

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Tatjana V. Riba entitled “Applied Sport Psychology: Unearthing and Contextualizing a Dual Genealogy.”

I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Education.

Craig Wrisberg

Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Joy DeSensi

Diana Moyer

Mark Hector

Accepted for the Council:

Anne Mayhew

Vice Chancellor and Dean of
Graduate Studies

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Applied Sport Psychology: Unearthing and Contextualizing a Dual Genealogy

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Tatjana V. Riba

August, 2005

Copyright © 2005 by Tatiana V. Ryba
All rights reserved

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Vladimir Fiodorovich Ryba and Taisa Andreevna Ivanika. They *are* the beginning.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to the supervisor of this dissertation and my mentor, Dr. Craig Wrisberg, and members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Joy DeSensi, Dr. Diana Moyer and Dr. Mark Hector, for supporting, encouraging and pushing me beyond my intellectual barriers to produce my best work. I feel privileged to have as my mentor one of the most dedicated scholars in the field of sport psychology, who introduced me to and taught me about the beauty and excitement of research.

My very special thanks are reserved for Dr. Natalia Stambulova, Dr. Lydia Yevgenieva and Dr. Joan Paul, who unselfishly devoted their precious time and shared their unique expertise in order to support and advance my dissertation project.

I want to thank my friends and colleagues for shared laughs, stimulating discussions and peaceful silence. Special thanks to my feminist group, Kerrie Kauer, Elizabeth Slator, Karen Applebee, Amy Cotter, Vanessa Shannon, Alexis Lombard, Leslee Fisher, Joy DeSensi and Camille O'Bryant, for always being there for me during this incredibly complex period of my life journey. They helped to keep me (in)sane.

The departmental staff, Glenda Dills, Denise Howell, Frankie Stroud, Jo Allen, Earlene Ledbetter, Linda Pryor and Lori Fielden, have done so much over the years to make me feel welcome, supported and appreciated by this institution. I will miss them dearly.

My family deserves much more recognition than I can *ever* put on paper. The pain of separation, missed opportunities and overall sacrifices each of them has endured over the years is something I will always remember. I owe everything to my loved ones.

Namaste,
Tatiana Ryba

Abstract

In this dissertation, I trace the historical development of sport psychology and draw on multiple fields to rethink its taken-for-granted practices and future trajectories. Influenced by Foucault's (1977) genealogical approach to historical analysis, I challenge the conventions of linear chronology and provide competing narratives that highlight a set of discursive possibilities for the emergence of the psychology of sport. Though my focus is on a dual genealogy of applied sport psychology (i.e., American and Soviet discourses), I do not offer a new hegemonic discourse or origin story. Rather I attempt to provide a genealogical analysis of the (sub)discipline to show how and why sport psychology discourse has come to be the way it is performed today. Drawing on Foucault's (1982, 1995) conceptual understanding of the subject and of knowledge production, I approach the work of Avksenty Cezarevich Puni and Coleman Roberts Griffith as two sites of origins of (applied) sport psychology. My prime interest here is not so much in identifying these two scholars' individual practices as in uncovering the discursive formations of that historical conjuncture that shaped the way sport psychology has come to be conceptualized, theorized, practiced and institutionalized. I situate a dual genealogy of the discourse within global and local (i.e., *glocal*) particularities of the Cold War culture and socio-political practices in order to interrogate the interplay between the actual events and their representations in scholarly activities, particularly as they relate to the construction of oppositions and tensions between the Soviet and American discourses. I examine the implications of certain exclusions and inclusions for shaping current interpretations of international sport psychology within a broader context of national identity construction, deconstruction and reconstruction. My discourse analysis highlights rhetorical strategies aligned with technologies of institutional power and reveals the role of (sport) historiography in the production of a hierarchical and sealed system of knowledge. Each chapter of this dissertation holds a piece (or a fragmented narrative) of the historical analysis of the psychology of sport. The presentation of competing narratives of the past, the present and the future throughout the dissertation is aimed at "provoking [the field of sport psychology] into new moves and spaces where [it] hardly recognizes [itself] in becoming otherwise, the unforeseeable that [it is] already becoming" (Lather, 2003, p. 5). Finally, drawing on a recent co-authored paper with Handel Wright (Ryba & Wright, 2005), I attempt to articulate the intersection of sport psychology and cultural studies as one of the possible approaches to future work in sport psychology and put forward an argument for an integrated sport studies that includes (applied) sport psychology.

Table of Contents

Chapter One:	1
The Inward Path.....	1
Literature review	9
Purpose of the study.....	13
Significance of the study.....	13
Chapters' overview	15
Chapter Two:	17
Re-telling of the Past.....	17
What is the “linguistic turn,” anyway?	18
Dealing with this troubling turn.....	23
Is (sport) history dead or alive?	30
And what is discourse analysis, exactly?	32
Is the troubling worth the effort?	38
Chapter Three:	42
The Sport System of the Soviet Union: The Marriage of Science and Politics	42
Historical background of the Soviet system of physical education	43
Decrees of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Soviet government on the development of physical culture and sport	50
The role of public organizations in the development of physical culture and sport	54
VLKSM.....	54
DSO.....	56
DOSAAF.....	58
The function of the GTO program and All-Union Universal Sport Classification scheme in the sporting movement of the Soviet Union	58
Educational structure for preparing physical education teachers and professional coaches.....	61
Colleges of physical culture.....	62
Trainers' schools.....	62
Faculties of physical education.....	62
Institutes of physical culture.....	63
VShT	64
The role of science in the sport system of the Soviet Union	66
Biographical overview of Avksenty Cezarevich Puni (1898 – 1986)	73
Conclusion	78
Chapter Four:	80
Triangulation of American Physical Education, the Sporting Movement and	80
Sport Psychology	80
Timeline (1840s – 1890s)	81
Biographical overview of Coleman Roberts Griffith (1893 – 1966).....	84
Men's sporting programs	89
(White) Women's sporting programs	94

Historical underpinnings of the emergence of the current discourse of sport psychology	100
Chapter Five:.....	104
Battle between Different Discursive Regimes: the Sameness and the Other	104
New kind of questions	108
Emergence of sport psychology in the early works of Puni and Griffith	112
Comparative history of discontinuities	120
Discipline and genealogy	127
Who is the “other”?	131
Chapter Six:	139
From Mental Game to Cultural Praxis:.....	139
A Cultural Studies Model’s Implications for the Future of Sport Psychology	139
History of (applied) sport psychology: The American narrative	142
Future trajectories of sport psychology.....	146
What is cultural studies?	149
Cultural studies intersection with sport studies and (applied) sport psychology	152
The emerging model	157
The cultural studies “model” fosters applied sport psychology as cultural praxis	161
Conclusion	167
References.....	173
Vita.....	199

Chapter One

The Inward Path

The unique nature of dialogic relations. The problem of the inner dialogism. The seams of the boundaries between utterances. The problem of the double-voiced word. Understanding as dialogue.

Bakhtin, 1986, p. 119.

Why am I drawn to this project? What do I have to say? From what place do I speak? What role do my experience and identity play in becoming interested in these issues? Stuart Hall (1994) reminds us that “though we speak, so to say ‘in our own name’, of ourselves and from our own experience, nevertheless who speaks, and the subject who is spoken of, are never identical, never exactly in the same place” (p. 392). My identity as a performative “production” (Hall, 1994, p. 392) is in the process of becoming. The elusive fluidity of identity constituted within constantly shifting discursive fields problematises the rhetoric of authenticity (Hall, 1994; Wright, 2003). The fact that my cultural identity shares or identifies with some historical and cultural codes of what Foucault following the Annales school calls (Soviet) *mentalite* does not automatically assign the authority of authenticity to my account nor grant me epistemological privilege. I speak here from what I conceive as *lived historical knowledge*, not “an essence but a *positioning*” (Hall, 1994, p. 395), in a reflexive effort to trace the origins¹ of both my subjectivity and applied sport psychology, both of which have no guarantee.

¹ I use the word “origin” in plural to signify Foucault’s rejection of “origin stories or essences” (Cole, 1998, p. 267) in the course of uninterrupted continuities in favor of “multiplication or pluralisation of causes” (Foucault, 1991, p. 76) in contingent historical beginnings.

I heard the other day on TV someone ruminating about his fascination with how vivid and detailed some of his memories were. Clear as a picture. And how blurred and untraceable others were. Like a dull story.

One of my earliest memories is when I am three years old. I remember the night when I saw Maya Plisetskaya² starring as Odette-Odile in the *Swan Lake*—a ballet by Tchaikovsky. The show was broadcast on TV past my bed time. I am glued to a small black-and-white screen, refusing to go to bed. Am I mesmerized by graceful ballerinas performing in what appears to be an ephemeral celestial dance? Or rather I am a captive of athletic and fiery Maya who is weaving a tilt of bravado into her dance. My mother decided not to argue with me because I would soon fall asleep anyway. To her surprise, I watch the show to the very end. I don't even know the story behind the dance but it doesn't seem to matter.

Something profound happened that night. Ballet became a passion of my life...and my unfulfilled dream. I begged my parents to send me to a specialized school for little ballerinas. However, ballet was such an elitist art form that even for my highly educated parents, my request seemed to be an outrageous idea. Instead, my mom convinced me that I could not possibly be a ballerina because I was not naturally flexible.

² Maya Plisetskaya, a renowned Soviet ballerina, choreographer and teacher, was born in 1925 into a Jewish theatrical dynasty. Known for her plasticity and powerful leaps, Plisetskaya was accepted as a soloist by the Bolshoi Theatre immediately after her graduation from the ballet school in 1943. She danced *Swan Lake* over 800 times, making first Odette-Odile and then Michel Fokine's *The Dying Swan* (created for Anna Pavlova) her signature roles. [Much of this information is obtained from http://great.russian-women.net/Maya_Plisetskaya.shtml]

For years it became my mantra. To the question, “What do you want to be when you grow up?” my answer was, “I want to be a ballerina but I’m not flexible enough.”

How do you *write* postmodern? What form would it take? My subjectivity is very much embedded in the complexities of this project, in the unpatterned jagged moves between experiential and autobiographical, methodological and theoretical. Inserting researcher’s subjectivity into the text, however, does not make the writing postmodern. Is the challenge then one that revolves around form, structure and organization? Lather and Smithies (1997) have created what some would consider a postmodern text by means of a format that by “moving from inside to outside, across different levels and a multiplicity and complexity of layers [...] unfold[s] an event which exceeds [their] frames of reference, [...] their own understandings, [...] to speak beyond [their] means” (p. xvi).

Very few sport studies scholars have experimented with postmodern performativity (c.f., Kohn & Sydnor, 1998; McGannon, Stephens, & Johnson, 2004; Sydnor, 1998). Or put another way, very few sport studies texts have crossed the censorship of gatekeepers. These authors’ preoccupation with a kaleidoscope of fragmented images, a patched together multiplicity of expressive techniques and styles, hyperreality, a theoretical pasticcio, imagined words that my laptop reads as misspelled, and a raw “display [of] the seams of [their] construction” (cited in Sydnor, 1998) aims to expose, provoke, challenge, convey, politicize, creep under your skin, and evoke in the hope of triggering uncomfortable understanding. “Understanding as dialogue” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 119).

*Of grandfatherly gentleness I'm devoid,
There's not a single grey hair in my soul!
Thundering the world with the might of my
Voice,
I go by—handsome, twenty-two-year-old.*

Vladimir Mayakovsky³ "Cloud in Trousers," 1915

Read it and envy. I'm a citizen of the Soviet Union.

Vladimir Mayakovsky "Verses about the Soviet passport," 1929

*Agitprop
sticks
in my teeth too,
and I'd rather
compose
romances for you—
more profit in it
and more charm.*

³ Vladimir Mayakovsky (1894 – 1930), a talented poet and writer, prominent member of literary futurists group *Hylaea* and co-editor of *Lef* (Left Front for the Arts), became an embodiment of the Russian avant-garde. Mayakovsky passionately embraced the Russian revolution and devoted himself to (re)construction of the new socialist culture and society, willingly sacrificing his lyrical poems for the propagandist slogans, leaflets and newspaper couplets to further the Soviet culture. He shot himself on April 14, 1930. [Much of this information is obtained from http://www.vor.ru/culture/cultarch29_eng.html]

*But I
subdued
myself,
setting my heel
on the throat
of my own song.*

Vladimir
Mayakovsky
“At the Top
of My Voice,”
1930

For the last three years I have been collaborating with Dr. Craig Wrisberg and Dr. Natalia Stambulova on a project that is quite ambitious. Influenced by the cultural studies notion that it is always difficult if not dangerous and misleading to pinpoint specific and singular moments and figures of origins of disciplines (Ryba & Wright, 2005), we have attempted to historicize the psychology of sport against the established linear flow of the North American narrative. The alternative articulation of sport psychology examines the theorization of Avksenty Cezarevich Puni (1898 – 1986), a prominent Russian sport psychologist, who made a profound impact on the development of sport psychology in the Soviet Union and whose influence persists to the present day in Russia and other East European countries.

In the first essay “The Russian origins of sport psychology: a translation of an early work of A. C. Puni” (Ryba, Stambulova, & Wrisberg, 2005), we discuss Puni’s innovative ideas of psychological preparation of athletes based on his classic paper “Psychological preparation of athletes for a competition” that was published in 1963. We disrupt the traditional historical narrative by juxtaposing Russian and English historical texts, Puni’s original writings (including documents from his personal archives), and oral history. Dr. Stambulova, who worked closely with Puni as an undergraduate student, doctoral student and colleague in the Department of Sport Psychology at the Lesgaft Institute, provides invaluable insights into the intricate sophistication of Puni’s thought.

In the sequel to this paper (Stambulova, Wrisberg, & Ryba, under review), we provide a comparative evolution of two traditions, i.e., the Soviet and North American, in applied sport psychology. We contextualize Puni’s pioneering work within the specific socio-political and historical context of his era and highlight the sport psychological activity taking place in North America during the same time period. The concluding section maps some of the cornerstone theoretical, practical and professional issues sport psychologists have faced in the decades since Puni developed his model of Psychological Preparation for a Competition and suggests some ways future models might expand on Puni’s view of the provision of psychological assistance for athletes.



The imagery of *sankofa* discussed by Derrick Alridge (2003) resonates with me. The Adinkra (West African) symbol of sankofa is often associated with the sankofa

bird—a bird that looks behind it. Though the bird moves forward, it constantly looks back to its past symbolizing “return to the past to go forward” (p. 29). In methodological terms, Alridge asserts that sankofa reminds historians “to think of history not as events frozen in time, but rather as occurrences that are one with the present and future” (p. 29). By analogy, the circular symbol of sankofa invokes Foucault’s (1972) notion of archeology, i.e., history is like the site of archeological excavations at which one digs in different directions, unearthing layers of cultural formations. Intertextuality of historical layers that draw upon, appropriate and dialogue with each other brings together the past, the present and the future.⁴

My intellectual history in terms of sport psychology has been an integral part of my life’s journey. Indeed, because my parents were high-level athletic coaches, insights and observations about the psychology of competition have been pouring into my mind since childhood, and they now provide me with a wellspring of inspiration for my current academic and professional goals.

My real biography begins in a sector of the world which is usually unfamiliar to most Americans. My parents were born in the Ukraine during World War II. They met in Kyiv, the Ukrainian capital, where both were students of the Institute of Physical Culture. After graduation, my father became a soccer coach; my mother became a track-and-field athletics coach (both earned a five-year university degree), and then I was born.

⁴ Yet another interpretation of sankofa is “we must go back and *reclaim* our past so we *can* move forward; so we understand why and how we came to be who we are today” (emphasis added). Stemming from this reading of the symbol, sankofa is used as a platform for (diasporic) West Africans to interrogate into European historians’ distortion, misrepresentation and even erasure of their stories and subjectivities. [Much of this information is obtained from <http://www.sankofa.com/about.shtml>].

Both of my parents became well-established in their respective fields in the Ukraine, and because they attained such a high level of professional expertise, they were invited to Latvia by the Sports Committee of Latvia when I was seven years old. Later, after six years in Latvia, they were sent by the Republic of Latvia to an elite, two-year training program, i.e., the *VShT*, for the best coaches of the entire Soviet Union. This was a tremendous honor for our whole family. (As an example, during the 14 years of this program's existence, *VShT* graduated only five soccer coaches, two track and field coaches, and one hockey coach from Latvia).

I grew up immersed in the world of sports; indeed, my first memory is of running track with my mother's athletes. At home, my parents were always discussing methods and techniques of coaching, so, inevitably as I matured, I often thought about how to enhance athletic performance. Furthermore, I spent so much time with my mother at the track that it was quite natural for me to start practicing and competing in track at the age of six. My mother encouraged me and, as it turned out, it seems that I had a genuine talent for sprinting, and later for running hurdles.

In the first year of my high-school athletic career, I intuitively started using visualization to master and sharpen my grasp of the technical nuances of the hurdle race. I instantly knew that I was ready to perform as soon as I could clearly see myself, in my mind, doing exactly what I wanted to accomplish. In general, my understanding of and interest in sport psychology was exclusively from an applied perspective. I was particularly interested in various mental strategies to facilitate the learning and retention of motor skills, and to provide coping skills for pre-competition anxiety.

A journey to the past. You never know what the before now will reveal to you, what artifacts you collect along the way. “No one ever comes back [...] empty-handed from that destination” (Jenkins, 2003 p. 11).

Literature review

FACTS:

Founding fathers	Avksenty Cezarevich Puni (1898 – 1986), Leningrad school Piotr Antonovich Roudik (1893 – 1983), Moscow school Coleman Roberts Griffith (1893 – 1966), North American school
1920	Griffith receives a Ph.D. in (experimental) psychology
1923	Griffith designs and teaches a Psychology in Athletics course at the University of Illinois
1925	First sport psychology laboratory is established in the Soviet Union (Piotr Roudik, Moscow State Central Institute of Physical Culture)
1925	First sport psychology laboratory is established in North America (Coleman Griffith, University of Illinois)
1927	Puni conducts his first study examining the psycho-physiological effects of training in the sport of table tennis
1928	Griffith publishes his classic book <i>Psychology and Athletics</i>
1932	Griffith’s Research in Athletics Laboratory is shut down

1938	Griffith is hired as a sport psychologist by the Chicago Cubs professional baseball team
1938	Puni receives a Ph.D. in pedagogy
1938	Griffith finishes his research project with the Chicago Cubs, which marks the end of his career as a sport psychologist
1946	Puni organizes and launches the Department of Sport Psychology in the Lesgaft Institute
1952	Triumphant appearance of the Soviet team at the Olympic Games in Helsinki; contributing role of sport psychology is acknowledged
1952	Puni receives a second Ph.D. in (sport) psychology
early 1950s – late 1970s	Rivalry continues between Roudik and Puni for the role of acknowledged leader in the field
mid-1960s	Puni develops a Psychological Preparation for a Competition (PPC) model
mid-1960s	(Re)birth of North American sport psychology within departments of physical education, kinesiology and/or leisure studies

EARLY RESEARCH KEYWORDS: scientific methods; experiment; motor learning; psychomotor skills; psychological characteristics of sports; ideomotor training; organism; personality; nervous system; Marxist psychological science; volition; tactical preparation; historical materialism; competition; psychological preparation

INTERPRETATION:

Despite some apparent philosophical and ideological differences in the approaches taken by Griffith and Puni, there were a number of similarities and intersections in both individuals' early conceptualizations of the psychology of sport. Sport psychology of that period was a distinctly masculine scientific discourse, rooted in physiological psychology. It attempted to bridge the gap between science and practice by bringing the latest scientific advances in psychology to the athletic field but at the same time tested theoretical and/or experimental psychological knowledge through practical application.

Over the succeeding years, the psychology of sport took different routes in the United States and the Soviet Union, substantially evolved and shifted its focus a number of times (both theoretically and methodologically as well as in terms of the research/application balance), and recently converged again in a global discourse. As Gill (2000) observed, North American sport psychology has shifted its focus from an emphasis on basic research in the broader social psychology paradigm to applied work with athletes. Meanwhile, East European sport psychology, which tended to emphasize the provision of performance enhancement services for elite athletes, has become more involved in research and practice in health and exercise psychology with diverse populations. Thus, the global sport psychological discourse appears now to “share a similar research-application balance” (Gill, 2000, p. 229).

The project of my dissertation is to historicize further the field of applied sport psychology. Various (post)modern discourses in sport psychology point to the fact that

sport in general and sport psychology in particular are not fixed monolithic formations but have a history that reflects sociocultural politics and is related to efforts at social engineering (Wright & Ryba, under review). In other words, the meanings of sport and sport psychology “always already” have an initial sociocultural purpose that has been shifting over time to reflect dominant social values and cultural practices. Stuart Hall (1996b) has coined this phenomenon a “floating” signifier. Instead of approaching the psychology of sport in its totality using historical examples to legitimize the existing practices, my task is to disrupt this neat linear narrative by putting forward multiple, competing and shifting narratives and interpretations.

My project is aligned with Foucault’s genealogical approach which is based on Nietzsche’s vision of history. Influenced by Nietzsche’s tactic of the presentation of difference, Foucault has rejected the Hegelian view of history as progress (Foucault, 1977). Instead, he is interested in discontinuities, ruptures, possibilities and irrationalities. In genealogical analysis, Foucault goes back in time until a difference is detected. Then he carefully maps the transformations, preserving the “discontinuities as well as connection” (Sarup, 1989, p. 63). In *Madness and Civilization*, for example, Foucault locates a social space of the replacement of the “madship” by the “madhouse” (Sarup, 1989). During the Renaissance, it was an accepted practice to put the mad (i.e., insane) on a ship as it was commonly known that insanity got along with the sea. By the second half of the 17th century Europe, however, madness along with unemployment and poverty began to be viewed as a form of idleness and the great sin. To deal with that problem, houses of correction were created throughout Europe. The unemployed, the insane, the sick and the criminal were placed in a corrective institution; they “had the right to be fed,

but [they had to] accept the physical and moral constraint of confinement” (Foucault, 1967, p. 48) and the moral obligation to work. Foucault further argues that “the new meaning [was] assigned to poverty” and “the importance given to the obligation to work, and all the ethical values that [were] linked to labour, ultimately determined the experience of madness and inflected its course” (p. 64). In *Madness and Civilization*, genealogy, as a critical discursive examination, is used to undermine the rationality of legitimized and taken-for-granted contemporary practices.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is neither “corrective” (Wright, 2004a) nor additive. The study does not intend to “correct” existing versions of the history of sport psychology nor to add an alternative narrative to the body of historical knowledge. Rather it attempts to provide a genealogical analysis of the (sub)discipline to show how and why sport psychology discourse has come to be the way it is performed today.

Significance of the study

This dissertation presents an argument that sport psychology has evolved and established itself as a singular discipline positioned, at best, on the margins of interdisciplinary sport studies. I argue that a modern historical rendering of sport psychology is sustained by a sense of inevitable progress that creates and further legitimizes and naturalizes the existing practices. The significance of this project is not in its attempt to identify the roots of sport psychology but in the attempt to map “floating”

signifiers in sport psychology and articulate a paradigm shift that I believe is necessary for sport psychology scholars to make; from a scientific approach to the study of human performativity to a postmodern approach to understating of the psychology of sport.

In an attempt to reconcile my subject position, I queer into the *in-betweenness* of my existence. I was born in Russia, spent my early childhood in Ukraine, adolescence and early adulthood in Latvia, and my years of post-graduate education in the United States. I therefore conceive my life experience to be that of a nomad. Rosi Braidotti (1994) contends that nomadic consciousness “consists in not taking any kind of identity as permanent. The nomad is only passing through; s/he makes those necessarily situated connections that can help her/him to survive, but s/he never takes on fully the limits of one national, fixed identity. The nomad has no passport—or has too many of them” (p. 33). In my own academic work, this nomadic consciousness has posed a perplexing problem of how to conduct reliable qualitative research while negotiating my subject position and my identification with multiple, competing and even conflicting cultural codes. Exposing my personal history, nevertheless, has no intent to allow my personal voice to substitute for a rigorous, theoretically informed, politicized intellectual endeavor. Instead, acknowledging my *lived historical knowledge* contextualizes and advances my reflexivity.

Chapters' overview

In *Chapter Two* I discuss the theoretical and methodological influences for my interdisciplinary but predominantly historiographical study. Specifically, I explain how poststructuralist and postmodern theorizing in general and Foucault's work in particular influence the dissertation. Therefore, I situate the study within larger debates in history and sport history surrounding the possibilities and challenges of poststructuralism and postmodernism. I critique the hegemonic way of the historical process in (sport) historiography and discuss the disciplinary implications of the postmodern challenge, which encompasses the "linguistic turn," the "cultural turn" and the "rhetoric turn" (Phillips, 2001; Poster, 1997). Finally, I address the specific methodological strategies employed in the disciplinary analysis of applied sport psychology.

In *Chapters Three and Four* I explore and trace the Russian and American origins of organized sporting movements, respectively. More specifically, I attempt to contextualize the emergence of sport psychology within specific socio-political and cultural contexts (i.e., Russian/Soviet and American). Respective historical narratives, covering the major shifts in national and global social formations, and brief biographical overviews of Puni and Griffith contextualize further a dual genealogy of sport psychology. The primary interest of the study is not so much in identifying these two scholars' practices as in uncovering the discursive formations of that historical conjuncture that shaped the way sport psychology is/has been conceptualized, theorized, practiced and institutionalized.

In *Chapter Five* I provide a discourse analysis of applied sport psychology. Here, I attempt to unearth the intricate discursive constructedness of the (sub)discipline in and through the secondary literature dealing with the history of sport psychology. Arguing from the “inside/outside” position, I assert that the modern discourse of sport psychology has been constructed on the oppositional binary, infused with national identity politics, and sustained by mutual exclusions that give meaning to each category in structuring the relationship between Russian/Soviet and American sport psychology.

Finally, in *Chapter Six* I shift the focus of discussion on the theorization of the intersection of sport psychology with cultural studies as a discursive site of cultural praxis. Such an articulation contributes to bridging the dichotomies between academic and applied work, theory and practice, text and lived culture. In a word, “sport psychology as cultural praxis” (Ryba & Wright, 2005) is a form of sport psychology that has evolved from being a single discipline to one that represents a broader work in sport studies; that is interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, focused on issues of sociocultural difference and justice (with a particular emphasis on a reconceptualization of the athlete’s identity); that blends theoretical and practice work together in praxis; and that favors qualitative research approaches (especially what Patti Lather (1991) has called *research as praxis* and other forms of progressive qualitative research). I argue, therefore, that cultural studies paradigm provides one of several interrelated trajectories for future work in sport psychology.

Chapter Two

Re-telling of the Past

...all history is really historiography (the accumulation of the writings that make up our representations and presentations of the past) and is always self-referencing in terms of its own credibility [...]

Jenkins, 2003, p. 11.

Any discourse that pretends to be critical of the prevailing order, call it “modern” or call it “capitalist,” must begin by putting this figure of the self into question. This is what social and political historians have not been able to do, and this is the exact purpose of cultural history in its poststructuralist versions.

Poster, 1997, pp. 4-5.

In response to the general absence of self-reflexivity in the sport studies literature and/or calls for a questioning of the role of the author in knowledge production (c.f., Andrews, 2000; Moyer, 2001; Poster, 1997), in this chapter I discuss the theoretical and methodological influences for my interdisciplinary, but predominantly historiographical, dissertation project. In this research, I attempt to locate the emergence of sport psychology historically and then, drawing on cultural history, feminist poststructuralism, cultural studies of sport and Foucault’s discourse analysis, deconstruct my own writing in an effort to examine how the sport psychology discourse is both an object/subject of and subjected to a conjunction of multiple discursive activities. While critical debates surrounding the possibilities and challenges of poststructuralist and postmodern theorizing are considered passé in various fields of the humanities and social sciences, contemporary sport psychologists still appear to be reluctant to engage with the philosophical, epistemological and methodological issues raised by poststructuralism(s).

Influenced by Foucault's work in particular, I critique, therefore, the hegemonic way of the historical process in (sport) histor(y)iography and discuss the disciplinary implications of the postmodern challenge, which encompass the "linguistic turn," the "cultural turn" and the "rhetoric turn" (Phillips, 2001; Poster, 1997). Finally, I address the specific methodological strategies that have been employed in the disciplinary analysis of applied sport psychology.

What is the "linguistic turn," anyway?

History in general and sport history in particular have been deeply affected by a period of interdisciplinary cross-fertilization, followed by a profound crisis of representation in the social sciences and humanities. Issues of social difference have become very important, giving rise to research methodologies that include critical, feminist, and postcolonial epistemologies as well as epistemologies of color (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Such epistemologies have produced a shift in the analytical structures of perception and reason as well as in the conceptualization of knowledge and methods of inquiry. Of particular interest are the challenges and possibilities of the poststructuralist strand of thought and the "linguistic turn" for historiography.

Poststructuralism as an umbrella discourse encompasses a number of diverse theoretical positions developed by Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Julia Kristeva, Jacques Lacan, Luce Irigaray and others (Rail, 1998; Sarup, 1989). Though these critical thinkers vary considerably in their politics and theoretical perspectives, they share several fundamental assumptions about language, meaning and subjectivity. They also emphasize and hold as their central concern, text as a form of knowledge production. Therefore,

these concepts are pivotal to the approach I use in my work. In the remainder of this section, I discuss these concepts primarily in the context of Foucault's work.

Drawing on the structuralist linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure, who argued that language presupposes an inherent structure and that when this structure is imposed on the natural world it constitutes social reality, poststructuralism(s) asserts that meaning is constructed within the language of historically specific discourses (Weedon, 1997). Taking further Saussure's ground-breaking challenge to the arbitrary connection between signifiers and signified, poststructuralist theorists, namely Derrida and Foucault, contend that meaning is not locked in the "signifier-signified" couplet but shifts from context to context. Derrida's work on the structure and function of language is particularly important for exposing the instability and ambiguity of language. He argues that there is no stable definable distinction between signifiers and signified; therefore, the meaning of the sign is identified by what the sign is *not* and in that sense is "always already inhabited by the trace of another sign" (Sarup, 1989, p. 36). The following quote represents Sarup's cogent explanation of Derrida's argument:

Suppose you want to know the meaning of a signifier, you can look it up in the dictionary; but all you will find will be yet more signifiers, whose signified you can in turn look up, and so on. The process is not only infinite but somehow circular; signifiers keep transforming into signifieds, and vice versa, and you never arrive at a final signified which is not a signifier in itself (p. 35).

Thus, instead of confining meaning in a sign, poststructuralists situate signifiers in a discursive context that opens meaning to reinterpretation and change with shifts in the variety of discursive fields. As Weedon (1997) asserts: "[...] language [in

poststructuralist theory] is understood in terms of competing discourses, [and] competing ways of giving meaning to the world, which imply differences in the organization of social power [...]” (p. 23). In other words, historical experience is produced within discourse.

Foucault’s work has been extremely influential in the development of discourse theories. He uses the term discourse as an amalgam notion that signifies a wide range of meanings: “sometimes as the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements” (Foucault, 1972, p. 80). The third reading of discourse as rule-guided practices embedded in institutional and social contexts, which produce and circulate texts of power, is arguably the most significant one. In discourse theoretical work, however, these different readings of the term are often used interchangeably and/or intertextually.

Furthermore, Mills (2003) has asserted that discourse is not synonymous with language nor is there a direct relation between discourse and reality. She argues that discourse should be “seen as a system that structures the way that we perceive reality” (p. 55). For example, Nashwa van Houts’ (2003) historiographical study demonstrates how the “vision of reality” regarding Muslim immigration in Britain has shifted from a race-identified representation of immigrants in 1978 to a religious-based identification in 1989. Van Houts examined two British papers, *The Guardian* and the *Times*, to trace the evolution of immigration and assimilation discourse in general and Muslim immigrants’ representation in particular and asserts that three events, i.e., Thatcher’s 1978 intention to end immigration, the 1979 Iranian revolution and the 1989 Salman Rushdie affair, were

crucial to the changes in language, attitudes and signifying markers, used to portray Muslim immigrants in the press during that time period. Van Houts' historical and historiographical analyses of the variety of discursive practices reveal how historical knowledge was (re)produced and (re)circulated by British newspapers, linking Islamic fundamentalists of the Iranian revolution with the large Muslim immigrant population in Britain, and thus, "systematically form[ing] the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972, p. 49).

In poststructuralist theory, language is also theorized as a discursive site where subjectivity is constructed. Subjectivity, according to Weedon's (1997) interpretation of the term, "refer[s] to the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world" (p. 32). Poststructuralist's conceptualization of subjectivity as fragmented, contradictory, fluid and in process constitutes a crucial break from the liberal humanist belief in essential subjectivity (Braidotti, 1994; Irigaray, 1997). Foucault as well as many other poststructuralist critics, attack the Enlightenment discourses of the unified rational subject, who has agency and control over his or her life. The liberal humanist conception of the individual presupposes a predetermined authentic essence that makes the individual what he or she is (Weedon, 1997). Humanist discourses stem from the scientific assumptions of reality, objectivity and truth, subscribing to the idea of a singular true reality that can be accessed by means of rationality and modes of scientific thinking. Contrary to the humanist essence of subjectivity, Foucault proposes the subject as an "effect of power relations" (Mills, 2003, p. 107).

Drawing on Foucault's work, feminist poststructuralists assert that subjectivity is textual and a product of the society and culture within a certain historical context. The constant fragmentation of subjectivity is due to a whole range of competing, contradictory and overlapping discursive practices (e.g., social, economic, political, etc.), in which subjectivity is (re)produced (Weedon, 1997). The political implications of de-centering the subject and conceptualizing subjectivity as the product of historically specific, discursive sociocultural relations, is that it opens both subjectivity and the process of its construction to change and historical investigation.

The poststructuralist move away from essentialism allows, moreover, for a much more complex and nuanced sociocultural analysis of identity and identification, experience, knowledge production and power relation that does not subvert difference within a certain social group and that accounts for a variety of experiences among members of the group. In terms of history and historiography, it becomes questionable to rely on the rationality of the historian in an attempt to discover and explain so-called historical truth. Derrida and Foucault have challenged the sense of inevitable progress of history sustained by exclusions of certain themes and rational explanation of the reasons for historical change. These reasons, Poster (1997) asserts, "erase differences between the present and the past, linking the two in a chain of continuity" (p. 29). On the contrary, Foucault's genealogical approach emphasizes differences and discontinuities in the past in order to trouble and undermine the naturalized and legitimized present.

Dealing with this troubling turn

Structuralism and poststructuralism “with rapturous playfulness” (Appleby, Hunt, & Jacob, 1994, p. 268) challenge the positivistic assumptions of reality, objectivity and truth, and raise some important questions, such as: What is the relationship between the past and the present? How is the historian situated in the historical text? What are the implications of the elusive nature of language? Is it even possible for the historian to capture lived experience of the past?

When faced with the “reality” of historical conjuncture, the field of history exploded. Heated interchanges between the proponents and opponents of postmodern philosophy and poststructuralism exposed and problematised the complex and multifaceted dynamics of conceptual, political, methodological and practical discourses, which historians employ in the production of knowledge. Lyotard’s use of the term postmodern as “incredulity toward metanarratives” (cited in Poster, 1997, p. 66) contested a scientific historical process of producing a coherent master narrative of the past. For Lyotard, small narratives that give voice to different marginalized groups further justice and provide a richer account of the past. Thus, the crisis surrounding the “linguistic turn” drew attention to the very issues of power and representation previously raised by revisionist historians, namely that power to represent “selves” and misrepresent and/or exclude “others” in and from the historical text lies within the dominant social groups.

One of the books that attempted to deal with the challenges and possibilities of a postmodern history was *Telling the Truth About History*, written by three prominent historians, Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt and Margaret Jacobs. In this book, the authors

attempt to “provide general readers, history students, and professional historians with some sense of the debates currently raging about history’s relationship to scientific truth, objectivity, postmodernism, and the politics of identity” (1994, pp. 9-10). Despite the plausible intent to further historical knowledge by addressing postmodern critique and (re)evaluate the nature of historical truth, Appleby, Hunt and Jacobs appear to take another route when they state that: “Professional historians have been so successfully socialized by demands to publish that we have little time or inclination to participate in general debates about the meaning of our work” (p. 9). This resistance to self-reflexivity is generally reflective of the prevalent approach to historical knowledge and scholarship. Some historians regard reflexivity to be “futile diversions from the ‘real’ labor of gathering, sorting, and representing so-called facts” (Poster, 1997, pp. 48-49).

In the first couple chapters of their book, Appleby et al. (1994) effectively situate contemporary history within larger debates about science. The authors provide an extensive overview of three intellectual absolutisms: (a) the heroic model of science, (b) scientific history and the idea of modernity, and (c) the role of history in shaping national identity. The heroic model of science refers to the Enlightenment project, which had revolutionary implications for cultural and political life in the late 17th – early 18th century. In the argument that history can discover the laws of human development, the second intellectual absolutism endorses scientific models of investigation in the search for historical truth. Finally, the third absolutism unreflectively assumes history’s responsibility/contribution to nation building and construction of a sense of national unity and pride.

In the chapters that follow, however, Appleby et al. (1994) spend little time examining the issues of validity and rigor of current historical discourse. Moreover, they provide no analysis of the disciplinary methods used to evaluate current historical practices and knowledge production. Such “negligence” serves the authors well in their “moral” defense of historical truth against the “nihilism” of questionable postmodern theory. Appleby et al. (1994) further charge Foucault and Derrida with the “descent into discourse” (to appropriate the title of Brian Palmer’s book) and the reduction of reality to the language of “words dancing, cascading, colliding, escaping, deceiving, [and] hiding” (Appleby et al., 1994, p. 268). Yet Derrida somewhere else (in Kearney, 1984) forcefully refutes the critics who insist that his theorizing is an attempt to demonstrate that “there is nothing beyond language.” As he asserts: “I totally refuse the label of nihilism which has been ascribed to me and my American colleagues. Deconstruction is not an enclosure in nothingness, but an openness towards the other” (pp. 123-124).

After attacking several tenets of postmodernism and poststructuralism, Appleby et al. (1994) conclude that “postmodern history too often seems to consist of denunciation of history as it has been” (p. 236) and therefore “there can be no postmodern history” (p. 237). Overall, *Telling the Truth About History* contains a defensive overtone and fails to thoroughly examine and/or discuss the possibilities, in terms of new methodologies and epistemologies that emerged from postmodernism and poststructuralism.

On the other hand, some highly respected historians, such as Keith Jenkins, Mark Poster and Joan Scott, embraced postmodern challenges and appropriated postmodern and poststructuralist theories in order to reflect on what the “linguistic,” “cultural” and/or “rhetoric” turn(s) meant for history. Building on the advances of social history that has

attempted to deconstruct grand “his-story” to give voice to “her-story” and “history from below,” these progressive scholars focus on describing the mechanisms through which marginalized subjects are constituted as the “other” and positioned “outside the couplet truth-real” (Poster, 1997, p. 5). Most importantly, poststructuralist theorizing heightened historians’ questioning of the ability of history to reconstruct the past, since the only vantage point to access “the before now” is the text. On this point Jenkins (2003) compellingly argues that:

...it is patently obvious that it is historians who create history and that ‘the past’ which they carve-up into meaning is utterly promiscuous. [...] Because the so-called past (the before now) doesn’t exist ‘meaningfully’ prior to the efforts of historians to impose upon it a structure or form; ‘the before now’ is utterly shapeless and knows of no significance of its own either in terms of its whole or its parts before it is ‘figured out’ by us. Consequently, no historian or anyone else acting as if they were a historian ever returns from his or her trip to ‘the past’ without precisely the historicisation they wanted to get; no one ever comes back surprised or empty-handed from that destination (pp. 10-11).

Thus, the postmodern notion of “disappearance of the author and the historical actor as a coherent subject” (Wilson, 1999, p. 113) and Foucault’s conceptualization of power, knowledge and “eventalisation” (i.e., “multiplication or pluralisation of causes,” Foucault, 1991, p. 76) in the hands of postmodern historians have led to the acknowledgment that history consists of discontinuities and breaks in the linear chains of events and is embedded in power relations. Therefore, history is never politically neutral but is “always already” from a certain perspective. Joan Scott, whose work was deeply

influenced by Derrida and Foucault's theorizing, urges a rethinking of the very foundations of the discipline of history and recognizes that historical knowledge "is conflictual, political, [and] that certain themes are constructed through the exclusion and suppression of others" (cited in Moyer, 2001, p. 48).

In light of the discussed debates that demystified the process of knowledge production in historiography and that exposed the construction of meaning by means of "othering" marginalized discourses, reflexivity becomes a crucial link in the postmodern text's interruption of "othering." Inserting the author's subjectivity through "a messy series of questions about methods, ethics, and epistemologies" (Fine, 1994, p. 70) illuminates a political act of creating and interpreting the text. Many critical qualitative researchers working within the cultural studies paradigm (e.g., Patti Lather and Handel Wright) as well as postmodern historians (e.g., Mark Poster and Diana Moyer) view reflexivity as responsibility and an integral part of "always already" political social research.

During the period when mainstream history was raging with debates about the future of history, sport historians did not appear to be preoccupied with the challenges posited by postmodernism and poststructuralism. Nauright (1999) asserts that in sport history, main debates have revolved around "whether sports history should stand alone as a distinct or discrete field, or whether there are greater advantages in pursuing a more encompassing and interdisciplinary sports studies that links more to cultural studies than to social history" (p. 6). The antagonistic polemics between historians and sociologists of sport expose some of the problematic principles of sport history, such as the perennial danger of atheoretical historical writing that "let[s] the facts speak for themselves"

(Phillips, 2001). Though these divisive debates have prompted some to announce the “end of sports history,” (a theme reflective of a broader trend in the social sciences and humanities), they haven’t sparked a (re)evaluation of the fundamental methodological, epistemological and ontological assumptions prevalent in the history of sport. As Phillips (2001) argues, “precious little is written about the fundamental tenets that govern the production of knowledge” (p. 327) in sport history.

Nevertheless, since the 1990s there appears to be an isolated but crucial shift towards the theoretically informed sport historical texts that are situated within the broader cultural studies paradigm. This “cultural turn” trend is evident in the work of Michael Oriard, Richard Gruneau, Jennifer Hargreaves, Steve Pope and Synthia Sydnor, to name but a few. Some have credited Gruneau, a sociologist, for broaching a theoretically more rigorous approach to historical analysis (Pope, 1997). Pope further argues that Gruneau’s work, grounded in the British Marxist cultural studies tradition, introduces issues of power relations and class struggle in sport as an inevitable historical process, which is reflective of the capitalist relations of production.

Likewise, influenced by the progressive cultural and social theories of Raymond Williams and Antonio Gramsci and neo-Marxist feminist work, sport sociologist Jennifer Hargreaves initiated the socio-historical study of gender and the body in the field of sport history. Instead of approaching women’s sporting practices simply as a reflection of women’s oppression in the patriarchal discourse, Hargreaves (1990) disrupts a cohesive unproblematical category of “women” by broaching issues of class and race as critical dynamic categories of power relations. In addition, working with the Gramscian notion of hegemony, Hargreaves contends that some women and men have resisted oppressive

practices in sport and that throughout history, male domination in sport and athletics has never been hermetically sealed.

The hallmark of the “cultural turn” in sport history appears to be Oriard’s (1993) *Reading football: how the popular press created an American spectacle*, which maps how a handful of elite American universities shaped the development of that sport, meticulously transforming English rugby into the new American spectacle. Oriard provides a historiographical analysis of the text, produced by the “father of American football,” Walter Camp, in relation to the discursive context around the turn of the 20th century. Oriard asserts that a number of critical changes in the game’s rules “complicated distribution of power among ‘producers’ and ‘consumers’ of culture” (Oriard, 1993). Moreover, the sudden emergence of the narrative possibilities and exploitation of these narratives, linking them to national identity, and the growing importance of mass media resulted in the seduction of American sporting consciousness, firmly positioning football as the American national pastime.

Reflecting on the evolution of this (post)modern sport history discourse, Nauright (1999) states that, “we can no longer isolate sports history behind modernist disciplinary walls” (p. 8). Hence, heated debates and the controversy surrounding postmodernist and poststructuralist critiques of the historical process eventually permeated the discipline of sport history.

The implications of the postmodern (i.e., “linguistic” and “cultural”) turn(s) for history and sport history are significant. They affect the epistemological, methodological and ideological dimensions of the historical process. There is a general shift in historiography from a social history emphasis on causality and context to a cultural

history emphasis on analysis of meaning production and representation (Poster, 1997). From an epistemological perspective, historical “truth” is an idle endeavor simply because it is unachievable (Jenkins, 2003). From a methodological perspective, instead of an “accumulation of facts and details” approach to history (Bain, 2000), there is a dizzying array of competing, contested and contradictory paradigms that bring inherent politics and ideological underpinnings to the historical project. In this context, an explicit discussion of the methods used in the production of historical knowledge becomes a necessity in the overall examination of validity and rigor in current historical discourse. As indicated previously, many postmodern historians argue, therefore, for an increased reflexivity in historiography and explicit theoretical and a methodological situatedness of the historical text.

Is (sport) history dead or alive?

Francis Fukuyama’s essay “The End of History?” which appeared in the November 1989 issue of *The National Review*, spurred heated debates over both the “nature of contemporary existence” (Andrews, 1999, p. 73) and the future of history. While I do not intend to reiterate eloquent arguments put forward by various prominent scholars over the last two decades, I do refer the interested reader to Mark Poster’s *Cultural History and Postmodernity: Disciplinary Readings and Challenges* (1997) and to the November 1999 special issue of *Sporting Traditions*, for a sense of the debates over postmodernity in mainstream history and sport history, respectively. What I intend to do here is to reflect on how these philosophical and theoretical debates in history and

sport history impact and shape my situatedness as a qualitative researcher and the conceptualization of this project.

As indicated earlier, the present study's methodological and theoretical frameworks are influenced by cultural studies of sport (Andrews, 1993, 2002; Cole, 1993), cultural history (Jenkins, 2003; Poster, 1997), feminist poststructuralism (Moyer, 2001; Weedon, 1997), qualitative research (Lather, 1991; Wright, 2003, 2004b) and Foucault's discourse analysis (Foucault, 1972, 1977, 1995). All of these influences allow for a multifaceted interdisciplinary historiography of sport psychology as the object⁵ "under a description" (Jenkins, 2003, p. 45). The unifying element for these approaches is the centrality of meaning, which is "always already" contested, elusive and embedded in the discursive contingencies of history. No single one of these approaches attempts to reveal a single "truth" but as eclectic theorizing, "a pieced-together set of representations" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p.4), they provide a revealing montage, allowing for a "more fully historicised account" (Mills, 2003, p. 121).

The methodologies that are strategically employed in this exploration of the dual genealogy of applied sport psychology follow the poststructuralist tradition and, in this sense, speak for an end to the hegemonic discourse of sport history still practiced in many sport science departments. The purpose of the study is neither "corrective" (Wright, 2004a) nor additive. The study does not intend to "correct" existing versions of the history of sport psychology or add an alternative narrative to the body of historical knowledge. Rather it attempts to provide a discourse analysis of the discipline,

⁵ Jenkins (2003) argues that historical discourse is characterized by a double articulation: of the historian's object of interest and of the historian's representation of the object (i.e., the historian's way of "putting the object 'under a description'" (p. 45)).

excavating the grounds on which it was produced and institutionalized. Drawing on Foucault's genealogical approach to historical analysis, which resists providing a linear causal connection and explanation of why something happened in the past in a simplistic singularity (Mills, 2003), I attempt to unearth the emergence of sport psychology and trace its development. Specifically, I attempt to map the major conceptual shifts by juxtaposing Russian and English historical texts; biographies of the established "fathers" of sport psychology (i.e., Avksenty Cezarevich Puni and Coleman Roberts Griffith) and other papers describing their contributions to the field; oral histories of former Soviet elite coaches and sport psychologists; and my own lived historical knowledge.

The main interest of this project is to illuminate discourses that have been previously marginalized and/or excluded from the hegemonic writings of sport history. The history of sport psychology does not occur in a linear progression, building up knowledge on the basis of the previous one. Instead, there are multiple competing discourses that create volatile tensions at certain moments in time, challenging the status quo and contesting taken-for-granted, naturalized and legitimized practices. In this sense, a postmodern history of sport psychology has the potential to usher in an exciting multiplicity of discursive politicized histories—colliding, intersecting, converging, and even contradicting and under erasure.

And what is discourse analysis, exactly?

There is no single and unproblematic way to answer this question, especially if discourse is taken seriously in "all its messiness and variability" (Gill, 1993, p. 323). Gill (1993), for example, distinguishes at least three traditions in a discourse analytic

approach. The first encompasses the variety of work in critical linguistics, critical language studies and/or social semiotics (c.f., Fairclough, 1989; Halliday, 1978; Kress & Hodge, 1979). This position grew out of the germane idea in structural linguistics that meaning is not fixed in the relationship between signifier and signified but relies on a system of oppositional linguistic categories.

A relatively recent development in this discourse analytic tradition, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), emerged in the work of Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak and Teun van Dijk in the late 1980s (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). Since then CDA has become one of the most visible schools of discourse analysis. Wodak (1995) contends that CDA is overtly interested in issues of power and employs social theories, such as those of Althusser and Gramsci, in an effort to analyze “opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language” (p. 204). It would be inaccurate, however, to conclude that CDA approaches discourse only as social practice. In fact, Fairclough (1992) outlines a three-dimensional frame for analyzing discourse that includes discourse-as-text and discourse-as-discursive-practice aspects as well as a discourse-as-social-practice dimension. The discourse-as-text aspect of analysis meticulously deals with concrete linguistic features of the text, such as vocabulary, grammar, cohesion and text structure. The discourse-as-discursive-practice aspect further contextualizes discourse as “something that is produced, circulated, distributed, [and] consumed in society” (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000, p. 448).

CDA as an analytic device has been widely appropriated by scholars in the social sciences and humanities. Threadgold (2003) asserts, however, that researchers from those fields with little if any background in language studies tend to approach CDA as the

study of the textual and the discursive dealing primarily with language and representation. Threadgold (2003) directs her critique toward discourse analytic work that uses such terms as representation, discourse, intertextuality, genre and performativity as tools for the analysis and/or as categories for naming certain things, but rarely undertakes work on the “materiality of language to demonstrate that existence in recognizable and replicable linguistic terms” (p. 9). CDA’s attention to linguistic characteristics of the text distinguishes this tradition from those associated with poststructuralism in general and Michel Foucault in particular.

The second tradition, according to Gill (1993), deals primarily with the analysis of speech rather than written text. This tradition is influenced by ethnomethodology, speech act theory and conversation analysis (c.f., Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Heritage, 1984) and is interested in uncovering the underlying structure and organization of social interaction. Emphasizing naturally occurring talk, ethnomethodological research usually examines how social order is (re)constructed in the course of everyday interaction and how talk and conversation participate in the production of meaning. Ethnomethodological texts tend to provide the ethnographical thick description of local settings and everyday life, which “mediate[s] the meaning of what is said [in everyday communication]” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 492).

Conversation analysts, however, seem to be keenly interested in the structure of talk in and of itself. Thus, according to Gubrium and Holstein (2000), ethnomethodologists attack conversation analysis for its unbalanced concern with the “machinery of conversation” (p. 493). Ethnomethodological researchers argue that the conversation analysts’ singular focus on “utterance-by-utterance” linguistic structure

dangerously reduces social life to “recorded talk and conversational sequencing” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 492). Yet another critique of conversational analysis, as Threadgold (2003) observes, is that privileging speech over written text altogether perpetuates the hierarchical binary that poststructuralist theory attempts to deconstruct. Appealing to Derrida, Threadgold argues against the “authenticity” of speech and stresses that “both speech and writing are forms of writing in the complex sense” (p. 7).

The third tradition identified by Gill (1993) is often associated with poststructuralism(s). Though it is as heterogeneous as the other two traditions, poststructuralist discourse analysis generally tends to permeate a critical analysis of social interaction with historical, cultural and institutional power interplay. Utilizing different analytical strategies, poststructuralist critics, such as Derrida, Foucault, Deleuze and Irigaray, demonstrate a common concern with the relations among language, power, knowledge, subjectivity and truth. In sport studies research, Foucault’s theorizing in general and the Foucauldian rule-governed notion of discourse and discourse analysis in particular seem to be the most embraced frameworks for examining various facets of the sport problematic (Andrews, 2000).

Foucault appeared on the “analytic stage” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 493) in the early 1960s. His historically and culturally located analysis focused on an examination of the ways in which systems of power-knowledge produce human subjects, both enabling and constraining their everyday worlds (Andrews, 2000; Cole, 1998). Foucault is interested in institutional sites, such as the hospital and the prison, explicating the discursive practices that produce legitimized knowledge and suppress the subjugated one(s).

For example, in her essay “The medical discourse on female physical culture in Germany in the 19th and early 20th centuries,” Gertrud Pfister (1990) discusses how scientific views on the female body and its “natural” fragility participated in the construction of women’s everyday knowledge about themselves, the desired norms of passive and frail femininity, the legitimization of girls’ and women’s poor health, the marginalization of women’s sports, and the naturalization of differences between the sexes. Pfister’s analysis demonstrates how male doctors used anatomical differences in the sexual organs of women and men to explain the peculiar nature of the “weaker sex” and keep women away from the previously male domains of sport, politics, science and the labor market. Pfister illustrates her critique with the following warning from a doctor in Berlin cautioning women about the dangers of physical activity:

Violent movements of the body can cause a shift in the position and a loosening of the uterus as well as prolapse and bleeding, with resulting sterility, thus defeating a woman’s true purpose in life, i.e., the bringing forth of strong children (cited in Pfister, 1990, p. 191).

Furthermore, male gynecologists justified their prejudices on the basis of medical authority, scientific objectivity and rational knowledge and accused female doctors, who argued that the human organism, female or male, responds to the same exercises with the same effect, of a biased view and of “using all kind of tricks [in] the unconscious desire to make up for their inferiority complexes” (cited in Pfister, 1990, p. 197).

It is important to stress that knowledge, according to Foucault, is produced within the discourse and technologies of power, power-knowledge in particular, determine what knowledge stays in circulation and what knowledge is suppressed. Foucault’s main

concern is to excavate and analyze the abstract forces that underlie discourse formation, i.e., an episteme⁶, and the radical breaks in history that occur when subjugated knowledge is released and consequently changes the way a phenomenon is perceived and conceptualized.

Thus, with reference to the previous example of the medical discourse on female physical culture, in order to substantiate their arguments, female doctors had to build an empirical knowledge based on the effects of physical exercise on the female body. They launched a systematic research in an effort to understand how sports and competition influence female organs, particularly with regard to their effects on menstruation, reproduction and childbirth. It was revealed experimentally, for example, that so-called female shallow breathing was not a natural female condition but rather the effect of accepted practices and customs like the corset and that there were no justified reasons for women to avoid practicing or participating in competitive sports during their menstrual periods. Pfister (1990) concludes that:

The further development of medical science, and the growing commitment of female doctors, encouraged a more differentiated discussion and more subtle discriminations, while the voices of those who refuted the prejudices and overcame the reservations about women's sports became louder and stronger" (p. 197).

⁶ Mills (2003) explains the episteme as "not the sum of everything which can be known within a period but [...] the complex set of relationships between the knowledges which are produced within a particular period and the rules by which new knowledge is generated" (p. 62). Foucault (1972) has further asserted that history can be seen as an accumulation of epistemes and the shift from one episteme to another creates rupture or discontinuities at a particular historical conjuncture.

In Foucauldian terms, Pfister (1990) provides a remarkable account of the sudden break between epistemes when alternative discourse on the female body and physical culture challenge the governing one, leading to shifts in medical views on female physical culture in early 20th century Germany.

Is the troubling worth the effort?

Postmodern troubling of the boundaries and taken-for-granted practices of academic disciplines have elicited a whole range of reactions among scholars, from venomous bemoaning to enthusiastic embracing of the challenges and possibilities of the changed postmodern circumstances. This sudden rapture, or episteme in Foucault's terms, resulted in an ongoing (re)evaluation of the foundations of various disciplines in general and sport studies in particular and the inevitable revision of key assumptions underlying academic practices.

In this chapter, I have examined in some depth how poststructuralist and postmodern theorizations constitute an exciting theoretical frame that has impacted the ontological, epistemological and methodological aspects of sport historiography and particularly my own dissertation project. I have positioned my study within the broader debates over the challenges and possibilities of the "linguistic turn" that have been raging in the discourses of history and historiography for the last two decades. I further discussed the employed approach to historicizing sport psychology influenced by Foucault's notion of genealogy, which is associated with the technologies of power-knowledge and sudden breaks between epistemes.

My decision to approach the work of Avksenty Cezarevich Puni and Coleman Roberts Griffith as the sites of origins of sport psychology stems from Foucault's (1972, 1980) assertion that it is not individual thinkers who produce knowledge. Consistent with his own project of establishing a history of discontinuities, Foucault undermines the continuing dominance of the centrality of the subject in Western liberal thought and, consequently, the uninterrupted development of intellectual history. Foucault's history tends to be a study of the formation of concepts (i.e., madness, sexuality, etc.), derived from discursive institutional practices, which "chronological history would assume had no history" (Young, 2004, p. 106). Knowledge, Foucault argues, is produced within discourse and power-knowledge determines what knowledge stays in circulation and what knowledge is suppressed (Mills, 2003). In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, within which Foucault (1991) crystallizes the concept of genealogy and genealogical analysis, he asserts that:

The subject who knows, the objects to be known and the modalities of knowledge must be regarded as so many effects of fundamental implications of power-knowledge and their historical transformations. In short it is not the activity of the subject of knowledge that produces a corpus of knowledge, useful or resistant to power, but power-knowledge, the processes and struggles that traverse it, and of which it is made up, that determines the forms and possible domains of knowledge (pp. 27-28).

Influenced by Foucault's epistemological approach to historical analysis, therefore, I do not attempt to trace *the* origin of sport psychology to Puni or Griffith by providing causal links and explanations of the unfolding of a historical evolution of each person's thought.

Instead, I attempt to explore these scholars' legacy as the archeological site where sport psychology knowledge was produced. I am interested not so much in identifying each scholar's academic practices as in uncovering the discursive formations of that historical conjuncture that shaped the way sport psychology was conceptualized, theorized, practiced and institutionalized in that period.

The dominant American and Russian/Soviet discourses of sport psychology respectively present, moreover, a complex excavation; they were constructed in isolation, separated by the iron curtain, and at the same time in relation to the "other." Attempting a genealogical analysis of the history of sport psychology of the two competing "superpowers" includes an inherent possibility of "fall[ing] into the trap of a nationalistic manipulation of history" (Nauright, 1999, p. 9). Acknowledging the fact that the deepest layers of my subjectivity were formed within an ideologically-charged hegemonic discourse of Soviet-American competition, tapping into these discursive identifications and critically (re)evaluating /(re)constructing fragments of my subjectivity is an inextricable and messy part of the reflexivity process. Interestingly, self-reflexivity as a process of "turning inwards" constitutes simultaneously a possibility for the emergence of a critical perspective of outside thinking (Young, 2004).

In conclusion, though I am uncomfortable with the constructed monolithic historiography of sport psychology, which obscures the difference within the discourse and creates an impression of its linear development, and have attempted to disrupt this linearity, the text of my dissertation does not take a truly postmodern form. On the one hand, I realize the limitations of my epistemological subject position located, at best, inside/outside (post)modern discourse and the inevitability of textual modernity against

which postmodern insights can be elucidated. On the other, I understand that the significance of the postmodern thought is not contained in form itself. Form does not exist independently. As Vygotsky (1971) asserts, form or structure *penetrates* into the content of a work of art. Therefore, for the purpose of this dissertation project, it seems to be more meaningful to engage and (re)evaluate the ontological, epistemological and methodological possibilities of poststructuralist theorizing for sport studies in general and sport psychology in particular than to strive for the creation of a postmodern textual form.

Chapter Three

The Sport System of the Soviet Union: The Marriage of Science and Politics

Physical culture must be considered not only from the point of view of physical training but should also be utilized as a means to rally the broad working masses around various Party, Government and trade union organizations through which the masses of workers and peasants are drawn into social and political life...Physical culture must play an integral part in the general political and cultural training of the masses.

Communist Party of the Soviet Union's resolution of 1925.

In the first monograph of its kind published in the Soviet Union, Puni (1959) credited Soviet social formation and the organizational structure of Soviet physical culture and sport for the emergence of sport psychology in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). In particular, Puni emphasized the pedagogical role that science played in both physical education and athletic training. Consistent with this view, a number of sport historians (c.f., Baumann, 1988; Riordan, 1977; Samoukov, 1964) have asserted that the USSR was the first country in the world to make a grand scale commitment to a mass sporting movement and high-level athletic achievement. This political system of total control along with the ideological motivation to demonstrate the superiority of the Soviet social order called for the molding of young men and women into *Soviet* athletes who represented the *Soviet school* of sport. David Marples, an internationally recognized expert in Soviet and East European studies, argues that "one cannot discuss [a certain event] without some understanding of its setting" (1986, p. x). Consequently, in order to fully understand Puni's assertion, it is important to understand

the Soviet system of physical education that provided a foundation for the elite sporting establishment to emerge and flourish.

In this chapter, I contextualize the discourse of sport psychology within the Soviet socio-political system, the ideological philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, cultural practices, issues of sport and leisure, implications of the Cold War on Soviet academia, and major theoretical and practical developments in the sport sciences. Specifically, the chapter is intended to provide a detailed description of the complex organizational structure of the Soviet sporting system, including sports societies, clubs and committees; the built-in incentives system (i.e., the *Ready for Labor and Defense* program and the *All-Union Universal Sport Classification* scheme); coaching programs (training, qualification and certification); the system of selection and competition; and the scientific basis underlying sport. This chapter concludes with a brief biographical sketch of Puni that highlights his contribution to the field of applied sport psychology.

Historical background of the Soviet system of physical education

Organized sport in pre-revolutionary Russia and subsequently in the Soviet Union were inextricably linked with the military training of youth. Physical education in the Russian Empire was under the supervision of two state departments, the Ministry of Education and the War Ministry (Kukushkin, 1962). In 1844, for example, fencing, swimming and gymnastics were incorporated into the academic curriculum of the military Cadet Corps (Baumann, 1988). Baumann further reported that due to the imposition of universal military training in 1874, the spontaneous so-called “shooting-gymnastics” societies became popular. The mission of these societies was to teach young

men skills that would help them become better soldiers and officers. Not surprisingly, the military actively supported the development of these and other voluntary sporting organizations. As a result, Russia's budding "sporting movement progressed and bred competition in soccer, yachting, tennis, cycling and ice skating" (Baumann, 1988).

Furthermore, after Russia's defeat in the war with Japan (1904 - 1905) and the suppression of the revolution of 1905, known as *Bloody Sunday*, the Russian government desperately needed to enhance the military prestige of the Russian Empire, unite the nation under the banner of patriotism and loyalty, and physically strengthen young people for future military service. Accordingly, semi-military organizations for boys, the so-called *poteshtny* detachments, were formed in secondary schools all across the country. These detachments of boy-soldiers were analogous to Boy Scout organizations in the United States. They promoted physical fitness and further prompted the popularity of sports among male students. The Ministry of Education was largely responsible for sponsoring these sporting societies and clubs for youth (Stolbov, 1983).

The physical training of young men and women was also of great concern to the Bolshevik party (which was the predecessor to the Communist party). The Party's program of 1903, for example, stressed the integral role of sport training in preparing proletariat youth both physically and morally for the anticipated revolutionary struggle. Therefore, the Bolsheviks viewed sporting organizations as a social space for politicizing and mobilizing Russian youth.

In 1912, the Minister of Internal Affairs in his report to Russia's Tsar Nicolas II warned that various youth sporting establishments could be transformed into revolutionary detachments of the Bolshevik militia. In an effort to thwart such a

possibility, the Tsar personally ordered the establishment of a government position called the All-Russia Supervisor for the Physical Development of the Russian People. This supervisor was granted considerable authority and answered only to the Tsar himself. From that time on, the activity of all sporting organizations had to be ratified by the supervisor and was under the strict control of the Supervisor's chancellery (Kukushkin, 1961).

It should be noted that, in general, Imperial Russia lacked a unified system of physical education and a strong physical culture. Although about a thousand bourgeois sports societies and clubs existed in 1910 (Kukushkin, 1962), only an inner circle of the army and society's elite had access to them. Methodologically, physical education curricula in the schools, the military and sporting organizations were modeled after those of foreign systems (e.g., Swedish and German calisthenics and gymnastics; and Czech and Prussian military training). The more innovative and scientifically inspired system of physical education developed by the Russian biologist, anatomist, educator and social reformer⁷ P. F. Lesgaft did not fully receive the support of official circles (Kukushkin, 1963) until after the Socialist revolution.

Nevertheless, despite the modest general accomplishments of Russian sport in general, some individual athletes achieved international recognition for their performance. For example, in 1908, the Russian figure skater Panin-Kolomensky won the

⁷ Piotr Franzevich Lesgaft (1837 – 1909), the founder of Russian physical education, was a notorious advocate for women's sporting rights. Speaking to the issue, for example, Lesgaft has stated: "Social slavery has left its degrading imprint on women. Our task is to free the maidenly body of its fetters, conventions and drooping posture, and return to our pupils their freedom and suppleness which have been stolen from them. We must develop in them firmness, initiative and independence, teach them to think and take decisions, give them knowledge of life and make physical educationalists out of them" (cited in Riordan, 1977, p. 234).

Olympic gold medal in London and in 1910 and 1911, Strunnikov did the same in the European and World Speed Skating Championships (Stolbov, 1983). However, following a poor performance of the Russian team at the Olympic Games of 1912 in Stockholm, the Russian government and public organizations (including the All-Russia Olympic Committee established a year earlier in 1911) were forced to pay more attention to the sporting movement. In order to produce a better-trained team for the next Olympic Games, the decision was made to hold an annual All-Russia Olympiad in the hope that these sporting events would facilitate the competitive preparation of athletes. As it turned out, the two All-Russia Olympiads held in 1913 and 1914 in Kyiv and Riga, respectively, were the last highlights of pre-revolutionary sport in the country. The latter Olympiad ended just a few days prior to the onset of World War I, which produced the fall of the Russian Empire and the Socialist Revolution of 1917. As a result, the Bolshevik Party seized and held power for next 70 years.

Thus, on October 25, 1917 the first socialist republic was created. The Soviet state proclaimed the working people's right to wellbeing and universal health care as Russian citizens. Among the first steps proposed by V. I. Lenin, physical education was to become a required subject in the public schools. On November 9, 1917, the State Commission of People's Education was established, one department of which was responsible for incorporating physical education into the school curriculum as well as supervising students' medical care and catering school lunches. This proposed program for the comprehensive and harmonious development of students was embedded into the system of physical education recommended by Lesgaft in 1901.

It is important to note that the socio-political climate in Russia remained tense and apprehensive for some time following the Socialist Revolution. The country was exhausted by the many years of war, including the massacre of World War I, the subsequent economic crisis, the rebellions that climaxed in the Socialist Revolution of 1917, and the major civil war that had broken out by 1918. This civil war between the *Reds* (i.e., the Bolsheviks) and the *Whites* (i.e., army units led by the anti-Bolshevik officers) represented one of the most serious threats to the freedom of the newly formed state. The threat was exacerbated by the foreign intervention of France, England and the United States of America, all of which sent troops and supplies in support of the Whites during the autumn of 1919 (Bunyan & Fisher, 1934). Such support of the Whites was in part due to the desire by these countries to have Russia fight Germany during World War I, but also because they feared the spread of socialism.

In light of these internal and external pressures, it was necessary for Russia to mobilize all its means and resources, including organized sport, in its struggle for survival. The newly formed armed forces, known as the *Red Army*, needed a physically and militarily trained reserve of soldiers and officers. As a result the comprehensive, systematic and universal military training of adult men and women was an expressed part of the Party's resolution, entitled "On War and Peace," that was based on Lenin's address to the VIIth Congress of the Bolshevik Party during March of 1918. On April 22, the All-Russia Central Executive Committee (*VTsIK*) of the Soviet Republic passed a decree entitled "On Compulsory Military Training," that established universal military training for men and women (ages 16 to 40). *Vsevoluch* (Russian acronym for universal military training) included a department of physical culture and sport that supervised the physical

training of military personnel and civilians. The civilian population was required to complete a 96-hour-program of physical training and marksmanship, which included 50 percent of the time devoted to gymnastics, team games and various sports (Stolbov, 1983). Soviet leaders believed that sport training would facilitate a revolutionary transformation of personal characteristics and the development of desirable *Soviet* traits, such as a dedication to communist ideals, determination and the will to win, conscious and disciplined preparation, and most importantly, the subordination of individual interests to collective ones. The Commissar for Military and Naval Affairs, Mikhail Frunze, was known to have asserted that competitive team sports were a valuable tool of psychological preparation of soldiers for combat (Baumann, 1988).

Due to the continuous and severe class struggle and incidents involving the use of training facilities for anti-revolutionary purposes, *Vsevoluch* came to play a very specific socio-political role in the Revolution. *Vsevoluch* as an institution was used as a means of uniting the working people, who “did not exploit other people’s labor” (Stolbov, 1983, p. 179), and drawing them into the social and political movement. It also became a communal place where social support was provided for workers and peasants. During the time of enrollment in the 96-hour-program, for example, students received free meals along with their military and physical training. In sum, *Vsevoluch* was an important institution that directed and supervised the work of all sporting organizations and the athletic facilities that existed at the time.

Interestingly, Lenin appointed his close friend N. I. Podvoisky to head *Vsevoluch*. Podvoisky authored a number of research papers on the topic of physical education in the USSR and the international sporting movement (Kukushkin, 1962), and was credited

with defining the high standards and challenging goals of Soviet sport as well as delineating the process of its development. As a result, Lenin proclaimed Podvoisky the “father” of Soviet physical culture and sport (Stolbov, 1983).

As previously stated, the Soviet government from its inception attempted to implement physical education in both the schools and the workplace in order to ensure its citizens’ health and increase their labor productivity. In addition Soviet citizens, especially those children and youth left homeless after the war, were encouraged to participate in various sports and games as a means of taking them off the streets, isolating them from the influence of alcohol and prostitution; emancipating and empowering the women; and developing communist morality in general. According to Lenin, the main concern of the Soviet state was to construct a new society and develop individuals who are strong in body and spirit and free from the bourgeois ideal of “rugged individualism.” Addressing the challenges confronting Soviet youth, Lenin (1966) in his speech delivered at the Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League (October 2, 1920), stated:

...morality serves the purpose of helping human society to rise to a higher level and rid itself of the exploitation of labor. [...] Communist morality is based on the struggle for the consolidation and completion of communism. That is also the basis of communist training, education and teaching (pp. 294-295).

Lenin further stressed the virtues of comradeship, social interdependence and persistence, hard work for the common cause and individual responsibility to the larger social collective and believed that all of these could be instilled through sport participation. Lenin’s historical speech played a crucial role in strengthening the ideological

foundations of Soviet physical education that, in turn, became an integral part of the communist upbringing⁸ of youth (Samoukov, 1964; Stolbov, 1983).

Decrees of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Soviet government on the development of physical culture and sport

From the moment the Bolsheviks came to power until the fall of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party and Soviet government directed the development of a national physical culture and sporting movement through a prism of ideological and socio-political issues. The following is a brief mapping of the major events in the evolution of the Soviet system of physical education.

The XIIth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) held in April of 1923 emphasized the point that working class youths' interest in sport should be used as a means of both improving and strengthening young people's health and fitness as well as fostering cohesion between young communists and the not yet politicized youth. It was proposed that young working men and women be united via athletic participation in various groups of physical culture at the work place (Kukushkin, 1962). Interestingly, the formation of the Supreme Council of Physical Culture in 1923 marked an unprecedented establishment of a ministry of sport and physical education on the state level.

The XIIIth Congress of Russia's Communist Party (Bolsheviks) held in May of 1924 emphasized the further incorporation of working class youth into the national sporting movement, especially those living in the rural areas (Kukushkin, 1962).

⁸ According to Russian terminology, "development" refers to a process of change within a person. The terms "education" and "upbringing" refer to different socially-organized pedagogical processes. Formal education deals with the development of students' knowledge and skills while upbringing deals with the formation of their personalities (i.e., motivation, moral values, character, etc.). Both education and upbringing include interactions between teachers and students (i.e., joint activities) as well as students' own efforts at self-improvement.

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party of the Bolsheviks was adopted on June 13, 1925 and entitled “The Party’s Tasks in the Field of Physical Culture.” This appears to have been a founding document that delineated the formative agenda and ideological frame for the future development of Soviet physical culture and sport. Lenin’s idea of the great social significance of physical culture runs throughout the entire document. The following quote, which I used previously as an epigraph to this chapter, highlights the Bolshevik Party’s tasks and objectives at that historical conjuncture:

Physical culture must be considered not only from the point of view of physical training but should also be utilized as a means to rally the broad working masses around various Party, Government and trade union organizations through which the masses of workers and peasants are drawn into social and political life...Physical culture must play an integral part in the general political and cultural training of the masses.

Four years later, however, on September 23, 1929, the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) severely criticized previous exploits in the field of physical education and exposed numerous shortcomings in the Soviet physical culture movement. As a result, immediate attention was devoted to the prevalence of dangerous practices and the dramatic revision and modification of such practices that was needed. The Party’s main concerns were the striking decrease in participation in physical culture and sport by the masses; apolitical tendencies in the field of physical education; and the lack of communication and coordinated actions among the various institutional departments. The Central Executive Committee (*TsIK*) emphasized the necessity to

strengthen the state governing body and establish the All-Union Council of Physical Culture (Kukushkin, 1962). On June 21, 1936, therefore, the Council of People's Commissars ruled that the All-Union Committee for Physical Culture and Sport be founded to exact a more strict government control over physical education and sport in the Soviet Union (Ageevts & Kanevets, 1986).

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of December 27, 1948, entitled "On the Execution of Guidelines of the Party and Government on the Development of Mass Physical Culture Movement in the Country and on Enhancement of Athletic Mastery of Soviet Athletes by the State Committee for Physical Culture and Sport," was arguably one of the most important Soviet decrees for the advancement of physical culture and the sporting movement. This resolution emphasized the importance of striving for athletic excellence and high standards that would enable Soviet athletes to enter the international sporting arena. Meticulous details of sporting activities, such as the construction and management of training facilities, financial support and fund raising, selection of athletes for competitions and the like were taken as seriously as any other state function performed on behalf of the government (Kukushkin, 1963). Furthermore, drawing an analogy from Lenin's (1966) assertion: "You will not build a communist society unless you enlist the masses of young workers and peasants in the work of building communism" (p. 290), the Central Committee proclaimed that the goal of superior athletic achievements and the winning of world championships in future years would only be reached if there was an increased popularity and mass involvement in physical culture and sport.

Thereafter, issues of physical culture and sport, mass participation of children and youth in physical activity, and the necessity of further progress in the area of physical education (in terms of scientific research, pedagogy and praxis) were constantly stressed in the directives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The last document addressing the topic of Soviet physical culture and sport that was issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, was the resolution of 1981, entitled “On Further Improvement of Physical Culture and Sport.” The aim of this document was to eliminate serious drawbacks in the sporting movement and carry out the decisions of the XXVIth Congress of the Communist Party. The resolution conveyed a deep concern for the future of Soviet sport in general and the further development of Olympic sports in particular. Recommendations included increased support of sports schools for elite athletes; the development of Olympic training centers and sports boarding schools for young developing athletes; the securing of financial support for the promotion of physical culture and sport; the improvement of ideological education of athletes; and the continuing education of coaching staff and required certification renewal within the period of 1982 – 1984. In order to achieve these objectives, a vital role was ascribed to sport science research and the need for an immediate implementation of its findings in sport practice. In addition, it was recommended that a unitary sporting calendar for major national and international competitions based on the Olympic cycle be approved.

The role of public organizations in the development of physical culture and sport

The following public organizations played an essential role in the development of Soviet physical culture and the sporting movement:

VLKSM (Russian acronym for the All-Union Lenin Young Communist League).

The role of *VLKSM* in the sporting movement of the USSR is quite controversial. During the founding years of the Soviet republic, this organization was abreast of the ideological education of youth, implementing the Party's resolutions and decrees for the strengthening of young men and women, physically and morally, through their involvement in sport. Members of the Young Communist League took an active part in the venomous class struggle against the remnants of pre-revolutionary bourgeois sporting clubs and organizations, such as "Sokol," "Maccabi," "Shevardenya" and the Boy Scouts. In an attempt to attract and rally proletariat youth around various Soviet organizations, young communists established their own sporting clubs (e.g., "Spartak" was founded in 1918) and other physical training societies of *Vsevoluch* (Kukushkin, 1961).

Physical education, as previously stressed, was inevitably connected to the ability of Soviet citizens to defend their socialist society. The practical broad-scale implementation of this objective was achieved through the semi-militant program, the *GTO* (Russian acronym for the Ready for Labor and Defense) program. The implementation of the *GTO* program, which was initiated by *VLKSM* in collaboration with the Trade Unions, was sanctioned in 1931. The program was designed to give everyone, youth and adults alike, access to structured physical culture. In particular, *GTO* emphasized competitive sports and basic military skills, such as the grenade throw and rifle marksmanship (Riordan 1977). *VLKSM* further proposed a children's level of *GTO*,

the *BGTO* (Russian acronym for Be Ready for Labor and Defense) program, which was introduced in 1934 (Kukushkin, 1961). Each level of *GTO* included both theoretical exams and a required level of physical fitness. Women as well as men were active participants in the *GTO* athletic programs. In fact, over half a million young women passed athletic tests to earn the *GTO* badge annually.

In addition, *VLKSM* rendered great service to the country, carrying on the physical and military training of both young draftees and civilians throughout the dreadful years of the Great Patriotic War (1941 -1945). Baumann (1988) suggests that the *GTO* program played a crucial role in preparing Soviet citizens for combat and many subsequently fought with distinction. In support of his argument, Baumann (1988) cites the Chairman of the Sports Committee of the USSR Ministry of Defense, Major General Koshelev, who in commenting on his men's dominance in hand to hand combat, said it "was no accident because next to their battle decorations was proudly displayed the *GTO* badge" (p. 156).

Critics of the *VLKSM*, however, point out that the constructive role of the Young Communist League in the Soviet sporting movement came to an end when secretaries of the district, regional and territory committees of *VLKSM* were appointed to direct and manage the work of various sport and athletic organizations. The responsibility of *VLKSM* leaders was merely to ensure the realization and implementation of numerous resolutions adopted at the Congresses of the Communist Party and All-Union Lenin Young Communist League. Thus, all major mass sporting events were held under the formal and arbitrary patronage of *VLKSM*.

Many Soviet athletes remembered with horror the comprehensive and thorough interviewing they had to endure at the district and regional Komsomol (i.e., *VLKSM*) committees in order to receive clearance to participate in international competitions held abroad (V. Ryba, personal communication, December 2004). For example, Vladislav Tretiak (1977), a renowned Soviet hockey goalie, recalled that before the international games, the Soviet national teams were required to attend Komsomol meetings during which players listened to patriotic talks by the team's *VLKSM* organizer. As a result, the attitude of both Soviet athletes and coaches towards *VLKSM* gradually became one of suspicion and distrust.

DSO (Russian acronym for Voluntary Sport Society). In 1936, the Council of the People's Commissars authorized the formation of voluntary sports societies (*DSO*) under the auspices of trade unions (Kukushkin, 1962). These collectives became the foundation of a broad-based physical culture movement in the Soviet Union and consisted of a number of athletic sections for different individual sports and/or sports teams. The sections and teams were further subdivided into various groups based on gender, age and athletic qualification. The annual growth of the *DSO* supposedly reflected the expansion of mass participation by Soviet citizens in the physical culture and sporting movement of the country.

The growing necessity to organize *DSO* was realized when the number of physical culture collectives reached 50,000. In order to structure and coordinate the collectives' functioning more efficiently, 99 *DSOs* were created in the period from 1936 to 1938. By 1958, trade unions were subsidizing the remaining 20 *DSOs* that had merged in an effort to improve the quality of work performed by administrative and coaching

staff, consolidate training facilities and support staff, and promote the successful participation of athletes in competitions (Kukushkin, 1961).

Further reorganization of the *DSO* was initiated within the framework of the overall system of Soviet physical culture and sport. As of January 1, 1961 there were 36 *DSOs*, 19 trade union sports societies (arranged by the industrial and territorial principle), 15 rural sports societies (one in each of the Soviet Republics) as well as the sports societies of “Dinamo” and “Trudoviye Rezervi” (Kukushkin, 1961). Later, the “TsSK MO” (i.e., the Central Sport Club of the Ministry of Defense) was added. Each *DSO* had its own flag, pennant, emblem, uniform and decoration badge.

In 1961, the Presidium of All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions decided to award the best collectives of physical culture with the status of “Sports Club.” In general, though, only the collectives of physical culture sponsored by the largest Soviet manufacturing establishments, which had excellent training facilities, substantial financial resources and success in preparing elite athletes, especially in Olympic sports, were granted that status.

The quality of *DSO*’s work was reflected in the performances of the athletes, who defended the sports club’s honor in all major competitions, such as the USSR national championships and the Olympic Games. Even in competitions like the Spartakiads (derived from the word Spartacus) of Soviet Nations, involving rivalries among the Soviet Republics represented by their respective national (i.e., all-stars) teams, athletes’ performances were considered in terms of their *DSO* membership.

In sum, vigorous competition among the sports societies and clubs, particularly for the Olympic medal count, benefited the development of Soviet physical culture and

sport to a great extent. It should be mentioned, nevertheless, that at times this rivalry was so intense and disproportionate that it prompted some club officials to entice talented athletes from rival organizations to switch their allegiance and join their own club (Riordan, 1988; V. Ryba, personal communication, December 2004).

DOSAAF (Russian acronym for Voluntary Society for Support of the Army, Aviation and the Fleet). The voluntary society for support of the army, aviation and the fleet was a mass organization intended to spread civil defense programs to the schools and the workplace. The *DOSAAF* was fully implemented by 1951 as a result of numerous mergers between various organizations that had previously provided physical and military training and marksmanship programs for young people in the Soviet state. Not surprisingly, the *DOSAAF* emphasized the development of athletes for the three Olympic sports of shooting, sailing and rowing (Kukushkin, 1961).

The function of the GTO program and All-Union Universal Sport Classification scheme in the sporting movement of the Soviet Union

The All-Union Ready for Labor and Defense program (*GTO*) that had been introduced as an initiative of the Young Communist League in 1931 became the foundational structure of the entire Soviet system of physical education (Kukushkin, 1961). *GTO* was not only a built-in incentive complex but also an institutional tool employed in the pursuit of specific socio-political objectives. The main purpose of the 1st level of the *GTO* program, for example, was to improve the overall wellbeing of Soviet youth, facilitate their harmonious physical development, and prepare them for dedicated and disciplined work including, if necessary, the defense of the socialist motherland. This level, which was developed for 16- to 18-year-old men and women, consisted of eight

tests consisting of theoretical exams and a required level of physical fitness. The 2nd level of the *GTO*, implemented in 1932, was intended for men and women 19 years of age and older. It had the same objectives and number of tests as the 1st level but the exams had a higher degree of difficulty. In 1934, the *GTO* level for school children (*BGTO*) was integrated into the public schools' physical education curriculum nationwide. The main goal of *BGTO* was to advance students' fitness, hygiene and health habits.

It is significant to note that by 1946 the *Ready for Labor and Defense* program had been successfully synchronized with both the general physical fitness movement and the growing trend toward sports specialization. According to the *All-Union Universal Sport Classification* scheme, this meant that in order to receive a certain sport rank (based on an athlete's sporting achievements) the athlete had to first pass the corresponding *GTO* exam (that was based on the athlete's age). Clearly, the interdependent nature of the *GTO* program played a prominent role in popularizing physical culture and fostering mass participation in the sporting movement in the USSR. By the early 1960s, however, the *GTO* had begun to lose its significance until eventually it became a rudimentary appendix of the sporting system (V. Ryba & Ivanika, personal communication, December 2004).

The *All-Union Universal Sport Classification* scheme that existed in the former Soviet Union and is still used in Russia today was introduced in 1935. While the *GTO* program was considered to be the foundation of the Soviet system of physical education, the *Universal Sport Classification* scheme was the fundamental basis of Soviet sport. This system included a set of criteria that allowed the comparison of athletes' performances in any given sport. The classification scheme was regularly updated to

reflect the contemporary level of athletic achievement in the world arena. Beginning in 1960, the qualification criteria were reviewed every four years after the Olympic Games and modified accordingly. The only factor that remained constant was the classification system's link with the *BGTO* and *GTO*. That is, no level of athletic proficiency was awarded without the successful completion of the respective *BGTO* or *GTO* norms, which supposedly facilitated the all-around development of athletes.

In ascending order, the levels of classification included three junior grades (3rd, 2nd, and 1st), three senior grades (3rd, 2nd, and 1st), Master of sport candidate, Master of sport, Master of sport international, and honored Master of sport. As an example, for an athlete to qualify as a Master of sport in an event he or she would have to have won two or more awards at the junior national championship, placed among the top ten in the senior championship and at least participated in international competitions. All Soviet athletes' qualifications were monitored and recorded by sporting officials.

The rapid rise in athletic standards and qualifying requirements also stimulated the advancement of the sport sciences in the Soviet Union. Attention was devoted to both theoretical and methodological work designed to discover new and more effective athletic training techniques. Moreover, pedagogical and training practices were increasingly grounded in a contemporary scientific knowledge base. As a result, science became a vehicle for cultivating high-achievement sport in the USSR. All in all, the implementation of the *All-Union Universal Sport Classification* scheme was a significant step in the evolution of the Soviet sport. The "coach-athlete" team utilized this universal system as a framework for planning each athlete's career from beginner to Master of

sport, determining the short-term and long-term training goals, and developing a systematic and disciplined schedule of practice.

Educational structure for preparing physical education teachers and professional coaches

An important part of the historical evolution of the Soviet state was the establishment of a comprehensive schooling system for the preparation of physical educators. This system included, but was not limited to, workshops and seminars, short-term training courses, institutions of physical culture (that had day, night and correspondence departments), graduate schools, continuing education, and advanced training courses for physical education teachers and coaches with higher education degrees (Kukushkin, 1961). From the early days of the Soviet state, six-month-courses for school physical education teachers and athletic instructors were in operation in Moscow. Based on the subject matter contained in these courses, the Soviet Government founded the first Soviet Institute of Physical Culture in 1918, which initially offered a one-year program of study (Stolbov, 1983). In 1920, Lenin signed a resolution of the Council of People's Commissars for the purpose of reorganizing this institute into a "scientific educational institute." During the Soviet era, this institute came to be known as the State Central Institute of Physical Culture (now the Russian State Academy of Physical Culture). In the same year, the Central Military School of Physical Education was established for the training of physical education teachers for Army and military schools. The oldest institution of physical education, however, is the P. F. Lesgaft Institute of Physical Culture, which was founded in 1896 by Piotr Lesgaft (Volkov, Gorbunov, & Stambulova, 1998). This institute (now known as the P. F. Lesgaft State

Academy of Physical Culture) was the first of its kind in Russia to be devoted to the study of physical education and sport and, to the present day, is still famous for preparing physical education teachers and professional coaches in a wide variety of sports.

By 1960 the Soviet system for preparing physical education teachers and professional coaches included the following educational institutions:

Colleges of physical culture. These were vocational schools that prepared medium-level qualification personnel for teaching in secondary schools and physical culture collectives. The first colleges were established in 1925. By 1940 there were 27 and by 1948, 39 colleges of physical culture across the country. In addition, a number of colleges were reorganized into institutes of physical culture. On the moment of the fall of the Soviet Union, there were 33 colleges in the country.

Trainers' schools. These were secondary specialization educational institutions that were housed within the institutes of physical culture. Their primary function was to prepare coaches in a variety of sports for work in the large physical culture collectives. The first trainers' schools were established in 1934 and by January 1, 1962 they numbered 21 throughout the USSR. To be accepted to a trainers' school, a person was required to have a general education certificate and an athletic qualification not lower than the 1st grade of the *All-Union Universal Sport Classification* scheme.

Faculties of physical education. These faculties were housed in the Pedagogical Institutes of the Ministries of Education of the Soviet Republics. Established during the post-war period (i.e., 1947 – 1948), they were created to address a severe shortage of physical education teachers in the secondary schools. In order to be accepted to one of the faculties, applicants were required to successfully pass an entrance examination covering

a number of general subject matter areas within the scope of the secondary schools curriculum as well as gymnastics, track and field activities, and swimming. In addition, they had to have completed level 1 or 2 of the *GTO* program and obtained an athletic classification no lower than the 3rd level according to the *All-Union Universal Sport Classification* scheme. Following a four-year-program of study, graduates of a faculty of physical education taught physical culture at both the secondary school and university levels.

Institutes of physical culture. These were specialized institutions of higher education and were the main educational, methodological and scientific centers of physical education and sport in the USSR. There were 16 such institutes in the country in the early 1960s. Two of them, the State Central Institute of Physical Culture in Moscow and the P. F. Lesgaft Institute of Physical Culture in Leningrad, played a central role in the formation and development of the Soviet system of physical education. Institutes of physical culture in the Soviet republics were mainly responsible for preparing physical education teachers for positions in the local schools. All institutes had a pedagogical department but only four of them, in Moscow, Leningrad, Kyiv and Minsk, included a sport (i.e., coaching) department as well.

In order to be accepted to an institute of physical culture, all individuals were required to pass entrance exams. Students entering a pedagogical department were required to have a 2nd level of athletic classification while those entering a sport department had to possess at least a 1st level classification according to the *All-Union Universal Sport Classification* scheme. All students who maintained satisfactory progress in their studies received a state scholarship and sport apparel. In addition to general

subjects, such as bio-medical courses and major sport courses, students took in-depth coursework in a sporting event of their specialization (e.g., theory and methods of teaching gymnastics). The sport department curriculum was devoted to more hours in a student's specialization and fewer required hours in general sport courses. Institute of physical culture students were in fact student-athletes, who continued their own sport training while they were pursuing a degree.

Graduates of an institute of physical culture held a degree in either physical education (pedagogical department) and were certified as teachers of physical culture or in coaching (sport department) and were certified both as coaches for a specific sport and as teachers of physical education. Upon graduation, these individuals assumed teaching positions at various educational institutions, sports clubs, children's and youth sports schools, sports committees, or the *DSO* (Kukushkin, 1961).

VShT (Russian acronym for High Trainers' School). As a result of the consecutive poor performance of Soviet soccer players in international competitions during the decade of 1970s – 1980s, the Council of Ministers of the USSR sanctioned the opening of *VShT* for the training of soccer coaches within the State Central Institute of Physical Culture in Moscow (resolution No.179 of March 1976). The main objective of this newly formed elite two-year training program was to prepare coaches of the highest caliber to work with elite teams, national teams of the Soviet Republics and/or at the Olympic training centers. Shortly after the summer Olympic Games of 1980, two other specializations, i.e., ice hockey and track and field athletics, were added to the elite program for coaches. All students of *VShT* were professional coaches who possessed

considerable practical experience with athletes and were recommended for the program by the Sports Committees of Soviet Republics.⁹

VShT attracted the most prominent scholars in their respective fields to teach courses such as the planning of the training process, methods of training, sport psychology, sport medicine and medical supervision of athletes, physiology, and biochemistry. In addition, lecturers in sports specialization were both academic faculty (i.e., faculty of the State Central Institute of Physical Culture and the P. F. Lesgaft Institute of Physical Culture) and practitioners (i.e., coaches of national teams of the Soviet Union and head coaches of the leading elite soccer clubs). Professional internships were incorporated into the two-year academic curriculum. Soccer students, for example, experienced three internships during their time of study (i.e., 1st year: 40 days with a Soviet elite soccer team during the pre-season in February and March; 2nd year: 14 days with a soccer club of England, Italy, Holland, Spain, Germany, Hungary or the Czech Republic during the competitive season in March; and 30 days with an elite soccer club of the student's home republic during the competitive season). Moreover, students participated in supervised pedagogical practice with junior athletes and teams from various Moscow athletic clubs (e.g., "Spartak," "Dinamo," "TsSKA" and "Torpedo"). While at *VShT*, students were paid a stipend comparable to the salary they had been earning prior to entering the program. Furthermore, they received a full set of sport uniforms and accommodations (including members of their family) in institute housing.

⁹ *VShT* had a rigorous selection process and offered a very limited number of vacancies. In an effort to maintain fairness and provide this opportunity to coaches from different regions of the country, the vacancies were distributed among the 15 Soviet Republics and major cosmopolitan centers (i.e., Moscow and Leningrad) in the following order: Leningrad and each republic (Ukraine and Russian Federation excluded) had one spot, Ukraine had three, and Moscow and the Russian Federation had seven spots each.

The Soviet government also covered all work-related traveling expenses. It is likely, therefore, that *VShT* was the only educational institution of its kind during that time.

The role of science in the sport system of the Soviet Union

At each historical juncture of its development, officials of the Soviet state were aware of the integral role of science in furthering the development of high-achievement sport and paid close attention to the findings of basic scientific research in the field of physical culture and sport. Sport science, as a matter of fact, was incorporated into the organizational structure of Soviet sport. As early as 1930, four *NII*s (Russian acronym for the Institute of Scientific Research) of physical culture were established in Moscow, Leningrad, Ukraine and Georgia (Stolbov, 1983). The principal task of the *NII* was to provide a scientific rationale for the training and development of elite athletes. *NII*'s research interests were diverse; however, the principal objective was to discover ways of optimizing the organizational processes of athletic training in different sports. Together, the academic disciplines of pedagogy, psychology, physiology, hygiene and biomechanics pursued the unified goal of advancing sport practice.

It is important to note that Russian intellectual thought was informed by a strong tradition of materialism in general and a materialist understanding of the nature of psychic processes in particular, as evident in the work of M. V. Lomonosov (1711 – 1765), V. G. Belinsky (1811 – 1848), I. M. Sechenov (1829 – 1905), I. P. Pavlov (1849 – 1935) and V. M. Bekhterev (1857 – 1927), to name but a few (Roudik, 1964). Interestingly, however, the doctrine of materialism had relatively little influence on institutionalized general psychology. Prior to the Socialist Revolution of 1917, Russian

mainstream psychology was greatly influenced by idealism and the idealist thought of G. I. Chelpanov, who had established a Psychological Institute within the philosophical department at Moscow University in 1912. Eventually, this institute became the largest center for experimental scientific studies in psychology in the country. However, the Socialist Revolution marked a crucial break from the dominant psychological discourse and sparked larger debates about the necessity to reconceptualize (psychological) science on the basis of Marxist philosophy (Andreeva, 1997). These debates lasted until the early 1930s and coincided with the emergence of ideological education that was being increasingly stressed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Building up on the Russian heritage of scientific materialism and the fundamental work of the neuroscientist Krestovnikov on the specificity of central nervous system's role in the formation and development of motor skills, the anatomist Bernstein, the biomechanist Ivanitsky, and sport psychologists Puni and Roudik, the foundation of Soviet sport scientific knowledge was laid (Stolbov, 1983). In 1939, Professor Farfel compiled a collection of research papers dealing with the problems of the training effect and the principle of progressive overload that was published in what became a landmark book entitled *Investigation into the Physiology of Physical Exercises*. Two scholars from the field of sport psychology, Piotr Roudik and Avksenty Puni, played a seminal role in developing the psychology of sport as an academic discipline. Both Puni's and Roudik's psychological orientation was grounded in Marxist historical materialism and physiological psychology and emphasized the principles of conditioning discovered by Pavlov. As a result, the dominant psychological discourse in the Soviet Union was characterized by the following six principles, summarized by Roudik (1964):

- *Principle of materialist monism* – states that the psyche is a function of the brain. Therefore, in order to develop the materialist understanding of psychic processes, psychologists need to study the nervous system and the physiological basis of these processes.
- *Principle of determinism* – states that psychic processes are determined by physiological processes of the nervous system and influences of the external environment.
- *Principle of reflection* – states that consciousness is a subjective reflection of the objective natural world. Therefore, psychologists need to study the psyche and/or consciousness not as some autonomous phenomenon but as the product of the psychic function of the brain, which reflects objective reality.
- *Principle of unity between consciousness and activity* – states that consciousness is inseparable from the activity; that is, consciousness and activity create an indissoluble unity. Consciousness is not only manifested by but also formed by the process of activity. Therefore, psychologists need to study psychic processes not as abstract forces but as processes that exist in the context of specific forms of activity.
- *Principle of historicism* – states that the psyche and/or consciousness develop in the process of people's historical development. Therefore, psychologists need to study psychic processes in their dialectical evolution, identifying those aspects of human consciousness and personality that are socially determined.

- *Principle of a unity between theory and practice* – stresses the importance of psychologists’ active participation, by means of their scientific research, in solving the practical tasks of socialist society.

To illustrate how the above principles of Marxist psychological science provided a theoretical framework for Soviet psychologists’ conceptualizations of psychological processes, I offer the following excerpt of Puni’s argument (taken from his essay “Some questions in the theory of the will and the development of will power in sport”) for the notion of will power as a psychic phenomenon:

The experimentally substantiated idea of the polyfunctioning of psychic processes is one of the significant achievements of contemporary Soviet psychology.

Considerable research has supported the notion that such functioning is determined by a variety of circumstances in a person’s life and activity, through which the individual’s psyche is manifested, developed, and formed. However, there are also reasons to consider the polyfunctioning of the will and its role in the self-regulation of human behavior and action. As Lenin put it, the will is a function of a normally working brain. This means that the will, like all psychic events, is a secondary product of the brain’s functioning.¹⁰ Thus, when Soviet psychologists talk about the determinative influence of external causes via internal conditions, they give primary status to the unique structure, functioning, and status of the brain (and, in broader scale, the nervous system) in each particular moment, as the material basis of psychic states, thoughts, feelings, and

¹⁰ In materialist theory, organic matter (e.g., the brain and the nervous system) is given primary status while psychic functioning (e.g., the will) is viewed as a secondary product of this matter.

voluntary personality manifestations. In essence, then, the will as a psychic phenomenon can be briefly defined as an active side of the mind and moral sense, and a function of a normally working brain that enables an individual to persevere, especially when overcoming obstacles of varying degrees of difficulty (Puni, 1982).

At the beginning of the 1960s, sport scientific research became more complex and tended to be of collaborative nature among scholars in the *NII* of physical culture, the Academies of Pedagogy and Medical Sciences of the USSR, and the Academies of Sciences of the Soviet Republics. At that time, research problems were focused on (a) the identification and practical implementation of the most efficient means and methods of physical, technical, tactical, psychological and theoretical preparation of athletes; (b) improvements in the planning of annual and long-term (i.e., several years in advance) athletic training; (c) advances in pedagogical, medical and physiological supervision of athletes during the training process; (d) recovery, rehabilitation and general enhancement of athletic efficiency; and (e) issues of youth sport (Stolbov, 1983).

To facilitate elite athletes' preparation for international competitions and the Olympic Games in particular, so-called "complex scientific groups" (abbreviated *KNG* in Russian) or "scientific support units" were formed in 1959 to work with Soviet national teams. The *KNG* consisted of head coaches of national teams for a certain sport and representatives from various sport sciences, such as physicians, physiologists, educational specialists, biochemists, and psychologists. The main task of these groups was to assist athletes and coaches in improving the effectiveness of their training, especially for competitions at the elite level.

Dr. Yevgenieva, professor of physiology at the Kyiv Institute of Physical Culture, was one of those who participated in the work of the *KNG*, directing the bio-medical supervision and support of the USSR national handball team between 1972 and 1990 (personal communication, December 2004). During that period, the Soviet national team won the Montreal Olympic Games in 1976, placed second at the Moscow Olympic Games in 1980, became a two-time World Champion, and placed among the top three a number of times at the European Championships. According to Dr. Yevgenieva, each *KNG* consisted of three groups or teams: pedagogical, bio-medical and psychological.

The pedagogical team was responsible for the planning of the training process (i.e., four-year-cycle, one-year-cycle, mesa-cycle and micro-cycle); analysis of the team's competitive performance, including the relationship of its performance to that of the leading teams in the world; and the analysis of the methods of development and refinement of motor skills.

The bio-medical team provided the team's coach with information concerning the level of functional readiness of athletes at the beginning of each stage of training; the cumulative effect of training at each stage; athletes' tolerance towards progressive overload during random practice in the micro-cycle and mesa-cycle; the rate of athletes' recovery after practice, which allowed the coach to individualize the training process and determine the tactics of the rehabilitation procedure. Comprehensive checkups were conducted twice a year in collaboration with the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Physical Culture's (abbreviated *VNIIFK* in Russian) laboratory of functional diagnostics and the republican center of sport medicine.

The psychological team's tasks (usually one sport psychologist was assigned to each team) was to observe and study the influence of sport activity on athletes' psyche; formulate and create a psychological climate that increased the efficiency of athletes' training; promote the development of athletes' psychological skills and mental preparation for competitions; and assess the psychological and social status of interpersonal relations among team members in order to facilitate the formation of optimal group dynamics.

Results obtained by the pedagogical, bio-medical and psychological teams were relayed to each member of the *KNG* and routinely discussed with the team's coach. Based on the dynamics of this comprehensive information, the head coach would modify the training process and offer suggestions for further study by one or more of the teams. In a personal interview, Dr. Yevgenieva praised the professional competence and expertise of the head coach of the national team, Professor Yevtushenko and credited the collaborative efforts of the coaching staff and the *KNG* for the international success of the Soviet handball team in the years between 1972 and 1990.

The previous example of the work of the *KNG* with the national handball team is representative of the practical implementation of the latest scientific advances that took place at that time in all Soviet elite sport, and particularly those national teams that participated in Olympic sports. After 1980, all teams at the elite level continued their required collaboration with a *KNG*. However, those support teams were less effective because for cost and expediency sake they were based in institutes or faculties of physical culture within pedagogical institutes located in the teams' hometowns. Frequently, this

meant that the *KNG* was comprised of weaker research personnel, especially those in the bio-medical sciences (V. Ryba, personal communication, December 2004).

Biographical overview of Avksenty Cezarevich Puni (1898 – 1986)

This section is a slightly revised version of an introductory section of the paper entitled “The Russian origins of sport psychology: a translation of an early work of A. C. Puni” published in the *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology* by Tatiana V. Ryba, Natalia B. Stambulova and Craig A. Wrisberg:

Ryba, T. V., Stambulova, N. B., & Wrisberg, C. A. (2005). The Russian origins of sport psychology: a translation of an early work of A. C. Puni. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 17(2), 157 – 169.

My use of “we” in this section refers to my co-authors and myself.

Avksenty Cezarevich Puni was born in Vyatka, a small town in northwestern Russia in 1898 (Puni, 1978). As a youth Puni received what in Russia was described as a gymnasium education, involving the study of classical languages, Greek and Roman, classical literature and arts. Puni was very active in sports and was known as a good soccer goalkeeper, sprinter, gymnast, and table tennis player. At 16 years of age, Puni organized a society of amateur sport enthusiasts, first in Vyatka. In 1917, Puni entered the University of Perm to study medicine but his education was curtailed when the Soviet Socialist Revolution and Civil War broke out later that year. Puni left the university and joined the *Red Army* to fight in that war.

Because of his involvement as an athlete in a variety of sports and his interest in sport generally, Puni accepted a position as a sport organizer in his native town of Vyatka following the Civil War. Puni’s experiences both as an athlete and sport organizer

sparked a deeper interest in questions relating to the psychology of training and performance. In 1927, Puni in collaboration with Dr. Kostrov conducted his first study examining the psycho-physiological effects of training in the sport of table tennis (Puni & Kostrov, 1930). In 1929, Puni moved to Leningrad (now St. Petersburg) and entered the P. F. Lesgaft Institute of Physical Culture (now known as the P. F. Lesgaft State Academy of Physical Culture) founded in 1896 by Piotr Lesgaft (Volkov et al., 1998).

Puni not only completed undergraduate and graduate studies at the Lesgaft Institute but also served on the faculty there during the remainder of his professional life. During his student years Puni was involved in research studies examining a number of psychological issues pertaining to sport performance. He also published several papers in the main sport science journal in the USSR, *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*. Puni's papers are considered to be among the earliest published works in the field of sport psychology in Russia. In 1938, he received a Ph.D. in pedagogy from the Lesgaft Institute. Later, as an Associate Professor in the Psychology Department, Puni devoted most of his attention to the study of applications of psychology to sport and became identified as one of the Soviet Union's first sport psychologists.

During World War II, Puni worked as a physiotherapist¹¹ at several hospitals in Leningrad (Shakhverdov, Semenov, Bogdanova, & Kiselev, 1970) and survived a 900-day blockade of the city that occurred between 1941 and 1944. After the war he returned to the Lesgaft Institute and resumed his work in sport psychology. By that time Puni and

¹¹ Students at the Lesgaft Institute of Physical Culture could take additional coursework to obtain a second diploma in physical rehabilitation. Puni had pursued this course of study and was a certified "metodist po lechebnoi fizkulture" [rehabilitation specialist]. During the blockade of Leningrad, he provided physical rehabilitation assistance for wounded soldiers and civilians.

some of his colleagues had begun to develop the psychology of sport as a distinct area of research and scholarship. In 1946, Puni made the then bold move of formalizing the discipline of sport psychology by organizing and launching a department by that name at the institute. Not surprisingly, Puni was elected the department's first chair. Puni and a small group of enthusiastic co-workers, including Risya Abelskaya and Anna Rafalovich, set out to establish this new field by creating sport psychology coursework for students, organizing a laboratory, conducting research¹² and establishing contacts with other scholars in sport studies and psychology in Leningrad and around the Soviet Union.

Puni served as department chair for 30 years and never fully retired. He continued working as a professor-consultant and supervisor of doctoral students until his death at the age of 87. In honor of his establishment of and life-long association with the Department of Sport Psychology, the Lesgaft Institute re-named the department after Puni in 1992 (Stambulova & Hvatskaya, 1996).

We would be remiss if we did not note that a parallel development in the field of Soviet sport psychology, led by Piotr Antonovich Roudik, occurred in the Psychology Department at the State Central Institute of Physical Culture in Moscow (now the Russian State Academy of Physical Culture) around the same time Puni was building the program at the Lesgaft Institute. Consequently, Roudik is also considered to be one of the

¹² The line of research in the Department of Sport Psychology at that time included: a) psychological aspects of motor learning (i.e., technical preparation of athletes), including ideomotor training, the role of self-talk, development of awareness/non-awareness of motor habits, etc.; b) psychological aspects of tactical preparation (i.e., thinking, memory, anticipation); c) volition in sport and exercise; and d) psychological characteristics of sport in general and of specific sports (see Abelskaya, 1955, 1957a, 1957b; Abelskaya & Surkov, 1955; Egupov, 1955; Puni, 1952, 1955, 1957a, 1957b, 1957c, 1959; Rafalovich, 1955).

early patriarchs of Russian sport psychology. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, the focus of most sport psychology research was on psychophysical mechanisms underlying motor behavior. In 1925, Roudik founded the first sport psychology laboratory in the Soviet Union. In the following years, he and his team of researchers directed their focus on the conceptualization of the notions of will and the moral and volitional preparation of Soviet athletes (Rodionov & Hudadov, 1982; Roudik, 1962). Though some research interests of Puni and Roudik overlapped, Roudik's general orientation was much more ideological and less applied than that of Puni.

During the 1950s, Roudik and Puni competed for the role of acknowledged leader in the field. Their rivalry continued actively throughout the 1960s and 1970s and had an inextricable and complex influence on the development of sport psychology in the USSR. On the one hand, it stimulated both individuals and their respective colleagues to establish the highest standards possible in both research and scholarship, and to pioneer ingenious and innovative applications of psychology to competitive sport. On the other hand, the rivalry spurred frequent confrontations between representatives of the Moscow and Leningrad schools and obstructed productive communication and advancement of the field.

The decade of the 1950s was a significant marker in the history of the Soviet sport psychology. In 1952, Puni received a second doctoral degree from the Leningrad State University, following the successful defense of his thesis, entitled "Sport Psychology." This event marked the official recognition of sport psychology as a separate discipline in the USSR. Interestingly, that same year the Soviet National team was triumphant in its first appearance at the Olympic Games held in Helsinki. Most significantly, the sport

sciences, including sport psychology, were acknowledged to be an important contributor to the successes of Soviet athletes. As a result there was an increased call for applied research and for the improved education of Soviet coaches in the area of sport psychology. In general, Soviet sport psychologists of Puni's era emphasized the application of psychological science to sport in order to promote the athletic achievement of Soviet athletes in national and international competitions.

Puni's major contribution to the field is arguably the establishment of the Leningrad scientific school of sport psychology (Shakhverdov et al., 1970; Volkov et al., 1998) and his theory of competition preparation, which was formalized in an applied model he called Psychological Preparation for a Competition (PPC). The PPC model in its completed form was published in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Puni, 1969, 1973). It was based on a theoretical analysis of existing literature and the results of a number of empirical studies Puni had conducted with some of his colleagues and doctoral students. Because Puni felt that the main goal of psychological preparation was to develop and maintain an optimal state of psychological readiness, he stressed the importance of developing instruments and methods that could be used to monitor and diagnose psychological states. Puni also discussed a number of possible interventions (e.g., relaxation, focusing techniques, positive self-suggestions, etc.) that could be used by athletes for the purpose of regulating suboptimal pre-competition states. In fact, diagnoses and interventions of this nature represented the two main tasks of applied sport psychologists working with elite Soviet athletes and teams during that era.

Puni's PPC model provided clear guidelines for performance enhancement and, therefore, was very popular with practitioners. The model stimulated a perspective on

applied sport psychology that epitomized the connection between science and practice. Moreover, Puni's students and others who represented the "first wave" of applied sport psychologists in the Soviet Union (e.g., Alexeev, Ganushkin, Gissen, Gorbunov, Hanin, Kiselev, Khudadov, Radchenko, Rodionov, and Stambulov), engaged in numerous debates centered on the role of the sport psychologist and the scope of psychological services that sport psychologists should provide for athletic teams, elevating the psychology of sport to a position of greater prominence in Soviet sport. Eventually, these individuals developed their own approaches to the provision of sport psychology consultation grounded in their respective training experiences and applied work. However, the impact of Puni's PPC model can be seen in each of these approaches. Clearly, Puni's leadership in academic scholarship, pedagogy, supervision of graduate students' work and service in professional organizations continued to shape the development of sport psychology in the USSR for over 50 years.

Conclusion

Sporting practices, as an integral part of culture, mean different things in different social systems and have very definite social and political ramifications. Moreover, the meaning of sport in general and sport psychology in particular shifts over time. In this chapter, I have attempted to contextualize the emergence of the Soviet sport psychological discourse and highlight its intimate connection with the state-sponsored system of physical culture and sport. Many sport historians have acknowledged the fact that the well organized comprehensive sport system in the Soviet Union allowed for the concentrated mutual efforts of a whole range of sport practitioners and scholars to

advance Soviet sport and, by means of its international recognition, trumpet the ideology of socialism.

It is significant to note that, initially, a wide-scale sporting movement in the USSR was intended to improve the health and overall wellbeing of Soviet people (particularly the youth), facilitate their harmonious physical and intellectual development, and draw them into the country's social and political life. Soviet leaders attempted further to use physical culture and sport to instill communist moral values and prepare young men and women for dedicated work, including, if necessary, the defense of the Socialist way of life. Eventually the focus of Soviet sport began to shift towards performance excellence and the cultivation of superior athletes. By the mid 1970s, the era when "high athletic performance was synonymous with good health, has long [...] passed" (Shneidman, 1979). The goal of sport was blurring and shifting; becoming devoted less to the strengthening of citizens' health and more to advancing the reputation of the Soviet social order. Sport sciences, including sport psychology, were called upon to enhance athletic performance and assist athletes in coping with the demands of training and competitive pressure. It's important to bear in mind, however, that the benefits of psychological support services for athletes were fully realized due in large part to the complex centralized sporting structure (e.g., talent identification and selection; the built-in incentives system; and the scientific basis underlying sport performance) and the working conditions of Soviet sport psychologists (e.g., prestigious and secure state employment; the relatively stable composition of national teams; and collaboration with other sport experts, including highly qualified coaches).

Chapter Four
Triangulation of American Physical Education, the Sporting Movement and
Sport Psychology

The immigration and industrialization of America spawned the growth of large, populated cities. Sports clubs were formed that offered those individuals having fewer work hours opportunities to engage in leisure activities. The physical education profession was initially directed by medical doctors and other people interested in the effects of exercise upon the health and well-being of the general population. From this impetus arose recognized programs of study, or teacher training institutions, to prepare and certify teachers of physical education.

Welch & Lerch, 1981, p. 9.

The purpose of this chapter is to contextualize the emergence of sport psychology in the early work of Griffith and (re)birth of the discourse within physical education departments in the 1960s. I work from a premise that there is an abundant literature on the American history of physical education and sport that is readily available for English speaking audiences. In this chapter, therefore, I present a pasticcio of images of the American sporting experience in an attempt to illustrate the underlying discursive forces that transformed Griffith's work into a hermetically sealed text, so to speak, and became the focus of contemporary sport psychological discourse. I begin with a brief timeline of the 19th century American sporting movement, which is a modified and shortened version of Paul's (personal communication, March 2005) list of themes. I then provide a biographical narrative of Griffith along with glimpses of certain individual and institutional practices of his day to further contextualize the emergence of the early discourse in sport psychology. The chapter concludes with a depiction of the parallel historical developments in American sporting discourse (i.e., women's sporting practices

and men's sporting practices) and a brief discussion of the discursive possibilities for the emergence of the current sport psychological discourse in the mid 1960s.

Timeline (1840s – 1890s)

1840s:

Beginning of the Turnverein (i.e., the German system of gymnastics) movement in the United States

Early shaping of the American educational system. Dr. William Wood contends that “if the student wishes to retain energy of both mind and body, he (*sic*) must resort to exercise daily. It will add beauty and proportion to his body, strength and activity to his mind, ease and grace to all his movements” (cited in Rice, 1939).

1845 The first baseball club, the Knickerbocker Club of New York City, organized

1848 Seneca Falls Women's Rights Convention

1850s:

Rapid spread of the Turnverein movement

First college gymnasium constructed (becomes the basis for the first physical education departments)

Swedish gymnastics introduced

Arrival of “bloomers”

1851 YMCA founded by George Petrie in Boston, MA

1852 First intercollegiate competition (Yale vs. Harvard rowing race)

First publications on gymnastics and exercise

1853 First black (athletic) association established in Washington, D.C.

1860s:

New Gymnastics introduced by Dr. Dio Lewis

1861 Vassar is first college to require PE for women

1861 Lewis opens Normal Institute for Physical Education, devoted to specialized training of American physical education teachers

1862 Lewis's book New Gymnastics for Men, Women and Children published and widely read

Medical doctors perform duties of physical educators

First professional baseball team, Cincinnati Red Stockings, formed

1861 – 1865 American Civil War

1863 Lincoln issues Emancipation Proclamation

1866 YWCA opens in Boston

1867 Ku Klux Klan organized in Nashville, TN

1870s:

Intercollegiate sports become an important feature of college life

1879 National Association of Amateur Athletes of America organized

1880s:

YMCA begins practice of physical education

1885 American Association for Physical Education founded

1889 Mary Hemenway and Amy Morris Homans convene the famous Boston
Conference in the Interest of Physical Training
More colleges add physical education departments
Delphine Hanna is first female to teach co-educational college PE courses

1890s:

Bicycling for women becomes popular
Basketball turns professional

1894 First State law requiring PE passed

1896 Revival of Olympic Games

Historically sport has been a public space where sex differentiation as a form of power has been constructed and the hegemonic power hierarchy and male superiority rhetoric has been reinforced. For example, Gorn (1997) argues that despite a strict hierarchical class system, sports and games of the 19th century served as a “social glue,” providing cultural space for male bonding and the redefinition of masculinity via aggressiveness, competitiveness, physicality and courage. Women could only participate in socially sanctioned physical activities, such as archery, horseback riding and bathing. Discriminatory practices, which denied girls and women equal access to sports, were designed to ensure men’s control over the female body and the societal ideal of femininity. Consider the following account of a “girls’ regatta” held in 1878:

Excitement ran high on the 19th, in Fair Haven, New Jersey, on the beautiful Shrewsbury. The white skirts of Jersey belles fluttered in the breeze...The sails of

yachts sparkled in the sunshine, and rowboats flitted...to and fro. The occasion was a regatta for the fair sex, and bebies of pretty girls danced along the...shore...

(cited in Welch & Lerch, 1981, p. 10).

Until the early 1970s, women who challenged societal norms and dared show their performing bodies faced disparaging public ridicule, ostracism and social isolation.

Biographical overview of Coleman Roberts Griffith (1893 – 1966)

Coleman Griffith, who is widely known as the father of sport psychology in the United States, was born in Guthrie Center, Iowa. There is not much documented information about Griffith's youth. What is known is that he attended Greenville College in Illinois, where he was very active in athletics, participating in many intramural sports including tennis, baseball, basketball and handball. Griffith also became known as the successful organizer of numerous gymnastics events. After his graduation in 1916, Griffith took a position as physical director and instructor of education at Greenville College (Gould & Pick, 1995).

In 1917, Griffith began his graduate studies in experimental psychology at the University of Illinois under the mentorship of scholars who had studied psychology with Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig. Griffith's major professor, Madison Bentley, was a strong proponent of a psychobiological basis of behavior. Bentley's theoretical position rested on the notion that the human organism consists of both biological and psychological functions (Tolman, 1999). Bentley's orientation shaped Griffith's theoretical approach to sport psychology, which involved the examination of psychological functions in the

context of athletic competition. In 1920, Griffith received the PhD degree in psychology after successfully defending his dissertation entitled “Organic and Mental Effects of Repeated Rotation” (Griffith, 1920).

It appears that during this time Griffith became interested in various psychological aspects of sports such as football and basketball. For example, he conducted research on the reaction time of football players at the University of Illinois. Griffith later incorporated that data along with other psychological observations he had obtained from athletes in an introductory course in psychology he taught at Illinois (Gould & Pick, 1995; Wiggins, 1984). Almost a decade later, Griffith designed and began to teach a course entitled Psychology in Athletics. Commenting on this new course, Griffith (1930) stated,

Instead of confining itself to the illustration of psychological facts and principles by drawing upon athletics...the new course sought to make a serious psychological analysis of all phases of athletic competition, to review the literature already available which bore upon such problems as skill, learning, habit, attention, vision, emotion, and reaction time, and again, wherever possible, such new knowledge as time and the facilities warranted (pp. 35-36).

Gould and Pick (1995) found that “between the years of 1925 and 1931, sport psychology flourished at Illinois” (p. 398). Griffith’s innovative work so impressed the University of Illinois’ Head of the Department of Physical Welfare, George Huff, that he initiated the establishment of a Research in Athletics Laboratory in 1925, and named Griffith its director. The laboratory was well financed by the athletic association and Griffith was able to employ a technician who developed various testing instruments (e.g.,

apparatus for measuring everything from reaction time to muscular load; a test of motor steadiness, muscular coordination and learning ability; a test of mental alertness, etc.) for research conducted in the lab (Gould & Pick, 1995; Kroll & Lewis, 1970). For Griffith, one of the main tasks of the sport psychologist was to adapt theoretical knowledge and research findings from the field of general psychology to sport. He believed that various psychological processes, such as attention, motivation, thinking and problem solving, were in “constant play” (Griffith, 1934, p. 23) in every athletic activity. Describing the athlete as a constant learner, Griffith clearly conceptualized the psychology of athletics as a learning process. The following assertion is representative of Griffith’s views on sport psychology:

Some men (*sic*) may be ‘born athletes,’ but most men can learn to be athletes if they give their time to the development of skill in the mental as well as in the physical capacities (Griffith, 1928, p. 14).

Another function of the psychology of sport, according to Griffith (1925), was to provide young and inexperienced coaches with the psychological principles used by highly successful coaches, in order to assist them in the teaching of sports skills. Griffith further advocated the use of scientific methods of investigation to both advance the knowledge base in sport psychology and to assist practitioners in the applied fields. Most of Griffith’s research was conducted in a controlled laboratory setting. Yet he was receptive to the fact that different research problems require different research methods as reflected in the following statement:

There are a great many problems that cannot now even be experimented upon for we do not know how to formulate proper methods. Many of the questions that are

asked of psychologists by people on the street cannot be answered because the science is still in its youth (Griffith, 1928, p. ix).

Thus, Griffith also conducted field observations and interviewed coaches and athletes to gain their insights into the psychological aspects of competition. Overall, it appears that Griffith's conceptualization of sport psychology emphasized the application of psychological theory to sport and the provision of consulting services to coaches.

Despite the numerous experimental successes of the Research in Athletics Laboratory, it was shut down in 1932. Most sources attribute the closure to a reduction in financial support from the athletic association as a result of the Great Depression (e.g., Gould & Pick, 1995; Wiggins, 1984). However, Kroll (1971) suggested that the Illinois' football coach, Robert Zuppke, advocated the closing of the lab because he felt Griffith's research did not assist in improving his players' performance. Ironically, Zuppke's view of sport psychology as a means of enhancing the performance of his football team was different from Huff's notion of sport psychology as an academic activity, which had originally prompted the development of the Research in Athletics Laboratory.

After the laboratory was closed, Griffith concentrated on his duties as a professor of Educational Psychology at Illinois. In 1938, however, the owner of the Chicago Cubs professional baseball team Philip Wrigley hired Griffith to help the Cubs players improve their game. From spring training until the end of the season, Griffith carried out the responsibilities of filming, observing and testing each player and providing consulting services for both the coach and the players. This endeavor constituted one of the largest applied research projects Griffith conducted in the field of sport psychology. Unfortunately, it was also Griffith's last applied project. Although the Cubs had a very

successful season and Griffith was offered a full-time consulting position for the following year, he chose to resume his faculty position at the University of Illinois. From 1944 until 1953, Griffith served as provost of the university and after his retirement from Illinois in 1962, he took a position with the Oregon State System of Higher Education. Griffith died in 1966 at the age of 72.

In contrast to the development of men's sport which predominately occurred outside the walls of academia, the evolution of women's sport in America is closely linked to the field of physical education. Even though the establishment of collegiate sports for men dates as early as 1852, intercollegiate competition was neither sanctioned nor supported by educators. In the case of women, educators attempted to control their every sporting experience. This was primarily due to the presumption that girls and women lacked a capacity for intellectual and physical tasks. Therefore, the goal of physical education was to improve female students' health by systematically strengthening their musculoskeletal and nervous systems (DeSensi & Paul, personal communication, March 2005). Interestingly, this goal prompted physical education to become one of the most important subjects in the formal education of women. In the early 1900s, games and sports began to replace gymnastics in the physical education curriculum under the assumption that these sporting practices would facilitate female students' personal and social development as well as their physical health. Most physical educators also advocated a version of women's sport that was free from strenuous training and competition—"the 'abuses' which had infected men's intercollegiate programs" (Park & Hult, 1993).

Men's sporting programs

Along with industrialization and urbanization, the rise of American sport is associated with the 19th – early 20th century cult of manliness and competitiveness (Gorn, 1997; Sage, 1998). As radical social changes had challenged and begun to alter traditional gendered practices of socialization and behavior, there was a growing concern over the possible influence of modernization on the development of masculinity and such “male” traits as ruggedness, fierceness and courage (Coakley, 2001; Sage, 1998). In this context, organized sports were assigned a very special role of saving the “future of the nation” (Sage, 1990, p. 98) from effeminacy and preparing boys to face the tough competitiveness of the contemporary job market. Thus, sport became a primary space where male identity was constructed and masculinity was reaffirmed. Men's sporting programs were developed and promoted principally by the efforts of the Boy Scouts, the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), private athletic clubs and college students interested in sporting competition (Welch & Lerch, 1981).

The origin story of intercollegiate athletics can be traced back to the year 1852 when the first rowing competition between Harvard and Yale took place on a lake in New Hampshire. Interestingly, from the very beginning men's intercollegiate sporting events were linked with commercialism and consumerism. In a personal interview, the sport historian Joan Paul explained that this rowing contest was widely advertised in the mass media and organized on a neutral site in order to prompt the fans of both teams to travel, generating profit for the railroad companies and local businesses. The competition,

however, turned out to be a financial disaster and was over three years before the second intercollegiate rowing race between Harvard and Yale took place.

Originally, organized collegiate sports were established by the student body and were generally modeled after the British public schools' sporting system, which emphasized student initiative and self-government. Though collegiate athletic teams competed under the school's name, the institutions provided no financial and/or administrative assistance. In fact, many of the faculty, including physical educators, spoke against college athletics, opposing the inordinate emphasis on winning and "exaggerated importance" of collegiate sport (Welch & Lerch, 1981, p. 206). Physical educators tended to advocate for faculty-controlled sporting programs that would ensure the wellness benefits of participation in games and sports. Consequently, management of the business of intercollegiate athletics was left to the student organized athletic associations. These associations were responsible for the scheduling of games and sporting events, maintenance of the fields and equipment, and later on the hiring of professional coaches for the season (Sage, 1990).

The ongoing pressing issue for most athletic associations was to find funds to support their athletic teams. Yet, student athletic organizations quickly discovered the marketing power of a winning team that brings visibility to the school, attracts spectators and community support, and increases revenues. Thus, the purpose of intercollegiate athletics shifted from its original health orientation to a "win-at-all-cost" one. Deep-rooted in commercialism, athletic associations were preoccupied with recruiting promising athletes to attend their schools; enticing and bribing talented athletes from rival

schools to switch teams; keeping their own graduating star athletes as assistant coaches; and generally searching for any means to produce winning teams (Welch & Lerch, 1981).

Lewis (1972) argues that by the turn of the 20th century, the organizational structure and culture of both higher education and intercollegiate sport reflected middle class values, which governed campus activities and developments. As collegiate sport grew in popularity and intercollegiate contests became important public events, students overextended their capacity to finance and manage day-to-day operations. Alumni were ready to provide assistance but only in exchange for limiting the students' control of athletic associations. Shortly, at most institutions, intercollegiate sport programs were "conducted by an athletic association but much of its authority was vested in a board" (Lewis, 1972, pp. 61-62) that represented and protected the interests and traditions of the alumni. Thus, students' enthusiasm for intercollegiate athletics under the auspices of alumni and local communities encouraged the acceptance of collegiate sport as an integral part of higher education (Rice, 1939; Welch & Lerch, 1981).

From the 1880s until the early 1900s, major intercollegiate contests in rowing, baseball, track, football and later basketball contained questionable practices and abuses. Rowing, for example, was the sport that initially raised the issue of professionalism since it was "obviously unfair to permit the experienced seaman to compete with the untrained amateur oarsman" (Rice, 1939, p. 218). Most collegiate sports at the time had no strict rules and regulations governing sporting competitions and general practices and the game of football epitomized the numerous controversies. Football brutality, injuries and fatalities particularly alarmed physical educators, medical doctors, politicians and the

general public and forced faculty to intervene. Thus began the discussion of possible reforms in college athletics.

In 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt called for a meeting of representatives of leading universities and colleges to discuss intercollegiate athletics in general and the pending reforms in football in particular (Welch & Lerch, 1981). The major outcome of the meeting was the establishment of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association (IAA), which later became known as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1910. This organization was the first nation-wide governing body aimed at regulating and supervising the athletic activities of colleges and universities throughout the United States. The supervision was intended to promote the conduct of athletic activities that were “on the ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education” (Pierce, 1908, p. 87). The newly formed organization was dedicated to uniting colleges and executing control over collegiate sport in the United States, promoting and enforcing the ideals of amateur sport, and generally ensuring the standardization of rules and participants’ safety.

After World War II, the NCAA experienced phenomenal growth but continued to wage battles with many colleges over issues that were evident in earlier decades. Many sport historians and sport sociologists (c.f., Rader, 1983; Sage, 1998; Welch & Lerch, 1981) blame the all-consuming pressure to win for illegal practices and abuses in collegiate sport (e.g., recruiting violations, unethical methods of luring athletes to colleges, falsification of academic records and controversies over “big-time” college

football). In the context of intense intercollegiate rivalry,¹³ it was crucial to enforce high standards of conduct. In 1948, therefore, the NCAA adopted the following governing principles:

- *Principle of Amateurism* – an amateur sportsman (*sic*) is one who engages in sports for the physical, mental, or social benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom sport is an avocation.
- *Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility* – the control and responsibility for the conduct of both intercollegiate and intramural athletics shall in the last analysis be exercised by the institution itself.
- *Principle of Sound Academic Standards* – athletes shall be admitted to the institution on the same basis as any other students and shall be required to observe and maintain the same academic standards.
- *Principle Governing Financial Aids to Students* – financial aids in the form of scholarships, fellowships or otherwise shall be permitted without loss of eligibility.
- *Principle Governing Recruiting* – no member of an athletic staff or other official representative of athletic interest shall solicit the attendance of his institution of any prospective student with the offer of financial aid or equivalent inducements. This however, shall not be deemed to prohibit such staff member or other representative from giving information regarding aids [...] (NCAA Report on Constitutional Revisions, cited in Welch & Lerch, 1981, pp. 216 - 217).

¹³ Rader (1983), for example, asserts that “intercollegiate games frequently represented to fans symbolic battles for superiority between states and regions, sometimes even ethnic groups, religions, and ideologies [...] A winning state university football team [was] a source of indisputable state pride” (pp. 209-210).

Despite the NCAA's efforts, scandals and controversies in college sports continue to be a perennial problem. In fact, critical sport studies scholars argue that the organizational structure of the NCAA, which has been largely preserved in its present form since the 1920s, and its hypocritical guiding philosophy of amateurism and "fair play" are problematic in and of themselves. For example, Sage (1990) asserts that addressing minor issues and blaming the victim (i.e., the student-athlete) for the serious offenses is the NCAA's "brilliant strategy for diverting attention from the real sources of the fundamental problems and for justifying a perverse system of social action" (1990, p. 186).

In conclusion, men's sport in general and intercollegiate athletics in particular was at the forefront of the transformation of American participatory sport into one of spectator sport in the post 1920s. As collegiate sports evolved from a form of campus recreation to a big-time entertainment enterprise, the commodified market and consumers "rather than the players, ultimately determined the broad contours of American sport" (Rader, 1983, p. 196). The "big business" trend is particularly reflective of the sporting culture in NCAA Division I schools.

(White) Women's sporting programs

The early 20th century witnessed a tremendous growth in both physical education and sport. As indicated earlier, the women's sporting movement is associated predominately with the development of physical education. When women's colleges began to offer physical education programs in the 1890s, sporting participation became a part of college women's campus activities (Welch & Lerch, 1981). The elite Seven Sister

colleges¹⁴ were the main sites of women's sports participation, which eventually brought visibility to women's athletics (Riess, 1984).

Basketball was arguably the major sport for college women and its popularity contributed to the development of women's intercollegiate competition. Though the level of competition in women's basketball and other sports varied, female physical educators generally opposed the so-called male model of intercollegiate sport programs in favor of one that encouraged sporting activities for fun, health and friendship. Smith (1984), for example, reported that in 1923 only 11 out of 50 surveyed colleges allowed intercollegiate competition for women, 93 percent of physical educators were opposed to intercollegiate women's sport and 60 percent believed that competitive sport was harmful physically and psychologically for girls and women. As a result, men's basketball rules were modified for women's games and women's intercollegiate competition was largely abandoned to reflect athletic values, which were expressed in a popular motto—a sport for every girl and every girl in a sport.

The evolution of sporting practices for girls and women was seriously hindered by the Victorian notion of frail femininity. The strong muscular female body was not socially desirable at the turn of the 20th century (Riess, 1984). Ironically, Dr. Dudley Sargent, who passionately believed in and promoted vigorous physical activities for women, contributed to the stigmatizing of female athletes by suggesting that “in the athletic type of woman sex characteristics are less accentuated” and that “even the mental and moral qualities that accompany the development of such a figure are largely

¹⁴ The following schools constituted the Seven Sister Institutions: Mount Holyoke Female Seminary, Mount Holyoke College, Vassar College, Smith College, Wellesley College, Radcliffe College and Barnard College.

masculine [...]” (Sargent, 1984, p. 260). Accordingly, the societal suspicion and questioning of sporting women’s femininity and domesticity (which was a code word for heterosexuality) discouraged girls’ and women’s participation in competitive sports and ensured men’s control over the historically male sporting domain (Cahn, 1994).

Thus, female physical educators of the Golden Age carved a separate sphere of physical activities for women, that included play days, sports days and interclass games and that were administered by women (Hardy, 1997; Welch & Lerch, 1981). The Athletic Conference of American College Women (formed in 1917 and in 1933 became the Athletic Federation of College Women) promoted strong connections between women’s sport programs and women’s departments of physical education and opposed intercollegiate competitive sporting events for female athletes. Interestingly, since the philosophy of these women’s programs generally conformed to “male dogma about female limitations,” they were allowed to exist in “relative security and obscurity” (Hardy, 1997, p. 696). However, female athletes who challenged social norms and attempted to enter male terrain by playing “male” versions of basketball, tennis, track and baseball were typically marginalized and put “under a cloud of sexual suspicion” (Cahn, 1994, p. 181). The outstanding female athletes like Gertrude Ederle, who not only swam the English Channel but shattered *all* previous records for doing so, and Helen Wills, who shocked and thrilled the tennis world with her powerful “smashing volleying shots” (quote by Wills cited in Hardy, 1997), threatened and questioned socially erected boundaries of the traditional male/female space. In return, the hegemonic civic and sporting discourses constructed a history of sport that largely deleted the Golden Age

female athletes' stories from "public space and public memory" for the following forty years (Cahn, 1994; Hardy, 1997; Hardy & Ingham, 1983).

It appears that sports that developed independent of an educational affiliation (e.g., archery, tennis, golf and swimming) initiated and provided systematic competitive opportunities for women. The Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) became the leading organization for girls' and women's competitive sport, sponsoring contests and promoting female athletes' participation in the Olympic Games and other international competitions (Welch & Lerch, 1981). Not surprisingly, female physical educators resisted the AAU's attempts to assume jurisdiction over and coordinate women's athletics. The infamous controversy over the U.S. women's track and field team's participation in the first "women's" Olympic Games in 1922, exemplified the then contemporary state of affairs in women's sport. Early in 1922 the AAU expressed the intention to supervise the preparation and transport of a track and field team to Paris. However, many women physical education professionals believed that the American Physical Education Association was the only organization suitable to oversee women's sport programs and strongly opposed the AAU's control of women's track and field. Despite numerous disapprovals voiced by many physical educators, the AAU assumed jurisdiction over women's track and field and sent a team to the Olympic Games. Ironically, that initial team's participation in the Paris Olympics contributed to the curtailment of intercollegiate sporting events for women in subsequent years.

By the mid 1950s, some physical educators began to recognize the necessity to address the needs of highly skilled collegiate female athletes. In November 1953, the Chairperson of the National Section of Girls' and Women's Sports (which was the

predecessor to the National Association for Girls and Women in Sport (NAGWS) of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation) reported that conservative female physical educators continued to favor social interaction over competition in women's programs. Therefore, many colleges were more inclined to hire men, who tended to emphasize competitive intercollegiate sports. Due to the growing interest in women's competitive sports, a Tripartite Committee was formed in order to offer and supervise college women's extramural sports. The Tripartite Committee soon became the National Joint Committee on Extramural Sports for College Women. A significant event in women's sports occurred in 1971 when the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) was established (Welch & Lerch, 1981). The AIAW was the NCAA's counterpart, administering athletic programs for women and sponsoring National championships. However, the AIAW condemned the "win-at-all-cost" philosophy and "evil" practices associated with men's athletics.

In the early 1970s leadership positions in women's intercollegiate athletic programs, including the title of Athletic Director, were occupied almost exclusively by women (Sage, 1998). In fact, at the moment of enactment of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 (Title IX), over 90% of the coaches of women's intercollegiate sporting teams were women. Title IX stated:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

In terms of sporting practices, Title IX required equal opportunity and access to athletic facilities, coaching and training, practice time and travel for women and men (Lucas &

Smith, 1978). Though Title IX dramatically increased athletic opportunities for girls and women, the NCAA fought fiercely to preserve its governance of collegiate athletics and by the 1980s attempted to make inroads into women's collegiate sport. Initially, the NCAA chose to sponsor five women's championships in Divisions II and III schools. The AIAW perceived this move as an attempt to destroy the association from within by bringing women's athletics into the NCAA. One year later, the NCAA organized 12 women's championship competitions for Division I schools. The NCAA's increased visibility and involvement in women's collegiate sport subsequently influenced the decision of 35% of AIAW member institutions to switch governing bodies for the 1981-1982 school year. As a result of a diminishing membership, a dwindling number of championships and a consequent reduction in income the AIAW ceased functioning in 1982. Once the NCAA gained complete control of women's athletics and the majority of schools combined their men's and women's athletic departments into one, the percentage of women in administrative positions began to progressively diminish (Sage, 1990). Acosta and Carpenter (2004) note that by 1988, 84.8% of the women's intercollegiate athletic programs were placed under male leadership and in 2004 women coached only 44.1% of women's sporting teams.

In sum, women's sport developed from recreational activities and health-related exercise programs to eventually include a wide range of organized competitive sports. It appears that the female sporting experience has been under the strict surveillance and shaping of patriarchal social norms, medical views of the female body and hegemonic practices in the field of physical education. Many early (female) physical educators were opposed to incorporating intense training and athletic competition into sporting programs

for girls and women. With the passage of Title IX and the shift of control of women's athletics under the auspices of NCAA, competitive opportunities for girls and women dramatically increased. Ironically, the 1970s also marked the steady decline in leadership opportunities for women in physical education as well as in a number of sporting domains.

Historical underpinnings of the emergence of the current discourse of sport psychology

During the period of World War II and the immediate post war years, the popularity of sporting programs grew immensely. The intercollegiate athletic mantra of winning became the one of paramount importance. However, within the emerging context of intense competition for ideological supremacy between the United States and the Soviet Union, the pressure to produce winning teams and superior athletes began to alter the underlying colors of sport to the distinct colors of red, white and blue. As Wrisberg (personal communication, February 2004) noted, the "Red Scare" and the McCarthy hearings of the 1950s cast virtually every aspect of American everyday life in the light of events occurring in the Soviet Union.

For example, the success of the Soviet space program, especially the launching of the *Sputnik* space satellite in 1954 and a second spacecraft with a human on board in 1961, contributed significantly to President John F. Kennedy's decision to make space exploration a priority of his new administration (Kroll, 1971). The U.S. government felt considerable pressure to respond to the Soviet challenge and turned to American higher education for the important answers. At that time, many scholars began (re)evaluating the quality of college curricula and the kinds of experiences students were receiving. As a

result, the field of physical education, from which American sport psychology would eventually emerge as an academic discipline, became the target of criticism for some educational philosophers. In his book *The Education of American Teachers*, Conant (1963) launched a verbal attack on the curricula of graduate programs in physical education by declaring:

If I wished to portray the education of teachers in the worst terms, I should quote from the descriptions of some graduate courses in physical education. To my mind, a university should cancel graduate programs in this area (cited in Wrisberg, 2004).

As a result of such critiques, a number of prominent physical education academicians began advocating for a shift of emphasis away from traditional programs of professional preparation to ones that emphasized the development of the field as an academic discipline. In 1964, the renowned University of California at Berkeley professor Franklin Henry presented an influential paper entitled “Physical Education: An Academic Discipline” at the National College Physical Education Association meeting. The paper, which was later published in the *Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation* (Henry, 1964), argued for the importance of specialized study, especially in upper-division physical education courses:

This field of study, considered as an academic discipline, does not consist of the application of the disciplines of anthropology, physiology, psychology and the like to the study of physical activity. On the contrary, it has to do with the study, as a discipline, of certain aspects of anatomy, anthropology, physiology, psychology, and other appropriate fields (p. 33).

Thus, Henry contended that the physiology of athletic training, for example, is not really an *application* of physiology but a part of the academic discipline of physical education, which only becomes applied when it is actually applied to practical problems. By the same token, Henry would argue that sport psychology is not really an applied sub-discipline of general psychology because it represents more than the study of general psychology and the simple application of its tenets to the domains of sport and exercise. Interestingly, Henry's insightful and visionary arguments were prophetic of the emergence of a number of specialized disciplines within the field of physical education, including sport psychology.

The formal recognition of an academic sport psychology in the United States may be traced to the 1966 meeting of the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation when a steering committee met to explore the feasibility of a North American sport psychology society (Salmela, 1992). The eventual result of this meeting was the formation of the North American Society for the Psychology of Sport and Physical Activity (NASPSPA). From its inception NASPSPA's sole mission has been to hold one meeting a year for the purpose of exchanging research in the areas of motor learning and control, motor development, and sport psychology.

In conclusion, contrary to the Soviet discourse, American sport psychology had no historically presupposed links with a state-sanctioned system of physical education and sport. As a result little to no collaboration between academicians and sports practitioners was fostered. Thus, when the (sub)discipline of sport psychology began to emerge during the turbulent period of restructuring of higher education, very few scholars were driven by utilitarian and/or pragmatic aspirations of providing applied services for

athletes and teams. Rather, most were concerned with their own professional survival and engaged in vigorous research activity that would assure them continued employment in American higher education (Thomas, 1997). Interestingly, despite a strong legacy of women in the field of physical education, there appeared to be little scholarly involvement by female faculty during this time period. On the one hand, the previous disciplinary emphasis on professional issues might explain the ostensibly reluctant involvement of female physical educators in basic research and academic activities. On the other hand, as Gill (1995) asserts, most sport psychology histories tend to omit the pioneering work of female scholars, such as Dorothy Harris and Carole Oglesby in the 1970s, as well as the female scholarship that provided the foundation for these two women's research. When history does not include the experiences and perspectives of the "other" (i.e., minorities or marginalized groups), it is always incomplete and sometimes can be dangerous by perpetuating stereotypes and justifying discrimination (Hall, 2000). Thus, it is important to remember that a historical text often speaks as much through the silence(d) voices as through the powerful ones.

Chapter Five

Battle between Different Discursive Regimes: the Sameness and the Other

One has to dispense with the constituent subject [...] to arrive at an analysis which can account for the constitution of the subject within a historical framework. And this is what I would call genealogy [...] a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledge, discourses, domains of objects etc., without having to make reference to a subject which is either transcendental in relation to the field of events or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history.

Foucault, 1980, p. 117.

Derrida's critique of *Madness and Civilization* in his essay "Cogito and the History of Madness" highlights Foucault's reliance on rationality to articulate madness. Derrida questions the possibility of writing a history of the "other" in "its original language" (Foucault, 1976, p. 76). That is, if one's representation of the world is caught up in a textuality of "differences and references" (Lather, 2003, p. 2) in order to derive meaning, is it even possible for madness to speak for itself? Derrida charges Foucault with (mis)reading the polluted relation of the "same" to the "other." He argues that to constitute madness as the "other," oppressed by reason, means that reason "always already" contains and is defined through the notion of madness. Madness, therefore, cannot be posited outside the discursive historical schema and restored to its own language (Young, 2004).

Derrida's intervention produced a serious impact on Foucault's subsequent work. Rethinking the oppositional inside/outside model of historical production that influenced his approach to historical investigation in *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault initiated a project that addressed the "possibility of history" (Young, 2004, p. 109). Foucault's criticism of an unfolding of historical progress dependent on the rationality of the subject

was tainted by positioning madness within the historical conditions of its construction. Young argues that Foucault's (re)articulation of madness or the "otherness" as a part of reason or the "same" resulted in a reformulation of his previous argument. The revisited argument posits that while the histories of the "other" and the "same" are "implicated within each other" (Young, 2004, p. 109), the "same" is incapable of comprehending the "other." Therefore, the "otherness" works disruptively within a common system, causing paradoxical raptures and breaks in a unity of historical time.

Within Foucault's historical framework, the grand chronological narrative of the evolution of the field of sport psychology is challenged by the specificity of multiple histories (e.g., the American history and the Soviet history), which occupy "discrete temporalities" (Young, 2004, p. 110) within the context of general history. Cultural history in its poststructuralist versions (e.g., influenced by such notions as genealogy and/or deconstruction) problematises transcendental signifiers and situates "reference within the differential systems from which making meaning is possible" (Lather, 2003, p. 2). For sport psychology this translates into a multiplicity of discrete histories that locate the "other" *inside* the discursive system. That is, the "same" and the "other" are dependent on each other and considered together within a general historical context. For example, Soviet sport has traditionally been defined through bourgeois sport in general and American sport in particular. The mechanism of such constructed situatedness by defining and emphasizing what Soviet sport and Soviet athletes are *not* operates similarly to the attempts of American sport to consolidate its symbolic global position by denormalizing and forcing Soviet sport to the margins of the constituted meaning of international sport. Later in this chapter, I discuss how oppositional categories (e.g.,

American discourse vs. Soviet discourse, freedom vs. regimen and research vs. practice) have shaped current interpretations of international sport psychology.

Lather (2003) rightfully asserts, “[R]eality does not precede representation but is constituted by it” (p. 3). In sport historiography, the cultural shift revealed the limitations of fixed categories of meaning, such as false consciousness, catharsis and the safety valve, assigned to sporting practices by some sport historians. Frederick L. Paxson, for example, attributed the rise of American sport in the late 19th century to the disappearance of the frontier. He argued that with the loss of the frontier, which had served as a physical regulator or safety valve, overcrowded American cities needed a new safety valve to regulate urban tensions. Organized sport, therefore, developed during the period of urbanization as a means of maintaining social order in the heavily populated cities. For almost 40 years, Paxson’s theory provided a hegemonic singular interpretation of the rise of American sport (Riess, 1984). Simultaneously, this uncontested representation failed to address many other complexities of the late 19th – early 20th century sporting discourse.

Sporting practices are a contested terrain and are constantly mutating and shifting in order to reflect the contemporary sociocultural politics of any historical conjuncture. Therefore, the meaning of sport and sport psychology carries an inherent tension derived from the “irresolvable tension [of] the historical schema itself” (Young, 2004, p. 120). Foucault’s shift from archeological analysis of epistemes to the more politicized genealogical approach to historical inquiry highlights competing differentiated histories and the complexity of historical production. Drawing on Foucault’s “genealogy,” I now attempt to elucidate a set of discursive possibilities for the emergence of sport

psychology. In the previous two chapters, I provided a traditional chronology of the historical development of sporting movements in the Soviet Union and the United States, which is one way of reading (and representing) history. In this chapter, I disrupt my own text in an effort to historicize the psychology of sport against the grain, which allows for an articulation of competing narratives. It is significant to note, therefore, that in this chapter I do not intend to provide a chronological account of the progressive development of the (sub)discipline of sport psychology and its causes.

Shifting to Foucault's reading of the historical event, I approach sport psychology as an object/subject of historical investigation, unraveling its conceptual formation through discursive institutional practices. Reflecting on the process of writing about football from a cultural studies perspective, Oriard (1993) in a similar vein stated:

I would consider football as a "cultural text" but in a particular way: reading its "primary" text, if you will—the game itself, as played on the field—through its "secondary" texts, the interpretations of the game in popular journalism (p. xviii).

Correspondingly, I read the establishment of the concept of applied sport psychology through a discursive reading of secondary texts (i.e., various historical accounts of the conception and growth of the field), including selected original writings of its alleged founding fathers. Throughout this dissertation project, I have maintained a focus on a *dual* genealogy of applied sport psychology. It's important to acknowledge, therefore, that a history of Soviet sport psychology and American sport psychology respectively, does not constitute a totalizing discourse unified by a certain underlying principle.

New kind of questions

In the year 2005 the field of sport psychology celebrates the 80th anniversary of the establishment of the first sport psychology laboratory in both the Soviet Union and the United States. Interestingly, Piotr Roudik (one of the founding figures of Soviet sport psychology) of the Moscow State Central Institute of Physical Culture, and Coleman Griffith of the University of Illinois opened the first sport psychology laboratories in their respective countries in the same year (i.e., 1925).

I am intrigued by the coincidence of two individuals, working independently of each other, establishing their respective sport psychology laboratories in the same year. The fact that no existing documented evidence suggests any kind of intellectual exchange between these two individuals or the universities that had housed their respective laboratories forced me to search for other fomenting sites of origins¹⁵ beyond the individual level and to shift to new kinds of questions. Instead of the

[...] old questions of the traditional analysis (What link should be made between disparate events? How can a causal succession be established between them? What continuity or overall significance do they possess? [...]), questions of another type [arose]: which strata should be isolated from others? [...] What criteria of periodisation should be adopted for each of them? What system of relations (hierarchy, dominance, stratification, univocal determination, circular causality) may be established between them? [...] And in what large-scale

¹⁵ I use the word “origin” in plural to signify Foucault’s rejection of “origin stories or essences” (Cole, 1998, p. 267) in the course of uninterrupted continuities in favor of “multiplication or pluralisation of causes” (Foucault, 1991, p. 76) in contingent historical beginnings.

chronological table may distinct series of events be determined? (Foucault, 1972, pp. 3-4).

Traditionally, sport psychologists interested in the historical development of the field tended to trace its disciplinary origin to the individual. They further attempted to unravel the intellectual history of various individuals and establish rational causal connections between different events. Contrary to conventional scholarly practices that use historical examples to explain and legitimize current discursive activities, my intent was to map the “floating” meaning of sport psychology. Thus, I became interested in excavating historical discursive formations that provide the grounds for the emergence of sport psychology. I also attempted to untangle the system of power relations between these formations that located subjects within the various local fields of power-knowledge. In an effort to establish a system of relations between the two discourses in sport psychology (i.e., Soviet and American), I entertained the possibilities of temporalities and periodisation in a large-scale historical schema. As a result of my findings, I argue that the emergence of sport psychology as a concept was due to the complex interplay of a multiplicity of socio-political and cultural, historically specific discursive formations, occurring on a *glocal* level (i.e., the *local/global* fluid system of dealing with national issues within a global scope) and that specific mechanisms of regulation of the subject were an integral part of these discursive formations. I further assert that sport psychology emerged at the point of breaks between the epistemes; however, despite its seemingly simultaneous and independent establishment, the two discourses were constructed in relation to each other although formed at different moments in history.

At the turn of the 20th century, a number of isolated theoretical and empirical studies on various psychological aspects of sport began to appear in the scientific and popular literature in both the United States and Russia. The following “snapshot” of studies is representative of this initial work in sport psychology.

Some of the earliest writings published in the U.S. attempted either to describe the psychological benefits derived from athletic participation or explain the psychological aspects of physical education instruction (Wiggins, 1984). In her paper “A Psychological Basis for Physical Culture” Frances A. Kellor (1898) argued for a shift in emphasis in women’s physical education away from that of formal gymnastics to one that encouraged participation in a variety of sports and games. Kellor believed that participation in different kinds of games and sporting activities would enable women to “engage in the various other mental processes not associated with apparatus work” (p. 104).

Arguably the most often cited of the early research in sport psychology in the U.S. is Norman Triplett’s work on the effect of social facilitation on cycling performance conducted at Indiana University in 1898 (Gill, 2000). Interestingly, in a recent essay “A Neglected Innovator in Sports Psychology: Norman Triplett and the Early History of Competitive Performance,” Vaughan and Guerin (1997) refute the widely recognized notion that Triplett was the founder of experimental social psychology and argue instead that he was the founder of sport psychology.

One of the earliest papers published in Russia was Piotr Lesgaft’s (1901) collection of descriptive essays dealing with the benefits of physical activity on the psychological and intellectual development of children (Roudik, 1964). Then, in 1910,

Professor Tchizh from the St. Petersburg Medical School published a ground-breaking paper that broadened the then popular notion that the psychological aspects of physical culture and sport participation were primarily aesthetic and pleasurable to one that included the consideration of performance-related mental states and issues of team dynamics (Stambulova, personal communication, January 2004).

The preceding examples are representative of a wide-scale but sporadic interest in the psychology of sporting practices among diverse groups of scholars and practitioners (e.g., physical educators, psychologists, physicians, physiologists and social reformers) at the turn of the 20th century and point to the fact that the discursive conditions of that historical period created a formative site for the “emergence of the subject as the basis of knowledge” (Young, 2004, p. 116). In other words, no single or unique individual conceived of and produced an early body of knowledge in sport psychology. Rather the subjectivities of various scholars and educators were formed by and subjected to different regimes of power and knowledge that required a wide range of negotiations, including resistance to hegemonic power and overt subversion as well as complete submission to institutional power. For example, during the late 19th – early 20th century there was an increased public and professional interest in movement practices. In the United States, the rise of physical education was characterized by the battle of the gymnastic systems (mainly those of German and Swedish origin). Proponents of each system attempted to understand the underlying physiological and psychological principles of sporting activities and provide a scientific rationale for their respective views of physical training. Interestingly, competing discourses stimulated empirical research in the field of physical education, which contributed to the heightened profile of physical education as a

profession (Schwendener, 1942; Welch & Lerch, 1981). In the Soviet Union, the Socialist revolution released a previously marginalized system of physical education formulated earlier by Lesgaft, which in turn promoted a scientific approach to the study of physical culture and sport. In addition, the engagement of both the United States and Russia in World War I and, in the case of the latter country, the resulting Socialist revolution, shaped and fueled specific interests in physical fitness, including an emphasis on testing and measurement. Reflective of the traits necessary for military duty, various physical education tests were developed to measure physical efficiency and performance skills as well as psychological constructs such as motivation and leadership (Kukushkin, 1961, 1962; Welch & Lerch, 1981).

Thus, the early body of sport psychological knowledge was produced within a particular discourse that was governed by the technologies of power, which regulated the type of knowledge to be generated and further circulated. Stemming from Foucault's assertion that the "individual, with his identity and characteristics, is [not a "pre-given entity"] but a product of a relation of power exercised over bodies" (cited in Young, 2004, p. 116), I now examine the early works of Puni and Griffith as discursive sites of origins of sport psychological knowledge and application.

Emergence of sport psychology in the early works of Puni and Griffith

During the period of what Weinberg and Gould (2003) refer to as the Griffith era (1921 – 1938) and, by analogy, the early Puni era (1927 – 1941), a number of abstract forces underlying discourse formation and organization (i.e., an episteme) were in play. In both countries on a *glocal* level, the following types of knowledge and discursive

practices converged to produce new conceptual knowledge: (a) published philosophical and empirical studies on the benefits of physical exercise, the psychological aspects of sport, and issues of motor learning; (b) increased popularity of sports and games, athletic participation and competition; (c) the endorsement of organized sports; (d) the empowerment of girls and women in and through physical education and sport participation; and (e) advances in experimental psychology that led to the testing of psychological theories in applied settings.

Most importantly, the national and global socio-political climate of the early 20th century endured a number of dramatic changes. In the United States, for example, a massive urbanization movement provided a large pool of potential consumers of commercialized sports. Technological inventions improved the quality of sporting equipment, provided electric lighting for indoor facilities and transformed modes of communication, enabling fans to follow the course of athletic competitions and obtain the results of sporting events. At the same time, in the Soviet Union socio-political, economical and cultural crises were fueling issues of power and representation. Marginalized and subjugated discourses participated in the (re)articulation of power dynamics, giving new meaning to sport and art as cultural practices for all instead of a privileged few. Organized sport became a vital political tool for mobilizing youth, instilling communist morality and reaffirming the ideals of socialism. On a global level, at this historical juncture DeCoubertin and sport leaders throughout the world attempted to revive an international sporting movement, including the ancient Olympic Games. From its inception, the modern Olympics were embedded in oppressive and exclusionary practices, such as denying equal participation to female and Soviet athletes (Sage, 1998).

Ironically, the Olympic Games became both the (re)producer and (re)produced by the contemporary social (in)justice discourse. The intricate relationship and interplay of these and numerous other discursive and material factors created a stimulating environment for scholars like Puni and Griffith to initiate academic research and scholarship in the area of sport psychology.

It is worth noting that both individuals were trained in general psychology, influenced by physiology and biopsychology, and, that despite differences in ideological orientation (i.e., Marxism-Leninism vs. Western humanism), shared fundamental theoretical assumptions, such as views of the rationality of the subject, progressive linear development, scientific objectivity, the physiological basis of psychic activity and the overall determinism of psychic processes. Challenging the notion of a mind-body split, Griffith (1928) in *Psychology and Athletics* argued, for example, that it is a mistake to think of mental and physical fatigue as two separate states. Griffith insisted that the only fatigue athletes encounter is the “fatigue of the total human organism” (p. 188). He further explained that athletes’ mental skills depend on an effective functioning of the nervous system and cannot be performed efficiently in a fatigued body. Similarly, Griffith asserted that motor skills can hardly be considered precise when the athlete’s nervous system is worn out.

It could be argued that early sport psychology was mainly an *exploratory* and *descriptive* sub-discipline of general psychology, which was the empirical knowledge base that shaped research topics and research questions in sport psychology. Both Griffith’s and Puni’s perspective on the psychology of sport at the time was primarily that of the psychologist. Thus, as Gould and Pick (1995) contend, Griffith assumed that one

of the main tasks of the sport psychologist was to “adapt the information already gained in the field of psychology to sports” and “apply what is known in general psychology on such topics as perception, memory, emotion, and personality to the athletic context” (p. 395). Griffith (1934) in his book *An Introduction to Applied Psychology* stated that “[t]he athletic field, [...], holds even more interest for the psychologist because it is, in a sense, a brief and a very concentrated picture of all of the psychological things which men are” (p. 23). Likewise, the development of Soviet sport psychology “was determined by theoretical and methodological perspectives prevalent in general psychology at the time” (Mel’nikov, 1987, p. 196).

In addition, Puni and Griffith were motivated by their own interests and expertise in the variety of sports (e.g., gymnastics, baseball, soccer, table tennis, etc.) and sporting practices in general. Interestingly, the following accidental occurrence, described in the essay “To the centennial of Avksentii Cezarevich Puni” (Volkov, Gorbunov, & Stambulova, 1998), led Puni to conduct his first experimental study in sport psychology, which was later published in the main sport science journal in the Soviet Union, *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*. As a youth, Puni was a table tennis player. Once in the middle of a very intense practice, Puni remembered that he had to make an important phone call. He dialed the phone number several times but couldn’t get a connection. Puni was stunned when he realized that he was dialing his own number. Since he considered himself to be a focused and accurate person, this incident made Puni ponder the possible effects of athletic training on the athlete’s psyche. Interestingly, this unintentional event created the possibility for a sport psychological problematic to emerge and become intelligible.

Not surprisingly, developments in sport psychology in the 1920s and early 1930s were characterized by efforts to understand the effects of sporting activity on the development of psychic processes (with a primary focus on analysis of motor learning and psychomotor skills) and the relationship between various types of sport performance and personality variables (Kroll & Lewis, 1970; Puni, 1959; Vanek & Cratty, 1970). Among the first studies conducted in the Soviet Union were those of Roudik (e.g., effect of muscular activity on reaction time), Nechaev and Kudish (e.g., influence of physical culture on psychic activity, such as kinesthetic awareness, perception and memory), Chuchmarev (e.g., relationships between physical education and intellectual development and self-control of school children) and Puni (e.g., effect of skiing competition on the athlete's psyche and the psycho-physiological effects of training in the sport of table tennis) (Puni, 1959; Roudik, 1960).

In the United States, Coleman Griffith appears to be the only scholar who devoted a considerable portion of his career to the study of psychological concepts and their application to sport performance. Griffith established a line of research that was principally focused on the areas of psychomotor skills, learning and personality traits (Kroll & Lewis, 1970). He was also the first person to teach coursework in the psychology of athletics. Interestingly, Griffith's work seems to have been independent of and not influenced by the efforts of earlier American researchers interested in movement behavior. However, the early to mid-1930s included some systematic research by two other teams of scholars. One team consisted of the physical educator C. H. McCloy and his students at the University of Iowa who attempted to understand the relationship between athletics and personality as well as the effects of physical education on character

development. The second team was headed by Walter Miles who, in collaboration with one of his colleagues at the Stanford Psychological Laboratories, studied the reaction time of football linebackers (Wiggins, 1984).

Most of the research in sport psychology in the 1920s and 1930s was conducted in a controlled laboratory setting. However Griffith, who was trained in experimental psychology, expanded his laboratory research and field investigations to include observations of and interviews with coaches and athletes (Gould & Pick, 1995; Kroll & Lewis, 1970). Gould and Pick (1995) assert that Griffith maintained an impressive balance between the conduct of scientific research and the dissemination of sport psychology findings to improve professional practice. His publication record indicates that Griffith was interested in publishing papers in both the prestigious research journals, such as the *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, and applied professional journals, such as the *Athletic Journal*. Moreover, in his book *The Psychology of Coaching* Griffith (1926) sought to inform coaches about the psychic processes underlying coaching and athletic practices. Similarly, Puni believed in the importance of addressing theoretical and practical issues in sport psychology and educating coaches about the various psychological aspects of sport practice (Ryba, Stambulova, & Wrisberg, 2005).

Nevertheless, most of the early work in sport psychology did not focus on improving athletic performance or enhancing athletes' performance in competition. As mentioned earlier, both Griffith and Puni approached sport psychological discourse principally from the position of the experimental psychologist. Griffith emphasized "problems in psychology and physiology of athletic activity quite independently of any attempt to 'create bigger and better athletic teams'" (Griffith, 1930, p. 36). His primary

scholarly goal, therefore, was to contribute to the growth of the psychological knowledge base. As a result, Robert Zuppke, the Illinois' football coach who initially was very supportive of Griffith's Research in Athletics Laboratory, eventually lost interest in Griffith's work and contributed significantly to the closing of Griffith's lab in 1932 (Kroll, 1971). Zuppke came to conclusion that Griffith's research was doing little to improve his players' game performance. While it has also been suggested that the loss of the athletic association's financial support and subsequent closing of Griffith's lab was just another result of the Great Depression (c.f., Gould & Pick, 1995; Wiggins, 1984), Zuppke's response suggests that sport coaches tend to be interested exclusively in the applied aspects of sport psychology and may be receptive to implementing psychological knowledge in professional practice only if they see it as a means of enhancing athletic performance.

In 1938, Philip Wrigley, the owner of the Chicago Cubs professional baseball club, hired Griffith to help his team improve their game. From spring training until the end of the season, Griffith filmed, observed and tested each player on the team, and provided consulting for both the coaches and players. Though Griffith was offered a full-time consulting position with the Cubs after what became a very successful season, he chose to resume his position of educational psychologist at the University of Illinois. This event signaled the end of Griffith's career in both applied sport psychology and academic sport psychology.

The initial work of Soviet sport psychologists was primarily devoted to the psychological examination of the athlete and the demands of various sporting activities.

While mostly of an exploratory and descriptive nature, the sport psychological discourse was working towards the development of theory and a methodology of sport and sport training (Grigoryants, 1997). During this period, the leading figures in the field of psychology and the emerging field of sport psychology (i.e., Puni and Roudik) formulated and described the key theoretical premises of Soviet psychological science. Principles of psychic activity of the human, which were explained in more detail in chapter three, were that (a) the human psyche is a function of the brain and a reflection of objective reality; (b) psychic processes are physiologically determined; (c) human consciousness is socially conditioned; and (d) there is a unity between human consciousness and human activity. Therefore, it was assumed that the athlete's psyche is developed and manifested through socially determined and motivated sporting activity (Puni, 1959).

The utilitarian feature of the Soviet scientific discourse generated tension between “pure” academic research of the psychological structure and specificity of sports activity and attempts to apply psychology to contemporary real-life tasks. Gorbunov and Shlenkov (1998) contend that throughout his entire career, Puni maintained a heightened sensitivity to demands for applied knowledge coming from sport practitioners. Consistent with this view, Volkov et al. (1998) observe that Puni tended to collaborate with physical educators who had extensive athletic and coaching experience. Moreover, Puni's theoretical work and empirical research always included practical recommendations for athletes, coaches and sport practitioners. This location of institutional practices at the intersection of the permeable boundaries of research and application is not surprising when contextualized within the *principle of a unity between theory and practice*—a

leitmotiv of Soviet science in general and sport psychological science in particular. The underlying utilitarian purpose of the Soviet sport sciences was deeply influenced by Lenin's early critique of the separation of theory and practice. Lenin (1966) asserted that this separation was "the most pernicious feature of the old, bourgeois society" and "one of the greatest evils [...] left to us by the capitalist society" (p. 285).

In sum, the early rise and development of sport psychology was characterized by the application of general psychological theories, methods and research findings to sport. Early sport psychologists, such as Griffith, Roudik and Puni, attempted to define the object of (sub)disciplinary study and delineate the field's major theoretical premises. As a sub-discipline of general psychology, the emerging sport psychological discourse also seemed to be influenced by sexist and racist assumptions and exclusionary practices that were prevalent in mainstream psychology in those days (Gill, 1995). The marginalization of women and neglect of gender issues resulted in a conception of sport psychology that was characterized as a male-dominated scientific discourse. As described earlier, this historical conjuncture endured a series of dramatic changes and stands as an ambiguous period of shift from one episteme to another, creating ruptures and discontinuities.

Comparative history of discontinuities

A metaphor that different sport researchers have frequently used to describe Griffith's role in sport psychology is "a prophet without disciples" (Kroll & Lewis, 1970, p. 4). This metaphor captures well Griffith's visionary work in sport psychology as well as his failure to train or stimulate others to follow in his footsteps. In fact, Gould and Pick (1995) assert that Coleman Griffith had no direct impact on the evolution of American

sport psychology because by the mid 1960s, the contemporary discourse had emerged and developed “almost exclusively” (Wiggins, 1984, p. 9) within physical education and kinesiology departments. Physical educators were largely unaware of Griffith’s pioneer work. As Kroll and Lewis (1970) contend, while Griffith was a recipient of numerous accolades and distinctions from professional societies in psychology and education, physical education associations “failed to recognize the importance of his contributions” (p. 4). Thus, due to the *glocal* specificity of the American socio-political discourse, Griffith’s innovative ideas in sport psychology were predestined to stagnate on both the individual and institutional levels and produce practically no impact on the construction of the contemporary discourse in sport psychology.

This historical account is a noteworthy example that represents the break in a unified historical time-scheme. To support my argument that the two discourses in sport psychology were formed at different times in history, I rely on Foucault’s notion of discrete temporalities instead of the unbreakable chronology of the master narrative. Different temporalities suggest the recognition of a historicity of a certain area of knowledge, such as sport psychology. The discontinuity in the history of the American sport psychological discourse is visible through the constituted series of events, “its elements, its limits, and its relation to other series, or [...] rules operated for particular discursive practices” (Young, 2004, p. 115). Moreover, my analysis of the two historical discourses of sport psychology (i.e., American and Soviet) indicates not only their heterogeneous temporalities but also the occurrence of displacement, which problematises a direct comparison.

In his paper “Comparative sport psychology,” which seems to be the only thorough account of its kind, Salmela (1984) discusses the similarities and differences in sport psychological practices in the early 1980s in North America and Eastern Europe.¹⁶ Comparing two discourses that occupy the same place in a historical chronology but have different temporalities seems to be an inherently problematic approach to historical analysis. Similarly, comparing two temporalities, which mutate in their interactions with a certain historical juncture, is problematic in and of itself as well. Instead of engaging in direct comparison, it would seem more productive to highlight the multiplicity of existing knowledges and disciplinary practices and the complexity of historical representation.

While Salmela admits that the socialist countries of the former Soviet bloc were a “surprisingly varied mosaic for what is often believed to be a monolithic system” (p. 26), he fails to question what appear to be his assumptions for the monolithic Soviet model. For example, he asserts that many East European researchers were obligated to work on a research topic selected by the state, in spite of their own research interests. To substantiate this point, Salmela states that during the time of his visit to various East European countries, a focal point of sport psychology research “in at least two national 5-year plans in Eastern Europe has been to determine the personality of athletes” (p. 26). Yet Norman Shneidman, a former elite athlete and coach in the Soviet Union, provides a somewhat different account. Shneidman presented his paper “Soviet sport psychology in the 1970s and the superior athlete” at the Applied Sciences Symposium organized in

¹⁶ Interestingly, while researching Soviet sources for my dissertation, I did not come across a single paper on the history of American sport psychology or the comparative history of Soviet and American discourses. I do not intend to suggest that Soviet sport psychologists were unaware of the American discourse. On the contrary, the list of references found in Soviet sources indicates that Soviet sport psychologists were familiar with and utilized their American colleagues’ work.

conjunction with the 1978 Congress of the Canadian Society for Psychomotor Learning and Sport Psychology. Papers presented at the conference were subsequently compiled in a classic volume *Coach, Athlete, and the Sport Psychologist* edited by Peter Klavara and Juri Daniel (1979). With reference to Rodionov (one of the leading Soviet sport psychologists at the time), Shneidman (1979) outlines the primary contemporary research orientation of several Soviet institutions as follows (one can only assume that this list would have been even more diverse if the investigations, undertaken in a number of *East European* institutions, were included as well):

- Moscow All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Physical Culture: the psychic reliability of athletes in different conditions of sports activity and the mechanics of self-control during technical training;
- Moscow Central State Institute of Physical Culture: motivational factors and the psychological factor of optimum conditions in sports activity;
- Lesgaft Institute of Physical Culture: psychographic characteristics of different sports and the factors determining readiness for sports activity on the elite level;
- Leningrad Scientific Research Institute of Physical Culture: tolerance of psychic tension and the psychological foundations of technical and physical preparation;
- Kyiv State Institute of Physical Culture: recovery and rehabilitation after heavy workloads and the psychological foundation of technical training; and
- Scientific Research Institute of General and Pedagogical Psychology of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences: methods of the selection of athletes.

The early 1980s Soviet discourse, in its overarching stability, was moving towards maturity while the American one, located at the beginning of its historicity, resembled a young teenager searching for identity. Consider the following verbal images used by different North American sport psychologists in their descriptions of the contemporary discourse in sport psychology (provided by Salmela, 1981): “an undisciplined discipline” (Martens, 1981, p. 1); “fragmented and poorly organized” (Nideffer, 1981, p. 115); “like tips of tentacles severed from the arms of various octopi” (Wilberg, 1981, p. 1); and “scattered and has a shotgun look” (Tutko, 1981, p. 115). Salmela (1984) implies that these phrases indicate a diversity of research in the field and attributes the diversity solely to the socio-political features of the capitalist free market and democracy; thus, buying into the stereotypical “West vs. East” binaries of potential tensions, such as freedom vs. regimen and democracy vs. communism. Just as both American and Soviet (sport) historians of the politically charged Cold War era emphasized how sport reflected the superiority of their respective socio-political systems and exceptional “moral” character of their athletes, Salmela participates in the construction and assignment of meaning to the two discourses in sport psychology. The discursive forces at play, however, were multivocal and considerably more complex than Salmela acknowledges.

I have asserted earlier that “developmentally,” the two sport psychologies were, in fact, two dialoging tectonic layers (with series of discontinuities and the *long duree*) in the global sport psychological discourse. During the time of relative inactivity in the field of sport psychology in the United States, Soviet sport psychologists were researching various topics, including the psychological specificity of different sports; the role of

kinesthetic awareness and imagery in the acquisition of motor skills; the role of language, demonstration and cognition in motor learning and control; the development of motor habits; and methods of training, which resulted in an accumulation of knowledge concerning both the general psychological basis of technical training in sports and the individual psychological specificity of the athlete's activity in a particular sport. By the mid 1950s, Soviet sport psychology was established and recognized as a separate discipline in the USSR. Not surprisingly then, the discipline was "disciplined" and focused on certain "promising" theoretical and methodological areas of research.

Without omitting the fact that sport psychology, like any other social institution in the Soviet Union, was characterized by an overly centralized approach, the forces of resistance were present in the structures of power. The "other" and the "same," resistance and domination, are necessarily parts of the same system, caught up within each other. Resistance (not necessarily in the form of direct opposition) as a web of capillaries permeated Soviet state apparatuses and social institutions. In a personal interview, Dr. Natalia Stambulova provided the following example of a five-year-research project in sport psychology, elaborating on the technologies and institutional practices of the workings of power:

The government, of course, did not originate any research topics. It only approved topics that were developed by specialists at the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Physical Culture (*VNIIFK*) in Moscow. Usually the topics were very broad and therefore it was easy to adjust our own interests to a so-called compulsory topic. For example, I remember how we worked on the assigned topic *Athletes' Resources*. All internal and external factors that help the athlete to

improve can be defined as resources. Therefore, we could do research on almost any topic we were interested in under this rubric. We were not prohibited from initiating our own line of research, but it was more difficult to find funding for it. Big general topics (like the *Athletes' Resources*) also created good conditions for streamlining collaboration among the different sports sciences, which was encouraged and very much supported (for example, looking at physiological resources, psychological resources, biochemical resources and the like).

This account illuminates Foucault's model of analysis of the interaction of power and resistance. Foucault is more interested in the analysis of discursive particularities (e.g., ones illustrated by Stambulova) than universal categories of the conventional inside/outside model that claims universal effects (e.g., Salmela's oppositional categories of freedom/regimen and science/practice). Foucault asserts that resistance is entrenched in power and constantly disrupts it, dislocates and interrupts it, and occasionally ruptures the power system altogether (Foucault, 1978, 1995; Young, 2004).

Thus, there is a story (or rather various stories) behind Salmela's story, stories of resistance, contestation, marginalization, negotiation and open confrontation. Salmela provides a hegemonic narrative, ignoring voices of the marginalized discourses that, nevertheless, actively participated in the construction and shaping of the international sport psychological discourse. Reliance on these omissions and exclusions in sport psychology historiography has resulted in a solidification and fixation of distinct political categories within the discursively constructed representation of the American discourse and the Soviet discourse. In the following section "Who is the 'other'?" I discuss in more detail the role of historiography in shaping our reading of sport psychology.

Discipline and genealogy

It is fascinating to reflect on the ways academic discipline generates a body of knowledge. The more the discipline is disciplined, the more efficiently it operates. Practiced discipline mirrors the practiced body. It seems inevitable, therefore, to draw an analogy between Foucault's disciplined body and the disciplined discipline. In Foucauldian terms, both are subjects of and subjected to the discursive technologies of power or political anatomy. Both form power relations, the innate mechanism of which makes them more "obedient as they become more useful, and conversely" (Foucault, 1995, p. 138). Foucault further elaborates:

Thus discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies, 'docile' bodies.

Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience). In short, it dissociates power from the body; on the one hand, it turns it into an 'aptitude', a 'capacity', which it seeks to increase; on the other hand, it reverses the course of the energy, the power that might result from it, and turns it into a relation of strict subjection (p. 138).

Foucault's astute philosophical insights in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* are responsible for my desire to challenge conventions of representation in sport psychology and pull to the surface what has not previously been seen. Throughout my dissertation project, I have attempted to uncover the historicities of discursive formations and institutional practices that shaped existing interpretations of sport psychology.

Sport psychology today is primarily about the athlete and performance. Some would argue that this has always been the case. My genealogical investigation indicates, however, that even for the Soviet discourse, notorious for its applied focus, the provision of performance enhancement services for elite athletes was not emphasized initially. The critical, primarily politically motivated, shift in Soviet sport psychology institutional practices occurred in the late 1940s – early 1950s.

Before World War II, despite some great athletic achievements, Soviet athletes were excluded from international competitions. On the one hand, the Soviet state was critical of the bourgeoisie ideals of international sport and considered the Olympic Games to be a “plaything of international capitalism” (Senn, 1999, p. 84). On the other hand, throughout the 1920s and 1930s, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) made no attempt to include Soviet athletes in the Olympic Games. Senn (1999) asserts that the IOC’s disinterest was because it “had not believed that the presence of Soviet competitors would add to the character or popularity of the games” (p. 84). Before Soviet athletes took part in the Olympic Games, they had competed in games organized by the Soviet government called Spartakiads, the first of which was held in Moscow in 1928. Spartakiads were intended to demonstrate proletarian internationalism, and early Spartakiads were indeed well attended by foreign athletes. Later on Spartakiads ceased to have a viable international significance but remained one of the major national competitions, held once every five years (see chapter three for more details).

After World War II, the Soviet Union emerged as a “superpower” whose presence could not be ignored any more. The Soviet National team’s forceful debut at the Olympic Games held in Helsinki in 1952, further overwhelmed the international community. All

of a sudden, the United States found itself in a serious competition/confrontation with the USSR, which began to shape the discourse of international sport in general and sport psychology in particular. Both countries were eager to reclaim sport supremacy especially that of Olympic sport, as a major space for “fair” global competition and called upon their athletes to serve as missionaries who would validate the superiority of their respective social systems by winning medals. Colored by the Cold War’s intricate dynamics, the ideological education of Soviet athletes, who were supposed to embody the “communist personality,” was deemed vital *and* consistent with Soviet theory of physical education.

What is interesting, though, is that one of the key *Soviet* traits of superior performance was the nebulous notion of will power. Will to endure a heavy workload, persevere and win was a crucial signifier that defined Soviet citizens and supposedly set Soviet athletes apart from the “other” (i.e., American athletes). Hence, the concept of volition and will power needed to be transformed into something tangible. An array of discursive activities (e.g., historical state documents; scientific and technological advances; and cultural, socio-political and specific institutional practices) interacted in a number of ways, generating vigorous research in the area of volition (c.f., Puni, 1959; Roudik, 1962; Selivanov, 1964) and making the resulting knowledge intelligible. More importantly, in terms of applied sport psychology, theoretical and practical investigations of the volitional and moral preparation of athletes opened up uncharted waters of *psychological* preparation of athletes (Gorbunov & Shlenkov, 1998).

[This] ‘invention’ [...] must not be seen as a sudden discovery. It is rather a multiplicity of often minor processes, of different origin and scattered location,

which overlap, repeat, or imitate one another, support one another, distinguish themselves from one another according to their domain of application, converge and gradually produce the *blueprint* of a general method” (Foucault, 1995, p. 138; with emphasis added).

In pursuit of sporting excellence, Soviet athletes and coaches needed to unlock a reserve of human potential in order to maintain their competitive edge. During this period, i.e., in the early 1960s, the sport sciences and especially the psychology of sport were invigorated by new concepts and methods that held considerable theoretical and practical promise for both scholars and sport practitioners (Volkov et al., 1998). Additionally, Soviet coaches in their perpetual effort to increase of athletes’ training loads felt that the well-developed methods of moral and volitional preparation were insufficient. Thus, it became evident that psychological preparation, analogous to technical and tactical preparation, had to be independently organized and implemented under the supervision of an expert in sport psychology (Mel’nikov, 1987). The paramount importance of mental training was stressed in Puni’s legendary monograph *Sport Psychology Essays*, published in 1959, which immediately became a coaches’ and sport psychologists’ handbook for the psychological preparation of athletes. Puni (1959) called attention to “psychological preparation for competitions [as] one of the most urgent problems in the training of [Soviet] athletes and teams” (p. 7). He further asserted that the solution to this problem was of the greatest applied significance and a necessary prerequisite for Soviet athletes to achieve new world records and Olympic victories. Acknowledgement of the necessity of psychological preparation of athletes for

competitions resulted in the assignment of sport psychologists, called simply *psychologists*, to perform “clinical” (Shneidman, 1979, p.234) duties with Soviet national teams (see chapter three for more details). Thus, the practice of psychological service provision for elite athletes became a blueprint¹⁷ of the Soviet discourse of applied sport psychology.

Who is the “other”?

I began to seriously contemplate this question after coming across the following historical account of the Cold War culture in Jane Sherron De Hart’s essay “Containment at home: gender, sexuality, and national identity in Cold War America.” De Hart (2001) asserts that during the Cold War, conservative politicians in the U.S. constructed an intimate link between homosexuality and communism in the American civic discourse. Homosexuality was presented as a disease and gays and lesbians were seen as deviants, lacking in character and moral integrity. Exploiting the homosexual body, right-wing ideologies created a frightening image of decay in an attempt to elicit associations with communist cells, analogous to pathogens, contaminating and spreading further through the national body. This historical representation caught my attention because anyone who grew up behind the Iron Curtain knows that homosexuality is a *malicious rudimentary feature of decadent bourgeois society* and was legally prohibited in the Soviet Union. The Cold War discourse of gender and sexual politics is complex and multifaceted; yet clearly one facet of the provided account was an attempt, in both countries, to demonize

¹⁷ Discursive practices of psychological preparation of athletes did not freeze but shifted over time. For example, Puni’s concept was transformed by his student Gorbunov into a system of psychological provision for sports activity. Gorbunov’s model became a dominant applied approach in the 1980s. Currently a competing approach, called psychological support for sports activity, emerges in the work of Dr. Voronova at the Kyiv Institute of Physical Culture.

homosexuality in order to assert heterosexual normativity. However, this facet represented but a piece of a larger discourse, namely, the construction of national identity.

I argue, therefore, that bipolar categorizations in sport psychology have served specific purposes in the larger context of national identity politics. For both countries, an “evil empire” as a symbolic “other” structured hierarchical relationships between supposedly neutral scientific discourses of Soviet and American sport psychology. The “other,” by means of exclusionary practices, gives meaning to the “same” which is identified and unified against the “other.”

In this section I address a canonized bipolar signifier, research vs. practice, assigned to the American and Soviet discourses respectively. At a glance, this representation makes perfect sense. Most sport scholars agree that applied practice in sport psychology in the United States was not taken seriously until the mid 1980s while at the same time in the USSR, the provision of psychological services for coaches and athletes was already a well established practice (c.f., Gill, 1997, 2000; Salmela, 1984; Silva, 2001; Williams & Straub, 2001). It also appears that increased interest in applied issues and the implementation of systematic psychological preparation of athletes in the U.S. was, for the most part, a reaction to the international successes of Soviet and East European athletes (Stambulova, Wrisberg, & Ryba, under review).

In his paper “From Smocks to Jocks: A New Adventure for Sport Psychologists,” Martens (1979) asserted that most research produced by academic sport psychologists (including Martens himself) during the previous decade was of very little value to sport practitioners. He called for an increased attention to the needs of athletes and coaches and

encouraged more practical and applied research. Highlighting two discrete approaches (i.e., basic and applied) taken by American and Soviet sport psychologists, respectively, Martens stated, “North America has by far the strongest research and empirical base in sport psychology, but Eastern Europe and the USSR probably do more application” (cited in Salmela, 1992, p. 57). In accord, Salmela (1984) contended that North American students in sport psychology gain a much richer academic experience and their academic indices are higher than those of East European students. He then declared, “This reflects the North American disposition toward the use of the scientific method with specific emphasis on statistics, computer science, and other forms of laboratory technology” (p. 28). Thus, the implication readers are left with is that in spite of their lack of practical experience, American sport psychologists are better trained academically than their East European counterparts and involved in prestigious scholarly activity due to their “desire to generate new knowledge and [...] contribute to the general body of knowledge in the field” (Salmela, 1984, pp. 26-27).

Ironically, though Soviet sport psychologists did not seem to be interested in direct comparisons between the respective sport psychological practices, Soviet general psychology waged an ideological war against Western psychological discourses. In chapter three, I discussed major theoretical premises of the Soviet (sport) psychological discourse grounded in the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism. The influential Soviet psychologist Leontiev (1971), for example, asserted the importance of “rebuilding the science of psychology on the foundations of Marxism” (p. v) and critiqued Western discourses for their utilization of unscientific methods of investigation. Interestingly, Leontiev referred to Marxist psychology (i.e., Soviet psychology) as *scientific*

psychology as opposed to idealistic psychology. Attempting further to create boundaries for the appropriate *Soviet* discourse, he used signifiers such as progressive, objective, analytical and free from the “old subjective-empirical psychology” (p. vi).

A massive underscoring of academic research activity, which was almost exclusively motivated to generate new knowledge, obscured and diminished applied work with athletes and coaches of a number of American psychologists during the decades of the 1960s and 1970s. Prior to the 1960s, a few psychologists like Yates (1957) and Tracy (1951) had established contacts with professional athletes and teams (c.f., Kornspan & MacCracken, 2002). During the 1960s and 1970s, however, the most prominent applied sport psychologists were arguably Bruce Ogilvie and Thomas Tutko. Interestingly, the introduction of these scholars to the domain of sport and sport psychology in particular was both “serendipitous and unexpected” (Wrisberg, 2004) in light of the negative perceptions coaches and athletes held about psychologists. Ogilvie, for example, believed that his initial consulting opportunities came because coaches at his university, San Jose State, thought he was a “jock” (i.e., an athletic individual). Ogilvie further explained, “My identification (on campus) was as a member of the counseling center staff and a jock. Coaches began asking me about problems they were having with their athletes [...]” (Simons & Andersen, 1995, p. 454). Both Ogilvie and Tutko were trained in clinical psychology and, consequently, utilized a psychotherapeutic approach in their work with athletes and coaches. They shared an opinion that the role of the sport psychologist was to provide coaches with a means of identifying specific psychological problems athletes were having (e.g., phobias, depression, etc.) and then assist the coach in addressing those problems (Stambulova et al., under review).

Similarly, as stressed earlier in this chapter, Soviet sport psychology has been a heterogeneous mutating discourse that has not been solely preoccupied with high performance sport and performance enhancement services for elite athletes. For example, Shneidman (1979) refuted this widely-accepted myth when he stated:

[...] Soviet research in sport psychology until the 1970s, has been of little use to the individual athlete aspiring to improve his athletic proficiency at the highest level. Practical Soviet research findings were important and useful, but they mainly benefited the average athlete, while the superior sportsman, in need of personal attention and individual help in coping with his problems, was left to himself (p. 237).

Shneidman further admitted that the ever increasing demand to produce superior athletes had forced Soviet sport psychologists of the 1970s to search for new directions in psychological research, thus, gradually creating a *blueprint* for the Soviet sport psychological discourse.

Interestingly, the cultural studies notion of “praxis” (i.e., theory-driven practice and theory informed by practice) seems to capture the quintessence of the Soviet orientation in sport psychology. In a personal communication, Dr. Stambulova emphasized this issue when she argued:

It was almost impossible for applied sport psychologists to work without a theoretical framework in the USSR. Of course, we didn’t use Freud or Rogers or Bandura but Leontiev, Rubinshtein, Myasischev, Levitov, Ananiev and many other scholars in Soviet general psychology, as well as Puni’s and Roudik’s conceptual work in sport psychology. For example, Puni’s Psychological

Preparation for a Competition model was an exceptionally popular theoretical frame. Many Soviet applied sport psychologists went through the following evolutionary spiral: general psychology, cornerstone theories in sport psychology, their own applied research experience and implementation, and the creation of their own theory or model (e.g., Hanin, Gorbunov, Gorskaya and Stambulova).

The oppositional binary “research vs. practice” serves as an example of how bipolar rhetoric and historical representation has relied on omissions in the construction of meaning and structuring of the relationship between the Soviet and American sport psychology discourses. As Poster (1997) has asserted, “[m]odern freedom has always only been possible through its exclusions” (p. 11). In terms of sport psychology, the two discourses represent a multiplicity of discursive practices, intertwining, overlapping, diverging, leading nowhere, competing, supporting and of “different origin and scattered location” (Foucault, 1995, p. 138). However, this complexity becomes invisible when the author “wills” his or her meaning, which “then [becomes] ‘fixed’ for all time in a particular set of material signs” (Eagleton, 1983, p. 67). Drawing on Foucault’s genealogical approach to historical analysis, I have elucidated differences in the past of sport psychology to challenge the legitimized and taken-for-granted present.

In conclusion, this chapter has presented a textual analysis of the sport psychology historiography that problematises conventions of representation of the sport psychological discourse. Excavating from within the disciplinary constraints, I attempted to queer into the established coherent boundaries that hegemonically exist in various descriptions of sport psychology. The provided discourse analysis of the (sub)discipline

highlights the discursive possibilities for the emergence of sport psychology, the discontinuities of its histories and major shifts in meaning, as well as the multiplicity of sport psychological practices that exceed the rhetorically constructed boundaries of mutually exclusive categories. I have attempted to situate a dual genealogy of applied sport psychology within the global and local particularities of Cold War culture and socio-political practices in an effort to elucidate new possibilities for understanding the polluted relationship between the Soviet and American sport psychology discourses. Underscoring that the “same” and the “other” are located *inside* the discursive system and depend on each other for continued existence, I have argued that the two discourses are constructed against each other and sustained by mutual exclusions that give meaning to each category.

Moreover, drawing on Foucault’s conceptual understanding of the subject and the production of knowledge, I have approached the work of Puni and Griffith as two sites of origins of sport psychology. Though I did not intend to link biography with discourse analysis (for this kind of innovative work in historiography, see Moyer, 2001), locating Puni and Griffith within the discursive historical formations as the “basis of knowledge” (Young, 2004, p. 116) problematises and complicates notions of uninterrupted knowledge and identity. Simultaneously, these insights create possibilities for new directions in the research and practice of sport psychology. In the final chapter of my dissertation, I address the implications of an articulation of sport psychology and cultural studies influenced by poststructuralist theorizing for future work in sport psychology, with a particular emphasis on a reconceptualization of the athlete’s identity.

Finally, my dissertation project reveals the role of (sport) historiography in the production of a hierarchical and closed system of knowledge. A genealogical approach to historical analysis has served as a means of exposing discursive strategies and technologies of power crucial to the understanding of how taken-for-granted knowledge is produced, censored and circulated. It seems important to note that the presentation of excavated historical knowledge contains traces of the historian's theoretical assumptions and subjective interpretations of the event. Therefore, reflexivity becomes a crucial link in elucidating contingencies and breaks in the constructed flow of uninterrupted narrative and ought to be considered an integral aspect of the "always already" political and contested sport psychology historiography. Interestingly, the discursive rhetorical strategies used in the production of meaning often lie undetected due to the fact that these divisive practices are deeply embedded into the complexities of nationalism, patriotism and national identity politics. The Cold War culture played a pivotal role in the construction of subjectivity and had a long lasting effect, shaping the way people read their social worlds (Kuznick & Gilbert, 2001). Communism also provided the profound context within and against which the meaning of America "took sharpness." So I conclude by underscoring my argument with the John Updike character Rabbit's lament, "Without the Cold War, what's the point of being an American?" (cited in De Hart, 2001).

Chapter Six

From Mental Game to Cultural Praxis:

A Cultural Studies Model's Implications for the Future of Sport Psychology

This chapter is a slightly revised version of a paper by the same name published in the journal *Quest* in 2005 by Tatiana V. Ryba and Handel Kashope Wright:

Ryba, T. V., & Wright, H. K. (2005). From mental game to cultural praxis: a cultural studies model's implications for the future of sport psychology. *Quest*, 57, 192 – 212.

My use of “we” in this chapter refers to my co-author, Handel Wright, and myself.

In this dissertation I have attempted to trace the historical development of sport psychology by writing an interdisciplinary historiography of the discourse. Each chapter holds a piece (or a fragmented narrative) of the historical analysis of the (sub)discipline. These fragmented histories highlight the technologies of power-knowledge and assemble a bricolage of multiple historical representations of the sport psychological discourse. In this chapter I propose future trajectories of sport psychology based on an earlier paper with Handel Wright (Ryba & Wright, 2005) and, in so doing, attempt to add another dimension of historical representation to the bricolage.

In this chapter the possibility of (re)conceptualizing sport psychology by means of its articulation with cultural studies is discussed. Specifically, a heuristic “model” of cultural studies as praxis, developed by Handel Kashope Wright at the University of Tennessee, is drawn upon to problematise the privileged modern status of sport psychological discourse (i.e., institutionalized, positivistic, white, male, middle class and

elitist). In 1994, the College of Education at the University of Tennessee was reorganized into 11 “units,” one of which was Cultural Studies in Education. Faculty in this unit took up cultural studies as a broad umbrella discourse that allowed them to take a critical approach in examining the foundations of education (history, anthropology, sociology and philosophy), cultural studies in education and sport studies (sociocultural foundations of sport and sport psychology). The College has since been reorganized yet again, this time into traditional departments, with the sport and education elements housed in different departments (the sport programs in the Department of Exercise, Sport and Leisure Studies and the renamed Cultural Studies of Educational Foundations program in the Department of Instructional Technology and Educational Studies). Faculty and students in the two areas have remained committed to cultural studies, however, and have therefore maintained the umbrella approach to their work and programs. In addition, they have continued informal discussions as well as team taught courses that take a cultural studies approach to both education and sport studies.

The sustained articulation of sociocultural foundations of sport, sport psychology and education with cultural studies has led to a number of interesting developments, including the promotion of interdisciplinary work, a shift in emphasis from quantitative to qualitative research methods, the exploration of social and cultural difference and social justice, the simultaneous focus on both theory and practice, and the articulation of all these characteristics into an emerging heuristic.¹⁸

¹⁸ We use the terms “model” and “heuristic” interchangeably and even in combination at different points in this essay in order to signal both that the work being done is systematic (like a model) and open-ended and pliant (as cultural studies work is, ideally). The principal elements of the “model” appear to us to be concretized as (cultural studies) theory, (qualitative) research and service learning (for social justice). However, we are cognizant of a cultural studies emphasis on openness as well as the fact that cultural

The focus of the present chapter is on the potential significance of this “model” for the field of sport psychology in particular. More specifically, we hold that in the present era, in which considerable interest in predicting and proposing future directions for sport psychology exists, the heuristic model and the environment it creates make for yet another possible direction for this field. We proceed by chronicling the American genealogy of applied sport psychology, introducing cultural studies and pointing to its intersection with sport studies, laying out the cultural studies as praxis heuristic being developed principally at the University of Tennessee, and discussing how the articulation of applied sport psychology with cultural studies could lead, or perhaps is already leading to the evolution of a radically expanded and altered psychology of sport.

This discussion is necessarily self-referential in certain sections since the idea is to discuss the heuristic emerging locally at the University of Tennessee and the implications this work has for sport studies work in general and sport psychology work in particular. We then attempt to indicate what the implications of the model and of a turn to cultural studies in order to address the issue of “difference” might be, as an alternative future for sport psychology in general.

studies has been and should emerge anew, with different characteristics, concerns and resources in different locations. Thus, the idea of a model that can be replicated is not what this work is about. In fact, even at the University of Tennessee the number and details of the principal characteristics of the model are not considered fixed. Rather, there is an openness to the possibility that elements could be added or eliminated from the heuristic and that the specifics of say research approaches could change from project to project.

*History of (applied) sport psychology: The American narrative*¹⁹

Sport psychology in the United States is a relatively young, vibrant field that emerged as a separate (sub)discipline within physical education departments in the 1960s (Silva, 2001; Williams & Straub, 2001). It encompasses many dimensions of scholarship, such as group dynamics, counseling, psychological assessment, mental training/psychological skills, quality of life, and acquisition of performance skills (Singer, Hausenblas, & Janelle, 2001). As the name implies, applied sport psychology originated as a field that attempted to apply psychological theories to explain, control, and predict individual behavior(s) in sport contexts. However, since its inception there have been inherent tensions between the contributing disciplines and sub-disciplines of sport psychology: sport psychologists were primarily either *psychologists* (i.e., those who held a degree in clinical psychology) or *sport scientists* (i.e., usually with degrees in physical education). Sport psychologists from a physical education background feared that psychologists from a clinical background would endorse a clinical model as the singular and exclusive approach to applied work with athletes, thus “perpetuating the idea that sport psychologists are ‘shrinks’ who deal with crazy athletes” (Nideffer, 1984, p. 37). On the other hand, sport psychologists from a clinical background considered the educational model advocated by individuals with a physical education background inadequate and feared that it would lead to a dangerous eschewing of psychopathology and a lack of sensitivity and ability to address clinical issues. To complicate matters even further, some psychologists, mostly clinicians, held that psychologists should be in the business of addressing real issues (psychological problems of everyday people) and that

¹⁹ We specify “the American narrative” here to indicate that we do not take for granted the notion that sport psychology originated in the United States.

sport psychology was a diversion created to “indulge the elite,” namely athletes (Nideffer, 1984, p. 39).

Sport psychology could have acknowledged and harnessed these different emphases and perspectives by establishing itself initially as a loose, multi/interdisciplinary discourse. Such a beginning would have coincided well with developments in the academic disciplines in general during the same period, since the social sciences and humanities were also going through a period of interdisciplinary cross-fertilization that has since been identified as the era of “blurred genres” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Instead, despite being pulled in various directions by the different types of disciplinary orientations, applied sport psychology appeared to be singular in its orientation as an emerging discipline. Struggling to build the credibility of the evolving discipline, American sport psychologists were united in promoting sport psychology as purely scientific (i.e., rationalist, positivist, quantitative, neutral, dispassionate, etc.), with an emphasis on the disciplinary and scholarly aspects of the field at the expense of practice and contact with athletes (Silva, 2001).

Whereas early sport psychology research was somewhat sporadic and mainly “dealt with personality and success, abilities and achievement” (Singer et al., 2001, p. xiv), sport psychologists in the 1970s engaged vigorously in consistent laboratory-type experimental research in order to advance the knowledge base. However, personality studies, which dominated the early research, consistently failed to predict successful performance based on the athlete’s personality profile and were eventually abandoned. Sport scientists began investigating a much more comprehensive range of issues, such as motivation, attributions, stress and anxiety, arousal, self-efficacy, attention, and levels of

performance skill. While research topics were multiple and diverse, however, they still originated from within the two primary fields, namely mainstream psychology (specifically social psychology) and physical education (with an emphasis on motor learning) (Silva & Weinberg, 1984; Williams & Straub, 2001).

The 1980s were marked by increased interest in the application of sport psychology as a potential blending of the psychological and physical fields of sport science. Applied sport psychologists, whose work focused on the issue of mental preparation of competitive athletes, realized that athletes' mental states and attitudes affected their physical performance. Therefore, they contended that mental training was crucial to successful sport performance and turned to the athletes' minds in order to help them "get into the zone," and experience "flow." In other words, sport psychologists turned to athletes' mental state as the potential key to achieving peak performance.

As Ryba, Stambulova and Wrisberg (2005) have argued, applied sport psychology has at least two founding fathers, two distinct origins in the 1920s and two traditions, namely Avksenty Cezarevich Puni and a USSR tradition and Coleman Roberts Griffith and a USA tradition. From the very beginning, the Soviet model of sport psychology was oriented toward the provision of mental training services for elite athletes. Thus, by the 1980s, the "mental game" was already well established in the Soviet system and constituted an integral aspect of athletes' preparation for competition. The noteworthy success of the Soviet team in the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games, followed by the even more outstanding performances of Soviet athletes in the 1980 Moscow Olympics (where they won 80 Gold, 69 Silver, and 46 Bronze medals), were attributed in large part to the

incorporation of mental training into athletes' preparation for competition.²⁰ This realization led to a mushrooming of interest in the systematic psychological preparation of elite athletes in many countries, including the United States (Silva, 2001).

Interestingly, the emphasis on the “mental game” in sport psychology reflected a paradigmatic shift in mainstream psychology towards viewing cognitive processes as behavior that can be learned and controlled at will. As the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics approached, the US Olympic Committee (USOC) integrated sport psychology into athletic programs and provided psychological support services for US Olympic athletes (Silva, 2001). Thus, more opportunities were created for sport psychologists to do fieldwork and to deliver applied consulting directly to athletes.

By the mid-1980s, a profound crisis of representation was spreading across disciplinary boundaries in the social sciences and humanities. Issues of social difference became very important, giving rise in terms of research to critical, feminist, postcolonial epistemologies as well as epistemologies of color (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Although a few figures began to contend that applied sport psychology was a site of complex interconnections between psychological theories, athletic practices, and socio-historical contexts (c.f., Goldstein & Krasner, 1987; Sherif, 1982), most applied research still utilized the positivistic paradigm and was undertaken in the controlled atmosphere of the experimental lab.

²⁰ The U.S. boycott of the 1980 Summer Olympics accounted to some extent for the actual number of medals won by Soviet athletes. The boycott, however, does not diminish the fact that Soviet athletes were successful on the international level at that time and that the heyday of Soviet sport was attributed primarily to the implementation of psychological preparation of elite athletes and teams for competition.

Most significantly, sport psychology was going through its own, very different crisis at this time. The crisis was due to the parallel development of two divergent genres of sport psychology, namely academic sport psychology and practicing (applied) sport psychology. In his essay “Science, Knowledge, and Sport Psychology” (1987), Rainer Martens expressed concern about the development of two diverging sport psychologies—what he called academic sport psychology and practicing sport psychology. The former, he held, approached the study of human behavior with the scrutiny of orthodox science, i.e., reducing complex behavior to a number of simplistic isolated components that could be easily manipulated in an artificial environment. The latter, he observed, effectively critiqued “the inadequacy of the laboratory experiments” and emphasized tacit knowledge, “the idiographic approach, introspective methods, and field studies” (Martens, 1987, p. 29). Martens proceeded to advocate for a raised profile of applied sport psychology informed by humanistic theories of academic sport psychology. His essay was radical for its day and challenged the practical significance of contemporary orthodox sport psychology texts while questioning the underlying ontological assumptions of sport psychology’s knowledge base that had resulted in the utilization of limited and limiting epistemologies.

Future trajectories of sport psychology

The late 1990s and turn of the 21st century witnessed sport psychologists ruminating about the future of the discipline. The “mental game,” i.e., a focus on performance enhancement, was firmly established as the primary emphasis of sport psychology theory and practice. This, in combination with a consideration of the athlete

as an individual, the utilization of quantitative research methods, and an accepted divergence of academic and applied sport psychology, constituted a mainstream, traditional psychology of sport that hegemonically exists to the present day. However, there are a number of current developments and proposals (interdisciplinarity, consideration of gender and power issues, etc.) that have begun to introduce new, distinctly untraditional trajectories for sport psychology. Silva (2001) recently observed that “[s]port psychology is at a vital crossroads;” and that “[d]ecisions made in this decade will determine the future [...] growth of sport psychology on a global level” (Silva, 2001, p. 830). As a result, a number of prominent scholars in the field have attempted to predict future trajectories for sport psychology (c.f., Silva, 2001; Williams & Straub, 2001) and many of them point to new directions rather than a continuation of traditional approaches and characteristics. Figures like Daniel Gould, Terry Orlick, John Silva, and Robert Weinberg, for example, appear to be in agreement that sport psychology will forge links with other related fields such as exercise science, counseling, and psychology and that strongly interrelated programs or even interdisciplinary programs will emerge as a result. They also anticipate that applied sport psychology will bridge the gap between research and practice, that research will increasingly be conducted in naturalistic settings and sport-simulating lab situations (as opposed to the purely artificial environment of the traditional laboratory), and that there will be a shift toward the educational model, as opposed to the clinical model, of sport psychology consulting (Silva & Weinberg, 1984; Williams & Straub, 2001).

Another set of figures, like Brenda Bredemeier, Diane Gill, Vikki Krane and Carole Oglesby, have contributed to the evolution of an emerging feminist sport

psychology. Drawing on the work of such feminist theorists as Judith Butler, Ann Hall, Sandra Harding and bell hooks, these individuals have initiated a new dialogue on the future of sport psychology, one that predicts the growing importance of such issues as interdisciplinarity, gender and social difference in general and issues of power and representation in research and in the field of sport in particular. Their efforts are testimony to the importance and growing influence of feminist work in the field that, apart from individual essays, include an entire issue of *The Sport Psychologist* being recently devoted to the topic of feminist sport psychology.²¹

We hold that the intersection of cultural studies and applied sport psychology (and specifically in the case of the University of Tennessee model, with sport psychology located within a heuristic “model” that involves the general foundations of sport juxtaposed with the foundations of education, all under a cultural studies umbrella) offers yet another possible future for the field of sport psychology. It is a future discourse and practice that in some ways intersects with and underscores previously mentioned new trajectories. For example, it involves a move toward interdisciplinarity, a bridging of the gap between research and practice, and the incorporation of gender issues, social difference and power dynamics. However, with a cultural studies approach, the specifics, scope and areas of emphasis of some of these characteristics might differ somewhat from what others have predicted. Therefore, we suggest that applied sport psychology be reconceptualized as a form of “cultural praxis.”

²¹ Gill, D. (Ed.). (2001). In search of feminist sport psychology: then, now, and always [Special Issue]. *The Sport Psychologist*, 15(4). This special issue provides an inclusive overview of various approaches to feminist sport psychology research. The contributors are Diane Gill, Carole Oglesby, Ruth Hall, Vikki Krane, Brenda Bredemeier, Diane Whaley, Christy Greenleaf and Karen Collins, Tamar Semerjian and Jennifer Waldron, and Emily Roper.

What is cultural studies?

Cultural studies is a generic term that can refer variously to the general study of culture, the study of intercultural relations, and the anthropological study of culture. The cultural studies discourse that has been undertaken in the Cultural Studies in Education Unit at the University of Tennessee, however, is derived from a relatively new discourse that had its institutional origins at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham, England in the 1960s. British cultural studies emerged as an attempt to understand the changing socio-political and cultural environment of post Second World War Britain. This attempt to make meaning of the then contemporary culture meant undertaking such projects as the critical analysis and theorizing of the phenomenon of Thatcherite Britain (Hall, 1988); the retelling history from the perspectives of previously marginalized groups in society (e.g., “herstory” or history from women’s perspective and also undertaking “history from below” or history from the perspective of the working class) (Women’s Studies Group, 1978; CCCS, 1982b); the examination and critique of police brutality directed at black and working class populations (CCCS, 1982a); the study of such movements and subcultures as the “hippie,” and “skin heads” (Clarke, 1973); and the exploration of popular culture and how the media operates in the production of meaning (Hall, 1977; Peters, 1976).

Most accounts of the origin of cultural studies point to a period marked by crises of identity in the social sciences and humanities as the environment of ferment and foment in which the new, interdisciplinary and indeed anti-disciplinary field of cultural studies was able to emerge and thrive (Gray & McGuigan, 1993). The narrative is of a distinctly British and singular history, conceived with the seminal work of three founding

fathers, Raymond Williams, Richard Hoggart and E. P. Thompson, and born in 1964 with the establishment of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham (the centre which named the new field “cultural studies”). Though it quickly became quite interdisciplinary, English studies and sociology were the first discourses that cultural studies spoke as a toddler. This neat, singular, British academic narrative of origin has been muddled considerably by some who argue for multiple origins, including African (theater), Russian (culturology), African American (black studies) and Appalachian (progressive education), rather than a single one that is white and British (English and sociology) (Wright, 1995, 1998). Similarly, others have argued for an activist and performative acts origin rather than an academic origin of cultural studies (Davies, 1995). Ioan Davies, for example, has put forward the following alternative narrative of the origin of cultural studies:

Those of us who marched to Aldermaston and back in the 1950s and early 1960s, who helped establish the New Left Club...who discovered Jazz with Eric Hobsbawm, who taught evening classes for the Workers’ Educational Association, who fought with the Fife Socialist League who defended (equally) Tom M’boya, Lenny Bruce, Wole Soyinka, CLR James, Vic Allen are surprised to discover that what we were doing was inventing Cultural Studies (1995, p. 31).

What we have in Davies’ account is an identification of leftist political activism and performative acts rather than academic work and struggle over crises in the disciplines as the origin of cultural studies. These alternative narratives serve in part to confound cultural studies’ purported and, ironically “singular geographical and specific racial and cultural (read white, male, working class, British) origin” (Wright, 1995, p.

159). The point of the resulting multiplicity of narratives of the origin and history of cultural studies is not meant to confuse readers as to the version that is most “accurate” but to acknowledge that the history of cultural studies should be conceptualized as being as open-ended and fluid as its discourse and praxis. As some cultural studies theorists have pointed out, we ought not to look to a particular school nor to the emergence of institutionalized cultural studies as a singular, definitive origin, but rather to a messy situation of difficult to pinpoint conjunctures of political activism, performative acts, and intellectual and academic work at various moments and sites (c.f., Gilroy, 1991; Wright, 1998).

CCCS projects displayed a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches because the issues being investigated were considered to be more important than the disciplinary constraints placed on the questions one could ask and examine within an individual discipline. Thus, a radical ground-breaking discourse was developed at the CCCS that allowed leftist British intellectuals to undertake progressive activism in an academic setting and to address pressing issues of social justice in and through culture in an interdisciplinary and also anti-disciplinary manner. Drawing from various disciplines, reading the latest theory (and undertaking theorizing of their own), and generally working for progressive social change, they undertook mainly ethnographic studies to examine how power and privilege operated in culture and society and to give a voice to oppressed and marginalized groups.

Once cultural studies was established as a discourse that dealt primarily with class issues, feminist and race theory and politics were used to examine women and gender issues, and black identity and race issues, and thus intervene in cultural studies itself and

change the discourse from within (CCCS, 1982a, 1982b; Women's Studies Group, 1978). While different cultural studies theorists and activists may emphasize different characteristics or aspects of cultural studies, or even reject certain aspects, it is important to note that "openness" (in terms of theoretical and methodological approaches as well as content) has always been a pivotal characteristic of cultural studies (Gray & McGuigan, 1993). As Stuart Hall (1990) once observed, "cultural studies is not one thing. It has never been one thing" (p. 11). The fact that the "definition, scope, and concerns of cultural studies are [...] constantly differed and differing" (Wright, 1995, p. 158) within various contexts has resulted in the development of diverse versions of cultural studies. The various discourses are distinguishable by such factors as geographical location (e.g., British, Canadian, American, African, Nordic, Australian, Asian, etc.), close disciplinary affiliation (e.g., closely related to communications and media studies, English and literary studies, sociology and anthropology, history, etc.) and variations on the theory/practice balance (while cultural studies is supposed to involve the blending of theory and practice in "praxis," some versions are almost purely theoretical while others maintain strong connections with grass-roots activism).

Cultural studies intersection with sport studies and (applied) sport psychology

Originally, sport was not established as a substantial part of academic scholarship. Sports activities were studied primarily within the context of cultural practices by anthropologists and/or historians. Generally subscribing to the arbitrary division between high and low culture, most scholars considered sport to be an unworthy subject for academic pursuit. Ironically, this marginalization was endorsed by both progressive and

conservative politics (Blake, 1996). For the Left, examining sport meant diverting attention away from the more “real” political issues that were at stake. The Right, on the other hand, wanted to perpetuate the assumed unproblematic nature of sport—“a blissful unawareness about the social relations that control sport and other forms of physical activity, a frightening naiveté about the social context and material conditions underlying physical culture” (Sage, 1998, p. 13).

Pioneering socio-historical texts by C. L. R. James (1963), Tony Mason (1989) and Wray Vamplew (1988), that produced important insights into sport as everyday practices, professional sports in Britain, and the relationship between sport and colonialism, by E. P. Thompson (1966), that highlighted the relationship between sport and working class culture, and by Jennifer Hargreaves (1982) and Pierre Bourdieu (1978), that undertook the theorizing of how sport fits in the social structure of modern societies, elevated the study of sport to a position of acceptance by some scholars in the traditional disciplines. However, it was a slow process and sport as an object of study remained on the margins of what became its sociocultural foundations (history, sociology, philosophy). Andrew Blake (1996) has observed that:

Sociologists and historians tended firstly to ignore sport; then, when from mid-1960s they began to consider it, they saw it within these frameworks as either unimportant leisure practices or as harmful economic and ideological aspects of the class system (p. 14).

Though some figures (c.f., Blake, 1996; Hargreaves, 1982; Gorn & Oriard, 1995) have asserted that cultural studies followed the established academic pattern of marginalizing sport, others have argued that this was not the case; that cultural studies

took up sport as a significant sociocultural phenomenon. As Andrews and Loy (1993) have rightly pointed out, since the days of the CCCS cultural studies has taken up “the study of sport as a cultural practice” (p. 255), as an aspect of its project of taking up popular culture seriously. From Birmingham onwards, cultural studies projects have questioned sport practices deconstructively, revealing the constructedness of what had been taken up as ordinary and reading actively against the grain of the common sense and taken-for-grantedness of sport as a neutral, apolitical activity. Thus cultural studies as an approach to sport studies has played a crucial role in elucidating the process of meaning making in relation to cultural productions/commodities mediated through popular sporting practices.

The cultural studies’ conceptual framework has blended well with relatively recent critical approaches to sport studies because both share similar characteristics, such as inter/multi/disciplinarity, a focus on the object of study without close adherence to the constraints of a single and singular discipline, and the centrality of issues of power and meaning making. Texts by critical sport sociologists and educators such as Jay Coakley, Joy DeSensi and George Sage, and by philosophers of sport such as William Morgan, for example, have injected critical approaches into their fields by undertaking analyses of sport practices in conjunction with political economy, ideology, and power relations. These scholars have argued that the analysis of sport must be based on an understanding of its relationships with other everyday sociocultural and political issues of contemporary societies. Cheryl Cole (1993) put forward a cogent summary of this position when she stressed that:

sport is always already embedded in a theoretical/political position since any

conceptualization of sport presupposes a relationship between power/knowledge and meaning/politics and is embedded in a theory of power, its operations and mechanisms (typically liberal and/or repressive), and corresponding strategies of resistance and change (p. 78).

Cole further pointed out the importance of considering culture, cultural theories and cultural analysis of the place of sport in society. She insisted on the rethinking of the foundations of sport sociology and asserted that the challenge cultural theories pose to sport studies is the need to reconceptualize the category of sport as a discursive construct that is focused on theorizing the body (Cole, 1993; Birrell & Cole, 1994).

Taken together, interdisciplinarity, considerations of social difference, power issues, culture and cultural theories, and especially cultural studies writings, have meant that cultural studies has indeed made inroads into sport studies such that we can now speak of a cultural studies of sport. These developments parallel the inroads cultural studies has made into the disciplines that constitute the foundations of sport studies, namely sociology, history and philosophy. Of these various disciplinary approaches to the study of sport, it would appear that the sociology of sport is most amenable to an articulation with cultural studies. In part, the taking up of cultural studies in the home disciplines and in sport studies has been due to the breadth of the home disciplines (e.g. sociology as a social science is expansive enough to accommodate both quantitative and qualitative research approaches as well as interdisciplinary branches such as historical sociology).

Interdisciplinary sport studies has emerged and involves various combinations of the foundations of sport—namely sociology, history and philosophy. There have even

been indications that the interdisciplinarity of sport studies might be expanding to include the psychology of sport (c.f., Ingham, Blissmer, & Wells Davidson, 1999). However, sport psychology appears to still occupy a position on the margins of sport studies. While it is often associated with sport studies, sport psychology is not readily included as an aspect of the field. In large part this positioning of sport psychology in relation to sport studies is a result of the fact that sport studies is based on the more expansive and relatively open social sciences while (traditional) sport psychology is distinctly framed as a single, scientific discipline. Thus, in terms of their openness to cultural studies, sociology and sport psychology are at opposite ends of the continuum. While sociology is the most open, sport psychology is the sport discourse and praxis that is least amenable to an articulation with cultural studies. Traditionally, sport psychology has been definitively scientific, positivistic, and quantitative while cultural studies has favored the cross-fertilization of the humanities and social sciences, and been critical and qualitative. Not surprisingly, therefore, few scholars in the field of applied sport psychology work explicitly within a cultural studies framework. Nevertheless, there are a small number, including Vikki Krane (Krane, 2001; Krane, Waldron, Michalenok, & Stiles-Shipley, 2001), Leslee Fisher (Fisher, 1997; Fisher & Bredemeier, 2000), Ted Butryn (Butryn, 2002; Butryn & Masucci, 2003) and Emily Roper (Roper, 2001)²² who have recently started taking a cultural studies approach in some of their work and utilized qualitative methodologies and critical cultural analyses.

²² The work being done on developing a cultural studies approach to sport at the University of Tennessee is well represented on this short list: Leslee Fisher teaches sport psychology and both Emily Roper and Ted Butryn are graduates of the doctoral program in sport psychology. In fact these three figures have recently co-authored an essay on a cultural studies approach to transforming the work of applied sport psychologists (Fisher, L., Butryn, T., & Roper, E., 2003).

The emerging model

Since 1994 cultural studies has been used as an umbrella discourse for undertaking work in the sociocultural foundations of education and sport at the University of Tennessee. This approach has been manifested in several ways including the development and co-teaching of courses that juxtapose and make connections between various areas of sport studies (e.g. Women, Sport and Culture) or even sport and education (e.g. Justice, Schools and Sports); the exposure of education and sport students to qualitative research traditions (overview and introductory courses and specific courses in phenomenology, ethnography, etc.); discussion of cultural studies theoretical work and its possible application in sport and education (e.g. through a Cultural Studies Seminar in which all sport studies and foundations of education faculty and students participate); the taking up of issues of social difference, social justice and power dynamics in virtually all courses; and ongoing discussions among faculty, among students, and between faculty and students about what cultural studies can contribute to their specific disciplines and projects, and vice versa.

To varying degrees, faculty and students recognize this set of courses and interactions as a loose heuristic that infuses cultural studies into their work in a general way. Handel Wright (hired as a cultural studies and education scholar in 1995, specifically to contribute to the development of cultural studies at the University of Tennessee) has worked to put some of these and other elements together more systematically and to create a pedagogical heuristic that could be said to be evolving into something of a local and Tennessee-specific “model” of cultural studies.

The starting point of the heuristic has been Wright's work with the broad elements of theory, practice and research. These elements are not held apart and taken up separately but rather are considered as inextricably linked, blended together with progressive politics in praxis (Freire, 1970, 1985, 1987). More specifically, then, what Wright conceptualizes locally as "cultural studies as praxis" blends the theory and literature of cultural studies, service learning as an activist/practice component, and empirical research as mediator between theory and practice, with the various components held together with a progressive politics that focuses on social difference, equity and justice (Wright, 2001/2002, 2003). Admittedly, this summary is something of an oversimplification since cultural studies comes with a built-in activist component and a preferred range of research approaches, and cultural studies theory and literature draw on social difference and disciplinary based theories. Similarly, service learning is not merely practice; it does have an albeit nascent set of theories associated with it and involves a form of "reflection-in-action" (Schön, 1983). Finally, there is both a diverse set of theories and forms of action involved in qualitative research.

While, as previously indicated, the various elements of the cultural studies model are found in a number of various courses at the institution, Wright has brought them together in a course that serves as a single, concentrated and comprehensive introduction for graduate students. The course, Issues in Cultural Studies, which Wright has been teaching and revising for the past seven years, encapsulates the "model" in the form of a three-pronged version of cultural studies as praxis and fosters student activism, research, and theorizing (Wright, 2001/2002; 2002; 2003). For example, students are introduced to the theory and history of service learning (which makes it part of both the theory and the

practice components) and to the theoretical and political arguments for using qualitative methods in general and critical ethnography in particular for social justice ends (Griffiths, 1998).

A specific genre of service learning that Stephen Fisher (1993, 1997) and others are calling “service learning for social justice” is the principal practice and activist component of the heuristic. This requires students to volunteer for a semester with a community organization, to learn about that organization, and to reflect on and present to the class what they have learned. As the name implies, this is a version of service learning that is overtly politicized and aims at examining issues of social difference (race, social class, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) and addressing issues of discrimination based on social difference in or through institutions and organizations. Service learning for social justice is a radical form of service learning that “adds the element of pedagogy to the conceptualization and practice of service” (Wright, 2002) and forges links between the university and progressive community groups. In this approach, universities are seen as active agents in their surrounding communities, and service learning activism mediates the formation and sustenance of “town-gown collaborations” (Benson & Harkavy, 1997). Town-gown relationships and collaborations are central aspects in service learning theory. Therefore, cultural studies theory and an overtly politicized version of service learning constitute a foundation for critically examining the organizations students work with and for identifying issues of social difference and social justice (or lack thereof) in the work of the institution.

The third element of the model, one that grounds cultural studies work, is the undertaking of a qualitative research project that allows a systematic study of the

organization with which students work. Despite the methodological openness of cultural studies (Nelson, Treichler, & Grossberg, 1992), certain approaches have been more prevalent than others. Cultural studies has tended to favor qualitative over quantitative methodologies, a critical paradigm over post-positivism, and critical forms of ethnography over any other research tradition. Emphasizing this point, Ann Gray (2003) has identified ethnographic research as an approach to “doing” cultural studies, thereby endorsing empirical research as a factor that engenders cultural studies as praxis. Students in Wright’s Issues course are required to undertake systematic research of the institution or organization at which they volunteer. Data can be collected through individual and focus group interviews, surveys, participant observations, and document collection and analysis. While the research approach is open, critical ethnography in general and institutional ethnography especially (Smith, 1987, 1990a, 1990b) are encouraged as preferred traditions.

In sum, elements such as cultural studies, service learning and qualitative methods, theory and practice, and reflexivity are brought together in this semester-long course. The three principal components of the model (i.e., cultural studies, service learning for social justice and qualitative research) are articulated as interrelated elements that inform each other in the production of cultural studies as social justice praxis work. Students read cultural studies literature and theory, undertake service work with a community organization of interest to them, examine that organization systematically through qualitative research and write a final paper that ideally is a report on the

organization, based on a combination of cultural studies analysis, a qualitative research study, and service learning approaches.²³

The cultural studies “model” fosters applied sport psychology as cultural praxis

Most sport studies students at the University of Tennessee, including sport psychology and foundations of education students who are exposed to this “model” and to cultural studies in general, tend to undertake work (including theses and dissertations) that is interdisciplinary, qualitative, and focused on sociocultural difference and social justice issues. What this means for applied sport psychology in particular is that there is what might be referred to as “sport psychology as cultural praxis” work emerging and taking its place beside a still existing traditional sport psychology.

What are the characteristics of sport psychology as cultural praxis and in what ways does the incorporation of cultural studies foster its emergence? In a word, this is a form of sport psychology that is evolving from being a single discipline to one that represents another aspect of sport studies. In other words it is interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, focused on issues of sociocultural difference and social justice (with a particular emphasis on a reconceptualization of the athlete’s identity), blends theoretical and practice work together in praxis, and that favors qualitative research approaches (especially what Patti Lather (1991) has called “research as praxis” and other forms of progressive qualitative research).

²³ Students also have the option of doing only a mid-semester report on the organization and for the final paper some choose to undertake a theoretical paper on a particular cultural studies issue (which could include a cultural studies analysis of a sport related topical issue).

As we have pointed out, inter/anti/post/disciplinarity are integral developments that now characterize cultural studies. When cultural studies is articulated with sport psychology, these characteristics promote the latter as a comprehensive and pliant discourse and praxis. In other words cultural studies pushes sport psychology out of its single and singular disciplinary nature into becoming an aspect of inter/anti/post/disciplinarity. “Doing” sport psychology this way allows the field to transcend tradition, to see itself as a part of a more comprehensive gestalt, and to realize that the work sport psychologists do can and should be affected by other disciplines, such as sociology, history, philosophy, linguistics and media studies. More importantly, cultural studies pushes sport psychology to incorporate itself into a more comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach to *sport studies*.

One of the effects of inter/post/disciplinarity is that it opens up many more topics for inquiry and research. Traditionally, sport psychology research could not possibly explore athletes’ subjective experiences of being gendered, raced, sexualized, collegiate or professional; the way athletes perform their identities/identifications and negotiate power in everyday life; or even explore athletic culture and sports subcultures. Cultural studies opens up sport psychology to these questions and provides powerful tools both in terms of theory and methodology for undertaking this type of work. Since the days of the CCCS, research has been a principal means of grounding cultural studies work. Nelson, Treichler, and Grossberg (1992) state that:

...cultural studies has no guarantees about what questions are important to ask within given contexts or how to answer them; hence no methodology can be privileged out of hand. Textual analysis, semiotics, deconstruction, ethnography,

interviews, phonemic analysis, psychoanalysis, rhizomatics, content analysis, survey research—all can provide important insights and knowledge (p. 2).

In a cultural studies framework, the examination of identity is particularly important and, for sport psychology, this translates into a re-examination of identity in general and the identity of the athlete in particular. Issues of identity/identification in general and re-examination of athletes' identities and identifications in particular become central in the articulation of applied sport psychology with cultural studies. Postmodernist and poststructuralist influences push forward a notion of identity not as the given, stable, singular, and essentialist category that traditional sport psychology takes for granted but as a number of "identifications come to light" (Fuss, 1995); as a concept that though "under erasure" can be usefully deployed strategically (Hall, 1996a), with the caveat that any declaration of identity be recognized as positional, selective, and provisional (Wright, 2003). The complexity of identity means that "the construction of cultural identity is always an intellectual enterprise" (Gripsrud, 1994, p. 220). It also means that one cannot merely replace one form of identity with another. For example, the African athlete who comes to the US on an athletic scholarship does not automatically cease to be a continental African athlete and become a "black" athlete upon entering an American college. Rather, this athlete's identity is a series of complimentary and contradictory identifications operating simultaneously, with some coming to the foreground or receding depending on context (e.g., the athlete lives and studies in the United States but is not an American citizen, is "black" but not African American, is simultaneously a continental and a diasporic African). The athlete's experiences are shaped by her identity and vice versa. Ann Gray (2003) points to the inextricable interrelationship between experience

and identity when she asserts that “experience can be understood as a discursive ‘site of articulation’ upon and through which subjectivities and identities are shaped and constructed” (p. 25).

Thus, influenced by postmodernist and poststructuralist theory (especially by Foucault’s work), sport psychology as a cultural studies praxis moves away from looking at the athlete in isolation as a whole, singular, unified individual in the way orthodox sport psychology tends to do. Instead, the athlete is considered to be a subject of multiple discourses and various identifications, a member of numerous social and cultural groups, and a part of sport as an institution immersed in a particular sociocultural and historical context. Considered in light of Foucault’s (1982, 1985) notion of subjectivity, athletes are both subjected to and possessing the agency to negotiate power relationships within various discourses. Foucault contends that to avoid the seduction of power, we need to acknowledge the multiplicity of identity and constantly consider our identity as fragmented rather than whole and singular. This reconceptualization of identity is one that sport psychology students find particularly difficult to accept and to which they offer considerable resistance. This resistance is not surprising since orthodox sport psychology advocates a holistic approach. Whether dealing with the integration of the psyche or the concept of mind/body unity, students are encouraged to look at the athlete as a whole person. However, it is not enough to simply look at the whole athlete. Sport psychologists must confront the fact that athletes have fragmented identities and identifications within various discourses of class, gender, race, sexual orientation, region, etc., that athletics is a subculture

within a larger culture, and that the institutions in which athletes are located attempt to control and mold their behavior. The complex dynamics involved in athletes' negotiations of their subjectivities within and in relation to these various discourses has a crucial effect on athletes' lives and performances.

Drawing on Freire (1970, 1985), athletes are approached as experts of their individual experiences, who co-participate in the applied consultancy work always already knowing about their performing bodies, and having agency and the potential to negotiate power in their dealings with institutions and with corporate sporting culture. From this perspective, the role of the sport psychologist shifts from merely attempting to improve athletes' performance in a narrowly focused sense to assisting athletes in the process of "conscienticization"²⁴ and in creating possibilities for both performance enhancement, athlete self-assurance and empowerment and indeed social transformations to occur.

In order to accomplish this task, the training and work of the sport psychologist takes the educational model seriously and infuses it with critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1988; McLaren, 2003). Taking seriously the Freirean and critical pedagogy notion that education and pedagogy are "always already" political, the sport psychology educational model in this conception goes beyond teaching athletes to develop

²⁴ "Conscienticization" is a principal concept in Paulo Freire's liberation pedagogy. The assumption is that dehumanization, although a concrete historical fact is *not* a given destiny but the result of an unjust order. The oppressed can remove barriers to total liberation when they become critically aware of the injustice in the world and perform acts that destroy it. In a way, the process of conscienticization is the creation of new perceptions of reality, an awareness of how one is positioned in society and a starting point for doing something to change oneself and society for the better.

psychological skills and the notion of performance enhancement as neutral and an end in itself. Ingham et al. (1999) observe that far from being politically neutral,

The work of many applied sport psychologists unwittingly sustains the system of oppression and exploitation, and focuses on normalizing the individual's responses to such systems as if adjustment and accommodation are the only solutions to distress (pp. 240-241).

The incorporation of critical pedagogy makes for a sport psychology educational model that rejects both the myth of neutrality and the insidious endorsement of oppression and exploitation that it masks. This is not to suggest that teaching performance enhancement techniques is wrong or ought to be abandoned. Rather, performance enhancement is taken up as political and as a potential tool for individual empowerment and social justice rather than as neutral and an end in itself. Thus, it is sport enhancement for sport enhancement sake that is eschewed in favor of the notion of sport enhancement in the context of athletes' general self-awareness and empowerment (in terms of their sociocultural identities, identifications and relationships, and the like). The overt politicization of applied sport psychology and the incorporation of critical pedagogy into its education model facilitate the production of a cultural praxis version of sport psychology.

Despite the declaration of methodological openness, historically cultural studies has tended to favor qualitative traditions, especially various ethnographic genres (see CCCS studies and beyond, such as the work of Paul Willis (1977, 2000)). Sport psychology, on the other hand, has traditionally been quantitative and positivistic. Gradually, under the influence of feminist and existential/humanist epistemologies, the

field of applied sport psychology is becoming more qualitative research friendly. Cultural studies methodological intervention has the potential to open up sport psychology to an even greater acceptance of qualitative studies and a wider variety of qualitative approaches and traditions. For example, as an innovative approach, institutional ethnography (IE) and the work of Dorothy Smith (1987) on the everyday as problematic appears to be particularly useful. Smith's IE would facilitate sport researchers' (including sport psychologists') deconstruction and problematisation of the ruling relations that exist in the corporate culture of institutionalized sports. Institutional ethnography would also contribute to establishing and maintaining a critical edge in doing sport psychology, since IE requires taking a political stance and working from the standpoint of the marginalized and oppressed, thus working towards social justice (Smith, 1990a, 1990b).

Conclusion

Building on the progressive work of scholars like George Sage (1993), who challenged physical educators to look at their work in connection to the larger socio-political context and become agents of social change, and Brenda Bredemeier (2001) who proposed the grounding of sport psychology research in feminist praxis, and the cultural studies as social justice praxis model developed by Handel Wright (2001/2002; 2002), we have pointed in this paper to the implications of the intersection of sport psychology with cultural studies as a discursive site of cultural praxis. Such an articulation contributes to bridging the dichotomies between academic and applied work, theory and practice, text and lived culture. While we acknowledge the constraints we all operate under in the academy and the perennial threat posed by theoreticism to academic work as praxis

work,²⁵ we nevertheless believe that it is possible and valuable to undertake work in the academy that goes beyond various binaries (e.g., university/community, theory/practice, and academic/activist work). What cultural studies offers, therefore, in the notion of praxis, is the integration of two genres of sport psychology, academic sport psychology and practicing sport psychology (to employ Martens' (1987) terminology). This emergent discursive praxis, as an alternative future for sport psychology, has the potential to evolve into interdisciplinary sport psychology praxis (i.e., theory driven practice and theory informed by practice).

In sum, cultural studies in general and the University of Tennessee cultural studies as praxis heuristic in particular make for a new trajectory for sport psychology. While this new trajectory intersects with some predictions and recommendations made by others, it differs significantly in terms of some of its details. First, while it has been predicted and proposed that sport psychology would forge links with related disciplines, such as exercise science, counseling and psychology and might even develop interdisciplinarity, the cultural studies approach makes interdisciplinarity almost a foregone conclusion rather than a mere possibility. Moreover, the links that it promotes are with sport studies (sociology, philosophy, and history of sport) rather than with exercise science and psychology. Second, it has been anticipated that sport psychology might start to incorporate qualitative research methods, especially phenomenology, and indeed at the University of Tennessee the most popular approach taken in students' studies has been phenomenological. However, in the cultural studies "model" sport

²⁵ Stuart Hall (1992), for example, had been aware of the danger of armchair theorizing as far back as the 1970s and warned of it in the early 1990s.

psychology students are introduced to other, more explicitly political forms of qualitative research, such as feminist research, narrative work, critical ethnography and institutional ethnography, and a few students are beginning to use these qualitative methods in theses and dissertations, thereby taking sport psychology into what appears to be uncharted research waters. Third, while feminist sport psychology has opened up the field to the examination of issues of gender and power, especially the empowerment of women, cultural studies has broadened that focus to include sociocultural difference (including masculinity, sexual orientation, race, etc.) and justice in general and the empowerment of athletes from socially and culturally marginalized groups in particular.

The articulation of sport psychology and cultural studies need not be one-sided. Though applied sport psychology is not yet recognized as a field that contributes to cultural studies, it has the potential to be such. For example, sport psychology theory and practice can join sport studies in contributing to cultural studies work on the body. The corporeal nature of sport provides “embodied” accounts of everyday practices, thus opening a vantage point for applying sociocultural analysis to the personal and intimate constructions of identity and the body (Andrews, 2001; Cole, 1998; Duncan, 1994; Early, 1998), pleasure and enjoyment (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), agency and social justice (McDonald & Birrell, 1999; Sage, 1993) and aesthetics (Bourdieu, 1984). Also, in their direct applied work with athletes, sport psychologists can contribute to stemming the tide of theoreticism (a perennial danger in cultural studies work) and promote cultural studies as praxis work. Finally, by giving back to cultural studies in the form of praxis, sport psychology would be maintaining the politics of reciprocity in the process of interdisciplinary borrowings.

In this dissertation, I have attempted to present an “inside/outside” gaze on the multiplicity of historical narratives in the sport psychological discourse. Though my focus has been on a dual genealogy of applied sport psychology, I do not offer a new hegemonic discourse or origin story. On the contrary, I challenge conventions of linear chronology and provide competing narratives that highlight a set of discursive possibilities for the emergence of the psychology of sport. Drawing on Foucault’s genealogical approach to historical analysis, I have examined the work of Avksenty Cezarevich Puni and Coleman Roberts Griffith as two sites of origins of (applied) sport psychology. Interested in unearthing the historically specific discursive formations underlying the emergence of sport psychology, I have pointed to the gaps in existing linear histories of the (sub)discipline that rely on oppositional binaries when structuring the relationship between Russian/Soviet and American discourses. The implications of these omissions have very definite political ramifications for developments in sport psychology. Mutual exclusions give meaning to each category, shaping current interpretations of international sport psychology and fixing the totalizing discourse in a number of material signs. Moreover, the long-established privileged status of academic scholarship and research over professional issues and application have resulted in a fostering of sport psychology as a homogeneous scientific and institutionalized discourse, positioned on the margins of interdisciplinary sport studies. I have argued, therefore, that a modern historical rendering of the field is sustained by putting forward a monolithic, singular history of sport psychology that creates a sense of uninterrupted progress.

The presentation of competing narratives of the past, the present and the future throughout this dissertation is aimed at “provoking [the field of sport psychology] into new moves and spaces where [it] hardly recognizes [itself] in becoming otherwise, the unforeseeable that [it is] already becoming” (Lather, 2003, p. 5). Contemporary sport psychological discourse, regardless of its (non)awareness, represents a (post)modern space of various competing, colliding, converging and mutating discourses of the psychology of sporting experience.

It is significant to note that sport psychology, as a discourse that “focuses on the individual” (Gill, 2000, p. 228), is intimately connected to the theorization of the athlete’s subjectivity. Thus, the way subjectivity is theorized is not merely central to the psychology of sport but also determines the focus of its research and practice (in terms of pedagogy, methodology, research methods and theoretical frame). As discussed in chapter two, poststructuralism(s) offers a theorization of the individual, which is radically different from the liberal humanism that is central to Western academic and civic discourses. By default, then, poststructuralism(s) disrupts and problematises the dominant sport psychological perspective on the individual and the modern understanding of sporting structure and athletic experience.

Chapter six provides a (re)articulation of the athlete’s identity within a cultural studies framework, which reflects and works with the swiftly changing conditions of the (post)modern world. When sport psychology is articulated with cultural studies, the discourse has the potential to move to a new space as part of a comprehensive and interdisciplinary sport studies. This (post)modern move towards interdisciplinary work diminishes the possibility of an implosion of the field. Drawing on Baudrillard’s notion

of mediated *simulations*, that “real is not only what can be reproduced, but that which is already reproduced” (cited in Andrews, 2000, p. 128) i.e., the hyperreal, it can be theorized that an encapsulated insular discipline that polices its disciplinary borders participates in the production of recycled and, inevitably, inadequate knowledge. Therefore, it appears that cultural studies, which has been increasingly informed by poststructuralist and postmodern theorizing (Andrews, 2000), offers the most robust yet fluid paradigm for the “becoming” work in sport psychology, as emphasized in the following quote:

[...] post-structuralist approaches lead us to recognize that no theoretical paradigm is flawless, and no theoretical paradigm is forever. But post-structuralisms that remain attentive to history and power relations allow us to understand and, perhaps, to transform our worlds. Provisionally, they are the best we have...at least for now (Kondo, 1995, p. 99).

References

References

- Abelskaya, R. S. (1955). Ob osmyslivanii dvizhenii v protsesse ovladeniya pryzhkom v vysotu s razbega [About awareness of movements in the process of mastering a high jump technique]. In A. C. Puni (Ed.), *Voprosy psikhologii sporta*. Moscow: FiS.
- Abelskaya, R. S. (1957a). O roli slova i obraza v vospriyatii situatsii sportivnoi igry [About the role of a word and an image in the perception of a sport game]. *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 4.
- Abelskaya, R. S. (1957b). *Vnutrennyaya rech v formirovanii proizvolnykh deistvii u sportsmenov* [The role of self-talk in the formation of voluntary motor acts in athletes]. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the P. F. Lesgaft Institute of Physical Culture, Leningrad.
- Abelskaya, R. S., & Surkov, E. N. (1955). Formirovanie gimnasticheskikh ponyatii i ih vliyanie na zapominanie gimnasticheskikh uprazhnenii i ovladenie imi [Formation of gymnastics concepts and their impact on memorizing gymnastics exercises and mastering them]. In A. C. Puni (Ed.), *Voprosy psikhologii sporta*. Moscow: FiS.
- Acosta, R., & Carpenter, L. (2004). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study twenty-seven year update, 1977-2004*. Retrieved November 3, 2004, from http://www.smith.edu/wsc/women_in_sport.pdf
- Ageevts, V. U., & Kanevets, T. M. (Eds.). (1986). *Organizatsiya fizicheskoi kul'tury i sporta* [The organization of physical culture and sport]. Moscow: FiS.
- Alridge, D. P. (2003). The dilemmas, challenges, and duality of an African-American educational historian. *Educational Researcher*, December, 25-34.

- Andreeva, G. M. (1997). K istorii stanovleniya socialnoj psihologii v Rossii [History of the formation of social psychology in Russia]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta*, 4(4), 6-17.
- Andrews, D. L. (1993). Desperately seeking Michel: Foucault's genealogy, the body and critical sport sociology. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10(2), 148-167.
- Andrews, D. L. (1999). Dead and alive?: Sports history in the late capitalist moment. *Sporting Traditions*, 16(1), 73-83.
- Andrews, D. L. (2000). Posting up: French post-structuralism and the critical analysis of contemporary sporting culture. In J. Coakley & E. Dunning (Eds.), *Handbook of sports studies* (pp. 106-137). London: Sage.
- Andrews, D. L. (2002). Coming to terms with cultural studies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 26(1), 110-117.
- Andrews, D. L. (Ed.). (2001). *Michael Jordan, Inc.: corporate sport, media culture, and late modern America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Andrews, D. L., & Loy, J. (1993). British cultural studies and sport: Past encounters and future possibilities. *Quest*, 45, 255-276.
- Appleby, J., Hunt, L., & Jacob, M. (1994). *Telling the truth about history*. New York and London: Norton & Company.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bain, R. (2000). Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history instruction. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching & learning*

- history: National and international perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). The problem of the text in linguistics, philology, and the human sciences: An experiment in philosophical analysis (V. W. McGee, Trans.). In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.), *Speech genres and other late essays* (pp. 103-131). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Baumann, R. F. (1988). The central army sports club (TsSKA) forging a military tradition in Soviet ice hockey. *Journal of Sport History*, 1.5(2), 151-166.
- Bennett, B. L. (Ed.). (1972). *History of physical education and sport*. Chicago, IL: The Athletic Institute.
- Benson, L., & Harkavy, I. (1997). Introduction: universities, colleges, and their neighboring communities. *Universities and Community Schools*, 5(1-2), 5-11.
- Birrell, S., & Cole, C. L. (Eds.). (1994). *Women, sport, and culture*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Blake, A. (1996). *The body language: The meaning of modern sport*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 29, 447-466.
- Bourdieu, P. (1978). Sport and social class. *Social Science Information*, 17(6), 819-840.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic subjects: embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bredemeier, B. (2001). Feminist praxis in sport psychology research. *The Sport Psychologist*, 15(4), 412-418.
- Bunyan, J., & Fisher, H. H. (1934). *The Bolshevik Revolution*. Stanford University Press.
- Butryn, T. M. (2002). Critically examining white racial identity and privilege in sport psychology consulting. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16(3), 316 -336.
- Butryn, T. M., & Masucci, M. A. (2003). It's not about the book: A cyborg counternarrative of Lance Armstrong. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 27(2), 124-144.
- Cahn, S. K. (1994). *Coming on strong: Gender and sexuality in twentieth-century sport*. New York: The Free Press.
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). (1982a). *The empire strikes back: Race and racism in 70s Britain*. London: Hutchinson.
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). (1982b). *Making histories: Studies in history-writing and politics*. London: Hutchinson.
- Clarke, J. (1973). Football hooliganism and the skinheads. *Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Stencilled Occasional Paper Series*, 42.
- Coakley, J. (2001). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Cole, C. L. (1993). Resisting the canon: Feminist cultural studies, sport, and technologies of the body. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 17(2), 77-97.

- Cole, C. L. (1998). Addiction, exercise, and cyborgs: technologies of deviant bodies. In G. Rail (Ed.), *Sport and postmodern time* (pp. 261-275). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Conant, J. B. (1963). *The education of American teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety: the experience of play in work and games*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davies, I. (1995). *Cultural studies and beyond: Fragments of empire*. New York: Routledge.
- De Hart, J. S. (2001). Containment at home: gender, sexuality, and national identity in Cold War America. In P. J. Kuznick & J. Gilbert (Eds.), *Rethinking Cold War Culture* (pp. 124-155). Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2000). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Derrida, J. (1978). Cogito and the history of madness (A. Bass, Trans.). In J. Derrida (Ed.), *Writing and Difference* (pp. 45-63). Urbana: Chicago University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978/1981). Structure, sign and play in the discourse of the human sciences (A. Bass, Trans.). In J. Derrida (Ed.), *Writing and difference* (pp. 278-294). London.
- Derrida, J. (1998). *Of Grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- DeSensi, J., & Paul, J. (March, 2005). Personal communication.

- Duncan, M. C. (1994). The politics of women's body images and practices: Foucault, the panopticon, and Shape Magazine. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 18(1), 48-65.
- Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Early, G. (Ed.). (1998). *Body language*. Saint Paul: Graywolf Press.
- Egupov, L. F. (1955). Zapominanie slalomnoi trassy [Memorizing of a route in slalom]. In A. C. Puni (Ed.), *Voprosy psikhologii sporta*. Moscow: FiS.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Harlow: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fisher, L. A. (1997). "Building one's self up": The construction of identity among professional female bodybuilders. In P. Moore (Ed.), *Building bodies* (pp. 135-161). New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Fisher, L. A., & Bredemeier, B. (2000). Caring about injustice: The moral self-perceptions of professional female bodybuilders. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 22(4), 327-244.
- Fisher, L. A., Butryn, T. M., & Roper, E. A. (2003). Diversifying (and politicizing) sport psychology through cultural studies: A promising perspective. *The Sport Psychologist*, 17(4), 391-405.

- Fisher, S. (1997). *Service learning for social justice--opening remarks*. Paper presented at the Service Learning for Social Justice Workshop.
- Fisher, S. (Ed.). (1993). *Fighting back in Appalachia: Traditions of resistance and change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1967). *Madness and civilization*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1973). *The order of things: an archeology of the human sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1976). *Mental illness and psychology* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History (D. F. Bouchard & S. Simon, Trans.). In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: An introduction* (Vol. 1): Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972 - 1977* (C. Gordon, L. Marhall, J. Mepham & K. Soper, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Brighton, England: Harvester Press.

- Foucault, M. (1991). Questions of method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. S. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans. 2 ed.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum Press.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: culture, power, and liberation*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, P. (1987). *Literacy: reading the word & the world*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.
- Fuss, D. (1995). *Identification papers*. New York: Routledge.
- Gill, D. (1997). Sport and exercise psychology. In J. Massengale & R. Swanson (Eds.), *The history of exercise and sport science* (pp. 293-320). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Gill, D. (2000). Psychology and the study of sport. In J. Coakley & E. Dunning (Eds.), *Handbook of sports studies* (pp. 228-240). London: Sage.
- Gill, D. (2001). In search of feminist sport psychology: then, now, and always [Special Issue]. *The Sport Psychologist*, 15(4).
- Gill, R. (1993). Ideology, gender and popular radio: A discourse analytic approach. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 317-323.
- Gilroy, P. (1991). *There ain't no black in the union jack: The cultural politics of race and nation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Giroux, H. (1988). *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Goldstein, A. P., & Krasner, L. (1987). *Modern applied psychology*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Gorbunov, G. D., & Shlenkov, A. V. (1998). Razvitie idei A. C. Puni v razrabotke nauchno-prakticheskoi problemy psihologicheskoi podgotovki [Development of A. C. Puni's ideas in elaboration of scientific-practical problem of athlete's psychological training]. *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 11/12, 7-10.
- Gorn, E. J. (1997). Sports through the Nineteenth Century. In S. W. Pope (Ed.), *The new American sport history: recent approaches and perspectives* (pp. 33-57). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Gorn, E. J., & Oriard, M. (1995). Taking sports seriously. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52.
- Gould, D., & Pick, S. (1995). Sport psychology: the Griffith era, 1920 - 1940. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9(4), 391-405.
- Gray, A. (2003). *Research practice for cultural studies*. London: Sage.
- Gray, A., & McGuigan, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Studying culture: An introductory reader*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Griffith, C. R. (1920). The organic and mental effects of repeated bodily rotations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 3, 15-46, 89-125.
- Griffith, C. R. (1925). Psychology and its relation to athletic competition. *American Physical Education Review* (30), 193-199.

- Griffith, C. R. (1926). *Psychology of coaching*. New York - London: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Griffith, C. R. (1928). *Psychology and athletics*. New York - London: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Griffith, C. R. (1930). A laboratory for research in athletics. *Research Quarterly*, 1, 34-41.
- Griffith, C. R. (1934). *An introduction to applied psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Griffiths, M. (1998). *Educational research for social justice: Getting off the fence*. Buckingham: Open Universities Press.
- Grigoryants, L. A. (1997). O perspektivah razvitiya psihologii sporta [Sport psychology: outlook for development]. *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 5, 12-14.
- Gripsrud, J. (1994). Intellectuals as constructors of cultural identities. *Cultural Studies*, 8(2), 220-231.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2000). Analyzing interpretive practice. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 487-508). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1977). Culture, the media and the "ideological effect". In J. Curran, M. Gurevitch & J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Mass communications and society* (pp. 56-90). London: Arnold.
- Hall, S. (1988). The toad in the garden: Thatcherism among the theorists. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 35-57). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

- Hall, S. (1990). The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis of the humanities. *October*, 53, 11-90.
- Hall, S. (1992). Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 277-294). New York & London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1994). Cultural identity and diaspora. In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory* (pp. 392-403). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hall, S. (1996a). Introduction: Who needs identity? In S. Hall & P. d. Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1 - 18). London: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1996b). Race: the floating signifier [Video Recording]. In S. Jhally (Producer). Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hardy, S. (1997). Sport in urbanizing America: a historical review. *Journal of Urban History*, 23(6), 675-708.
- Hardy, S., & Ingham, A. (1983). Games, structures and agency: historians on the American play movement. *Journal of Social History*, 17, 285 - 302.
- Hargreaves, J. (1982). Sport, culture, and ideology. In J. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Sport, culture, and ideology* (pp. 30-61). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hargreaves, J. (1990). Gender on the sports agenda. *International Review of the Sociology of Sport*, 25, 287-308.

- Henry, F. M. (1964). Physical education: an academic discipline. *Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, 35, 32-33.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ingham, A. G., Blissmer, B. J., & Wells Davidson, K. (1999). The expendable prolympic self: Going beyond the boundaries of sociology and psychology of sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16, 236-285.
- Irigaray, L. (1997). "This sex which is not one". In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *The second wave: a reader in feminist theory* (pp. 323-329). New York and London: Routledge.
- James, C. L. R. (1963). *Beyond a boundary*. London: Stanley Paul.
- Jenkins, K. (2003). *Refiguring history: new thoughts on an old discipline*. London: Routledge.
- Kearney, R. (1984). *Dialogues with Contemporary Continental Thinkers*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kellor, F. A. (1898). A psychological basis for physical culture. *Education*, 19, 100-104.
- Kohn, N., & Sydnor, S. (1998). "How do you warm-up for a stretch class?": Sub/In/Di/verting hegemonic shoves toward sport. In G. Rail (Ed.), *Sport and postmodern time* (pp. 21-32). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kondo, D. (1995). Poststructuralist theory as political necessity. *Amerasia Journal*, 21(1 & 2), 95-100.
- Kornspan, A. S., & MacCracken, M. J. (2002). The use of psychology in professional baseball. *NINE: A Journal of Baseball History and Culture*, 11, 36-43.

- Krane, V. (2001). One lesbian feminist epistemology: integrating feminist standpoint, queer theory, and feminist cultural studies. *The Sport Psychologist*, 15(4), 401-411.
- Krane, V., Waldron, J., Michalenok, J., & Stiles-Shipley, J. (2001). Body image, and eating and exercise behaviors: A feminist cultural studies perspective. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal*, 10(1), 17-54.
- Kress, G., & Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Kroll, W. (1971). *Perspectives in physical education*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kroll, W., & Lewis, G. (1970). America's first sport psychologist. *Quest*, 13, 1-4.
- Kukushkin, G. I. (Ed.). (1961). *Encyclopedia of Physical Culture and Sport* (Vol. 1). Moscow: FiS.
- Kukushkin, G. I. (Ed.). (1962). *Encyclopedia of Physical Culture and Sport* (Vol. 2). Moscow: FiS.
- Kukushkin, G. I. (Ed.). (1963). *Encyclopedia of Physical Culture and Sport* (Vol. 3). Moscow: FiS.
- Kuznick, P. J., & Gilbert, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Rethinking Cold War Culture*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. London: Routledge.
- Lather, P. (2003). *Applied Derrida: (Mis)Reading the Work of Mourning in Educational Research*. Paper presented at the AERA, Chicago.
- Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: women living with HIV/AIDS*. Westview Press.

- Lenin, V. I. (1966). The tasks of the Youth Leagues (J. Katzer, Trans.). In J. Katzer (Ed.), *V. I. Lenin: collected works* (4th ed., Vol. 31, pp. 283-299). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Leontiev, A. N. (1971). Introduction. In L. S. Vygotsky (Ed.), *The psychology of art* (pp. v-xi). Cambridge, MA and London, England: The M.I.T. Press.
- Lesgaft, P. F. (1901). *Rukovodstvo k fiziceskomu obrazovaniju detej shkolnogo vozrasta* [*A guide to physical education of school age children*]. St. Petersburg.
- Lewis, G. (1972). Enterprise on the campus: developments in intercollegiate sport and higher education, 1875-1939. In B. L. Bennett (Ed.), *History of physical education and sport*. Chicago, IL: The Athletic Institute.
- Lucas, J. A., & Smith, R. A. (1978). *Saga of American sport*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Marples, D. R. (1986). *Chernobyl and nuclear power in the USSR*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Martens, R. (1979). From smocks to jocks: a new adventure for sports psychologists. In P. Klavara & J. V. Daniel (Eds.), *Coach, athlete, and the sport psychologist* (pp. 56-62). Toronto: School of Physical Education, University of Toronto.
- Martens, R. (1987). Science, knowledge, and sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 1, 29-55.
- Mason, T. (Ed.). (1989). *Sport in Britain: a social history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayakovsky, V. (1955/1958). *Mayakovsky: collected works* (Vol. 1-10). Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya Literatura.

- McDonald, M. G., & Birrell, S. (1999). Reading sport critically: A methodology for interrogating power. *Sociology of sport journal*, 16, 283-300.
- McGannon, K. R., Stephens, D. E., & Johnson, C. R. (2004, September 29 - October 2, 2004). *My story, their story and our story: using autoethnographies to understand the (embodied)Self in sport and physical activity participation*. Paper presented at the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology Conference, Minneapolis, MN.
- McLaren, P. (2003). *Life in Schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mel'nikov, V. M. (Ed.). (1987). *Psihologiya [Psychology]*. Moscow: FiS.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.
- Moyer, D. K. (2001). *"Sentimentalists and radicals": the role of gender in the construction of 1930s progressive education*. Unpublished Dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Nauright, J. (1999). The end of sports history?? From sports history to sports studies. *Sporting Traditions*, 16(1), 5-13.
- Nelson, C., Treichler, P., & Grossberg, L. (1992). Cultural studies: an introduction. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.
- Nideffer, R. M. (1984). Current concerns in sport psychology. In J. Silva & R. Weinberg (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of sport* (pp. 35-44). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Oriard, M. (1993). *Reading football: how the popular press created an American spectacle*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Park, R. J., & Hult, J. S. (1993). Women as leaders in physical education and school-based sports, 1865 to the 1930s. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 64(3), 33-36.
- Paul, J. (March, 2005). Personal communication.
- Peters, R. (1976). Television coverage of sport. *Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Stencilled Occasional Paper Series*, 48.
- Pfister, G. (1990). The medical discourse on female physical culture in Germany in the 19th and early 20th centuries. *Journal of Sport History*, 17(2), 183-198.
- Phillips, M. G. (2001). Deconstructing sport history: The postmodern challenge. *Journal of Sport History*, 28(3), 327-343.
- Pierce, P. E. (1908). The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States. *American Physical Education Review*, 13.
- Pope, S. W. (Ed.). (1997). *The new American sport history: recent approaches and perspectives*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Poster, M. (1997). *Cultural history and postmodernity: disciplinary readings and challenges*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Puni, A. C. (1952). *Psihologiya sporta [Sport psychology]*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Leningrad State University, Leningrad.
- Puni, A. C. (1955). Ob osoznavanii i neososnovanii dvizhenii v zauchennyh deistviyah [Awareness and non-awareness of movements in motor habits]. In A. C. Puni (Ed.), *Voprosy psikhologii sporta*. Moscow: FiS.

- Puni, A. C. (1957a, June 1-6). *O chuvstvennyh i logicheskikh componentah dvigatelnoi deyatelnosti sportsmenov [Perception and thinking as components of athletes' motor activity]*. Paper presented at the meeting on the level of the Russian Academy of Pedagogical Sciences (APN RSFSR), Moscow.
- Puni, A. C. (1957b). O volevoi podgotovke legkoatleta [About volitional preparation of track-and-field athletes]. *Legkaya atletica*, 2.
- Puni, A. C. (1957c). *Rol predstavlenii v formirovanii dvigatelnyh navykov [The role of imagination in the formation of motor habits]*. Leningrad: GDOIFK.
- Puni, A. C. (1959). *Ocherki psihologii sporta [Sport psychology essays]*. Moscow: FiS.
- Puni, A. C. (1963). Psihologicheskaya podgotovka sportsmena k sorevnovaniyu [Psychological preparation of athletes for a competition]. *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 2, 52-56.
- Puni, A. C. (1969). *Psihologicheskaya podgotovka k sorevnovaniyu v sporte [Psychological preparation for a competition in sport]*. Moscow: FiS.
- Puni, A. C. (1973). *Nekotorye psihologicheskie voprosy gotovnosti k sorevnovaniyam v sporte [Some psychological aspects of readiness for a competition in sport]*. Leningrad: GDOIFK.
- Puni, A. C. (1978). *Autobiography*. Unpublished manuscript, Leningrad.
- Puni, A. C. (1982). Some questions in the theory of the will and the development of will power in sports. In A. V. Rodionov & N. A. Hudadov (Eds.), *Psihologiya i sovremenniy sport [Psychology and contemporary sports]*. Moscow: FiS.

- Puni, A. C., & Kostrov, N. F. (1930). Psiho-fiziologicheskoe vlijanie ping-ponga [Psycho-physiological effects of ping-pong]. *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 2(26), 13-23.
- Rader, B. G. (1983). *American sports: From the age of folk games to the age of spectators*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Rafalovich, A. G. (1955). Razvitie "chuvstva vremeni" u begunov [Development of a "sense of time" in runners]. In A. C. Puni (Ed.), *Voprosy psikhologii sporta*. Moscow: FiS.
- Rail, G. (Ed.). (1998). *Sport and postmodern time*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rice, E. A. (1939). *A brief history of physical education* (Revised and enlarged ed.). New York: Barnes and Company.
- Riordan, J. (1977a). Pyotr Franzevich Lesgaft (1837 - 1909) the founder of Russian physical education. *Journal of Sport History*, 4(2), 229-241.
- Riordan, J. (1977b). *Sport in Soviet Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodionov, A. V., & Hudadov, N. A. (Eds.). (1982). *Psikhologiya i sovremennyyi sport* [Psychology and contemporary sports]. Moscow: FiS.
- Roper, E. (2001). The personal becomes political: Exploring the potential of feminist sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 15(4), 445-449.
- Roudik, P. A. (1960). *Psihologicheskaya nauka v S.S.S.R. [Psychological science in the U.S.S.R.]*. Moscow: FiS.
- Roudik, P. A. (1962). Psihologicheskie osnovy moralno-volevoi podgotovki sportsmena [Psychological foundations of moral-volitional preparation of an athlete]. In P. A.

- Roudik (Ed.), *Problemy psihologii sporta [Problems of Sport Psychology]*.
Moscow: FiS.
- Roudik, P. A. (1964). *Psihologiya [Psychology]*. Moscow: Fizkultura i Sport.
- Ryba, T. V., Stambulova, N. B., & Wrisberg, C. A. (2005). The Russian origins of sport psychology: a translation of an early work of A. C. Puni. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 17(2), 157-169.
- Ryba, T. V., & Wright, H. K. (2005). From mental game to cultural praxis: A cultural studies model's implications for the future of sport psychology. *Quest*, 57, 192-212.
- Ryba, V. (December, 2004). Personal communication.
- Ryba, V., & Ivanika, T. (December, 2004). Personal communication.
- Sage, G. H. (1990). *Power and ideology in American sport: a critical perspective*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Sage, G. H. (1993). Sport and physical education in the New World Order: Dare we be agents of social change? *Quest*, 45, 151-164.
- Sage, G. H. (1998). *Power and ideology in American sport: a critical perspective* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Salmela, J. (1981). *The world sport psychology sourcebook*. Ithaca, NY: Movement.
- Salmela, J. (1984). Comparative sport psychology. In J. Silva & R. Weinberg (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of sport* (pp. 23-34). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Salmela, J. (1992). *The world sport psychology sourcebook*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Samoukov, F. I. (Ed.). (1964). *Istoriya fizicheskoi kul'tury*. Moscow.

- Sargent, D. A. (1984). Are athletics making girls masculine? A practical answer to a question every girl asks. In S. A. Riess (Ed.), *The American sporting experience: a historical anthology of sport in America* (pp. 255-263). Champaign, IL: Leisure Press.
- Sarup, M. (1989). *Introduction to post-structuralism and postmodernism*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London: Temple Smith.
- Schwendener, N. (1942). *A history of physical education in the United States*. New York: Barnes and Company.
- Selivanov, V. I. (1964). Problemy voli v sovetskoi psihologii [Issues of the will in Soviet psychology]. *Voprosy psihologii, 1*.
- Senn, A. E. (1999). *Power, politics, and the Olympic Games*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Shakhverdov, G. G., Semenov, D. A., Bogdanova, D. Y., & Kiselev, Y. Y. (1970). A.C. Puni: K semidesyatiletiyu so dnya rozhdeniya [A.C.Puni: To his seventieth birthday]. In D. Y. Bogdanova & Y. Y. Kiselev (Eds.), *Problemy psihologii sporta [Problems of sport psychology]* (pp. 3-11). Leningrad: The P. F. Lesgaft Institute of Physical Culture.
- Sherif, C. W. (1982). Needed concepts in the study of gender identity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 6*, 375-398.

- Shneidman, N. N. (1979). Soviet sport psychology in the 1970s and the superior athlete. In P. Klavara & J. V. Daniel (Eds.), *Coach, athlete, and the sport psychologist* (pp. 230-247). Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Silva, J. M. (2001). Current trends and future directions in sport psychology. In R. N. Singer, H. A. Hausenblas & C. M. Janelle (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (2d ed., pp. 823-832). New York: Wiley.
- Silva, J. M., & Weinberg, R. S. (Eds.). (1984). *Psychological foundations of sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Simons, J. P., & Andersen, M. B. (1995). The development of consulting practice in applied sport psychology: some personal perspectives. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 449-468.
- Singer, R. N., Hausenblas, H. A., & Janelle, C. M. (2001). Prologue: A brief history of research in sport psychology. In R. N. Singer, H. A. Hausenblas & C. M. Janelle (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (2d ed., pp. xiii-xix). New York: Wiley.
- Smith, D. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: a feminist sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, D. (1990a). *Conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, D. (1990b). *Texts, facts, and femininity: Exploring the relations of ruling*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Smith, R. A. (1984). The rise of basketball for women in colleges. In S. A. Riess (Ed.), *The American sporting experience: a historical anthology of sport in America* (pp. 239-254). Champaign, IL: Leisure Press.

- Stambulova, N. B. (January, 2004). Personal communication.
- Stambulova, N. B., & Hvatskaya, E. E. (1996). The oldest Russian Sport Psychology Center celebrates its 50th anniversary. *FEPSAC Bulletin*, 2, 15-17.
- Stambulova, N. B., Wrisberg, C. A., & Ryba, T. V. (under review). A tale of two traditions in applied sport psychology: The heyday of Soviet sport and wake-up call(s) for North America. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*.
- Stolbov, V. V. (Ed.). (1983). *Istoriya fizicheskoi kul'tury i sporta*. Moscow: FiS.
- Sydnor, S. (1998). A history of synchronized swimming. *Journal of Sport History*, 25(2), 252-267.
- Tchizh, V. F. (1910). Psihologija sporta [Sports psychology]. *Practicheskaja Meditsina [Practicing Medicine]*, 40, 41 & 42, 1-25.
- Thomas, J. R. (1997). Motor behavior. In J. D. Massengale & R. A. Swanson (Eds.), *The history of exercise and sport science* (pp. 203-292). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Threadgold, T. (2003). *Cultural studies, critical theory and critical discourse analysis: histories, remembering and futures*. Retrieved October 13, 2004, from http://www.linguistik-online.de/14_03/threadgold.html
- Tolman, C. W. (1999). Bentley, Madison (1870 - 1955). In E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Psychology*: APA & Oxford University Press.
- Tracy, D. (1951). *The psychologist at bat*. New York: Sterling.
- Tretiak, V. (1977). *The hockey I love*. Westport: Lawrence Hill.
- Vamplew, W. (1988). *Pay up and play the game: professional sport in Britain, 1875-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- van Houts, N. M. (2003). *An assessment of responses in the British press to Muslim immigrants 1978-1989*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Vanek, M., & Cratty, B. J. (1970). *Psychology and the superior athlete*. London: Macmillan.
- Vaughan, G., & Guerin, B. (1997). A neglected innovator in sports psychology: Norman Triplett and the early history of competitive performance. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 14(2), 82-99.
- Verschueren, J., Ostman, J., & Blommaert, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Handbook of pragmatics 1995*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Volkov, I. P., Gorbunov, G. D., & Stambulova, N. B. (1998). K 100-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya Avksentiya Cezarevicha Puni [To the centennial of Avksentii Cezarevich Puni]. *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 11/12, 2-6.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1971). *The psychology of art*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: The M.I.T. Press.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice & poststructuralist theory* (2 ed.). Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (2003). *Foundations of sport and exercise psychology* (3d ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Welch, P. D., & Lerch, H. A. (1981). *History of American physical education and sport*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

- Wiggins, D. (1984). The history of sport psychology in North America. In J. Silva & R. Weinberg (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of sport* (pp. 9-22). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Williams, J. M., & Straub, W. F. (2001). Sport psychology: past, present, and future. In J. M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (4th ed., pp. 1-12). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Aldershot: Saxon House.
- Willis, P. (2000). *The ethnographic imagination*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Wilson, N. J. (1999). *History in crisis? Recent directions in historiography*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Women's Studies Group (CCCS). (1978). *Women take issue*. London: Hutchinson.
- Wright, H. K. (1995). Would we know African cultural studies if we saw it? *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies*, 17(2), 157-165.
- Wright, H. K. (1998). Dare we de-Centre Birmingham? Troubling the origins and trajectories of cultural studies. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 1(1), 33-56.
- Wright, H. K. (2001/2002). Editorial: Cultural Studies and Service Learning for Social Justice. *Tennessee Education*, 31/32(2,1), 11-16.
- Wright, H. K. (2002, November). *Facilitating student activism and research: The (potential) contribution of institutional ethnography*. Paper presented at the Sociology for Changing the World: Political Activist Ethnography, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Canada.

- Wright, H. K. (2003). Cultural studies as praxis: (Making) an autobiographical case. *Cultural Studies*, 17(6), 805-822.
- Wright, H. K. (2004a). Does Hlebowitsh improve on curriculum history? Reading a re-reading for its political purpose and implications. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 35(1), 103-117.
- Wright, H. K. (2004b). *A prescience of African cultural studies: the future of literature in Africa is not what it was* (Vol. 40). New York: Peter Lang.
- Wright, H. K., & Ryba, T. V. (under review). Organized youth sport and its alternatives. In S. Steinberg, P. Parmar & B. Richard (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Youth Culture*: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Wrisberg, C. A. (February, 2004). Personal communication.
- Wrisberg, C. A. (2004). *The practice of sport psychology: the emerging tension between clinical psychologists and sport scientists*. Unpublished manuscript, Knoxville, TN.
- Yates, D. H. (1957). *Psychology you can use*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Yevgenieva, L. (December, 2004). Personal communication.
- Young, R. J. C. (2004). *White mythologies: Writing History and the West* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Vita

I was born and raised in the Soviet Union. In 1997, I came to the United States. I completed a two year program for majors in Experimental Psychology as my Post Baccalaureate studies in Maryville College, Maryville, TN. I earned my Master of Science degree in Human Performances and Sport Studies and Doctor of Philosophy in Sport Studies from the University of Tennessee in 2002 and 2005 respectively.