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ABSTRACT

Researchers consistently find that mainstream media often represent women athletes in stereotypical ways including trivialization, sexualization, infantilization, passivity, and utilization of camera down-angles. However, research on new media’s visual representation of women athletes is still in its infancy. This study adds to the growing literature on new media’s representation of women athletes and concurs with previous findings suggesting that new media might be an outlet that can counter old media gender stereotypes. This thesis used mixed methods of qualitative content analysis and photovoice in order to better understand how Big East volleyball players are represented in photographs on websites: Instances of stereotypes were few, action shots were numerous, and “extreme game faces” emerged as a new category for the visual representation of women athletes. These results might suggest that new media, specifically collegiate athletics’ websites and volleyball fans, might defy traditional media’s stereotypical gender representations. This thesis found that Big East women volleyball players were, overall, visually represented positively by NCAA.com, BigEast.org, Big East member schools’ collegiate athletics websites, and fans of the University of South Florida’s volleyball team during, and shortly after, the 2010 season.
CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

Women’s growing participation in sports has led to decades of media studies regarding the quantity and quality of coverage by the mainstream media in regards to women athletes. Despite numerous studies on how the mainstream media depict women athletes, few studies examine how new media represent women athletes, and no studies look at how sports fans visually portray them. This thesis used mixed methods to study the ways NCAA.com, BigEast.org, Big East college websites (full list of schools in Appendix A), and fans of the University of South Florida women’s volleyball team visually represent women collegiate volleyball players.

Mass communications scholars have studied the representation of women athletes to expose the derogation of women in mainstream sports news (e.g. Daddario, 1994; Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Kane, 1996; Hardin, Lynn, & Walsdorf, 2005). Scholars consistently find that mainstream media trivialize (Billings & Eastman, 2002; Cooky, Wachs, Messner, & Dworkin, 2010; Curry, Arriagada, & Cornwell, 2002; Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992; Lee, 1992; Pirinen, 1997), sexualize (Buysse & Embser-Herbert, 2004; Cooky, et al., 2010; Daddario & Wigley, 2007; Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Hardin, et al., 2005; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Lee, 1992; Messner, Duncan, & Cooky, 2003; Pirinen, 1997), and infantilize (Daddario, 1994; Daddario &
women athletes. Also, media often use passive photographs (Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Hardin, et. al, 2005; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992; Pack, 2009) and down-angle camera shots (Duncan, 1990) to further reinforce negative images of women athletes. Meanwhile, only a few scholars interested in sports have studied new media (Kian & Clavio, 2011; Kian, Mondello, & Vincent, 2009) or sports fandom (e.g. Dietz-Uhler, Harrick, End, & Jacquemotte, 2000; Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1999; Gantz & Wenner, 1995). Little of the work on sports fandom focuses on fans of women’s teams, (for more information on sports fans, audience reception, and interpretive communities see Appendix B). My research question is straightforward: How do NCAA.com, BigEast.org, Big East college athletic websites, and fans of a women’s athletic team visually represent collegiate women’s volleyball players?

This thesis builds on the studies of Pack (2009) and Hiatt (2008). In a pilot study, I examined Big East athletics’ websites, the conference that the University of South Florida plays in, for two weeks during the 2009 season in order to see if mainstream media stereotypes of women athletes, such as trivialization and sexualization, existed in not-for-profit college websites (Pack, 2009). My study found instances of stereotyping of women athletes, including trivialization and infantilization. Hiatt (2008) used photovoice to empower high school women’s volleyball players to chronicle one week of their lives and then to choose the photographs that the volleyball players valued. Three recurring themes emerged from the players’ pictures: photographs of pre-game activities, action of the game, and group huddles (Hiatt, 2008). Also, many of the photographs taken had
more than one athlete in the picture. In the present study, I argue that new media, namely NCAA.com, BigEast.org, Big East college athletics websites, and volleyball fans, may counter traditional forms of media bias because these new media revealed relatively few instances of trivialization, sexualization, infantilization, and down angles.

In what follows, chapter two surveys the literature on how mainstream media portray women athletes and includes information on trivialization, sexualization, infantilization, passivity, utilization of camera angles. Chapter two also provides information on new media. In chapter three, I explain my mixed methods of qualitative content analysis and photovoice. I decided on qualitative content analysis because the process is emergent, meaning that categories can change based on the information obtained during research (Creswell, 2007). I preferred this flexibility in categories so that I could observe any emergent categories, as well as modify existing categories, trivialization, sexualization, and infantilization, for this study if needed. Also, the focus of qualitative content analysis is on characteristics of text with attention on the meaning of the text (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). I wanted to empower University of South Florida volleyball fans to become encoders of media and pictures, and give them an opportunity to voice their opinions about the photos taken. Photovoice is a method that allows participants the chance to take pictures and describe the meanings participants interpret from the pictures (e.g. Goodhart, Hsu, Baek, Coleman, Maresca, & Miller, 2006; Wang, 1999; Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001). Chapter four explicates my findings, as well as explains my coding. Overall, this thesis found few instances of stereotypes. Instead, the photos studied show women volleyball players engaged in competition. These athletes use equipment in competition, where they display extreme “game” faces. Taken as
whole, these positive representations of women athletes suggest that new media may provide an outlet for better portrayal of women in sports by showing women volleyball players as serious athletes actively competing in a sport. This runs counter to the traditional media portrayals of passivity and beauty.
CHAPTER 2:

MAINSTREAM MEDIA PORTRAYALS OF WOMEN ATHLETES

Four decades of research on the mainstream media’s portrayal of women athletes consistently finds the same stereotypes of trivialization, sexualization, infantilization, passivity, and negative utilization of camera angles. These stereotypes effectively denigrate women athletes to the point that their athleticism is no longer the emphasis of a sports story (e.g., Harris & Clayton, 2002). Sexualizing women athletes frames them not as accomplished athletes, but as pretty “girls” for men, and even women, to look at and not take seriously (e.g. Kane, 1996). Women athletes are often referred to as “girls” rather than women, which infantilizes them (e.g. Daddario, 1994). This frames women as innocent and weak, needing to be taken care of. A sportswriter, or fan, would never refer to a college football team as “the boys’ football team.” “Men’s football” or “the football team” is considered appropriate. Conversely, despite the fact that volleyball is mainly a women’s-only sport at the competitive collegiate level, it is not uncommon to hear “girls’ volleyball” or “lady (insert school mascot here)” (Eitzen & Zinn, 2001). The media also trivialize by selecting photographs or videos that portray women passively (e.g. Duncan, 1990). Sports are active, but showing a team huddle or celebration in women’s sports does not capture the athleticism of the athlete(s) or competition of the game. Finally, shooting photographs down on the subject literally puts the viewer in a superior symbolic position to the subject of the photo, implying that the viewer is looking down on the
subject (Duncan, 1990). Many previous studies group anything that detracts from an athlete’s accomplishments, such as focusing on sexuality, as “trivialization.” This review examines trivialization, sexualization, infantilization, action, non-action, and utilization of camera angles as separate categories and discusses each stereotype in detail.

**Trivialization**

Scholarly studies find that, generally, women athletes’ skills and accomplishments in sports are trivialized by the mainstream media (Billings & Eastman, 2002; Cooky, et. al., 2010; Curry, et. al., 2002; Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992; Lee, 1992; Pirinen, 1997). Trivialization occurs when athletes are “portrayed in ways that do not treat them, or their athletic achievements, seriously” (Kane, 1996, p. 108). It degrades the accomplishments and efforts of women athletes and women in general (Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Lee, 1992; Pirinen, 1997). Ultimately, trivialization reinforces the idea that men and women are not equal (Curry, et. al, 2002; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Lee, 1992; Kane, 1996; Kinnick, 1998; Pirinen, 1997). One form that trivialization can take is focusing on non-sport related issues, such as the athlete’s marital status or her fashion sense (Kane, 1996).

A study on *Sports Illustrated* written coverage from 1997 to 1999 discovered that only 43% of stories covered women in sport-related ways compared to 87% of stories covering men (Fink & Kensicki, 2002). Another study finds that only 61% of studied sport articles in British tabloids about women athletes had a sports-relevant focus versus 94% of articles covering men athletes (Harris & Clayton, 2002).
An analysis of newspaper coverage during the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Games finds that women were more likely to be trivialized than men (Lee, 1992). “Not only were strategies of marginalization and trivialization clearly seen in the quantitative coverage of women, but styles in which text and photographs were constructed revealed different ways of portraying female athletes” (p. 216). This included references to the athlete’s life outside of the sport, the athlete’s appearance, the athlete’s psychological traits, and so-called physiological differences between men and women. Scholars note that these kinds of references are the most common forms of trivialization (Leath & Lumpkin, 1992).

Media stories about women athletes often focus on, or include, issues other than athleticism or the sport (Daddario & Wigley, 2007; Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Kane, 1996; Kian & Clavio, 2011; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992). For example, an article in the May/June 2000 issue of *Sports Illustrated for Women* regarding WNBA star Sheryl Swoopes was not about her athletic ability, but about her decision not to join the United States National Team in favor of staying home with her 2-year-old son (Fink & Kensicki, 2002). This symbolically shows that staying home is more important than the game for Swoopes. Another story on Swoopes ended with the line “play the game, play it hard, and eventually a man will take notice” (Fink & Kinsicki, 2002, p.334). This implies that Swoopes only played basketball in order to acquire the attention of a man.

Other studies find that appearance, such as clothes, beauty, and hair, is mentioned more often in stories or shown more often in photographs covering women athletes than in stories or photographs covering men athletes (Curry, et. al., 2002; Duncan, 1990; Fink
& Kensicki, 2002; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Kian & Clavio, 2011; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992). Not surprisingly, this is true in non-sport magazines too, such as Elle, where the emphasis on women athletes’ beauty is apparent (Curry, et. al., 2002; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992). One magazine article stated that “the new star athletes are committed, strong, and unrelentingly glamorous” (Curry, et. al., 2002, p. 408). Newspapers also focus on appearance (Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kian & Clavio, 2011). Newspapers stories in 2000 often focused on tennis star Anna Kournikova despite the fact that there were other more accomplished women tennis players, such as Jennifer Capriati and Lindsay Davenport (Harris & Clayton, 2002). References to Kournikova included “model,” “glamour girl,” and “babe,” thus trivializing her accomplishments (p. 407). When a woman is counter to the norm of feminine beauty, the media may discuss the issue in negative ways. A newspaper story about Jennifer Capriati focused on the fact that she had gained weight instead of her recent second-round Wimbledon win in 2000 (Harris & Clayton, 2002). The main photograph was of Capriati at Wimbledon with an inset picture of her 10 years earlier with a caption “Slender” (p. 409). This emphasis on beauty detracts from athletic accomplishments and implies that women athletes are more concerned about how they look than on the sports they play (Curry, et. al., 2002).

Another common form of trivialization emphasizes the physical differences between men athletes and women athletes. Women are seen as different from men (Duncan, 1990), and, therefore, women cannot possess the sports traits that men generally are thought to have: speed, strength, and athleticism (Billings & Eastman, 2002; Buysse & Embser-Herbert, 2004; Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988; Eastman & Billings, 2001; Kane, 1996). “In the patriarchal societies of western industrialized countries, these culturally
constructed differences tend to confer power upon men and limit power for women” (Ducan, 1990, p.25). Photographs, in particular, are a snapshot of an actual moment that viewers can then construe as reality. Photographs can easily depict the physical differences between men and women, and viewers then perceive these differences as “natural and real” (Duncan, 1990, p. 25).

One constructed difference between men and women athletes is that women are weak and/or emotional (Daddario & Wigley, 2007; Duncan, 1990; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Hardin, et. al, 2005; Kane, 1996; Lee, 1992; Rodgers, Kenix, & Thorson, 2007; Ross & Shinew, 2007). Newspaper coverage during the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Summer Games framed women athletes as vulnerable, emotional, or tragically flawed heroines (Lee, 1992). Other studies find that magazines also portray women as vulnerable, emotional, or tragically flawed (Duncan, 1990; Fink & Kensicki, 2002). A picture featured in the February 1988 issue of *Sports Illustrated* shows a woman ice skater kneeling at her partner’s feet while he looks off into the distance with his head held high. The caption read “Dominance” (Duncan, 1990, p. 34). The picture depicts the man as superior to the woman because of his dominant position over the woman ice skater.

One study focusing on the representation of men’s and women’s basketball teams on CBS Sports’ and ESPN’s web pages during the 2006 March Madness tournament finds contradicting evidence to previous studies of traditional media’s coverage of the tournament (Kian, Mondello, & Vincent, 2009). Researchers found that physical descriptors and non-competition information were more likely to be discussed in articles about men athletes than women athletes. The study concluded that new media may counter old media gender bias. Another article that looked at
Internet coverage of the U.S. Open men’s and women’s tournaments found mixed results (Kian & Clavio, 2011). Despite the mixed results, the researchers stated that newspapers were “more likely to describe physical appearances, attire, and personal relationships in articles on women’s tennis than stories written for online sites” (Kian & Clavio, 2011, p. 73).

For the purpose of this thesis, trivialization was defined as anything that denigrates the athlete(s), the game, and/or the athleticism of the sport. For example, one picture in the study was taken during practice and showed the front of the man coach, but the back of the woman athlete. This trivializes the athlete by showing her back to the camera and by capturing her outside of competition.

Sexualization

Numerous studies find that women are more likely than men to be sexualized in all forms of media (Buysse & Embser-Herbert, 2004; Cooky, et al., 2010; Daddario & Wigley, 2007; Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Hardin, et al., 2005; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Lee, 1992; Messner, et al., 2003; Pirinen, 1997). Women athletes “are sexualized either overtly, by portraying them as sexual objects, or more covertly, by overemphasizing their physical attractiveness. In either case, female athleticism is ignored or devalued” (Kane, 1996, p. 108). In sports photographs, sexualization can be seen when “they highlight women’s hips, thighs, buttocks, breasts, crotches, when they offer viewers voyeuristic thrills by showing ‘forbidden’ sights or when they show female athletes with certain facial expressions signifying sexual invitation” (Duncan, 1990, p. 30). Sexualization is common across all platforms of media including magazines, television, and photographs.
Magazines that target men as well as women sexualize women athletes. In a study examining issues of *Sports Illustrated* and *Sports Illustrated for Women* from 1997-1999, seven out of nine photographs considered pornographic were images of women (Fink & Kensicki, 2002). One of these photographs pictured Olympic weightlifter Cheryl Haworth with a barbell on her shoulders while she was “covered only in feathers” (Fink & Kensicki, 2002, p. 333). Even *Time* magazine sexualized women. In 1999, one picture in *Time* framed gymnast Bonnie Warner’s crotch in the center of the photograph. The photographer snapped the picture from between Warner’s legs (Duncan, 1990).

A study reviewing television news’ sports stories and ESPN’s *SportsCenter*, in 1999, concludes that the coverage of women athletes consisted of many instances of sexual objectification (Messner, et al., 2003). This included several mentions of soccer player Brandi Chastain taking off her shirt after winning the 1999 World Cup Championship, a nude bungee jumper, and wrestler/model Sable’s risqué attire and appearance in *Playboy*. In March 2004, a “promo” for the night’s sports stories on NBC teased that President George W. Bush was “scoring with the USC championship volleyball team” (Duncan & Messner, 2005, p. 15). The subsequent story was 34 seconds long, and only six seconds talked about the volleyball team; the rest was about the USC football team meeting with President Bush. In a study that examined the rebroadcast of a 1985 surfing competition, women’s body parts were emphasized more than men’s body parts (Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988). In fact, the majority of shots were of women’s bodies and body parts; not of the surfing competition. “Women were fragmented, reduced to faces, bikinied torsos, breasts, bottoms, thighs” (p. 12).
For the purpose of this thesis, sexualization was defined as framing the photograph in such a way that gives the viewer a voyeuristic view of the athlete. For example, sexualization occurred when the photographer took the picture looking up at the athlete from between her legs. Another common instance was framing the crotch area in the center of the photo. Due to the provocative nature of the uniforms volleyball players wear, only pictures framed in sexual ways by the photographer were coded for in this thesis. Otherwise, nearly any photo of a volleyball player might be construed as “sexy,” a subject I return to later.

Infantilization

Another recurring theme in the mainstream media’s portrayal of women in sports is that of infantilization, which occurs when women are portrayed as, or referred to in, child-like ways (Daddario, 1994; Daddario & Wigley; 2007; Duncan, 1990; Duncan, 2006; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Kinnick, 1998). Infantilization often occurs in language, such as calling a woman a “girl” (Daddario, 1994; Kinnick, 1998), and can be conveyed in pictures by emphasizing women in less competitive situations, such as having fun.

In the May/June 2000 issue of *Sports Illustrated for Women*, an in-depth analysis of the approaching WNBA season included a section entitled “How I spent my summer vacation” (Fink & Kensicki, 2002, p. 332). Instead of focusing on the players, their talent, and accomplishments, the story focused on what the players did during their time off. Mainstream media also often portray women as emotional. Magazine photographs during the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Games were more likely to depict women crying than men crying (Duncan, 1990). Only one photograph showed a man crying while 12 stories depicted women crying. One of the 12 photographs was of swimmer Kim Lineham
hugging her father with her head buried in his chest after having finished fourth in the 400-meter race (Duncan, 1990). Other photographs captured women weeping in happiness on the podium. Pictures of women crying send the message that women cry frequently displaying their emotions and weaknesses, while strong men rarely cry (Duncan, 1990).

In an examination of newspaper profiles covering 1996 Olympic athletes, writers portrayed women as “girls” or “kids” slightly more frequently than men (Kinnick, 1998, p.9). One author even wrote about swimmer Amy Van Dyken bringing a “good luck toy” (Kinnick, 1998, p. 10). A photograph that made the front page of one of the Big East athletics’ websites in 2009 embodies the idea of infantilization: a woman with her arms outstretched like an airplane and a big smile on her face (Pack, 2009). This photograph in particular portrays the woman athlete as more playful, less competitive, and child-like (Pack, 2009).

For the purpose of this study, infantilization was defined as picturing the athlete(s) in a child-like manner. This included being overly emotional, and showing the players as just having fun and not being serious about the game or competition.

*Active and Passive Portrayal in Photographs*

A photograph portrays an enormous amount of information in its content (Duncan, 1990). An action shot can capture the moment of competition, the skill of the athlete, and/or the concentration that performing the sport takes. Yet, women athletes are often photographed in passive shots (Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Hardin, et. al, 2005; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992; Pack, 2009). For women, that passivity sends the message that what
happens outside of the heat of competition is more important than athletic ability and competition (Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992). “Showing women less in athletic poses and more in posed photographs enables a media outlet to construct a reality that serves to maintain the status-quo ideology of women as different and inferior to men” (Fink & Kensicki, 2002, p. 325).

In a 1988 Winter Games preview issue of Sports Illustrated, one article featured husband and wife cross-country skiers. In three of the accompanying photographs the husband was shown in action shots. The only photograph of the wife was that of the family sitting down to eat dinner. This sends the message that the man is active, and the woman passively sits at home in the kitchen (Duncan, 1990). In Women’s Sports & Fitness magazine between 1975 and 1989, 58.3% of photographs pictured athletes in posed positions rather than actively competing (Leath & Lumpkin, 1992). In Sports Illustrated from 1997-1999, 56% of photographs depicted women athletes passively compared to 44% of men’s photos (Fink & Kensicki, 2002). Even on the covers of these magazines, photographers posed women athletes for the pictures (Leath & Lumpkin, 1992). The 2000 Olympic preview in Sports Illustrated devoted 11 full-page pictures to women athletes. Out of the 11 photographs, only one featured an athlete in action (Fink & Kensicki, 2002). One reason for the large proportion of posed photographs of women athletes is because women’s sports are not covered as extensively as men’s sports by the mainstream media (Duncan, 2006; Kane, 1996; Hardin, 2005; Hardin, Lynn, & Walsdorf, 2005; Salween & Wood, 1994). That means fewer archival photos available for stories of women.
College media guides and websites for the 1989-1990 and 1996-1997 school years also portrayed women athletes’ passively (Buysse & Embser-Herbert, 2004; Pack, 2009). One study looked specifically at media guides given out by colleges (Buysse & Embser-Herbert, 2004). Men were shown on the court 68% of the time while women were seen on the court 51% of the time in 1990. In 1997, the study once again found a significant difference. Men were photographed on the court 57% of the time while women were only shown on the court 41% of the time. Representing women this way reinforces the stereotypical passive portrayal of women in sports. My Internet study of Big East athletics’ photographs of women’s volleyball in 2009 found several instances of players celebrating, as well as a few instances of posed athletes and athletes not competing (Pack, 2009).

For the purpose of this thesis, I defined action shots as the athlete actively playing on court. This included practices, warm-ups, and games. In order to be considered action, the player must have been in motion during play. I defined passive photographs as shots where the athlete was not actively participating or on the court. This included posed photographs of players, players standing on the sidelines, huddles, and standing in line before a game. For the purpose of this thesis, I defined celebrations as the athlete(s) engaged in celebratory actions. This mostly included smiles, excited emotions, group hugs, and arms in the air. Finally, the emergent category of “on the court ready” was defined as players on the court ready to play, but not, at that moment, in motion. This category was included because the shots were not posed or in motion, but they were taken during the game and often did show intense emotion of the athlete preparing for the ball.
Camera Angles

The content of a photograph, including camera angles, gives meaning to the picture and can influence what the viewer thinks about the picture (Duncan, 1990). The position of the camera can give the viewer the impression of seeing the subject on eye-level, looking up at the subject, or looking down on the subject. Looking up at a subject conveys a symbolic message that the subject of the picture is in a dominant position vis-à-vis the viewer. A photograph looking down at the subject conveys the opposite message; the viewer is in a dominant position and has power over the subject (Duncan, 1990; Rose, 2007). The down-angle has the most negative connotation, as it puts the viewer at a higher level than subject, thus placing the subject of the photograph in a position of inferiority (Duncan, 1990).

A study of several magazines during the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Games found more down-angle photographs of women than men, putting the subject in a position of inferiority (Duncan, 1990). In the 1988 Summer Games preview edition of *Sports Illustrated*, one article about Olympic divers featured two pictures; in the first picture the man is above the viewer, and in the second photo the woman is below the viewer (Duncan, 1990). These two photographs were laid out near each other, thus emphasizing a difference between men and women in how they are photographed. Men are looked up at and women are looked down on.

My study of photographs of women’s volleyball on Big East websites in 2009 found that out of 77 total pictures, there were 34 eye-level shots, 8 up-angle shots, and 30 down-angle shots over a three-week period (Pack, 2009).
For the purpose of this thesis, eye-level shots were defined as the photographer taking the picture on the same level as the athlete. When the picture is looked at, the athlete is at eye-level vis-à-vis the viewer. Down-angle shots were defined as the photographer taking the picture from a higher level than the subject; thus the camera lens is looking down on the subject. Down-angle shots look down at the subject when the picture is viewed. Up-angle shots were defined as the photographer taking the picture from below the subject and looking up at the subject.

**Excessive Happiness**

Scholars repeatedly find that women, more so than men, are seen as emotional (Lee, 1992). In conventional media representations of women, their emotionality causes them seemingly to lose emotional control, and unrestrained, uncontrollable laughter results (Goffman, 1979; Media Education Foundation, 2009). This uninhibited happiness is “not just a smile, but a much more extreme response. While men have to hold their emotions, women express them to the breaking point as a matter of course” (Media Education Foundation, 2009, 31:41). In other words, not only do women smile more than men, they smile much more expansively and expressively (Goffman, 1979). This uncontrolled emotion, excessive happiness, gives the impression that the woman has become detached from reality and is off in her own world (Goffman, 1979; Media Education Foundation, 2009). Goffman (1979) asked why we don’t view such representations as absurd. This thesis found occurrences of these seemingly uncontrollable emotional states, namely expansive, extreme smiles, and I based my definition for happy faces on Goffman’s (1979) and Jhally’s (Media Education Foundation, 2009) explanations. For the purpose of this thesis, happy faces were defined
as uncontrollable excited emotion that is so extreme it looks out of place for a sporting event.

Goffman’s (1979) landmark study remains relevant in the study of gender and print advertising. However, the ideas posited by Goffman transcend advertising, and the concepts he developed apply to all media, both fiction (advertising) and nonfiction (news). Jhally (Media Education Foundation, 2009) updates Goffman 30 years later by reiterating Goffman’s findings now applied to video and motion pictures, and incorporating contemporary images and trends.

New Media

Internet is a relatively young and understudied medium (Pedersen, Whisenant, & Schneider, 2007; Real, 2006). How gender is portrayed online is still in question (van Zoonen, 2003). However, some scholars argue that the Internet might be a medium that will help shift the status of women’s sports (Hardin, 2005; Johnson & Kelly, 2003; Kian & Clavio, 2011; Kian, Mondello, & Vincent, 2009). The main demographics of online sports users are 18- to 34-year-olds (Real, 2006). These younger audiences may be more open to reading and viewing information about women athletes (Hardin, 2005) than those who consume the traditional media (i.e. newspaper, television) that have been covering the same sports for a long time (Real, 2006). However, there is no set standard yet as to what constitutes sports media coverage on the Internet (Butler & Sagas, 2008).

In sum, past studies repeatedly find that the stereotypes of trivialization, sexualization, infantilization, passivity, and negativity in camera angles occur in the mainstream media’s portrayal of women athletes. These stereotypes effectively trivialize women athletes and their accomplishments. The question becomes how do new media,
specifically, collegiate athletic websites, represent women athletes and, in the present case, collegiate volleyball players.
CHAPTER 3:  
METHOD

This study used mixed methods of qualitative content analysis and photovoice in order to better understand how NCAA.com, BigEast.org, Big East conference college websites, and fans portrayed women volleyball players visually during the 2010 season.

Part I

I used qualitative content analysis in order to evaluate pictures found on NCAA.com, BigEast.org, and the websites of the 15 Big East conference schools (listed in Appendix A). Qualitative content analysis is “a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns” (Hseih & Shannon, 2005, p. 1278). Interpretation in qualitative content analysis allows for emergent categories based on the information obtained. For the purposes of this thesis, the texts being studied were photographs.

On NCAA.com, the pictures examined were from photo galleries of the championship tournaments of Divisions I, II, and III. For BigEast.org and 12 of the schools, I looked at pictures that accompanied articles that were written about the team, coaches, or players on the websites. I examined these photos because the content producer had chosen them specifically to represent the team in the story. I chose to examine all available photos because, for most of the schools, the number of unique
photos was low enough not to warrant a selected sample. Also, I wanted a census of pictures so that any emergent categories could have been thoroughly explored. I examined volleyball photo galleries from three schools, Notre Dame, Pittsburgh, and St. John’s. I used photo galleries for Pittsburgh and St. John’s because articles did not have pictures. I looked at Notre Dame’s photo gallery because it was more predominantly featured than links to archival articles were on the website. The photo gallery was more easily accessible than articles, and the photo gallery link was positioned before the first link for the archives. The first time I accessed the site I could not find the archived articles. Also, I wanted a more representative sample of photo gallery pictures than galleries from just two schools would produce. I utilized the photo galleries because I did not want to exclude these schools from the study, and I wanted to determine what kinds of photographs are displayed in a Big East school’s photo gallery.

I evaluated pictures posted on NCAA.com, BigEast.org, and the 15 Big East member schools from Sept. 24 to March 1. This time frame was chosen because it corresponds with the start of regular season play with the University of South Florida. The study extends past the end of the season in order to gain some insight into postseason portrayal of women volleyball players in the Big East conference.

I collected and coded all pictures. Analysis of pictures on the websites consisted of examining the picture for the overall impression, and then I recorded the information on a coding sheet (Appendix D). I categorized action shots as the athlete being in motion during play, including warm-ups, practices, and game play. Conversely, I coded passive shots as when the athlete was not in motion during play and/or not on the court ready to play. The middle category of “on the court ready to play” emerged because these shots
were neither passive nor action. The athletes were on the court; they were just not in motion. I coded for “on the court ready” when the athlete(s) was in a ready-to-play stance on the court. I also coded for celebration shots, which, for the purpose of thesis, were defined as players showing celebratory emotions. These pictures most often included at least one of the following: smiles, excited emotion, hugs, and/or arms in the air. I recorded trivialization as anything that detracted from the player(s), athleticism, the game, or the sport. I coded for sexualization when the picture was framed in such a way as to give the viewer a voyeuristic look at the player, which included looking up at crotches and sexually provocative images (Duncan, 1990). I recorded infantilization when women athletes were portrayed in child-like ways. This included gestures and over-emotional states. Two emergent categories evolved: happy faces and game faces. These two categories were not “normal” happy or game faces, but extreme faces. I coded for happy faces when there was such an extreme emotional happiness that the expression looked disjointed from the context of the game (Goffman, 1979; Media Education Foundation, 2009). Similarly, I found game faces when the face displayed was more extreme than a typical game face or a face that is typically shown in media photographs. I also wanted to see if the use of equipment was prevalent throughout pictures and across sites. I broke down equipment into three categories: net, ball, and equipment. I coded for net when the net was shown in the picture. I coded for ball when the ball was visible in the picture. Then, as an overall category, I coded for equipment when the ball, the net, or both were pictured. I further examined photographs for the angle in which the picture was taken. I coded for up-angle, down-angle, or eye-level. I recorded up-angle if the photographer was below the subject when the picture was taken. I coded down-angle if
the subject was below the photographer. Finally I coded eye-level if the photographer
and the subject were on the same level and the picture looks straight on at the subject.

I based my categories on previous scholarly studies on gender and women in
sports (Curry, et. al., 2002; Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988; Duncan &
Messner, 2005; Kane, 1996; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992; Lee, 1992). Generally speaking,
most of the categories I included are most commonly used in scholarly research (Clayton,
2002; Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Hardin, et. al.,
2005; Kinnick, 1998; Messner, et. al., 2003; Pirinen, 1997). My definitions of
trivialization (Clayton, 2002; Curry, et. al., 2002; Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Hasbrook,
1988; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Kane, 1996; Kinnick, 1998;
Lee, 1992; Messner, et. al., 2003; Pirinen, 1997), sexualization (Clayton, 2002; Duncan,
1990; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Fink & Kensicki, 2002; Kane, 1996; Messner, et. al.,
2003; Pirinen, 1997), infantilization (Kane, 1996; Kinnick, 1998), action shots (Duncan,
1990; Hardin, et. al., 2005; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992), passive shots (Clayton, 2002; Fink
& Kensicki, 2002; Hardin, et. al., 2005; Leath & Lumpkin, 1992), and camera angles
(Duncan, 1990; Hardin, et. al., 2005) are derived from numerous previous studies. My
inclusion of happy faces and game faces was an emergent category. I defined happy
faces based on Goffman’s (1979) extreme happy faces. My definition of game faces
came from the extreme nature of these faces and that, unlike men athletes, women in
sports are more often shown as beautiful and/or sexy athletes (Duncan, 1990; Fink &
Kensicki, 2002; Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kane, 1996; Kian & Clavio, 2011; Leath &
Lumpkin, 1992) than extremely competitively (Curry, et. al., 2002). In fact, “female
athletes who are less glamorous, less obviously and outwardly different from males, are
less frequently the subject of photographs” (Duncan, 1990, p. 28). Equipment has been mentioned in a previous study (Buysse, J.M. & Embser-Herbert, M.S., 2004), but has not been thoroughly researched by mass communications scholars.

As a final observation, I looked at a small sample of 38 pictures taken by University of South Florida volleyball players and posted on USF’s athletics’ website. Since players took these pictures, only content was evaluated using qualitative content analysis. I recorded information including how many players were present in the photo and what was occurring in the photograph.

Part II

In brief (full length original version appears in Appendix E), the second part of my study consisted of attending University of South Florida home volleyball games, handing out flyers (Appendix G) asking fans for pictures of the games, uploading pictures to a blog site, and examining the pictures for ways that the fans represented the team. I chose photovoice as my method for the second part of the study because it allows for respondents to be encoders of media. Photovoice literally puts cameras into the hands of participants. The participants then visually give, and vocally tell, information to the researcher, which empowers the participants (e.g. Wang, 1999; Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001).

I conducted this study over the 2010 women’s volleyball season at the University of South Florida in which I attended all regular season home volleyball games. The first home game was played on Sept. 24, and the last home game was played on Nov. 14. A total of eight home games took place during this time (see Appendix F for full schedule).
Games were played throughout the week. At the games, I gave out information on a slip of paper (Appendix G) to game attendees as they walked into the lobby.

Fans were asked to email or mail me pictures they took at the games. I then uploaded those pictures to the blog site. Participants were asked to include basic demographic information and describe briefly their favorite picture(s). Every person who responded was sent a thank you email and an attached copy of my consent form.

The website was a blog site where I uploaded pictures, and viewers could have anonymously commented on the photographs. No one chose to comment.

Analysis was comprised of several steps. First, I looked at the images and recorded my overall thoughts on the pictures. This was done twice. Next, I used the same coding sheet (Appendix D) and definitions as Part I, and analyzed the pictures a third and a fourth time. I coded all photographs for each category so some overlap occurred. Finally, pictures were spread out and grouped in piles of “likeness.”

This study was approved by the University of South Florida’s Athletics’ Department and the University of South Florida’s Internal Review Board. The USF IRB did require the study to include a consent form (Appendix H) which was posted on the blog and emailed to respondents.

I chose both qualitative content analysis and photovoice as methods in order to gain a deeper insight into all of the pictures in the study. I wanted to examine the ways in which collegiate athletics’ sites and fans of the University of South Florida’s volleyball team visually represent women athletes. Since scholars have not studied how sports fans visually represent women athletes, I wanted to also examine what meanings fans interpret from the photos taken. I used the methods of qualitative content analysis and photovoice
because I did not want to be limited to a predefined set of codes. Due to my qualitative analysis, I did indeed uncover emergent categories. However, I thought it also important to include the established media gender stereotypes in order to see if new media visually represents women athletes in the same ways. In what follows, I explicate my findings and include specific examples of pictures found in my research.
CHAPTER 4:

ANALYSIS

In all, I evaluated a total of 651 women’s volleyball pictures from the 2010 season; of those, 77 were fan pictures, 40 were from NCAA.com, 27 from BigEast.org, and 507 were from the 15 colleges in the Big East Conference. Overall, the results of this study were positive in regards to the portrayal of women volleyball players by new media outlets. Instances of stereotyping were low, shots showing players using equipment were prevalent, and photographers most often utilized camera angles that put the viewer on the same level as the subject. Table 1 shows a breakdown of the overall results (comprehensive table located in Appendix I).
Table 1: Overall Percentages of Photographs by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pictures</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Celeb</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>On court</th>
<th>Triv</th>
<th>Infant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Happy Face</th>
<th>Game Face</th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>Ball</th>
<th>Equip</th>
<th>Up Angle</th>
<th>Down Angle</th>
<th>Eye level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Pictures</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(651)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Only</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(574)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Pictures</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Overall**

All pictures in the present study included, 68% (442 pictures) were action shots. I coded for action shots when a player was actively participating in the sport; including practices, warm-ups, and game-play. Similarly, a 2004 study found that men athletes were shown on court on the cover of college media guides 68% of the time (Buysse & Embser-Herbert, 2004). The pictures I acquired from Internet sites only also had a high percentage of action shots at 67%. These action shots more positively portray women athletes because action shows women players as athletes and competitors. Passive photographs accounted for 18% of all pictures in the present study. I coded a picture as passive when the subject was neither in motion nor on the court ready to play. Passive pictures included posed pictures, huddles, and players standing in a line. The use of passive photos detracts from the athleticism of the players and from the competition itself.

In every photograph, I coded whether or not equipment was present in the frame. For the purpose of this thesis, equipment was defined as the ball and/or the net being present in the picture. My findings show that equipment was present in 463 (71%) of all pictures; of these, 364 included the ball, which can be difficult to capture in a fast moving game. Many sports are named after the equipment that sport uses, such as volleyball, football, and basketball. Equipment itself is a necessity of any sport. The inclusion and significance of equipment in media photographs is understudied in mass communications.

Eye-level photos, putting the subject on the same level as the viewer, accounted for half of all photos. Pictures obtained from Internet sites had a slightly higher
percentage of eye-level shots at 52% than the overall eye-level picture total which was 50%. I coded for eye-level angles when the subject was framed straight-on in the photo as observed by the viewer. These pictures were most likely taken from the bleachers or standing on the sidelines. Eye-level photos symbolically show that the subject of the photo is on an equal level as the viewer. Conversely, down-angles look down at a subject and symbolically put the viewer at a higher level than the photo’s subject. This most negative camera angle (Duncan, 1990; Rose, 2007) accounted for 37% of all photographs in the present study. I coded for down-angles when the subject was looked down on in the picture, meaning the photographer was above the player when the picture was snapped. These pictures were photographed from places much higher than the floor of the court. For some photographs, shots were taken from directly above the net. It should be noted that, as the sophistication of sports news technologies has increased, the symbolic meaning of the down-angle has and continues to shift. A sky-cam mounted in the ceiling of an athletic arena becomes a way to increase viewers’ access to competition rather than to trivialize players. However, issues such as these require closer scrutiny, given the history of the down-angle in photographing women.

One emergent category I found was that of game faces. While it is somewhat common to see an intense game face on men athletes, traditionally it has been uncommon to see women athletes photographically depicted with these same faces. Game faces may be construed as unattractive on women, thus exposing the gendered double standard for women athletes. My study found that women’s game face photographs are being taken and used on college athletic sites. One quarter of all Internet photographs and 22% of all pictures portrayed the athlete with an intense game face. This inclusion of game faces on
new media sites could help counter old media gender stereotypes because it shows 
women athletes as serious competitors. The following links are examples of extreme 
game faces found in the study: DePaul extreme game face 
http://www.depaulbluedemons.com/sports/w-volley/recaps/101010aaa.html; University 
of Louisville extreme game face http://www.uoflsports.com/sports/w-volley/spec-
rel/110810aaa.html#; NCAA.com extreme game faces at 
http://www.ncaa.com/photos/volleyball-women/2010-12-11/2010-diii-womens-
volleyball-championship/page~0%2C5?page=0.5. It is important to note that these faces 
were only coded as such if the game face was more exaggerated and intense than what is 
a typical face made during an athletic event and what is typically shown in photographs 
of women athletes.

This thesis found that instances of trivialization as downplaying the athlete, 
sexualization as giving the audience a voyeuristic view of the athlete, and infantilization 
as portraying the athlete like a child, were almost nonexistent overall in the examined 
pictures. Only 70 of all pictures in the study contained one or more of these stereotypes. 
Individual photographs did not contain many stereotypes, but how the sites used the 
photographs can effectively trivialize the team overall. BigEast.org and 10 of the 12 
schools that posted photos with articles used “recycled” archival photographs. This is 
one of the most significant findings of this study. I will return to this subject later. 
Reusing photos can trivialize the team by not sharing new content from games recently 
played. Two schools, Pittsburgh and St. John’s, had articles about their volleyball team, 
but did not include pictures with any of the stories. This may be a problem of having no 
one in sports information photographing women’s volleyball games.
Fan Pictures

I color-printed and coded all usable pictures that fans submitted after attending 2010 University of South Florida home volleyball games. Only one picture was not usable because it did not contain any players or coaches. Seven pictures were examined only for action or passivity and presence of the net. These seven pictures were blurry and taken from a long distance so ascertaining any more information was impossible.

I only had five respondents so my sample size was too small to make any general claim, but several commonalities in the pictures can be noted. Fan photographs had a high rate of action shots (71%). I did not find any occurrences of trivialization or infantilization. However, fans took the highest rate of sexualized photos at 6%. Many of the photos coded as sexualization were taken at an angle that looked up between the athletes’ legs, putting the athlete in a prone position and/or giving the viewer a voyeuristic look.

Fan picture taken looking up between legs. Courtesy of University of South Florida volleyball fan participant.
In 88% of all the study’s photographs, equipment, the ball and/or net, was visible in the picture. Fans had the highest percentage of equipment inclusion. Half of all fan photos included the ball. Volleyball is a rapidly moving sport where photographically capturing the ball clearly is often difficult. In terms of camera angles, there were actually more up-angle pictures, showing the athlete as above the viewer, than eye-level or down-angle shots. In fact, fans had, by far, the highest percentage of up-angles of any group at 44%. This finding is interesting in that fans are often limited to seating areas in terms of where they can take pictures, meaning that the photographers would have to position themselves on the court floor in order to take these up-angle photos. The majority of photographs taken by fans were of high quality; something not expected due to limitations of equipment and location, as well as to the speed of the game itself. These high quality pictures were taken by two out of the five respondents. The other three respondents took pictures on cell phone cameras, which, therefore, resulted in a much lower quality photograph.
When broken down, NCAA.com portrayed women volleyball players more negatively than BigEast.org, the schools themselves, or fans. The pictures I evaluated from NCAA.com were taken at the Division I, Division II, and Division III championship tournaments. Divisions I, II, and III all had high percentages of celebration photos, picturing players with exuberant smiles, cheering, and/or hugging, with half of all Division I photos being celebratory in nature. These celebrations send the symbolic message that the players are just having fun, and it detracts from the competition and athleticism. All three Divisions had high instances of extreme happy faces. I coded “happy faces” when there was what appeared to be an uncontrollable happy emotion (Goffman, E. 1979; Media Education Foundation, 2009) that was to the point of being out of place for a sporting event. I coded happy faces when there was such an extreme happy emotion that the women looked like they were detached from the reality of the game. The following links are examples of NCAA.com extreme happy faces found in the study: http://www.ncaa.com/photos/volleyball-women/2010-12-11/2010-diii-womens-volleyball-championship/page~0%2C6?page=0,6 which shows a picture of players gathering in circle with outstretched arms and extremely happy faces; http://www.ncaa.com/photos/volleyball-women/2010-12-19/2010-di-volleyball-championship/page~0%2C1?page=0,1, which pictures players with arms outstretched gathering in a circle with extreme happy faces. However, all pictures were taken at the championship tournaments so excited emotion is to be expected, and, indeed, becomes part of the “thrill of victory” in sports.
As a means of comparison, I conducted an informal survey of NCAA men’s and women’s basketball tournaments for the same academic year, 2010-2011, from NCAA.com. Men’s Division I did have several celebration photos, but, for the most part, the excitement was not as exuberant as women’s volleyball. A few of the emotional shots were taken at a distance and, therefore, the emotion was not as noticeable. The following link provides an example of an NCAA men’s Division I championship photo:

http://www.ncaa.com/photos/basketball-men/2010-12-11/duke-wins-national-championship/page~0%2C4?page=0,4, which shows an extreme happy face that is not prominent in the photo due to how far away the picture was taken and because of the abundance of party streamers. One of only two action shots in the photo gallery for Division I did include the athlete with an extreme game face. The following link provides an example of men’s Division I game face see:

http://www.ncaa.com/photos/basketball-men/2010-12-11/duke-wins-national-championship/page~0%2C9?page=0,9, which shows two players, one of which has an extreme game face. For men’s Division II, most of the photo gallery consisted of action shots taken during the game. I found no extreme happy emotion in these pictures. The few celebration shots were mostly posed team pictures. NCAA Division III did not have a photo gallery. For women’s basketball, Division I had six total pictures; three of which were action oriented. Two of the pictures were celebration shots, with one player in one picture having an extreme happy face. Division II also had six pictures. Of these, four pictures were of celebrations, and the athletes did have extreme happy faces. An example of a women’s NCAA Division II basketball extreme happy face is provided in this link:

One of the celebration shots was taken from far away, and the emphasis is not on the face. Women’s Division III gallery only had five pictures. Three of these were action shots with very extreme game faces, one was a celebration shot with extreme happy faces, and the last picture was a posed team picture with silly happy faces. This informal survey of men’s and women’s NCAA championship basketball might suggest that while pictures of both men’s and women’s basketball players do consist of happy faces, it is more prevalent in pictures of women athletes.

Women’s NCAA volleyball Divisions II and III both had over half of all shots taken at down-angles, putting the viewer above the subject of the photo, for the majority of pictures. This literal angle of putting the subject below the viewer sends a symbolic message that the subject of the picture is lower than the viewer. In terms of stereotypes, both Division I and II included high percentages of trivialization (30% and 40% respectively). Division I had, by far, the highest percentage of infantilization at 20%. However, Divisions I and II had no occurrences of sexualization in any photographs, and Divisions I and III had high percentages of photographs that included equipment, the net and/or the ball.

BigEast.org portrayed women volleyball players as athletes more positively than NCAA.com. This study found no instances of sexualization on BigEast.org. Action shots accounted for 78% of all photographs on the site. Intense game faces were present in 37% of photographs, and over half of the pictures found on BigEast.org were taken at eye-level. Taken together, photos on BigEast.org most often placed the viewer on the same level as the athlete and highlight the intensity of the game.
**Big East Conference College Athletic Websites**

Many of the college athletic websites in the Big East portrayed women volleyball players quite positively. Six schools posted action shots in excess of 75%. Eight schools pictured women with game faces in more than a quarter of the shots. Notre Dame had the highest percentage (among the schools) of up-angles at 26%, and 10 schools pictured athletes at eye-level more than half of the time.

A few potential issues did arise. As stated earlier, 10 of the 15 schools included in the study reused the same photo(s) for different stories; of these schools, seven reused passive and/or celebration photographs. The repetition of these photos places emphasis on the importance of these photos, thereby placing emphasis on the content: celebrations and passivity. The following link shows an example of a passive photo reused by Syracuse:

[http://www.suathletics.com/news/2010/11/13/VB_1113101031.aspx?path=vball](http://www.suathletics.com/news/2010/11/13/VB_1113101031.aspx?path=vball), picture of Syracuse volleyball players sitting on floor signing autographs). Photos that were reused were only counted and coded for one time. However, DePaul reused the same three passive photographs eight times. Again, recycling photos may trivialize the team because it connotes that the team is not important enough to warrant new photographic content. Cincinnati used the same three passive and celebration photos of one player for 19 out of its 60 pictures (almost one-third of all pictures for that school). Four schools pictured athletes passively in 45% or more of their photos. Also, four schools used down-angles more than half of the time.

The University of South Florida had the most “glamorous-looking” photos. The overall feel to the photos looked less like a sporting event and more like headshots.
These seemingly “headshot” pictures were close-up (or cropped), did not show equipment or the game, and emphasized the facial beauty of the athlete, not the competition of the game. It is important to note that these photos were taken during games and were not posed pictures. An example of a USF glamour shot of a player looking flawless in a pink uniform during a game can be found at this link:
http://www.gousfbulls.com/ViewArticle.dbml?SPSID=36667&SPID=2920&DB_OEM_ID=7700&ATCLID=205027620. USF had a high number of passive photos. In fact, the same picture of a team huddle was pictured with articles 17 times. USF reposted two celebration photographs. Also, 12 of USF’s 33 pictures were of the coach or coaches, not the players or the game. This is due, in part, to the fact that the coach does a webcast after many of the games.

Louisville posted no photographs taken at an up-angle, but 78% of all photos were down-angles. One example of Louisville down-angle found in the study can be seen at: http://www.uoflsports.com/sports/w-volley/spec-rel/111510aaa.html#, shot taken from above the net looking down on player spiking. Many of these down-angles were seemingly taken from straight above the net. The validity of the negative connotation of these down-angles could not be verified due to the almost artistic quality these severe down-angled photos possessed. Louisville also had the highest percentage of extreme happy faces at 24%. An example of a Louisville volleyball happy face can be found at this link: http://www.uoflsports.com/sports/w-volley/recaps/112010aab.html#.  

Only six of West Virginia’s articles had accompanying pictures. One article that covered the whole season didn’t include a single picture. Out of the six total pictures for this school, four were passive. West Virginia had the highest percentage of passive
photographs found in the study, but the overall number of volleyball photos posted on West Virginia’s site was so low as to render such a percentage meaningless.

Uniforms

This study found few instances of sexualization overall. However, it is imperative to discuss the uniforms that volleyball players wear. Every attempt was made to be objective about sexuality in pictures, but, due to the skimpy nature of the uniforms, sexualization could have been construed in most of the pictures. I only coded photographs as sexualization if the viewer was given a voyeuristic look at the player or if body parts were provocatively shown in the picture. For example, many of the sexualized photos looked up between the athlete’s legs, thus giving the viewer a voyeuristic look. For an example of a photograph taken looking up between legs see: http://www.und.com/photogallery/gallery_index.html?school=nd&sport=w-volley&; for example of a Pittsburgh player with a scantily clad crotch area see this link: http://www.pittsburghpanthers.com/photogallery/gallery_index.html?school=pitt&sport=w-volley&.

The uniforms that collegiate women volleyball athletes wear consist of small, tight-fitting spandex shorts and tops that barely touch the waistband of the shorts. The shorts are so small that thighs and bottoms of rear ends are commonly visible. NCAA rules, however, do not state that spandex shorts must be worn, just that bottoms have to be worn (Alterman, 2010). NCAA rules also do not state that shirts have to be tucked in as is the case with women’s basketball (Bilik & Williamson, 2010). In volleyball, common play consists of arms above the head, and this often causes short shirts not
tucked in to rise up and expose stomach, side, and back areas. In other words, bare midriffs are common, too.

*USF Volleyball Player Photographs*

The University of South Florida volleyball players’ pictures often portrayed the message of “team.” This observation is congruent with Hiatt’s (2008) findings that high school volleyball players often pictured more than one person in photographs. In the present study, out of the 38 total pictures taken by USF team members, 27 included more than one player. In another photograph, no volleyball players were present, but a wide shot of many USF football players was pictured. Most of the pictures captured the volleyball player(s) smiling (31 pictures). The locations for the photos included Dave and Busters, which is a restaurant and arcade, and an away USF football game. Taken as a whole, the pictures suggest a strong sense of team unity, and, when outside the game, the players enjoy having fun.

This thesis did find some overall negative visual representations of women volleyball players in the Big East by a few websites. The recycling of archival photos happened across schools and on BigEast.org. This reuse might send a symbolic message that the team doesn’t warrant new photographic content. Recycling also suggests no one has been assigned to cover games, neither on-staff photographers nor stringers, let alone reporters. This is an important finding in an understudied area. I also found that celebration shots and extreme happy faces were occurring. These types of images can seem to mean that the players are all about having a good time and are not currently involved in a serious athletic competition. The happy faces are so extreme that the subsequent image looks detached from the current reality of the game. Also, websites
that had high rates of passive shots, NCAA.com, Syracuse, USF, tended to have lower, or no, occurrences of up-angles, as well as fewer instances of equipment inclusion.

Despite these negative instances, overall the findings were positive. I found few instances of trivialization, sexualization, and infantilization. Few stereotypes led the way for better visual coverage, including action shots and serious game faces. Sites that had high percentages of action shots also had high rates of equipment inclusion, and many of these sites often utilized up-angles. These sites thus portrayed women athletes actively playing a sport and were put at a symbolically higher position than the viewer of the photo. Game faces, commonly found in pictures featuring men athletes, are not commonly seen on women athletes, since women athletes have typically been portrayed as beautiful. Another finding that could prove important if more thoroughly studied is that of the inclusion of equipment in pictures. Sports are often defined by the equipment that the specific game uses, but the importance of equipment inclusion has not been researched. This study found almost three quarters of the total pictures did include equipment, the net and/or the ball. Taken all together, NCAA.com, BigEast.org, Big East athletics’ websites, and USF volleyball fans visually represented women volleyball players in action, using equipment, and competing as serious athletes during the 2010 volleyball season.
CHAPTER 6:
CONCLUSION

Scholarly studies consistently find that the mainstream media portray women athletes stereotypically, specifically trivialization, infantilization, sexualization, passivity, and utilization of down angles (e.g. Daddario, 1994; Duncan, 1990; Duncan & Messner, 2005; Kane, 1996; Hardin, Lynn, & Walsdorf, 2005). These stereotypes effectively degrade women athletes and their accomplishments. Only a few scholars have chosen to study new media representations of women athletes (Kian & Clavio, 2011; Kian, et. al, 2009) and sports fans themselves (e.g. Dietz-Uhler, Harrick, End, & Jacquemotte, 2000; Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1999; Gantz & Wenner, 1995). The Internet is a relatively young and understudied medium (Pedersen, 2003; Real, 2006), especially in the realm of Internet sites maintained by the university’s athletics department or sites dedicated to covering collegiate sports. The issue of how gender is portrayed online is one that is still in question (van Zoonen, 2003), and thus the Internet may provide a medium that will help shift the status of women’s sports (Hardin, 2005; Johnson & Kelly, 2003). By using qualitative content analysis and photovoice, I examined how NCAA.com, BigEast.org, Big East collegiate athletics’ websites, and fans of the University of South Florida’s volleyball team visually represented women volleyball players during, and a few months after, the 2010 season.
This thesis used qualitative content analysis in order to examine how Big East volleyball players are visually represented on new media sites. This study chose qualitative content analysis because it “defines itself … as an approach of empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication, following content analytical rules and step by step models, without rash quantification” (Mayring, 2005, p.2). This permitted emergent categories and critical interpretation of the picture content. This thesis wanted to explore all of the ways, including new representations, in which women volleyball players in the Big East were visually portrayed on new media sites.

This thesis selected photovoice as a method in order to better understand how fans of the University of South Florida volleyball team would visually and verbally portray the players. Photovoice, as a method, gives participants a chance to take pictures and explain why the picture resonates with them, thereby empowering otherwise voiceless participants to have a voice (Goodhart, Hsu, Baek, Coleman, Maresca, & Miller, 2006; Wang, 1999). Nevertheless, the results in the present study’s use of photovoice are disappointing.

The results of this study concerning the visual portrayal of women volleyball players on NCAA.com, BigEast.org, Big East Athletic websites, and by University of South Florida volleyball fans during the 2010 volleyball season were overall positive. Shots of the athlete actively competing in the sport were common. These action shots can show the intensity of the competition, as well as the athleticism of the player. Instances of trivialization, sexualization, and infantilization were low. Due to these low instances of stereotypes, I posit that new media may provide an outlet to counter
traditional media gender stereotypes. For many of the pictures, equipment, the net and/or the ball, was included in the frame. Equipment is vital to any sport, but the use of equipment in sports photographs is an issue that mass communications have not studied. Half of all photos pictured women athletes at eye-level with the viewer, putting the athlete on the same level as the viewer. This same-level viewing symbolically puts the subject of the photograph on an equal level with the viewer. Game faces, an emergent category, were found in almost one quarter of all photos. These game faces run counter to the normal portrayal of feminine beauty by showing the athletes as serious competitors in the heat of the game. Game faces are rather typical for photographs of men athletes, but not normally shown in pictures depicting women athletes. All of this taken together means that women volleyball players in the Big East were often pictured as actively competing in intense competitions, and were shown as equals to the viewer of the photograph. The overall results of this study seem to be in accordance with one new media study that concluded that new media might counter old media gender bias (Kian, et. al, 2009).

This thesis adds to several areas of study. Most importantly, this study adds to the small amount of research on new media portrayal of women athletes, specifically, not-for-profit websites dedicated to college athletics. As part of Title IX compliance, colleges must equally promote women’s sports. Even though schools are promoting women’s teams, it does not mean that the promotion is positive. Thus, how women are represented on these sites must be examined.

Second, it might add to information on sports fans, because, to a small extent, this thesis studied how fans of a women’s sports team visually represented women athletes.
This study can open up new avenues for researchers of sports fans to explore. Sports fans are understudied in mass communications research, and studying how sports fans themselves represent women athletes has not been studied, other than what was attempted by this thesis.

Third, this study included the use of equipment in pictures, something that scholars have not studied. The importance of the inclusion of equipment in pictures is not known since it has not, as of yet, been researched. It is known that equipment is of vital importance to sports in general. In fact, many sports are named after the equipment the sport uses, such as volleyball, football, and basketball. This importance of equipment to sport photographs should warrant further investigation by scholars.

Fourth, this study specifically examined a women’s sports team, volleyball, which has not been studied in mass communications. There have been previous studies focusing on specific sports, such as basketball (Kian, 2009) and tennis (Harris & Clayton, 2002; Kian & Clavio, 2011), but volleyball, by itself, as a women’s sport has not been studied by mass communications research. The uniforms that volleyball players wear, as well as the fact that the sport is played during the same months as the popular men’s sport of football, makes the sport a viable topic to research. The uniforms are tight, skimpy outfits that allow for sexualization in almost every photograph. Volleyball is played during the same time as a football, a sport that receives ample coverage. The coverage of football versus volleyball, in essence a men’s-only sport versus a woman’s-only sport, should be studied.

Finally, this thesis modified photovoice, thus expanding the usefulness of the method. As new media expand, and audiences have the ability to encode their own
media, more research is needed. Also, mass communications scholars should more thoroughly explore photovoice as a workable method. This thesis laid out ways in which mass communications scholars can incorporate photovoice as a method into their research.

The greatest limitation of this study was the lack of respondents for fan pictures. Only five fans chose to participate. Future researchers wanting to examine how sports fans visually portray women athletes may want to provide incentives for participation, such as giving extra credit to students. Another variation of the study that may provide better results would be to supply fans with cameras at games, as is typical for photovoice studies. This could be accomplished by checking out cameras at games, and then when the participant brings the camera back the researcher could ask questions about the pictures taken.

This study was limited to the Big East conference schools, NCAA.com, BigEast.org, and a few fans of the University of South Florida’s volleyball team. Future researchers should study other universities and conferences. Other colleges and conferences may not portray women athletes in the same ways that Big East member schools did. Also, mainstream media’s portrayal and coverage of women’s collegiate volleyball could be observed. This thesis did research the local Tampa Bay papers for articles covering the University of South Florida volleyball team. Other than short mentions in a USF sports blog about upcoming games, no articles were found. This lack of reporting by mainstream media is worth further investigation. The Olympic sport of volleyball is another place to examine. The Olympics boast two types of volleyball,
indoor and beach. Indoor Olympic volleyball could be studied and the results compared to how college volleyball players are visually represented.

This study only looked at the visual representation of women athletes. It did not examine the stories written about the team and the players. Again, just because a school is writing articles about women’s teams does not mean that these articles portray women positively. However, like the results of this thesis, written stories on women collegiate volleyball players may be positive. Likewise, the amount of coverage the team received was not studied. This study only looked at what picture accompanied an article, not how many articles were written. Both written coverage and amount of coverage are avenues for future research.

Finally, this study only examined women’s college volleyball. Other researchers should study different sports, including soccer, golf, track and field, cross country, swimming, gymnastics, tennis, softball and baseball, and basketball, where both men’s and women’s teams exist, and so provide some means of comparison. This comparison is vital to better understanding the differences in the portrayal of men’s and women’s collegiate sports by new media by sport. The comparisons should include visual and verbal representations, as well as the amount of coverage the teams receive.

Nonetheless, for researchers and scholars of the visual representations of women athletes by traditional and/or new media, this thesis provides suggestions on new categories to look for and ways to study new media’s visual portrayal of women athletes, as well as information on how to examine the ways in which fans visually represent women in sports. Game faces and equipment inclusion are both categories that have not previously been studied. Whether or not game faces are included on other sites or media
is something to be determined. Taking pictures of women with these serious and extreme game faces could be considered a step toward better content coverage of women athletes. Equipment inclusion has not been studied so its relevance to the positive portrayals of women athletes is not known. However, equipment is vital to any sport and, therefore, it is an issue that should be further explored. Additionally, the practice of recycling photos/reusing archival photos represents a new issue and, I argue, form of trivialization. This thesis suggests steps for studying new media’s visual representations of women athletes. First, traditional media gender stereotypes of trivialization, infantilization, sexualization, passivity, and utilization of down-angles continue to be a concern requiring monitoring. Second, it is also important to keep an open mind about new categories of representation that may arise. Third, although this thesis did not have enough fan respondents, it is still important to study how fans of women athletes encode their own media. Now it is more important than ever to study fandom since fans are using websites, such as Flikr, YouTube, and FaceBook, among others, thus enabling fans to become media producers in addition to media consumers.

For practitioners, those in the sports information business, the results translate into a set of guidelines on how positively to portray women athletes visually, particularly on collegiate athletics sites. This positive portrayal means including action shots, game faces, equipment, and new photographic content, as well as rejecting mainstream media’s gender biases. Game faces go against the stereotypical ideal that women athletes must be beautiful and glamorous, though less serious athletes. Similarly, the contexts of competition and using equipment distinguish sports photos from others, regardless of gender of athlete. Women athletes at the collegiate competition level deserve respect as
athletes in their own right without resorting to tired stereotypes that constrict women’s
value to their beauty. Additionally, photographs of women athletes should not be overly
reused. When a picture is recycled many times, it not only emphasizes the importance of
that particular photo, it also sends a symbolic message that the team, the players, and/or
the sport are not important enough to merit up-to-date coverage. Thus, university
athletics’ programs and sports information officers must ensure equal coverage during
competition as well as after. Finally, traditional mainstream media gender stereotypes
should be researched, in order to better understand how these stereotypes are
incorporated into pictures, and then such practices must be rejected. As a “best practices”
checklist for collegiate sports information, these recommendations can be encapsulated in
the following rules for coverage of women:

1. Make sure personnel or representatives are assigned to cover women’s games,
   including the collection of still and video images.

2. Post coverage of women’s teams, including still and video images, on school
   athletics’ websites in proportions equal to men’s teams.

3. Keep coverage of women’s teams free of gendered stereotypes, including
   trivialization, infantilization, sexualization, and gendered rules requiring women
   athletes to enact hetero-normative beauty ideals.

4. Respect women’s athletics and women athletes by covering and representing the
   physical, mental, psychological prowess required for elite competition.

5. Balance representations of women student athletes as positive role models
   engaged in community service with representations of women student athletes as
   serious competitors engaged in competitive physical play.
As the popularity of new media grows, so does the necessity of research. Collegiate athletics’ websites have a legal and moral obligation to represent all sports that the school participates in. Thus, as a not-for-profit site operating in the best interests of the school and student body, it is important to see how these sites portray women athletes.
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University of South Florida fan pictures were all taken in Tampa, FL at USF volleyball games during the 2010 season.
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St. John’s University
Syracuse University
University of South Florida
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APPENDIX B: SPORTS FANS, INTERPRETIVE COMMUNITIES, AND AUDIENCE RECEPTION

Many Americans are sports fans, but despite this vast group of people, this community has not been studied extensively by mass communications scholars. Despite this underreporting, some scholars have studied sports fandom and found similarities between different fans, as well as differences by gender (Dietz-Uhler, et al., 2000; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Wann, et al., 1999). Generally, sports fans identify themselves as sports fans, enjoy watching sport(s) and/or their team(s), and discussing sports (Gantz & Wenner, 1991, 1995; James & Ridinger, 2002). This identification with, and discussion of, sports is similar to the concept of interpretive communities where groups of people identify with, decode, and discuss certain texts, such as a sporting event or romance novel (Aden, Rahoi, & Beck, 1995; Costello & Moore, 2007; Fish, 1982; Lindlof, 1988; Lindlof, 1991; Radway, 1984). Scholarship on interpretive communities stems from audience reception theory where emphasis is placed on audience members and the medium.

Several of the few studies regarding sports fans focus on the motivations of being a sports fan (Dietz-Uhler, et al., 2000; Wann, Schrader, & Wilson, 1999) and the sports viewing experience (Gantz, 1981; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Gantz & Wenner, 1995; James & Ridinger, 2002). Motivations for men and women sports fans differ in some respects. Studies find that men are slightly more involved in watching sports, such as watching
pregame shows and reading about sports facts or games (Gantz & Wenner, 1991, 1995). Women fans more often reported being fans because they enjoy watching live games with family and friends (Dietz-Uhler, et al., 2000; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Wann, et al., 1999). Women, in general, do not discuss sports as often as men (Dietz-Uhler, et al., 2000; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; James & Ridinger, 2002). Women fans, while reporting to be sports fans (Gantz & Wenner, 1991, 1995; James & Ridinger, 2002), generally, have more loyalty to specific teams than sports in general (James & Ridinger, 2002). At the collegiate level, researchers found that students with a strong university identity were more likely to evaluate the school’s football team more favorably than those with a low university identity (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1999). Social identity might be a part of sports fandom. In general, sports fans are likely to watch games in order to feel like they are part of their favorite team (social identity) (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1999), to follow their team(s), enjoy the action and aesthetics of the sport, and relax or escape (Gantz & Wenner, 1995; James & Ridinger, 2002; Wann, et al., 1999). Some sports fans, such as those who regularly attend University of South Florida volleyball games and discuss the games, make up an interpretive community.

An interpretive community is a population who decodes mediated texts and shares their interpretations with others (Aden, Rahoi, & Beck, 1995; Costello & Moore, 2007; Fish, 1982; Lindlof, 1988; Lindlof, 1991; Radway, 1984). An example of an interpretive community is that of romance novel readers. In Radway’s (1984) study of a small sample of romance novel readers, she found that readers shared reasons as to why they read the novels which included for enjoyment and escape from daily life, acquisition of information, needed personal time, and “vicarious attention” (p. 65). Some, but not all,
media audiences are considered interpretive communities (romance readers, X-Files
watchers, etc.) since the audience exists together with shared ideas and social rituals of
media texts (messages) (Lindlof, 1988). Interpretive communities’ studies derive from
audience reception studies that spotlight the audience’s interpretation of a text or
message.

Mass communications research, from its inception, has been concerned with
issues of impact and effects (Jensen, 1987). But audience reception theory is based upon
what meanings different audience members ascertain from the signs and symbols
(messages) that the media distribute (Baran & Davis, 2009; Hall, 2001; Jensen, 1987).
Therefore, the emphasis is on the audience member’s interpretations. The main concern
behind audience reception is the relationship between the audience and the medium
(Jensen 1987; Livingstone, 1998). Katz and Liebes (1984) succinctly state that “it is of
particular interest to examine the extent to which members of the audience, absorb,
explicitly or implicitly, the messages which critics and scholars allege that they are
receiving” (p.29). Sports fans, as audience members, have only begun to be studied.

While audience reception theory focuses on the audience member’s decoding of
the text, technology has advanced to the point where almost anyone can produce his or
her own media. The abundance of cameras and video cameras, combined with social
media sites such as Twitter, Facebook, and Blogspot, allow anyone to encode (produce)
and distribute (uploading to the Internet) their media. This empowers the formerly
voiceless audience to have a voice. This has been dubbed “the fifth estate,” yet another
emergent area of scholarly research in mass communications (Dutton, W., 2009).
APPENDIX C: PHOTOVoice

Photovoice is a research method that places cameras into the hands of human research subjects, and, in turn, empowers them to have a voice. The method was first developed as a way for rural Chinese women to express their health concerns to village leaders (Gant, Shimshock, Allen-Meares, Smith, Miller, Hollingsworth, & Shanks, 2009; Wang, 1999; Wang & Burris, 1994; Wang, Burris, & Ping, 1996; Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001). Photovoice is a participatory action research method (Wang, et al., 1996; Wang, 1999; Wang, Yi, & Carovano, 1998; Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001).

Photovoice gives participants the ability to visually show their needs through images, increase the collective knowledge about issues surrounding the participants by using photographs, and to inform policymakers, which empowers the participants (Gant, et al., 2009; Goodhart, Hsu, Baek, Coleman, Maresca, & Miller, 2006; Wang, 1999; Wang, et al., 1996; Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001). Traditionally photovoice participants are asked to take photographs and then choose the most representative pictures to present to policymakers. For example, a child attending a school that needs repairs could photograph a leaky roof and then present the picture to the superintendent of the school district.

This thesis tried to use a modified form of photovoice to encourage people who attended University of South Florida women’s home volleyball games during the 2010 season to represent the volleyball team visually. Fans had the opportunity to become producers of images instead of consumers of media.
APPENDIX D: CODING SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Celebration</th>
<th>Trivial</th>
<th>Infant</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
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APPENDIX E: METHOD PART II FULL VERSION

In brief, the second part of my study consisted of attending University of South Florida home volleyball games, handing out flyers, asking fans for pictures of the games, uploading pictures to a blog site, and examining the pictures for ways that the fans represented the team. This study was approved by the University of South Florida’s Athletics’ Department and the University of South Florida’s Internal Review Board. The USF IRB did require the study to include a consent form (Appendix H) which was posted on the blog and emailed to respondents.

I conducted this study over the 2010 women’s volleyball season at the University of South Florida and involved the volleyball team’s fans by requesting pictures from them. I chose USF because it is easily accessible to me. I attended all regular season home volleyball games at USF. The first home game was played on Sept. 24, and the last home game was played on Nov. 14. A total of eight home games took place during this time (see Appendix F for full schedule). Games were played throughout the week. At the games, I gave out information on a slip of paper to game attendees as they walked into the lobby. The flyers stated:

I am a graduate student at USF, and I want your pictures of USF volleyball games to help with my thesis study. You can help in two ways: using provided cameras or emailing your own pictures. I have two stationary cameras located in the bleachers. You also can email me pictures from your own camera or phone. My email address is apack@mail.usf.edu. All pictures will be uploaded to my fan blog site at http://usfvb.blogspot.com/. In your email please include the following information:

- Your gender
• Your age
• Your race
• Are you a volleyball fan?
• Which school are you supporting?
• Attach picture(s) and include date of game(s)
• Please tell me which picture is your favorite and why

Please only include pictures from 2010 volleyball games. If you need assistance attaching photographs into an email, please email me and I will send you instructions. Your identity will be protected; it will not be included in the site or study. IRB study #2258.

Thank you for your help!

At the games, I set up two cameras on tripods. Audience members were invited to take pictures with these cameras, but the cameras remained stationary (next to me). Unfortunately no one chose to use the cameras. I would have taken demographic information from participants on a preprinted form that included: gender, age, race/ethnicity, sports fan, and if the person is a supporter of USF or of the opposing school. I also would have recorded which pictures each person took on his/her form. I would have asked about their favorite picture taken at the game in order to gain insight as to why they found those images important. The form looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fan:</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture #s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Picture:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents would have filled out their demographic information as well as their favorite picture and information on why it’s a favorite. I would have filled in the picture numbers.
based on the numbers the camera assigns to the pictures. No one chose to participate in
this part of the study.

The second way in which audience members were able to participate was to email
or mail me their own pictures. I uploaded those pictures to the blog site. Participants
were asked to include basic demographic information and describe briefly their favorite
picture(s). My email was checked daily in order to identify submitted pictures. Every
person who responded was sent a thank you email and an attached copy of my consent
form.

The website was a blog site where I uploaded pictures and viewers could have
anonymously commented on the photographs (this was done by selecting ‘Anonymous’
in the drop down menu in the comments section). No one chose to comment. The site
was maintained by me, and the USF volleyball team had the ability to contribute on the
site. I also blogged about the games in order to make the site more interesting for
visitors.

All usable pictures that audience members submitted were printed in color and
coded by me. Only one picture was not usable because it did not contain any players or
coaches. Seven pictures were too blurry and wide so they were examined only for action
or passivity and presence of the net since that was the only information that could be
accurately ascertained.

Analysis was made up of several steps. First, images were looked at and overall
thoughts on the pictures recorded. This was done twice. Second, a coding sheet
(Appendix D) was created and pictures were analyzed a third and fourth time. All
photographs were coded for each category so some overlap occurred. Finally, pictures
were spread out and grouped in piles of “likeness.” Several categories of likeness emerged as pictures were grouped.

This study deviated from traditional photovoice studies because participants had the ability to comment on pictures by utilizing the blog site. In this way, the study was designed to allow those who wanted to contribute more to do so; the audience members had the ability to produce as much content as they wanted. The only participants were those who wanted to submit photos and only a brief amount of information.
APPENDIX F: SCHEDULE OF UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA HOME VOLLEYBALL GAMES

Friday Sept. 24, 7pm vs. Marquette
Sunday Sept. 26, 2pm vs. Syracuse
Friday Oct. 1, 7pm vs. Notre Dame
Sunday Oct. 3, 2pm vs. DePaul
Friday Oct. 29, 7pm vs. Seton Hall
Sunday Oct. 31, 12 pm vs. Rutgers
Thursday Nov. 11, 7pm vs. Florida Gulf Coast
Sunday Nov. 14, 2 pm vs. Villanova
I am a graduate student at USF, and I want your pictures of USF volleyball games to help
with my thesis study. You can help in two ways: using provided cameras or emailing
your own pictures. I have two stationary cameras located in the bleachers. You also can
e-mail me pictures from your own camera or phone. My email address is
apack@mail.usf.edu. All pictures will be uploaded to my fan blog site at
http://usfvb.blogspot.com/. In your email please include the following information:

• Your gender
• Your age
• Your race
• Are you a volleyball fan?
• Which school are you supporting?
• Attach picture(s) and include date of game(s)
• Please tell me which picture is your favorite and why

Please only include pictures from 2010 volleyball games. If you need assistance
attaching photographs into an email, please email me and I will send you instructions.
Your identity will be protected; it will not be included in the site or study. IRB study
#2258.

Thank you for your help!
APPENDIX H: CONSENT FORM REQUIRED BY USF IRB

Informed Consent to Participate in Research
Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Research Study

IRB Study # 2258

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Research studies include only people who choose to take part. This document is called an informed consent form. Please read this information carefully and take your time making your decision. Ask the researcher or study staff to discuss this consent form with you, please ask him/her to explain any words or information you do not clearly understand. We encourage you to talk with your family and friends before you decide to take part in this research study.

We are asking you to take part in a research study called: Fan Pictures

The person who is in charge of this research study is Alicia Pack. This person is called the Principal Investigator. However, other research staff may be involved and can act on behalf of the person in charge. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Kim Golombisky.

The research will be conducted at the Sun Dome Corral.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to:

- Evaluate fan pictures of women’s volleyball games
- This study is for a master’s thesis.

Study Procedures

If you take part in this study, you will be asked to:
• Take pictures of volleyball games and email them for use on a website.
• Comment on blog as willing.
• This information will be kept for 5 years.

Alternatives
You do not have to participate in this research study.

Benefits
We are unsure if you will receive any benefits by taking part in this research study.

Risks or Discomfort
This research is considered to be minimal risk. That means that the risks associated with this study are the same as what you face every day. There are no known additional risks to those who take part in this study.

Compensation
You will receive no payment or other compensation for taking part in this study.

Cost
There will be no additional costs to you as a result of being in this study.

How Do I Withdraw Permission to Use My Information?
You can revoke this form at any time by sending a letter clearly stating that you wish to withdraw your authorization to use your pictures and/or comments. If you revoke your permission:

• You will no longer be a participant in this research study;
• We will stop collecting new information about you;
• We will use the information collected prior to the revocation of your authorization. This information may already have been used or shared with other, or we may need it to complete and protect the validity of the research.

To revoke this form, please write to:

Principal Investigator Alicia Pack
For IRB Study # 2258

While we are conducting the research study, we cannot let you see or copy the research information we have about you. After the research is completed, you have a right to see the information about you, as allowed by USF policies.
Privacy and Confidentiality

We will keep your study records private and confidential. Certain people may need to see your study records. By law, anyone who looks at your records must keep them completely confidential. The only people who will be allowed to see these records are:

The research team, including the Principal Investigator, study coordinator, and all other research staff.

Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study. For example, individuals who provide oversight on this study may need to look at your records. This is done to make sure that we are doing the study in the right way. They also need to make sure that we are protecting your rights and your safety.

The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and its related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, staff in the USF Office of Research and Innovation, USF Division of Research Integrity and Compliance, and other USF offices who oversee this research.

- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research. This includes the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Florida Department of Health, and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP).

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your name. We will not publish anything that would let people know who you are.

Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal

You should only take part in this study if you want to volunteer. You should not feel that there is any pressure to take part in the study. You are free to participate in this research or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this study.

You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints

If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, or experience an adverse event or unanticipated problem, email Alicia Pack at apack@mail.usf.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, general questions, or have complaints, concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, call the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638.
## APPENDIX I: TABLE 2 BROKEN DOWN BY WEBSITE

### Table 2: Results broken down by website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Celeb</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>On court</th>
<th>Trivial</th>
<th>Infant</th>
<th>Sex.</th>
<th>Happy Face</th>
<th>Game Face</th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>Ball</th>
<th>Equip.</th>
<th>Up level</th>
<th>Down level</th>
<th>Eye level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Pictures (651)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Websites Only (574)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fan Pictures (77)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCAA Div. I (10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCAA Div. II (5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCAA Div. III (25)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BigEast.org (27)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cincinnati (26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut (19)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Celeb</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>On court</th>
<th>Trivial</th>
<th>Infant</th>
<th>Sex.</th>
<th>Happy Face</th>
<th>Game Face</th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>Ball</th>
<th>Equip.</th>
<th>Up level</th>
<th>Down level</th>
<th>Eye level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DePaul (20)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown (28)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville (41)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette (19)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame (74)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (119)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall (30)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s (46)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse (22) (2 graph)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF (33)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia (6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>