Inside Jokes: Color-blind Racism and Racial Humor

ABSTRACT

Research on racial humor emphasizes the subversive role of marginal group humor, while the media studies literature highlights the dominant ideological work reproduced by popular television. This paper examines racial humor on television. I analyze two popular sketch comedy shows hosted by comedians of color, Dave Chappelle's *Chappelle's Show* and Carlos Mencia's *Mind of Mencia*. I explore how the frames of color-blind racism are used within the context of these television programs. How do these two particular comedians of color mediate these contrasting roles with regards to the dominant ideology of color-blind racism? Beyond a mere count of the use of color-blind racism frames, I am interested in how they are used. Do these comedians use the frames to perform dominant or oppositional ideological material? Using poisson and negative binomial regressions, and textual examples I present the ways comedians of color both challenge and reproduce systems of oppression.

Chuck: “Wait, Wendy. Let me get this straight. Why aren’t there any banks in the ghetto?”
Wendy: “That’s because banks hate black people. But I think that’s about to change [now that African Americans have received reparations].”

-Television reporters in a sketch on *Chappelle’s Show*

Do you want to know how bad it’s getting [in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina]? Mexico sent us help! I swear to God! They sent 39 trucks filled with Mexican soldiers to help out the cause. Now, first of all, they said it was 39 trucks and 180 soldiers. I’m a beaner, I’m telling you white people that’s a bullshit number right off the bat. There’s at least 1,000 beaners right now.

-Carlos Mencia during a monologue on *Mind of Mencia*

Racial humor has a long history in the United States. It has served both as an oppressive and uplifting element for racial minority groups (Boskin 1997; Gandy, Jr. 1998). As social productions, jokes rely heavily on context for success or failure (Mulkay 1988). Who laughs at ethnic or racial jokes usually depends on who is telling them (Gandy, Jr. 1998: 90; Willis 2005: 131). It has been argued that appropriate laughter at an ethnic joke is contingent upon an in-group member telling it, to “acknowledge that there are limits within which the joke is being told” (Billings 2005: 31); however, should we assume that every time an insider tells a racial or ethnic joke “the joke can be understood and enjoyed as mocking stereotyping and prejudice” (32)?
Following Gandy, Jr.’s suggestion that “ethnic humor represents another critical site at which we might observe, or at least theorize on, the nature of structuration and the reproduction of racism” (89), I use two racial sketch comedy shows to understand the influence of the dominant racial ideology of color-blind racism on people of color.² Applying the frames of color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva 2003: 26), I do a content analysis of Chappelle’s Show and Mind of Mencia, comparing and contrasting the material presented on these shows. These two sketch comedies are hosted and produced by comedians of color Dave Chappelle and Carlos Mencia, respectively, and have experienced immense popularity.³ I am specifically interested in which color-blind frames are used to structure jokes, and if they are used to invert or perpetuate common stereotypes. The frames, abstract liberalism, cultural racism, minimization of racism and naturalization, are the contemporary ways in which individuals understand and discuss racial relations (Lewis 2004: 632). The content analysis provides both a big picture textual look as well as an up-close view of how color-blind racism is embedded in popular culture.

I begin with a discussion of my theoretical foundation, specifically examining the role of comedians and color-blind racial ideology. I follow with an explanation of my content analysis methodology and the presentation of my results. By emphasizing both the differences and similarities between the two sketch comedy shows, I state the distinct way color-blind racism influences the manner comedians of color discuss race on television.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

In this section I discuss the comedian as cultural critic and humor among oppressed groups. I also define the concept and tenets of the color-blind racism ideology and explore how mass media representations are imbued ideologically and help reproduce the social order.

COMEDIAN AS CRITIC
As stand-up comedians and television personalities, Dave Chappelle and Carlos Mencia occupy a particular social space as both social commentators and mass media productions. As a social commentator/participant observer, a comedian talks to “people in his own society about the cultural rules and behavior patterns in their and his own society” (Koziski 1997: 92). This is an important element of a comedian’s role because what he observes is often so commonplace and taken-for-granted that it is left unspoken (90). Simultaneously, these comedians are television productions, whose “comedy is socially constructed, political, and an important part of popular culture;” “it is an essential ingredient to hegemonic consent” (Artz and Murphy 2000: 111). The extent to which oppositional, rather than dominant, ideological materials are used by Chappelle and Mencia is one of the elements I hope to identify. As Koziski (1997) argues, “The unreflective artist may merely betray and depict covert traits of culture. The more sensitive and critical will discover, analyze and account for the discrepancies found in their observations of how things should operate in the culture but don’t” (99); therefore, we may ask, how do these artists understand their roles as comedians?

Both comedians speak during introductions to sketches and introductory monologues about their views of the world and their roles in it. Mencia, during a 2003 National Public Radio interview by Tony Cox, articulated the importance of comedy as social commentary; “[w]hen you make people laugh, that door opens whether they like it or not. As soon as you laugh at something, you open yourself up to whatever’s coming through, and so within the context of a joke, I can make people think later on.” Chappelle characterized his own work on a 2006 episode of Inside the Actor’s Studio as “truth in jest. I pride myself in saying real shit that people don’t even notice I’m saying, but they feel it.” He defended his racial comedy during his second season claiming that “whenever we do these racial commentaries it’s always about the
subtleties.” Three years later, in a 2007 interview, Mencia echoed Chappelle’s sentiments, “People actually take some of this stuff to heart, or they don’t understand that it’s a performance, or that maybe we mean the opposite of what we’re saying. Sometimes it’s satire” (Pizek 2007).

**SUBORDINATE GROUP HUMOR**

Dave Chappelle and Carlos Mencia’s comedy focuses on racial issues. Historically, ethnic humor has functioned as “miniatures of rebelliousness” (Boskin and Dorinson 1985: 93). Comedians engaging in this type of humor have “reverse[d] roles and turn[ed] the tables on their adversaries by striving for a language of self-acceptance” (97). Although both comedians did provide evidence that they were cognizant of the cultural critic role that is associated with comedy, how did this play out specifically in regards to their subordinate group membership?

Chappelle seemed to base his comedy, in part, on trying to combat the racism and racial inequality in America. On *Inside the Actor’s Studio*, Chappelle was frank about what he wanted his comedy to achieve. “America needs an honest discourse with itself.” His response to a question posed by a white audience member about pushing boundaries on his show indicated this intent:

> Things like racism are institutionalized and systemic. You might not know any bigots [...] but you benefit from racism just by the merit of the color of your skin. There’s opportunities that you have, you’re privileged in ways that you may not even realize because you haven’t been deprived in certain ways. We need to talk about these things in order for things to change.

This acknowledgment of racial inequality indicates Chappelle’s understanding of systemic racism and white privilege.
Mencia provides a different viewpoint of racial inequality in America, although the theme of honesty and unveiling truth remained constant between the two comedians. When asked in a 2007 interview if a white comedian “would be able to get the same laughs doing what you do” he said

I think that he would have to defend his right to do so. I think so. On some of the episodes [this season] I talk about that and how it’s really unfair. I attribute the fact that a lot of young white guys, right now, are joining groups like the KKK and the Aryan Nation in bigger numbers than they ever did before, because I say it’s our faults as minorities for not letting these poor kids, you know, just be normal and have fun and say jokes like everybody else. […] I don’t think it’s fair, and I don’t like it. So I’ve been out there defending the white man (Sheridan 2007).

Mencia makes an argument against what he sees as the absurdity of political correctness and its disproportionate effect on white youths’ ability to tell racial jokes. Political correctness is rooted in concerns, initiated by both neoconservatives and neoliberals, over race-based policies and “identity politics” (Omi and Winant 1994: 148). Political correctness legitimizes race, gender and class insensitivity by forwarding an underlying argument of universalism and equal opportunity, two main tenets of color-blind racism. The gains made by subordinated groups in the 1960s and 1970s that forced acknowledgment of oppressive practices and behaviors by dominant group members were repealed as any group-based grievance is now commonly interpreted as the incendiary, unsubstantiated protest by a group who no longer deserves to complain. Claims decrying politically correctness serve as the ultimate mute button for subordinate groups and are also made by self-proclaimed liberals as shows like Politically
Incorrect indicate. Mencia’s statement is especially striking when contrasted with the structural inequality argument presented by Chappelle.

Mencia addresses racial inequality in a later interview, in response to people’s indignation at his routines. “After all these years, people still get offended by comedy. [...] I mean, God bless you if you have such a wonderful, perfect life that you can be affected that severely by a joke. Not by the fact that human beings oppress one another, not by the fact that people are killing one another, but by a joke. Good for you” (Balmaseda 2008). It is important to note that in this interview Mencia assumes jokes cannot be materially harmful to people.

Dyer, however, argues that what makes cultural representations so important is their connection to material conditions (1993: 1). It seems this concern over the harmful nature of representation is what ultimately caused Chappelle to leave his show in 2005. According to a 2005 interview, Chappelle “wondered if the new [third] season of his show had gone from sending up stereotypes to merely reinforcing them” after a white crew member “laughed particularly loud and long” at Chappelle in blackface (Robinson 2005).

The differences in these comedians’ approaches to racial inequality are important, considering that they both seem to understand themselves as cultural critics. It could be argued that this difference in approach is reflective of what they perceive society to be; it seems, according to interviews, that Mencia has bought into the color-blind ideology, while Chappelle is attempting to make it visible. Based on these perception differences, I expect Chappelle to use more oppositional frames that Mencia.

RACIAL IDEOLOGY

In this analysis I am most interested in the dominant racial ideology of color-blind racism and its tenets, which emphasize egalitarianism and the end of racism while sustaining racial
inequality (Bonilla-Silva 2003: 26; McDermott and Samson 2005: 248). This ideology serves “both to explain and to protect the current racial formation” (Lewis 2004: 636). Thompson argues that “the analysis of ideology should be centrally concerned with the symbolic forms transmitted by the technical media of mass communication” (1990: 265) since these symbolic forms “are often taken up in contexts of everyday life and incorporated in the symbolic content of social interaction” (266). By focusing on the possible ideological role of these two televisions shows, the cultural element of the racialized social system becomes both visible and open to examination. The power of the humor reproduced by this system lies in the underlying values of the comedy. As Gandy, Jr. states, racial humor “usually works in a conservative fashion in that 'it works in a given society, within and between sub-groups, to reinforce accepted values, goals, and ideals. And these accepted values are, more often than not, the values of dominant groups’” (1998: 89).

Using the concept of cultural hegemony, Artz and Murphy argue that “television as the major hegemonic medium in contemporary America has consistently presented images supportive of dominant capitalist interests,” but “also struggled to work in black cultural images whenever possible to solidify subordinate consent for the status quo” (107). They continue, saying “[t]elevision thus becomes a key site for the construction of black consent for the existing social order” (108). Jackman provides a similar view, arguing that dominant group members want to maintain their power and avoid conflict. To do so “they work to engage subordinates in a common view of the world that rationalizes the current order. The surest method of social control is to induce subordinates to regulate themselves. To that end, the unmediated weapon of choice is ideology” (1994: 59). This idea supports the view that subordinate group members are only incorporated to further the dominant ideology. Their presence on the small screen
legitimizes television as a site of ideological work and their subordinate group status strengthens the power of the dominant ideological message.

From a racial humor perspective, Gordon argues that African American comedians perform “humor [that] challenges White oppression and promotes Black emancipation as part of its effort to bring justice to the scene in which both groups have to coexist” (1998: 273). Under this view subordinate group members use the media to challenge the dominant racial order and present a divergent interpretation of the world.

These two perspectives provide interesting and contrasting arguments. Their differences, however, do not necessarily indicate that it must be one way or the other. Mencia and Chappelle, as comedians of color on television, have to navigate a variety of established roles and performance options. Do they continue the legacy of oppositional subordinate group humor or reproduce the dominant racial ideology on television? The material they choose to present provides us insight into how these competing influences are managed.

**IDEOLOGICAL FRAMES.** Color-blind racism is the dominant racial ideology in post-Civil Rights era America. Color-blind racism is the main way Americans understand race and racial issues. In this view, racism no longer exists thanks to the gains of the Civil Rights era and all remaining racial inequality is a result of individual characteristics (Bonilla-Silva 2003, 2001; Forman 2006; Gallagher 2003). Since racial inequality still exists despite the end of racism, these differences must somehow be explained. The main ways these differences are explained are the frames of color-blind racism: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism and minimization of racism (Bonilla-Silva 2003: 28-9).

In line with the literature on comedians of color and African American humor as a “relatively safe way to do violence to the oppressor in return for injustice,” I am also coding for
oppositional versions of the color-blind racism frames (Gordon 1998: 259). Oppositional material, as defined by Gitlin, would entail an “authentically different social order” (1979: 263). This oppositional material would, therefore, be an inverted presentation of the dominant frames, purposefully displaying the inadequacies and contradictions of color-blind racism. The emphasis would be on oppression, power and inequality. Definitions for the main frames of the dominant and oppositional racial ideologies are found in Table 1.  

[Table 1 about here] 

METHODOLOGY

To observe the way comedians of color mediate contesting roles, I examined the first two seasons of both Chappelle’s Show and Mind of Mencia. There were a total of 25 individual episodes of Chappelle’s Show and 28 of Mind of Mencia (12 and 13, and 12 and 16, respectively). Each show was then further divided into individual sketches. Overall, there were 109 Chappelle’s Show sketches and 161 Mind of Mencia sketches. These sketches were split into racial and nonracial categories. I classify racial material as sketches that included either racial subjects (i.e. stereotypes, racial and ethnic group differences) or racialized characters, (i.e. characters that embody racial stereotypes). Although racialized characters do not discuss racial subjects, they present important racially-coded messages and images about what it means to be black, white or Latino.

Both content and textual analyses were conducted to elicit the most information from the television shows. Content analysis, where a predetermined standardized measure (here, the frames of color-blind racism) is used to “characterize and compare documents,” comprised the first element of analysis (Manning and Cullum-Swan 1998: 248; Stokes 2003). The second element, textual analysis, examines the context and meaning of these sketches, which is often
lost in variable-driven content analysis (Manning and Cullum-Swan 1998: 251). In combination these two methodologies provide an overview of the shows as well as detailed readings of particular sketches (Stokes 2003: 95).

Each sketch was analyzed for the inclusion of the four frames of color-blind racism: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism and minimization of racism. Distinctions were made between frames used as dictated by dominant ideology and those that were inverted. Also, the racial and ethnic group of the actors and the racial and ethnic group that was discussed were both noted. In the case of cross-racial characters, the race of the group portrayed was used. Multiple frames can be used in a single sketch, so each frame incorporated in the sketch was coded; special attention will be paid to these paired frames. In addition to the analysis of the televisions shows I reviewed Facebook fan pages for both Chappelle’s Show and Mind of Mencia. In this preliminary analysis I examine the kinds of comments made by fans, specifically those pertaining to which episodes and sketches they enjoyed the most (i.e. those they chose to quote) and also reasons they gave for their fandom. Although only a preliminary investigation, these fan pages are accessible by over 130 million active Facebook members; those 25 years old and older are the website’s fastest growing demographic (Facebook Press Release 2008). According to Comedy Central’s network profile, their targeted and typical viewer is between the ages of 18-49 (Cabletelevision Advertising Bureau 2008). This network profile also indicates that Comedy Central viewers are “high tech,” spending more on computers than the average adult over 18. For these reasons I use Facebook users as a gauge of Mind of Mencia and Chappelle’s Show viewers.

First, the episodes were transcribed by one undergraduate research assistant and the author. I transcribed three seasons and the research assistant transcribed one. Second, the
sketches from all four seasons were coded by the author. Each episode has a three-digit reference number that indicates the season and episode number. For instance, episode 7 in season 2 is episode 207.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics for the dependent variables used are presented in Table 2. All the variables are counts, with their means, standard errors, and ranges listed. Independent sample t-tests were run for each variable, comparing the Chappelle’s Show sample to that of Mind of Mencia. T-tests indicate whether the means of the two groups of sketches (separated by show) are statistically different from one another. The statistically significant differences here are important for they point out how all minority-produced comedy is not the same, and that each show must be critically viewed rather than accepted as progressive because of its host’s skin color.

[Table 2 about here]

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CHAPPELLE’S SHOW AND MIND OF MENCIA

As Table 2 indicates, Mencia included, on average, more dominant frames than Chappelle’s. An interesting difference is that Mencia was statistically more likely to use both abstract liberalism and minimization of racism. In Mencia, these frames were often used in conjunction to forward themes of hard work and success. Negative binomial regressions indicated that for a unit increase in the number of minimization of racism frames, the odds of a unit increase in abstract liberalism frames are 105.8% larger, holding the show constant⁸ (p = .001). One example of this pairing is a phrase Mencia uses to describe what he calls “stupid people” – “dee dee dees”. In episode 213 he writes a song about them, exclaiming
They say no cause I’m black, so we lower the standards.  
They say no cause I’m white, so we lower the standards.  
They say no cause I’m Asian, so we lower the standards.  
No habla Ingles, so we all become Spaniards.  
And you wake up one day and you don’t have the skills  
To get a better job so you’re stuck on the grill.  
You’re wondering why Julio took your job,  
But you forgot to see you’re as dumb as a knob.  
[...]
So they outsource your job to some guy named Habib  
Cause he works harder than you and he’s got five degrees.  
And you’re asking yourself ‘how could this happen to me?’  
I’ll tell you why, homie! Cause you’re...dee dee dee.

Here the individualism of abstract liberalism takes the front seat, which rationalizes racial inequality and the inability to become upwardly mobile. Contemporary employee discrimination and even globalization are ignored, as the individual is responsible for everything that occurs in his life. 

The standing ovation this song received from the audience is a small indication of its resonance with dominant frames of understanding.

The power of this text lies in its message that racism is dead and any counter claims are merely excuses from behaviorally deficient, hypersensitive individuals. This storyline is repeated throughout Mencia’s first two seasons. Important to this continuing theme is Mencia’s immigrant status. As a famous comedian he has lived the American Dream of upward mobility and is perpetuating its ideological mythology. In episode 104 he explains, “Now if you were born in this country, you went to school in this country, you’re 28, 35, 40, 45 and you still work at a fast food restaurant. You’re fucking retarded. You understand that?”

Minimization of racism by itself is also used more frequently by Mencia. Mencia regularly says that his work is not racist because it attacks all groups equally; “I don’t care. I’ll make fun of anybody. It’s America.” “Everybody went through it. That’s what I don’t understand” (Episode 201). This is especially true when he espouses anti-Arab sentiment.
Mencia justifies it by claiming the United States is like a fraternity, and the newcomers, Arabs, are merely getting hazed. He combines this ‘equal opportunity’ approach to racial comedy with the idea that this discrimination is deserved because other minority groups have endured it.

Rather than problematize the white supremacist practice of nonwhite marginalization, he joins in. In one instance Mencia constructs a sketch completely around the idea that racism does not exist. Here, his brother Joseph, who is often on the show playing a recent immigrant, is airing his grievances about employer discrimination. At the bottom of the screen subtitles are provided to translate his accented English and they read, “I’ve been in the United States for thirty years. I have been at the same crappy job since I get here. I went to the financial district to apply for a position in investment banker. But I never get hired. Why? Racism! As long as there is a racism, I will never be able to get a better job.” Carlos Mencia then jumps into the scene and remarks, “Racism my ass. The reason this man cannot get a better position is because there is no ‘y’ in the word job. And now you know” (Episode 103). Here he promotes the importance of language assimilation and the deservedness of the discrimination Joseph received.

An interesting element of this interaction is that his brother Joseph, according to Mencia, has been in the United States for over 30 years but has never lost his accent. He often uses his brother Joseph as the butt of jokes because of Joseph’s accent, and even made a video montage of his brother’s difficulty pronouncing the words in a previous sketch on skateboarding (Episode 212). Besides the difference in accent, Joseph is also darker skinned and looks more stereotypically Mexican than Carlos. The relationship between these two brothers, television host versus television extra, is underscored by the differences in their accents and skin color. As if that weren’t enough, Carlos states at the end of this sketch that he “love[s] having my brother on the show because we pay him, so I don’t have to give him money anymore.”
Differences were also found in the number and type of oppositional frames between both shows. Overall, Chappelle was statistically more likely to use oppositional cultural racism, oppositional naturalization and oppositional minimization of racism frames. Each of the aforementioned t-tests were statistically significant (p = .10, .05, .10, respectively). What did these instances look like? Oppositional cultural racism frames emphasized the social aspect of cultural practices, which are often presumed to be pseudo-biological. Particularly telling instances of this were the sequence of sketches entitled “A Moment in the Life of Lil Jon,” an Atlanta-based rapper whose catchphrases included “What?” “Yeah!” and “Okay!”. Chappelle, as Lil Jon, would go back and forth, first speaking only in the rapper’s catchphrases and then switching to full, verbose sentences. Below is the exchange he shared with a Barbara Walters-esque interviewer Theresa Roddy in episode 206.

THERESA RODDY: Now, Lil Jon, I heard that you once worked in a fast food restaurant.
LIL JON: Yeah!
TR: And you almost made it to night management, is that also correct?
LJ: Yeah! Yeah!
TR: Now, I’m going to change the subject a little, if that’s alright with you.
LJ: What?
TR: I would like to change the subject.
LJ: What?
TR: Change the subject?
LJ: What?
TR: I’m gonna change the subject if that’s alright with you.
LJ: Okay!
TR: And this is a little sensitive…please feel free to stop me.
LJ: Okay!
TR: In my research I found out that you had been beaten brutally by two white police officers. Uh, under mistaken identity. Is that correct?
LJ: Yes, that is true. That was the first time in my life that I ever experienced any type of racial discrimination and I made up my mind then and there that I would transcend these social constraints. You see, madam, so often black youth are cast aside by a society that is too afraid of them to recognize their humanity. My mother knew this, and she did her damnedest to make sure that I knew it. And I, madam, through my music, will make sure that all black youth realize the truth because to me, that is an act of love.
TR: That must have been very painful for you.
LJ: Yeah! Yeah!
TR: Thank you, Lil Jon.
LJ: What?
TR: Thank you, Lil Jon
LJ: What?
TR: Thank you, Lil Jon
LJ: What?

This sketch is particularly interesting because it showcases the ways in which presumed racially determined cultural practices are not racially definitive but rather socially produced (Perry 2001). Here, a rapper, the ultimate embodiment of urban black youth, is able to eloquently articulate his thoughts on police brutality and racism. This sketch also incorporates an oppositional minimization of racism frame, providing a qualitative example of the relationships listed in Appendix B. We see that for a unit increase in the number of oppositional minimization of racism frames, the odds of a unit increase in oppositional cultural racism frames are 120.0% larger, holding the show constant (p = .05). This means that the odds of oppositional cultural racism being used increase with the use of oppositional minimization of racism. An example of Chappelle’s use of oppositional minimization of racism is his Law and Order parody that has white and black males switch roles in their interactions with the police (Episode 205). This challenges the idea that our legal system is color-blind, and argues that in fact, racism does exist and race plays a large role in how a person is treated within the legal system.

The oppositional naturalization tenant also exhibits similar themes. In a sketch as a psychic who bases his predictions off of stereotypes, Chappelle reveals the difficulties of a young, white woman caller: “your parents. They’re angry. Real angry. They kicked you out for dating a black dude, didn’t they?” (Episode 102). This implies that the deterrence of interracial dating is commonplace enough to be predicted; therefore, the predominance of intra-racial dating is a socially produced rather than naturally occurring phenomenon. Not only does the white
woman want to date a black man, which challenges the idea that people instinctively are drawn to date intra-racially, but Chappelle specifically points to the social pressure, especially from family, to reinforce intra-racial dating patterns. As a society we perpetuate racialized ideas about who is and is not a good partner, and then justify it as human nature. Chappelle contests those assertions with his unveiling of parental opposition to interracial dating.

Although there is no statistically significant difference between the use of the oppositional abstract liberalism in both shows (p = .11), the relationship between abstract liberalism and minimization of racism is also present in the oppositional frames. Appendix B shows that for a unit increase in the number of oppositional minimization of racism frames, the odds of a unit increase in oppositional abstract liberalism frames are 170.7% larger, holding the show constant (p=.01). These two frames were usually paired to convey the existence of institutional barriers to minority mobility. For example, in episode 202 Chappelle includes a sketch on WacArnold’s, a fast food restaurant. WacArnold’s runs an ad campaign that highlights its work within the black community, much to Chappelle’s dismay. He comments, “They act like [getting a fast food job is] the best thing that can happen to a guy in the ghetto. Everybody in the neighborhood is excited, like this is going to end poverty.” Here Chappelle highlights that although there may be jobs out there, the jobs available in minority neighborhoods do not provide living wages. In addition, the lack of quality jobs specifically in black neighborhoods is the result of an unequal society. Equal opportunity, especially in employment quality, is more a slogan than a reality for Chappelle.

Chappelle was also statistically more likely to use the oppositional minimization of racism tenant alone (p = .01), which included claims that racism does in fact exist. The oppositional minimization of racism frame specifically addresses how racial inequality is
systemic and how claims of racism are not just isolated instances brought to light by overly sensitive minorities. In episode 102, Chappelle invites a young, white opera singer to sing his thoughts, as he claims that is the only way people will want to hear his thoughts. He continues by explaining, “You wouldn’t wanna hear a young black dude saying half the things I be thinking.” In this performance, the young woman sings what Chappelle has written on note cards for her, including “crack was invented and distributed to intentionally destroy the black community. AIDS was too.” Here, the message is two-fold: first, our society has deemed certain voices rational and acceptable, while others are incendiary and discountable. Second, this same society deliberately harms communities of color. This sketch is an exemplar of the oppositional frame.

**Similarities between Chappelle’s Show and Mind of Mencia**

Despite all these inter-show differences, there are some pervasive similarities that must be noted. There were no statistically significant differences in the use of cultural racism and naturalization between shows (p = .18, .86, respectively). When paired, however, these two tenets shared a statistically significant relationship. Appendix A shows that for a unit increase in the number of naturalization frames, the odds of a unit increase in cultural racism frames are 72.7% larger, holding the show constant (p = .01). For example, in episode 215 of *Mind of Mencia* Mencia holds a stereotype Olympics where representatives from five racial and ethnic groups in the United States compete in stereotypical events (i.e. watermelon eating contest, border/fence jumping contest). In this sketch the events focus on both physical characteristics and behaviors. Mencia frames each individual’s performance as a reflection of his particular racial or ethnic group and its propensity to act in certain ways. He leaves no room for intragroup differences, simultaneously reifying the pseudo-biology of cultural racism.
Cultural racism is certainly the most used dominant frame, and is the main way both Chappelle and Mencia discuss racial differences in their sketches. The discussion of all four major minority groups (Blacks, Latinos, Asians and Arabs) increased the odds of a unit increase in cultural racism frames (95.5%, 127.4%, 90.9%, 91.6%, respectively), at a statistically significant level (p = .01, .01, .001, .01, respectively) even when holding constant for show differences, as illustrated in Appendix A. In real terms, this means that with the inclusion of any of the major minority groups as a subject in a sketch, the likelihood of the use of cultural racism increased in both shows. This provides evidence that cultural racism, an update of pre-Civil Rights biological racism, is the main way that people of color are described and discussed. The inclusion of white Americans as a subject in a sketch was insignificant in predicting the use of cultural racism (p = .12).

Episode 212 of Chappelle’s Show includes a Training Day parody featuring Wayne Brady that illustrates this frame well. Wayne Brady, a black actor with a very clean cut on-screen persona, drives around downtown with Dave Chappelle. In fact, in an earlier sketch on Chappelle’s Show, Paul Mooney as “Negrodamus” predicts that the reason white people love Wayne Brady so much is because “he makes Bryant Gumbel look like Malcolm X” (Episode 205). Here, Bryant Gumbel, another non-threatening black man, who is notable for his light skin and sunny on-air persona from The Today Show, is compared to a radical black leader of the 1960s, who disagreed with Martin Luther King Jr.’s call for nonviolence. With this backdrop, the sketch unfolds and the audience finds out Brady is actually a violent pimp and cop killer. Here, we see that no matter how much some seem to be different, ultimately all black men are violent and aggressive. This cultural trait is racially determined.
Similarly, Mencia solidifies racial determinism in a season one monologue on American adoption of Asian babies. He says, “It’s not my fault they can’t drive. Put an Asian in a classroom, and they’ll mess up the curve. Put them in car and they’ll hit the curb.” Mencia’s matter-of-fact tone implies universal applicability, thereby protecting his statement from claims of racism.

The t-test for the use of naturalization is also statistically insignificant (p = .86), indicating that there is no major difference in the number of times both comedians use this frame. One of the best instances of this frame, which compares the separation of races to the separation of species, is used by Mencia. In the episode 105 monologue on the tsunami in Southeast Asia he gives instructions on the importance of following the lead of animals; they are more likely to know when a natural disaster is coming. He says,

If you ever see a dog run that way, who cares. If you ever see a cat run that way, who cares. If you ever in your life see a dog, with a cat on its back and a mouse hanging onto its tail, follow that animal! Listen, if you ever see a beaner [Latino], a black guy and a cop holding hands running, RUN!

Similarly, Chappelle’s second season “Racial Draft” sketch is created to “state the racial standings of [multiracial] Americans once and for all” (Episode 201). In the Racial Draft sketch, multiracial and racially ambiguous celebrities, like Tiger Woods, are “drafted” by different racial groups to decidedly state which racial or ethnic community in the United States they are solely aligned with. The need to singularly define minority groups is reflective of the same separation of species theme, where limited contact between groups is rationalized, normalized and ultimately encouraged. Chappelle’s sketch also incorporates cultural racism, however, as it includes the drafting of individuals that do not act in racially-cued ways. Here, black
conservative political actors Condoleezza Rice and Colin Powell and white rap star Eminem are up for grabs by the black and white delegations.

There was only one oppositional frame that was not statistically more likely to be used by Chappelle, oppositional abstract liberalism (p = .11). This frame, which emphasizes the inequality in America and the need for government intervention is best illustrated by the precursor sketch to *Chappelle’s* famed “Reparations” sketch. Here, Chappelle inserts his own post-hoc commentary into an old *Donahue* appearance he made entitled “Angry White Men.” In this *Donahue* appearance, white males used many examples of color-blind racism, emphasizing that affirmative action is reverse discrimination and that nothing should be forced on people. Replying to a claim by a white guest on *Donahue* that affirmative action hurts minorities by associating them with a quota program Chappelle said, “He’s an ‘affirmative action hire’? That’s a lot better than staying ‘hey, that n---- is homeless.’ I’d much rather be called an affirmative action hire than broke and unemployed.” Chappelle argues that government intervention, specifically in the form of affirmative action, is necessary to counteract the racial inequality present in America. This claim challenges the dominant view of abstract liberalism that the racial playing field is equal.

One of the important similarities between the two comedians is the authoritative way they both spoke about race, free of any of the color-blind rhetorical and stylistic devices. This supports the findings in Bonilla-Silva (2003). This straight-talk was often used to name racial inequality and contradictions. Their positions as both comedians and members of marginalized groups could have facilitated their matter-of-fact approach. Mencia, dressed as a character called Confucius Carlos, points to the contradictions of white Americans who do extreme sports. He says, “Why do white people do crazy shit like climb mountains? You will go to the top of a
mountain, you will go to the moon, you will go to the North Pole to hang out with polar bears, but you will not go to Compton for a barbeque because you are afraid of the black people.”

The best showcase of this kind of straight-talk on *Chappelle’s Show* is the recurring segment “Ask a Black Dude” with black comedian Paul Mooney. In this segment people off the streets, sometimes celebrities, ask Mooney questions about black people. After a question from Stephen King Mooney responds, “I wrote a script for Stephen King. I have a Stephen King horror movie: N---- with a brain. We’ll see how that scares people. N----s in school. How about that, Stephen?” In another segment Mooney states how “the black man in America is the most copied man on this planet, bar none. Everybody wanna be a n----, but nobody wanna be a n----. How about that question?” Here, Mooney makes claims about the tenuous status of black males in mainstream society, without fear that his claims will be dismissed as hypersensitivity.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The content and textual analyses of *Chappelle’s Show* and *Mind of Mencia* have illustrated the ways in which dominant racial ideological material is also reproduced by subordinate group members. The issue of dominant ideological transmission is pervasive in television and cultural studies (Gitlin 1979; Schudson 1989; Thompson 1990). As bell hooks writes, however, “it was not so much the color of the person who made images that was crucial but the perspective, the standpoint, the politics” (1996: 7). Clear from this analysis is that no primary oppositional message was displayed.

These shows, although they included oppositional material, usually paired it with material that reinforced the status quo. No sketch was solely oppositional, although there were sketches that contained only dominant frames. Perhaps what we are observing then is the presentation of alternative material, which according to Gitlin presents a “distinct but
supplementary and containable view of the world” (1979: 263). Here, oppositional messages are included with dominant material, but only dominant material is processed by the audience.

How is the combination of dominant and oppositional material in these shows interpreted by viewers? Do ideas that counter the dominant racial ideology get registered as such by mass audiences, particularly in a comedic setting? Is there something peculiar about comedy that makes reformist versions of it difficult to appreciate? A preliminary examination of Mencia fan websites may provide a small clue of what audience members who tune in regularly to watch his show perceive. Of the 193 posts made on the Carlos Mencia Fan Club Facebook page for example, most of the comments were general statements of support for Mencia (i.e. “you’re awesome” and “you’re the funniest comedian ever”). Some posts against Mencia were also made, although these generally discussed his unoriginality and reputation for stealing jokes. One repeat-poster makes this very clear when he states, “I don’t mind comedic racism, I just mind stupidity” and “I AM NOT OFFENDED BY CARLOS MENCIA.” These proclamations make clear that his comedy is interpreted as racist, for better or for worse.

Less than 25% of the posts included reasons why Carlos Mencia’s comedy was funny or enjoyable. The majority of those posts, however, (over 80 percent) stated something along the lines of he “tells it like it is,” he pushes the envelope, what he says is true and if you do not like his comedy than you are too uptight/politically correct/unintelligent. For example, one fan celebrated that “Mencia isn't afraid to do whatever the hell it takes to make people laugh,” while another stated: “Fuck the haters....they don't understand the comedy of Carlos Mencia. All they know is that he is offensive. But that's why he rocks...he's not afraid to be offensive.” Only two posts stated their appreciation for his satirical approach. Five posts were also made by self-proclaimed “others” in which they declared their ethnic or racial identity followed by how their
particular identity and appreciation for Mencia’s comedy made it acceptable and true. For example, one person wrote “carlos mencias jokes are pretty much true. like when he makes middle eastern jokes i get annoyed but i realize he’s right. he is so funny.” This concession illustrates the pervasiveness of Mencia’s ideological positions; because of their agreement with the dominant racial ideology they are interpreted simply as truth (Holtzman 2000: 34).

Similar interpretations of Chappelle’s Show are found on Dave Chappelle fan pages. Almost half of the 420 posts on Chappelle’s Facebook fan page included a quotation from Chappelle’s Show. Of these 189 quotations, four referenced oppositional elements of sketches (i.e. “this racism is killing me inside” from The Niggar Family sketch). The most quoted sketches were Charlie Murphy’s True Hollywood Stories of Rick James and Prince where common stereotypes of blackness (aggression, violence, irrationality) and excess predominate. Sketches with some oppositional facets, like A Moment in the Life of Lil Jon, were quoted for their dominant ideological components. It is interesting how these two shows, though distinct in their use of oppositional material (Chappelle was statistically more likely to use three of the four oppositional frames), are interpreted similarly.

In my preliminary analysis of fan pages dominant frames and representations are most often appreciated and repeated. This finding parallels the literature in media studies on oppositional material. In regards to situation comedies, Mulkay argued that “[i]n so far as laughter and amusement are substitutes for serious political action, it seems likely that action designed to produce political change will be stunted rather than stimulated by the political sitcom” (1988: 195). Goodchilds (1959) makes a similar claim about humor, claiming popularity and influence are mutually exclusive. Countless studies have called for the exploration of audience reception, and have also attempted to address it (Corner 1999; Delgado
1998; Gruner 1996; Howitt and Owusu-Bempah 2005; Jensen and Pauly 1997; Morreale 1991; Orbe, Seymour and Kang 1998; Willis 2005). In the spirit of Vidmar and Rokeach (1974), Shively (1992), and Jhally and Lewis (2005), the role of the audience is certainly the next step in fully understanding how dominant color-blind ideology and its oppositional counterparts function in Chappelle’s Show and Mind of Mencia. If their popularity and fan website posts are any indication, the few oppositional messages being produced may not be registering as such across groups. As hooks argues, “[u]ntil both colonizer and colonized decolonize their minds, audiences in white supremacist cultures will have difficulty ‘seeing’ and understanding images of blackness that do not conform to the stereotype” (1996: 76). Perhaps because of this blindness, Chappelle left his show at the peak of its popularity. He may have realized that at the end of the day the intentions of a comedian do not always match the messages received by their captivated audience, as oppositional ideas are interpreted with alternative meanings.
Notes

1. Dave Chappelle is an African American comedian who grew up in Baltimore and has been doing stand-up comedy since high school. His *Chappelle’s Show* is comprised of pre-recorded sketches and live introductions that tackle issues ranging from “the absurdity of public-service announcements to the complexities of race relations in the United States” (Ogunnaike 2004). Carlos Mencia is a Latino comedian born into a Mexican-Honduran family. He grew up in East Los Angeles and became a comedian in his 20s. His *Mind of Mencia* is characterized as a “racially charged mix of stand-up rants and sketches” (Pizek 2007). Both of their television shows air on the television channel *Comedy Central*.

2. Though Chappelle and Mencia belong to distinct racial and ethnic groups with particular histories in the United States and relationships to whiteness, I am using an aggregate level dichotomy of non-white – white for the purposes of this paper. This includes assuming that previous research done on the role of African American humor loosely applies to other minority groups based on their shared subordinate group status. Though aggregation always risks the loss of analytical nuance, the focus here is on larger scale comparisons.

3. At the time of their release, *Chappelle’s Show’s* Season 1 and 2 DVDs were the bestselling television DVDs of all-time. His show averaged 3 million viewers while it was on-air, “twice as many as Comedy Central’s other big draw” (Ogunnaike 2005). Similarly, Mencia is currently under contract for a fourth season of *Mind of Mencia*, and his stand-up comedy shows are sold out across the nation. As he exclaimed in an interview, “We’re sold out in Utah. Dude, Utah” (Balmaseda 2008).

4. Though Chappelle and Mencia belong to distinct racial and ethnic groups with particular histories in the United States and relationships to whiteness, I am using an aggregate level dichotomy of non-white – white for the purposes of this paper. This includes assuming that previous research done on the role of African American humor loosely applies to other minority groups based on their shared subordinate group status. Though aggregation always risks the loss of analytical nuance, the focus here is on larger scale comparisons.

5. At the time of their release, *Chappelle’s Show’s* Season 1 and 2 DVDs were the bestselling television DVDs of all-time. His show averaged 3 million viewers while it was on-air, “twice as many as Comedy Central’s other big draw” (Ogunnaike 2005). Similarly, Mencia is currently under contract for a fourth season of *Mind of Mencia*, and his stand-up comedy shows are sold out across the nation. As he exclaimed in an interview, “We’re sold out in Utah. Dude, Utah” (Balmaseda 2008).

6. Some readers may be concerned about my sole discretion in distinguishing between dominant and oppositional frames, and the reliability of my distinctions. The question of reliability is a difficult one that plagues content analysis, much like other research. Robert Philip Weber provides helpful insight into this dilemma; “just as it is true that quantitative data do not speak for themselves […], so it is true that texts do not speak for themselves either. The investigator must do the speaking and the language of that speech is the language of the theory” (1990, 80). I have attempted to be unambiguous in my theoretical application, and hopefully, my explicitness allows the reader to follow my coding schema. In a situation where I was unsure whether the intended message was satirical or not I chose to air on the conservative side and coded it as dominant.
7. Cross-racial characters refer to characters of one race portrayed by actors of a different racial group. Dave Chappelle’s portrayal of a white news reporter is an example of a cross-racial character. There were 16 cases of cross-racial acting, which comprises 11.35% of the coded sketches.

8. For all negative binomial and poisson regression results please turn to Appendix A and B.

9. The relationship between globalization and American urban deindustrialization has been well-documented. For more on globalization and the impact on US wages see Morris and Western (1999). See Sugrue (1997) for a discussion on the effect of deindustrialization on urban areas.

10. He ignores that the anti-Arab sentiment and caricatures he presents have a long history in American media (Shaheen 2001).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Dominant Racial Ideology</th>
<th>Oppositional Racial Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Abstract Liberalism</em></td>
<td>Uses ideas related with political and economic liberalism in a selective way (i.e. egalitarian-based claims against affirmative action that ignore the pervasive inequality in corporate America hires)</td>
<td>Emphasizes how society is not egalitarian and that there are dominant and subordinate groups; also argues for government involvement to correct for unequal playing field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cultural Racism</em></td>
<td>Culture is constructed as pseudo-biological and used as an explanation for racial differences</td>
<td>Cultural practices are not racially determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Minimization of Racism</em></td>
<td>Argues race no longer matters in terms of life chances and that claims of racism are merely minority hypersensitivity</td>
<td>Emphasizes the continuing existence of racial inequality and new forms of racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Naturalization</em></td>
<td>Explains racialized patterns and phenomena as if there were forces of nature behind them (i.e. “blacks just like hanging out with blacks and whites just like hanging out with whites”)</td>
<td>Points out how the “natural” is actually socially constructed (i.e. intraracial dating patterns are not predisposed but socially enforced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Chappelle's Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-blind-Dominant Frames</td>
<td>3.83 (3.54)*</td>
<td>2.92 (2.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Liberalism</td>
<td>9.57%*</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Racism</td>
<td>75.05%</td>
<td>86.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization of Racism</td>
<td>10.51%**</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional Frames</td>
<td>.78 (1.41)**</td>
<td>1.22 (1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp. Abstract Liberalism</td>
<td>49.09%</td>
<td>43.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp. Cultural Racism</td>
<td>29.09%*^</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp. Minimization of Racism</td>
<td>12.73%*</td>
<td>14.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp. Naturalization</td>
<td>9.09%*</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ^p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001
Appendix A: Negative Binomial and Poisson Regression Results for Dominant Frames, Predicted Probabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Number of Color-blind Frames</th>
<th>Number of Abstract Liberalism Frames</th>
<th>Number of Cultural Racism Frames</th>
<th>Number of Minimization of Racism Frames</th>
<th>Number of Naturalization Frames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Group Subjects Discussed</td>
<td>125.2%**</td>
<td>115.4%</td>
<td>151.0%**</td>
<td>151.3%</td>
<td>-28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-37.7%**</td>
<td>-78.2%**</td>
<td>-27.9%</td>
<td>-87.5%**</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs are discussed</td>
<td>70.3%*</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>91.6%**</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-26.2%*</td>
<td>-77.2%</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>-86.3%</td>
<td>1.4%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians are discussed</td>
<td>68.8%**</td>
<td>-30.2%</td>
<td>90.9%***</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
<td>213.7%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-27.0%*</td>
<td>-78.0%**</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
<td>-86.6%**</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks are discussed</td>
<td>73.4%**</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>95.5%**</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-46.7%***</td>
<td>-80.0%**</td>
<td>-40.4%**</td>
<td>-87.6%**</td>
<td>-18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos are discussed</td>
<td>128.6%***</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>127.4%**</td>
<td>347.8%*</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>-64.5%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>-69.3%*</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups are discussed</td>
<td>49.4%*</td>
<td>-23.8%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-30.4%*</td>
<td>-77.1%**</td>
<td>-18.4%</td>
<td>-85.8%**</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites are discussed</td>
<td>42.9%*</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>175.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-34.0%*</td>
<td>-76.7%**</td>
<td>-22.7%</td>
<td>-86.9%**</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Abstract Liberalism Frames</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>139.7%***</td>
<td>-22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
<td>-70.0%*</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Cultural Racism Frames</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>17.9%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-76.2%**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-86.0%***</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Minimization of Racism Frames</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>105.8%***</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-42.5%</td>
<td>-20.1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Naturalization Frames</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-32.2%</td>
<td>72.7%**</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-75.0%**</td>
<td>-21.7%</td>
<td>-86.9%**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oppositional Abstract Lib. Frames</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
<td>19.6%*</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-35.4%**</td>
<td>-75.6%**</td>
<td>-25.2%</td>
<td>-86.0%**</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oppositional Cultural Racism Frames</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>-16.70%</td>
<td>-24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-33.1%*</td>
<td>-76.3%**</td>
<td>-23.1%</td>
<td>-86.2%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oppositional Min. of Racism Frames</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>-48.8%</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-32.9%</td>
<td>-78.1%**</td>
<td>-21.3%</td>
<td>-85.2%**</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oppositional Naturalization Frames</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>106.1%</td>
<td>83.4%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>-35.5%**</td>
<td>-75.4%**</td>
<td>-21.8%</td>
<td>-89.9%**</td>
<td>-24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^p<.10  *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001
+All predicted probabilities were estimated using negative binomial regression, except those predicting the number of Naturalization Frames, which were estimated with poisson regressions.
## Appendix B: Negative Binomial Regression Results for Oppositional Frames, Predicted Probabilities

### Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Number of Oppositional Frames</th>
<th>Number of Opp. Abstract Lib. Frames</th>
<th>Number of Opp. Cultural Racism Frames</th>
<th>Number of Opp. Minimization of Racism Frames</th>
<th>Number of Opp. Naturalization Frames+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabs are discussed</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>128.4%</strong></td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td><strong>102.4%^</strong></td>
<td>210.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians are discussed</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>-42.2%</td>
<td>-18.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>130.3%</strong></td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td><strong>107.4%^</strong></td>
<td>211.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks are discussed</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>-28.3%</td>
<td>282.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td>107.1%*</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td><strong>170.6%^</strong></td>
<td>102.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos are discussed</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>131.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>230.1%</strong></td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td><strong>264.8%^</strong></td>
<td>488.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups are discussed</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>137.4%</strong></td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td><strong>157.0%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>216.8%^</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites are discussed</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>108.5%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>127.3%</strong></td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td><strong>127.3%^</strong></td>
<td>216.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Abstract Liberalism Frames</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>118.6%</strong></td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td><strong>-120.3%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>230.0%^</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Cultural Racism Frames</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td><strong>11.0%^</strong></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>137.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.4%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>129.5%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>214.3%^</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Minimization of Racism Frames</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
<td>-26.1%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-56.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>119%</strong></td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td><strong>125.6%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>180.3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Naturalization Frames</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>-33.8%</td>
<td>-35.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td><strong>128.7%</strong></td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td><strong>125.5%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>227.8%^</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oppositional Abstract Lib. Frames</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><strong>88.6%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>267.2%^</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td><strong>124.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oppositional Cultural Racism Frames</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><strong>79.4%^</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td><strong>123.9%^</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>56.4%</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td><strong>139.3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oppositional Min. of Racism Frames</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><strong>170.7%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>120.0%^</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td><strong>90.60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>194.5%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Oppositional Naturalization Frames</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><strong>-35.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-45.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.6%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Chappelle=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>79.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>133.7%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>194.5%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^p<.10  *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001

+ No regressions were run predicting Oppositional Naturalization because only 7 out of the 141 sketches had a non-zero value.
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