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Colin Kaepernick spearheaded a social movement to protest police brutality and other oppression experienced by the Black community by choosing to kneel during the National Anthem before NFL games. These protests quickly became controversial and created a media firestorm. This research aims to understand how conservative media outlets framed the protests, and more specifically Colin Kaepernick, through the lenses of masculinity and whiteness, as well as attempts to understand how culture surrounding football reinforce these tropes. The analysis was based on a purposeful sampling and emergent coding of 77 opinion media pieces from Fox News Network, as well as ethnographic observations that followed a rural Virginia high school football team and interviews with 21 participants from the high school community. This study revealed how the portrayal of Colin Kaepernick is displayed through the creation of *The American
man, based largely in ideas of whiteness, patriotism, and subservience, challenging of *The American man*, and notions of crafting the American “we” through collective identity and how these portrayals are deeply rooted in the culture of American football.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The United States’ founding is grounded in racism and patriarchal values. However, little research has explored how both systems work in congruence as a means of maintaining this traditional ‘order’ in the wake of the National Anthem protests in the National Football League that have sparked controversy since first performed by Colin Kaepernick in 2016 (Brinson 2016; Martin 2018). Analysis of Fox News’ coverage of Colin Kaepernick and National Anthem protests in the National Football League reveals how white men maintain their masculine nationalistic identity as superior specifically by restricting, and in some cases policing, alternative constructions of masculinity, specifically those associated with non-white men. I aim to understand how the opposition to national anthem protests demonstrates and maintains white hegemonic nationalist masculine identities in opposition to Black agentic masculinities. Since the United States was founded, a racial and gender hierarchy was established and maintained through structures and institutions, as well as identity formations, for those living in the United States (Kendi 2017). I theorize that the opinions expressed by the op-ed writers I analyzed reveal the ways in which white hegemonic masculinity is established using both a nationalistic frame and white paternalism in opposition to Black masculinity. Seeking to understand the role that football culture plays in supporting ideologies that are engaged and mobilized as part of the backlash experienced by Kaepernick, I conducted
ethnographic research at football games at a high school in rural Virginia. During the fall of 2019, I attended most of the team’s football games and interviewed 21 members of the community. From interview data and my observations, I began to understand that football culture is one that is dominated by white masculinity and white moral codes. Tradition and rituals laid foundations for a communal identity. As a result, violations of rituals or traditions were interpreted as a threat to personal identity. This research is important because, as the conceptualization of opposition to protests and identity formation is better understood, racial tensions can be addressed and mediated in an effort to help the United States address its racist and patriarchal history (Wondolleck, Gray, & Bryan 2003). Additionally, my research will encourage the reader to think critically about the use of media as a tool to maintain oppressive systems.

**Background**

Colin Kaepernick, a quarterback in the National Football League, first protested during a preseason game on August 14, 2016 (Brinson 2016; Martin 2018). He did so to bring attention to the issue of police brutality in the wake of the then recent deaths of Alton Sterling and Philando Castile, as well as other inequalities experienced by people of color (Brinson 2016; Martin 2018; Stites 2018). At that time, he was a quarterback for the San Francisco 49ers fighting for the starting position. On August 14, during the national anthem of the game, he sat on the bench. After seeing his protest, Nate Boyer, a Green Beret, wrote an open letter to Kaepernick in hopes of discussing his protest. He understood that Kaepernick was trying to bring attention to the issue of police brutality, but he felt that sitting on the bench was a disrespectful way to do so. Kaepernick reached
out to Boyer and the two met to discuss the protest. They eventually came to a compromise, Kaepernick choosing to kneel rather than sit during the National Anthem because kneeling is how soldiers show respect to their fallen comrades. Before the last preseason game on September 1, 2016, Boyer remained standing during the national anthem, but stood beside Kaepernick as a sign of support (Brinson 2016).

Kaepernick continued to kneel throughout the rest of the 2017 NFL season. At the end of the season, Kaepernick became a free agent. He was not picked up by any NFL team and eventually filed a collusion grievance against the NFL on the grounds that the NFL was preventing teams from signing him because of his activism (Stites 2018). On September 22, 2017, President Donald Trump responded to the protests by calling the players who partook in the protests “sons of bitches” and citing anti-patriotism (Stites 2018). As a result, on September 24, 2017, more players protested than ever before (Stites 2018). Entire teams remained in the locker rooms during the national anthem and there was a noticeable increase in the number of players protesting on the field (Stites 2018). In October 2017, rumors began circulating about NFL anthem rule changes. Prior to this time, there was no rule regarding the National Anthem; however, on May 23, 2018, the NFL instituted a rule that required players to stand and “show respect for the flag and the anthem” or choose to stay in the locker room during the playing and/or singing of the anthem (Stites 2018). In July 2018, the NFL froze the anthem policy, leaving the NFL without a policy to control players’ actions during the National Anthem (Stites 2018).
While many supported Kaepernick as he brought attention to an important societal issue, others viewed his protests as anti-American and anti-White (Thomas 2016; Martin 2018: 26). Many media outlets portrayed him as turning his back on thousands of military members and police that protect the United States and aim to make it a safer place (Erickson 2016). His protest was narrativized as direct opposition to the American flag as opposed to a statement about racial justice, which according to Kaepernick was how he meant it - as opposition to the intense racial history that claims the lives of many in marginalized communities (Erickson 2016).

In 2017, GQ named Colin Kaepernick the “Citizen of the Year,” (Editors of GQ 2017). Backlash immediately followed. Fox News directly attacked GQ, calling it the magazine of “emasculated men,” (Starnes 2017b). Critics also called Kaepernick the “Coward” of the Year (Starnes 2017b). Starnes, a Fox new columnist, and white man, directly challenged Kaepernick’s masculinity by saying that GQ’s definition of “what it means to be a good citizen and a good man and a hero [was] puzzling,” (2017b). He goes on to say “they seem to believe the epitome of manhood is taking a knee. But I say the true measure of a man is taking a stand,” (Starnes 2017b). Kaepernick’s protest did not meet Starnes’ definition of “taking a stand” because it was being framed as unpatriotic.

In September of 2018, Nike released an advertisement with Colin Kaepernick. The theme of this advertisement was to “believe in something, even if it meant sacrificing everything,” (Thomas 2018). The response to this advertisement perfectly encompasses the response many white men had to the National Anthem protests themselves. Kaepernick was called privileged, and a man who did not understand sacrifice (McHenry
Critics defined “sacrifice” as putting one’s life at risk, a willingness to pay the ultimate price, a narrative that is often invoked when speaking of the military and its veterans. Many critiqued Nike for spreading the idea that Kaepernick’s inability to play football could be defined as a similar sacrifice (McHenry 2018).

CNN conducted a poll in 2017 about American opinions on anthem protests. Fifty-two percent of men believed athletes were doing the wrong thing by protesting, as did 59% of whites (Agiesta 2017). Other polls have been conducted, focusing on the three main themes: patriotism, free speech, and race (Casteel 2017). These three themes are often the foundation on which people base their approval or disapproval of the protests. Polls reveal a strong racial divide on the issue (Casteel 2017). These polls also look at opinions based on gender; while the gap between men and women are smaller, men show stronger opposition to the protest (Casteel 2017). These polls fail to demonstrate how intersections of both race and gender effect disapproval of the protests. White people and men consistently report the highest levels of disapproval of the anthem protests, but how do white men and men of color differ? What about white men and women of color?

Kaepernick’s protest was a highly visible social movement that gained national attention and, as noted, the “talking heads” responded. Yet, the attitudes expressed by the op-ed writers are not isolated or particularly unique. They are grounded in the larger landscape of sports that are played in high schools and colleges around the country. In order to situate Kaepernick’s protests and the responses to it, I conducted ethnographic observations at high school football games. These observations led me to an interest in
the collective identity of the fans. While attending games I observed different ways in which the fans took on the identity of the school and how the school and the football team became a major symbol of the larger community.

I conducted my ethnographic research at Mountain High School, which is in a small rural town, Mountainsville, Virginia. The town has a total of about 6,000 residents with populations being about 94 percent white, four percent African American, and one percent Latinx. Mountain High School has about 600 students that attend. Mountainsville is part of River County, Virginia. River County has about 42,000 residents with a racial makeup of about 93 percent white, two percent Black, and six percent Latinx. According to the 2010 US Census, the average household income of River County was approximately $39,000. The three high schools that are in River County are Mountain High, Washington High, and McClellan High. The three high schools were all involved in the ethnography, but the focus of the study was Mountain High School. McClellan High is named after a confederate general because a major civil war battle occurred in this county. In the 2016 presidential election, about 70 percent of the county voted Republican. These statistics give a general sense of the community being studied - the community was largely white, of a lower socioeconomic status, and conservative values are the dominant political and ideological leanings.

This study aims to understand the portrayal of Colin Kaepernick by mainstream America in two parts. First, in the summer of 2019, I performed a content analysis of Fox News anchors’ framing and discussions surrounding Colin Kaepernick and the nature of

---

1 Citation withheld to maintain the confidentiality of the location studied.
his protest. Then in the fall of 2019 and the beginning months of 2020, I studied one high school football team to attempt to understand the connection between football and communal identity, in order to understand the impact this may have on peoples’ understanding of Kaepernick.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Throughout my research on the portrayal of Colin Kaepernick and American football culture more broadly, it became clear to me that this research was complex. There were elements of identity and community identity formation at play that interlocked with roles of hegemonic masculinity as well as white paternalism. These ideas combined to form the foundation of American nationalism that deeply reinforces the white American soldier as the ideal man in the United States, marking other expressions of masculinity as deviant. Additionally, Kaepernick is situated within a long lineage of Black athlete activists that have called attention to the injustices occurring in the United States. Finally, the portrayal of Kaepernick is also linked to the marriage of the sports industrial complex and the military industrial complex.

Nationalism

Walker Connor has done extensive work conceptualizing nationalism. Connor notes that nationalism is an irrational emotional bond to one’s country that creates an “us versus them” dichotomy (Connor 1993; Conversi 2002). Connor also argues that the concept of the nation simply allows people to self-differentiate from others, specifically based on ethnicity (Connor 1993; Conversi 2002). Other researchers have furthered Connor’s work by examining modern day definitions and characteristics of nationalism (Pew Research Center 2018; Hartig 2018; Valluvan 2017). Nationalism is built on a
foundation characterized by xenophobia as well as exclusionary definitions of “we” often based on race (Connor 1993; Conversi 2002; Valluvan 2017). As Chaplin & Montez de Oca note, the “stigmatizing label of ‘unpatriotic’ has historically been applied to racialized minorities to disqualify them from political citizenship as well as justify state violence and social control,” ensuring their position in the “them” category, while preventing their acceptance in the “us” category (Chaplin & Montez de Oca 2019: 14; Burkey & Zamalin 2016). The framing of Kaepernick as unpatriotic justifies and encourages the control of his means of protest. Nationalism has as much to do with creating a sense of not belonging as creating a sense of belonging (Valluvan 2017). It also requires extensive labor in the creation and maintenance of tradition. Creating tradition allows nationalists to distinguish between those who adhere to the tradition and those who do not. Those that adhere to the tradition gain acceptance and an “us” group status, while those who challenge tradition are denied acceptance and forced to adopt a “them” group status (Valluvan 2017).

**Gazing & Surveillance**

The process of identity formation occurs at two levels: the personal and the social (Deaux 1993; Moran 2009). The personal identity refers to the “traits and behaviors ...that the person finds self-descriptive, characteristics that are typically linked to one or more of the identity categories,” (Deaux 1993: 6; Moran 2009: 469-470). Examples of this include being kind or responsible (Deaux 1993: 6; Moran 2009: 469-470). The social identity formation is on a more visible level. It represents “roles or membership categories … that a person claims as representative,” (Deaux 1993: 6; Moran 2009: 470).
An example of this is whether a person identifies as Latinx or white (Deaux 1993: 6; Moran 2009: 470). There are many dimensions that shape a person’s social identity including race, gender, religion, class, sexual orientation, and culture (Jones & McEwen 2000; Moran 2009; Greenfield 2012). Identities also allow people to conceptualize themselves while positioning themselves as opposite of others. Identities allow people to describe themselves as “‘me versus you’ or ‘us versus them’” (Wondolleck et al 2003: 207). Identities serve many purposes such as providing a sense of self as well as distinguishing between one’s group and other (Wondolleck et al 2003). They can serve as a social organizing mechanism, promote tension, and form the foundation for exclusionary characteristics (Wondolleck et al 2003).

Smelser & Baltes note that there are three types of identity: personal, social, and collective. The personal identity is the attributes and the meanings applied to one’s self. The social identity represents the identities that are put onto others as a way to situate them in a social space (Smelser & Baltes 2001). Smelser & Baltes describe this as “establishing social roles,” for one within a community, (Smelser & Baltes 2001: 2). They describe the collective identity as the “shared sense of ‘one-ness’ and ‘we-ness,’” (Smelser & Baltes 2001: 2). The authors also note that collective identity is a process rather than a property (Smelser & Baltes 2001: 2). Collective identity is not something that one possesses but rather it is a practice that one actively upholds and supports. While observing high school football games, I noticed the energy put into maintaining one’s collective identity most obviously in dress. Almost everyone at events wore clothing of the color of the school to denote who one was rooting for, and also who one was rooting
against. Ziakas & Costa examine how power dynamics operate within this definition of community identity, specifically in rural settings with the influence of sport (2010). Ziakas & Costa describe that “in the context of events, performance and dramaturgy shape a symbolic social context in which communities reaffirm, contest, or transform the conditions which make up their social order.” (Ziakas & Costa 2010: 10). The attempt to create “we-ness” across a group is often utilized in the creation and support of collective identity but can also be challenged. This idea of oneness also relates to Durkheim’s concept of mechanical solidarity. When one violates a norm, they are committing a crime against society - they are challenging the we-ness that is established (Durkheim 1897).

There were times that the gendered power hierarchy of the broader society was reaffirmed as a way to challenge the concept of a collective identity and collective power within a smaller community, but the need to maintain community cohesiveness dominated the desire of some to challenge this hierarchy.

Tradition is a mechanism used to uphold the “us versus them” dichotomy. It operates to create anxiety about outsiders and immigrants as well as their beliefs and norms (Valluvan 2017). These traditions rely heavily on people adhering to the rituals to remain intact. As Kaepernick challenged the tradition of standing for the national anthem, people became increasingly uncomfortable with a fragmented “us” so they othered Kaepernick, so he was no longer representative of the “us.” Foucault theorizes about gaze and surveillance as a means of control in society. Foucault understands society to operate similarly to the panopticon prison design. The panopticon is a prison where there are many cells with a guard tower in the center. The inmates in the cells cannot see each
other, but instead can see the tower in the middle holding guards with lights pointing at the prisoners to eliminate their ability to see into the tower. The inmates never know when they are being watched, but instead know of the constant possibility of being monitored. Assuming that the inmates care about conforming to the guards’ expectations, the inmates will continue to police their own behavior. Panopticism creates the foundation for a power dynamic. Power is diffused everywhere - there really isn’t a top down or a bottom up approach to power. Instead, the idea of constant surveillance powerfully imposes norms. This constant possibility situates the prisoner within a gaze. The gaze is the foundational piece in power relations. It was a very subconscious thing and something that is diffused into society. Panopticism was a way to reinforce social norms - when someone has no idea if they are being watched or not, they will police themselves to not deviate from societal expectations (Foucault 1977). Foucault’s idea of the gaze gives power to those that are able to create norms in society. In the case of America, the societal norms are created by white men.

White paternalism plays a major role in the understanding of the pushback against Colin Kaepernick’s protest. White paternalism is a powerful tool that “reproduces white power, control, and privilege,” (Lacy 2010: 10). The concept of white paternalism was critical in the foundation and maintenance of the institution of slavery. White paternalism is the belief that whites hold superior values and beliefs to all other races, and then establishes that people of color are “primitive, barbaric, childlike, and incapable of governing themselves,” and “therefore … need to be saved by whites in order to survive,” (Lacy 2010: 10; Lacy 2008; Logue 1976). The portrayal of Black people as childlike
contributes to the ideology of racial paternalism, specifically the belief that whites are the “fathers” of all Black people, regardless of their age, (Lacy 2010: 10). White paternalism is used as a means to uphold the supremacy of white culture over other cultures.

Helms created the White Racial Identity model which connects to white paternalism. When looking at racial identity development theory, it is interesting to understand the different racial identification statuses that white people go through as they become aware of their whiteness. White paternalism seems to be most connected with the first status of “contact.” At this status, white people often operate under the assumption of colorblindness and might feel that racism is a product of discussions surrounding race. Essentially, they see racism as a product of Black people making it a problem. It requires the exposure to and willingness to listen to experiences of people of color for white people to develop from this status (Helms 1990; Helms 1995). John and Joy Hoffman present an integrated model of racial identity development. This model shows how white people and Black people understand their racial identity at analogical stages. The beginning of this stage for both white and Black people is the concept of conformity. Under this stage, both white and Black people feel “that they are just ‘regular Americans,’” (Interaction Institute for Social Change 2011: 4). They try to emulate dominant “speech, dress, beliefs, and attitudes,” which are set by whiteness (Interaction Institute for Social Change 2011: 4). After the conformity stage, people of color and white people split into different racial development stages. People of color enter the dissonance stage where they begin to have a disconnect with the dominant American identity and cultural practices. They begin to see that the American identity is deeply
interconnected with structures of racism and sexism. White people, on the other hand, enter a stage of acceptance where they believe that “everyone has struggles and people should just accept the way things are and try to be American,” (Interaction Institute of Social Change 2011: 4). Essentially, they want people of color to “get over it,” (Interaction Institute of Social Change 2011: 4). After this stage, white people enter the resistance stage where they express the idea that “racism is a thing of the past” and instead there is now a new racism, a reverse racism experienced by whites (Interaction Institute of Social Change 2011: 4). It is not until the next stage of retreat where whites are able to step back and really feel empathy for the obstacles structural racism has placed on people of color. (Interaction Institute of Social Change 2011: 4). The Hoffman model shows how there is a deep disconnect between the understanding of race as people become increasingly aware of their racial identities. White people take a great deal of convincing to understand that racism is a legitimate experience for people of color. As people of color become aware of oppression, they become increasingly disconnected from cultural narratives that dominate American culture (Interaction Institute of Social Change 2011: 4).

**Double Consciousness and the White Gaze**

As Foucault points out the power of the gaze, people of color in America are situated in a system that places them under a white gaze (Yancy 2013). The white gaze is something that is deeply entrenched in world history and is not something that is unique to America (Yancy 2013). Black bodies are “reduced to their surfaces and to stereotypes that are constricting and false,” (Yancy 2013). Black people are forced to navigate
society in a way that does not make white people uncomfortable (Yancy 2013). W.E.B. DuBois speaks directly to this idea. DuBois explains how in America the Black man can see “himself through the revelation of the other world” and experiences a double consciousness by seeing himself “through the eyes of other,” while also seeing himself as who he truly is (DuBois 1994: 2). DuBois reveals how Black men internalize the white gaze and therefore police their own actions based on what the white man expects of them (DuBois 1994: 2). The white gaze reinforces power relations because only white people are allowed to gaze and pass moral judgements - people of color cannot return the gaze and use it as a means of power (Yancy 2013; Blake 2018).

When defining double consciousness, DuBois explains the duality of Black identity - there is their actual identity and the identity that society places onto them (DuBois 1994). Africans were brought to America because of the “need” for slavery in American economic foundation. The African American identity stems from this idea - Africans were brought here to serve the sole purpose of being a slave. For American society, the African American will always be synonymous with the slave. The Black identity is what the Black person thinks of themselves, how they decide to define their race, free from the social construction of America’s racial history. In recognizing the double consciousness, the Black man does not aim to “Africanize America” nor does he want to “bleach his negro soul in flood of white Americanism,” (DuBois 1994: 3). His aim is instead to make it possible to be both the Negro and be American “without being spit upon by his fellows, without having the doors of Opportunity closed roughly in his face,” (DuBois 1994: 3).
The idea of white paternalism and the surveillance of the gaze it creates for communities of color and other marginalized identities is linked to the ability for white people, specifically white men, to be able to set the moral standards for society. As Marx demonstrated in *The Communist Manifesto*, there are two classes within society: the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Marx is an economic determinist, meaning that for him, money is the source of all power. The bourgeoisie have control over the base and, indirectly, the superstructure of society. The superstructure represents the ideological forms for society. It consists of morality, religion, art, law, etc. It also consists of the things we value and the things we are conscious of (Marx 1978). For Marx, the base controls, or at least strongly influences, the superstructure (Marx 1978). Bourdieu furthered Marx’s class based understanding of the morals of society in his theorizing of habitus, of “an actor’s inoculated and embodied dispositions that are formed through habitual practices consistent with one’s class position,” actions that lack a consciousness to them (Bourdieu 1984; Bourdieu 1990; Perry 2012: 90). DuBois first complicates Marx’s economic determinism and points to how there are not two classes as race further stratified these classes (DuBois 1999). More recent scholarship has pushed Bourdieu’s conception of habitus and instead theorizes a ‘racial habitus’ where there is a “matrix of tastes, perceptions, and cognitive frameworks that are often unconscious (particularly for whites) that regulate the racial practices of actors such that they tend to reproduce the very racial distinctions and inequalities that produced them,” (Bonilla-Silva 2003; Bonilla-Silva et al. 2006; Bonilla-Silva and Embrick 2007; Perry 2012: 90). Essentially, racial habitus is a mechanism for understanding how racial realities at the structural level
shape the dispositions, consequently, regulate the practices of marginalized white and African Americans,” (Perry 2012: 92). Bonilla-Silva links how residential segregation created a situation for racialized habitus to flourish. He describes how “white habitus” experienced an “uninterrupted socialization process that conditions and creates whites’ racial tastes, perceptions, feelings, and emotions on their views on racial matters,” (Perry 2012: 93; Bonilla-Silva 2003). This “white habitus” reinforces “in-group solidarity among whites, … negative stereotypes about non-whites and, in normalizing and legitimating the avoidance of racial out-groups, regulates white practices, thereby reproducing residential segregation,” (Perry 2012: 93; Bonilla-Silva et al. 2006; Bonilla-Silva and Embrick 2007). Additionally, Horvat and Antonio show how racialized “organizational habitus” or “a complex of perceptions, values, and etiquette” become the “established… institutional standard through which whites in predominantly white organizations privilege white habitus over non-white habitus and (through symbolic violence) force minority participants to make tremendous social and cultural sacrifices in exchange for the organizational benefits they seek,” (Horvat & Antonio 1999; Perry 2012: 93). In “Black Bodies - White Control: The Contested Terrain of Sportsmanlike Conduct,” Andrews argues how even the definitions and enforcement of sportsmanship is deeply linked to race. What Andrews emphasizes is that definitions of sportsmanship are often defined by predominantly white cultural definitions where white men hold the “power to normalize or abnormalize behavior, to sanction some outcomes and reprimand others, and the authority to enforce these opinions and sanctions,” (Andrews 1996: 37). Andrews points to how Black athletes have used their bodily expression as resistance
whether it be literal protest like John Carlos and Tommie Smith’s Black Power Salute or implicit protest of ‘excessive’ celebration after a touchdown, (Andrews 1996: 51-52).

While Andrews does not specifically say this, the connection can be made that sportsmanship is defined according to white habitus (Bonilla-Silva 2003; Andrews 1996). During my ethnography and interviews, it became clear that sports were used as a teaching mechanism. Sports were a place where young athletes went to learn not just a game, but a way to navigate life and important life lessons like sportsmanship, respect, and teamwork. However, as Andrews points out, the societal expectation and understanding of what things like sportsmanship and teamwork looks like is deeply entrenched in white habitus (1996).

**Masculinity in Black and White**

James W. Messerschmidt (2012) assesses the use of hegemonic masculinity in scholarship. While the goal of Messerschmidt’s research is to understand the misuse of the term hegemonic masculinity, it also provided a framework for previous literature conceptualizing the topic. Hegemonic masculinity was conceptualized by Raewyn Connell as masculinity that aims to create power structures between men and women, as well as men against other men, while pitting femininity against masculinity (Connell 1987; Connell 1995; Messerschmidt 2012). Central to hegemonic masculinity is the rejection of femininity. Hegemonic masculinity also began to be associated with certain character traits including self-reliance, aggressiveness, and sexual prowess, as well as emotional restrictiveness and physical competence (Smith et al 2007; Gage 2008; Logan 2010; Messerschmidt 2012). C.J. Pascoe provides a foundational analysis of gender
policing as a tool to enforce hegemonic masculinity. Pascoe’s ethnographic study looks at how high school boys specifically use the “fag discourse” to police masculinity. Through this discourse, boys reaffirm their own masculinity by challenging another boys’ masculinity by calling them “fags” or questioning their masculinity. Because masculinity and heterosexuality are deeply interconnected, calling another boy a “fag” is directly challenging their masculinity and therefore establishing social power. Boys strive to avoid being called a “fag” and perform masculinity in a way that would allow them to not be labeled as such. This process of avoidance reveals the basis of gender policing and masculinity (Pascoe 2007).

Much of the work outlined above is defining hegemonic masculinity in terms of white masculinity. Smith (2008) critiques the inability of Messerschmidt and Connell to acknowledge race more than noting the impact “structural factors” play on definitions of masculinity. Smith points to how “marginalized groups form their own definitions of masculinity,” but still experience underlying pressures and influence from dominant white discourses (2008: 161). For example, a major tenant of the normative (white) definition of masculinity is being the breadwinner of the familial unit. This is complicated for Black men as they experience increased discrimination in the workforce and disproportionate exposure to incarceration (Smith 2008). Neal theorizes how Black masculinity is largely influenced by the “legible Black masculinity” made visible by white media (2013; Dickerson 2018). There are two legible Black masculinities - the “good” Black man and the “bad” Black man. The “good” Black man is represented by the Black men portrayed on the Cosby Show - Black men that have assimilated to white
cultural norms (Dickerson 2018). The “bad” Black man is represented by criminals and thugs and seen as morally deficient, being egotistical and individualistic (Dickerson 2018). This Black masculinity ignores the complexities of being a Black man and reinforces the racial hierarchy grounded in white supremacy (Dickerson 2018). Both depictions of Black men are needed to uphold the racist structures though, as the “good” Black man attempts to show racist barriers no longer exist while the “bad” Black man depiction shows that the Black man should be feared (Neal 2013; Dickerson 2018). The “bad” Black man depiction, based on the perceived disproportionate criminality of the Black man is also used to justify increased surveillance (Alexander 2010, Dickerson 2018). Finally, men that challenge the “good” Black depiction are seen as challenging the white status quo. As a result, Black men, like Allen Iverson, who are unapologetic and not subservient are seen as needing “civilizing” in order to achieve the “good” Black status (Ferber 2007: 388).

After 9/11, there was an intense return to white cultural nationalism as a means to “protect our besieged nation from ‘uncivilized’ and ‘barbaric’ terrorists set on destroying our freedom and disrupting our way of life,” (Kusz 2007: 78). This behavior was modelled by prominent white men, including the president at the time, President George W. Bush, who encouraged “American (White) men” to “‘man-up’ and once again feel like ‘real men,’” (Kusz 2007: 78). This behavior is exactly the kind of phenomenon revealed in Pascoe’s analysis of gender policing - white men are “taking back their country” and doing so by challenging the manliness of other men (Kusz 2007: 78, Pascoe 2007). Additionally, Jackson Katz’s narrative Tough Guise 2, provides additional
evidence to reinforce the notion of hegemonic ideology, an idea that society tells us that there is a correct way to perform our gender and specifically a correct way to perform masculinity. Katz explains that every part of society - media, peers, sports, politics, etc. - reinforces masculine norms; how boys and men are supposed to “be a man” and the correct way of doing so (Katz & Earp 2013). According to Katz, American masculinity finds its foundation in violent ideas of male power and American militarism (Katz & Earp 2013). Because of the reigniting dominance of white cultural nationalism, and patriotism being defined as a staple of this form of nationalism, it becomes apparent that any questioning of the military is equated to being unpatriotic. Essentially, American society’s dedication to conventional white masculinity became reinvigorated (Kusz 2007). Questioning this was not framed as challenging white male supremacy, but instead as anti-patriotism, creating a powerful way to censor the ways in which marginalized groups questioned power relations. This dedication to ‘patriotism’ quickly became a mechanism from which contemporary racism could operate (Kusz 2007). The return of “traditional American values” is essentially “code for creating and maintaining the optimal conditions for White patriarchal global capitalism and undermining of the minimal gains made by historically marginalized groups since the 1960s,” (Kusz 2007: 79).

When Black athletes speak out, or are unapologetically Black, they are treated as deviant beings often because they are creating white male anxiety and discontent. This is a direct result of white men’s feelings that they are losing power. As a result, white men aim to control men of color by policing their masculinity and race, labeling them as
“unpatriotic,” which demonizes men of color in the eyes of white Americans (Kusz 2007). This strategy is one often used by groups with the master status in order to maintain their fragile power. Dominant groups employ many defense strategies in order to police the rhetoric created by marginalized groups. Martin notes that the dominant group often “control the means of protest [which] ultimately ends up silencing marginalized populations from voicing any discontent at all” (Martin 2018: 28). Kaepernick’s protest was often shut down by those in the dominant white male class, including Donald Trump, and labelled as being unpatriotic, and Kaepernick as ungrateful. This strategy is deeply embedded in the rise in dominance of white cultural nationalism after 9/11 (Kusz 2007). Kusz demonstrates this through his analysis of media portrayal of Pat Tillman, the NFL player who was killed after he left the league to serve in the military. Tillman’s exceptionalism is situated against and depends upon “portrayals of Black professional athletes not only as threats to ‘traditional’ American values but as some of the most ungrateful, over privileged and unpatriotic Americans in post-9/11 America,” (Kusz 2007: 80). Essentially, Tillman was used to uphold a racial hierarchy “where...patriotism, heroism, and articulation as ‘the ultimate American’ are predicated on the defining of African American male athletes as selfish, greedy symbols of American excess,” (Kusz 2007: 86). The same mechanisms are at work in the celebration of Tim Tebow, who for many represented politics of a “‘late-capitalism, [paleo]conservative, patriarchal’ America,” (Hawzen & Newman 2017: 13).

Athletic Industrial Complex
Sports have always been a structure used to reinforce white ideologies (Rhoden 2006; Kusz 2007). As William Rhoden explains in *Forty Million Dollar Slaves*, the professional sports arena is metaphorical to the plantation that once enslaved Black bodies. White men occupy almost all of the powerful administrative and “ownership” positions (Reid & McManus 2017). Therefore, this structure allows white men to continue to police the actions of players (who are predominantly Black), while Black bodies are providing the labor from which they benefit (Rhoden 2006; Reid & McManus 2017; Lapchick 2017). Many often cite the exorbitant payment of professional athletes as justification to control athletes; however, this justification fails to recognize that professional athletes are never paid enough that they could buy themselves into “ownership” roles, the true “power” roles in the institution (Rhoden 2006; Kusz 2007). In *Race, Sport, and the American Dream*, Earl Smith explores how the athletic industrial complex further alienates the athlete. Smith explains that the athletic industrial complex (AIC) is “important to understanding the role that money and power plays” in the athletic arena as “it is the driving force behind virtually every decision that is made,” (2014: 184). Smith also explains that as “economies - local, regional, institutional- become dependent upon continued expansion” of the AIC, there is an increased promotion of further alienation and exploitation of the athlete (Smith 2014: 184). While Smith’s understanding of the AIC is most purely applied to the intercollegiate athlete, his definition of the AIC applies to professional athletics also as decisions made are driven by money in the front offices and separated from the athletes themselves (Smith 2014). As Harry Edwards says in *The Revolt of the Black Athlete*, “the same humiliations and degradations that plague
the athletic careers of Black amateurs also haunt Black professional” because “all professional athletes - Black and white - are officially and formally classified as property,” (Edwards 2017: 25).

An important thing to note is the history of Black athletic activism. Kaepernick was not the first Black athlete to protest the oppression of the Black community in the United States. Many point to John Carlos and Tommie Smith’s Black Power Salute during the 1968 Olympic Games as another example of this activism (Edwards 2017). However, the history of Black athletic activism is much richer than just Kaepernick, Carlos, and Smith. Jackie Robinson became increasingly radical and outspoken in his retirement. Muhammad Ali became see as an activist after he refused to his draft order in the Vietnam War because he did not support war due to his religion. Bill Russell, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, Mahmoud Abdul-Rauf, Chris Hodges, Etan Thomas, and now LeBron James are notable athletes in the NBA across decades. WNBA players, entire teams even, protested police brutality (Bryant 2018). While there is in no way an exhaustive list, my point is to show that that, as Howard Bryant points out, there is a “heritage” of Black athletes using their privileged position to bring attention to oppression of marginalized identities (Bryant 2018).

The Athletic Industrial Complex and the Military Industrial Complex

The NFL has been an active agent in creating a strong connection between the military and sports. This relationship has become increasingly strong since 9/11. In the months following 9/11, the sports’ fields and ballparks became sites of healing (Bryant 2018). In the games following, the playing of “God Bless America” became “mandatory
at every ballpark in the county, with all uniformed personnel required to be on the field or
top step of the dugout, or face discipline,” (Bryant 2018: 107). The “NFL stitched
American flags onto the black and white striped referee uniform,” (Bryant 2018: 107).
Steps like these were understood as selling the “idea of healing,” but in reality, it also
sold ideas of “conformity and obedience cloaked in an ostensibly benign patriotism,”
(Bryant 2018). It was an “easy sell,” because questioning the increased patriotic display
was seen as supporting terrorism (Bryant 2018: 107). As Bryant puts it, “Fans expected
every other fan in the ballpark to go along with the spectacle, to act right. Hand on heart.
Sing along, or you were the problem,” (Bryant 2018: 110).

These patriotic displays did not stop after 9/11. The NFL started a Salute to
Service campaign in 2011 which allowed military spotlights to slowly diffuse into the
athletic experience. This campaign “reflected the increasing incorporation of the military
into routinized sporting events that intensified after 9/11,” (Rugg 2016: 21). The Salute
to Service campaign is positioned alongside the leagues other two goodwill campaigns,
Crucial Catch and Play 60. The three campaigns work together to “construct the league as
not just a compassionate corporate citizen passively embodying ‘American values,' but
also an ideologically active and authoritative American public institution,” (Rugg 2016:
21).

The Salute to Service campaign allowed an “extension of the football-military
complex that has permeated college and professional football leagues for over a century,”
(Rugg 2016: 22; Butterworth 2012; Fischer 2013; Gems 2000; King 2008, Sabo & Jansen
1992; Stampel 2006). Football has long been connected to militarism through similar
language and strategies. As the game increased in popularity, it was “implicated into the larger cultural mechanisms for producing and sustaining a patriarchal society,” (Rugg 2016: 22). Also, similar to the military, “football came to be seen as a way to build the ideal ‘American,’” (Rugg 2016: 22, Montez de Oca 2013). Football became known as a way to “mold” the young men into the “masculine leaders of tomorrow” using “teaching techniques and authoritative structures modeled on the military,” (Rugg 2016: 22). This relationship is further reinforced as the military “has further incorporated itself into the entertainment industries and American popular culture as a whole,” (Rugg 2016: 22; Jansen & Sabo 1994; Boggs & Pollard 2007; Butterworth & Moskal 2009; Robinson 2012; Stahl 2010). Bairner explains that the use of military language in football and sports more generally “heightens the perceived importance of the game” and “produces a connection between sport and national identity,” (Bairner 2013; Rugg 2016: 22). While football adopts militaristic language, the military also adopts “sportspeak” when discussing the winning and losing of wars (Rugg 2016: 22). This reciprocal use of language allows both parties to adopt the rationalization of “death and injury, embed themselves within the performance of national identity, and obscure investigation and question of motives and reasons,” (Rugg 2016: 22). Messner, Dunbar, and Hunt “fuse (and confuse) the distinctions between values of nationalism with team identity and athletic aggression with military destruction,” (2010: 389; Rugg 2016: 22).

The increased militarization of sport is largely connected to 9/11. After 9/11, nationalistic demonstrations increased across America, including in the sports context. Silk and Falcous point to how this militarization of sport was not just a “cheerleading
effort for military actions, but also part of a larger realignment of mainstream ‘American’
identity that advocated for a carefully selected (and discriminatory) ‘harmonious
pluralism’ buttressed by a militarized “protection of the normal”’ (2005: 463; Rugg 2016:
23). These demonstrations continued long term in a means that allowed their construction
to become seen as “normal” and allowed the audiences exposure to the “‘ritualized
exercise in American patriotism and nationalism’ that worked to bolster support for
military action and,” arguably most importantly in the case of Kaepernick, “marginalize
Additionally, these campaigns allowed the NFL to participate in “politically neutral …
displays of nationalism, patriotism, and militarism” instead of acknowledging the
“support for foreign and military policies,” (Rugg 2016: 27). The league’s attempts to
frame the Salute to Service campaign as a “politically agnostic attempt” to “provide
much needed social service to those being underserved by the state,” (Rugg 2016: 27). In
reality, this campaign prompted the military to become actively involved in the sports-
military complex (Rugg 2016: 26). The Salute to Service campaign, alongside Crucial
Catch and Play 60, positions the league as an agent for positive change in societal issues,
such as veteran care, health care, and physical education,” (Rugg 2016: 27). This proves
the NFL to be a league that is not just an “entertainment institution, but a social and
political institution as well,” (Rugg 2016: 27).

Super Bowl LIV was one of the most patriotically charged Super Bowls of recent
history. David Zirin writes of the Super Bowl as being “blatantly propagandistic,” (Zirin
2020). Zirin points to the blatant irony around this as there has been a major push by the
NFL to “keep politics out of sports,” (Zirin 2020). Zirin points out the flaw in the NFL’s argument - it’s not politics they want out of sports, it’s a “certain kind of politics” that they want out of sports: “resistance politics, anti-racist politics, anti-militaristic politics, [and] the politics of human liberation,” (Zirin 2020). A Fox Executive was quoted as saying that “if [a commercial] doesn’t celebrate football or celebrate America, it’s not going to be in the show,” (Zirin 2020). Celebrating America was demonstrated by depicting the military, furthering the connection of the NFL players and the troops (Zirin 2020). There was an erasure of the problems facing America - and when they were depicted, they were overly simplified. For example, Budweiser showed a commercial where a black man hugged a group of police officers in riot gear to end a protest where protesters were protesting the systemic murders of black men (Zirin 2020, Budweiser 2020). The systemic and institutional problem of police brutality can be eradicated if we just hugged more police officers, right? Zirin points to a major theme of this paper in his concluding sentence: “there is no amount of football and no flag big enough to hide the fact that these are dangerous times, and any kind of national unity - even around football - only exists in the fevered dreams of Fox Sports executives and Madison Avenue hacks,” (Zirin 2020).

**Recent Research on Kaepernick**

While there has not been an overwhelming amount of research regarding public response to the Kaepernick protest, specifically in connection to white masculinity and white paternalism, Schmidt and colleagues did conduct a content analysis on social media response to the protests to see how they were being framed. They analyzed data from
Facebook posts specifically, which revealed four major themes: American values, shunning, racial inequality, and masculinity (Schmidt et al 2018). The theme of American values revealed debates about whether or not Kaepernick was upholding or challenging American values. Of social media users that decided Kaepernick did challenge American values, they went on to discuss what was an appropriate punishment for his actions (Schmidt et al 2018). In other words, many social media users were “more concerned with what should happen to Kaepernick and athletes after they violated sacred nationalistic norms,” than they were with why he was protesting (Schmidt et al 2018: 12). When speaking of racial inequality, people on social media questioned if racism was still a problem in America or not (Schmidt et al 2018). Finally, social media users discussed the definition of masculinity in regard to whether Kaepernick was exhibiting what a ‘real’ man was through his protests - some users felt he was supporting traditional forms of masculinity, while other users felt he directly challenged these traditional norms (Schmidt et al 2018).

Graber, Figueroa, and Vasudevan analyzed newspaper coverage of Colin Kaepernick through the lens of aversive racism, modern racism, and colorblind racism. They attempt to understand how newspapers grappled with the intersection of sport and race. What they found is that “patriotism became a surrogate for the discussion of racism, a means for journalists to cover Kaepernick’s protest without contributing a meaningful critique or interrogation - nay, even a mention - of racism as a social structure,” (Graber et al 2019: 11). Patriotism was then positioned as just as important as the police brutality, the very thing that Kaepernick was protesting. This allowed the interrogation and critique
of racism to the backburner and therefore minimized what is being protested (Graber et al 2019: 11-12).

**Conclusion**

The formation of American nationalism and patriotism is deeply connected to ideas of white racial identity and hegemonic masculinity. Understanding social identity formation through intersections of race, gender, and nationality in the context of national anthem protests will aim to reveal how white patriarchal and nationalistic structures created in the past are still at work today (Moran 2009). This allows the white male military figure to be seen as supreme. White men are often seen as the “ideal” depiction of patriotic heroes (Kusz 2007). As a result, white males adopt paternalistic attitudes, deeming other identities as morally deviant and needing guidance. White paternalism therefore establishes that white people’s idea of morality is the standard that guides society. Sport is an institution that has married all of these concepts, especially post 9/11. White male morality has created the definitions of sportsmanship and patriotic symbols and rituals are deeply integrated into sporting events. Interrupting these rituals is portrayed as violating not just American identity, but also white masculinity. Recent research on Colin Kaepernick has shown that oftentimes Kaepernick’s manhood is questioned as he is not meeting the definition of a “real” manhood, white manhood. Additionally, newspapers are using patriotism to avoid discussing actual system racism, the very issue Kaepernick is protesting. The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore how football culture and the American moral standard--deeply rooted in white
masculinity-- reinforces the racist emasculation and portrayal of Colin Kaepernick and protesting of police brutality.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

In this study, I attempt to understand how football culture and the American moral standard are connected to the portrayal and treatment of Colin Kaepernick. This study was a two-part study. First, I attempted to explore the portrayal of Colin Kaepernick and his protests by news anchors at Fox News through content analysis of articles and news segments. The goal of this study was to understand how white masculinity informed the treatment of Kaepernick. Next, I performed ethnographic observations at high school football games and follow-up interviews with members of varying membership categories within the community I studied to explore how football culture connects to the emasculation of Colin Kaepernick.

Research Design

I was interested in the degree to which the critique of Colin Kaepernick and the kneeling protest he spearheaded was informed by theories and ideologies of white masculinity. Therefore, I needed to find a source of data that was critical of Colin Kaepernick in order to understand the basis of their criticism. Based on my casual observations, I noticed that conservative newspapers often articulated opposition to Kaepernick and his method of protest (Dubenko 2017). In order to examine the specific ideologies that were invoked in these critiques of Kaepernick, I relied on articles that ranked conservative news sources on their popularity in order to select conservative news
sources for my sample. Using this data, I ranked several news sources as the “most” popular, including The Federalist, the Weekly Standard, the Breitbart Report, and Fox News. After exploring a few of the websites, I determined that Fox News was the best source to systematically research because it was named among one of the most popular/visited conservative news networks (Liberty Nation Staff 2019; Polskin 2018) and it was easily accessible to the researcher. Fox News has a search engine making searching and retrieving articles efficient, and during the discovery phase, the search of Fox News yielded the greatest number of opinion pieces related to Kaepernick and the protest he led.

Using purposeful sampling, I analyzed a total of 77 media posts from Fox News, including 57 op-ed articles and 20 opinion videos. These media posts originally appeared between August 28, 2016 and April 26, 2019. These pieces were found by searching for the word “Kaepernick” on the search engine on FoxNews.com. The results were then narrowed down to make sure there were no duplicate articles or videos. If a media piece was both an article and a video, I chose to code the article because the articles were easier to analyze because they were more likely to include only one “voice” or author. When coding videos, I only coded the statements made by the host or the person with the most dominant viewpoint. As of June 25, 2019, my data includes all of the media posts generated by the Fox Search engine when searching for “Kaepernick.”

In analyzing my data, I used the emergent coding strategy of content analysis (Stemler 2001; Blair 2015). First, I read the articles and watched the videos and I made notes about the themes that were present. Next, I pulled major quotes from the op-eds,
both written and video, that illustrated each theme. Finally, I reassessed the media posts to code them according to the major themes to understand the patterns in the data (Stemler 2001; Blair 2015).

There are two common scales used to measure hegemonic masculinity: the Male Role Norms Scale and the Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised Scale (Levant et al 1992; Pleck et al 1994; Whorley et al 2006; Levant et al 2010). These two scales measure masculinity quantitatively. While my research is qualitative, these scales outline the traits that serve as the foundation for the academic definition of masculinity. The Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS) is a scale that aims to understand traditional masculinity ideology that analyzes masculinity based on three factors: status, toughness, and anti-femininity (Pleck et al 1994; Levant et al 2010). The Male Role Norms Inventory - Revised (MRNI) scale is more in-depth than the MRNS scale (Levant & Richmond 2007; Levant et al 2010). The MRNI-R is a Likert scale measuring hegemonic masculinity based on seven characteristics: avoidance of femininity, negativity towards sexual minorities, self-reliance, aggression, dominance, non-relational sexuality, and restrictive emotionality (Levant et al 2007; Levant et al 2010). While this scale is thorough, I think a limitation could be that it does not consider the effect race has on perceived masculinity. Levant and colleagues even discuss the role that whiteness plays on African American men. They note how African American boys change the way that they act because of their marginalization to the definition of hegemonic masculinity. While Levant colleagues note the racial implications on masculinity, they fail to account for this in the scale (Majors & Bilson 2001; Walsh et al 2001; Levant et al 2010). However, it is important to note that
in most areas of the world and specifically the United States, whiteness works in congruence with masculinity to designate white men as the “real men” and all other categories of masculinity as subordinate (Bucholtz 1999).

When analyzing the op-eds, I revisited the major themes that I found when coding the data and analyzed which themes were most prevalent. In the end, I categorized the themes into major and minor themes. The four major themes were present in at least 44% of articles and the four minor themes were present in at least 15% of the articles. I also explored how/if the themes differed based on the demographics of the author.

The target media of this study were opinion media posts on Fox News networks. I coded media posts by race and gender to understand if there were differences in the way Kaepernick and the national anthem protests are being articulated and understood.

Although my study was designed to be inductive, allowing for themes to emerge organically, I hypothesized that the race and gender of the speaker might also be important. Therefore, I compiled data on the authors of the opinion pieces. I created small biographies of all the authors to see if I could find any additional biographical information that would reveal any religion or education patterns in the findings of my data. In total, I gathered 77 media posts from 47 different authors, including 28 white men, 9 white women, 6 men of color, and 6 women of color. Two authors (one man and one woman) were coded as both white and as people of color. They self-identified as having lineage of color, but both were white passing.

As I will discuss in the findings and analysis, strong evidence emerged from the content analysis that suggested the importance and deeply embedded nature of
hegemonic masculinity, whiteness, and nationalism. In order to learn more about the
development of these beliefs in individuals as well as the role of the institution of sports
in socializing these beliefs, I conducted ethnographic research and interviews at a local
high school with a strong football culture. I followed one high school football team, the
Mountainsville Mountain Lions, during their regular season. I chose this research site due
to a personal connection to the administration that would gain me access more efficiently.
I also had a connection to a peripheral personal experience with this site, having grown
up in a nearby community. I observed four high school football games. As mentioned
previously, Mountainsville High is one of three high schools in River County. I observed
the games where MHS played the other two schools, as well as two schools outside of the
county. The games were on September 6th, September 20th, October 4th, and November
1st. All games took place in rural settings except for the game on September 6th, which
took place in a suburb to a metropolitan city.

After the ethnographic data collection, I coded my ethnographic observations
using emergent coding used the major codes I found to create an interview protocol.
Smelser & Baltes’ conception of “one-ness” formed the foundation of understanding my
observations and therefore guided my interview protocol (2001). Questions were asked
regarding one’s position in the community, rituals and traditions, surveillance, familial
connection, and organization of groups of people, which are all crucial parts to the
communal identity formation at football games. I chose to conduct semi-structured
interviews because of my connection to the community. As Johnson & Parry note, semi-
structured or active interviews allow for “mutual disclosure and sharing of information,”
These interviews are more conversational in nature and “creates a space where participants … can share their own narratives and explain their own experiences,” (Johnson & Parry 2015: 56). These interviews also “[yield] rich data that would not have been possible without a forum in which [participants] are able to share their experiences … throughout the interviews,” (Johnson & Parry 2015: 56). I conducted interviews with twenty-one participants from my ethnographic site: three school administrators, four high school faculty members, eleven students including five football players, a current and retired football coach, and two alums. I interviewed 9 people identifying as women and 12 people identifying as men, with ages ranging from 16 to 79 years old. Participants identified as being a member of and living in the Mountainsville community from anywhere between a few months to over 50 years. I recruited students from an athletic leadership club. The officer team informed the club of my research and every member had the opportunity to sign the interest form. The athletic director then gave those interested students consent forms to return and helped me organize interviews with the students. The participants were from purposeful sampling of people holding a variety of different positions in the community. Interviews ranged from 13 minutes to 1 hour and 52 minutes.
The two broad concepts that I analyzed in my data are American Nationalism and hegemonic masculinity. For this study, American Nationalism is defined as an emotional bond to the United States that is maintained by creating a sense of not belonging to other identities through reinforcement of traditions (Connor 1993; Conversi 2002; Valluvan 2017; Hartig 2018; Pew Research Center 2018). This “us” versus “them” dichotomy is most often demonstrated as white Americans being considered the “us” and other racial categories defaulting to the “them.” (Connor 1993; Conversi 2002). Indicators for this definition are xenophobic statements, expressing a protection of an American tradition, including the military and capitalism, and rejecting someone’s American identity. For example, if a tweet is positioning Kaepernick against the American military, it demonstrates a nationalist sentiment.

The second theme that emerged in this study is hegemonic masculinity which is defined based on a list qualities presented in previous literature including rejecting femininity, self-reliance, aggressiveness, sexual prowess, emotional restrictiveness, dominance, physical competence, negativity towards sexual minorities, and being white (Connell 1987; Levant et al 1992; Pleck et al 1994; Connell 1995; Whorley et al 2006; Smith et al 2007; Gage 2008; Levant et al 2010; Logan 2010; Messerschmidt 2012). For example, an indicator would be if an author questions or attacks Kaepernick’s manliness.
The results of the content analysis revealed four prominent themes surrounding Fox News’s coverage of Colin Kaepernick and the National Anthem protests. I categorized these themes as major themes and minor themes. The four major themes include: 1) mentioning of white male American symbols, 2) juxtaposing Kaepernick against the military/police, 3) feminization and emasculation of Kaepernick, and 4) painting Kaepernick as anti-American. The four minor themes include: 1) comparing Kaepernick to white men, 2) protest, but not by kneeling, 3) Kaepernick painted as selfish, and 4) direct emasculation of Kaepernick’s manhood. After conducting the content analysis of Fox News’ media regarding Kaepernick, I began to question how the backlash experienced by Colin Kaepernick is related to sport in general. I attempted to begin to answer this question by focusing on high school football. Through interviews conducted with 21 members (for demographic data, see Appendix B, Chart 4.1) of the Mountainsville community, a fifth theme emerged: sport, as an institution that creates and maintains communal and/or national identity.

**Theme #1: THE American Man - white, patriotic, & subservient**

Out of the 77 articles and videos collected from Fox News, 67 mentioned white male American symbols. These symbols were mentioned in a way that endorsed and encouraged the hegemony of these symbols. These articles mentioned Donald Trump, the flag, capitalism, Christianity, or “America” as a term in and of itself. Kusz, Hawzen & Newman discuss the ways in which these symbols have become synonymous with the widespread definition of America. They also discuss how these symbols are used to
maintain the definition of American as dominated by white, male, and capitalistic norms (Kusz 2007; Hawzen & Newman 2017).

The discourse around these symbols often position Kaepernick against white males and paints Kaepernick as unpatriotic. For example, Judge Jeanine Pirro noted that the “same liberals who want to protect the constitutional right of people like Colin Kaepernick to symbolically reject America by taking a knee were the ones quick to criticize Tim Tebow for bending a knee to pray and thank God on the field,” (Pirro 2017). This shows that Kaepernick is “reject[ing] America” by making his opinions known, but Tim Tebow, showing his Christian faith, which arguably is another symbol of white male hegemony, is still maintaining his Americanism. While on Fox & Friends, Burgess Owens appealed to the white patriarchal symbol of capitalism when saying that the “capitalism free market says that America is still good by our flag, good by our country, and it will pay those who stand for it and it will not pay those who will stand against it,” (Owens 2017). Finally, Taya Kyle argued that Kaepernick’s “taking a stand, or rather a knee, against the flag which has covered the caskets of so many who actually did sacrifice everything for something they believe in,” which is a rhetorical strategy that puts him in direct opposition of the American symbol of the flag and the military (Kyle 2018).

Specific white men were mentioned in 17 of the 77 articles. Men that were often named were Tim Tebow, J.J. Watt, and Pat Tillman. These men are notable white athletes that stood up for their beliefs while they were playing professional football (Kusz 2007). For example, Taya Kyle advocates for Pat Tillman’s morals and states, “You want to talk
about someone in the NFL sacrificing everything? Pat Tillman. NFL starting player, not benched, who left to join the Army and died for it. THAT is sacrificing everything for something you believe in,” (Kyle 2018). These athletes were named specifically, but as explained above, they may have been named for reasons in addition to being white, like their (inadvertent or not) support and depiction of the white male patriarchal symbols. Their alignment with the military and Christianity allowed them to become symbols of the white patriarchal dominance and white paternalism.

In interviews, there was also discussion positioning sport, specifically football, as deeply American or representative of American symbols, like the military. For example, Coach Harbaugh, the longtime coach of Mountain High, says “I have always liked the ruggedness of football. I think if you were to look at the people who have sacrificed their lives in the wars for the United States, I think they were probably football type players.” This conversation was usually connected to discussions around the ritual playing of the national anthem before games. Chris is a tri sport athlete and a senior at Mountainsville High School. Chris reinforces this by saying, “football seems like people say American … It's like that big symbol like America is like football.” Mike, a Mountain High alum and football player at the school in the 1980s, also sees the ritual of playing the national anthem as supporting the American identity. “Just one time that everybody can be I guess on the same level even though you’re competing against this other team. Right now, you’re just one. One group under that one flag” says Mike. These answers prompted me to hone in more closely on responses how participants understood the symbolism of the national anthem.
These examples demonstrate the ways in which the white patriarchal hegemonic symbols have become equivalent to American symbols. While these mentionings may seem subtle, they directly support the juxtaposition of Kaepernick and Americanism, forming the foundation for the idea that Kaepernick as anti-American. As noted by many authors on nationalism, the “reinforcement of traditions,” is used to create an “us” versus “them” dichotomy, which in this case pits a white man against a Black man (Connor 1993; Conversi 2002; Valluvan 2017; Hartig 2018; Pew Research Center 2018). By including symbols of the white patriarchy, hosts of the media posts further support this hegemonic idea, which is grounded in white supremacy. It reproduces that the Black community will always be the marked category of Americanism (ex. Black American) and will never be able to represent the hegemonic definition of Americanism (McVeigh & Estep 2019).

As Dickerson (2018) describes, there are two types of Black masculinity according to the white public - the “good” Black man and the “bad” Black man (Neal 2013). The “bad” Black man is described as criminal, egotistical, and individualistic (Neal 2013, Dickerson 2018). While some could see Kaepernick and his activism as being extremely selfless, 14 of the 77 media posts depicted Kaepernick as selfish, aligning with the description of the “bad” Black man. This also feeds into the idea of white paternalism and Black men being depicted as childish. These media posts show Kaepernick as spoiled and a greedy player who just wanted more money and spotlight for his own gain. For example, Kaepernick was called an “overgrown, spoiled brat” and a “spoiled, ungrateful brat,” (Starnes 2017a; Gutfeld 2016b). Laura Ingraham also made
her belief that Kaepernick was money hungry known when saying “Well, of course, he got a multimillion-dollar Nike contract and a hefty NFL settlement out of the whole deal. So, you see, victimhood pays,” (Ingraham 2018). This tactic is a means to attack Kaepernick’s character while also discrediting his protest.

In a media post on August 29, 2016, Tucker Carlson on The Greg Gutfeld Show also challenged Kaepernick’s masculinity by calling him a “child with a head injury,” which reinforces ideas of white paternalism (Lacy 2010; Gutfeld 2016a). By depicting Kaepernick as a child, his manhood is challenged as he then defaults to be a boy. This positions the white man as the “man” who is meant to teach him what is right and wrong. This continues the racist trope of white paternalism, which serves as a foundation in the emasculation of Black masculinity, as Black masculinity was always contingent upon one’s ability to conform to the standards set by white masculinity (Lacy 2010).

**Theme #2: Challenging THE American Man**

Kaepernick was placed in direct opposition to military and police members in 46 of the 77 articles. As Kusz discusses in his article on Pat Tillman, white men became the example of patriotic heroism (Kusz 2007). While the number of people of color in the military and the police force is growing, numbers show that all branches of the military and police force are still predominantly white and male by large margins (Reynolds & Shendruk 2018; Data USA). So, not only are the authors of the media posts comparing Kaepernick to white men, they are comparing him to the white men that are considered to be the symbol of American patriotic heroism in police officers and military personnel (Kusz 2007). Todd Starnes juxtaposes Kaepernick against these men when saying instead
of honoring Kaepernick we should “honor true heroes, those who protect us daily, some even sacrificing their own lives … [they] are the true heroes,” (Starnes 2018b). Laura Ingraham also positioned Kaepernick against the military when she said, “I know of some really courageous advocates who never take a knee … and since this year marks their 242nd birthday, they are the ideal ‘Person of the Year.’ Try the Marines. Semper Fi, baby,” (Ingraham 2017). As these quotes show, Kaepernick was compared to the definition of the American man. This comparison is connected to the mentioning of the white male American symbols from Theme #1. The military and police represent additional white male symbols that statistically deserve their own recognition. While they are serving the same purpose as mentioning symbols that uphold the white male patriarchy, there is a nuanced difference in mentioning these two groups because these two groups arguably are the white male patriarchy, as they are the symbol of American patriotic heroism (Kusz 2007).

The topic of sportsmanship in football was one I also explored with interview participants. Most sportsmanship conversations were centered around the national anthem. I asked the participants what the national anthem symbolized to them. The answers varied drastically, which surprised me because the media seems to create this idea that everyone’s opinion on the anthem is monolithic. The analysis of the interview answers is seen in Chart 5.1 in Appendix B. Four major themes emerged from analyzing participants' responses in explaining what the national anthem means to them. The four major themes are tradition, unity, morality, and Americanism. Gracie, a current student at Mountain High, notes that playing the national anthem “shows like sportsmanship too
in a way, like because when you’re playing against each other, like stuff can get crazy sometimes when you’re on opposing teams and … it kinda also symbolizes sportsmanship.” Emma is a current student at Mountain High and the daughter of a faculty member at the school. She says “since sports are all around the nation, it’s just … it’s good. A good song to play since it represents that we are here and we’re just playing for good causes and this is for everyone.” This relates to the idea of morality as portraying America as inherently good and again inherently feeling as one. To the participants, the national anthem is representative of aspects of the political system. Participants also noted how the anthem is becoming merely ceremonial or routine. This implies that in the past the anthem was something more than ceremonial and also implies discomfort surrounding the changing meaning. It also shows that by connecting the anthem to politics that the national anthem is inherently political. Participants suggested that the anthem represented a collective or ideas surrounding unity, a unity that is being challenged by the changing landscape of the United States via immigration, globalization, and diversification. For example, when I asked Coach Harbaugh what he felt the national anthem symbolized, he responded:

“I would like to say unity, but we live in a world now where we don’t have as much unity as we once did because we are the land of the free and home of the brave. And we because of so much immigration. Now, one of my sons (who is a corporate executive)... said if we do not start making kids come to school every day when they're able. Learn to follow simple directions and instructions, do their best. And I'd say stand for a national anthem. He said we are not going to have to
worry about immigration. He said, because they're aren't going to be any jobs, he said people come here for the freedoms and the liberties but there are going to be any jobs. I said what do you mean? He said. Even now, because of the high cost of inflation for American employees, particularly in American automobile industry, he said, we can send parts abroad, have done fixed assembled, whatever we need done, have sent their ship back here and get it done cheaper than we can. When we've got somebody who's gonna mess up, some guy's got to redo it and all that. He said it's more economically feasible. And so right now, I mean, you know, we we've uh we had people from so many countries. ... I hate shopping in Tysons and the places I go there some, but I'm not often because, you know, everyone is speaking a different language. You know, it's like and I'm not accustomed to that. You know, I'm used to everybody, just men, old country bumpkins.”

This implies that the participants felt there was a collective identity that represented an American identity. They also felt discomfort surrounding the diluting of the identity. Paired with this, participants brought connected militarism towards the identity and past sacrifices of our forefathers. For example, Chris says “to me the national anthem just means take that little bit of time to respect everybody. Your country, you live in it and just a little bit of time. You don’t have to. It's not gonna take that long … It's like 45 seconds that you can pay respect to [the military].”

The sacrifices of those that served in the military and those of our forefathers are seen as honorable but the sacrifices of other groups (i.e. the murders of natives, the labor
of enslaved laborers that built the nation) are overlooked. Participants also connected the national anthem to ideas of morality like sportsmanship, respect, and safety. Jared, a senior football player, describes the national anthem as representing “respect for … America.” Claire, a senior athlete at Mountain High, says “The national anthem … represents our nation and … it gives me like a safety barrier. … like we are still our nation.”

Finally, there were two polar opposite responses when asking for the symbolism of the national anthem. A few participants answered “life” and “everything,” symbolizing that the American identity was all encompassing. The major themes of the national anthem were largely pulled from interviews of 20 of the 21 participants. Twenty of the participants were white and one was Black. When the Black participant was asked what the national anthem meant to him, he responded “not a damn thing.” This response showed the other end of the extreme of the symbolism of the national anthem. While I am not implying that his response should be understood to represent the feeling of all Black Americans, I did think it was worth noting that the one participant of color had drastically different understanding and feelings about the national anthem than the white participants. Going forward, the question of how Americans of color and white Americans interpret national symbols differently could be explored. However, looking back at discourses of the symbolism of the national anthem in this study, many participants mentioned its connection to being “country,” being from a rural school, or more plainly, “redneck culture.” Literature on the term “redneck” explains that while the term used to be a class slur for a “rural poor white man of the American South,” it has
now been reclaimed by “self-styled rednecks” who speak “powerfully to their racial and class consciousness as an economically exploited and yet racially privileged group,” showing that redneck is a veiled word for whiteness (Huber 1995:145-146). Jess, a senior athlete at Mountain High, says “coming from a redneck [community] … it’s just tradition.” This reaffirmed my suspicion of the racial element in the symbolism of the national anthem. While a single Black participant is not enough to conclude a racial element to the national anthem, multiple white students mentioning how it is linked to their “country” or “redneck culture” is telling of at least an element of whiteness, a definition that is largely linked to American tradition. Claire sums up this argument in saying:

“I feel like it’s part of football. We’ve done it for so long. I feel like it’s almost like a tradition to me … we always [play it] when we’re at home because in Mountainsville, like we’ve always played the national anthem … it shows like that major connection between like our own little community, but we still have this belief and … we respect this. And our belief here is like you stand for the national anthem like you support it because it's always kind of been how it is.”

While the other major findings situated Kaepernick in opposition to American symbols, some media posts explicitly depict Kaepernick as not being American. Of the 77 media posts, 34 media posts used language that challenged Kaepernick’s Americanism. They did so by mentioning how the Iranian president supported him and his tactics (McHenry 2018; Starnes 2018a). Todd Starnes challenged Kaepernick’s citizenship by noting how his protest is “not citizenship” but instead “cowardice,”
Diamond and Silk went so far as to say that Kaepernick is trying to “destroy the orthodox of America,” (Watters 2018). Quotes like these show that not only is Kaepernick juxtaposed against white male American symbols, but that his rejection and opposition to these symbols means that he is not considered American. Again, this links to the other major themes and explicitly shows the nationalistic maintenance of the “us” versus “them” dichotomy in the creation of Americanism (Connor 1993; Conversi 2002; Valluvan 2017; Hartig 2018; Pew Research Center 2018). Additionally, this supports the idea that a Black man will never be fully American and instead will be a marked category where their American identity can be revoked (McVeigh & Estep 2019).

Also, by protesting the pregame ritual of the national anthem, the moment of (white) American togetherness, Kaepernick is interrupting the American identity and arguably the American masculine identity.

**Theme #3: Crafting the American “We”**

Sport became a mechanism for the community to create a collective identity and therefore feelings of togetherness. Football is the sport that most participants noted as the sport that the community rallies behind. One participant even joked that if you wanted to rob someone, Friday night was the night to do it because everyone was at the football game. Football was a major instrument that helped build and maintain a strong connection between the school and the broader Mountainsville community. The street signs and the police cars in Mountainsville are pink, the same as the high school’s color. People are invested in the success of the football team and keep up to date with the team. One player discussed the common occurrence of people who he didn’t know coming up
to him in town and talking to him about football. Chris recalls “I was amazed about how
like people, they always come and talk to me or my teammates and … we don’t even
know who they are, but they still come and talk and it’s like wow, … they don’t really
know us, but they know who we are and they come to the games and support us.” He
mentioned how surprising it was to him at times because he had no idea who these people
were, but they knew who he was. Additionally, multiple participants noted how it wasn’t
just the parents or families of the kids that came to the games, but people who had no
personal or familial connection.

From observations and interviews, I saw that football is a game that is largely
built upon rituals. I observed the same pregame rituals of running out together, stretching,
walking out to the coin toss hand in hand. Chris, the football player I introduced earlier
also revealed other pregame rituals that I missed. For example, Chris explains that “for
every game we have a sledgehammer and somebody, whoever that previous game, they
had a big hit or played really well, had a bunch of tackles or even on offense ran the ball
really well or put the hammer down or whatever, they get the hammer and when you get
the hammer, you get to sign it on the handle” and run out on the field with the hammer.
Also, Mike described how younger players were hazed during his time playing - though
he emphasized in the interview that it was not hazing because that was illegal - instead
they just “picked on [the sophomores] a bit” in ways that “made ‘em tougher.” For
example, Chris describes that “there was a lot of river balls” where they would throw the
balls in the river and the sophomores would have to go get it. Also, they “used to have a
mud pit so we could throw the sophomore’s in it, it was a coming to varsity experience.”
In addition to the players themselves, the fans act in ways that are deeply ritualistic. Where the fans sit when they go to games is deeply ritualistic - specifically at home games. I observed the traditions and asked interviewees about where different people sit. Tye, the assistant principal, talked me through where people sit.

*The good ole boys club, they hang around by the pine tree .... And then you have the little kids and their parents and then you have the stands which are you know the Peak (the student section) and the general seating and the longtime supporters sit in the middle and then the parents and then at the other end, a lot of the players’ dads hangout down by the other gate.*

References to seating were reiterated throughout most of the interviews. Everyone had a place to sit. Additionally, the section called The Peak represents a tradition in and of itself. This section is where the students sit. They named themselves The Peak a few years back. Jared is a football player but has become the leader of the Peak during the winter athletic season. He describes the Peak as a “section for the kids to get rowdy and get the game intensified.” The Peak is meant to bring the student body together and give them a place to cheer for their team. Additionally, Jacky, an alum and longtime community member, describes how dress is also important when attending the games and even the day leading up to the game. Jacky says, “because we were born and bred here like you just know Friday nights is football and Friday nights you wear pink.” Jacky describes her traditional outfit that she wears to games - she has mountain lion earrings, pink shoelaces, a pink shirt, a pink construction helmet with cat ears attached with all the seniors’ numbers painted on it.
While Jacky notes traditions surrounding support, she also reveals how the community supporting the football team is deeply connected to morals. She says “it’s just always been a big thing in the community and it’s always been a community thing. That’s the respect, that’s the way we were raised in the community, so you just come out and support them like you were supported when you were a student.” Attending football games is more than just a thing to do, it shows how one is deeply connected to their community - as they were taught to be.

Just as sport is a place to display morality, it is also a site to teach morality. Morality was present in many of the discourses surrounding sport. For example, Chris points to how football taught him about hard work. He says, “if you don’t put all you have into it, not even during the game, that week prior or the summer before, if you don’t put that work in all the time, somebody is going to beat you.” This, therefore, creates an idea that winning is desirable not just because of competition but also because it implies you are morally intact. You worked hard, so you won.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Trends of the Fox News media pieces showed the portrayal of Colin Kaepernick is grounded in ideas of white paternalism and maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. Commentators often made statements that emasculated Kaepernick as a strategy to reaffirm white masculinity as the *real* masculinity, ideas that are resonant with Pascoe and Bucholtz’s theories. The commentators also questioned Kaepernick’s Americanism, furthering the idea of “us versus them” dichotomy that forms the foundation of nationalistic sentiments. The white masculine symbols to which Kaepernick was compared were portrayed as superior. This is important because their superiority implied Kaepernick’s inferiority in morals, supporting the idea of Black men being “childish” and in need of guidance from the white man’s paternity. This supports Kusz and Lacy’s understanding of white paternalism and its connection to the treatment of the Black athlete. Kaepernick and other protesters are situated within the power relation of a gaze. They are constantly being policed according to how the white man wants them to perform. Kaepernick is performing his Blackness in a way that makes white people uncomfortable, therefore inciting pushback from white America.

When positioning Kaepernick in comparison to the military, the sacrifices of the military were mentioned, specifically how many military personnel had died for the United States. However, this rebuttal of Kaepernick’s protest misses the point of what he
is protesting. He is protesting a racist police state that has murdered countless members of the Black community, specifically Black men. By positioning the military deaths against Kaepernick’s struggle, his opponents are sending an implied message - white deaths on behalf of the state mean more than Black deaths at the hands of the state.

Interviews with participants showed a major connection of sport to collective identity, generational connections, morality, tradition, and Americanism. Exploration of the national anthem specifically showed themes of tradition, unity, Americanism, and morality, while also pointing to racial elements of the national symbol. Sport is a means for a community to create a collective identity. This collective identity hinges largely on traditions and rituals to hold the identity together. Also, sport is a place where morality was passed on, such as sportsmanship and respect. It can also be argued that sport is a place where boys are socialized how to be a man (Messner et al 1999). The collective identity of the community, the rituals associated with the community, and the morals are passed down through generations. Sport, specifically football, is seen as an American symbol. Therefore, football and American tradition are deeply connected. Morality and American unity and tradition are passed down through the sport; however, what this can overlook is whose morality is being passed down? White morality, white tradition, and white Americanism.

If sport is a site for generational transfer of tradition and morality, there is going to be backlash when these traditions are challenged. When Colin Kaepernick kneels during the national anthem, he is challenging the traditions and questioning the morals that parents are expecting their kids to learn from football. For example, if football is a
site where fathers look to teach their sons about the morality of being a good man, what they really mean is they want their white boys to be shown stereotypical white masculinity (i.e. military men, all American football players). When a football player challenges an American symbol because that symbol is not representative of his experience, he is not being a “good man” as demonstrated with Fox News’ portrayal of Colin Kaepenrick as not only anti-American, but as a feminized figure. Essentially, this is creating the idea that whiteness is good and other races are somehow morally deficient. Participants also connected the national anthem to “Redneck culture” which I translate to white culture; therefore, Kaepernick is directly challenging white culture when kneeling. He is also disrupting the patrilineal generational transfer of white morality. Participants noted discomfort around the changing landscape of America because of globalization and immigration. I conclude that this discomfort is also linked to Kaepernick. He is outwardly showing a different discourse of masculinity - some might argue that he is introducing a Black masculinity to the viewer. While Fox News portrays him as anti-American, he is really simply challenging the white forms of masculinity that are dominated by violence and the two forms of Black masculinity the white media presents to the audience.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

Fox News rejected Colin Kaepernick largely using the mechanisms of white paternalism and hegemonic masculinity. They emasculated Kaepernick and used discourse that demonstrated he needed the guidance of white masculinity. This idea of white moral standards as supreme was reinforced by observations and interviews conducted about high school football culture. Football culture is also a place where boys were sent to learn how to be a “good man,” but the definition of being a “good man” is deeply intertwined with whiteness, making it impossible for people of color to be seen as anything other than morally deficient. The culture surrounding high school football largely supported the creation and maintenance of collective identity. This collective identity was upheld largely through traditions and rituals. Therefore, violation of a tradition was interpreted largely as a violation of one’s identity. So, when Kaepernick knelt during the national anthem, an anthem that participants connected with redneck (i.e. white) culture, white Americans interpreted the protest as a direct violation of one’s identity, encouraging an increasingly emotional response. They then portrayed Kaepernick as being anti-American, because he was violating white traditions, the traditions that are the “American” standard because of white supremacy. This reinforced the idea that the “us” as Americans is deeply contingent on whiteness, and the creation of the “them” that nationalism depends on is linked to racial categories other than whiteness.
This paper reveals a discomfort on white peoples’ behalf with the changing landscape of the United States, which is coded language for people of color gaining power to question white supremacy. As Bryant quotes, “‘America is a strange place. America believes in the Constitution up until the point where it is scared,’ said Eric Adams, Brooklyn borough president and former NYPD officer for twenty-two years. ‘When she becomes afraid, the Constitution means nothing. All those words about life, liberty, and justice, the freedom to do this and that, all that shit goes out the window.’” (Bryant 2018: 121). The white moral standard calls for “fairness” in sport or “liberty and justice for all” in American society, but in reality, these are promises that are made only to white Americans and are upheld out of convenience for people of color and ignored when that justice challenges the maintenance of white supremacy. The pushback that Kaepernick experiences is because white racial identity, an identity that is deeply built upon oppressing others, is being questioned. While some might feel uncomfortable with this, I argue we should celebrate it. The white racial identity should be challenged. The moral codes that white people have established in sport - and the larger United States - is built largely on violence, oppression, and alienation. Kaepernick knelt to protest police brutality, to bring attention to those murdered by the hands of police like Sandra Bland and Philando Castile - but in reality, he was challenging a system that turned a blind eye to the murders of people of color, women, the LGBTQ+ community, undocumented immigrants, Indigenous peoples, and other marginalized identities. Kaepernick is calling for a better America, and that is extremely patriotic.

Limitations

57
One limitation of this study is that I only searched for the word “Kaepernick” in the Fox News search engine. While I am confident I have a holistic understanding of how the anchors of Fox News articulate their understanding of Colin Kaepernick and the national anthem protests, it is possible that there are articles that do not discuss Colin Kaepernick, but do discuss the national anthem protests. Because they do not contain the keyword “Kaepernick,” that data would not be considered in this study. Additionally, when categorizing the users gender and race, I am doing so based on the information given in their profiles and/or their pictures, therefore, the categorizations are inferences and may maintain errors.

I was surprised that the data showed no patterns based on demographic differences. While this is surprising, it could have been linked to the lack of diversity in the commentators. The authors of the media pieces were overwhelmingly white and male. If I were to do this study again, I would include other conservative news sources. This would allow me to compare data across media sources as well as hopefully gain a larger sample size of all demographics in order to more accurately understand demographic differences in critiques of Kaepernick.

Another limitation of this study is the representation of the interview sample. The sample is made up of 11 participants who identified as women and 10 participants that identified as men, which is a fairly representative sample. At the same time, the sample consists of 20 participants that identify as white and one participant that identifies as black. There is an obvious discrepancy of race in the sample; however, the representation of the sample is similar to the racial makeup of Mountainsville. Also, the focus of the
study was not necessarily to understand how races understand the culture surrounding football differently, but instead to understand the culture surrounding football.

**Reflexivity**

I am a longtime member of the River County community. While I did not attend MHS, I have a family member that is in the administration and often go to the games with other family members. Some people within the community know that I am related to the Principal. Because of this, I was careful to spend time with the Principal, but also be separated from the Principal during my observations. Because people in the community know me, I felt more comfortable doing research in the area and was able to pull on my insider knowledge of the culture of the general area. This was a double-edged sword though: while people were more comfortable with me because I was a part of the community, they also know more deeply about my research interests. I have had discussions about my past research on Colin Kaepernick with two of my participants. I realized when I asked a question about the ritual of national anthems playing before sporting events, the participants would respond with why they thought the national anthem was played before sporting events, and immediately followed with their opinions on if there was a right or wrong way to behave during the anthem. I found this interesting because I was asking the participants *why* there was an anthem, not how they felt about national anthem protests. Additionally, I acknowledge that my connection to the community is linked with power. My credentials of a researcher from a higher education institution, connection to the Principal, and my whiteness can put me at a privileged position compared to my research participants. To combat this power struggle, I would
always leave the interview open ended, allowing them to add anything that they wanted to add. Additionally, I approached the interviews conversationally, so they felt relaxed.

Having a connection to the community is a balancing act. I usually rode to games with a family member and another family friend. Aware that I was going to be doing research that night, it was unclear when my research actually started and/or ended. I went to a tailgate before a game and I typed a jotting in my phone and my friend looked at me and said, “Wait, are you researching now?” I answered that I was and reminded him that everybody would have pseudonyms and he responded “oh, that’s right.” I had to navigate the decision of when I was doing research versus when I was assuming my normal position within the community. This was hard for me at times but made sure to only start my research around the time of entrance into the game or events connected to the game and stopped researching once I entered the car to leave the event. To me, this was a way to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the people I observed. Additionally, most of my jottings were on paper, so I immediately shredded my jottings once I had completed my field notes. I did take one set of jottings on my phone and the document was deleted upon completion of my field notes.

I was fairly familiar with the site that I was studying, but at the same time, I am still an outsider to this particular community. There were times when I was welcomed as if I was an insider of the community, and also times when I noticed people’s eyes lingering on the high school t-shirt that I wore to games, seeming as if they couldn’t place why I would be wearing that shirt and them trying to figure out how I belonged in that community. At the same time, I did purposefully wear a Mountain High School t-shirt or
jacket to games because I understood that it would be an easy signal to people that I had some connection to the community, making conversation and observation more natural. Though it is important to note that my feeling of outsider-ness could be imagined, as many researchers often feel they are hyper visible in the field.

Because of the closeness I felt towards a similar community, there were times I overlooked the agricultural foundation of the community. For example, there were multiple allusions to the influence of agriculture - for example, a questioning of the moon phase during the Tidewater football game. The focus on the full moon is one that I grew up with and I did not even think that this could be a product of the environment I was in until I sat critically with my field notes for multiple hours and thought about why she asked about the moon phase and the answer is that the moon phase is deeply based in agriculture. Once I realized my oversight, I was more conscious of overlooking things due to familiarity. While my closeness to the field can be seen as a weakness of my research, I also feel that it could be seen as a possible strength. Because of my peripheral closeness to the field, the objectification of research participants was reduced as I am to some degree one of “them.” I am not an outsider observing, and as some would argue judging them, but instead I am being critical of a community I am located socially near.

Because of my varied connection to the community, I did find myself being extra hesitant and careful when conducting research. I was hyper aware of my connection to the Principal and felt that I took extra caution when researching. At some points, the connection to the administration allowed for ease in navigating the bureaucratic barriers of getting permission to research in a school. For example, since they knew me, they
agreed to allow me to research in the school because they trusted me. At the same time, I also felt the added obstacle of pressure. I felt pressure to conduct myself professionally and also produce a product from my research that would do the community justice. While others will not know what community I researched, I will, and the participants will, and I wanted to create something of quality out of respect.

One major goal of my research is accessibility - how can I make research accessible through language and also the availability of medium, but also how can I frame issues in a way that allows people to see other perspectives that are not their own. I also think this is my duty as a white person. I’ve witnessed first-hand the most extreme versions of white supremacy on August 11th and 12th in Charlottesville, Virginia, and I’ve grown up around more diluted forms of white supremacy. August 11th and 12th allowed me to see my white skin as more than privilege but instead as responsibility also. I have a responsibility to attempt to undo the oppressive systems my ancestors created. It’s my duty to assume the emotional and mental work of attempting to help white people understand the oppression and discrimination we have created.

Because of my upbringing and experiences, I approach my research with the goal of breaking down oppressive structures. As a critical researcher, I rely heavily on feminist, queer, and critical race theories in framing and understanding data. I use the feminist research methods and a strong belief of anti-racism when approaching work. My feminism and my belief in dismantling white supremacy drives the way I approach work and also the research that I focus on. My data is from content analysis of Fox News reporters, an ethnography of high school football games, and unstructured interviews
with community members, coaches, and players of Mountainsville in order to gain a full perspective of football and its relation to America and more local communities. This approach allows for three data sources - observation, local community members, and Fox News anchors, which all provide different and unique perspectives to my question. While my research is not generalizable to the entire American public, it can give an insight into thought processes for how some are approaching Colin Kaepernick and the role of athletic protest. The goal is to understand the tension surrounding the activism in hopes of creating meaningful change of race relations in the United States.
APPENDIX A

TABLE 4.1: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR MEDIA POST AUTHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Person of Color</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* While I collected posts from 47 different authors, the total number reflected in this graphic is 49 because one man and one woman identified as having a lineage of color while being white passing.

As demonstrated in Figure 4.1, I gathered biographical data on the authors of the opinions. The media posts I collected were authored by 47 different authors, including 28 white men, 9 white women, 6 men of color, and 6 women of color. As previously noted, two authors (one man and one woman) were coded as both white and as people of color because of their self-identification as having lineage of color, while being white passing. After analyzing the data, I found no significant differences in biographical data and the author’s disapproval or approval and their framing of their opinion. This could be
a result of the small sample size of minority authors, as the majority of the sample were white men.
APPENDIX B

TABLE 5.1: NATIONAL ANTHEM RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Certain political system, ritual, some acknowledged the ceremonial aspect to the anthem and expressed sadness that the meaning was lost</td>
<td>The national anthem is entangled in a political system. The anthem itself is changing meaning and perhaps losing meaning.</td>
<td>The national anthem is political. There is discomfort surrounding the changing meanings of national symbols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>Common identity, whole country, brings people together, unity challenged by changing United States (immigration, globalization, &amp; diversification of language), communal belief</td>
<td>There is a common identity that the national anthem is representing. This common identity is being diluted by diversification.</td>
<td>There is an assumption that there has always been a common identity of being “American.” This identity is believed to be experienced by those living in America. Also, diversification is diluting American identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americanism</td>
<td>Certain political system, whole country, flag, military, appreciation of history and past sacrifices</td>
<td>American identity is encapsulated in military and appreciation for history and past sacrifices</td>
<td>Certain sacrifices are deemed as American and honorable in making America “better” (i.e. military sacrifices). Other sacrifices are seen as less American and less honorable (i.e. the work of those enslaved).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>Sportsmanship,</td>
<td>National anthem represents</td>
<td>National anthem is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noteworthy Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Freedom, Life, Everything, “Not a damn thing,” Redneck culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness, respect, safety</td>
<td>For some the national anthem means everything while for some the national anthem means nothing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entangled in sport and morality</td>
<td>Extreme polarization of understanding of representation of the national anthem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introduction:
Define community for me.

What communities do you consider yourself to be a part of?

Do you find any of your communities to be centered around sport?

What is your connection to Mountainsville?

Walk me through that last football game you went to.

Why do you attend football games?

Spatial:
I’ve noticed people sort themselves into sections. Have you noticed this, too?
- Who do you sit with?
- Why do you sit with the people you sit with?

Why don’t the visitors and the home teams sit together?

Symbols:
When I go to a football game, I find myself automatically searching for pink to wear. Do you find yourself doing this, too?
- How do you choose what to wear to football games?

Tell me about the cowbells I see at some of the games (what are they for?).

So, I noticed the schools always play the national anthem before the games. What’s that about?
What does the national anthem symbolize to you?

**Generational//Family:**
I’ve noticed that people come to football games as a family or with family. Have you noticed this, too?
- Who do you go to the games with?

**Rituals:**
I attended the community tailgate before the game. Why is there a tailgate before some games? What purposes does it serve?

I notice there is usually a coin toss at the beginning of the game. Why do you think that is? What do you think it symbolizes?

So, it sounds like you’ve attended more than one football game -- what are some things you see to happen at all football games? Or some common practices of football games?

While I was at one game, there were honorary captains. Why are there sometimes honorary captains?

Is there any time at games where you feel like everyone is united despite being on different teams or being in different spaces?

**Surveillance:**
What role do you think school resource officers serve by attending the game to the game?

Why do you think the principals come to the games? //what role do you serve by coming to the game?

Who do you focus on the most at games?

What role do you think coaches play at games?

What role do you think referees plays play?

**Players:**
Who do you notice at the games?
Who is it important to you attend the game?

You guys are physically separated from your fans – how do you feel a connection to them?

Do you feel connected to you coaches?

What role significance does the Peak hold for you as players?

**Students:**
Explain to me what is like to be in the Peak.

Why do you have the Peak? What’s the significance of the Peak?

**Coaches:**
Do you feel connected to your players?

**Faculty:**
What is your perception of the Peak?

Do you feel a connection to the Mountainsville Community?

Do sports make you feel more a part of the community?

**Mothers/Fathers/Parents:**
What is it like to watch your son play football?
RECRUITMENT SCRIPTS

Approaching the XX X Council officers (students over phone)

Hello -

I am here to talk to you guys a little bit about my research and then also ask some of you to help with it. I am Katelyn Foltz, a graduate student at George Mason University. I am a sociologist, which basically just means I study society. I am really interested in sport sociology - so I focus a lot on athletic events, athletes, and communities surrounding both. Right now, I’ve been doing some research around high school football games. I attended some of your games and made some observations. My next step in my research is to interview people that have attended these football games or play football. That’s where you all come in - I have interviewed some of your teachers and other community members, but I really want to get the student-athlete perspective so that my research is more complete.

If you agree to be interviewed, you have to sign this assent form and your parents have to sign this consent form - these forms basically just explain the research and make sure that you’re agreeing to this interview without anyone pressuring you. If you’re 18 years old, you just have to sign a consent form for adults - your parents don’t have to sign. Also, if you agree to participate, the only people that will know of your participation are me, my advisor who is a Professor at George Mason University, your parents if you’re under 18, and Mr. XXX No one else will know unless you tell them, but I cannot and will not release your name. The interviews will be about 20 minutes to an hour long and they will take place at XXX High School. There’s going to be folder in Mr. XXX mailbox that is on the outside of her door where you can turn in your consent forms. Once you have turned it in, I will collect the forms on December 12th and be in contact with you to set up an interview. The interview will most likely be at here at the school, but if we have some scheduling conflicts, we can arrange to meet somewhere else. My phone number
and email are on the paper, so feel free to reach out if you have any questions going forward!

**Script for Athletic Leadership Counsel Officer Team to use when presenting to the rest of the club**

Katelyn Foltz, a graduate student at George Mason University, is doing a project looking at sport and creating community norms. She is a sociologist, which basically just means she study society. She is really interested in sport sociology - so focuses a lot on athletic events, athletes, and communities surrounding both. Right now, she’s been doing some research around high school football games. She attended some of our games and made some observations. Her next step in her research is to interview people that have attended these football games or play football. That’s where we come in - she has interviewed some of our teachers and other community members, but she really wants to get the student-athlete perspective so that my research is more complete.

If you agree to be interviewed, you have to sign this assent form and your parents have to sign this consent form - these forms basically just explain the research and make sure that you’re agreeing to this interview without anyone pressuring you. If you’re 18 years old, you just have to sign a consent form for adults - your parents don’t have to sign. Also, if you agree to participate, the only people that will know of your participation are Katelyn Foltz, her advisor who is a Professor at George Mason University, your parents if you’re under 18, and Mr. XXX. No one else will know unless you tell them, but I cannot and will not release your name. The interviews will be about 20 minutes to an hour long and they will take place at XXX High School. There’s going to be folder in Mr. XXX’s mailbox that is on the outside of her door where you can turn in your consent forms. Once you have turned it in, I will collect the forms on December 12th and be in contact with you to set up an interview. The interview will most likely be at here at the school, but if we have some scheduling conflicts, we can arrange to meet somewhere else. Her phone number and email are on the paper, so feel free to reach out if you have any questions going forward! Mr. XXX has an interest sheet for us to fill out so they can coordinate potential interviews. Putting the name on this interest form is only showing tentative interest and is not saying you definitely consent.

**Script to Faculty, Community Members, Referred person etc. - approaching in person**

Hello - I have a quick question to ask you. I’ve been doing research at some of the football games and I made some observations about the community and its relation to
football and the team. My next step in my research is to interview people that have attended these football games or play football. So, I was wondering if I would be able to interview you sometime? It would be a quick interview, most are around 20 minutes, though no longer than an hour. Really, we would just be talking about your experience at football games. No one would know you are participating except for my advisor, Professor Hattery. If you agree, we can set up a time - most likely at the school, to do the interview. If we have some trouble setting up a time, we can even do the interview over the phone.
PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

RESEARCH PROCEDURES
My name is Katelyn Foltz and I am a Graduate Student in Sociology at George Mason University. I am asking your child to participate in a research study being conducted to better understand community formation through spaces involving sport. I am conducting interviews with people involved in the XXX community. The interview consists of approximately five to ten questions posed by me and should last between 20 minutes and 1 hour. In the interviews I will be asking about your child’s attendance and experience at sporting events, specifically football games. This research is being conducted to understand how community identity are connected to sport. If you agree to allow your child to participate, your child will be asked to recall their attendance and experience at sporting events, specifically football games. The interview consists of approximately five to ten questions posed by me and should last between 15 minutes and 1 hour. In the interviews I will be asking about.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research.

BENEFITS
There are no benefits to you or your child as a participant other than to further research in

CONFIDENTIALITY
The data in this study will be confidential. Interviews will be transcribed and then any identifiable characteristics (including names, school, and towns) will be removed and replaced with pseudonyms. Also, interview audio tapes will be destroyed after transcription. The data in this study are confidential. (1) Your child’s name is not included on the interview transcriptions and other collected data; (2) A code is placed on the interview transcriptions and other collected data in place of your name; (3) Only I will have access to the identification key that links your interview to your name. Any audio tapes created are only accessed by Katelyn Foltz, or my advisor Angela Hattery,
and will be destroyed after transcription. The audio tape will be stored on Katelyn Foltz’s laptop, which has password and fingerprint protection, until their transcription. Transcription will occur within a month of the interview. After transcription, the audio file will be destroyed. The de-identified data could be used for future research without additional consent from participants. The Athletic Director, XXX, will be aware of who participated as he will help me coordinate interviews with the student athletes, however, he will not be granted access to the data.

PARTICIPATION
Your/Your child’s participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw your child from the study at any time and for any reason. If you or your child decide not to participate or if you or your child withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you or your child are otherwise entitled. There are no costs to you or any other party.

CONTACT
This research is being conducted Katelyn Foltz in the Sociology Department at George Mason University. He/she may be reached at (540) 975-1854 for questions or to report a research-related problem. She is being advised by Dr. Angela Hattery in the Women & Gender Studies Department at George Mason University. She can be reached at 703-993-2897. You may contact the George Mason University Institutional Review Board office at 703-993-4121 regarding study number 1518529-1 if you have questions or comments regarding your or your child’s rights as a participant in the research.

This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your or your child’s participation in this research.

CONSENT
I have read this form, all of the questions I have at this time have been answered by the research staff, and I agree to allow my child to participate in this study.

☐ I agree to Audio Taping of the Interview
☐ I do not agree to Audio Taping of the Interview

_________________________________  ____________________________
Signature                                Name of Child

_________________________________
Date of Signature
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ASSENT FORM

My name is Katelyn Foltz and I am from the Sociology Department at George Mason University.

I want to talk to you about a research study I am doing. In our study, we want to learn more about how sports allow you to connect to your community. Your parents have already agreed that you may take part in the study, so feel free to talk with them about it before you decide whether you want to join the study.

What will happen to me in the study?
We would like you to participate because of your attendance at your school football games and/or your involvement in athletics yourself. If you would like to participate in the study, you will be asked to have a conversation with me about your experiences at athletic events, as both fans and as athletes. The conversation will last from 20 minutes to an hour.

What are the risks?
There are no risks to participating in this study.

What are the benefits?
There are no benefits to participating in this study

Will anyone know that I am in the study?
No one will know that you participated in this study other than you, me, your parents, my advisor, and the Athletic Director XXX. XXX will be aware of your participation as he is helping me coordinate interviews; however, he will not be granted access to the data.

What if I do not want to participate or decide later to withdraw?
Being in this study is voluntary. You don’t have to be in this study if you don’t want to or you can stop being in the study at any time.
Will I receive anything for being in the study?
There will be no compensation for being in this study.

Who can I talk to about this study?
If you have questions about the study or have any problems, you can talk to you parents, or call Katelyn Foltz at 540-975-1854, the Principal Investigator for this study. If you have questions about the study but want to talk to someone else who is not a part of the study, you can call the Institutional Review Board office at George Mason University at 703-993-4121 regarding study number 1518529-1.

Your signature below means that you have read the above information about the study, have had a chance to ask questions to help you understand what you will do in this study, and you are willing to be in the study. Your signature also means that you have been told that you can change your mind later if you want to.

☐ I agree to Audio Taping
☐ I do not agree to Audio Taping

_________________________  ______________________  __________
Child’s Name (printed)          Signature          Date
18+ CONSENT FORM

Dear Interview Participant,

My name is Katelyn Foltz and I am a Graduate Student in Sociology at George Mason University. I am asking you to participate in a research study being conducted to better understand community formation through spaces involving sport. I am conducting interviews with people involved in the XXX community. The interview consists of approximately five to ten questions posed by me and should last between 20 minutes and 1 hour. In the interviews I will be asking about your attendance and experience at sporting events, specifically football games.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research.

BENEFITS
There are no benefits to you as a participant.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The data in this study are confidential. (1) Your name is not included on the interview transcriptions and other collected data; (2) A code is placed on the interview transcriptions and other collected data in place of your name; (3) Only I will have access to the identification key that links your interview to your name. Any audio tapes created are only accessed by Katelyn Foltz, or my advisor Angela Hattery, and will be destroyed after transcription. The audio tape will be stored on Katelyn Foltz’s laptop, which has password and fingerprint protection, until their transcription. Transcription will occur within a month of the interview. After transcription, the audio file will be destroyed. The de-identified data could be used for future research without additional consent from participants. The Athletic Director, XXX, will be aware of who participated as he will
help me coordinate interviews with the student athletes, however, he will not be granted access to the data.

PARTICIPATION
Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason without prejudice. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. There are no costs to you or any other party. You must be 18 years of age or older to sign this consent form.

CONTACT
This research is being conducted by Katelyn Foltz in the Sociology Department at George Mason University. She may be reached at 540-975-1854 for questions or to report a research-related problem. She is being advised by Dr. Angela Hattery in the Women & Gender Studies Department at George Mason University. Dr. Hattery can be reached at 703-993-2897 for research related questions. You may contact the George Mason University Institutional Review Board (IRB) at 703-993-4121 regarding study number 1518529-1 if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research.

CONSENT
☐ I agree to Audio Taping
☐ I do not agree to Audio Taping

I have read this form, all of the questions I have at this time have been answered by the research staff, and I agree to participate in this study.

_________________________    _______________________
Signature                      Date of Signature
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