comments, before the initial sampling phase.

Initially, a purposive sampling strategy was used to derive a sufficient amount of coding units from the total amount of comments, as not all comments were fitting for the nature of this research. Therefore, a comment was selected based on whether they were deemed useful or representative for the aim of this study (Babbie, 2017, p. 196), borrowing Billings and Eastman's (2003, p. 575) guidelines comments regarding the circuit, previous grand prix, not related to drivers or teams, and comments made by others (i.e. non-commentators) were excluded from the analysis, resulting in a total of 2905 comments. However, due to the timeline of this study, the total of 2905 was not feasible to be coded

and analysed. Therefore, the initial coding phase was followed by a random sampling procedure, aimed at collecting seventy comments for each grand prix. Within the transcript, each comment was numbered, allowing the use of a random number generator, resulting in the final total of 420 comments, which is in line with the MA guidelines for research utilizing QCA.

3.3 Operationalization

In its essence, this research aims to measure whether there is a relationship between the framing of F1 drivers based on their nationality in relation to the racing season. Therefore, the independent variables (IVs) were found to be the racing season (IV1: Year) and the nationality of the referred driver (IV2: Nationality driver). Furthermore, based on the hypotheses, the DVs were selected as Success/Failure based on H1 (DV1: Success/Failure), Personality/Physicality based on H2 (DV2: Personality/Physicality), Scapegoat/Hero based on H3 (DV3: Scapegoat/Hero), driver name based on H4 (DV4: Drivername), and team name based on H5 (DV5: Teamname). It is important to note that H1, H2, and H3 were tested based on the sample derived from the transcripts, while H5 and H6 were tested based on the complete 648 minutes of data. Thus, to accurately code and analyse the data, two coding methods were applied to the transcripts. This choice was made based on the previous studies on framing of nationality in international sporting events (e.g. Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 569-586; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 95-111; Billings et al., 2011, pp. 251-266), although these studies conducted three coding methods whereas this study only followed two. As their first coding method focused largely on deriving, what they called, the word-for-word descriptor and coding them based on gender of the athlete, gender of the commentator, ethnicity of the athlete and gender of the sport being discussed (Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 575-576; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 100-102; Billings et al., 2011, pp. 256-258), the choice was made to remove this coding phase as the collection of the comments was already done during the data collection and sampling procedure, and the other factors were deemed irrelevant as the current study focused solely on the framing of nationality within one sport that has only male athletes.

Therefore, for this study, the first coding method focused on coding for (1) Comment, (2) Year ($\kappa = 1.00$), (3) Grand Prix ($\kappa = .943$), (4) Driver ($\kappa = .948$), and (5) Nationality ($\kappa =$

1.00), which were used to account for the IVs, followed by an extensive list of indicators to test for DV1, DV2, and DV3. The indicators used to measure DV1: Success/Failure and DV2: Personality/Physicality, were derived from Billings and Eastman (2003, pp. 575-576), Billings and Angelini (2007, pp. 100-102), and Billings et al. (2011, pp. 256-258), and accounted for the following; (a) concentration, (b) athletic skills – strength, (c) athletic skills – talent/ability, (d) composure, (e) commitment, (f) courage, (g) experience, (h) athletic consonance, (i) intelligence, (j) outgoing/ extroverted, (k) modest/introverted, (l) emotional, (m) attractiveness, (n) size/parts of body, (o) background, (p) other. For which the first nine (a-i) accounted for DV1 ($\kappa = .940$), while the other seven (j-p) accounted for DV2 ($\kappa = .627$). Each comment was coded through a yes or no question for each of the indicators. A "not applicable" option was added to account for neutral comments, without creating a gap in the final dataset. Instructions were given to only file "not applicable" when a comment did not refer to Success/Failure or Personality/Physicality. To account for DV3: Scapegoat/Hero, the coding scheme created by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, pp. 97-101) was adapted, as they focused on analysing frames within news media rather than sports media. Therefore, the formulation of the questions was changed to fit sports commentary. For example, Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, p. 100) used the term "story", which has been changed to "comment". Additionally, the term "government" will, in this case, refer to team orders. Moreover, the morality frame and the economic frame were removed from the coding scheme for this study, this choice was made due to the nature of this study and its corresponding data in comparison to the nature and data of the research conducted by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, pp. 93-109). Furthermore, each comment was coded for DV3: Scapegoat/Hero, meaning only comments that were answered with "not applicable" for both Success/Failure and Personality/Physicality, and that were answered with only "no" in regards to Scapegoat/Hero were deemed neutral. Comments that were answered with "not applicable" for Success/Failure and Personality/Physicality but did answer at least one question with "Yes" for Scapegoat/Hero were included in the analysis of H3a and H3b. The complete coding scheme for the first coding method can be found in Appendix A.

The second coding method for this study focused on the commentators' use of drivers' full names and team names, to account for DV4: Drivername and DV5: Teamname. As mentioned, in line with Billings and Eastman (2003, pp. 575-576), Billings and Angelini (2007, pp. 100-102), and Billings et al. (2011, pp. 256-258), this coding method focused on

the complete 648 minutes of collected data in order to test H4 and H5. The coding scheme for this method focused on coding for (1) Year and (2) Grand Prix, followed by questioning whether a driver or team is being coded provided with a list of all possible drivers and teams for the years 2019 and 2023. Similarly, a "not applicable" option was included to account for whether a driver name or team name was being coded. The complete coding scheme for the second coding method can be found in Appendix B.

3.4 Data analysis

In order to analyse the data, the coding scheme was filled out through a survey format in Qualtrics. Qualtrics allows for the coded data to be transferred into a complete dataset for IBM SPSS Statistics, Version: 28.0.1.0 (142), which was used to further analyse and test the data. Furthermore, before coding and analysing the obtained data the coding scheme was checked on the accounts of reliability and validity, to ensure that the coding scheme measured the concepts as intended.

3.4.1 Reliability and Validity

As this research is dealing with human coding techniques, reliability and validity of the coding process are deemed a necessity (Neuendorf, 2017, p. 166). To reach reliability, Krippendorff (2019, p. 278) notes that it is important that the data is trusted to mean the same to all possible users and the results are replicable. Therefore, to ensure the reliability of this research an intercoder reliability test was conducted prior to the final coding and analysis process, so that changes could be made and justified if deemed necessary. In order to conduct the intercoder reliability test, reliability data was created for 10% of the collected data, which was shared with a separate coder, who tested the coding scheme in accordance with the available data. The results of the reliability data were compared to the initial results, using Cohen's Kappa. The relevant scores of the intercoder reliability check are mentioned within the operationalization of the variables. Furthermore, for the second coding method, an intercoder reliability check was deemed not necessary as it focused on recorded facts.

As for validity, where reliability checks whether the data is replicable, validity ensures that the measuring procedure, in this case the coding scheme, is representative of the

intended concepts (Neuendorf, 2017, p. 122). As mentioned, the coding scheme created for this research was largely based on previous coding schemes that were used to measure framing of nationality within international sporting events (i.e. Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 575-576; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 100-102; Billings et al. 2011, pp. 256-258), while being extended by the coding scheme created by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, pp. 97-101). Although their research topics were not related to F1, and in the case of Semetko and Valkenburg (2000, pp. 97-101) were not related to frames within sports media, due to alterations they were found to be fitting and representative to measure this research concepts.

3.4.2 Analysis process

In order to test for *H1a: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary of F1, comments regarding achievements will flatter British drivers but diminish those of Non-British drivers in terms of success*, and *H1b: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding achievements will flatter British drivers but diminish those of Non-British drivers in terms of failure,* the data relating to DV1: Success/Failure has been used. To start, the corresponding data has been recoded into two different variables "Success" and "Failure," focusing on whether a comment was referring to success or failure. Both of the newly created variables consisted of the 9 indicators (α = .995) that were used to test for DV1; Concentration, Strength, Talent/Ability, Composure, Commitment, Courage, Experience, Consonance, and Intelligence. Creating the new variables allows for the use of a Simple Linear Regression Analysis to determine to what extent the nationality of the driver could predict Success (H1a) and Failure (H1b), as they are now measured on a continuous level. Additionally, aside from testing the Success and Failure variables, the corresponding indicators were also tested separately using the Chi-Square Test for Independence, to look for any significant relationship between the indicators and the nationality of the driver.

Moreover, to test for *H1c: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding achievements will flatter British drivers but diminish those of Non-British drivers more in 2023 than in 2019, in terms of success*, and *H1d: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding achievements will flatter British drivers but diminish those of Non-British drivers more in 2023 than in 2019, in terms of*

failure, the newly created Success and Failure variables were used in a similar manner to the analysis process of H1a and H1b. However, as these hypotheses are dealing with two IVs, a Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted to test to what extent the year and the nationality of the driver could predict Success (H1c) and Failure (H1d). Furthermore, similar to H1a and H1b, the Chi-Square Test for Independence was conducted where each separate indicator was held against IV1: Year, with IV2: Nationality driver added as Layer 1, to look for any significant relationships aside from the general analysis.

In order to test *H2a: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding Personality/Physicality will be more flattering for British drivers than for Non-British drivers*, and *H2b: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, comments regarding Personality/Physicality will be more flattering for British drivers than for Non-British drivers in 2023 than 2019*, a similar tactic to H1a, H1b, H1c, and H1d was used. The main difference is the fact that the indicators for Personality/Physicality were computed into one variable "PersonalityPhysicality," rather than into two as was the case for Success/Failure. This decision was made as the coding scheme did not provide an option to split comments based on whether they were referring to personality or physicality, which is in line with the previous studies that conducted research on framing of nationality within international sporting competitions (i.e. Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 575-581; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 100-107; Billings et al, 2011, pp. 256-262). The newly created variable consisted of the 7 indicators (α = .997) that were used to test for DV2; Outgoing/extroverted, Modest/introverted, Emotional, Attractiveness, Size/parts of body, Background, and Other. Similar to the variables of Success and Failure, the variable PersonalityPhysicality is continuous, allowing the use of regression analysis. Therefore, for H2a, a Simple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted to test to what extent the nationality of the driver could predict PersonalityPhysicality, while a Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted to test H2b, as this hypothesis is dealing with two IVs. Lastly, for both hypotheses, the indicators were all tested separately, using a Chi-Square Test for Independence.

As for *H3a: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, Non-British drivers are more likely to be framed as the "scapegoat", while British drivers are more likely to be framed as the "hero",* and *H3b: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, Non-British drivers are more likely to be framed as the "scapegoat", while British drivers*

are more likely to be framed as the "hero", more so in 2023 than in 2019, a decision to accept or reject the hypotheses was made based on the results of the Chi-Square Test for Independence for each individual indicator that were used to measure for DV3; Alleviate, Gov.res1, Gov.res2, Solution, Gro.Ind.res, Gro.Ind.res1, Action, Human_Example, Feeling, Affect, Personal, Disagreement, Sides, Sides2, and Winners_losers. This decision was made as there is no clear distinction as to which comment is framed as "Hero" or as "Scapegoat." Therefore, conducting a Simple or Multiple Regression analysis was not deemed sufficient enough to accurately test the hypotheses. In that sense, for H3a all of the specific indicators were tested using the Chi-Square Test for Independence, with the indicators being used as the DVs while the nationality of the driver was used as the IV. A similar strategy was used to test H3b, the difference being that while the indicators remained as the DVs, IV1: Year was used as the IV and IV2: Nationality driver was added as Layer 1. For both hypotheses, the decision was made based on whether the results show enough support to accurately accept or reject the hypotheses. This strategy was also used by Billings and Eastman (2003, pp. 576-581) and Billings and Angelini (2007, pp. 102-107), therefore it was deemed a suitable strategy in regards to this thesis.

As for *H4: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary on F1, the majority of the mentions of the drivers' full name will be of British drivers in 2019 as well as in 2023,* and *H5: In the population of British Sky Sports commentary of F1, the majority of the mentions of teams will be of teams with a British driver in 2019 as well as in 2023*, the data was sorted based on whether a team or driver was discussed. In line with the previous studies (i.e. Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 576-581; Billings & Angelini, 2007, 102-107), no separate variables were created for the analysis process due to the factual nature of the data. Therefore, the data was further analysed based on the amount of references made and how many of those were attributed to British and Non-British drivers or towards teams consisting of at least one or more British drivers. Furthermore, a Chi-Square of Independence was conducted to test whether there was any significant growth, however due to the formulation of the hypotheses these results could not reject or accept the hypotheses.

4 Results

As mentioned, this research focused on a total of 648 minutes of recorded data, resulting in a total sample of 420 (100%) comments used for this study, from which 24 (5,7%) were deemed as neutral and were therefore excluded from any further tests. Furthermore, within the 648 minutes of data, a total of 3722 (100%) mentions of driver names and team names were found from which 2684 (72,1%) were mentions of full driver names and 1038 (27,9%) were mentions of team names. That being said, Table 1 shows the distribution of the comments and mentions for each DV. This chapter delves into the results for each DV in order to test the corresponding hypotheses.

Table 1

Comment/mention distribution across all DVs.

	Success	Failure	Personality/ Physicality	Scapegoat/ Hero	Team	Driver
2019	66 (42,6%)	67 (58,8%)	21 (53,8%)	197 (49,7%)	476 (45,9%)	1260 (46,1%)
2023	89 (57,4%)	47 (41,2%)	18 (46,2%)	199 (50,3%)	562 (54,1%)	1424 (53,1%)
Total	155 (100%)	114 (100%)	39 (100%)	396 (100%)	1038 (100%)	2684 (100%)
British	26 (16,8%)	34 (29,8%)	4 (10,3%)	89 (22,5%)	317 (30,5%)	535 (19,9%)
Non-British	129 (83,2%)	80 (70,2%)	35 (89,7%)	307 (77,5%)	721 (69,5%)	2149 (80,1%)
Total	155 (100%)	114 (100%)	39 (100%)	396 (100%)	1038 (100%)	2684 (100%)
British 2019	11 (42,3%)	18 (52,9%)	2 (50%)	34 (38,2%)	141 (44,5%)	175 (32,7%)
British 2023	15 (57,7%)	16 (47,1%)	2 (50%)	55 (61,8%)	176 (55,5%)	360 (67,3%)
Total	26	34	4	89	317	535

	(100%)[a]	(100%)[a]	(100%)[a]	(100%)[a]	(100%)[a]	(100%)[a]
Non-British 2019	55 (42,6%)	49 (61,2%)	19 (54,3%)	163 (53,1%)	335 (46,5%)	1085 (50,5%)
Non-British 2023	74 (57,4%)	31 (38,8%)	16 (45,7%)	144 (46,9%)	386 (53,5%)	1064 (49,5%)
Total	129 (100%)[b]	80 (100%)[b]	35 (100%)[b]	307 (100%)[b]	721 (100%)[b]	2149 (100%)[b]

Note. This table represents the distribution of comments and/or mentions for each DV, based on Year and Nationality.

[a] This total represents the total number of comments or mentions regarding British drivers or teams.

[b] This total represents the total numbers of comments or mentions regarding Non-British drivers or teams.

4.1 Success/Failure

As mentioned, to test H1a and H1b, a Linear Regression Analysis was conducted using IV2: Nationality driver as the predictor variable, and the newly computed variables "Success" and "Failure" as the criterion variable. The conducted analysis indicates that there is no linear relationship between the nationality of the driver and the comments regarding Success, $F(1, 153) = 0.851$, $p = .358$, and between the nationality of the driver and the comments regarding Failure, $F(1, 112) = 0.423$, $p = .517$. Therefore, hypothesis H1a and hypothesis H1b should be rejected. However, when conducting the Chi-Square Test for Independence for each specific indicator, the results showed some significant findings in regards to Success that bring nuance to the immediate rejection of H1a.

As shown in Table 2, the British drivers were more likely to be characterized as succeeding because of the Talent/ability of their athletic skills (n = 12, 46,2%), than Non-British drivers (n = 30, 23,3%). Another noticeable result is that of the relationship between the nationality of the driver and the indicator for Consonance, although this result is not significant when using an alpha of .050, it is significant when using an alpha of .100. This result indicates that Non-British drivers were more likely to be characterized as succeeding due to Consonance (n = 37, 28,7%), than British drivers (n = 3, 11,5%). Even though both

results are deemed as flattering for both the British and Non-British drivers, it is interesting to point out that the indicator of Talent/ability focuses on the skills of the driver, whereas Consonance does not necessarily directly refer to a drivers' skillset. Therefore, these results are in support of hypothesis 1a, as Consonance, although positively attributed, is seen to be a more diminishing indicator in comparison to Talent/ability. In regards to hypothesis 1b, no significant results were found for the specific indicators in regards to Failure.

Table 2

Talent/ability and Consonance within Success by Nationality driver

Indicators	Non-British		British	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
Talent/ability*	99 (76,7%)	30 (23,3%)	14 (53,8%)	12 (46,2%)
Consonance**	92 (71,3%)	37 (28,7%)	23 (88,5%)	3 (11,5%)

Note. This table represents the indicators that showed a significant result when compared to IV2: Nationality driver.

*$X^2(1, N = 155) = 5.7, p = .017$.

**$X^2(1, N = 155) = 3.3, p = .068$.

Furthermore, to test H1c and H1d, a Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted, using IV1: Year and IV2: Nationality driver as the predictor variables, and Success and Failure as the criterion variables. This analysis showed that there was no linear relationship between the IVs and Success, $F(2, 152) = 1.852, p = .160$, and between the IVs and Failure, $F(2, 111) = 0.227, p = .797$, therefore rejecting both hypotheses. Moreover, when conducting the Chi-Square Test of Independence for each of the specific indicators in relation to the nationality of the driver and the year the grand prix was held in, there were some significant findings in regards to comments referring to Success.

As shown in Table 3, Non-British drivers had a higher chance of being described as succeeding based on the strength of their athletic skills in 2023 (n = 20, 27%), than in 2019 (n = 7, 12,7%). In regards to British drivers, this indicator did not show any significant results. Furthermore, Non-British drivers also had a higher chance to be described as succeeding based on their experience in 2023 (n = 14, 18,9%), than in 2019 (n = 2, 3,6%). Similarly, the

results for this indicator in relation to British drivers also did not show any significance.

Table 3

Strength and Experience within Success by Nationality driver and Year

Indicators	2023		2019	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
		Non-British		
Strength*	54 (73,0%)	20 (27,0%)	48 (87,3%)	7 (12,7%)
Experience**	60 (81,1%)	14 (18,9%)	53 (96,4%)	2 (3,6%)
		British		
Strength*	11 (73,3%)	4 (26,7%)	7 (63,6%)	4 (36,4%)
Experience**	13 (86,7%)	2 (13,3%)	8 (72,7%)	3 (27,3%)

Note. This table represents the indicators that showed a significant result when compared to IV1: Year and IV2: Nationality driver.

* $X^2(1, N = 129) = 3.9$, $p = .048$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 26) = 0.3$, $p = .597$ (British).

** $X^2(1, N = 129) = 6.8$, $p = .009$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 26) = 0.8$, $p = .373$ (British).

It is interesting to point out that, when only the nationality is taken into account, the specific indicators do show support of H1a, but when the year is added they do not show support of H1c. Meaning, in general, the commentators, conscious or subconscious, chose to use a more diminishing indicator when describing the success of Non-British drivers than when describing the success of British drivers. Meanwhile, when differentiating between the years, the commentators chose to use more flattering indicators for the success of Non-British drivers in 2023 than in 2019. Although it could be argued that Experience is more diminishing as it is not directly referring to a drivers' skillset, which is also the case with Consonance. Nonetheless, Experience can only be used as an attribute when the driver has had prior success. In that sense, this result can be explained by the fact that 2023 and the year before were seen to be unsuccessful for the British drivers, meaning that if it was more successful for Non-British drivers they also had the space to gain in experience. Nonetheless, although the nationality of the driver cannot be seen as a direct predictor for Success, the specific indicators do show significant results that are supportive of H1a, and while the

nationality in combination with the year can also not be seen as a predictor for Success, the specific indicators show significant findings that are supportive of the Multiple Regression Analysis results but do bring some explanation as to why the IVs do not predict Success. All the while, the results regarding Failure did not lend any support to H1b and H1d, and the specific indicators also did not bring any nuance to the rejection of both hypotheses.

4.2 Physicality/Personality

To test H2a, a Simple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted using IV2: Nationality driver as the predictor variable and the newly computed variable "PersonalityPhysicality" as the criterion variable. This analysis indicates that there is no significant linear relationship between the two variables, $F(1, 37) = 0.247$, $p = .622$, therefore rejecting the hypothesis. Meaning, the nationality of the driver cannot be seen as a predictor for PersonalityPhysicality. Moreover, when conducting the Chi-Square Test for Independence for each of the specific indicators, no significant relationships were found to bring more insight to the rejection of the hypothesis.

Furthermore, to test H2b, a Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted adding IV1: Year as the second predictor variable. Similarly, this test indicates that there is no significant linear relationship between the variables, $F(1, 36) = 0.333$, $p = .719$, therefore also rejecting the hypothesis. Moreover, when conducting the Chi-Square Test for Independence for the specific indicators, there were no significant results found for any of the indicators in relation to this hypothesis.

In that sense, the findings related to PersonalityPhysicality did not lend any support for H2a and H2b. Therefore, the commentary did not show any favouritism towards the British drivers, nor were they more diminishing towards Non-British drivers. However, it has to be noted that these results could change when using a larger sample, as there were only 39 comments in total that were found to be attributed to Personality/Physicality.

4.3 Scapegoat/Hero

To test H3a, the Chi-Square Test for Independence was conducted for each of the specific indicators that were related to DV3: Scapegoat/Hero. For this hypothesis, IV2: Nationality driver was used as the IV, while the indicators were used as the DVs. Based on these tests, some significant results were found, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Indicator explanation within Scapegoat/Hero by Nationality driver

Indicators	Non-British		British	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
Alleviate*	275 (89,6%)	32 (10,4%)	74 (83,1%)	15 (16,9%)
Gov.res.1**	268 (87,3%)	39 (12,7%)	64 (71,9%)	25 (28,1%)
Solution***	259 (84,4%)	48 (15,6%)	67 (75,3%)	22 (24,7%)
Human_example****	232 (75,6%)	75 (24,4%)	78 (87,6%)	11 (12,4%)
Sides*****	231 (75,2%)	76 (24,8%)	57 (64,0%)	32 (36,0%)
Sides2******	198 (64,5%)	109 (35,5%)	67 (75,3%)	22 (24,7%)

Note. This table represents the indicators that showed a significant result when compared to IV2: Nationality driver.

* X^2 (1, N = 396) = 2.7, p = .099

** X^2 (1, N = 396) = 12.0, p < .001

*** X^2(1, N = 396) = 3.9, p = .048

**** X^2(1, N = 396) = 5.9, p = .015

***** X^2(1, N = 396) = 4.4, p = .037

****** X^2(1, N = 396) = 3.6, p = .057

To start, the findings show that there is a significant relationship between the nationality of the driver and whether the comment suggests that some level of team government is responsible for an issue/problem (Gov.res.1). In this case, comments regarding British drivers were more likely to suggest that some level of team government is responsible for issues/problems rather than the driver himself (n = 25, 28,1%), in contrast to comments referring to Non-British drivers (n = 39, 12,7%). Moreover, the results also

indicate a significant relationship between the nationality of the driver and whether the comment suggests any solutions for an issue/problem (Solution). Similarly, the frequencies for this test indicate that this was more likely to happen in comments made in reference to British drivers (n = 22, 24,7%), rather than in comments referring to Non-British drivers (n = 48, 15,6%). In addition, the results also show a significant relationship between the nationality of the driver and whether the comment provides a human example (Human_example). In this case, the results indicate that comments regarding Non-British drivers are more likely to provide a human example (n = 75, 24,4%), in contrast to comments regarding British drivers (n = 11, 12,4%). Furthermore, there is also a significant relationship between the nationality of the driver and whether the comment refers to two or more than two sides of an issue/problem (Sides). The results indicate that comments regarding British drivers are more likely to do so (n = 32, 36%), than comments regarding Non-British drivers (n = 76, 24,8). Lastly, when shifting the alpha to .100, two more significant relationships were found, between the nationality of the driver and whether a comment suggests that team government has the power to alleviate a problem (Alleviate), and whether a comment refers to two or more sides of a success (Sides2). In regards to Alleviate, the frequencies show that this is more likely to happen in reference to British drivers (n = 15, 16,9%), than in reference to Non-British drivers (n = 32, 10,4%). As for Sides2, this is more likely to occur in reference to Non-British drivers (n = 109, 35,5%), than in reference to British drivers (n = 22, 24,7%).

Based on these results hypothesis 3a is accepted, as the comments were more likely to find a scapegoat as the reason for issues or problems occurring to British drivers. Moreover, the indicators that showed a “positive” significant result for Non-British drivers, were more likely to question their success (Sides2) or used an example (Human_example). Based on the latter, it could be argued that the commentators are either comparing or are not familiar enough with the discussed driver. Therefore, these results showed several key differences in how British and Non-British drivers were depicted by the commentators that lend support to H3a.

As for hypothesis 3b, the Chi-Square Test for Independence was conducted using IV1: Year as the IV, while IV2: Nationality driver was added as Layer 1 and the indicators remained as the DVs. These tests showed some significant results, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Indicator explanation within Scapegoat/Hero by Nationality driver and Year

Indicators	2023		2019	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
			Non-British	
Gov.res.1*	123 (85,4%)	21 (14,6%)	145 (89,0%)	18 (11,0%)
Gro.ind.res2**	134 (93,1%)	10 (6,9%)	141 (86,5%)	22 (13,5%)
Human_example***	116 (80,6%)	28 (19,4%)	116 (71,2%)	47 (28,8%)
Feeling****	76 (52,8%)	68 (47,2%)	111 (68,1%)	52 (31,9%)
Affect*****	113 (78,5%)	31 (21,5%)	107 (65,6%)	56 (34,4%)
Personal******	143 (99,3%)	1 (0,7%)	155 (95,1%)	8 (4,9%)
Sides*******	116 (80,6%)	28 (19,4%)	115 (70,6%)	48 (29,4%)
Winners_losers********	119 (82,6%)	25 (17,4%)	135 (82,8%)	28 (17,2%)
			British	
Gov.res.1*	35 (63,6%)	20 (36,4%)	29 (85,3%)	5 (14,7%)
Gro.ind.res2**	51 (92,7%)	4 (7,3%)	32 (94,1%)	2 (5,9%)
Human_example***	50 (90,9%)	5 (9,1%)	28 (82,4%)	6 (17,6%)
Feeling****	27 (49,1%)	28 (50,9%)	25 (73,5%)	9 (26,5%)
Affect*****	33 (60,0%)	22 (40,0%)	24 (70,6%)	10 (29,4%)
Personal******	55 (100%)	0 (0%)	34 (100%)	0 (0%)
Sides*******	40 (72,7%)	15 (27,3%)	17 (50,0%)	17 (50,0%)
Winners_losers********	50 (90,9%)	5 (9,1%)	26 (76,5%)	8 (23,5%)

Note. This table represents the indicators that showed a significant result when compared to IV1: Year and IV2: Nationality driver.

* $X^2(1, N = 307) = 0.9$, $p = .353$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 89) = 4.9$, $p = .027$ (British).

** $X^2(1, N = 307) = 3.5$, $p = .061$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 89) = 0.0$, $p = .799$ (British).

*** $X^2(1, N = 307) = 3.7$, $p = .056$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 89) = 1.4$, $p = .233$ (British).

**** $X^2(1, N= 307) = 7.5$, $P = .006$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 89) = 5.2$, $p = .023$ (British).

***** $X^2(1, N = 307) = 6.2$, $p = .013$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 89) = 1.0$, $p = .312$ (British).

******$X^2(1, N = 307) = 4.8$, $p = .029$ (Non-British).

******* $X^2(1, N = 307) = 4.1$, $p = .043$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 89) = 4.7$, $p = .030$ (British).

******** $X^2(1, N = 307) = 0.0$, $p = .966$ (Non-British), $X^2(1, N = 89) = 3.5$, $p = .061$ (British).

The results show that there is a significant relationship between the comments regarding British drivers and whether they suggest that some form of team government is responsible for an issue/problem (Gov.res.1), in relation to the year the race was held in. The corresponding frequencies suggest that there was a bigger chance of such suggestions in 2023 (n = 20, 36,4%), than in 2019 (n = 5, 14,7%). Meanwhile, the same test did not show any significant results in regards to Non-British drivers. Furthermore, a significant relationship was also found between whether comments regarding Non-British drivers and British drivers, employ adjectives or personal vignettes that generate feeling of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy, or compassion (Feeling), in relation to the year the race was held in. The frequencies for this indicator suggest that this was more likely to happen in 2023 than in 2019 for Non-British drivers (n = 68, 47,2%), as well as for British drivers (n = 28, 50,9%). These frequencies would also suggest that in 2023 this is more likely to happen for comments in reference to British drivers, than for comments referring to Non-British drivers. Additionally, another significant relationship was found between whether comments regarding Non-British drivers emphasize how the referred driver is affected by an issue/problem (Affect), in relation to the year the race was held in. In this case the frequencies indicate that this was more likely to occur in 2019 (n = 56, 34,4%) than in 2023 (n = 31, 21,5%). The same test did not show any significant results regarding British drivers. Moreover, a significant relationship was found between whether comments regarding Non-British drivers go into the private or personal lives of the referred driver (Personal), in relation to the race the year was held in. For this indicator, the frequencies show that this was more likely to occur in 2019 (n = 8, 4,9%) than in 2023 (n = 1, 0,7%). The same test could not offer any results regarding British drivers as none of the comments were answered with "Yes" in both 2019 and 2023. Lastly, a significant relationship was found between comments referring to two or more than two sides of an issue/problem (Sides) and the year the race was held in, for both British and Non-British drivers. The frequencies show that, in case of Non-British drivers, this was most likely to occur in 2019 (n = 48, 29,4%) than in 2023 (n = 28, 19,4%). Although, the frequencies in relation to British drivers suggests that this was also more likely to occur in 2019 (n = 17, 50%), than in 2023 (n = 15, 27,3%), this assumption cannot be made as the comments made in 2019 had an equal chance of being answered

with “Yes” as with “No”.

Furthermore, when shifting the alpha from .050 to .100, three more significant results were found. To start, the results showed that the commentators were more likely to suggest that a group or individual that is not the referred driver was responsible for the success of Non-British drivers in 2019 (n = 22, 13,5%), than in 2023 (n = 10, 6,9%). This test did not show any significant results in regards to British drivers. Moreover, the use of a human example in comments referring to Non-British drivers were also more likely to happen in 2019 (n = 47, 28,8%), than in 2023 (n = 28, 19,4%). Similarly, this test did also not show any significant results in regards to British drivers. Lastly, the results showed a significant relationship between the year, the nationality of the driver, and whether the comment referred to winners or losers. This test showed that comments regarding British drivers were more likely to do so in 2019 (n = 8, 23,5%), than in 2023 (n = 5, 9,1%). Meanwhile, this test did not show any significant results regarding Non-British drivers.

Based on these results it could be argued that hypothesis 3b can neither be accepted nor rejected. Although the results did show that the commentators were more likely to show compassion for Non-British drivers in 2019 than in 2023, they did not necessarily search for a scapegoat. Similarly, the commentators were also not necessarily looking for a scapegoat in regards to issues or problems of British drivers. In this case, the British and Non-British drivers were merely differently portrayed, whereas the results regarding H3a showed clear differences in choosing to blame someone else for issues or problems for British drivers, while choosing not to do so for Non-British drivers. Additionally, for H3a almost half of the Chi-Square analyses showed significant results, while more than half of the Chi-Square analyses showed significant results for H3b.

4.4 Driver & Team

4.4.1 Hypothesis 4

To test H4, the frequencies of the variable “Driver” were analysed and compared to IV1: Year. Although, the majority of the mentions were not of British drivers’ full name, therefore rejecting the hypothesis, it is interesting to note that there is a clear increase in the mentions of British drivers while the mentions of Non-British drivers showed a decrease in 2023 (British: N = 360, 25,3%; Non-British: N = 1064, 47,7%) compared to 2019 (British: N

= 175, 13,9%; Non-British: N = 1085, 86,1%), as shown in Table 6. Moreover, when conducting the Chi-Square Test for Independence, these differences were found to be significant, $X^2(1, N = 2684) = 54.4$, $p < .001$. Additionally, when taking the frequencies for each driver into account, all three British drivers can be found in the top five of full name mentions in 2023, while in 2019 only one British driver had a spot in the top five, which was the then championship defender and WDC of that season; Lewis Hamilton. Additionally, speaking of World Champions, the frequencies show that current WDC, Max Verstappen, was only 7th on the list in 2023, ranking below all three British drivers and his own teammate, Sergio Perez, who ranked first. Meanwhile, in 2019, Max Verstappen ranked third, above all the British drivers, despite not being a World Champion yet. Furthermore, the increase for the British drivers could be attributed to the fact that all three British drivers were driving for a "top team" in 2023. These top teams are often found to be battling in the top 10 during races, which is objectively more interesting than on track battles in the lower regions, as only the top 10 can score points. The frequencies for each driver can be found in Appendix C.

Table 6

Frequency explanation of Drivername by Nationality and Year

Is he British?	What year was the race held in?	
	2023	2019
No	1064 (47,7%)	1085 (86,1%)
Yes	360 (25,3%)	175 (13,9%)

Note. This table represent the difference in the amount of full name mentions that were made in 2019 and 2023, in regard to British and Non-British drivers.

4.4.2 Hypothesis 5

To test H5, the frequencies of the variable "Team" were analysed and compared to IV1: Year, as shown in Table 7. The frequencies show that the teams with British drivers were not the majority of the mentions in either 2019 or in 2023, therefore rejecting the hypothesis. However, the mentions of teams with British drivers saw a slight increase in 2023 (n = 176, 31,4%) compared to 2019 (n = 141, 29,6%), despite only having two teams

with British drivers in 2023 while there were three teams with British drivers in 2019. In that line, the mentions of teams without British drivers saw a decrease in 2023 (n = 386, 68,7%) compared to 2019 (335, 70,4%). Moreover, the frequencies for each team, which can be found in Appendix D, also showed some fluctuations. To start, despite the gap between the first and second spot, the mentions were more evenly spread out in 2019 than in comparison to 2023 where the top five got over 75% of the mentions.

Table 7

Frequency explanation Teamname by Nationality team and Year

Does the team have at least one British driver?	What year was the race held in?	
	2023	2019
No	386 (68,7%)	335 (70,3%)
Yes	176 (31,4%)	141 (29,6%)

Note. This table represent the difference in the amount of team name mentions that were made in 2019 and 2023, in regard to teams with and without a British driver.

5 Conclusion

This study set out to find out whether there is a change in the framing of nationality within the British Sky Sports commentary on F1 in 2019 and 2023, using a quantitative content analysis approach. The following chapter will present a discussion of the relevant test results in relation to the literature, and will answer the research question; *To what extent is there a change in framing nationality in the British Sky Sports commentating on Formula 1 in 2019 and 2023?* Moreover, this chapter will provide an insight into the limitations of this study and the implications for future research.

In this research, the British Sky Sports commentary was analyzed for the occurrence of favouritism towards the British drivers in 2019 and 2023, based on comments regarding Success/Failure, Personality/Physicality, framing as Scapegoat/Hero, and the frequency of name mentions regarding British drivers and of teams with at least one British driver. Based on the results, conclusions can be made which are presented in the subsequent paragraphs.

5.1 Discussion

In terms of Succes, the comments regarding British drivers were, in general, more likely to be attributed to the skills of a driver. Meanwhile, the results taking the year into account were not necessarily more diminishing towards Non-British drivers in 2023 than in 2019, the comments were still not significantly attributed to the drivers' own skills. Moreover, in terms of Scapegoat/Hero, the results showed that, in general, when an issue/problem occur the comments are more in favour of the British drivers. The commentators are quick to suggest that the team, rather than the British driver, are responsible when issues/problems occur. While the commentators emphasized the affects of an issue/problem of a Non-British driver significantly more in 2019. Although the general hypotheses were rejected, the results of the indicators are not all that surprising, as Billings et al. (2011, p. 263) found that, within American and Chinese broadcasts of the Olympics, the "home" athletes are found to be the multi-faceted "us", being described in more flourishing and detailed language, whereas the composing athletes are found to be the one-dimensional "other".

Moreover, when combining the results of Success/Failure and Scapegoat/Hero, it can be argued that the Non-British drivers are framed in an unfavourable or unflattering way, to

require some form of redemption for the in-group, this would align with Butterworth's (2010, pp. 133-152) research. In that sense, the fact that the results showed that the commentators were more likely to show empathy towards Non-British drivers in 2019 than in 2023, could be attributed to the fact that, as mentioned, 2023 is deemed as a relatively unsuccessful year for British drivers, as none of them took the top step of the podium at any of the 23 races. That being said, the overall results of this research could be attributed to a sense of familiarity (Sabo et al., 1996, pp. 18-19), where the commentators are more familiar with the, in this case, British drivers due to them coming from the same country and speaking the same language. However, it can be argued that such clarifications do not necessarily apply to F1, where in the years 2019 and 2023 the driver line-up more or less stayed the same. Meaning, the commentators follow the same set of 20 drivers for about 21 weekends a year, for a longer period of time, raising the question as to what would count as familiarity. Even so, when excluding familiarity, the results can still be explained through the Sports/Media Complex, where the commentators are targeting towards their biggest paying audience (Beck, 2017, p. 3). Which, similar to Sabo et al. (1996, pp. 18-19) arguments, will be the British audience, even though the international audience is seen to be growing. Although the hypotheses were rejected and the results are not necessarily surprising, it is striking to see that the use of nationalistic stereotypes still stands and although they are not necessarily increasing, the results do show that there is a difference in the portrayal of British drivers in comparison to the portrayal of Non-British drivers.

In this sense, the results undermine Poli's (2007, pp. 657-658) arguments that sports are a form of denationalization, while reinforcing Calhoun's (2007, p. 4) statements that nationalism cannot be disregarded in a globalized world. Additionally, where Billings and Eastman (2003, p. 584) and Billings and Angelini (2007, p. 109) found political reasoning for the clear favouritism for the in-group, this study merely found the overall standings within the Championship in the current year (i.e. 2019 or 2023) and the previous years, together with attracting the biggest, paying audience, to be reasons as to why British drivers are favoured over Non-British drivers.

To conclude, although the hypotheses were rejected, the results of the specific indicators in relation to the research question showed that there were definitely some changes in terms of framing nationality in the British Sky Sports commentary on F1 in 2019 and 2023. Furthermore, even though the general results do not necessarily show a change in

terms of increase, they also do not show a change in terms of decrease. Meaning, even though F1 is becoming more globalized, likeliness of framing based on nationality remains more or less the same, at least in the British Sky Sports commentary. Therefore, this study underscores arguments made by Miller et al. (2001, p. 3) and Kim and Billings (2017, p. 197), that nationalism is seemingly an important part of international sporting events, and that, even in the 2020s, Billig's (1995, pp.49-51) banal forms of nationalism should not and cannot be forgotten in sociological studies.

5.2 Limitations & Implications

Due to the timeframe for this research and the amount of available data, sampling choices had to be made in order to fit a sufficient amount of data within the timeframe. Although the sampling procedures were trusted to sample relevant data, a bigger sample could have changed or underscored the current results. In this sense, future studies with a bigger timeframe could opt for a bigger sample from each of the selected races or choose to use more than only three races per season.

Second, although the quantitative nature of the study is not a limitation in itself, this study could also benefit from a mixed methods approach. This would allow for more insights into, for example, the intonations that were used by commentators. As a Dutch researcher, the factual nature of the coding scheme allowed for a neutral approach during the coding process. Moreover, as this research was dealing with groups, i.e. British and Non-British, instead of comparisons between drivers from specific nations, the results could not reflect possible bias towards one singular driver.

Lastly, this study was somewhat limited by the source material. As the main literature (i.e. Billings & Eastman, 2003, pp. 569-584; Billings & Angelini, 2007, pp. 95-109; Billings et al., 2011, pp. 251-264) focused on analyzing the Olympics, which in itself is a completely different event than F1 even though they are both international sporting events. This is mainly shown in the hypotheses for this study, where taking the British drivers as the majority, for example, is in hindsight not a logical choice as there are only three British drivers, while in the Olympics the participating athlete per nation count is more spread out over the different nations and over the different sports.

As for the scientific and societal implications, this study proved that within a

globalized world, nationalistic tendencies still stand, especially in sports. However, future studies could shift the focus to whether there are differences between commentary from different broadcasters or whether specific race results show any significance in terms of whether the nationality of the winner influences the commentary. Moreso, future studies could also opt for researching the effects such framing tendencies can have on the audience, as Beck (2017, p. 2) noted that the use of nationalistic stereotypes within the commentary plays into the sense of belonging and identity creation of the audience. Therefore, future studies could focus on whether the Non-British audience reacts differently to the British Sky Sports commentary than the British audience and what this might entail for the overall engagement with the sport. In line with Gitlin's (1980, p. 14) statements, this research provides the symbolic content that is needed before the effects question can be asked.

Altogether, this study builds on existing research and offered new insights using a more recent case. As this study started from an interest in F1 and in nationalism within a globalized world, it is interesting to see that the results underscore statements, some of which were made over a decade or two ago, that still hold true in this day and age. Therefore, even though sports have been a defined as a globalization process since its beginnings, it is still very much a place where nationalistic tendencies and nationalism are seemingly important, and, based on the results of this study, are ever so slightly increasing, at least in the commentary aspect. As Billig (1995) states in regard to banal form of nationalism "having no name, it cannot be identified as a problem" (p. 6), and that is exactly why this study is of great social and scientific relevance.

References

Babbie, E. (2017). *The Basics of Social Research* (7th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning, Inc.

Beck, D. (2017). Media Representation: Sports. In P. Rössler, C. Hoffner, & L. Van Zoonen (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects* (pp. 1-9). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi:10.1002/9781118783764.wbieme0150

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Billings, A., & Angelini, J. (2007). Packaging the Games for Viewers Consumption: Gender, Ethnicity, and Nationality in NBC's Coverage of the 2004 Summer Olympics. *Communication Quarterly, 55*(1), 95-111. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370600998731

Billings, A., & Eastman, S. (2003). Framing Identities: Gender, Ethnic, and National Parity in Network Announcing of the 2002 Winter Olympics. *Journal of Communication, 53*(4), 569-586. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb02911.x

Billings, A., Angelini, J., & Wu, D. (2011). Nationalistic Notions of the Superpowers: Comparative Analyses of the American and Chinese Telecast in the 2008 Beijing Olympiad. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 55*(2), 251-266. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2011.571325

Butterworth, M. L. (2010). Do You Believe in Nationalism? American patriotism in Miracle. In H. Hundley, & A. Billings (Eds.), *Examining Identitiy in Sport Media* (pp. 133-152). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Calhoun, C. (2007). *Nations Matter: Culture, History, and the Cosmopolitan Dream.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Towards Clarification of a Framing Paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51-58. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Gamson, W., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(1), 1-37.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World Is Watching.* University of California Press.

Giulianotti, R., & Robertson, R. (2013). Sport and Globalization. In D. L. Andrews, & B. Carrington (Eds.), *A Companion to Sport* (pp. 41-60). West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. doi:https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/9781118325261.ch2

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Guha, T. (2023, September 24). *The Rise of Racing: The Digital Reinvention of Formula One*. Retrieved from The Edict: https://www.the-edict.in/post/the-rise-of-racing-the-digital-reinvention-of-formula-one

Kim, Y., & Billings, A. (2017). A Hostile Sports Media?: Percieved Nationalism Bias in Online Sports Coverage. *Electronic News, 11*(4), 195-210. doi:10.1177/1931243117701524

Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071878781

Lecler, R. (2019). What makes globalization really new? Sociological views on our current globalization. *Journal of Global History, 14*(3), 355-373. doi:10.1017/S1740022819000160

Lee, M., Lim, C., Yeo, I.-S., & Pedersen, P. (2015). The Marketing of an International Match in Asia: The Effects of Sport Commentary and Nationalistic Sentiments on Framing, Priming, and Consumer Behavior. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 24*(4), 235-245.

Matthes, J., & Kohring, M. (2008). The Content Analysis of Media Frames: Toward Improving Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Communication, 58*(2), 258-279. doi:https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00384.x

Miller, T., Lawrence, G., McKay, J., & Rowe, D. (2001). *Globalization and Sport: Playing the World.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446218396

Neuendorf, K. A. (2017). *The Content Analysis Guidebook* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, United States of America: SAGE Publications, Inc.

doi:https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802878

Poli, R. (2007). The Denationalization of Sport: De-ethnicization of the Nation and Identity Deterritorialization. *Sport in Society, 10*(4), 646-661. doi:10.1080/17430430701388798

Real, M. (1989). *Super Media: A Cultural Studies Approach.* Newbury Park: SAGE Publication, Inc.

Rowe, D. (2013). The Sport/Media Complex. In B. Carrington, & D. L. Andrews (Eds.), *A Companion to Sport* (pp. 61-77). West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. doi:https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/9781118325261.ch3

Sabo, D., Jansen, S. C., Tate, D., Duncan, M. C., & Leggett, S. (1996). Televising International Sport: Race, Ethnicity, and Nationalistic Bias. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 20*(1), 7-21.

Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. *Journal of Communication, 49*(1), 103-122. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x

Scholte, J. A. (2008). Defining Globalisation. *The World Economy, 31*(11), 1471-1502. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9701.2007.01019.x

Scott, O., Hill, B., & Zakus, D. (2014). Framing the 2007 National Basketball Association finals: An analysis of commentator discourse. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 49*(6), 728-744. doi:10.1177/1012690212466852

Seippel, Ø. (2017). Sports and Nationalism in a Globalized World. *International Journal of Sociology, 47*(1), 43-61. doi:10.1080/00207659.2017.1264835

Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News. *Journal of Communication, 50*(2), 93-109. doi:https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2000.tb02843.x

Wann, D., & Grieve, F. (2005). Biased Evaluations of In-Group and Out-Group Spectator Behavior at Sporting Events: The Importance of Team Identification and Threats to Social Identity. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*(5), 531-545.

doi:https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.145.5.531-54

Appendix A

Appendix A1

Coding scheme 1

Variable	Question	Answer options		
Comment	What is the comment?	Open-ended question.		
Year	What year was the race held in?	2019	2023	
Grand Prix	Which Grand Prix?	Multiple choice question, including the six watched races.		
Driver	To which driver do the commentators refer?	Multiple choice question, including all driver options for the years 2019 and 2023.		
Nationality	Is the driver British	Yes	No	
Success/failure	Is the comment referring to success/failure?	Yes	No	
	If yes, success or failure?	Success	Failure	N/A

Success/failure questions. Only answer "non applicable" when answered with "no"

Concentration	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to concentration? (e.g. "very focused," "never distracted")	Yes	No	N/A
Athletic skill – strength	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to strength of their athletic skills? (e.g. "powerful," "strong")	Yes	No	N/A
Athletic skill – talent/ability	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to talent/ability of their athletic skills? (e.g. "nailed the start," "great at overtaking")	Yes	No	N/A
Composure	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to composure? (e.g. "kept it together," "very calm")	Yes	No	N/A
Commitment	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to commitment? (e.g. "nobody works harder,"	Yes	No	N/A

	"never gave up")			
Courage	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to courage? (e.g. "gutsy," "determined")	Yes	No	N/A
Experience	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to experience? (e.g. "has 10 race wins", "multiple world champion")	Yes	No	N/A
Athletic consonance	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to consonance? (e.g. "it is his race," "it all came together for…")	Yes	No	N/A
Intelligence	Is the success/failure of the driver positively attributed to intelligence? (e.g. "smart move," "well thought of)	Yes	No	N/A
Personality/ physicality	Is the descriptor used to refer to the personality/physicality	Yes	No	

	of the driver?			
Personality/physicality questions. Only answer "non applicable" when answered with "no"				
Outgoing/ extroverted	Is the driver positively referred to as being outgoing/extroverted? (e.g. "bold personality," "very talkative")	Yes	No	N/A
Modest/ introverted	Is the driver positively referred to as being modest/introverted? (e.g. "he is shy," "very quiet")	Yes	No	N/A
Emotional	Is the driver positively referred to in terms of being emotional? (e.g. "grateful," "exuberant")	Yes	No	N/A
Attractiveness	Is the driver positively referred to in terms of attractiveness? (e.g. "goodlooking," "cute")	Yes	No	N/A
Size/parts of body	Is the driver positively referred to in terms of size/parts of body? (e.g. "lost weight," "big neck muscles")	Yes	No	N/A

Background	Is the background of the driver positively being referred to? (e.g. "moved at an early age," "lost his father")	Yes	No	N/A
Other	Is the drivers' personality/physicality positively referred to using other descriptors?	Yes	No	N/A
	If Yes? What descriptors?	Open-ended question, only available when answering "yes" for "other."		

Scapegoat/hero questions.

Alleviate	Does the comment suggest that some level of team government has the ability to alleviate a problem?	Yes	No
Gov.res1	Does the comment suggest that some level of team government is responsible for an issue/problem?	Yes	No
Gov.res2	Does the comment suggest that some level of team government is responsible for success?	Yes	No

Solution	Does the comment suggest any solution(s) to a problem/issue?	Yes	No
Gro.Ind.responsible	Does the comment suggest that an individual or a group (that is not the referred driver) is responsible for an issue/problem?	Yes	No
Gro.Ind.Resp1	Does the comment suggest that an individual or a group (that is not the referred driver) is responsible for a success?	Yes	No
Action	Does the comment suggest a problem/issue requires urgent action?	Yes	No
Human example	Does the comment provide a human example (that is not the referred driver)?	Yes	No
Feeling	Does the comment employ adjectives or personal vignettes that generate feeling of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy, or	Yes	No

	compassion?		
Affect	Does the comment emphasize how the referred driver is affected by an issue/problem	Yes	No
Personal live	Does the comment go into the private or personal lives of the referred driver?	Yes	No
Disagreement	Does the comment reflect disagreement between actors (i.e. team-driver)?	Yes	No
Sides	Does the comment refer to two sides or more than two sides of a problem/issue?	Yes	No
Sides2	Does the comment refer to two sides or more than two sides of success?	Yes	No
Winners/losers	Does the comment refer to winners and losers?	Yes	No

Appendix B

Appendix B1

Coding scheme 2

Variable	Question	Answer options		
Year	What year was the race held in?	2019	2023	
Grand Prix	Which Grand Prix?	Multiple choice question, including the six watched races.		
Driver/team	Are you coding a team or a driver?	Team	Driver	
Team question, only answer "non applicable" when answered "Driver."				
Team	Which team?	Multiple choice question, including all team name options for the year 2019 and 2023.		
Team British	Does the team have at least one British driver?	Yes	No	N/A
Driver question, only answer "non applicable" when answered "Team."				
Driver	Which driver?	Multiple choice question, including all driver options for 2019 and 2023.		
Driver British	Is the driver British?	Yes	No	N/A

Appendix C

Appendix C1

Frequencies Drivername by Year

Driver	How often was the driver's full name mentioned?
	2019
Valtteri Bottas (FI)[a]	131 (10,4%)
Sebastian Vettel (DE)[b]	121 (9,6%)
Max Verstappen (NL)	104 (8,3%)
Lewis Hamilton (GB)	101 (8%)
Charles Leclerc (MC)	99 (7,9%)
Alex Albon (TH)[a]	81 (6,4%)
Carlos Sainz (ES)[a]	78 (6,2%)
Lando Norris (GB)	66 (5,2%)
Lance Stroll (CA)[a]	59 (4,7%)
Nico Hulkenberg (DE)[a]	57 (4,5%)
Kevin Magnussen (DK)	57 (4,5%)
Daniil Kvyat (RU)[b]	53 (4,2%)
Sergio Perez (MX)[a]	51 (4%)
Pierre Gasly (FR)[a]	50 (4%)
Kimi Raikkonen (FI)[b]	37 (2,9%)
Romain Grosjean (FR)[b]	35 (2,8%)
Daniel Ricciardo (AU)[a]	32 (2,5%)
Robert Kubica (PL)[b]	21 (1,7%)
Antonio Giovinazzi (IT)[b]	19 (1,5%)
George Russell (GB)[a]	8 (0,6%)
	2023
Sergio Perez (MX)	156 (11%)
Fernando Alonso (ES)[b]	152 (10,7%)
Lewis Hamilton (GB)	123 (8,6%)
George Russell (GB)	122 (8,6%)
Lando Norris (GB)	115 (8,1%)

Carlos Sainz (ES)	100 (7%)
Max Verstappen (NL)	99 (7%)
Charles Leclerc (MC)	87 (6,1%)
Lance Stroll (CA)	79 (5,5%)
Oscar Piastri (AU)[b]	61 (4,3%)
Esteban Ocon (FR)[b]	43 (3%)
Zhou Guanyu (CN)[b]	40 (2,8%)
Alex Albon (TH)	40 (2,8%)
Yuki Tsunoda (JP)[b]	36 (2,5%)
Valtteri Bottas (FI)	35 (2,5%)
Nico Hulkenberg (DE)	31 (2,2%)
Pierre Gasly (FR)	27 (1,9%)
Logan Sargeant (US)[b]	26 (1,8%)
Daniel Ricciardo (AU)	21 (1,5%)
Kevin Magnussen (DK)	21 (1,5%)
Nyck de Vries (NL)[b]	10 (0,7%)

Note. This table represents the frequency of each full name mention in 2019 and in 2023 for each participating driver.

[a]These drivers participated in different teams in 2019

[b]These drivers were not participating in 2023

[c]These drivers were not participating in 2019

Appendix D

Appendix D1

Frequencies Teamname by Year

Team	How often is the team referred to?
	2019
Ferrari	113 (23,7%)
Mercedes[a]	68 (14,3%)
Red Bull	59 (12,4%)
McLaren[a]	49 (10,3%)
Renault/Alpine	45 (9,5%)
Racing Point	37 (7,8%)
Toro Rosso/Alpha Tauri	35 (7,4%)
Haas	35 (7,4%)
Williams[a]	24 (5%)
Alfa Romeo	11 (2,3%)
	2023
Ferrari	105 (18,7%)
Red Bull	92 (16,4%)
Mercedes[b]	88 (15,7%)
McLaren[b]	88 (15,7%)
Aston Martin	70 (12,5%)
Williams	32 (5,7%)
Renault/Alpine	31 (5,5%)
Alfa Romeo	20 (3,6%)
Toro Rosso/Alpha Tauri	18 (3,2%)
Haas	18 (3,2%)

Note. This table represents the frequency of each team name mention in 2019 and in 2023.

[a]These teams had at least one British driver in 2019

[b]These teams had at least one British driver in 2023