

Social Control Techniques in College Athletics:
An Application of Goffman and Foucault

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Kendall M. Rainey
August 2013

Copyright © 2013 by Kendall M. Rainey
All rights reserved.

DEDICATION

David J. Prior, Chancellor of The University of Virginia's College at Wise passed away suddenly in February 2012. His death marked an end to a wonderful era in the history and growth of UVa-Wise. Characterized by many accomplishments for the College in the areas of academic programming, development, and student life, his tenure was full of well-documented achievements; but his persona was much more than the sum of the buildings, the fundraising, the enrollments, and the literal miles traveled...he was a mentor, a leader, a teacher, a fan, a supporter, and a friend. The first time I met Chancellor Prior he asked me why I would want to leave the Division I arena and I explained that I hoped to have an opportunity to more directly impact the lives of student-athletes and be in a place where student-athletes and coaches were involved members of the campus community. I wanted to rejoin the college family that had shaped much of my worldview. Not knowing what to expect in response I waited slightly on edge. Then he replied with a resonating insight about why he chose to pursue the journey from a Research I university back to a small campus where he could interact more with the students. He epitomized the ideal of undergraduate education and overall college experiences providing a solid foundation for students.

He was overjoyed at seeing students succeed and spent valuable time assisting me as an "external reviewer" of my work. My mind wanders often to him coming into my office with a manuscript to read or his notes on my writing, his emails about telling a coherent story, or his ideas about cutting and pasting. He always had the right story with the right moral to help motivate me at the right time and I hope this final product would make him proud. His belief in me and constant encouragement helped me complete this dissertation and continue to grow professionally. This relationship is irreplaceable and I am grateful. He respected the ideas of

everyone and was prepared to propel anyone willing into the next phase of thinking, enlightenment, and happiness.

Chancellor Prior was a biologist who often joked on my qualitative writing, while simultaneously showing a genuine interest. One email I received from him closed with this line: “You know, cultural, gender, ability, perceptual, continualitally centered pragmatallically rendered centrism, engaged but incenterally postured third obsrevationalistically positioned.”

After a few exchanges that email thread ended with the last email I received from him in January 2012:

Mmmm. "That's my girl!!!". Remember, I am of another generation...so allow me an occasional...gender biased dated phrase!!! I am enormously proud of you! Cheers, D

David J. Prior (from my handheld)
Chancellor, UVa's College at Wise

At the end of *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*, Dumbledore reflects, "After all, to the well organized mind, death is but the next great adventure." I believe that this idea is fitting for the way Chancellor Prior lived. He was instrumental in helping me with this adventure which made a lifelong impression and I truly hope to make him proud. Cheers to a great man...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe great thanks to several individuals for their support throughout this project.

I want to thank my family for their support of my entire 13 year career as a college student. The meals, Budget trucks, bills, car services, and constant support and love they have provided me is incredible.

I want to thank my friends for knowing when I needed a mental break and exactly how to help. The tunes, drinks, emojis, sour gummy worms, and retail therapy opportunities have been tremendously helpful. Additionally, I want to thank SiriusXM Satellite Radio, iTunes, and Spotify for continuous streams of music as well as the playlist creators. A special thanks to the proofreaders as well.

I want to thank the UVA-Wise staff, faculty, students, and colleagues for providing me advice, support, and interest. The continuous support from so many people across campus has been remarkable.

I want to thank my committee members for their patience and guidance throughout this project. Without their advice, encouragement, and understanding I would not have completed the challenge. Specifically, I want to thank Rob for helping me gain confidence in my athletic administrative path; Dr. Barb for helping me understand that emotions can be beneficial and shouldn't be overlooked; Lars for his constant enthusiasm and thoughtfulness; and Dr. DeSensi for never giving up on me.

ABSTRACT

College athletics originated as a recess from academic demands and were originally organized by students, yet faculty took over supervision to address safety, professionalism, and academic integrity (Hawkins, 2010). This evolution led to the formation of athletic departments and a governing body (Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Hawkins, 2010). Thus, demonstrating a historical element of social control in the motives of sporting establishments; however, official aims such as character building are typically espoused (Shulman & Bowen, 2001), or as Goffman (1961) states, “the reformation of inmates in the direction of some ideal standard” (p. 74). Examination of the use of available resources within NCAA Division I institutions raises questions concerning relationships of power, locus of control, and the mission of universities and athletic departments, (Benford, 2007; Hughes & Coakley, 1991; Shulman & Bowen, 2001). This study analyzes how social control techniques have manifested within NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics as a perpetuation of commercialization.

The experience of three NCAA Division I softball student-athletes is presented. The work is methodologically grounded in the theoretical paradigm of pragmatism and is informed substantively by Foucault’s (1979/1995) panopticism and Goffman’s (1961) total institution. A narrative inquiry as defined by Clandinin and Connelly (1994; 2001; 2006) was designed using semi-structured interviews for data collection. The participants’ unique stories illustrate how they experience the disciplines of a total institution. A polycoval method of data analysis was used to ensure that the multiple voices present in the data were represented (Hatch, 2002). This study expands understanding of how the issues of power, social control, and personal empowerment are experienced by NCAA Division I softball student-athletes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study and Research Question.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	5
The Power of Intercollegiate Athletics.....	7
The Relationship of Intercollegiate Athletics and an Academic Mission.....	9
Comparison of NCAA Divisions.....	12
Commercial Motivation.....	16
The NCAA Entertainment Business.....	22
Rationale for the Study.....	26
Assumptions of the Study.....	27
Operational Definitions.....	28
Organization of the Study.....	29
Chapter II: Review of Literature.....	31
Introduction.....	31
Goffman in Sport Studies.....	32
Goffman's Total Institution.....	33
Foucault in Sport Studies.....	38
Foucault Overview.....	39
Foucault's Disciplinary Power.....	40
The Feminist-Pragmatist Perspective.....	43
Relevance of Theoretical Traditions.....	48
Literature Review Conclusion.....	51
Chapter III: Methodology.....	52
Introduction.....	52
Qualitative Methodology.....	53
Narrative Inquiry.....	53
Sport Specific Story.....	55
Inquiry Approach and Rationale.....	56
Instrumentation.....	57
Data Collection.....	58
Participants.....	59
Data Analysis.....	60
Reflexivity Statement.....	62
Trustworthiness.....	63
Methodology Conclusion.....	64

Chapter IV: Narratives.....	65
Introduction.....	65
Kim’s Narrative.....	65
Jill’s Narrative.....	76
Ashley’s Narrative.....	89
Kendall’s Narrative – The Researcher.....	101
Chapter V: Discussion.....	104
Introduction.....	104
Docile Bodies and Obligatory Participants.....	104
Institutional Arrangements: Distributions in Space and Control of Activity.....	114
The Welcome and Combining and Positioning Forces within a Unit.....	118
Observation, Examination, and Normalization.....	122
Panopticism and Integration of Life Activities.....	132
Conclusion.....	136
Chapter VI: Conclusions, Limitations, and Recommendations.....	141
Conclusions of the Study.....	141
Limitations of the Study.....	144
Recommendations.....	145
References.....	147
Appendices.....	159
Appendix A: Letter of Introduction.....	160
Appendix B: Informed Consent.....	161
Appendix C: Interview Protocol.....	163
Vita.....	165

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“[Coach] wants to fill up the day so we’re totally into the program and nothing else. He dud’n want Charles or anybody else just rattling around the campus at night...*thinking*...or anything counterproductive like that.”

(Wolfe, 2004, p. 119)

Collegiate athletics...to some the phrase may seem paradoxical due to the perception of incongruence between the two entities as illustrated by the introducing excerpt from Tom Wolfe’s popular novel *I Am Charlotte Simmons*, yet athletics have become institutionalized within higher education and for many it is a way of life (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). When soldiers returned from World War II, sports were used as a tool for transitioning them back into society and in the Industrial Era, sports were used by trade unions to “keep their members under control...and divert the workers’ [attention] from other less harmless activities” (Brohm, 1978, p. 142). In addition, physical education and school sport were “developed initially...to combat the indiscipline, immorality, and rebellion” present in public schools in the Victorian era (Treadwell, 1984, p. 115). Athletics emerged within institutions of higher education as a form of recreation and recess from academic demands and were originally organized by students, yet faculty soon took over supervision to address safety, professionalism, and academic integrity (Hawkins, 2010). Professionalization and safety concerns in football during the early 1900s led to the formation of athletic departments and a governing body (Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Hawkins, 2010). Therefore, as the origin of athletics demonstrate, there is a historical element of social control present in the motives of sporting establishments; however, official aims such as character building and personal development are typically espoused (Shulman & Bowen, 2001),

or related to Goffman's (1961) research, "the reformation of inmates in the direction of some ideal standard" (p. 74).

In modern society, the ever evolving nature of intercollegiate athletics has created a multi-billion dollar sector of the entertainment industry that runs on the work of amateurs: college students. Just like any business, colleges must care for their assets and continue to develop their resources through recruiting and training. In the case of many Division I programs sanctioned by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), these student-athletes are provided with every resource that is buyable and legal based on the guidelines of the NCAA. Student-athletes therefore develop a great sense of attachment and commitment to the university, similar to Goffman's (1961) discussion of how individuals in total institutions become attached. As with many aspects of education, there are strengths and weaknesses regarding the allocation of such resources for student-athletes. Examination of the use of available resources raises questions concerning relationships of power, locus of control, student-athlete dependency, and the mission of universities, athletic departments, coaches, professors, and student-athletes themselves (Benford, 2007; Hughes & Coakley, 1991; Shulman & Bowen, 2001). This study analyzes how social control techniques have manifested within NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics as a perpetuation of commercialization.

The issues of power and control related to the social order of intercollegiate athletics is the primary area of emphasis in this study. Priest, Krause, and Beach (1999) reported that college student-athletes' ethical choices in sport situations decreased from their freshmen year to their senior year. They explained that an underlying cause of this decrease in moral reasoning is that many of these student-athletes are not actually allowed opportunities to make critical decisions on their own during their playing careers (Priest, et al., 1999). Therefore, because they are

dependent upon coaches, university medical staff, administrators, and other college staff members for a majority of their decisions some student-athletes have a limited ability to reason morally. At many universities a student-athlete's entire schedule is planned for them, and as Coakley (2007) states, "much of their lives is controlled by others" (p. 518). This control is publicized as a means of ensuring student-athlete well-being, but underlying is the institutional motive to protect commercial assets.

Many services are provided to benefit student-athletes in order to help them fulfill their responsibilities as both students and athletes; however, research indicates they may also be limiting the growth opportunities for the student-athletes (Gerdy, 2002; Priest, et al., 1999, Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Intercollegiate athletics exist as part of the institution of academia, but as Coakley (2007) states, "athletes are not [necessarily] allowed to express critical thoughts about what happens to them" (p. 518). Similarly, Hughes and Coakley (1991) explain that overconformity and positive deviance result from external control (e.g. from coaches, fans, and media) that encourages student-athletes to act in the best interest of others rather than themselves. They assert that the self-sacrifices made by these student-athletes in order to achieve the institutional goal are acted out subconsciously because of the commitment inherent in team sports. These studies conclude that if student-athletes have no practice at moral decision making they may not be prepared for making responsible decisions once their collegiate experience has culminated (Gerdy, 2002; Hughes & Coakley, 1991; Priest, et al., 1999). As Billy Hawkins (2010) explains, "when we do not control the decisions about our productivity and creativity, we are internally colonized. When our career activities are not motivated by a desire for inner freedom, self-expression, and a desire to contribute to human development, we are functioning like internally colonized individuals" (p. xi).

Building from such research, this study aims to add to the conversation as it focuses specifically on the experiences of NCAA Division I softball student-athletes. It is methodologically grounded in the theoretical tradition of pragmatism and is informed substantively by Foucault's (1979/1995) panopticism and Goffman's (1961) total institution. In accordance with pragmatism's emphasis on the unique stories of experience, a narrative inquiry has been designed that uses semi-structured interviews as the primary means of data collection. A polycoval data analysis method was used to ensure that all voices present in the data are represented (Hatch, 2002). The remainder of this chapter provides a discussion of the relationship between academia and athletics as positioned within the context of higher education, highlighting variables that underlie power relations and social control. It concludes with a description of the study's framework, while the following chapters provide the depth of the research.

Purpose of the Study and Research Question

Hughes and Coakley (1991) and Johns and Johns (2000) suggest that sports as total institutions are exacerbating social control as a contributing factor to overconformity and positive deviance among athletes. Overconformity and positive deviance are defined as extreme identification with norms of the culture to achieve a desired status, success, or respect by others within the culture by meeting an ideal standard (Coakley, 2007). Disordered eating, playing through injuries, and using performance enhancing drugs are examples of how an athlete may overconform (Coakley, 2007). These observations are made in their research on the sport ethic. The sport ethic is defined as "a set of norms accepted as the dominant criteria for defining what is required to be defined and accepted as an athlete in power and performance sports" (Coakley, 2007, p. 161). These studies suggest that Goffman's theory may be applicable in the context of

athletics by arguing that inducements to deviance exist in those who are over-controlled and who are accepting of these situations (Hughes & Coakley, 1991; Johns & Johns, 2000). Similarly, Coakley and Dunning (2007) suggest that the Foucauldian idea of disciplinary power can be assessed in sport due to the attention to fundamentals and detail of movements, statistical measurements, visual examination and documentation, hierarchical observation, and positioning of bodies within the machine of production which may critically influence participants reasoning and decision making.

The purpose of this study is to contextualize and illustrate Erving Goffman's (1961) theory of total institution and Michel Foucault's (1979/1995) theory of panopticism within the environment of intercollegiate athletics. In particular, this narrative study focuses on the issues of power and discipline as they relate to the experience of student-athletes who compete in softball at NCAA Division I universities. The paradigm of total institution is generally defined as the disciplinary, surveillance, and total care mechanisms that the participants experience as collegiate student-athletes (Goffman, 1961). The paradigm of panopticism is defined as an environment where authority is omnipresent and this "gaze" leads the participants to a self-regulating path of normalization among their peers (Foucault, 1979/1995). This study is designed to expand understanding and answer the primary research question of how do the issues of power, social control, and personal empowerment appear within the narratives of NCAA Division I softball student-athletes?

Significance of the Study

The present study is designed to examine the experiences of NCAA Division I softball student-athletes in an effort to understand if the techniques of total institution and/or disciplinary power exist within their social system. The findings can help decision makers to better

understand the student-athletes' perceptions of certain activities, measures, and relationships.

This information can impact the structure and culture of intercollegiate athletic environments by promoting a positive learning environment.

The findings of this dissertation provide information for a variety of stakeholders including college coaches, athletic administrators, and scholars alike who are interested in learning more about the experience of collegiate student-athletes and how to influence them in a constructive manner. The resulting narrative can be beneficial to the fields of sport management, higher education, and sport sociology. More understanding of how these student-athletes perceive their role within the university (broadly) and the athletic department (specifically), how they produce meaning, and how they negotiate the relations of power within the context of NCAA Division I softball can facilitate the creation of adaptive strategies for teaching autonomous skills necessary of success in college careers and throughout their lives. Particularly, for professionals who work in intercollegiate athletic administration the resulting narratives provide deeper insight into the perceptions of certain student-athletes that may benefit programs for academic preparation and life skill development. The data may not directly result in changing the culture of intercollegiate sports at the NCAA Division I level, but it presents a basis for program enhancement in terms of how certain student-athletes internalize the discipline and control mechanisms they experience. Tangible factors addressed include items ranging from the language, tone, and physical actions of coaches to the provision or adaptation of student-athlete support services to the adoption of a set of best practices for facilitating the maturation of student-athletes.

The Power of Intercollegiate Athletics

The quandary surrounding the role, goals, and overall life of the intercollegiate student-athlete is one that involves many stakeholders and is largely influenced by individuals and groups with no direct relationship with the student-athletes. Such influences, including boosters, television networks, the NCAA, sponsors, and college presidents have histories that are deeply rooted in terms of their power over intercollegiate athletics and the respective individuals who participate. Further, the interests of the various stakeholders often oppose one another; the issues of higher admission standards versus a desire for more tutors, and better class attendance versus higher profile television games represent common conflicts that emerge as the mission of intercollegiate sports and the role of the student-athlete is developed (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). The expression of such differing points of view often reflects the values of these groups. In this culture, academic values and life skill development are often stretched to their limits by the economic pressures associated with high profile athletics, and student-athletes are positioned at the axis of these power struggles (Benford, 2007; Yost, 2010).

History illustrates how institutions of higher education can allow their mission to be compromised by the pressures surrounding athletic program success. For instance, in the early 1990s, there were several accusations of sexual assault by members of the University of Nebraska football team. Investigations were conducted by head coach Tom Osborne, but there was basically no police involvement and no punishment for the football players, while the women were continually harassed by Nebraska football fans (Benford, 2007). Although protests by women's activist groups kept the issue in the press, rather than denounce the football players, the university and its many constituents overwhelmingly continued to exalt them because of their athletic prowess (Benford, 2007). Similarly, in 1988 Indiana University head men's basketball

coach Bob Knight stated in an NBC interview with Connie Chung that the pressure of coaching a high profile college men's basketball team was similar to rape in that, "if rape is inevitable, relax and enjoy it" (as quoted in Moran, 1988, para. 2). Thomas Ehrlich, the president of IU at the time, released a statement that this sentiment was not supported by the university. This response sparked outrage from Knight and Ehrlich apologized, thus demonstrating "who possessed actual power at IU" (Sperber, 2000, p. 24).

These incidents illustrate the strong presence of athletics within the university setting 20 years ago. Since which time, this influence has continued as media attention and commercialization have increased exponentially. The 2012 scandal surrounding Penn State's football program is a prime example of the distribution of power within a high profile athletic department and university, as sexual abuse by the defensive coordinator went unreported to police authorities for decades (Moushey & Dvorchak, 2012). At a time of national economic crisis, many colleges and universities turned to their athletic departments to improve the institution's financial stability. Ironically, fewer than 25 NCAA sanctioned athletic departments can actually support themselves, much less other areas of the university (Fulks, 2012). Herein lies the dilemma, athletic departments act as an advertising agent and student recruitment tool for the institution as well as a tie to alumni and potential donors, while at the same time they are asking for lower academic expectations for student-athletes and additional financial support from the university (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Thus, questions arise concerning the role of intercollegiate athletics within higher education, the commitment of coaches and athletic departments to advocating the holistic development of student-athletes, and the power dynamics that are present within the context. By analyzing the stories and experiences of NCAA Division I

softball players, a better understanding of their position within the institution can lead to the development of a culture that provides them a voice.

The Relationship of Intercollegiate Athletics and an Academic Mission

A long history of support for and criticism of athletics within the educational setting exists in the United States. When the College of William and Mary was founded in 1692 college authorities were adverse to athletics on campus and this was the prevailing thought in American universities until the later nineteenth century (Smith, 1988). Athletics began on campuses as students used extracurricular activities such as “sport in a rejection of their highly restricted lives” (Smith, 1988, p. 14). Yet, by the mid-1800s intercollegiate athletic competition had been born, and from its inception with the Yale-Harvard regatta of 1852 there was commercial influence (Smith, 1988). “The freedom to pursue [what students felt was a liberating] pastime sometimes led to rancor as the strong competitive element in American society dominated the commercially stimulated collegiate contests” (Smith, 1988, p. 4). Thus, the two entities have been wedded for more than a century, yet some years have certainly been tumultuous with reform measures being the consistent norm (Hawkins, 2010). A discussion of the role of athletics in enhancing the educational and social development of participants, in promoting the university, and in supporting the overall mission of the university is critical to an analysis of intercollegiate athletics and student-athletes’ experiences.

The missions of colleges and universities are often stated and organized uniquely. Although varied, each represents one of two broad schools of thought: knowledge for the sake of knowledge or developing leaders for tomorrow (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Intercollegiate athletics “has no direct connection” to the premise of knowledge for its own sake, yet there is a strong voice from the athletic community for the case of developing leaders through sport

competition (Shulman & Bowen, 2001, p. 3). The argument is that discipline, teamwork, pursuit of goals, and self-sacrifice among other qualities can be learned through participation in athletics and can lead to the development of future leaders (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). The implication being that the positive leadership qualities which are learned through participation in athletics coupled with the sense of community that sports provide serve as adequate justification for universities to embrace college sports as an avenue for facilitating their overall mission of leader development. It seems, however, that the need to justify athletics as a part of the higher education system in America has been displaced as sports have become institutionalized within the modern culture of higher education. The fielding of intercollegiate athletic teams has essentially become expected and uncritically accepted as part of the educational development of campus communities. As Shulman and Bowen (2001) state, it appears that our societal preference is “for an extensive commitment to sports within higher education [due to an] insatiable appetite for sports that is evident in our daily lives” (p. 5).

In many ways athletics serves as the face of the university as scores, stories, and information on sports is more readily available than information on the college community at large. The daily, hourly, and even by the minute publication of athletic news makes this segment of an institution of higher education extremely prominent within broader society. To illustrate, 85% of Americans open the sports page of the newspaper first (Yost, 2010), and it was reported that businesses experienced a loss of nearly \$4 billion in productivity during March 2006 during the NCAA men’s basketball tournament, otherwise known as March Madness (Eder, 2008). In other years, this figure has been reported to be in the range of \$1 to \$3 billion (Eder, 2008). Therefore, university support of their athletics program increases publicity and connections to potential students, sponsors, donors, and alumni. For example, George Mason University’s

men's basketball team made a surprise run to the Final Four in 2006 and experienced an increase in admission inquiries of 350%, out-of-state applicants of 40%, and active alumni of 25% (Wolverton, 2008). Butler University saw a similar increase following their appearance in the 2010 men's basketball championship game as overall applications increased by 40% and out-of-state by 62% over the previous year (Butler University, 2011). Additionally, Pope and Pope (2012) found that a university that has a successful year in either football or men's basketball "on average receives up to 10% more SAT scores" from prospective applicants (p. 1). They attribute this increase to the accessibility and attention afforded the university surrounding the athletic success (Pope & Pope, 2012). Pope and Pope (2012) also cite the example of BYU experiencing a four percent increase in applications after Jimmer Fredette's impressive 2011 basketball season leading the team to the Sweet 16 (p. 4). The opportunity that sports provide to make such an impression on these respective groups serves as a basic pillar supporting the positive relation of college athletics to the university. Athletics is clearly an integral component of collegiate culture; "if [they] were still looked upon as peripheral activities that existed at the fringes of college life, it seems unlikely that either the presidents of these institutions, the [U.S.] Senate, or the Office of Civil Rights would have taken such a [historically] powerful interest in them" (Shulman & Bowen, 2001, p. 14).

However, this integration of athletic philosophies with the academic mission, goals, and values of the university is precisely what the 1929 Carnegie Report foreshadowed with the shifting governance of sports from student, to faculty, to athletic departments (Hawkins, 2010; Shulman & Bowen, 2001). The report espoused that "the heart of the problem facing college sports was commercialization...[and] the victim was the student-athlete in particular, the [diminution] of educational and intellectual values in general" (Thelin, 1994, p. 26). During

these early stages of intercollegiate competition several prominent university presidents expressed a sense of fear while observing the increasing influence of athletics within the organizational culture. In 1893, Cornell College President W.F. King noted that “the interest [in athletics] is too intense to be compatible with educational advantages” (Yost, 2010, p. 39); and in his justification for dropping football in 1939, Robert Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago remarked that, “college is not a great athletic association and social club, in which provision is made, merely incidentally, for intellectual activity on the part of the physically and socially unfit” (Yost, 2010, p. 41). Despite opinions like these, society’s affinity for intercollegiate sports has subsequently been overwhelmingly supported well into the 21st century (Gerdy, 2002). The 1890 perspective of Princeton President Woodrow Wilson has been perpetuated into the modern era; “Princeton is noted in this wide world for three things: Football, baseball, and collegiate instruction” (Yost, 2010, p. 38).

Comparison of NCAA Divisions

As indicated, the philosophical as well as sociological ideal of athletics housed within higher education is increasingly becoming challenged. Analyzing the differences between NCAA Division I, Division II, and Division III, economic forces and the evolution of athletics as an entertainment product, and the academic commitment of student-athletes are important in evaluating power relations and the social system of NCAA institutions and of intercollegiate athletics.

Traditionally, NCAA Division III athletics has been believed to embody the concept of what college athletics was intended to be, that is, Division III colleges cannot provide scholarships based solely on athletic talent. Theoretically, this restriction shields these schools and student-athletes from the commercialization and financial influences present in Division I

and Division II athletics. Based on the philosophy statements in the NCAA bylaws, Division III institutions are the closest to representing the true student-athlete dichotomy. The fundamental differences between NCAA divisions appear in their stated goals and expectations, constituencies served, sport sponsorship, and financial aid and minimum attendance requirements. Division I states a primary emphasis on competitiveness and revenue production while Divisions II and III place importance on the educational experience of the student-athlete. According to Bylaw 20.9 of the NCAA Division I Manual, “a member of Division I strives in its athletic program for regional and national excellence and prominence...and sponsors at the highest feasible level of intercollegiate competition in one or both of the traditional spectator-oriented, income-producing sports of football and basketball” (p. 340). This bylaw continues by explaining that Division I institutions should be cognizant of “maintaining an appropriate competitive level, especially in the emphasized, spectator-oriented sports” (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011, p. 340). Thus, producing a high quality athletic product in the spectator-oriented sports that achieves national recognition and can generate revenue encompasses the priorities of Division I.

In contrast, Division II focuses on the overall student-athlete experience by providing “growth opportunities through academic achievement, learning in high level athletics competition and development of positive social attitudes in service to the community” (NCAA Division II Manual, 2011, p. 277); and Bylaw 20.11 of the Division III Manual (2011) explicitly states that “athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete’s educational experience, in which the coaches play a significant role as educators” (p. 186). Division II emphasizes the “balance” of athletics in serving the institution and their region, while Division III “places special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than

on the spectators and places greater emphasis on the internal constituency than on the general public and its entertainment needs” (NCAA Division III Manual, 2011, p. 186). Even the Division II and III bylaws recognize the entertainment and revenue component of Division I culture as they strive to distinguish themselves.

Differences among divisions also appear in the criteria for scheduling contests and attendance requirements. Bylaw 20.9.6 for Division I requires men’s and women’s basketball to play Division I opponents in all but two contests and the men must play a minimum of one-third of their games at their home arena (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011, p. 345). Additionally, Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) programs must play at least five home football contests each season and “average at least 15,000 in actual or paid attendance for all home football games once every two years on a rolling basis” (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011, p. 346). These two bylaws reflect the significance of high level, spectator-friendly competition and the revenue it produces for Division I programs. Division II men’s and women’s basketball teams are required to play half of their contests against other Division II programs, however, there are no attendance requirements (NCAA Division II Manual, 2011). Division III has general sport sponsorship requirements, but no similar contest stipulations as described in Divisions I and II. The lack of such restrictions supports the lower divisions’ philosophies of promoting “equitable competition while minimizing infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs” (NCAA Division III Manual, 2011, p. 186).

Financial aid for student-athletes is another area in which philosophical differences appear between the three NCAA divisions. Division I requires its institutions to provide either (a) 50% of the maximum allowable grant-in-aids in 14 sports with at least seven for women’s

sports; (b) financial aid of at least \$1,394,580 in 2013-2014 exclusive of football and men's and women's basketball with at least \$697,290 in women's sports; or (c) a minimum of 50 full grant-in-aids, not including football and men's and women's basketball, with at least 25 in women's sports (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011, p. 341). Division II stipulates financial aid requirements of approximately half the financial commitment of Division I. Division II institutions must offer (a) 50% of the maximum allowable equivalencies in four sports, two being women's; (b) a minimum of 20 full grant-in-aids with 10 being women's; or (c) a minimum total scholarship expenditure of \$250,000 with half going to women's sports (NCAA Division II Manual, 2011, p. 278). On the opposite end of the continuum, Division III may not award financial aid based on athletic ability (NCAA Division III Manual, 2011, p. 187). These criteria for financial aid commitments further signify the importance of high caliber athletic performance in Division I, as well as representing a means of institutional power for rationalizing the control of activities for student-athletes. The philosophy statements of all three NCAA Divisions clearly distinguishes them from one another and indicate that Division I programs are more uniformly organized in a business-like manner while the lower two divisions are more unique and focus on being "integrated into the campus culture and educational mission" (NCAA Division III Manual, 2011, p. 186).

Examining how these philosophies translate into the day-to-day experience of student-athletes is the sociological basis for this study within the Division I environment with a primary focus on understanding the power dynamics and social control mechanisms that influence their lives within the context. A 2008 NCAA study provides tangible data to illustrate how these principles actually function with regard to time commitments of student-athletes (Paskus). Division I softball players report spending an average of 37.1% of their time on their sport

(which is the highest of all Division I women's sports) and 38.5% on academics, while their Division III counterparts spend 29.1% on athletics and 40.3% on their studies (Paskus, 2008). Thus, the time allocated for student-athlete responsibilities by softball players is 75.6% and 69.4% for Division I and Division III, respectively (Paskus, 2008). This finding that more than three-quarters of a Division I softball player's day is submitted to the control of institutional staff members provides a basis for examining the setting through the concepts of total institution and panopticism.

Commercial Motivation

The evolution of athletic influence within the campus community, particularly at major athletic schools has led college athletics reformers to assess it as a threat to the integrity of universities. This modern culture, which places such power in the hands of athletics, "represents a symbolic form of 'ownership,' a powerful reassuring sign that one's university...is not an outpost controlled by an alien 'higher' culture of ideas or knowledge" (Dowling, 2000, p. 33). The implication being that college athletics has been overtaken by commercial influences and the educational institutions are being influenced by the values represented by their athletic departments; this two-fold shift in control has reached a point of severe conflict between major college athletics and the academic mission of the university. Billy Hawkins (2010) is less subtle in stating, "intercollegiate athletics (specifically NCAA Division I Institutions) has purely embraced commercialism and capitalist ideals, while the academic arm of the university has wavered between academic elitism and academic capitalism" (p. 161). The academy has demonstrated extreme concern and has resisted many variables of this commercial athletic culture including media attention, high salaries for coaches, and high revenues and expenses (Hawkins, 2010). Finances are dictating many decisions regarding how student-athletes are

recruited, treated, and retained or released. Within the NCAA, Division I lies at one end of the funding continuum with Division III at the other end. A legislative attempt to lessen the strain on the relationship between the educational mission and intercollegiate athletics at NCAA Division I institutions in the state of California illustrates recognition of such issues and could be a step toward reform. The passage of the Student-Athlete Bill of Rights (California Senate Bill No. 1525) stipulates that institutions that generate at least \$10,000,000 through media rights must only allocate that revenue to provide life skills programs and financial planning workshops for student-athletes as well as sufficient healthcare and insurance for injured and low income student-athletes (2012, Section 2).

Across all levels of the NCAA there is almost an innate passion for sports on campus, yet their direct relevance to the overall mission of the school varies. For example, The University of Tennessee Knoxville's stated purpose is to "move forward the frontiers of human knowledge and enrich and elevate society" (University of Tennessee, 2010), and with "discovery at the heart of [the] university," The University of Washington "educates a diverse student body to become responsible global citizens and future leaders through a challenging learning environment" (University of Washington, 2010). Duke University aims to "provide a superior liberal education to undergraduate students, attending not only to their intellectual growth but also to their development as adults committed to high ethical standards and full participation as leaders in their communities" (Duke University, 2001). Athletics can certainly provide a challenging environment, situations to demonstrate ethical standards, and enrich society, so in these broad terms they can be justified as a supporting component of universities' missions.

A common position is that sports teach the same educational values that are championed by the university, such as desire, leadership, dedication, character, and commitment to a greater

cause; “In this sense, competitive athletics were viewed as an extracurricular activity, justified by the university as part of its ideal objective of educating the whole person” (Duderstadt, 2000, p. 70). Athletics definitely has the potential to foster such qualities; however, these are often the characteristics of student-athletes that are exploited by their athletic departments as well as the university for economic gain. They work hard, are loyal, and play for their love of the sport while their university is profiting from their performance. An alternative scenario is that the athletes are at the university with the objective of becoming professional athletes, thus using the university as a training center, having no concern for the educational mission. The acceptance of such devaluation of the academic role of the university further magnifies the divergence of athletics and education. Additionally, admission of less academically prepared student-athletes to a university is justified by attempting to create a more diverse student body and facilitating the educational experience through the interaction of differing cultures, backgrounds, and interests among the students (Shulman & Bowen, 2001); as The University of Washington advocates, “discovery through diversity” (University of Washington, 2010). This is appealing, but does it actually happen? On smaller campuses, the intended socialization is more apparent. Student-athletes are often members of other student organizations and are involved in activities within their academic departments. This engagement piece is actually central to the NCAA Division II and Division III platforms. On larger campuses, and in larger athletic programs, it seems that student-athletes do not feel they have time for socializing with their peers outside of sports to the same extent, or the effort of the institution to integrate them is minimal (Paskus, 2008).

For instance, obligations relative to their sport participation including community service projects, athletic training room visits, interviews, and team meetings minimize study time as well as social time. A 2008 NCAA study across all divisions indicated that 65% of student-athletes

wished they had more time for socializing, 59% for academics, and 50% for extracurricular activities (Paskus, 2008). However, 22% of males in the study would use an extra hour for athletics, 19% for socializing, and 18% for academics; whereas 27% of females would use extra time for socializing, 18% for academics, and only 11% for athletics (Paskus, 2008). One way to interpret these results is that males seem to place more significance on the athletic participation and want to spend all of their time involved in sport or socializing, while females appear to feel like they are consumed with their sport and academic responsibilities and wish for a little down time. Regardless, the high level of desire for academic and social time indicates that the greatest emphasis imposed on these student-athletes is their athletic performance. Cantor and Prentice (1996) found that bonding among athletes is not without consequence. “Compared with other students, athletes report having grown less as people at college and having spent limited time at cultural events, pursuing new interests, or meeting new people from different backgrounds” (p. 80). Therefore, the high profile athletic culture overrides the opportunity of student-athletes to benefit from interaction with other students who may come from very different backgrounds on a regular basis. Thus, this isolation begs the question, does the argument of athletics enhancing a diverse student body actually still apply, or are student-athletes at the NCAA Division I level being “internally colonized?” (Hawkins, 2010, p. xi).

It has been asserted that student-athletes in many programs are like cogs in a wheel, a means of production, and an economic asset for their high profile athletic departments and their respective universities (Benford, 2007). Some reformers have even referred to today’s intercollegiate athletic culture as “the new plantation” (Hawkins, 2010). Is a student-athlete’s use of a university as a gateway to professional athletics consistent with a school’s purpose, and is the consequent exploitation of talented, young adults congruent with a school’s mission?

Answering these questions is critical when exploring the holistic development and maturation of student-athletes. There is criticism of the idea that NCAA Division I college athletics is serving to educate students in a manner that will lead to a greater good for American society. Not only are the time commitments of student-athletes, which are assigned by staff members, limiting their opportunities for “outside” interaction, but this “controlled, authoritative environment also hinders an athlete’s ability to think and act for himself” (Gerdy, 2002, p. 46). Former student-athletes may be successful in careers where high energy and competitiveness are necessary qualities, yet in positions that “emphasize critical thinking, autonomy, and the capacity to know when not to seek a ‘win’ at all costs...athlete-type attributes may offer some disadvantages” (Shulman & Bowen, 2001, p. 190).

Nathan Tublitz, neurobiology professor at The University of Oregon and co-chairman of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, explains that “the goals of athletics and academics are divergent” (Yost, 2010, p. 172). He continued, “The values within the academic community are not being carried by the athletic community, [and] the end result is that there are still a lot of students coming to the university who are unprepared academically” (Yost, 2010, p. 172). Shulman and Bowen (2001) support these claims by demonstrating that the modern “athletic culture” is creating a division between student-athletes and other students and that “more recently recruited athletes are [increasingly] less like their classmates” when evaluated on several academic dimensions (p. 83). Hawkins (2010) explains the challenge as student-athletes enter the NCAA Division I setting where staying eligible is paramount. Academic advisors must assist student-athletes in meeting “academic demands instituted by the NCAA, work within the time constraints of athletic demands (which is a full-time occupation with over-time), as well as, be compassionate to the fact that many of the athletes they are working with are academically

unprepared” (Hawkins, 2010, p. 179). The commercial interests underlying the internal functions of NCAA Division I athletic programs lead to rationalized social control of student-athletes and a continued call for reform.

Concerns have been voiced that college student-athletes may not be negotiating some of the presumed life challenges for themselves, thus limiting their opportunities for the effectiveness of developmental processes. In some cases, such as at Kansas State University, tutors and other staff members are available to the student-athletes 24/7 and accept that “significant handholding” may be required (Yost, 2010, p. 17). The highly structured and detailed levels of control exercised by coaches and other college and athletic department officials may minimize the development of independent thoughts and actions of student-athletes. Further, the time that they are required to spend on their sport decreases the time available to spend on academic as well as social activities, thus limiting growth in these critical life skill areas as well. When responsibility for simple life skills such as deciding when and what to eat and washing your laundry are delegated to someone else there may well be a developmental digression. As Tublitz concludes, many high profile college student-athletes “Don’t have the training or the skills to be independent after they leave the University. They’re lost.” (Yost, 2010, p. 46). Yet, these services and resources are in place to ensure the well-being of student-athletes because decision makers within the institution “assume [to] know the interests and what is best for athletes” (Hawkins, 2010, p. 135). Critics, however, believe that means of social control are motivated by economic factors. Student-athlete are “exploited physically to accumulate capital for institutions that render them powerless and deprive them of their rights of making informed decisions about their lives” (Hawkins, 2010, p. 145). The National Letter of Intent (NLI) exemplifies some of the rights that student-athletes waive upon committing to an institution.

Once a student-athlete has signed the NLI they cannot transfer without losing eligibility for the academic year in all sports, and as it is designated that the student-athlete is committing to the institution rather than the coach, therefore, they remain bound to the NLI if the coach leaves the institution (National Letter of Intent, 2011). The NLI also permits the NLI office and the institution to disclose personal information to third parties including the media and waives the student-athlete's rights under the Family Educational Right and Privacy Act (FERPA) (National Letter of Intent, 2011). Additionally, before becoming certified as eligible to compete a student-athlete must be deemed an amateur by the NCAA Eligibility Center and throughout their career at the institution they must receive permission from the compliance office prior to working (NCAA Eligibility Center, 2011). Other information that must consistently be provided to the compliance office includes automobile information, including ownership information (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011).

The NCAA Entertainment Business

While acknowledging the vast “scope of operations” across college athletics, Li, Hofacre, and Mahony (2001) state that the mission of university athletic programs is to “provide an athletic entertainment product to their students, faculty, staff, and other constituents, such as their alumni and local communities” (p. 8). The higher the level the more pronounced this goal of serving the spectator becomes, with NCAA Division I bylaws explicitly requiring institutions to sponsor high level competition in “spectator-oriented, income-producing sports” (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011, p. 340). Given this philosophy, “the entertainment value overshadows and dulls our senses to the political aspects associated with intercollegiate athletics” (Hawkins, 2010, p. 133). In turn, as university athletic departments have become more revenue conscious

the more protective of their resources (student-athletes) they have become and thus more social control techniques have become common within these institutions (Hawkins, 2010).

The NCAA has enjoyed many terms of endearment throughout its existence, yet with regard to its business practices economists have described the NCAA as a monopsony, a cartel, and a monopoly among other things (Li, et al., 2001). Regarding NCAA operations, Hawkins (2010) explains, “although the original purpose of their existence was legislative, they have evolved to be in the business of marketing goods and services and wealth distribution” (p. 133). From the economist’s perspective, the vast number of participants under the umbrella of the NCAA, the large revenue stream the organization derives primarily from men’s basketball and football, and the relatively minimal compensation allocated to the labor force (student-athletes) justifies the use of such descriptors. The estimated marginal revenue product (MRP) for Division I FBS football players is upwards of \$400,000, while the MRP for premier men’s basketball players may exceed \$1 million (Brown & Jewell, 2004). With student-athletes generating revenue of this magnitude and their compensation level collusively set at the cost of tuition, room, and board, the NCAA and its major market member institutions are generating an excessive revenue margin. Lane, Nagel, and Netz (2010) found that approximately “60% of men’s basketball players, not just the stars,” have MRP’s that exceed athletic scholarship offers (p. 1). The NCAA’s defense against charges of exploitation is that, “providing the opportunity to earn a college degree, [and maintaining] that athletes are students first” they have fairly paid players for their work (Eckard, 2010, p. 45). Under the NCAA’s veil of amateurism, student-athletes’ “resources (skills and images) are extorted while they are restricted to an antiquated principle, which regulates their behavior and determines their benefits” (Hawkins, 2010, p. 135).

Ninety-two percent of the NCAA's revenue is derived from television and marketing rights and championship revenue, with the NCAA's television contract for March Madness accounting for the largest portion of this revenue stream (NCAA Revenue Breakdown, 2013). The NCAA's contract with CBS for television rights to March Madness, the Division I men's championship basketball tournament, was worth \$6.1 billion through 2010 (Yost, 2010). In April 2010, the NCAA signed a new contract with CBS and Turner Broadcasting valuing their 68-team men's basketball tournament at \$10.8 billion over 14 years (Hiestand, 2010). When compared to the NCAA's contract with ESPN for the women's basketball tournament, the baseball College World Series, and 20 other championships that is worth \$55 million over three years, the significant value placed on March Madness is evident (Hiestand, 2010). However, the NCAA serves as the non-profit middleman as they distribute about 96% of their revenue back to conferences and members institutions (NCAA Revenue Breakdown, 2013). According to the NCAA's published revenue distribution plan, in 2009-2010 approximately \$167.1 million was appropriated to conferences whose members competed in the Division I men's basketball championship (Revenue Distribution Plan, 2010, p. 7). This basketball distribution fund accounted for 40% of the revenue distributed, while five percent was appropriated for academic assistance (Revenue Distribution Plan, 2010, p. 3). The projected distribution for 2012-2013 is \$797 million with \$702 million being derived from the CBS contract (NCAA Revenue Breakdown, 2013). "Broadcasters and advertisers [have] repackaged athletic events, coaches, and players as entertainment products, creating a celebrity culture that [is] sharply contrasted with the academic culture of the university," which causes concern among reformers (Duderstadt, 2000, p. 76). The degree that such emphasis on spectator entertainment and revenue

leads to institutions' "socially controlling the lives of student-athletes" is the sociological focus of this study (Hawkins, 2010, p. 138).

Revenue distribution for football is managed differently than basketball. Currently, the NCAA does not sponsor a championship in NCAA FBS Division I football; revenue from the Bowl Championship Series (BCS) and non-BCS bowl games is distributed by each bowl committee and sponsoring agency to participating conference and teams (Smith, 2011). For the 2011 football bowl season the BCS's total payout was \$174.07 million, with 83.4% going to the six automatic qualifier conferences (Smith, 2011, p. 1). The big financial winners were the Big 10, Pac-10, and SEC, with each conference receiving \$27.2 million from their membership's bowl appearances (Smith, 2011). 2011's payout was 22% greater than 2010 due to a new media contract with ESPN (Smith, 2011).

Interestingly, a mere 25 NCAA Division I (FBS) athletic departments are operating with a surplus despite all of these large revenue distribution figures (Fulks, 2012). It may legitimately be asked how this is happening, and the simplest answer is extravagant spending. As a recent Knight Commission report on restoring balance within intercollegiate athletics recognized spending at current levels is "unsustainable" (Solomon, 2010, para. 3). Among the major conferences, "average spending per athlete...ranges from four to nearly 11 times more than the average spending on education-related activities per student" (Solomon, 2010, para. 4). In 2008, the SEC specifically spent \$144,592 per student-athlete and \$13,410 per student on campus (Solomon, 2010, para. 4). Therefore, for a university that has approximately 500 student-athletes they are spending over \$72 million per year.

Compensation for coaches and athletic administrators, incentive structures, and corporate sponsorship are also areas of commercial interests within intercollegiate athletics. Intercollegiate

athletics “are great entertainment conducted under the name of the universities, financed in part by student fees and gate receipts, but driven primarily by the hundreds of millions of dollars pumped in each year by the TV networks and media enterprises, shoe and apparel companies, and institutional boosters” (Friday, 2011, para. 3). Consequently, the financial gain that coaches and athletic administrators can reap from their student-athletes’ successes represents further motive for increased supervision and social control of student-athletes within the institutional setting. In 2011 for example, “32 NCAA FBS coaches and 11 NCAA Division I men's basketball coaches earned more than \$2 million annually,” and of the contracts that included academic performance incentives they “averaged \$52,000 per coach, while athletic incentives averaged \$600,000 per coach” (Duncan & McMillen, 2013, para. 4). This reward structure is another underlying factor indicating the connection between commercialization in NCAA Division I athletics contributing to the social control of student-athletes.

Rationale for the Study

The allowance of economic forces to infiltrate higher education with intercollegiate athletics as the gateway has led the edifice of education to be scrutinized. In athletics specifically, commercialization is a significant force that places pressure on the university’s intended mission and results in difficult governance issues throughout the institutions and within the NCAA. Is there an ideal for intercollegiate athletics; a perfectly unified and functioning system that provides financial stability and publicity for the institution, a superior extracurricular experience for the participants, and a solid entertainment product for the fans? A system that adequately meets all of these standards is not likely to be realized, but there are steps that can be taken in order to strive for such goals and satisfactory services.

Reviewing the evolution of the relationship between the mission of higher education and athletics, the educational and social value of college athletics, and the existing power relations provides an opportunity to assess the socialization experience of student-athletes from their unique perspectives. Additionally, recognizing the inherence of a social system of checks and balances and control mechanisms which are continually becoming more sophisticated allows for an analysis of the context through the lens of social theory paradigms. As layers of accountability are placed on student-athletes in order to ensure a functionality that ultimately results in financial profitability for the institution, the significance of listening to the student-athlete is magnified. Through this review, concerns emerge related to the well-being of the student-athlete; and in terms of regard for the civic maturity and social interaction of student-athletes, using the paradigms of total institution and panopticism in this study is intended to increase understanding of such relationships of power, social control, and personal empowerment within the environment of NCAA Division I softball.

Assumptions of the Study

It is impossible to approach any topic with complete objectivity as we are always “in the midst” of living and forming ideas from our experiences (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 63). Therefore, assumptions are ever-present in day-to-day living as well as the conduct of research projects. Given the narrative and specific nature of this study, there is one encompassing assumption to note: individual experiences are not to be generalized (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). It is assumed that the experience of a student-athlete is a phenomenon that varies greatly with the context of their participation, which includes but is not limited to the level of competition, the individual’s dispositions, the school of choice, their coaches, and their teammates. These are the dominant influences on how an individual is socialized into being an

intercollegiate student-athlete and how they create meaning from the experience. Other relevant assumptions include (a) semi-structured interviews are a valid means of data collection and (b) a narrative writing style is best for presenting resulting data.

Operational Definitions

It is necessary to define several terms that are used throughout this study in order to clarify the meaning of each in the given context. Consistency of usage and meaning of these ideas is critical to fully understanding the information.

NCAA Division I: The NCAA has three divisions of competition with scholarship structure, sport offering obligations, and sport contest requirements being the major distinguishing philosophical factors. There are 340 NCAA Division I institutions, 120 of which are Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) and 122 are Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) (NCAA Membership, 2012). The other 98 do not sponsor a football program. FBS programs are elaborate and must meet minimum attendance requirements that are not required of FCS programs (NCAA Membership, 2012).

Softball: For this study, the use of the term softball signifies women's fastpitch softball played with nine players on the field and the option to have a designated player. There are 5,539 NCAA Division I softball student-athletes and the first NCAA sponsored national championship in the sport was in 1982 (NCAA Membership, 2012).

Student-Athlete: In this study, the identifier of student-athlete implies that the individual is enrolled as a full-time degree seeking student at an accredited institution of higher education and simultaneously participates in an intercollegiate sport representing that institution (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011).

Intercollegiate: Intercollegiate is understood in this study as referring to athletic competition between other similar academic institutions (Random House, 2013).

The Sport Ethic: There are four norms associated with the sport ethic that should be understood as part of its reference. “a) An athlete is dedicated to “the game” above all other things, b) An athlete strives for distinction, c) An athlete accepts risks and plays through pain, and d) An athlete accepts no obstacles in the pursuit of possibilities” (Coakley, 2007, p. 161-163).

Total Institution (Goffman, 1961) and *Panopticism* (Foucault, 1979/1995) are theoretical paradigms that are used in this study and are thoroughly defined in chapter two, the literature review.

Narrative Inquiry is the methodological approach used in this study and it is explained in detail in chapter three, methodology (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

Polyvocal is a data analysis and presentation tool that is used to present the resulting data in this study (Hatch, 2002). The details associated with this tool are also expanded in chapter three.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is arranged as a coherent story articulated over five chapters, with each section of each chapter building upon the information provided in the ones preceding. Through a discussion regarding the position of athletics within institutions of higher education, economic pressures, and differences among NCAA divisions, this chapter has laid a foundation for examining intercollegiate sport as a site of social control based on the paradigms of total institution (Goffman, 1961) and panopticism (Foucault, 1979/1995).

In Chapter two, more detailed definitions of these two paradigms and literature from the field of sport studies related to them is reviewed in order to develop a theoretical foundation for the remainder of the study. A discussion of how the information provided by this study can add to the discipline also ensues.

Chapter three expounds on narrative methodology and its application to this study. Interview and polyvocal methods are also explicated for data collection and data analysis, respectfully. An illustration regarding the significance of stories to this type of sport research is also depicted.

Chapter four presents the resulting narratives in the words of the participants and chapter five provides a summary, discussion, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

"It's a matter of instinct,
It's a matter of conditioning,
It's a matter of fact.
You can call me Pavlov's dog,
Ring a bell and I'll salivate."

(Page, 1990)

Introduction

Assertions have been made that a connection between decreased moral reasoning and critical thinking skills among college student-athletes and the degree of social control present in their environment may develop as a result of "the closed nature of the athletic world, the total care environment, and the continual surveillance" (Birrell & Donnelly, 2004, pp. 57-58; Priest, et al., 1999). Eitzen (2000) explained that while mechanisms of social control are "believed to serve the common good," they can also lead to the loss of rights and decision making opportunities for student-athletes (p. 370). Further analysis of this connection through the lens of two social interaction paradigms, total institution and panopticism, provides more valuable information regarding this supposed relationship. A summary of existing information from this perspective in sport studies and an overview of these theoretical paradigms are included in this chapter. This review of theoretical and applied literature benefits this dissertation by providing a functional basis for collecting and analyzing data in the social context of NCAA Division I intercollegiate softball.

The over-arching theme that brings the theories of total institution and panopticism together with the social system of college athletics is the idea that the management of recruits is rationalized in terms of the ideal aims and functions of the institution. Thus, specific examples

are cited of management techniques that parallel between college athletics, other total institutions, and panoptic structures; therefore, the intent of this study is to determine if they are present in NCAA Division I softball. This literature review provides direction toward answering this question and a better understanding of what social issues can arise from such functionally designed social systems. The ideas of Erving Goffman on total institutions, the work of Michel Foucault regarding panopticism and disciplinary power, and applicable literature from the feminist perspective is specifically reviewed.

Goffman in Sport Studies

The work of Erving Goffman has been used to analyze various areas relevant to the sociology of sport. Throughout his career, Goffman developed multiple theories regarding the “social order of interactions,” including role theory, game theory, and linguistic theory (Birrell & Donnelly, 2004, p. 51). His conceptualizations regarding the dramaturgical model (Messner, 2002); credentialing and acceptance of personal claims (Donnelly, 1994); character elements (Birrell, 1981); sport subcultures (Wacquant, 1992); and gender advertisements (Duncan, 1990) have been applied to various settings within sport studies literature. However, the extent of the research in the area of total institution in athletics is limited. In an essay that primarily discusses Olympic sport, Brohm (1978) states that, “Sport exemplifies perfectly Goffman’s definition of totalitarian totality” but there is minimal further discussion (p. 138). Also, interscholastic sports have been analyzed as total institutions (Treadwell, 1984; Rinehart, 1998), and it has been suggested that the concept of total institution may be best applied to professional sports (Birrell & Donnelly, 2004). Finally, Hughes and Coakley (1991), Johns and Johns. (2000), and Coakley (2007) suggest that sports as total institutions are exacerbating social control as a contributing factor to overconformity and positive deviance among athletes.

The premise that connects all of Goffman's works is his primary interest in demonstrating that "everyday interaction is the foundation of social order" (Birrell & Donnelly, 2004, p. 51). Jones, Potrac, Cushion, and Ronglan (2011) suggest that using Goffman's ideas regarding "everyday routine" to analyze athletics, specifically sport coaching, is significant (p. 16). Therefore, one goal of this study is to determine if the theory of total institution, specifically the techniques related to institutional arrangements and processes that influence social construction of identity as defined by Goffman (1961) in *Asylums* may be applied and analyzed within the context of intercollegiate softball at the NCAA Division I level.

Goffman's Total Institution

Goffman brought his idea of total institution to the forefront in his 1961 publication, *Asylums*. "A total institution may be defined as a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life" (Goffman, 1961, p. xiii). He explains that the primary factor that distinguishes a total institution from civil society is the lack of barriers between the functions of sleep, play, and work (Goffman, 1961, pp. 5-6). Goffman (1961) further states that a total institution as has four basic features:

First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same authority. Second, each phase of the member's daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced

activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aim of the institution. (p. 6)

Goffman (1961) identifies five categories of total institutions based on the organization's formal objectives and members. Examples specific to these categories include orphanages for the incapable yet harmless; mental hospitals for the incapable and potentially harmful; penitentiaries to protect the community; army barracks for the pursuit of work; and monasteries for retreating from the world (Goffman, 1961). The basis for these divisions within Goffman's concept has been criticized for being too ambiguous (Perry, 1974) and negative (Mouzelis, 1971). However, in *Asylums*, Goffman (1961) himself recognizes that, "Individually, these features are found in places other than total institutions; for example, our large commercial, industrial, and educational establishments are increasingly providing cafeterias and free-time recreation for their members" (p. 6). The relationships of power within the total institutions are essentially exercised between the inmate and staff groups, and ideas regarding the shaping of identity, treatment, communication, surveillance, perception of the outside, and personal relationships should be analyzed in terms of the localized social system in contrast to the environing social norms (Goffman, 1961).

Based on Goffman's definition and narratives of this study, I deduce that intercollegiate athletics is most comparable to the context of the army described by Goffman due to the work-like nature of both environments. A student-athlete's work may be considered service oriented if we think of their work as serving the needs and mission of the academic institution that they represent. Their athletics performance may also be considered work-like when viewed as a means of entertainment for an audience. The latter could encompass any level of athletics from youth to professional because there will always be some spectators, and sport studies scholars

have speculated that the concept of total institution may be best applied to professional sports due to its work-like and “total care” tendencies (Birrell & Donnelly, 2004, p. 57). However, given that “the institution of sport is deeply tied” to the institutions of higher education (Brohm, 1978, p. 139), which have been analyzed through the lens of Goffman’s total institution theory (Shipman, 1967), it is apparent that his ideas should be studied from the perspective of intercollegiate sports. Additionally, the economic motives that have led to the increasing elitism and commercialization of college athletics and the increasing independence of professional athletes further supports this application of Goffman to the experience of college student-athletes. *Asylums* (1961) itself was an “analysis of institutions and how they do their work from the viewpoint of marginal groups” (Jones, et al., 2011, p. 26); therefore, exploring the way NCAA Division I college athletics works from the perspective of the most marginal decision makers, i.e. student-athletes, is valuable. As Birrell and Donnelly (2004) propose, “our understanding of sport may benefit from such an analysis” (p. 58).

The institution of intercollegiate athletics meets the residence, work, and time criteria representative of total institutions, the student-athletes are subject to the regimen imposed by the four general structural features of total institutions, and the organizational structure is administered to meet the “official aims” of the establishment. Although they might sleep, play, and work in different buildings, essentially all aspects of the student-athlete’s “round of life” are conducted on campus; and although they might be subject to the authority of professors and other staff members they are ultimately under the directive of their sport coach. Coaches decide who is on the team, when they play, “procedures for determining and enforcing team rules, training schedules, sanction player behavior...and make all decision during games” (Eitzen (2000, pp. 376-377)). This “coach as expert” discourse leads coaches to “control virtually every

detail” of the student-athletes life (Potrac & Jones, 2011, p. 145). Thus, these student-athletes are living in a theoretically closed environment where the authority of their coach overrides all others, including themselves. For student-athletes who are members of team sports a majority of their daily activities are required to be done with their teammates and they are all treated in a similar manner. Some examples of these group activities include practice, workouts, and eating meals in the athletic dining hall. Additionally, these daily activities are dictated by the coach and are “tightly scheduled” at “prearranged times” (Goffman, 1961, p. 6). Collectively, all of these detailed practices function together in a “single rational plan” in order to fulfill the goals of the institution (Goffman, 1961, p. 6).

This chronological division of activities may be translated in NCAA Division I softball on two levels, the student-athlete’s entire day and their time at practice or competition. A typical day, as structured in part by the university schedule, but most specifically by the coaches would be similar to the following: 6:00a.m. strength and conditioning workouts, 7:15a.m. breakfast in the athletic dining hall, 8:00a.m. until 11:00a.m. classes, 11:15a.m. lunch in the dining hall, 12:00p.m. athletic training needs, 1:00p.m. dress and warm-up for practice, 2:00p.m. until 5:00p.m. practice and film, 5:30p.m. dinner in the dining hall, 6:00p.m. tutor and study hall, 8:00p.m. shower and study, 10:00p.m. bedtime. Each student-athlete’s schedule may deviate slightly due to individual needs specific to their major, tutoring, and athletic training needs; however, in general their schedules are regulated to this degree with the goal of maximizing their useful time to reach the highest possible level of athletic and academic performance.

At the level of practice, the NCAA allows four hours per day and 20 hours per week, including workouts and film (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011, p. 244), so coaches determine what drills are most important at the given time and segment practices accordingly. An example

may be: warm-up and throw, infield and outfield defensive fundamentals, tee work in batting cages, batting practice and team defense simultaneously, pitchers and catchers in bullpen, all followed by watching film. With this type of organized practice, temporal norms are imposed on everyone at the same time while they are working to refine their individual skills to benefit the whole. Practice plans are also made to be implemented on the larger time scale of the off-season, pre-season, and in-season, where off- and pre-season work is typically more individualized and in-season practices are more team oriented, yet everyone is always participating in such coach directed activities (Eitzen, 2000). Within this structure, coaches orchestrate the activities of student-athletes from the smallest movement in their swing to the time that they eat dinner, thus the formal institutional arrangements present in NCAA Division I softball provide a disciplinary mechanism for the social control of student-athletes with the official goal of winning athletic contests as representatives of the university.

Therefore, a connection may be developed between this conception of total institutions and college athletics based on the structured environment experienced by the student-athletes (Birrell & Donnelly, 2004). Student-athletes, especially those who compete in team sports may gain a strong sense of camaraderie and friendship through the relationships they have with teammates and special bonds may form as a result of the amount of time spent together. Many student-athletes are likely to feel enough comfort with teammates to reveal very personal details about their lives. Further, by providing resources such as residence halls, cafeterias, study halls, and doctors on site, as well as coaches continually locating and supervising student-athletes through a complex network of disciplinary technologies, university athletic departments and coaches may be creating a sense of total institution. As Westwood (2002) states, such practice mirrors the “record keeping and accounting practices...central to modern states [where] citizens

were individuated and objectified simultaneously” (p. 134). The impending social implications of this type of established regimen for the NCAA Division I student-athlete is explored in this study.

Foucault in Sport Studies

Many philosophies attributed to Michel Foucault are applicable to sport studies. Due to his positioning of the body at the center of his theories of power and the inherent significance of the body in sport studies Foucault has been cited on many issues in sport (Rail & Hargreaves, 1995). Studies and analysis of sport in regard to the Foucauldian ideas of surveillance and power in physical education (Vigarello, 1978; Hargreaves, 1986); the politics of body management and the gaze in gymnastics (Harvey & Sparks, 1991), bodybuilding (Rail & Hargreaves, 1995), rowing (Chapman, 1997), elite gymnastics, wrestling, track, and synchronized swimming (Johns & Johns, 2000); and youth swimming (Rinehart, 1998); the technologies of self (Heikkala, 1993); the idea of episteme in boxing (Loudcher, 1994, as cited in Rail & Hargreaves, 1995); the spatial elements of a soccer stadium (Bale, 1993); the managerial authority in professional soccer (Kelly & Waddington, 2006); and panopticism in modern fitness centers (Markula, 2003) have been conducted over the past several decades.

All of these sport studies make use of Foucauldian theories developed in *Discipline and Punish* (1979/1995), yet none are situated within the context of collegiate athletics or team sports with the exclusion of professional soccer in Europe. This study demonstrates how the theory of disciplinary power, specifically the techniques related to docility, the means of correct training, and panopticism as defined by Foucault (1979/1995) are applied and analyzed within the context of intercollegiate softball at the NCAA Division I level.

Foucault Overview

One season of my high school basketball career, our coach ordered team sweatshirts with our school name and mascot on the front accompanied by the phrase, “I possess two outstanding characteristics: Attention to detail and a sense of urgency” printed in bold, capitalized, block lettering on the back. He repeated these ideas and drilled us until the proper movements were imprinted not only in our minds, but also into our muscle memory; or as Foucault would say the power of detail was articulated directly onto our bodies. Our coach believed that a team of individuals who were trained using techniques of extreme detail and had the ability to perform these specific movements under pressure would be a successful basketball team. As a volleyball coach, I believe in this principle as well, which is not uncommon in athletics. Also, as is general among team sports, each individual was assigned a position based on their skills that would contribute most to the workings of the team as a whole. Fundamental skills taught and assessed by the coaches, point production, game film analysis, and statistics served as the basic measurement tools for player and team evaluation. Further, we were divided by class: freshman, sophomores, juniors, and seniors, with the seniors typically being named team captains and having a monitoring role. We were also on an extremely structured schedule throughout the day and subject to the control of teachers, principals, and other school staff given that we were students as well. Thus, it can be said that we were subjected to practices that met the guidelines of Foucault’s (1979/1995) “means of correct training” and subsequently were transformed into productive, docile bodies useful for winning basketball games.

This attention to fundamentals and detail of movements, statistical measurements that are compared to the norm, visual examination and documentation, hierarchical observation, and positioning of bodies within the machine of production are all common elements of scholastic

and collegiate team sport, and they are all techniques of disciplinary power as described by Foucault (1979/1995). Additionally, the goal of these practices in team sports is to develop each individual within the framework of the team so that they function more efficiently and productively in order to win more competitions. This idea mirrors the goal of disciplinary power, which is to “increase forces in terms of utility” as stated by Foucault (1979/1995) in *Discipline and Punish* (p. 138).

Foucault’s Disciplinary Power

Although his theories are a formulation of knowledge, power, and discourse, Foucault’s fundamental goal was to understand the role of the individual within dynamic networks of power (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. xi). The question of how power is actually exercised within particular contexts is critical to the theories of Foucault as opposed to others who posit that power is totally a top-down function of societal structure. Foucault (1979/1995) actually described power as a “network of practices, institutions, and technologies that sustain positions of dominance and subordination within a particular domain” (p. 177); and he explained that power is “relational” and exists in “multiple forms” (Foucault, 1979/1995; Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 38). More specifically, Foucault (1980) explained his conception of power as being “co-extensive with the social body; interwoven with other kinds of relations (production, kinship, family, sexuality); a multiform production of relations of domination; [which] are capable of being utilized; and [necessarily] has resistances” (Foucault, 1980, p. 142). The important derivative of this definition of power is that the actual arrangement of practices and technologies leads to the subjectivity of the individuals rather than a sovereign, centrally located power (Foucault, 1979/1995). Power is not substantive; “Power is not one thing, but multiple and multiplied, scattered and disseminated” (Caputo & Yount, 1993). Given that power has no

substance, then it cannot be a possession of one individual or group used solely to oppress; it must be distributed in various forms from one person to another *ad infinitum*. Power, then “becomes a machinery that no one owns” (Foucault, 1980, p. 156).

Foucault’s paradigm of power as being disciplinary in its modalities derives from his concept of detailed exercises acting as control mechanisms beginning with the individual. Disciplinary power “makes individuals; it is the specific technique of power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 170). The primary goal of disciplinary power is to train individuals and combine their forces in order to create synergy (Foucault, 1979/1995). Discipline is a term that is used frequently in athletics to mean that an athlete is following instruction and closely adheres to expectations or that a coach’s regulatory authority leaves little room for deviance, thus implying its innate connotation of control. These processes become progressive as the athletes and team become increasingly skilled at executing the desired task. An in-depth study of the elements of Foucault’s disciplinary power within elite level college softball illustrates parallels between the context of athletics, particularly college softball and the institutions in which he describes these practices including prisons, asylums, hospitals, schools, and factories.

A brief discussion of Foucault’s view of institutions is imperative to understanding how the mechanisms of disciplinary power function within the given space. Power does not originate with the institution; rather the *a priori* network of power essentially uses the institution as a tool for further integration into human life (Caputo & Yount, 1993). Power relations have existed since the beginning of humanity; the disciplines provide a way for individuals to use these relations economically; and the institutions offer an enclosed space for the multiplication of disciplines, and consequently power. In this way, “institutions must be analyzed from the

standpoint of power” and not vice versa (Caputo & Yount, 1993, p. 5). Many contemporary institutions may not have stone walls surrounding them, yet the technologies of power that became refined within the physical structures of military barracks, hospitals, prisons, and schools of the 19th century continue to gain efficiency and actively infiltrate social networks of the 21st century, both in physical locations and in cyber space. These minute practices, which are not mutually exclusive, traverse institutional spaces and work through subtle conduction and persuasion to produce knowledge (Caputo & Yount, 1993). Such practices are identifiable in many areas of sport, yet they seem to be magnified within the institution of intercollegiate athletics, possibly due to the fact that collegiate student-athletes are actually part of educational institutions.

The word “power” itself has a variety of meanings and connotations and many philosophers, sociologists, and scientists have analyzed the concept of power from their respective positions. Foucault approaches the task from the perspective of relationships of power, and his emphasis on the disciplinary mechanisms of distributions, hierarchical observation, control of activity, social judgment, normalization, examination, and ultimately panopticism is pertinent to the institutional structure that is integrated into NCAA Division I softball.

Panopticon is a Greek derivative roughly translated to mean “sight of all” (Random House, 2013). Bentham and Foucault use the idea of the Panopticon to describe an apparatus where “each comrade becomes an overseer” (Foucault, 1980, p. 152). Therefore, power in these terms penetrates the society to function on the most minute level, reaching the point of self-regulation due to the “reign of opinion” (Foucault, 1980, p. 154). In the context of intercollegiate athletics, this type of power manifests itself through student-athletes feeling accountable to their teammates and policing each other. Eitzen (2000) describes how such informal social order

develops through “implicit norms;” incoming student-athletes “adopt the attitudes, style of dress, speech patterns, and behaviors of the established members” to be compliant with the expectations of the subculture (p. 377). However, as a result of each individual wielding power, they also embody sites of potential resistance to the dominance present in their social system, meaning that they are situated in a position to facilitate change from within (Foucault, 1979/1995).

The Feminist-Pragmatist Perspective

A pragmatic theoretical tradition, as defined by John Dewey (1925/1981), underlies this study which describes the experiences of three NCAA Division I softball players. The primary pillar of the paradigm that is significant to this research is the idea that social construction and continuity of experience are synonymous with knowledge and life (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Dewey, 1925/1981). Experiences and social interaction are the foundation of life, learning, and education. Emotions, intuition, and feelings are also significant factors that determine how we view, process, and ultimately learn from our experiences (Thayer-Bacon, 2000). Further, no experience is meaningless, regardless of the nature of the emotions it excites or actions it initiates. The stories that define individual lives are built on experiences with social interactions serving as the threads of continuity. Therefore, knowledge is predicated on experience and “experience happens narratively” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 19); that is, we think of our experiences as stories and re-tell them in a narrative format.

As Clandinin and Connelly (2000) explain, it is common and natural for our life experiences to facilitate our gravitation to certain areas of research; and Wolcott (1994) recommends “integrating elements of your life as a researcher and scholar with your ‘lived’ life in other roles” (p. 290). Accordingly, my experience as a graduate assistant in an NCAA

Division I softball program led to an interest to better understand the experience of the student-athletes in that environment. Thus, through a combination of personal experience, job-related issues, and a review of the sport sociology literature in the area, I chose to pursue this narrative research project to examine the participants' experiences in relation to the theories of total institution and panopticism more extensively.

The importance of experience is ingrained in most of us from childhood, and it is applicable in a variety of contexts. Experience is needed to obtain a job, it provides an advantage in an athletic contest, it helps in understanding friends, and it has implications in the creation of culture and acquisition of knowledge. Management theorist Peter Drucker wrote that "Life is lived forward but understood backward" (David, 2005, p. 198). This idea helps explain the conception of knowledge as derived from life experiences and interactions based on reading Dewey (1925/1981). Through everyday living, cultural norms are generated without those who are creating them being cognizant of the process; then as 'things' change with time people may become more aware (or knowledgeable) of what their culture had been. The emphasis on context indicated here also resonates strongly with Dewey's pragmatism which advocates the social construction of knowledge and with narrative inquiry's belief in the social and temporal characteristics of experience and knowledge.

Dewey and the pragmatists "establish[ed] the importance of understanding the contextuality of thoughts due to thinking's direct relation to experience" (Thayer-Bacon, 2000, p. 53). Additionally, experience is obviously not static, life is in continuous motion. Therefore, thoughts, knowledge, ideology, and identity are always evolving through time and space. These scholars also recognize the inherent need for knowledge to be plural. G.H. Mead believed that self-knowledge emerges from the community in which the individual is socialized and Dewey

expands this idea to explain that “social groups affect individuals and individuals affect social groups” (Thayer-Bacon, 2000, p. 50). At its most basic, this would constitute the argument of nature versus nurture, which involves a constant interaction between the biology and socialization that leads to the evolution of self and knowledge. The pragmatist argument is that meaning and knowledge are created or learned through interactions between people. Throughout life our opinions, views, maturity, and so on grow continuously and evolve as our experiences compound each other. Seigfried (1996) supports this constant connection between past, present, and future experiences; experience is “overlaid and saturated not only with previous philosophical interpretations but also with past beliefs, values, and classifications” (p. 156).

For example, there are obvious commonalities among universities, organizations, teams, states, firms, and families but each individual entity has characteristics that make it unique, and thus serve to define its respective culture. These distinctive attributes, values, norms, ethics, policies, and histories shape the cultures as a result of the interactions and relationships of the people’s lived experiences within the organization or community. Additionally, because they are aiding in the process of creating culture, most people take a lot of pride in being a part of these respective groups. This thought leads to the inclusion of meaning as an important component of the ideology and culture matrix. Specifically, positing that everyday interpersonal communication within any entity produces the respective culture of the group and that the individuals involved are proud of their membership, then obviously the group is a meaningful part of their lives. Also, because these interactions provide meaningful experience to people, it establishes a way of learning and knowing ‘things’ that are common or are the ‘norm’ of their culture. An intercollegiate athletic team provides an excellent example of these relationships and means of culture creation.

Critiques of Goffman, Foucault, and Dewey have largely come from feminist scholars due primarily to their omission of gender as a variable in the development of their social paradigms (Seigfried, 1996). Bordo (2003) explains it is critical to understand that even though forces of power are decentralized within the paradigm of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1979/1995), they still “configure to assume particular historical forms [where] certain groups do have dominance” (p. 26). Specifically, dominance is derived from the regulation of “the most intimate elements of the construction of space, time, desire, [and] embodiment” (Bordo, 2003, p. 27). This form of authority is illustrated in this study specifically by coaches historically holding a position of dominance over student-athletes as a result of their ability to control the student-athlete’s activities, and where the coach is male the assumed authority is exacerbated. Therefore, narratives of experience “cannot just be read off from nature but must be reconstructed within a historical process with which we are continuous” (Seigfried, 1996, p. 144).

Recognizing the “historically and culturally engrained definitions of femininity” are significant in exploring individual women’s experiences (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, Tarule, 1986/1997, p. 5). To highlight the relevance of history in athletics, in her essay “Throwing Like a Girl,” Young (1989) discusses gender stereotypes and provides a historical explanation for why women are perceived as lesser athletes than men by society, as well as why women tend to view themselves as physically inferior to their male counterparts. Young’s (1989) premise that the implied action represented by the cliché “throwing like a girl” indeed does exist lays the foundation for her theory that social ideals about masculinity and femininity are prevalent in sports (pp. 51-52). As Coakley (2007) reminds us, it has been thought that women are “naturally frail and unsuited for most sport participation” (p. 250); however, both he and Young (1989) agree that ideology and societal beliefs led to this idea of “female frailty” (p. 53). As Seigfried

(1996) explains from the pragmatist view, “our inherited beliefs and institutions continue to influence our perceptions” (p. 151). The masculine has served to define the feminine (Kaschak 1992); therefore, women have historically been treated as if they were less capable of physical activity, and in many cases this belief has manifested itself in individual women (Young, 1989). This belief regarding physical capabilities of women is a by-product of the societal phenomena where “men’s experience and competence [is used] as a baseline” for evaluating the development of men and women (Belenky, et al., 1986/1997, p. 7).

Both Young (1989) and Coakley (2007) explain that girls are typically socialized to be pretty and vulnerable; and that being healthy and fit are good, but “too many muscles are unfeminine (Coakley, 2007, p. 246). Conversely, boys are encouraged to be tough and competitive. These methods of socialization often lead women to participate in activities such as aerobics rather than hockey and men to participate in football rather than ice skating, thus perpetuating gender ideologies and stereotyping. Therefore, when significant others influence girls not to be overly athletic for fear of being too masculine, they are nurturing the negative connotation of “throwing like a girl” by implying that women should be weaker and overtly display their femininity. Fortunately, many female athletes today have prevailed and are transforming the way masculinity and femininity are defined within the context of sports (Coakley, 2007, p. 270). In particular, the phrase “throwing like a girl” has actually been reclaimed by women and used to positively brand and promote women’s fastpitch softball.

It is evident that the experiences of men and women in society and in sport differ, and that these experiences are largely contingent upon the respective environment. Often, the way that we are socialized determines what sports we choose to participate in and what we seek from our involvement. Societal expectations of women to be in control of their bodies, not to be too

aggressive, and to be relatively passive and traditional power relations between men and women transcend the boundaries of sport and are relevant to analyzing the social context of women's softball at the NCAA Division I level.

Relevance of Theoretical Traditions

It is significant to note the contrast between Goffman's (1961) paradigm of total institution and Foucault's idea of a progressive power. Where Foucault articulates a system that can create a sense of empowerment among its subjects, Goffman describes the confinement of such societies as leading to feelings of demoralization (Goffman, 1961); the interpretive difference being the potential individuality of power for Foucault versus the stripping of individuality leading to a group identity for Goffman. Where Goffman focuses on how individuals negotiate this totalitarian environment, Foucault provides explanation of how the interaction of the subjected individuals helps to define the institution (Hacking, 2004). Foucault describes a process of how the institution is created, while Goffman provides insight into how those within the institution function in "everyday life" (Hacking, 2004, p. 300). Traditionally, Goffman and Foucault are viewed in opposition, yet in regard to institutions and their social arrangements of power "they are complementary" (Hacking, 2004, p. 277; Jones, et al., 2011).

The development of a group identity as described by Goffman (1961) is present in the context on intercollegiate athletics, yet it can be empowering for the group as described by Foucault or oppressive for the individuals as described by Goffman. This idea is supported by Scott's (2009) study of negotiated order within the context of the swimming pool that also resonates with both Foucault and Goffman. She observes that the swimming pool has "a myriad of unspoken rules, norms, and rituals [that exist due to] an obvious pragmatic need for order and efficiency" (Scott, 2009, p. 127). That is, "bodies must be managed and conduct regulated so that

the pool as an institution can run smoothly” (Scott, 2009, p. 127). Per Foucault (1979/1995), this compliance results in a “disciplinary mechanism...[where] participants are ostensibly free to leave at any point, but willingly decide to stay, complicit in the exercise of power” (Scott, 2009, p. 125). Relating to Goffman (1961), she explains that “there is social urgency behind this [self-regulation], insofar as actors are concerned with matters of self-presentation and the emergence of a team impression” (Scott, 2009, p. 127).

The experience of student-athletes is a phenomenon that varies with the context of their participation, which includes but is not limited to the particular sport, the level of competition, the individual’s own dispositions and epistemology, the school of choice, their coaches, and their teammates. These are major factors that influence how an individual is socialized into being an intercollegiate student-athlete, and they each represent a fraction of the disciplinary system of power that revolves around hierarchical observation, regulatory procedures, and constant judgment relative to the norm. Certain practices of NCAA Division I softball programs have developed in a parallel fashion to the description of total institutions given by Goffman (1961) and industry and schools in the 18th century given by Foucault (1979/1995). Implementing systems of fundamental control, hierarchical observation, surveillance, examination, measurements, and documentation place student-athletes into a social system that simultaneously subjects them to these disciplinary powers and positions them as sites of potentially new forces.

The power structures that are inherent in our society often serve to reinforce the legitimate control, that “bestowed by formal organization” (Shriberg, Shriberg, & Kumari, 2005, p. 118), of certain positions such as coaches, administrators, priests, and teachers; therefore, exploring the extent of their existence and their manifestation in the athletic context of NCAA Division I softball is beneficial. Burke (2001) believes that only by radically transforming the

discourse and societal assumptions that have provided unquestioned power to coaches will the student-athlete be emancipated. Denison and Scott-Thomas (2011) support this by stating that we must “promote possibilities for innovation and change by questioning coach’s numerous taken-for-granted practices and possible unintended consequences” (p. 34). Foucault (1980) and Bordo (2003) explain that this type of transformation is possible through the subtle changing of forces over a period of time. Therefore, through the lens of panopticism, to what extent has disciplinary power in NCAA Division I softball evolved through the mechanisms of attention to detail, control of activity, and surveillance, and can it be transformed only through these same minute processes rather than “one fell swoop” (Bordo, 2003, p. 28)?

From the total institution perspective, Goffman (1961) provides the techniques of primary and secondary adjustments as a possible means of transforming institutional social structure from below; however, the participants must walk the thin line between challenging, conforming, or overconforming to the organizational culture. Similar to Foucault (1980) and Bordo (2003), he asserts that by taking ownership of certain daily processes recruits may become gradually empowered in their role. If such adaptations are not realized, student-athletes may continue to be conditioned to uncritical acceptance of coach directed disciplinary regimes that penetrate their entire lives. Seigfried (1996) explains that “by recognizing the experimental character of everyday experience, pragmatism...[can] empower those whose class, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation have not been privileged in the cultural setup” (p. 161). As Goffman (1961) so eloquently presents the social dichotomy these individuals experience, “to prescribe activity is to prescribe a world; to dodge a prescription can be to dodge an identity” (p. 187).

Literature Review Conclusion

The methodological basis for narrative study provided by Dewey's (1925/1981) ideas of learning through experience, coupled with the theoretical paradigms of Goffman's (1961) total institution and Foucault's (1979/1995) disciplinary power provide a solid platform for this study related to the sociology of sport. The specific context of intercollegiate athletics within institutions of higher education offers an excellent culture in which to explore these social interactions and power dynamics, and the specific sport of softball is under-represented in research circles, thus providing an opportunity to add to the discipline. Allusions have been made to the idea that the characteristics inherent in these two theoretical paradigms could be analyzed in the context of college athletics, but the current research is on the margins of total institution and disciplinary power theory as articulated by Goffman (1961) and Foucault (1979/1995), respectively. Studies exploring overconformity and moral reasoning begin the conversation regarding power dynamics and social structures within the athletic context. This study continues the discussion through the voices of several NCAA Division I softball student-athletes by focusing attention on "how decisions are made, the process of emerging norms, and how socialization is related to control and power relations" within the context (Eitzen, 2000, p. 378).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

“All of these lines across my face
tell you the story of who I am.
So many stories of where I've been,
and how I got to where I am.

But these stories don't mean anything
when you've got no one to tell them to.
It's true...”

(Hanseroth, 2007)

Introduction

Stories are an essential element that we as humans use to define our lives. Interpersonal interaction gives life to stories, and stories breathe life into human beings (Clandinin & Connelly, 2006). The medium in which we live, learn, and become is narrative or story. Through hearing an individual's story we are able to gain a deeper understanding of their life and experiences, therefore indicating the significance of a narrative form of data analysis in researching the student-athlete experiences of NCAA Division I softball players. By re-telling and giving voice to their experiences, this research can also enhance the meaning each participant attaches to her story.

The song lyrics above, made popular by Brandi Carlile, illustrate the significance that experiences and stories play in the construction of lives and how relations with others are important to narrative creation. Our origins, histories, acquaintances, and geographies compile over time to bring us to the contemporary and the future. Simply stated, the narrative approach used in this study is designed to tell and analyze the stories of individual participants in the context of NCAA Division I softball in an effort to better understand their perspectives relative to the theories of Foucault (1979/1995) and Goffman (1961).

Qualitative Methodology

The overall methodological approach for this study is qualitative with emphasis on a narrative design following that described by Clandinin and Connelly (1994; 2001; 2006). Given this inquiry is centered on understanding lived experience rather than “prediction and control” qualitative methods are most appropriate (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2006, p. 4). This study is congruent with qualitative assumptions in that it is conducted in the participants’ “natural settings attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of meanings people bring to them” and the final report is structured as a description (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 2). My interest in studying NCAA Division I softball players’ experiences is based on a desire to understand their perception of their particular college softball experiences and how this culture has shaped their individual lives, thus providing an analysis of their stories.

Narrative Inquiry

Focusing on lived stories of experience of NCAA Division I softball players reflects the incorporation of narrative inquiry as the specific qualitative method used in this study. As Pinnegar and Daynes (2006) state, “narrative inquiry begins in experience as expressed in lived and told stories” (p. 5). With this idea as the basis, they also delineate four steps researchers take as they move toward utilizing narrative (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2006). These four criteria may also serve as the basic assumptions that are characteristic of narrative research studies. The criteria are as follows: (a) recognizing “relationships among participants [and the researcher], (b) the move to words as data, (c) a shift in focus from the general and universal to the local and specific, and (d) an acceptance of alternative ways of knowing” (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2006, p. 1, 3). In other words, narrative inquiry values participant-researcher interaction, stories as data, the significance of context, and narrative as a way of learning.

The current study aligns with each of these criteria for narrative inquiry; first, I understand my relationship with the participants can influence the research due to potential assumptions and power dynamics. Second, the stories told to me by the student-athletes are the primary data used in the resulting analysis and write-up; and third, it is understood that these participants' stories are individual and originate from a particular context; therefore, they are not to be ascribed to an entire population. Finally, as the researcher, I accept that there are multiple ways of knowing and, resonating with Seigfried (1996), believe that each participant and I enter into this research with our own histories, stories, and assumptions about the experience of life within the context of NCAA Division I softball.

Clandinin and Connelly (2000) cite Dewey's (1938) ideas of experience as a backdrop for their research and a justification for narrative inquiry. The underlying premise of Dewey's (1938) pragmatic theory is that experience is the cornerstone of education and that lived experiences make up each individual life. Further, the experiences of individuals often involve other people, thus the basis of knowledge acquisition is not only individual, but it is also through interactions with others. In essence, we learn through the events and interactions that take place during the course of our lives; we are educated through personal, familial, social, and professional experiences in conjunction with others. Clandinin and Connelly (2006) explain:

People shape their daily lives by stories of who they are and others are and as they interpret their past in terms of these stories. Story, in the current idiom, is a portal through which a person enters the world and by which their experience of the world is interpreted and made personally meaningful. Narrative inquiry, the study of experience as story, then, is first and foremost a way of thinking about experience. Narrative inquiry as a methodology entails a view of the

phenomenon. To use narrative inquiry methodology is to adopt a particular view of *experience as phenomenon under study* (p. 375, emphasis added).

Therefore, in this narrative study, the unique experience of each student-athlete in the context of NCAA Division I softball is the phenomenon under study. “Experience is what we study, and we study it narratively because narrative thinking is a key form of experience and a key way of writing and thinking about it” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 18). Accordingly, narrative inquiry is used as the method for this study for two reasons. First, because of narrative’s emphasis on the significance of experience to knowledge and learning, and second because of the undeniable connection between stories lived (experiences), stories told, and narrative thinking. The stories lived and captured in interviews are the basis for understanding the participants’ experiences.

Sport Specific Story

Softball games progress from the first inning to the seventh inning and with each inning, coaches and players learn things about their opponents as well as themselves and their respective capabilities and tendencies. Charts are kept and film is taken. These things that are learned from information gathering and experience are then transferred into later innings and future games. From a micro-perspective, that which is learned during games is accumulated and transferred to the future. The same is possible for the entire college softball experience. Types of knowledge gained from the recruiting process, the beginning of the freshman year, and accrued through the student-athlete's senior year serve as building blocks for the experience, education, and thus life of each individual and group.

It is also beneficial to think of the analogy of box scores versus written or video accounts of games as a rationale for narrative analysis. Reporting the student-athletes’ experiences in the

form of a narrative is effective because there are plotlines outlined in their stories, thus the data development is facilitated through this format. Statistics and win-loss records cannot possibly tell the whole story of a game. To develop deeper understanding, we must read the article, hear the news story, or talk to a participant; it is the narrative account of the game which captures the drama, the themes, the characters, the decisions, the emotions, and so on. Rather than analyzing statistics like a SportsCenter reporter, this study focuses on the story behind the numbers: the overall experience and education of NCAA Division I softball student-athletes.

Inquiry Approach and Rationale

As stated, in order to investigate the collegiate student-athlete experience at the NCAA Division I level, a narrative qualitative inquiry strategy was utilized. Audio-recorded interviews were the primary means of data collection. The interviews were semi-structured with open-ended questions. I transcribed each interview following the conversation with each participant. The resulting interview transcripts and the emergent narratives were then read through the paradigms of total institution and panopticism using polyvocal data analysis procedures. Therefore, since the focus of this study is on describing individual experiences and perceptions of NCAA Division I softball, the narrative approach was chosen because of its emphasis on context (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The purpose is to better understand the lived experience of the participants within the social system of their NCAA Division I athletic environment, and frame them within the social interaction theories of total institution (Goffman, 1961) and panopticism (Foucault, 1979/1995). As Stratta (2002/3) indicates, this form of qualitative research “has the aim of understanding the data in the context of the lives of the people being studied” (p. 32), thus aligning with the premise of this study. It is expected that the same study conducted at different

universities, different competition levels, or with different student-athletes could produce a different story due to contextual, experiential, and personality variations.

Instrumentation

Data collection consisted of semi-structured interviews including open-ended questions. Each interview was audio-tape recorded. Interviewing was chosen as the primary means of data collection for this study because the direct communication allowed for the customization of questions based on the participant's answers, attitude, and general non-verbal language (Anderson & Kanuka, 2003). This type of "focused interaction [and] infinite flexibility [helps] the researcher pursue a deep understanding of the subjects' views" (Anderson & Kanuka, 2003, p. 85). The semi-structured interview model was selected because having an interview schedule was conducive to gaining insight into topics relevant to the theoretical framework, yet still allowed for open-ended probes (Anderson & Kanuka, 2003; Gratton & Jones, 2004). Therefore, the semi-structured interview method of data collection was consistent with the goals of this research due to the desire to better understand the participants' experiences relative to the theoretical frameworks of total institution and panopticism. Also, this interview technique allowed for a conversational style discussion, allowed unexpected information to emerge, and decreased the power dynamics between the researcher and the participant (Gratton & Jones, 2004).

A semi-structured interview protocol was designed to elicit discussion regarding the topics at hand (Appendix C). After question number one, the questions were not asked in any particular order; rather I followed the participant's conversational lead. The interview questions were prompted by my review of literature and my previous observations working in the culture. Following each in-depth interview, I transcribed the interview using a word processor and saved

the files on two sources. This process was done for each participant's interview. The interview with Kim lasted 45 minutes, with Jill 48 minutes, and with Ashley 55 minutes. Informed consent forms (Appendix B) were signed by the participants, participants understood that their participation was voluntary and they had the option not to answer any questions that they did not feel comfortable discussing, and they reserved the right to discontinue participation at any time.

Data Collection

The current research focuses on the experience of being a NCAA Division I collegiate softball player and is informed by Erving Goffman's total institution and Michel Foucault's panopticism. Therefore, the study includes an analysis of the participants, the respective universities, softball programs, and communities. Participants were initially contacted and invited to participate in this study via email (Appendix A). The invitation was emailed to all sophomore, junior, and senior softball student-athletes in two major NCAA Division I conferences whose email addresses could be accessed from their university's online directory. Student-athletes were asked to contact me in return if they were interested in participating. The nature of their participation was fully explained and I began a dialogue for response to any concerns. I further relayed that the research was for the purposes of completing my Ph.D. degree requirements and provided the contact information of my major advisor if they wished to follow-up. Approximately 200 potential participants were contacted twice and four responded. One participant ceased responding after the initial contact.

Participants were properly informed regarding their participation in the study (Appendix A). An informed consent statement (Appendix B) was provided to explain the purpose of the study and that involvement would consist of an open-ended audio-tape recorded interview regarding their experiences as a NCAA Division I softball student-athlete. They had the option

not to answer any questions they felt uncomfortable discussing. Participants chose a pseudonym which is used throughout the written study in order to preserve their anonymity, and confidentiality is ensured as their personal information is only known by me as the principal investigator and is not to be shared with anyone. Participants reserved the right to discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Interviews were conducted using Fuse web-based communication in a sound proof conference room. This technology allowed me and the participants to see each other via computer, but conversation was over the telephone and digitally recorded. Digitally recorded interview data were deleted following transcription of the data. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from the Department of Kinesiology, Recreation, and Sport Studies IRB Committee, the UTK IRB, and The University of Virginia's College at Wise IRB was received prior to collecting any interview data.

Participants

There were three NCAA Division I softball student-athletes who participated in this study, plus myself as the researcher. The participants involved in this project were 20 and 21 year old female softball student-athletes at different NCAA Division I universities in the United States. They were all position players on their respective teams. The relatively small number of participants is reflective of narrative inquiry's belief in focusing on the particular rather than the universal (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Additionally, the participants' narratives are used as illustrations of theoretical concepts rather than a saturated data set. This research represents the voices of the participants in this study as they are, rather than develop a universal conclusion about an entire population. The small population allowed for more in depth discussion and relation to the concepts of total institution and panopticism within the context of these three respective institutions. This approach was optimal given the contextual and historical differences

among institutions and participants and the similarity in the participants' years of experience within the culture served to strengthen the temporal relevance of the theoretical application.

The participants were all upperclassmen currently eligible for competition within the NCAA. None were freshmen because their stories from the relevant setting were thought to be limited due to their short time being in the environment. Basic demographic information (age, race, academic year, major) was gathered at the beginning of the interview. The participants were from a variety of racial and geographic backgrounds and had different academic discipline interests. Participants had the following characteristics:

Table 1:

Participants

Name	Class	Age	Race	Major
Jill	Junior	20	Caucasian	Marketing
Ashley	Junior	21	Africa-American	Political Science
Kim	Junior	21	Hispanic	Criminal Justice

Data Analysis

The transcript data from the interviews is presented in the form of polyvocal narratives where multiple individual voices are presented as primary data. Polyvocal analysis provided an excellent method to present the participants words verbatim, illustrate the role of various people with whom the participants interacted, show directly how I influenced the data, as well as allow flexibility in presentation (Hatch, 2002). By depicting certain significant social interactions as part of the participants' stories, polyvocal is consistent with the basic premise of pragmatism (Dewey, 1938; Seigfried, 1996). Polkinghorne (1995) states that narrative has expanded to include any prose, or "data in the form of natural discourse or speech, including interview

transcripts” or field notes (p. 13). The data in this study produces narratives in the form of paradigmatic categories rather than life histories (Polkinghorne, 1995); therefore, the strongest way to serve the purpose of contextualizing the theories without the ambiguity of my interpretation was to present primary linguistic data verbatim.

Polyvocal data analysis procedures as defined by Hatch (2002) were used. The following steps were employed (Hatch, 2002, p. 202):

- 1) Transcribe the interviews
- 2) Read the transcripts for a sense of the whole
- 3) Identify all of the voices contributing to the data, including my own
- 4) Read the transcript, marking the places where particular voices are heard
- 5) Study the data related to each voice, decide which voices I would include in my report, and write a narrative telling the story of each selected voice. I chose to present the data in the form of multiple individual voices rather than groups since the purpose of the study was to illustrate a theory and to focus on the specific rather than general.
- 6) Read the entire data set, searching for data that reflects elements of the theoretical paradigms
- 7) Write stories that represent each participant’s experience

Specifically, after reading the entire data set and reflecting on it, I created a list of all the voices that were present. This list included anyone to whom the participants gave voice (e.g., coaches, family, support staff, teammates) and the voice of the researcher. I then reviewed the data and highlighted where each of these voices was heard and identified whose voice was represented in the margin by a particular passage. Next, I studied the data for each specific voice and decided which voices to include in the narrative analysis based on their relevance to the research question

in this study. Yin (2003) explains that, having a “theoretical orientation guiding the analysis...helps [the researcher] to focus attention on certain data” (p. 112); therefore, the passages in the final stories were shaped by the level of resonance it had with the theoretical lens of total institution and panopticism and the voice of the researcher. Next, I created an outline for each voice that included the specific locations in the transcripts where each significant issue was addressed, and then I compiled the narrative.

These narratives include my interpretations of what the participants discussed in the interviews. Thus, the voices of those groups other than the participants are twice interpreted. That is, they are told from the perspective of the student-athlete and then from the perspective of the researcher. Finally, as Yin (2003) suggests, I related the narrative data to the theoretical framework of Goffman’s total institution and Foucault’s disciplinary power. In writing the discussion, direct quotes from the interview transcripts were used, along with an analysis from the theoretical perspectives.

Reflexivity Statement

In reflection upon my personal experiences as a college student-athlete within the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), a graduate assistant at the NCAA Division I level, a NAIA head coach, and NCAA Division II administrator I have formulated the following statement regarding my perspective. College athletics should be a means for student-athletes to pursue a higher education with the additional experience of being part of something special; a team, a group of individuals that work cooperatively together, overcome obstacles, and celebrate in their accomplishments. These trials and victories will result in personal maturation, memories, and friendships that they will carry with them throughout their lives and likely use as benchmarks, lessons, and examples in their professional and personal lives. The experience of

being a collegiate student-athlete should enhance the educational experience by providing a platform for successes, as well as the experience of failures which ultimately lead to personal growth and maturity. Additionally, the formation of friendships and the inclination for self-discovery that can be derived from being part of a college sports team can lead to emotional and social development. Qualities such as understanding and being able to control one's emotions are advantageous for anyone in most aspects of their life. Therefore, these athletic experiences together with all of the various interactions and lessons that are "standard" parts of college life may lead a person to become more broadly developed.

Trustworthiness

In narrative research, the term trustworthy serves to replace the traditional ideas of validity and reliability (Creswell, 2007). There are various techniques that qualitative researchers incorporate into their work in order for it to be considered trustworthy and valid. Outlined here are the particular methods that were implemented in this dissertation.

Prolonged engagement and clarifying researcher bias, are two of Creswell's (2007) validation strategies that were incorporated in the current study. Additionally, a variety of Creswell's (2007) standards for evaluation were utilized in order to ensure the quality of the study. The specific validation strategies that I use are explained as follows: (a) Prolonged engagement, building trust, learning the culture; through my life experiences I was fortunate enough to be a member of several softball teams and specifically one NCAA Division I program. Having been a part of the culture, I have a base for communication and building trust, yet I look forward to hearing a different perspective; and (b) Clarifying researcher bias through a reflexivity statement; this transparency explains any preconceived ideas that I had based on my personal perspective of the culture.

Further, I employed several of Stake's (1995) and Creswell's (2007) criteria for "good" research (Creswell, 2007, p. 218-219). I clearly define the case at hand, and am reflexive and self-disclosing by making my role, intentions, and point-of-view apparent as I write in a scholarly, yet easy to read manner. I provide sufficient raw data to support the themes and ideas that I am conveying, and I lend a sense of story to the presentation (Creswell, 2007).

Methodology Conclusion

Each college student-athlete, coach, and administrator brings their own beliefs, experiences, and personalities to their college team. The interaction of these perspectives functions in the creation of rules, policies, traditions, and ultimately a culture. Examining these cultures through the student-athlete participants' eyes in this study provides a more rich description of their experiences within the social system of NCAA Division I college softball. The narrative format allows for the data to be directly presented in the words of the participants and includes any other voice that is invoked in the data. Their stories, read in conjunction with the theoretical paradigms of total institution and panopticism provides a better understanding of how the operational norms and social structures function within the context.

CHAPTER IV:

NARRATIVES

"You spend a good piece of your life
gripping a [softball] and in the end
it turns out it was the other way around
all the time."

~Bouton (1970)

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the issues of power, social control, and personal empowerment within the context of NCAA Division I softball. The following narratives were derived from semi-structured interviews with the participants that were designed to discuss their experiences as NCAA Division I softball student-athletes relative to the theoretical frameworks of total institution (Goffman, 1961) and panopticism (Foucault, 1979/1995).

In the interview process, each participant chose a pseudonym and answered a few demographic questions then I began each conversation by asking the participant, *"Tell me about yourself and your experiences playing softball at [your school]."* The names of all coaches, teammates, institutions, and geographic locations are also pseudonyms to preserve the anonymity of the participants. The following conventions were used in the interview transcripts: Ellipsis (...): Indicates short (1-2 second) pauses; [pause]: Indicates longer (5-10 second) pauses; Underline: Indicates emphasis by speaker. The narrative of each participant is presented, as well as mine as the researcher. A total of four narratives are written in this chapter with discussion of the content positioned within the theories and existing literature in the following chapter.

Kim's Narrative

Kim is a 21 year old rising senior member of the softball team at a NCAA Division I university. She is a Hispanic student-athlete double-majoring in Criminal Justice and Sociology.

Kim grew up in a small rural community which was challenging in her recruiting process. This led her to a junior college initially prior to transferring to her current school. Her father and the junior college coach were influential in making this decision.

Where I'm from no one really gets recruited I mean...I'm from [small town], Texas which is like close to Mexico so down there I had to travel about 8 to 10 hours to get to Houston just to get recruited...so it was a long process when I got recruited...my junior year I got recruited to some small schools like [a couple mid-major Division I schools]...just little DI schools and Smith Community College actually picked me up and I wasn't too interested, I mean it was JUCO (Junior College)...I didn't really care I guess you could say...but I spoke to [the coach] and he said that you're a great athlete and I can get you recruited to [major Division I schools], you know whichever school you want to go to and I said oh wow that's great...so he called Coach Long [my coach now] and he called all of these other schools and U. University (current major Division I school) was actually you know very excited. [Coach Long] left me a voicemail on my dad's phone kind of saying he was interested. I obviously couldn't speak to him but all of that happened and they decided that my senior year I wasn't going to sign with anybody til I knew who I had on the table um...Smith said you can stay here and then fine [I did]. I didn't want to back stab a JUCO just because he found U. University or I spoke to the coach [at two other major Division I schools]...and I think he helped me a lot with recruiting and so I went for a year to the JUCO and then I went to U. University.

Kim's experience at the junior college level allowed her to have a transition into college life and to be able to compare the different competition levels. She shows appreciation for the amenities and prestige of the Division I university.

Kendall: Can you compare your experience at the JUCO level to what you have experienced at the Division I level?

Um it is very different but...I think that it was a great way for me to get that "college life" experience as well and not just jump into a really big school, just because where I'm from I mean it's totally different [laughs]...I think it really helped me a lot you know just to move that far away from home. Overall I think the workouts, the mentality is just different and I just really enjoy um just great competition I guess you could say...

Kendall: Right...as far as the day to day of softball...

It was really different...I mean...at the JUCO we just had a park and at U. University we have our own facility and everything is totally different...I was very impressed by um you know how I got treated here. You know, you're at a really big DI school and its ah it's a great honor to actually be playing here...I mean I never thought, I never ever ever thought I'd ever play college ball in my life...so...

Kim feels that her overall collegiate experience has been positive and she has learned valuable information that can be shared with younger girls who dream of playing NCAA Division I softball.

I think this whole thing has been a great experience for me personally because back home I think a lot of people look up to me and it's great because I feel like I

can go back there and kind of give them you know what a big DI school really does expect from a college player.

Kim describes many of the expectations and demands that she refers to throughout the conversation. She discusses things such as her schedule, academic expectations, her social time, traveling, and relationships with coaches and support staff.

Kendall: Ok, so tell me a little bit about your typical day.

Wake up, let's see what time is that...wake up about 7:00 in the morning, early morning workouts with conditioning afterwards, um...go straight to class um I only get 30 minutes for lunch and so go straight to another class and after that take the bus down straight to the field, have about 45 minutes to get dressed and then we have about a three hour practice, right after practice I have two tutors a day so that's two hours and I then that took...I got done about 8:30-9:00pm...so that was my typical day...

Kendall: Alright, so then by 8:30-9:00pm what did you do in the evenings...social time or anything?

[Laughs] Um...I guess my social time...that would have to be if you passed by somebody you may talk to them or texting people would be it...like social time would be you know like that...the only friends I could say I had were my softball team and other teammates...or other teams that I saw where I was at...and its really kind of awkward if you think about it because it's like you don't know no body in school unless you're in class with them or that's about it [laughs].

Kendall: Other than passing on the sidewalk or class where did you see the other athletes?

When I was with my tutors if other people had tutors or were in the same room you just say hi.

Kendall: Do you guys have a dining hall for athletes there?

No, not just athletes. Um, in our school they kind of don't exclude athletes...we kind of just go out together with the whole student group so yeah...

Kendall: So is that good?

Yeah, I mean it's different but I don't mind.

Kendall: Different than what?

I would say other large schools maybe [conference] schools...just because I mean here you can point out an athlete and know who an athlete is I mean just because like the athletes usually wear their gear because they just came out of practice and they're going straight to class.

Although the dining halls are not designated for student-athletes, they are recognizable by their gear and continue to gravitate to each other for meals.

Kendall: I gotcha....so if you had one more hour in your day for free time what would you do with it?

Well, I mean I'm a very spiritual person I guess and I did have an hour sometimes and maybe what we did was have a team Bible study or who ever wanted to come or I'd go to FCA or I'd go give testimony to other schools. I guess personally that is what I would do.

Kim described a typical game day as being very similar to any other day except that there was a game rather than practice.

We do have a morning workout, a light one just so you're there in the morning and a little conditioning as well and go straight to class and um [pause]...and go straight to the bus and it depends on what time our game was at um exactly so we'd...have to go straight to the locker room...I'm pretty sure we had like an hour so and I'd just you know get ready then it was warm-up and go...

Team travel was a rush and Kim primarily expressed concern about forgetting something. There were some rules that applied to staying in the hotel regarding visitors and curfew.

[Sigh] oh the road trip...um...I think personally I don't like road tripping just because I'm afraid I'm going to forget something and you know you can't forget anything! But um [laughs]...yeah I mean it is just a rush. You know it just depends on where you are going, how long you're going to be there to get your classes in order as well, it's just difficult because [pause] you're just...you're really in a hurry...and um road tripping just be ready...our typical day was that they would get us food either if we were leaving in the morning or afternoon...but um they get us food before we get on the bus and once we get on it's straight to the hotel.....I think our curfew was 11:00pm, you had to be in bed by 11:00pm. Also, you know, no drinking and you can't have parents, friends or anybody in your room. They took our phones away at the JUCO but U. University coaches are more lenient, but they make sure you are responsible.

Kim gets assistance from her academic advisor with scheduling courses and communicating with professors about travel, practice, and workout demands. She has a good relationship and feels comfortable working with the academic advisor.

[My] academic advisor is actually the one, well we get to pick our classes but she is the one who organizes them between our mornings to make sure that we do go to our morning workout and we do go to practice so she builds us a timeframe. If I can't get a class to get in then we'll change it. Yeah, she'll talk to our teachers and let them know what's going on and also I have to do my part and make sure they know...I have to reassure them that hey I'm leaving at this day and just make sure they know.

The team does not have a lot of formal rules, but they are expected to be punctual and responsible. The student-athletes communicate with each other to make sure everyone is meeting these expectations.

Well we just keep in check with the freshmen and make sure hey, don't do this and don't do that but you know they're freshmen...we were all there at one time and [laughs] they don't want to be you know checked on constantly either. I mean I guess it's an experience that they want to do themselves right now...but we do say hey girls don't forget to do this...we'll send a mass text and just make sure that we're communicating with each other but it's up to ourselves and we help each other get going...

Kendall: Ok, so everybody kind of looks out for each other?

Yes!

Kendall: So, if someone is late y'all are doing the call and text to find them?

Exactly, yeah. [laughs]

Kendall: You're laughing like that has happened before...

Yes, it has actually [laughs]. It really has and it's just funny but [laughs] but it really has and um I'm pretty sure it's happened to me once and I'm like guys I'm here...sorry I'm a little late but I am here. [laughs].

Also, when asked about advice she would give to an incoming freshman Kim indicated she would have a conversation with them about recognizing that their decisions do not just reflect upon them, but rather the entire team.

I would just have a polite conversation but um you know [pauses] I know they're going to want to have fun and experience, but it's more like just watch out who you're with and what you do. So that's personally what I go by you know. If I did this would it embarrass me or my family I guess I would say something along the lines of that.

Kim was unconcerned with compliance regulations and the rights that she waived regarding the use of her likeness and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and FERPA laws. She had a similar attitude about being subject to drug tests and paperwork regarding her vehicle. She seemingly dismissed it as just part of the experience and was "totally fine with it."

"I mean honestly it doesn't bother me but I mean it is just how it goes."

The process of drug testing was awkward and early in the morning, but Kim had been randomly selected "many times" and it was a standard part of being a student-athlete at her school. The way she described the process it was nearly comical for her.

We had to be there at 6:00 in the morning...so I woke up about 5:30am and got there and waited in line and had to pee right in front of them and that was you know...just waiting in line to get tested and put it in a bag and it was kind of

weird because you saw everyone's pee in the cup and [laughs] I was like that's not alright [laughs] so yeah...

Kim's team has a male head coach, one male assistant coach, one female assistant coach, a female graduate assistant, and a female volunteer coach. Coaches were very structured at practice; however, some of the drills were pointless to her and she expressed a concern that the male coaches were the dominate voices even though they had considerably less playing experience. Also, in discussing the use of film and video for scouting and skill improvement, Kim explained that it was a helpful tool and she wished the coaches utilized it with the team more frequently.

I mean I have gotten into some...what would I call it...I guess you could say arguments but not really arguments but kind of hit heads with an assistant coach who...I don't know how I'll explain this but we did hit heads...but um I think that it's just all good...

Kendall: So you have had some disagreements with an assistant coach?

Yeah just because I am not always going to agree with the way he teaches stuff just because he has never played before so it's just like...how do you know this is going to work if you haven't played...I mean you have only coached like little kids and been a volunteer and then think you can coach at a DI school..it's just like we've played, we know how it feels to move and stuff and we know how it feels to almost be so closed and I don't know it is kind of something that is difficult to explain but [laughs].

Kendall: Do you have a stronger relationship with any of the other coaches?

Um, [pauses] well my experience is hard to explain just because the males feel they are very dominate over the females and it's more like the males speak and I think we have trouble with that...just because the male coaches say they want them to speak but they never give the women the chance to, and it's like ok well the women have played...we have [All-American pitcher] as our GA and...a former catcher as our volunteer assistant coach who played for [major Division I school] and hit you know .360-.368 and an assistant who played U.S. Men's fastpitch and then our assistant coach who was a volunteer at [another conference school] and it's just like I don't want to...ugh...you have no experience...playing-wise you know...and it's just like why don't you let Tracy talk or Courtney you know someone who has played and been there and done that and have experience on the field like we want to know how they feel...they have been there before you know...

Kendall: Yeah, so do they ever have a chance to work with you guys more directly?

Oh, no they feel like they know what they're doing but we personally didn't know how to approach that because...when we...I actually had an opportunity to say something and I wanted to work with Courtney and work with her because she had a bad swing up there you know and um no, they got after us like you're going to come in and work with us...it's like dude I don't want to...you're going to do that...you're going to really take away someone who has been there and done that to go and do front toss with you...front toss...I was like really you want me to go hit front toss when Courtney is a pitcher and let me hit off Courtney you

know...so it's just I don't know that's a problem with our assistant coach...not as much our head coach really.

Kim had a similar concern about the lack of using video work in the most recent season. She felt it was a valuable tool for evaluation and correcting fundamental issues with her swing as well as scouting opposing pitchers.

Kendall: Ok, do you guys make use of film...like game film and practice film at all?

Well we did my sophomore year but this year we didn't. um, it was more for the coaches this year. I'm pretty sure they saw the film and saw the other players but this year we didn't see no body on film or didn't do anything and I was surprised because I really thought we would. I really thought we'd see somebody on film or a pitcher on film but we didn't.

Kendall: How about for skill stuff like hitting or things like that...do you guys use Dartfish or anything?

Yeah my sophomore year we used...um what was it...I can't remember what it was called...I know we used something...it was for our swings...yeah they put it on the computer and it was kind of messing with buttons but it was pretty cool. I got to see myself swing against Albert Pujols, yeah and it let me see how I wasn't showing a negative movement and stuff. It was very helpful actually, but this year we didn't do none of that.

Overall, Kim's narrative of being an NCAA Division I softball student-athlete indicates that she has had a positive experience. After a long recruiting process and playing one season at a junior college, she has experienced some disgruntlement with one particular coach and a limited social life but is proud and thankful to have had the opportunity to play NCAA Division I softball. She

does not question much of the organization and management tactics and just acknowledges it as “the way it is.” She wants to be a graduate assistant for softball upon graduation and would like to be a college softball coach, preferably at the NCAA Division I level. Specific items from Kim’s narrative will be highlighted and evaluated in the next chapter relative to the theoretical frameworks used in this study.

Jill’s Narrative

Jill is 20 years old and a junior softball student-athlete at an NCAA Division I university. She is Caucasian and majoring in Marketing. Her mother initially made her play softball as a child and she fought it; however, after her second season she was pretty good and enjoyed the feeling of being the best at something so she continued playing with high school and travel ball which earned her a spot at a NCAA Division I program.

I’m from Springville, North Carolina and am majoring in marketing. I’ve got a brother and a sister that are a lot older than me, so uh my brother was my coach growing up through high school and when I was younger...basically I just go to school and play ball. [pauses]...Um, well when I was eight my mom and dad would be like you need to get in some sports and so I was always a tomboy but I didn’t want to play like organized sports for whatever reason, I have no clue. And then I was eight and my mom took me to sign up for softball and I kicked and I screamed and I told her that I hated her and never wanted to see her again um so she signed me up anyway and was like ok you can go to practice for a few weeks and if you don’t like it then you can quit and I told her once again I hate you, you’re the worst mom in the world or whatever. So, I ended up, I can’t remember exactly how it happened, but I ended up like going to practice and I remember

being still reluctant about it like through the first couple weeks but for whatever reason I stuck with it and then my first season, I did not touch a single ball when I hit..did not foul one off, never made contact with a ball my entire first season, still after that for some reason, I don't know why, I played the next year. And it was like night and day, the next year I broke the homerun record and I was like the best player in the whole league, and so by that time I was nine and it was like the coolest thing on earth to be the best at something. And I played summer ball and started school ball when I was in eighth grade and like it is now it wasn't just playing ball, like it was your entire life but you know then you have your summer league team and yeah it sucks to lose, but it wasn't like live or die on whether you won or not, but it was so enjoyable then that you wanted to put in the work and you wanted to win no matter, you know at all costs. This is my fourth year here now and so slowly each year it's become like yeah I know I should put in more work and I know that I could be a lot better, but the stress and all the time we get taken away from us, it's kind of like I want to be that great player and stuff, but like if there was still someone in my softball career that I wanted to be great for besides myself then it would be a lot easier to like want to work and put in that extra.

Kendall: Yeah...

But, things are a lot different I mean like summer ball and the high school and stuff like it was so carefree and I think that it was easier to play like that than to always have certain expectations and when you don't live up to those expectations

then you are worthless and you get told how horrible you are and that you suck and that you are playing like freshmen and blah blah and it's just frustrating.

The uncertainty and variance of Jill's performance from day-to-day causes her extra stress because she wants to meet the expectations of the coach.

I think that it's worse than work. Because think about it, ok. When I graduate I'm going to have a job. You have a job and you either do it or you don't. like it's not, well let's say most jobs, like if you were a secretary or something...you go to work, you file your papers, you call who ever, you tell your boss whatever, you get them coffee, you do this. It's not based on your talent, and with talent, like a sport, like what you're gonna put out from day to day can vary. So, that just brings along the extra stress. And then you know that's going to happen so you worry about that happening and then that freaks you out even more. And I feel like with a job it's just like you go and you either do the stuff or you don't...like you have a choice and with sports you don't always have a choice...like if you had a choice I would be an All-American because I would play good every single day, but it's not that easy with you know athletics...

She expresses feeling stressed frequently due to the demands of her schedule as well.

Just everything put together, um, I would say for a normal student you would choose when you have classes and you can have classes from 8:00am to 8:00pm, and like with my major, my classes in business are offered once a semester, one class, one section that's it and so we have to squeeze in all of our classes before practice, and then you have, well, even before class you've been up for two to three hours because you've done running and lifting and you're already tired and

you go to class then you don't always have time to eat lunch...then as soon as you get done with lunch, if you get any, or you're eating on the way to the field, you get there and you have to warm-up and then the three hour practice and then you have to do treatment after that and then usually tutors...well your everyday is from 8:00am to 8:00pm and it's already scheduled for you. There is no time for laundry or to shower or to do dishes or to go to the grocery store or go to the store and get you know anything that you need from day-to-day.

Jill describes a similarly regimented schedule for game days.

Let's just take a [conference] series, like on a Saturday...we would usually eat breakfast as a team at like...well we play at 1:00pm, start warming up at 11:00am, have breakfast at like 9:30am, so...you have to be at breakfast at 9:30am, so you have to get up at 8:30 to get ready and to get to breakfast...you eat breakfast and you go to the field after that, you know change into your uniform and stuff and then you warm up for two hours before the game and you play usually like a two hour game with a 30 minute break and another two hour game, then after that you have treatment and rehab and all that stuff to keep your body working and then by that time it's 5:00-6:00pm and from then you just go home, take a shower, eat and then you usually want to go to sleep because you gotta get up and do it the next day. And then after that, the next day is Sunday when you have school and workouts on Monday morning so that whole cycle starts again, and then sometimes you have mid-week games where you go from class and you grab your food on the way to the game, and then you play and get home late and you have class the next day...

Jill talks in great detail about the schedule for away competitions as well, including meals, meetings, and other things that the team does in the hotel.

So, [conference] again, depending on where we're going we'll either leave Thursday afternoon or early on Friday and then whenever we get there we'll go to the opposing team's field. Sometimes we have like an eight hour bus ride to there or even if we fly it's like an eight hour process [laughs], um we get there, we have a walkthrough for like an hour or hour and a half and then we'll go eat dinner and then depending on whether our coaches think it's tough competition we'll have a film session...either after dinner or in the morning before or after breakfast...and then um, from there the days goes just about like when you're at home...and usually when we're on the road we have more film sessions since we're on the road and we don't really have anywhere to go...so we're all there together so we watch film and we play and then we play Sunday and then you fly or drive home, get home late...we've gotten home at like 2:00am sometimes and then we have class at 8:00am and you have to get up and go to class...

Kendall: Yeah. Um, so there is a lot of film on the road...what is the typical day in the hotel like?

Well our time usually gets taken up there too. Uh like if we were to have a day where we go somewhere and we get there late Thursday night or like early Friday morning we always have to have meals together and so, we have to be everywhere on time and early so...there's 30 minutes used up in that...or we'll have a meeting at 11:00am and then we eat or anything to like keep you occupied and not...no relaxing, no sleeping...and if they don't have anything else to meet

about, you have study hall and someone will come around and check to make sure you're studying and stuff.

Jill is very emotional when talking about her coaches from youth and travel ball and college. She compares them to each other as well as the other support staff members she has worked with in college. She describes a variance in the relationships she has had with these individuals.

[My travel ball coach] was the kind of coach that if I got up there and had a horrible at bat and I struck out or something or I just booted a ball on defense he would never break you down, he would never say anything that made you question your ability or anything like that...and having a coach like that motivated me so much more to like...not want to disappoint him like you know he is someone I like, I don't want to disappoint this person so I'm going to work hard and try hard for this person. And then now in college it's...like...she doesn't motivate me...don't make me feel worthless because that's not going to motivate me to do something for you...because why would you do something for somebody that you don't necessarily agree with, almost never. So, it was easier to love the game, to love to play and compete when you know that you're not going to get talked down to like the coach doesn't really care about you whether or not the person means it when they quote unquote talk down I guess, but sigh...I feel like that is just common knowledge you know the way you talk to somebody, the way you treat somebody is gonna be like what you get back from them...

Kendall: Uh huh...do you have any positive relationships at [school]?

Oh, yeah...um strength coach, it's the kind of thing, like if we have 20 runs in the morning and he says this is what you need to do and these are your times you

need get it in. Um, so those are like, he sets our goals for us, like this is what we want done...and as we're running if we have 19 seconds to finish a run and we finish the run in 18 seconds, we yeah, obviously we're cutting it close on time, but he'll never come out and yell at us like you're doing the minimum or something because he knows we're working hard and the reason he knows we're working hard is because we respect him and the way he has treated us before in the same situation and then like he'll say...you know, good job, way to finish, keep working hard, don't miss any times, you know it's easier to do it the first time, and if we were to miss our time he's like alright that's a miss, but come on, no more misses, we're going to get it, you all gotta work together, you can get through this and all of that stuff. And he works us through things, and even when we do mess up which you know sometimes happens more often, he knows that we're giving 110% whether we mess up or not it's not you're the worst runner I've ever seen in my entire life, you know, always focus on trying harder, and...um, academic advisor...always works with us, Heather's great, like if you ever do something wrong, she's like ok, come on now, but we'll fix this but you know try hard to not let it happen again, and usually she never has problems out of us either because we know that she's just gonna work with us and help us through things and we're going to try to do everything we can not to disappoint her or cause her any problems with scheduling us classes or anything like that...same with the athletic trainer...she gives us our rehab, we do our rehab, we try to stay healthy, you know she gets what we get from her and that's pretty

much how it is with everybody else around here that we have great relationships with.

Kendall: Uh huh...so these are more like working relationships...

Yeah, yeah, it's like we're in this together...cause it...haha takes two to tango [laughs]...you know though, if there is one person pulling one way and one person pulling the other you're not going to get anywhere you're just going to sit there tugging in the middle...you can only have progress if you know people are on the same page and working together towards a goal.

Kendall: So, as far as goals, it sounds like all of these people set goals for you all...as far as the coaches, do you guys do explicit goals as well...?

Umm..[pause] we do goals at really bad times...we'll do goals like...when fall practice is over or in February when we get back after we've been working for six months...and it would be kind of a smart idea to start from the beginning with a goal than do a goal when you are half way through something...

Kendall: Yeah

It's kind of like you're way too far into it now, you just need to give it all you've got instead of trying to slap some goals on something just for the fun of it 'cause you think, well, that's not working so let's try this or this isn't working lets go back to whatever...but yeah, and actually with rehab like with [the athletic trainer] we start when we go home for summer, you know...our goal is if you do this rehab three times a week, you add on to it, you keep it healthy and that's our goal to keep our arms healthy with her...with [the strength coach] we have a workout plan all summer, you do this and this and this and you will be ready

when you get back to school...with Heather of course we always have academic goals, above this GPA, take this many classes and graduate at this time...and then with softball it's like...[pause]..no goals all summer, no goals in August, no goals in the fall, so we're starting the season with no goals...and I guess we could take it upon ourselves to do our own separate goals but...you know, when you're working together with people you might want to have team goals and/or partner goals so you can help hold each other accountable since it's like...it's a skill, not just a given thing that everybody can do. If Mary has a goal of keeping her hips closed and I have a goal to keep my hips closed too, well not always can you feel your hips open, obviously or you wouldn't do it, then partner up so I can say hey Mary you're not keeping your hips closed so you can achieve a goal if you would ever have one in the first place...

On the topic of accountability, Jill feels like there are rules about everything and is very concerned about making a mistake.

Kendall: Right, so is there a lot of internal, everybody holds each other accountable since there may not be from the coach?

I think that we try to, but I think there is so much frustration toward the coach that we're just like just get through it...it's hard to keep people accountable because you get to a point where you're so worried about managing things like people being late or this and that then I start worrying about so many other people that I stop focusing on what I need to do.

Kendall: Along the lines of accountability, tell me about some team rules.

[pause]

Be on time...and that rule is kind of, well I'm gonna kind of go on a different point for just a second but with things like, well..what she also doesn't understand is if we have practice at 2:30pm, well we're getting there at 1:30pm which is an hour before she even thinks about getting there. She never takes into consideration that you have to drive places, have to get ready...we're there early and all that stuff so um...the whole being early thing she doesn't even take into consideration. So that's a rule, we have to be early everywhere...consume more time. Um...let's see, go to class, don't miss a class...um...with grades you have to have a 3.0 GPA or you have study hall every semester. I guess there's kind of like a lot of like I guess other rules, like just things that you know that you should abide by, like um, getting to the field before warm-up which is 30 minutes before practice to hit extra before practice...or...I don't know...everything...everything's a rule!, there's a rule with everything!! [sigh]. You know, if you're too fat, lose weight, if you're too skinny, gain weight, I mean there's like a rule on your weight because I've been told one season I was too big and the next season I was too little, so I guess she needs to put me on a diet too [laughs]. Um...don't leave your stuff out in the locker room, can't eat in the locker room, um, let's see, that's a good question...have your shirt tucked in at all times, catch with two hands [laugh], um...I mean really there's just...there's a rule on your entire life...basically, because for one your day starts out scheduled and it ends scheduled...and...you know, the rule is you're on time you're early, you never miss anything, so everything is planned...[pause]...and it's just one big rule...everything you do is a rule, you have to do everything a certain way at a

certain time...with certain people...[pause]...and if you have a meal plan you have to eat in the [athletic department cafeteria] for lunch because they pay for it or you'll get in trouble if you go get taco bell for lunch instead of going there...[pause]...you have to wear the same thing as everyone else...um...[pause].

Even though Jill seems somewhat resentful for the control that the coach has on her time, she acknowledges some advantages to her situation.

“There's perks.”

Kendall: [laughs] There are? Like what?

Uh huh, we have a great facility, we have somewhere to hang out, we've got a game room where we can go play Wii most any time we want to, and we have access to an academic advisor all the time, she's ours and not like the whole university's, and um, we have tutors on top of that any tutor you want, you get your tutor, and we get to sign up for classes earlier than normal students, um [pause]...free clothes, it may be practice clothes but it is still something to wear, someone that does our practice laundry, someone washes some of our clothes for us so that is always nice, and as far as when we eat as a team, like, I've probably saved thousands of dollars over the last few years you know eating a meal or two a day or a couple days a week with the team instead of spending \$20 or \$30 if we go to like a nice restaurant on my own, whether you're on scholarship or not, just travel with the team you get stuff like that...um...respect from teachers, it's amazing how much teachers will work with you when they know how much you're doing and stuff when you're not like a regular student that comes in and says hey can I do this and doesn't really have an excuse for it, um...you get to

meet new people and make best friends...it's kind of like our own sorority...you know I don't have to pay for my friends necessarily like some sororities and fraternities like that...but you definitely get to be surrounded with people that have close personalities even though we are all vastly different from each other but you know an athlete's an athlete and usually they all get along and it's just cool to be able to be with a group of girls that have the same interest and the same goals in life as you do to succeed...and we got water [laughs] in the locker room...and even if you don't play and you sit the bench you get a championship ring!...

Jill also sees herself and her teammates as role models for kids who come to the games, camps, and watch them on television. That relationship along with the community service projects that the team does are some things that she feels good about and describes as rewarding.

Well, when we have camps, the parents are always there, they love it, like their kids love it, the parents love it, you know being with DI college athletes...that's like the ultimate for them and it is really like flattering, you don't even have to be like the star athlete, like your name is in the paper, they know who you are, like they love you and they don't even know you. And it's really...I guess flattering, I mean I don't know another word, but sometimes you start to take for granted how much that should mean to you, but when you step back and think about it and realize what a impact you have on those little girls, like try to remember when you were a little girl and you first hated softball and you ended up loving it because it was fun and it was, you know who looked up to, well my age it was like Jessica

Mendoza was like God, the softball god...and like, um...just knowing that those people like that support you so much and also support you so much...

Kendall: Right...

But just knowing that somebody out there appreciates the work that you put in...people like when we do Habitat and stuff um, the people there are really appreciative, and it's like oh it's so awesome that you would take your time out of your day to help with the needy and stuff, it's like really...you know what I'm saying...very...rewarding, yes, there we go...it's just like you feel accomplished having done that like yes, I helped somebody and they just loved you for doing that...and not only is it nice to get that recognition for doing it, but it's awesome to have the opportunity to...if we weren't athletes we probably wouldn't go to the children's hospital and see two year olds who have cancer and stayed in the hospital the past six months and it makes her world light up when you just go and say hi and it's awesome to have that opportunity to be able to do that which you probably wouldn't have if you weren't an athlete.

Jill's experience of being an NCAA Division I softball student-athlete indicates that she has had a variety of relationships. She seems to experience a lot of stress due to the amount of time softball and academics require but likes the perks that are associated with her status of being an NCAA Division I softball student-athlete. She does not appear to believe she has much control over managing her own obligations and time commitments and this is overwhelming, but she feels rewarded when she participates in community service activities and makes a difference for someone. Specific items from Jill's narrative will be highlighted and evaluated in the next chapter relative to the theoretical frameworks used in this study.

Ashley's Narrative

Ashley is a 21 year old junior softball student-athlete at an NCAA Division I university. She has declared Political Science as her major and is African American. Ashley decided that she wanted to play softball in college rather than just focusing on academics or playing another sport which helped her make her college choice. She is happy with her choice even though she was not completely sure to begin with due to the close proximity to her hometown. Ashley also has an older sister who played softball at an NCAA Division II university and she sometimes compares stories. She immediately begins to talk about her travel playing experience relative to college primarily in terms of coaching.

I've been playing softball since I was very young, and I played lots of different sports growing up but I started playing softball first and I always did the best in it. I have two sisters, one older sister who played softball for four years at a DII school and my younger sister is a senior in high school. Um, I went to a private all girls' high school and [pause]... Well, first I decided that I wanted to play softball in college versus just going like the academic route or playing at a smaller level and when it came down after I narrowed my choices, I came here. I really didn't want to come here just because it is so close to where I'm from, it's only like an hour away, and you know I see a lot of people that I went to high school with and people that I know through friends and I just didn't think that's what I wanted but it has turned out that academically and like financially and athletically this was the best fit for me and knew I could always go somewhere else for graduate school.

Kendall: Tell me about your student-athlete experience here at this [NCAA Division I] school.

Well, I think my experience is probably really different from a lot of other people, I guess I was kind of spoiled coming into the program. I had played with the same team for a really really long time, and we were all really good friends off the playing field, and my coach was a really good family friend, he had a daughter on the team, he had a lot invested in the team, um, it was by no means his like way of making a living or anything like that, but he wanted us to succeed as much as he wanted his own kids to succeed, which is something that you don't find everywhere, especially when you get to this level. So, um I guess and I was kind of naive because he always had our best interest in mind and I thought that's like how it was and how it's supposed to be, um I guess I've learned a lot since I got here. I think my freshman year I was really kind of overwhelmed with like how much work was involved, just like physically and mentally, I just wasn't prepared. But you can't prepare for something like this until you actually do it. Um, I think my biggest disappoint my freshman year was that so much value was put into your performance, like I guess your worth to the team or like your worth as like a player or member of the team was put into your performance. So, as a freshman although I did sit the bench it was like I didn't even have to opportunity to perform so it was like I didn't even have the opportunity to like prove I was worth something and if you weren't the star player or weren't like constantly in the line-up you were just kind of like ignored. Or the coach would just send me and some of the other freshmen who weren't playing away to the cage, just to make you like do something or whatever to just get you out of the way kind of

and you didn't really get a lot of coaching, and she says that she wants to treat everyone fairly but it's not so much the case. The coach definitely plays favorites, and it's hard because some people will make a mistake and it will go unnoticed and then other people can make a mistake, and it's not even like just a mistake on the field, like break a rule or not go to class or something like that and it's always held against you, even when a new season comes like time to start over, it's like your past transgressions are held against you. I felt like I had a better connection with my summer coach, being able to tell him stuff and he would use it constructively versus like I don't know, I felt like I kind of took a step backwards, like being treated more like a child, instead of like, and not even like equal, but like an adult. I get really angry sometimes, because I'm like I'm 21 years old, there are people who have careers and lives and stuff that don't revolve around...like this...I don't know...it's really frustrating. Um, I think the coaching is definitely the hardest part to get along with, like I know that she deals with so many different people, but it's really frustrating too because we took these personality tests to show how we are best coached and what motivates you and we fill out all these papers and we put all of our time in it and like be really thoughtful about it and we give it to her and she'll maybe like read it once and then she'll forget about it and go back to treating everyone the same. I think you can't do that because people's different backgrounds and different temperaments and stuff like that, but I know like our coach isn't the only person that we deal with when we're on campus and it seems like everyone else is able to, not like

mold themselves to you, but kind of like compromise a little bit to get out...the best result..if that makes sense...

Ashley compares her youth coach and other members of the university staff whom she interacts with to her coaches by stating that they have treated her with more respect and like an adult and she respects that in return. This was one of the most challenging adjustments that she experienced entering her intercollegiate athletic environment.

Kendall: Earlier you mentioned feeling like you were treated like a child. Can you describe other instances that you have felt like you were being treated like a child and not an adult?

She'll [head coach] put you down a lot, it's like she'll try to hurt your feelings I don't know to try and motivate you or something and I feel like that is really immature and it doesn't work like that especially when you're at this level. Um, I don't know...just the way she treats us so we always feel like worried that we're going to get in trouble, or like we're going to do something to set her off and it all depends on her mood. And we have so many different rules but you're only told like part of the rules and then the rest you have to like pick up as you go along and I guess it's kind of the upper classmen's fault too because you prime the freshmen when they come in to like get ready because it's going to be bad, like we have all of these rules that we have to follow but it's just a way to like make sure that we don't get in trouble...if that makes sense...it's like the seniors did it to me when I was a freshman, and we've been doing it every year to kind of keep the peace but like in that sense I feel like if she really wanted it to be like a business partnership like she always says, it has to operate out of respect not fear that you're going to break the rules or get in trouble or like fear that you're gonna

be embarrassed or like humiliated [talking really fast]. I guess in that way I feel like our relationship is kind of childish.

Kendall: Yeah, so the seniors kind of self-regulate the team?

Yeah, but...like we kind of do it on our own, but I feel like the coaches expect that too, whether they say it or not.

Ashley describes rules and procedures that are stated within her program as well as some that are more like expectations.

She'll go over rules in terms of be on time places like when you have meetings you want to be sure that you have pen and paper, I expect you to come to practice and like practice hard, I expect you to go to class, just like the basic rules that you would pick up you know by yourself being in an academic and athletic situation, but the other rules are kind of like, rules that she doesn't say like um, I expect you to workout on your own extra, like those kind of things, let's see, I'm trying to think, there are so many though. Like stuff she'll just come up with out of nowhere like...[pause]...like in the locker room we would like roll our bags in there and it wasn't until she just felt like one day telling someone 'I don't want you guys rolling your bags in here' and then it becomes like a rule.

Ashley expands on the topic of rules when discussing traveling with the team.

We have rules like not drinking soda, that's one that always gets me, not drinking sodas, but when we are traveling we always have to wear the same thing even if we're on the bus and we're just going to be around us and the only time we see people is like when we get on the bus and when we get off at the hotel, wearing the same thing, having your shirts tucked in, looking presentable which I guess I

understand those things, um we always like sneak food but we're really not supposed to, it's always like kind of under cover like I'm sure she knows we have it but as long as it's out of sight then it's probably ok. Um, what else...we probably, we have like certain seats that we sit in, that's not really [coach's] rule though, it just kind of happens that way, and not so much anymore, but she used to be really big on seniority like to the point that it was ridiculous, like freshmen have to do all the...like freshmen have to carry all these things, which was ok, but then freshmen have to sit like in a certain place on the bus and then they can't get off until all the seniors get off...[pause]

Kendall: Ok...so, tell me about a typical road trip.

Ok, everyone shows up to the clubhouse wearing whatever it was that was designated, we have special travel outfits with special tennis shoes that you can only wear when you travel, which is like 15 times, um so we get there and everyone has their back packs that the bags that they are taking on the bus with them and they claim it and put it on their seat and then um you go and you put your travel bag with your clothes and your personal belongings under the bus and then you have to go check and make sure you get your bat bag and you have all your uniforms if you didn't pack them the night before and you get that stuff and you put them on the bus um and you have like these checklists to make sure you have all your different uniforms and all your different accessories and stuff that you'll need for the games, and um then everyone like files on the bus. The mood on the bus all depends on [the head coach's] mood, so if she's in a good mood then everyone's happy and talking and laughing, then um you know enjoying

themselves and if she's in a bad mood everyone's silent like don't look like you're having fun or like having a conversation or that you're happy basically [laughs], and don't be sleeping...but let's say if we're coming home from a series and we did poorly then our punishment is like watching film or we'll like eat at somewhere that's not very good or if we're getting a lecture she makes us all come up to the front of the bus and sit really close together so she can like see everyone and there's no smiling allowed [laughs]. Um, sometimes she makes us do study hall on the bus and so regardless of whether you have anything to do or not you are just supposed to study and we'll do it for hours at a time um but if she's in a good mood we'll watch movies. Um...so that's like if we're traveling on the bus, and then once we get off the bus, if we're going to the airport then there's just a lot of technicalities that comes with having to check the bags, but then everybody files off and gets your equipment bag and your clothes bag and you kind of go through the line.

Kendall: Ok, what is a day in the hotel like?

At the hotel she controls like every aspect of your life. You would think that if you had a night game you'd have like some kind of free time, but you have none because you have to get up at a certain time. I mean you'll have like a night game but breakfast will be at like 9:00am and then immediately after that you have film or something where we'll talk about the opposing and the game plan and you'll go back to your room for like an hour and then it'll be study hall, so you have study hall until lunch so then you go back down at noon and then by that time is when you like order whatever meal you want later or something like that and then by

that time because we prepare for the game so far in advance it's time for the bus to pull out, so it's like every aspect of your day is on a strict schedule so she always knows what you're doing, so even like after the game you'll go eat somewhere then you have to turn in your uniforms and then you like go to bed and you get up and do it again the next day.

Ashley describes home games as being very similar in terms of the schedule for pregame events and meals.

Home games depending on how the series is it will be similar to that. You'll come in for 9:00am breakfast about, it depends on game time, um and once you're there for breakfast then she'll come and give you a pep talk. Usually if we play the team the day before, and we have available film, then we'll watch film of our game that we just played. Um, but then everyone is kind of like...it's kind of like an unspoken rule that you're supposed to stay around. I don't think anyone ever said like you're not allowed to go home or you're not allowed to leave, but we are all just staying waiting around for the game to start. So, you like go to breakfast, pep talk or film and then we head over to the field and I still feel kind of leery about like watching TV or something before games, not that I think it's going to throw my focus off but I think that she thinks it's going to throw my focus off and so she's going to be really upset if she comes in at like 10:00am and we don't even start warming up until 11:00am and we're like playing the XBox or whatever when she has no clue what we would be doing if we were at home, like half of us would probably still be in bed. Um, so we hang at the clubhouse and then you'll get dressed and if you have like some kind of injury you'll go see the

trainer before hand and then you get all of your stuff out and go to the dugout and that's when we start our warm up with [the strength and conditioning coach] and getting ready to play, so that's when all of the physical stuff starts.

Kendall: ...and then game, and what happens after the game?

Again depending on how we do, we have a post game meeting, but usually after the game you shake the other teams hand and gather your stuff up, um clean up the dugout and then have a short meeting and a post game meal. That part is getting pretty strict, because we had uh well depending on if we win or lose, we would come out of the dugout and so if we're coming off of a good win then we take pictures and get to talk to your family and stuff, but if we're coming off a bad win then everyone, not like don't look sad, but don't be happy, don't talk to your family like just go in and basically eat our post game meal in silence but other than that she wants you all to be there like the meal's all together there so you have to like come in and everyone gets their food and sits down, and you don't have to stay til everyone leaves, but you have to stay for a while and she wants it to really be like a team togetherness thing...and I guess turn in your uniform and stuff and leave.

In reflecting on her experiences thus far, Ashley has advice for incoming student-athletes regarding how to handle the socialization process.

I guess the best thing that I could tell a freshman is do what you're supposed to do and as a freshman it's like the worst thing is to get in trouble because when you get in trouble then you get your whole team in trouble and then everybody on your team is really kind of like hostile towards you and really when you get here

all you want is like someone to like accept you so you can like be a part of it...so I guess try to fly under the radar when it comes to doing things that are looked down upon...but there's like also too, you have to develop this certain sense of like apprehension...does that make sense...like about being late. I would show up places like workouts, we had workouts at 6:20am and I'm like showing up at 5:50am for workouts just because it's like I'd rather be here 30 minutes early than to risk the chance of being one or two minutes late and having like the most severe punishment. Like always do things like you think that she's there because she'll just show up or spy on you from like up in the press box or something [laughs] to make sure that you're like doing what you're supposed to, so it's like you have to get that. I know like that the beginning of this year we had a real issue because our freshmen weren't like developing it, and it's not like you say you have to have this, it's just something that happens and it's like the way things are so...

Kendall: Um, so as far as the advice, develop this sense...

I don't know, like always do the right thing because you never know who's going to be there. It's funny [laughs] too because we'll be like in the locker room talking and somebody will make a joke about [head coach] and it will get really quite and everyone will like look around and make sure she's not around, and like I was eating lunch with Courtney and Megan and we were in the locker room and it was just like the three of us and we were the only three there besides like the managers and Megan said something about her and then she like stopped and started making a joke about how there's probably a video camera in the picture over there

[laughs], like she's probably recording you right now...and she knew you just had this whole conversation about like what would you'd do if she really was recording you, and she was like 'oh I thought I would just tell her oh I thought it was there and I was just testing it out to see if you would really listen to it' [laughs] or something like that. And especially with cameras like all over the field like people are just like worried that like you know when they don't think that they're being watched that they really are and that like coach really is like monitoring them when they don't think they're being watched.

Ashley laughs a lot about this surveillance and as she talks about her sister's experience at her NCAA Division II school as well as the structure that they both experienced with their respective coaches.

Well, my sister said that her coach is crazy, like [laughs] we were talking about my coach coming out of nowhere and she was talking about how her coach used to like hide in the bushes outside of their dorm and try to catch people coming in late for curfew like if you had an 11:00pm curfew and someone come in at 11:01pm she would jump out of the bushes and be like I got you, you're late [laughing]. So, I don't know. She was also telling me about how um, the assistant coach, she always get the assistant to be like a former player who I guess is like the favorite or whatever, but um, one of them put some like BC powder in a bag and like had it in her office or something and so the coach like freaks out and calls the assistant coach and tells her that there are drugs in there and they're trying to frame me and get me fired and all this stuff [laughing], so she must know that she's crazy and like the assistant coach is like what are you talking about, but she

has to know that she's bad if she can come up like conjure this idea that they would actually like buy drugs and plant them in her office to get her fired and like that's insane...[laughing]

Ashley describes her experience overall playing NCAA Division I softball as a learning experience that she is glad she pursued and believes the transferable skills will be good for her long term, yet she has little desire to pursue a career in the sport.

I am telling this guy like in my class like about, well I come in there every day looking like trash in my softball stuff, so I was telling him about playing and stuff and he asked me 'oh like are you going to like go play pro or go to the Olympics and stuff' and all I could think is like oh hell no, I'm like no I'm not good enough but even if I were I'm like I'm done, this has killed it for me. I've been doing this since I was like six years old but it's never been as strenuous as it is now, and I was joking with my mom like every year I'm at [school] I feel like I age like three years so it's like I'm really like 30. So, I mean I'm glad I did it, I'm glad I came here 'cause I've learned a lot about myself and I've learned a lot about the kind of person I want to be and the kind of person I don't want to be and, I've learned a lot about what I can endure um, I mean I could have maybe gone somewhere else and had a happier experience and maybe not have learned so much but I mean overall, I look back and think this is gonna be good for me in the long run.

Ashley seemed to worry extensively about her position with the coaches and the perception of her as a student-athlete. She initially expressed being torn about choosing academics or NCAA Division I softball. She found that at her school, she could pursue her ambition in the classroom and grow personally through the balancing of both academics and athletics. Specific items from

Ashley's narrative will be highlighted and evaluated in the next chapter relative to the theoretical frameworks used in this study.

Kendall's Narrative – The Researcher

Given my research interest in the concept of total institution and disciplinary power as related to the experience of NCAA Division I softball student-athletes, I am not only interested, but also had some assumptions and pre-conceived ideas of what the social control mechanisms were and how they manifested themselves in the day-to-day and overall experience of the participants. Additionally, I expect that my experiences influenced the data in some facets; however, the story that the participants told both supported some of my previous inclinations and brought new issues to the surface. What follows is my interpretation of how my voice shaped the data set for this project and a description of my experience of conducting this research.

I was a member of the support staff for an NCAA Division I softball team for four years; therefore, I asked certain questions to probe specific topics and used certain language and terminology that was common to me and the participants. Specifically, I was able to shape the interview protocol so that each question's answer would lead into another and touch on topics that were relevant to my research question. By asking about a typical day, the hotel, waived rights, and the rules, I elicited a lot of data that resonated with my research question. Also, terminology such as "watching film" or "front toss" may be a sport specific concept, but we were both able to understand what it meant; and when they said "and stuff" or "you know" at the end or middle of a statement I was understanding it as other things that were similar to the previously mentioned topic.

As a manager for my particular program for two years I felt that I experienced a lot of the same things that these participants described. I felt that my time was consumed and that I had

little control over the events that were taking up my days and I had often wondered if the student-athletes would articulate similar experiences. Additionally, now that I have coached and become an administrator at the NCAA Division II level, I am more aware of and concerned for the interests of the student-athletes and was curious to their awareness of some of the control mechanisms. Conducting the interviews, I felt that the participants believed I was willing to listen and somewhat able understand their perspective which at times led them into long monologues.

As a former college student-athlete, graduate assistant, coach, and now administrator, I was very intrigued by the differences and similarities discussed by the participants for different programs. They often described common schedules and tactics implemented by their respective coaches, yet their reactions and attitudes toward them were somewhat varied. I felt this could be for a variety of reasons, whether personality, background, playing time, or other factors. I found the commonalities across universities interesting as I believe it is a reflection of the accepted grand narratives of successful coaching.

My experience in conducting this research was very similar to my daily experiences interacting with student-athletes at the NAIA/Division II level. The participants were reluctant to respond to my initial email and I speculate it is partially because they were not required or told to do it by an authority and partially because the letter was too long and they lost attention reading it (I may have had a better response “tweeting” at them), yet once I was able to talk to them they were willing to answer my questions in great detail. However, as detailed as their responses were only one of the participants really expanded on her feelings about her situation while the others stated them very matter-of-fact and seemed to just say ‘this is the way it is.’ For instance, none of them was concerned about the HIPPA and FERPA rights they waived when signing their

National Letter of Intent, they just did it because it was necessary to play college softball. I truly enjoyed listening and analyzing the experiences of these student-athletes from across different backgrounds and programs and have gained myself from this experience.

CHAPTER V:

DISCUSSION

“We can wear anything we want as long as it’s U. University and Nike.”

~Kim (Study Participant)

Introduction

The student-athletes’ narratives in this study depict environments where they experience formalized relationships of power and structure within their institutions and are limited in social interactions outside of softball, and although at times this situation is frustrating, they seemingly accept the arrangements as an expected part of the culture and thankful for their opportunity. Each participant’s story is unique, yet excerpts that describe various mechanisms of social control emerge from them all. The introducing statement above from Kim illustrates perfectly the power dynamics that are discussed in this section. As a student-athlete, she is told exactly what to wear by coaches and administrators at her institution, yet she feels empowered to make that personal decision on her own. A discussion incorporating the narratives presented in the previous chapter, existing literature from sport studies regarding social control, and the theoretical framework of Goffman’s (1961) total institution and Foucault’s (1979/1995) disciplinary power expands understanding of the issues of power, social control, and empowerment within the context of NCAA Division I softball. The specific topics explored include the creation of docile bodies, institutional arrangements, socialization of the student-athlete within the culture, positioning within a unit, observation, examination, and the integration of life activities.

Docile Bodies and Obligatory Participants

Participants in this study display characteristics of what Foucault refers to as docile bodies and Goffman as obligatory participants; definitions of each are provided followed by

examples from sport studies and the data of this study. Foucault (1979/1995) asserts that every body, in every society is confined by “strict powers, which impose upon it constraints, prohibitions or obligations” (p. 136). In contemporary society, these societal impositions of disciplinary power function within a narrow scale of control, where the efficiency of bodily movements is the object of control and constant coercion and supervision is the modality (Foucault, 1979/1995). Through these meticulous methods, or disciplines, the body is constantly subjected to forces that lead to the institutional goal of “docility-utility” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 137). In short, by being attentive to the details and the efficiency of bodily movements through rigorous evaluation, individuals are subjected to disciplinary power. The precision of these exercises is intended to increase the productivity of the individuals and the group. From this perspective, power then has the potential to be both repressive and progressive, which is the basis of the concept of docility. Statements from Jill illustrate how this concept applies to her experience as she stated that, “your day starts out scheduled and it ends scheduled” but she goes on to say that upon graduation she believes she “will have a lot better time management than other people might.” She is subjected to the technique of scheduling, but the experience progresses her ability to manage her time.

A docile body as defined by Foucault (1979/1995) is one that can be “subjected, used, transformed, and improved;” and it can be found at the nexus where the “analyzable body meets the manipulable body” (p. 136). The docile body is the derivative of a schema of disciplines that advocate the importance of detailed movement and surveillance in order to create highly functioning, trainable, and useful human beings. Discipline may accordingly be ‘reduced’ to a “political anatomy” that produces “precise instruments for the calculation of the infinitely small” elements of human activity within a social institution (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 139). Foucault

(1979/1995) provides a description of four methods, which used together have the effect of creating docile bodies; distributing bodies in space, controlling activity, organizing time, and combining forces; where paying close attention to details is emphasized as a significant characteristic of all four methods. In sum, the distribution of individuals works by partitioning them into functional spaces where they may be constantly located; the control of activity centers around maximizing the efficiency of specific movements within the overall chronology of the task; the organization of time refers to the analytical progression from one task in a series to the next; and the combination of forces is when the trained individual becomes part of a functioning machine (Foucault, 1979/1995).

Goffman (1961) also provides four criteria of institutional systems that can lead to docility or obligatory participation; being similarly located under the same authority, moving as a group, following a pre-arranged schedule, all with the purpose of meeting the institutional goal. Within the structure of NCAA Division I softball, coaches dictate a wide range of skills and activities of student-athletes, thus the formal institutional arrangements present in NCAA Division I softball provide a disciplinary mechanism for the social control of student-athletes with the official goal of winning athletic contests as representatives of the university (Goffman, 1961). Therefore, a connection may be developed between the conception of total institutions and intercollegiate athletics based on “the closed (and close-knit) nature of the athletic world, the total care environment experienced by athletes, and the continual surveillance under which athletes find themselves” (Birrell & Donnelly, 2004, p. 57-58). Student-athletes, especially those who compete in team sports may gain a strong sense of camaraderie and friendship through the relationships they have with teammates and special bonds may form as a result of the amount of time spent together. Both Kim and Jill express gratitude for the friends they have made through

softball and Kim states that her only friends at college are her teammates and other student-athletes. Also, by providing resources such as residence halls, cafeterias, study halls, and doctors on site, as well as coaches continually locating and supervising student-athletes through a complex network of disciplinary technologies, university athletic departments and coaches appear to be creating a sense of total institution.

From Goffman's (1961) perspective, the methods by which inmates become re-socialized into their new selves and their new world are referred to as primary and secondary adjustments. Primary adjustments occur "when an individual cooperatively contributes required activity to an organization under [the] required conditions [and] becomes a cooperator, the 'normal,' 'programmed,' or built-in member (Goffman, 1961, p. 188-189). This type of acceptance of one's situation within an institution is typically found when the individual enters voluntarily and is "officially asked to be no more and no less than what he is prepared to be" (Goffman, 1961, p. 189). Kim explained that she was honored to be playing softball at her school, and that she was "totally fine" with waiving some of her autonomy. Secondary adjustments are "practices that do not directly challenge staff but allow inmates to obtain forbidden satisfactions" (Goffman, 1961, p. 54). An inmate who is assigned to the kitchen taking a left over sandwich and the laundry worker washing his own clothes daily are examples of secondary adjustments made within a total institution (Goffman, 1961). Such adaptations represent how inmates learn their new way of living and working through informal controls, i.e. how they come to "know the ropes" (Goffman, 1961, p. 54). Ashley's story about sneaking food undercover on the bus exemplifies a secondary adjustment from the data. Goffman (1961) identifies four individual adaptation techniques that are often employed by inmates. Situational regression is when an inmate refuses attention to anything "except events immediately around his body" (p. 61); intransigent line is a coping

mechanism where the inmate will not cooperate with staff to directly “challenge the institution” (p. 62); colonization occurs when the inmate “builds a contented existence [using] the maximum satisfactions procurable within the institution” (p. 62); and conversion is an adaptation where the inmate accepts the official view of him as his own and “tries to act out the role of the perfect inmate” by becoming more “disciplined and moralistic” (p. 63). Goffman (1961) notes that throughout their careers, inmates may fluctuate between these modes of social adjustment as their attitudes about the institution and the self evolve. These adjustments combine to create the social system that defines the “underlife,” or the unofficial normalized behaviors that are present in the respective institution (Goffman, 1961). Based on the literature and the data from this study, colonization and conversion are adaptations that occur within intercollegiate athletics (Hawkins, 2010).

Primary and secondary adjustments may be observed within the context of competitive athletics where the individuals are in large part informally socialized by learning the ropes from teammates and formally socialized to “exhibit commitment and attachment” to the organization (Goffman, 1961, p. 173). Ashley discussed “priming the freshmen” to the culture of her program which was like a tradition that was continually passed on, while formal socialization occurs through signing scholarship agreements and thus, submitting to the rules of the program. This expression of commitment is a highly valued quality in the arena of athletics, and is significant in college athletics because of the perception that “members in an organization voluntarily cooperate because of joint values through which the interests of the organization and the individual member coalesce” (Goffman, 1961, p. 178). However, as Goffman (1961) describes, the university athletic department “does not merely use the activity of its members,” but it also defines “officially appropriate standards of welfare, joint values, incentives, and penalties” (p.

179). Thus, participation of the student-athlete is not always strictly voluntary; as all participants indicated needs such as apparel, food, and lodging are met, and scholarships are provided as incentives. These standards “expand a mere participation contract into a definition of the participant’s nature or social being” (Goffman, 1961, p. 179). Once all the stipulations regarding commitment and social attachment are tacked on to the scholarship contract, or National Letter of Intent, that the NCAA Division I softball student-athlete signs it becomes more than a simple business transaction. Ultimately, they have become subject to the social control of the institution with their coach being the “attendant.” In Goffman’s (1961) words, the student-athlete’s “obligation is to be visibly engaged at appropriate times in the activity of the organization, which entails a mobilization of attention and muscular effort, a bending of oneself to the activity at hand” (p. 176). The subsequent “loss of self-determination” seems to lead to the student-athlete into demonstrating that she has reached a point of “personal inefficacy” (Goffman, 1961, p. 44), and that he is willing to surrender himself to the team and coaches, or complete the “conversion” adjustment. Jill explained that “you have to do everything a certain way at a certain time with certain people...and if you have a meal plan you have to eat in the athletic department dining hall;” thus, although they are not confined within a walled edifice these student-athletes day-to-day lives are subjected to institutional arrangements.

The precise functioning of the human body is inherently necessary in athletics as it must be used to perform actions that pertain to the specific game. As Cole, Giardina, and Andrews (2004) explain, the grid of discipline present in athletic settings “creates docile bodies: controlled, healthy, and regulated bodies, bodies whose training extends their capacity and usefulness” (p. 212). The power dynamics common to athletics, position the coach as the teacher analyzing the movements of the student-athlete in order to increase their operating speed and

efficiency. As Rinehart (1998) describes the power relation between a swimmer and her coach, he cites the imposed repetition, the minute analysis of stroke and pace, and the rhythmic breathing patterns as ways these control mechanisms are imposed upon the student-athlete's body. Also, the mention of extensive film work and mirror work parallel the training techniques used in other competitive sports (Rinehart, 1998). It is thus deduced that "discipline devours spontaneity" and the amount a "student practiced or not [becomes] a test for moral fortitude" (Rinehart, 1998, p. 43). These regimented practices limit how the student-athletes express themselves and seemingly stifle their uniqueness in every way except in the particular skill that is their most useful physical tool for performance. However, Foucault maintains that these student-athletes' bodies remain sites of possible resistance even though it is "unpredictable and hegemony is precarious" (Bordo, 2003, p. 262). Bordo (2003) explains this dynamic of the coach's dominance versus the student-athlete's potential resistance by stating that, "the fact that power is not held by any *one* does not mean that it is equally held by *all*" (p. 262, emphasis original). Several of the practices observed by Rinehart (1998) in swimming are replicated in the game of softball. Student-athletes are distributed by defensive assignments and position in the offensive batting order; their activity is controlled based on certain drills assigned by the coach; the order of the drills are similarly organized based on the specific skills the coach thinks need work, beginning with fundamentals and moving to more complex movements; and the team is combined to work on scenarios where all individuals may be involved, such as team defense or squeeze bunting situations. Kim provided the example of her head coach insisting on her hitting front toss with him rather than hitting off of the graduate assistant throwing live pitching because he did not want to relinquish authority to the student-athlete or graduate assistant to dictate the needs of the player.

The structural applications of Foucault's analysis of how docile bodies are created are equally significant to the context of athletics. In studying the development of athletic stadiums, Bale (1993) interprets Foucault's two poles of bio-power to be disciplinary and regulatory. The former includes training techniques and architecture that result in coerced bodies, and the latter pole includes "containment and surveillance" controls (Bale, 1993, p. 122). He concludes that the evolution of British football rules to include more strict boundaries, the clubs further separating and segregating spectators from each other, and an increase in seating and ticketing in stadiums leading to docile bodied fans are modern characteristics of athletics in which power for certain individuals or groups is derived via methods of social control (Bale, 1993). He further compares the modern stadium to the Great Confinement by positing that these rationalized, "unobtrusive" characteristics of modern athletics have led to a decrease in spontaneity and seem to be "restricting rather than enlightening," resulting in the "antithesis of play and freedom" (Bale, 1993, p. 128). Yet, as Foucault (1984) explains in his analysis of the Great Confinement, this modern rationalization of stadium arrangements assigns a purpose to each section, "thus making them contribute to the prosperity for all" (p. 133); i.e. each fan is expected to serve a function in the overall atmosphere of the game and stadium experience, just as student-athletes and coaches.

More specific to the athlete, in a study focusing on weight management by elite athletes in individual sports, Johns and Johns (2000) reference certain uniforms and socially expected images associated with the norms of each sport; however, the primary discourses of power are described as coming from coaches who are given the power of expertise in the sporting domain. These perceptions of expertise and knowledge give coaches nearly unlimited power over student-athletes, who in turn unquestionably comply with the controlled lifestyle which has become

normalized as the process of preparation (Johns & Johns, 2000). These powers, as Foucault (1979/1995) speculated can be enabling as well as inhibiting. If the student-athlete does not overconform to the cultural norms, reaching an unhealthy point, then their performance and life may be enhanced through the discipline of adhering to an organized set of practices designed to elicit the highest performance. However, when student-athletes prescribe to the extreme norms of the sport ethic they are often doing so due to the expert discourse of the coach and the self-induced ideal image produced by their sport, the image of those student-athletes who have been successful (Coakley, 2007). Jill somewhat joking says,

You know, if you're too fat, lose weight, if you're too skinny, gain weight, I mean there's like a rule on your weight because I've been told one season I was too big and the next season I was too little, so I guess she needs to put me on a diet too [laughs].

They perceive that a self-transformation, primarily physical, will lead to the achievement of their goal within their competitive field so they submit to the disciplinary control of the coach. Paskus (2008) reported that Division I softball student-athletes spend an average of 37.1 hours per week on their sport and 38.5 hours per week on academics; however, when the participants were asked almost one-third of the females indicated that they “would prefer to spend even more time on athletics” (p. 18).

These student-athletes' compliance and productivity is explained through Foucault's (1979/1995) idea of the docile body and Goffman's (1961) concept of the obligatory participant. The student-athlete reaches a point where they feel obligated to their university, coach, teammates, and self to reach the highest level of performance possible; and this point is where they become self-regulating because the disciplinary power is perceived to be omnipresent.

Goffman (1961) discusses that in many total institutions patients become “over engrossed” in certain activities, thus exhibiting “overcommitment to an establishment” (p. 311-312). He speculates that the secondary adjustment of over pursuing an activity represents some personal satisfaction for the patient (Goffman, 1961, p. 313). For example, a student-athlete striving for elite levels of performance will gain a sense of achievement through constant pursuit of success. In short, student-athletes justify ‘voluntary’ compliance with coaches’ demands and expectations because of the coaches’ perceived knowledge and their own internalization of the accepted norm (Hughes & Coakley, 1991; Johns & Johns, 2000). Knowledge equates to power and control (Caputo & Yount, 1993), which is illustrated in how coaches can essentially push these student-athletes to extremes of the sport, justify it by calling it preparation for high level performance, and ultimately these extreme images and training regimens become the norm (Johns & Johns, 2000). Therefore, these athletes are being obedient and useful in reaching the goal of the coach or institution. Although intercollegiate athletics is regulated by governing bodies (i.e. NCAA) in terms of length and number of practices, the same discourses of power and tendencies toward normalizing are present. Preparation for top performances is no less paramount and the games and student-athletes are certainly subjected to the gaze of the public as well as their coaches. Consequently, this creates a vicious circle where it is believed that implementing increasingly invasive and repressive systems of social control on student-athletes will reduce deviance and dangerous behaviors, when in reality keeping them in a “perpetual state of adolescence” will actually make them more susceptible to control and thus, lead to internalizing the characteristics of the sport ethic (Hughes & Coakley, 1991, p. 325). Ashley comparison of her relationship with her youth coach to her college coach is indicative:

I felt like I had a better connection with my summer coach, being able to tell him stuff and he would use it constructively versus like I don't know, I felt like I kind of took a step backwards, like being treated more like a child, instead of like, and not even like equal, but like an adult.”

Furthermore, the loss of the ability to make decisions for oneself that may initially lead to “high levels of anxiety” can ultimately lead to a loss of competence in seemingly trivial social behaviors due to a lapse in time (Goffman, 1961, p. 48). The control of her time makes Jill anxious as she describes being stressed because “there is no time for laundry or to shower or do dishes or go to the grocery store or go to the store and get anything that you need from day-to-day.”

Institutional Arrangements: Distributions in Space and Control of Activity

Patients may enter mental institutions either willingly or unwillingly; whereas most young people entering college as a student-athlete, even though sometimes influenced by parents and coaches, are entering under their own volition. However, aside from the initial acceptance of illness, regardless of whether an individual is pressured or forced by significant others or if they consent to admission to the formally organized establishment, the changes they experience in their moral career are likely to be similar (Goffman, 1961). Goffman (1961) describes the socialization processes that occur to inmates due to the alienating change in their environment as the “mortification of the self,” which is followed by “reorganizing influences [and] inmate responses” that collectively result in a “cultural milieu” representative of each institution (p. 70). As Goffman (1961) describes, the recruit comes to the institution with a self-concept that has been created through certain existing “stable social arrangements in his home world;” and then “upon entrance, he is immediately stripped of the support provided by these arrangements” (p.

14). The student-athlete entering the university is placed in an entirely new environment void of family and old friends. This move essentially leaves the student-athlete dependent upon coaches and upper classmen to help guide them into this venture, or acclimate them to the enviroing social climate. The following excerpt from Ashley's story illustrates:

I was kind of naive because [my travel coach] always had our best interest in mind and I thought that's like how it was and how it's supposed to be, um I guess I've learned a lot since I've, you know, I got here. I think my freshman year I was really kind of overwhelmed with like how much work was involved, just like physically, physically and mentally, I just wasn't prepared. But you can't prepare for something like this until you actually do it.

This disconnection between the individual and their support structures is the first major step in becoming acclimated to the arrangements of the institution (Goffman, 1961). Specific examples described by the participants in this study include rules that disallow the use of cell phones at certain times while travelling; rules that mandate "visitation time" for parents on away trips; and rules that ask parents to choose food and lodging accommodations different from the teams. Goffman (1961) explains that these short, punctuated visits in the initial year may be counterproductive and "temporarily strengthen [the student-athlete's] feelings of abandonment" (138). Thus, although they are not completely deprived of interaction with family and friends, the amount of contact likely deviates enough that there will be a necessary change in the perception of self for student-athletes. Kim describes her social experience as follows:

I guess my social time...that would have to be if you passed by somebody you may talk to them or texting people would be it...like social time would be you know like that...the only friends I could say I had were my softball team and

other teammates...or other teams that I saw where I was at...and its really kind of awkward if you think about it because it's like you don't know no body in school unless you're in class with them or that's about it.

Student-athlete acclimation in the context of NCAA Division I softball is punctuated by examples of their functional distribution, control of their activity, scheduling, combined forces, and an overarching theme of minute details which ultimately lead to docility and compliance (Foucault, 1979/1995; Goffman, 1961). First, spaces should be enclosures that constitute “protected places of disciplinary monotony” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 141). In the context of Division I softball, team clubhouses, locker rooms, home fields, and dugouts are examples of these protected places. Foucault (1979/1995) describes the workshop protection by stating that, an authority “will open the gates only on the return of the workers” (p. 142). Similarly, in the participants’ programs, only student-athletes and staff are allowed in the team clubhouses and on the fields, and this is only during the hours of practices and competitions, during which the modes of discipline are imposed. Further, these spaces would be divided according to function and use where “each individual has his own space” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 143) and according to the level of necessary supervision (p. 145). Within the setting of a Division I softball clubhouse, these dividing practices are seen with the partitioning of coaches’ offices, athletic training space, film rooms, and team locker rooms, where locker rooms are further subdivided into a space for each player. Within the game, players are assigned to certain defensive and offensive positions based on their particular skill. The layout of the stadium and batting cages is typically such that players can be supervised by coaches from a variety of locations. Each player is “assigned a place that corresponds to the function of each individual and to [her] value as a combatant in the unitary group of [her team],” and therefore, contributes to the success or failure

of the team (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 146). These players are assigned positions, such as lead-off batter and centerfield based on rank, or position on the depth chart. In the same way, the team is ranked within the conference and nation each week based on level of success. These practices of dividing and ranking are the base “conditions for control and use of an ensemble and its distinct elements” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 149).

The control of activity may be considered the foundation of control mechanisms in Division I softball. Time-tables, chronological development of movements, efficient manipulation of an object, and maximization of time are Foucault’s (1979/1995) criteria for defining how the disciplines control activity. The act of hitting in softball provides a good demonstration of how the disciplines are imposed directly on the body. The student-athlete must efficiently manipulate the bat by swinging with their arms and hands, while simultaneously stepping and using their hips, legs, and torso to contact the ball. The student-athlete must be able to correlate the timing of these movements with the pitch by utilizing their hand-eye coordination. At the competitive level of Division I softball, the precise movements beginning at the most miniscule point of how to stand properly are broken down and built back up by coaches and players because the slightest inefficiency in a swing will decrease the success of an individual batter and ultimately their team. Jill and Kim reference minute fundamentals they worked on such as a “negative movement” and “closed hips.” Drills begin very fundamental and move toward the complex, with each one being “repetitive and different, but always graduated” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 161).

In 17th century factories, time-tables divided the workday based on activity and in elementary schools signals such as bells signified when to move from one activity to the next (Foucault, 1979/1995). For Goffman (1961), formally imposed regimentation of the entire unit of

individuals is how institutional goals are accomplished. The typical daily schedule described by the participants exemplifies the structure that is present within their settings and resonates with the theoretical frameworks of Goffman and Foucault. Kim's describes her day as follows:

Wake up about 7:00 in the morning, early morning workouts with conditioning afterwards, um...go straight to class um I only get 30 minutes for lunch and so go straight to another class and after that take the bus down straight to the field, have about 45 minutes to get dressed and then we have about a three hour practice, right after practice I have two tutors a day so that's two hours and I then that took...I got done about 8:30-9:00pm...so that was my typical day...

With this type of organized structure, "temporal norms" are imposed on everyone at the same time while they are working on "different, but ordered activities" in order to achieve an institutional goal (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 154; Goffman, 1961). The seriated progression from minute, fundamental skills to combined movements within the system, both in each practice and within the whole year is indicative of Foucault's (1979/1995) organization of geneses where student-athletes are "organized according to an analytical plan" (p. 158). Within this structure, coaches orchestrate the activities of student-athletes from the smallest movement in their swing to the time that they eat dinner, thus "power is articulated directly onto time; it assures its control and guarantees its use" (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 160); and it has "access to their bodies, their gestures and all their daily actions" (Foucault, 1980, p. 152).

The Welcome and Combining and Positioning Forces within a Unit

Foucault (1979/1995) discusses the composition of forces as a component in the creation of docile bodies while Goffman (1961) describes a welcoming process and standardization of the unit, which are commonly viewed as imperative in the success of an athletic team. Not only must

each individual function as a disciplined body, all team members must work as a disciplined unit situated by the coaches. Such a “carefully measured combination of forces requires a precise system of command” that includes “prearranged codes” directed “from the master of discipline” to the subjects (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 166). In a Division I softball game, such a codified system can be equated to sets of offensive, defensive, and pitching signs. Each of these types of signals is typically communicated through hand gestures or a number system from a coach to a player, or a set of players depending upon the situation at the given time. For example, if there is a runner on first base, the coach of the offensive team may give the batter the sign to take a pitch (not to swing) and the runner the sign to steal; meanwhile the coach of the defensive team may signal for a pitch-out. In this scenario, both coaches are able to conduct the actions of the players on the field by using signals understood by everyone involved in the system. Ultimately, in high performance softball, coaches not only direct the fundamental actions of the student-athletes, but also their day-to-day schedules throughout the academic year. This excerpt from Jill’s narrative is a vivid description of her experience:

There’s a rule on your entire life...basically, because for one your day starts out scheduled and it ends scheduled...and...you know, the rule is you’re on time you’re early, you never miss anything, so everything is planned...[pause]...and it’s just one big rule...everything you do is a rule, you have to do everything a certain way at a certain time...with certain people...[pause]...and if you have a meal plan you have to eat in [athletic department cafeteria] for lunch because they pay for it or you’ll get in trouble if you go get taco bell for lunch instead of going to [athletic department cafeteria]...[pause]...you have to wear the same thing as everyone else...[pause]

These regulatory practices in turn lead to the docility of the student-athletes in their productivity and usefulness for their team, coach, and institution.

Similarly, Goffman (1961) describes a series of possible mortification processes that occur as the student-athlete is immersed into the culture. In civil society, individuals may have a variety of roles that do not necessarily interact with each other, for example one's private life and her work life may never intermingle. They are also accorded the privilege of making fundamental choices regarding the nature of their work, food, schedule, clothing, intimate friends, and entertainment. Contrastingly, in a total institution, the loss of the privilege to make such decisions about one's actions is referred to as a mortification process that leads to the loss, defacement, and embarrassment of the patient's imagery of the self (Goffman, 1961). There are a variety of mechanisms imposed by total institutions that are components of this process designed to break the patient down, including the symbolic "admissions procedures and obedience tests" (Goffman, 1961, p. 18). These procedures include the standard issue of clothing, a physical and mental evaluation, and the positioning of the patient within a unit of others to move collectively (Goffman, 1961).

Goffman (1961) describes the beginning of this process within a total institution as "the welcome" where each recruit is provided with a "standard issue uniform" (p. 18-19); and then the natural process is to be grouped together and treated alike hence forth (p. 6). Similarly, in Division I softball, it is common for student-athletes to be issued practice, competition, and travel gear such as uniforms, cleats, luggage and equipment bags, shorts, tee shirts, travel suits, and jackets; as well as equipment and accessories including bats, gloves, visors, wristbands, and sunglasses. "Some of these items technically remain the property of the institution while they are possessed by the individual and they will be recalled at regular intervals" (Goffman, 1961, p.

19). It is expressed to these student-athletes that they are always representing the university athletic department and that they should always be dressed in the appropriate attire as directed by the coaching staff. The participants explained that each player must wear the proper cleats, socks, pants, and tee shirt for practice and workouts each day and Jill mentioned that their shirts must be tucked in. Ashley explains, “everyone shows up to the clubhouse wearing whatever it was that was designated...we have special travel outfits with special tennis shoes that you can only wear when you travel, which is like 15 times.” These detailed standards of dress limit the self expression for student-athletes and may lead to further shifts in their identity of self. However, the participants see the gear as a perk of being a student-athlete at their institutions and the uniformity is so ingrained that Kim stated, “we can wear anything we want as long as it is U. University and Nike.”

Finally, as part of the multitude of directed conduct, the management of a total institution requires inmates to “perform [all] regulated activity in unison with other inmates” and they are constantly subject to an “echelon authority” (Goffman, 1961, p. 42). This echelon authority basically means that any staff member can discipline the inmates (Goffman, 1961). As previously described, Division I softball student-athletes must perform regulated activities together on and off the field on a daily basis. This expectation of unison extends to road trips as well. In addition to the standard clothing, meals, practices and games, everyone must be present for things such as film sessions, study hall, and room checks at the appointed times. The echelon authority translates to this context in terms of the number of staff members with varying roles to whom each student-athlete must remain accountable. Included in the regimented daily schedule cited previously are what amount to checkpoints, or individuals other than the coaches who are employed by the university in various capacities to ensure the overall productivity of student-

athletes. Academic advisors, athletic trainers, professors, strength and conditioning coaches, sport psychologists, and nutritionists are examples of people who serve as observers of student-athlete behavior, further extending the web of power. This process of uniformly standardizing everyone is yet another means of impacting the individual's sense of personal identity. For instance, everyone wearing the same thing, tucking their shirts in all of the time, eating meals together, the expectation that everyone will do everything together, and the emphasis on unity can be instrumental in transforming an individual's personal identity.

Observation, Examination, and Normalization

Disciplinary power creates docile bodies through certain means of training (Foucault, 1979/1995). These specific training tactics are implemented into a system where the characteristics of discipline, as described in the previous section are present. The disciplinary mechanisms that create docile bodies are more effective when the principles of hierarchical observation, constant examination, and normalization are imposed (Foucault, 1979/1995). These technologies of power demonstrate that controlling movement and activity alone are not sufficient; rather individuals will work more effectively if they are under continuous surveillance and subject to evaluative procedures (Foucault, 1979/1995). The emphasis is that being seen will “induce the effects of [disciplinary] power” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 171). Foucault (1980) further explains that “immersing people in a field of total visibility where the opinion, observation and discourse of others would restrain them from harmful acts” is an effective discipline (p. 153). Historically, techniques such as designing buildings to make those inside visible and creating a hierarchy of authority within the group have been used to improve the function of discipline within institutions (Foucault, 1979/1995).

For Goffman (1961), the physical and mental evaluation piece of “the welcoming” process is a technique that similarly influences the socialization of the patient. Each patient has a case file which is a compilation of all past and current medical records, as well as notes from doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, and significant others citing observances, tendencies, and social statuses of the individual (Goffman, 1961). The information provided in the case file is coupled with a complete physical and initial interview with the patient to determine his current state of health (Goffman, 1961). This formal process is the first “violation of one’s informational preserve regarding self;” however, the most intimate information may be revealed among inmates in a setting such as group therapy (Goffman, 1961, p. 23). Translated to Division I softball, the medical history and physical examination are standards that must be completed by each student-athlete with the institution’s athletic training staff prior to participating in any team practices, workouts, or competitions. These reports result in a documented case file for each student-athlete to be added and referred to throughout their career. Additionally, formal drug test results are also included if the student-athlete is selected and when the student-athletes sign their National Letter of Intent they effectively waive their rights to HIPPA and FERPA, allowing institutional staff to disclose their medical and educational information to others. In this context, however, the informal interrogative techniques can be more evasive than the described formal methods. First, the “collective sleeping arrangements” and bathroom facilities that are common to freshman residence halls and athletic locker rooms allow for little privacy leaving the student-athlete “always within sight and often earshot of someone” (Goffman, 1961, p. 25). These established arrangements leave a minimal amount of time for the individual to be alone and the social effects are exacerbated when teammates live together because they are on identical schedules, being in the continual presence of each other. This living situation may also hinder the

opportunity for private communication with family or other outside individuals. Second, each team will likely have different means of getting to know one another based on the individuals that comprise the team and traditions that have been passed down over time within the group, but there is likely to be a point in the moral career of the student-athlete where they are faced with questions regarding their private lives. Individuals may feel obligated to expose their own relationships, which will further serve to mortify their perception of self (Goffman, 1961). These methods of formally and informally imposed inspection of the self deeply penetrate the private reserve of an individual and can have a profound impact on their self image (Goffman, 1961). Kim's description of the drug testing procedure illustrates:

We had to be there at 6:00 in the morning...so I woke up about 5:30am and got there and waited in line and had to pee right in front of them and that was you know just waiting in line to get tested and put it in a bag and it was kind of weird because you saw everyone's pee in the cup and [laughs] I was like that's not alright [laughs] so yeah...

Observation. It is common in team sports to declare certain individuals team captains. The degree of influence these athletes have varies depending upon factors specific to their team, but generally in this role, athletes are given the authority to regulate matters within the team and are delegated to be a liaison between the athletes and the coaching staff. Their role is basically to monitor the team in terms of equipment and conduct (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 176). Examples cited by the participants include captains being responsible for ensuring that each player is wearing the proper practice and travel attire each day and that everyone is on time. Kim describes it as "keeping in check with each other" and cites mass texts as a way of communicating. This regulatory role of the captains is the same for games, yet it is even more

important because outsiders, such as fans and media will be observing as well. In these instances, individual student-athletes are not only required to comply with the prescribed uniform, but they are also being observed from within (teammates) and above (coaches and spectators) creating a network of hierarchical observation. This pyramid of observation enables the “petty forms of coercion” applied to creating productive bodies more effective simply through being watched (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 139). Foucault (1984) further illustrates the significance of visibility by stating that “a moral perception [among teammates] sustains and animates” the level of productivity of the team (p. 136). The student-athlete’s awareness of their teammates’ judgment tends to regulate their behavior toward accepted norms.

In Rinehart’s (1998) study of swimming and Markula and Pringle’s (2006) discussion of fitness centers, the authors provide examples of how architectural mechanisms have been applied to modern sport. The use of glass walls for instructors to see through, mirrors for the individuals to see themselves, and raised platforms for instructors are described in both facilities. These methods of observation plus several others manifest themselves in Division I softball as well. Many college weight rooms and batting cages are equipped with mirrors and exercises take place on platforms; some practice facilities are designed where coaches’ offices have glass walls or doors so that they may see what is happening on the field or in the batting cages, and video cameras are often setup in practice facilities. These architectural arrangements are discussed more thoroughly in the Panopticism section; yet it is important to note them as forms of hierarchical observation due to their arrangement within the network of power that allows coaches to supervise student-athletes both directly and indirectly. Therefore, by utilizing the structure of facilities and assigning regulatory functions to team members, coaches are able to

create a structure of hierarchical observation where “power is distributed through the individuals who are also subjected to it” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 177).

Examination. In addition to the loss of self, mortification processes can also take forms that lead to near demoralization of the inmate (Goffman, 1961). Within the walls of a mental institution these techniques include the work system, the constant judgment, and the lack of compatibility with family (Goffman, 1961). As Goffman (1961) discusses the demoralization associated with the work system that is present in total institutions, he explains that this furthers the compromise of the individuals’ conception of self because of the incongruence this structure has with that of the typical work-payment process outside. This disconnect occurs due to the lack of meaning derived from the trivial tasks performed by the individual, such as folding laundry; and the inmates often view these tasks as “beneath their self respect” (Goffman, 1961, p. 11).

Translated within the context of sport, extremely high performance expectations are placed upon the student-athletes by the Division I coaches and their respective universities, and if these expectations are not met then the player may be punished, or not privileged (Goffman, 1961, p. 51). With the discontinuation of Olympic softball, Division I collegiate level softball is being considered elite which is leading some Division I college softball coaches to approach the game as a business with the attitude that winning is everything and the student-athletes are their means of production. As Ashley perceives, they may tend to measure each player’s value based on their utility, and thus, determine the value the players based strictly on their performance on the field. In other words, each student-athlete’s worth as a player or member of the team may be perceived as being based solely upon their performance. A player’s performance is likely to vary some from day-to-day, thus their value as perceived by the coaches may fluctuate frequently. This type of competitive expectation leads to constant judgment of performance and a work-pay

system that may be different from what the student-athlete has been accustomed to; i.e rather than simply hard work leads to playing time they experience a system where refined skill and economic results are rewarded with little regard to the required level of work. Jill states,

I think that it's worse than work. Because think about it, ok. When I graduate I'm going to have a job. You have a job and you either do it or you don't. like it's not, well let's say most jobs, like if you were a secretary or something...you go to work, you file your papers, you call who ever, you tell your boss whatever, you get them coffee, you do this. It's not based on your talent, and with talent, like a sport, like what you're gonna put out from day to day can vary. So, that just brings along the extra stress. And then you know that's going to happen so you worry about that happening and then that freaks you out even more. And I feel like with a job it's just like you go and you either do the stuff or you don't...like you have a choice and with sports you don't always have a choice...like if you had a choice I would be an All-American because I would play good every single day, but it's not that easy with you know athletics...

However, the coaches may tend to focus only on those players who are getting regular playing time or are everyday starters, so everyone may not be provided an opportunity to prove their worth. Given that the player's "line of activity is regulated and penetrated by constant sanctioning" from the coaches, the player is "robbed of the autonomy of the act" (Goffman, 1961, p. 38). Essentially, college coaches are in a position to place their primary emphasis on performance and on-field production and show little concern for the best interests of the individual student-athletes. This increase in commodification and massification can easily lead to the exploitation of student-athletes, who in turn, may "feel alienated from their [non-athlete]

peers” (DeSensi & Rosenberg, 2003, p. 10). This commercial use of student-athletes is prominent at NCAA Division I institutions, and often creates a simultaneous alienation of the university from the athletic department (DeSensi & Rosenberg, 2003). These coaches have the liberty to “create and sustain a tension between the home world and the institutional world...and use [it] as strategic leverage in the management of [student-athletes]” (Goffman, 1961, p. 13). Therefore, Division I student-athletes may lose their sense of self-worth due to the initially demoralizing nature of the performance incentives and constant judgment present in their environment.

Normalization. Following all of these institutionally imposed mortifying and potentially demoralizing initiations into the established order of the total institution the inmate typically begins to reorganize himself by taking on the institution’s perspective and ideal of himself (Goffman, 1961). The inmate will come to realize that he was wrong about himself all along because he has now been re-socialized into a new way of knowing himself. As Goffman (1961) explains, “in the usual cycle of adult socialization one expects to find alienation and mortification followed by a new set of beliefs about the world and a new way of conceiving of themselves” (p. 169). By “removing certain behavior opportunities” and implementing a framework of established order, social and cultural change may occur (Goffman, 1961, p. 13). The means of order that Goffman (1961) describes as the framework through which inmates become socially reorganized to their current situation include house rules and a system of punishments and privileges, where privileges are “merely the absence of deprivations” (p. 51). This set of rules that govern behavior within an institution, including the coinciding consequences, are specific to the nature and official objectives of each individual establishment.

Certain antique “punishments in the form of physical, minor deprivations, or petty humiliations” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 178) are still present in athletics. Although there has been argument over the effectiveness and the long term effects of such punishments (Anshel, 2006), examples may include running for being late or making mistakes, losing locker room privileges, not eating a nice meal, or being made to take off a uniform. However, a trend toward more disciplinary forms of punishment that center on the value of normalizing judgments is becoming evident in athletics (Johns & Johns, 2000; Rinehart, 1998; Cole, et al., 2004). As Foucault (1979/1995) explains, these new forms of punishment are designed to “enforce order” using explicit rules coupled with evaluation of performance and “aptitude” (p. 179). With this type of evaluative punishment “individuals are measured in quantitative terms” and ranked accordingly based on the “ability, level, and nature of individuals” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 183). Thus, the assigned hierarchical values are not labeled good or bad, rather they position the individual around a certain quantifiable norm; and because the assessments are updated regularly individuals have the potential to move up or down in the order (Foucault, 1979/1995). Ashley’s description of the bus after a loss provides an example,

Let’s say if we’re coming home from a series and we did poorly then our punishment is like watching film or we’ll like eat at somewhere that’s not very good or if we’re getting a lecture she makes us all come up to the front of the bus and sit really close together so she can like see everyone and there’s no smiling allowed [laughs].

The mechanism of punishment in this sense is two-fold; it pushes individuals to work for reward and this work entails repetitive practice of the exercise (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 180). In

Division I softball this can be translated as a desire to achieve a high ranking, to reach the elite norm, which will be met through constant repetition and practice.

This use of the normalizing judgment component of disciplinary power is illustrated in Division I softball on an individual, as well as team level. Individually, student-athletes are measured quantitatively in the classroom and on the field. Within their sport specifically, Division I softball players are measured by a multitude of published statistical categories which are compared and ranked with other players throughout the nation, as well as by specific times and standards set by their coaches. Such an “appeal to statistical measures and judgments about what is normal and what is not in a given population” exemplifies what Foucault (1979/1995) meant by “systematic normalization” (Rabinow, 1984, p. 21). There are 279 NCAA Division I softball teams and each week statistics are released that rank players based on their success, or performance relative to each other (NCAA Participation, 2010). There are offensive, defensive and pitching categories by which they are constantly measured. Therefore, these players tend to strive for the quantitative norm that has been established not only in the current season, but over the course of years of compiled statistics. Some people in athletics call this “chasing records,” where Foucault (1979/1995) would describe it as a means of disciplinary control that drives the individual player to strive for the established norm. Kim’s desire to be as good a hitter as Courtney, her volunteer assistant coach exemplifies this concept. “I wanted to work with Courtney because she had a bad swing up there you know...she hit like .360-.368 at the [major Division I level].” Similarly, conference and national rankings are released each week and are based on measurements such as win-loss record and strength of schedule. These criteria measure a team both objectively and subjectively, which magnifies the significance of normative statistics as well as the judgment of peers on overall performance. The same principle applies to the team

as it does the individual; the entire team, including the staff, strives to conform to the normative demands that are recognized as elite relative to the competition. Goffman (1961) describes the social implication of this type of system as allowing for participants to regain some of their autonomy of self. Once they begin to feel rewarded by achieving the desired standard, they can begin to see themselves in a less helpless position. Therefore, the individual has cycled from being deprived of his home environment and support structures, to being initiated to the institutional norms through the processes of social mortification, and is now able to reorganize his view of self and others in terms of his current situation. In athletics, this logic is typically stated in terms of breaking an athlete down in order to build them back up.

The third major component of Foucault's (1979/1995) means of correct training is the examination. The examination is "a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify, and to punish;" it is an established differentiating power (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 184). Through a constant comparison with others, the visibility of one's actions, and documentation each individual is evaluated in the present as well as over a period of time (Foucault, 1979/1995). Markula and Pringle (2006) describe these examination techniques in modern fitness centers where each individual can always be seen by others, thus imposing a perpetual gaze of normalizing forces, and the requirement of submitting medical history serves as an instrument of documentation. As previously described, Division I softball student-athletes are constantly in a competitive state of examination through the recording of statistics on a team, conference, and national level; and they are judged based on how their performance relates to that of past and present players. Volumes of historical data, such as media guides including statistics and records allow for the creation of "classifications, categories, averages, and norms" (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 190). On the whole, the mechanism of examination allows for the

creation of this “comparative system” of normalization in addition to rendering the individual as “describable, analyzable, and manipulable” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 190). This technique of disciplinary examination gives Division I softball coaches yet another tool by which they can train, observe, measure, and judge student-athletes; while the knowledge of the presence of such normalizing judgments motivates players to work harder at gaining efficiency through repetition and practice in hopes of reaching the desired high level of performance.

Panopticism and Integration of Life Activities

“Visibility is a trap” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 200). The most effective mechanism of disciplinary power is that of constant surveillance and observation because the sense of being analyzed will ultimately lead subjects toward self-regulating procedures (Foucault, 1979/1995).

The following story from Ashley illustrates:

Always do the right thing because you never know who’s going to be there. It’s funny [laughs] too because we’ll be like in the locker room talking and somebody will make a joke about [head coach] and it will get really quite and everyone will like look around and make sure she’s not around, and like I was eating lunch with Courtney and Megan and we were in the locker room and it was just like the three of us and we were the only three there besides like the managers and Megan said something about her and then she like stopped and started making a joke about how there’s probably a video camera in the picture over there [laughs], like she’s probably recording you right now

Jeremy Bentham designed the Panopticon in 1791 with the intended goal of “maximizing the efficient workings of power” within the penitentiary setting (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 43). In the design, the guard is able to see all of the inmates simultaneously from a tower which is

situated in the center of a circular set of prison cells (Foucault, 1979/1995). The tower also has a one-way mirror so that the guard can see out, but the inmates are unable to see in (Foucault, 1979/1995). Thus, the inmates must always assume that there is a guard present and in turn this leads to practices of self-regulation and normalized behaviors (Markula & Pringle, 2006). The principles of discipline underlying the philosophy of the Panopticon have since diffused into other institutional settings, both physical and theoretical, in a sense becoming “de-institutionalized” (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 211). Simply being visible or having the feeling of being watched seems to eliminate the option of wrongdoing from the minds of many subjects (Foucault, 1980). “The penetration of regulation into even the smallest details of everyday life through the mediation of a complete hierarchy that assures the capillary functioning of power” culminates in the paradigm of panopticism (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 198). The continuation of Ashley’s statements is indicative, “always do things like you think that she’s there because she’ll just show up or spy on you from like up in the press box or something [laughs] to make sure that you’re like doing what you’re supposed to.”

The conclusions of “The Hawthorne Studies” conducted by Elton Mayo between 1927 and 1932 demonstrated the panoptic significance of supervision and the accepted norm on productivity in a factory setting (Griffin, 2003). The first study, which aimed at determining the effects of changes in lighting on worker efficiency, found that an increase in lighting for one group led to increased productivity for both groups (Griffin, 2003). Mayo thus concluded that all of the workers worked more efficiently because they knew they were being supervised (Griffin, 2003). A positive relationship between managerial attention and worker productivity was illustrated (Shriberg, et al., 2005). The second of the studies involved piecework pay, and it was concluded that workers were more concerned with “social acceptance” within the workplace than

“wage incentives” (Griffin, 2003, p. 17). Therefore, meeting the accepted norm, whether high performance or otherwise, and the known observer were most influential on productivity. “The Hawthorne Effect” provides an example of the effects of a panoptic system in the workplace, and this concept is also critical in team sports where the coach is a known observer and performing at a level accepted by coaches and peers is paramount (Johns & Johns, 2000). Foucault (1979/1995) explained that the tendency of “swarming disciplinary mechanisms to emerge from the closed fortresses in which they once functioned and to circulate in a ‘free’ state” (p. 211) has led to the materialization of “panopticism of everyday” (Coakley & Dunning, 2007, p. 123). Kim’s advice to incoming student-athletes alludes to this idea, “I know they’re going to want to have fun and experience, but it’s more like just watch out who you’re with and what you do.” As these passages indicate, the power structures represented by Bentham’s Panopticon in 1791 have been reproduced in the 21st century; however, they have manifested themselves in even more technologically advanced surveillance mechanisms and the constant threat of social judgment.

The video camera is a primary mechanism that can be considered a panopticon of modernity. Cameras are employed for a variety of reasons in society including security surveillance, policing traffic, and archiving events. These forms of surveillance serve as technologies of dominance within particular social settings by shaping behaviors and actions of the people who are “being watched.” Foucault explains that “a visible body is a knowable body that can subsequently become subject to the workings of power” (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 41). When subjected to the gaze of the video camera and the social judgment of others, individuals are likely to become docile bodies (Bordo, 1989). At the elite level of Division I softball the use of video, also referred to as film work, has become a critical component of skill improvement. In terms of structure, during a competition most teams will run a minimum of one

video camera which is located in centerfield, typically on a raised tower above the outfield fence to ensure an angle that will include all of the movements of the pitcher, the ball, and the other players as they are involved in the action. Many new softball facilities are equipped with fixed cameras positioned on either side of home plate in order to record each player's at bats; if this luxury is not provided many teams will assign someone to move from side-to-side videoing the batters. When a game is televised another three to four cameras are present and obviously broadcast to a greater viewing audience. When competing, every player is aware that these cameras are surveying nearly every move that they make for the purpose of evaluation from coaches, opponents, spectators, and themselves; thus resulting in controlled behaviors that are representative of the norm. Additionally, the examination techniques are even more minutely developed. Computer software has advanced to the point that a coach can take film of one player and project it side-by-side or even overlaid with another player. This is commonly done with batters swinging and pitchers throwing with the primary purpose of demonstrating to a particular student-athlete where their motions deviate from the successful norm. Kim explained how the system allowed her to compare her swing to Albert Pujols, "yeah and it let me see how I wasn't showing a negative movement." Therefore, through this "optical system" the student-athlete's performance is mechanically analyzed and comparatively measured in order to increase their utility (Foucault, 1980, p. 148).

The student-athlete is not only subjected to this system of gazes on the field, but also in their other daily activities. The university staff members described earlier as checkpoints within the web of power are examples. Further, these checkpoints have also become more technologically advanced by implementing "tracking" systems for student-athletes. They have a university issued student ID card which, in many cases, they must "swipe" to enter and leave

study halls, dorms, dining halls, some athletic facilities and events, and other campus locations. This advanced tool for locating student-athletes provides yet another layer of observation and surveillance. As Foucault (1979/1995) explains, this type of disciplinary regimen “arranges things in such a way that the exercise of power is not added on from the outside, like rigid, heavy constraint, to the functions it invests, but is so subtly present in them as to increase their efficiency by itself increasing its own points of contact” (p. 206).

This “widespread diffusion of power and its operation in ordinary day-to-day behavior” allows for deeper penetration of the coach’s dominance over the individual student-athlete (Mewett, 2003, p. 332). Ironically, the “disciplinary regimen” that college student-athletes live within includes demands from their coaches, professors, managers, athletic trainers, strength and conditioning staff, media, and teammates, but these individuals simultaneously provide all of the support structures necessary to reach the desired level of elite performance. Even though they are not in a physical panopticon, student-athletes function in an institutionalized environment where a dynamic disciplinary power is always present, even if it is not directly identifiable. Therefore, the student-athlete is positioned within an environment where there are multiple ideological dichotomies acting on them: student/athlete; control/dependence; and dominance/resistance and their moral careers seem to have some parallel characteristics to inmates in total institutions not only in regard to the regimentation of their daily lives, but also in the socialization processes that lead to identity transformation.

Conclusion

There are certain practices that are innate in softball, in NCAA Division I athletics, and thus in Division I softball, yet it is inevitable that some of these techniques will be adapted differently by various coaches, student-athletes, teams, and institutions. Such “political

anatomies” and processes are not invented; rather they evolve (Foucault, 1979/1995, p. 138).

“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, 1979/1995, p. 138). Coaching methods have similarly developed in the way that Foucault (1979/1995) describes the creation and replication of disciplinary practices. In college athletics, there is an inherent tendency to look toward the successful programs and coaches for advice and knowledge. Personal interaction, observation, and communication are some means through which coaches disperse the details of their techniques; and today, conferences, books, and instructional videos are heavily relied on as sources of such expert knowledge. In this way, disciplinary practices are “imitated and supported,” and if they lead to increased performance and a closer relation to the documented norm and culturally defined success then they are more likely to be accepted and reproduced.

However, as Foucault’s (1980) paradigm of relational power explains, the existence of power in a social system necessitates the presence of resistance. Therefore, many of the practices of successful softball coaches will be implemented by others, but it is nearly inevitable that at some point these dominant philosophies will be met with resistance. As Bordo (2003) explains, “dominant forms and institutions are continually being penetrated and reconstructed by values, styles, and knowledges that have been developing and gathering strength, energy, and distinctiveness ‘at the margins’” (p. 27). The gradual introduction of new practices and philosophies serve as forms of resistance to the dominant ideology, and as these counter ideas gain support from the community “minute shifts in power” occur (Bordo, 2003, p. 28). A recent

example of this type of ideological transformation within the softball community is the movement from rotational to linear styles of hitting.

The narratives of the participants in this study indicate each individual student-athlete is likely to respond differently to the institutional arrangements. The way and degree to which each person internalizes the system varies, yet each of these participants express that they believe it will help them in the long run. I recently heard a presentation from John Foley, a former captain of the Blue Angels (the elite Navy flying crew) on “high performance leadership.” He talked about precision and the significance of being detailed, teamwork, and trust within the Blue Angels and applied it to athletic teams and college athletic departments. The training principles that he described are reproduced in training regimens for elite athletic performance and many of which are evaluated through the concepts of total institution and panopticism in this paper. The replicated system is clearly progressive in terms of refining the skill set for high performance of the unit and as the participants in this study noted, although in the moment it may seem like an inconvenience, they truly feel they are developing valuable transferable skills and appreciate the growth opportunity. Based on the top performances that these student-athletes and their respective teams are demonstrating it seems clear that the training regimen is successful in making them productive bodies, yet it is also influencing their socialization and perception of their position within their program.

The grand narrative that institutional arrangements and discipline are effective developmental tools for the performance of student-athletes is reflected by the narratives in this study. While it can be stated that methods of social control are implemented and rationalized within intercollegiate athletic programs in terms of increasing productivity of student-athletes, the socialization process and the social implications inevitably vary due to such factors as

student-athlete personality, expectations of the program, previous athletic experiences, coaches, administrative philosophy, playing time, and the culture of the respective university and program. These factors impact the perception that each participant in this study has of her experience within her respective softball program.

I found the gender dynamics within the coach-athlete relationship to be interesting in the narratives of these participants. Kim, the participant whose head coach was male, described being uncertain on how to approach the issue of his and the male assistant coach's dominance over the female staff members and players even though she acknowledged it was a problem. Jill and Ashley both had female head coaches and they expressed frustration with some of the rules and structure, but did not imply that they considered speaking up or had any thoughts of not complying. In correlation with the research (Young, 1989; Seigfried, 1996), all three participants come to the culture of NCAA Division I softball with their previous experiences and ideas of "how things are." Interpreting solely from the three narratives presented here, I believe the "coach as authority" paradigm is more influential than the "male over female" given that the participants with female head coaches exhibited similar feelings of frustration with the coaches' control. Further probing in this area could certainly benefit our understanding of these gender relationships, yet I do not feel there is enough data in this report to make a definitive statement on the matter.

As these participants articulate their stories they implicitly differentiate themselves from other "normal students" and competition levels. They each describe high performance expectations from within their programs and although sometimes reluctant they ascribe to the social and functional demands imposed upon them. There seems a fine line between infantilizing and growth of transferable life skills. I conclude this based on their hesitance to question – not

even criticize, but question – the power to which they are willingly subjected. While the result of these training procedures correlates with the capitalistic mission of NCAA Division I athletics, the implication in the social processes of the student-athletes is unique to the individual.

CHAPTER VI:

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions of the Study

The narratives produced in this study highlight elements of power, social control, and personal empowerment within the context of NCAA Division I softball. Several conclusions can be drawn from the integration of the data, previous research in the field, and the theoretical framework of total institution and disciplinary power.

The student-athletes in this study do experience a variety of the mechanisms of disciplinary power and total institution as defined by Foucault (1979/1995) and Goffman (1961). The elements of control of activity, movement as a group, surveillance, and observation are common among the experiences of the participants. Each of these characteristics of their institutional arrangements serves the purpose of developing productive student-athletes and competitive teams, and they are productive in terms of meeting the competitive success goals of the intuitions.

These student-athletes view the head coach as the authority on nearly everything and assume the power is manifested in that position. Therefore, they accept the regimented arrangements as part of the experience and do not seem to believe they have the ability or power to change their position within the system. They have ascribed to the system of control that is present within their environments as a way for them to be successful. In order to function within the culture, they make adjustments throughout the socialization process as Foucault (1979/1995) and Goffman (1961) describe. For example, they all describe “looking out for each other” and being accountable to their teammates which, serves as a self-regulation method to ultimately

enhance the performance of the group; however, the participants actually perceive it as a means of not getting in trouble.

Simultaneously, although the student-athletes do not feel empowered to change their situations, they do gain a sense of empowerment from their position as elite softball players and from their overall experience at the NCAA Division I level. The knowledge and emotion of “being the best” and garnering national media attention as well as being a role model for young players provides a feeling of empowerment for the participants in this study. Kim describes the feeling by explaining how she is respected in her hometown for making it to the highest level and can now return to tell everyone what “the Division I really expects.” Also, the caliber of facilities, amenities, and resources provided for these student-athletes gives them a sense of pride and accomplishment. For example, each of the participants mentions the luxury of things such as games, stadiums, nice hotels and meals, priority class scheduling, and so on. Additionally, they all believe that the routinized structure that they have become accustomed to will translate into their lives after graduation as a positive for time management and organization which serves as an empowerment tool.

The narratives of the student-athletes in this study provide insight into their daily lives and how they function within their respective social systems. The context of NCAA Division I softball as experienced by the participants in this study possesses social control mechanisms and socialization processes as defined by Goffman (1961) and Foucault (1979/1995). Ultimately, these institutional arrangements are productive in developing successful teams to meet the athletic goals of the university and provide the student-athletes some empowerment in terms of recognition and the creation of routines.

Although the narratives of the participants in the study illustrate most elements of a total institution and panopticism and they are subjected to mechanisms of social control and discipline, I do not believe that NCAA Division I student-athletes are inmates or patients living within a complete and total institution. They do experience some autonomy, decision making, and leadership situations within the social system of intercollegiate athletics. Some examples from the data include having a Bible study and the possibility of living off campus, and depending upon a coach's philosophy and style some student-athletes may have considerably more input in daily activities. The degree of resonating elements between intercollegiate athletics and the concepts of total institution and disciplinary power may be unique to each program and institution; however, there are moral and practical implications that derive from this discussion.

The near complete integration of life activities for student-athletes within the social system of intercollegiate athletics, with coaches as the primary authority raises interesting issues for practitioners. Student-athletes are essentially at the coaches' discretion; thus, by allowing coaches to have such control and influence over the daily life activities of student-athletes while simultaneously setting high standards of success for coaches, administrators and institutions are setting the table for disciplinary techniques described by Goffman (1961) and Foucault (1979/1995) to be implemented. The need for efficiency in training sport specific skills to be successful has progressed to training the student-athlete academically, kinesthetically, psychologically, nutritionally, and so on. If properly trained, all of these areas can provide a competitive advantage for teams that employ such methods. The result of such a disciplined training regimen is well trained individuals for the purposes of fulfilling the aims of the coach and the athletic department; that is, winning competitions leads to recognition and revenue. However, this disciplinary structure also consumes the majority of the student-athlete's time

which may limit social development with individuals outside of athletics and hinder their personal growth opportunities as they are minimally expected to make decisions.

In practical terms, recommendations that are derived from the discussion of this study may include practices for coaches such as allowing student-athletes to have input on practice planning, creating communication methods and a dialog for student-athletes to interact in some decision making, have regular meetings, developing evaluation procedures that are less invasive so that student-athletes feel comfortable explaining their ideas and perspective on situations, include student-athletes in the rule making process, and develop leadership initiatives. Placing and emphasis on reciprocal communication between student-athletes, coaches, and administrators maybe be the most significant underlying factor that could soften the effects of the disciplinary power and provide a more idealistic student-athlete experience where personal growth is merged with athletic development and team success.

Transitioning into elite intercollegiate athletics can be a significant culture shift for many student-athletes. When entering the environment of NCAA Division I softball they can encounter separation from their known support structures and become dependent on the resources provided by their respective program and university, which simultaneously are the forces of power and social control of which they become objects. However, as their hard work has come to fruition by achieving this elite status, the ideal image which has developed in their pursuit of this goal continues to lead to feelings of empowerment.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations identified for this study which were primarily related to participation. The time frame for data collection was not ideal given that it was during the spring semester in which the target population was in their championship season. This time frame likely

kept potential participants from responding due to their own time constraints. Another limitation was in the logistics of the interviews. I believe that I could have garnered more rapport with the participants at a face-to-face interview as it would have been more personal rather than through the use of technology.

Only using student-athletes rather than including coaches as participants may also be viewed as a limitation. As Goffman only interviewed inmates and patients, I chose to focus on the student-athletes given their position as the subject of the institutional arrangements and management techniques. It could be beneficial to design a case study including student-athletes, coaches, and possibly support staff members in a future study to analyze their interrelatedness within the social system and expand understanding from various perspectives. This type of study could be a good addition to the literature on total institution and panopticism in sport studies, particularly intercollegiate athletics.

Recommendations

Recommendations expanding from the study limitations include addressing the data collection time frame and different populations. Interviewing student-athletes in person outside of their championship season would likely garner more interest from participants, or at least they would have more time to participate. If data collection were to be done during their championship season, possibly attending a pre-season, regular season, or conference tournament with multiple teams could enhance the data. It could also benefit the literature to do some research in other NCAA Division I sports using the theoretical paradigms. Further research may also include a comparison among different NCAA divisions. It would be interesting to see if smaller division student-athletes expressed similar social structures and how much their experience resonates with the philosophy of their respective divisions. Additionally, a more

feminist focused analysis of the gender dynamics of the power relations within the culture would be appropriate. I also believe it would be interesting to explore the theoretical paradigms in relation to the experiences of other support staff members such as athletic trainers, graduate assistants, and team managers.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- 2009-2010 revenue distribution plan (2010). Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved Jan. 10, 2011 from: www.ncaa.org.
- Anshel, M. (2006). *Applied exercise psychology: A practitioner's guide to improving client health and fitness*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Anderson, T., & Kanuka, H. (2003). *e-Research: Methods, strategies, and issues*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bale, J. (1993). The spatial development of the modern stadium. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 28(2/3), 121-134. doi: 10.1177/101269029302800204.
- Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., Tarule, J. (1997). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York, NY: Basic Books. (Original work published in 1986).
- Benford, R. (2007). The college sports reform movement: Reframing the "edutainment" industry. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 48, 1-28. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2007.00068.x.
- Birrell, S., & Donnelly, P. (2004). Reclaiming Goffman: Erving Goffman's influence on the sociology of sport. In R. Giulianotti (Ed.), *Sport and modern social theorists* (pp. 49-64). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Birrell, S. (1981). Sport as ritual. *Social Forces*, 60(2), 354-376.
- Bordo, S. (1989). The body and the reproduction of femininity: A feminist appropriation of Foucault. In A.M. Jagger & S.R. Bordo (Eds.), *Gender/body/knowledge: Feminist reconstructions of being and knowing*. (pp. 13-33). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bordo, S. (2003). *Unbearable weight: Feminism, western culture, and the body*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.

- Brohm, J. (1978). Towards an institutional analysis of competitive sport. In J. Brohm (Ed.), *Sport - A prison of measured time* (pp. 138-162). London: Ink Links, Ltd.
- Brown, R., & Jewel, R. (2004). Measuring marginal revenue product in college athletics: Updated estimates. In J. Fizel & R. Fort (Eds.), *Economics of college sports*. (pp. 153-162). Westport, CT: Praeger, Inc.
- Burke, M. (2001). Obeying until it hurts: Coach-athlete relationships. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 28(2), 227-240.
- Butler University. (16 March, 2011). Butler University's 2010 tourney exposure lifts all boats. *Butler University Newsroom*. Retrieved from: www.newswise.com.
- California student-athlete bill of rights (29 May, 2012). *California Senate Bill SB 1525*. Retrieved from www.leginfo.ca.gov.
- Cantor, N., & Prentice, D. (1996). The life of the modern-day student-athlete: Opportunities won and lost. Paper presented at the Princeton Conference on Higher Education. Princeton, NJ.
- Caputo, J., & Yount, M. (1993). Institutions, normalization, and power. In J. Caputo & M. Yount (Eds.), *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions*, (pp. 3-23). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Chapman, G. (1997). Making weight: Lightweight rowing, technologies of power, and technologies of self. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 14, p. 205-223.
- Clandinin, J. D., & Connelly, F. M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

- Clandinin, J. D., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clandinin, J. D., & Connelly, F. M. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Coakley, J. (2007). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Cole, C., Giardina, M., & Andrews, D. (2004). Michel Foucault: Studies of power and sport. In R. Giulianotti (Ed.), *Sport and Modern Social Theorists* (pp. 207-223). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- David, F. (2005). *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases*. (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Denison, J., & Scott-Thomas, D. (2011). Michel Foucault: Power and discourse: The 'loaded' language of coaching. In R. Jones, P. Potrac, C. Cushion, & L. Ronglan (Eds.). *The sociology of sport coaching*. (pp. 27-39). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeSensi, J., & Rosenberg, D. (2003). *Ethics and morality in sport management*. Morgantown, WV: Sports Management Library.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Collier Books.

- Dewey, J. (1981). Experience and nature. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *John Dewey: The later works, 1925-1953, Vol. 1*, (pp. 1-326). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
(Original work published in 1925).
- Donnelly, P. (1994). Take my word for it: Trust in the context of birding and mountaineering. *Qualitative Sociology*, 17(3), 215-241.
- Dowling, W. (2000). Sports, race, and resentment. *Society*, 37, 29-34.
- Duderstadt, J. (2000). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university: A university president's perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Duke University mission statement (2001). Retrieved June 14, 2010 from:
www.trustees.duke.edu/governing/mission.php.
- Duncan, M. (1990). Sports photographs and sexual difference: Images of women and men in the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Games. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 7(1), 22-43.
- Duncan, & McMillen (21 March, 2013). Want to change college athletics? Financially punish coaches. *USA Today*. Retrieved from: www.usatoday.com.
- Eckard, E. W. (2010). NCAA athlete graduation rates: Less than meets the eye. *Journal of Sport Management*, 24, 45-59.
- Eder, (2008, March 24). March madness at work: Is it a morale booster or a drain on the bottom line? *The News Journal*. Retrieved Jan. 8, 2011 from:
<http://www.delawareonline.com/article/20080324/BUSINESS/803240309/March-Madness-at-work>
- Eitzen, D. S. (2000). Social control and sport. In J. Coakley & E. Dunning (Eds.). *Handbook of sports studies*. (pp. 370-381). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books, a division of Random House, Inc. (Original work published in 1979).
- Friday, W. C. (11 December, 2011). Get out of show business. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: chronicle.com.
- Fulks, D. (2012). *Revenues and expenses 2004-2011: NCAA division I intercollegiate athletics programs report*. Report of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved from: www.ncaa.org.
- Gerdy, J. (2002). *Sports: The all-American addiction*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2004). *Research methods for sport studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Griffin, R. (2003). *Fundamentals of management: Core concepts and applications* (3rd ed). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hacking, I. (2004). Between Michel Foucault and Erving Goffman: Between discourse in the abstract and face-to-face interaction. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 277-302.
- Hanseroth, P. (2007). *The story* [song], performed by Brandi Carlile. Retrieved from <http://www.azlyrics.com/lyrics/brandicarlile/thestory.html>
- Hargreaves, J. (1986). *Sport, power, and culture*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Harvey, J., & Sparks, R. (1991). The politics of the body in the context of modernity. *Quest*, 43, 164-189.

- Hatch, J. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hawkins, B. (2010). *The new plantation*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heikkala, J. (1993). Discipline and excel: Techniques of the self and body and the logic of competing. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10(4), 397-412.
- Hiestand, M. (2010, April 22). NCAA reaches 14-year deal with CBS/Turner for men's tournament, which expands to 68 teams for now. *USA Today*. Retrieved Jan. 10, 2011 from: www.usatoday.com.
- Hughes, R., & Coakley, J. (1991). Positive deviance among athletes: The implications of overconformity to the sport ethic. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8(1), 307-325.
- Intercollegiate (n.d.). In *Random House online dictionary*. Retrieved from: dictionary.reference.com/browse/intercollegiate?s=t
- Johns, D., & Johns, J. (2000). Surveillance, subjectivism and technologies of power: An analysis of the discursive practice of high-performance sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 35(2), 219-234. doi: 10.1177/101269000035002006.
- Jones, R., Potrac, P., Cushion, C., & Ronglan, L. (Eds). (2011). Erving Goffman: Interaction and impression management. In *The sociology of sports coaching*, (pp. 15-26). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kaschak, E. (1992). *Engendered lives: A new psychology of women's experiences*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kelly, S., & Waddington, I. (2006). Abuse, intimidation and violence as aspects of managerial control in professional soccer in Britain and Ireland. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 41(2), 147-164. doi: 10.1177/1012690206075417.

- Lane, E., Nagel, J., & Netz, J. (2010). *Alternative approaches to measuring MRP: Are all men's college basketball players exploited?* Ann Arbor, MI: ApplEcon, LLC.
- Li, M., Hofacre, S., & Mahony, D. (2001). *Economics of sport*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.
- Markula, P., & Pringle, R. (2006). *Foucault, sport and exercise: Power, knowledge and transforming the self*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Markula, P. (2003). The technologies of the self: Sport, feminism, and Foucault. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 20(2), 87-107.
- Messner, M. (2002). *Taking the field: Women, men, and sports*. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Mewett, P. (2003). Conspiring to run: Women, their bodies, and athletics training. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 38(3), 331-349. doi: 10.1177/10126902030383005.
- Moran, M. (1988, April 27). Knight is criticized over rape remark. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1988/04/27/sports/knight-is-criticized-over-rape-remark.html>
- Mouzelis, N. (1971). On total institutions. *Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association*, 5, 113-120.
- Moushey, B., & Dvorchak, R. (2012). *Game over: Jerry Sandusky, Penn State, and the culture of silence*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- NCAA Division I manual*. (2011). Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- NCAA Division II manual*. (2011). Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.

- NCAA Division III manual*. (2011). Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- NCAA revised budget for fiscal year ended Aug. 31, 2010*. (2012). Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved from: www.ncaa.org.
- NCAA membership* (2012). Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved from: www.ncaa.org.
- NCAA participation report 2009-2010*. (2012). Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved from: www.ncaa.org.
- NCAA financial review 2009-2010*. (2010). Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved Jan. 10, 2011 from: www.ncaa.org.
- National Letter of Intent* (2011). Document of the National Letter of Intent program. Retrieved from: www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/nli/nli.
- Page, S. (1990). *Brian Wilson* [song], performed by Barenaked Ladies. Retrieved from <http://www.azlyrics.com/lyrics/barenakedladies/brianwilson.html>
- Panopticon. (n.d.). In *Random House online dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/panopticon>.
- Paskus, T. (2008). Study probes time allotments. *NCAA News*. Spring 2008, p. 18. Retrieved from NCAA Research: www.ncaa.org.
- Perry, N. (1974). Two cultures and the total institution. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 25(3), 345-355.
- Pinnegar, S., & Daynes, J. G. (2006). Locating narrative inquiry historically: Thematics in the turn to narrative. In J. Clandinin & F. Connelly (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 3-31). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Polkinghorne, D. (1995). Narrative configuration and qualitative analysis. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.). *Life history and narrative*. (pp. 5-24). London: Falmer.
- Pope, D. & Pope, J. (2012). Understanding college application decisions: Why college sports success matters. *Journal of Sports Economics*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/1527002512445569.
- Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2011). Power in coaching. In R. Jones, P. Potrac, C. Cushion, & L. Ronglan (Eds.). *The sociology of sport coaching*. (pp. 135-150). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Priest, R., Krause, J., & Beach, J. (June 1999). Four-year changes in college athletes' ethical value in sports situations. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 70(2), 170-179. doi: 10.1080/02701367.1999.10608034.
- Rabinow, P. (1984). Introduction. In P. Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 3-29). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Rail, G., & Hargreaves, J. (1995). Body at work: Michel Foucault and the sociology of sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12(2), 164-179.
- Rinehart, R. (1998). Born-again sport: Ethics in biographical research. In G. Rail (Ed.). *Sport and postmodern times*. (pp. 33-46). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Scott, S. (2009). Reclothing the emperor: The swimming pool as a negotiated order. *Symbolic Interaction*, 32(2), 123-145. doi: 10.1525/si.2009.32.2.123.
- Shipman, M. (1967). Education and college culture. *British Journal of Sociology*, 18, 425-434.
- Shriberg, A., Shriberg, D. & Kumari, R. (2005). *Practicing leadership: Principles and applications* (3rd ed.). Danvers, MA: John Wiley and Sons.

- Shulman, J., & Bowen, W. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Seigfried, C.H. (1996). *Pragmatism and feminism: Reweaving the social fabric*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, M. (24 January, 2011). TV fee boosts BCS payout 22 percent. *Sports Business Journal*. Retrieved from: www.sportsbusinessjournal.com.
- Smith, R. (1988). *Sports and freedom: The rise of big-time college athletics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Solomon, J. (2010, June 17). Reformers recommend changing BCS and NCAA revenue distribution. *The Birmingham News*. Retrieved from: connect.al.com
- Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stratta, T. (2002/3). Using ethnographic methods in cross-cultural research. *Tennessee Education*, 32(2)/33(1), 32-39.
- Thayer-Bacon, B. (2000). *Transforming critical thinking*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- The University of Tennessee vision and mission statements* (2010). Retrieved June 14, 2010 from: www.utk.edu/aboutut/vision/.
- The University of Washington vision and values statements* (2010). Retrieved June 14, 2010 from: www.washington.edu/discover/visionvalues/.
- Thelin, J. (1994). *Games colleges play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Treadwell, P. (1984). Victorian public school sport. *Physical Education Review*, 7(2), 113-119.
- Vigarello, G. (1995). The life of the body in "Discipline and Punish". *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12(2), 158-163.
- Wacquant, L. (1992). The social logic of boxing in black Chicago: Toward a sociology of pugilism. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 9(3), 221-254.
- Westwood, S. (2002). *Power and the social*. London: Routledge.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative research: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wolfe, T. (2004). *I am Charlotte Simmons*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Wolverton, B. (2008). George Mason U. drew big spike in applications after final four run. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(29), p. A21.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yost, M. (2010). *Varsity green*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Young, I. (1989). Throwing like a girl: A phenomenology of feminine body comportment, motility, and spatiality. In Allen & Young (Eds.), *The thinking muse* (pp. 51-69). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Letter of introduction to participants

{Date}

Dear _____,

I would like to invite you to participate in a study regarding your experience as a college student-athlete. The purpose of this study is to learn more about the NCAA Division I softball environment and specifically your day-to-day experiences. In order to fully understand the perspectives, needs, and concerns of student-athletes like yourself, it is important that your comments be heard and understood by sport researchers and decision makers.

Your participation will include an open-ended interview that will last approximately one hour and will be audio-recorded. A pseudonym of your choice will be used in the transcription of the interview and all personal information from this interview will be kept confidential.

This research is to complete the dissertation requirement for my Ph.D. in Sport Studies. If you are interested in participating in this study or have any questions please email me at krainey@utk.edu or call me at 276-376-4584 (office). Prior to the interview, I will have you read and sign an informed consent statement, which explains your rights. As part of this process, you will be able to withdraw at anytime. If you have any further concerns you may contact my major advisor, Dr. Joy T. DeSensi at desensi@utk.edu.

As an experienced NCAA Division I college softball player, your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Kendall M. Rainey
Associate Athletic Director &
Senior Woman Administrator
UVa-Wise
1 College Ave.
Wise, VA 24293
276-376-4584 (office)
krainey@utk.edu

Dr. Joy T. DeSensi, Professor
Department of Kinesiology,
Recreation, and Sport Studies
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
1914 Andy Holt Ave.
Knoxville, TN 37996
865-974-1282
desensi@utk.edu

Appendix B: Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Experiences of NCAA Division I Softball Players

INTRODUCTION

As a NCAA Division I softball player over the age of 18 years, you are invited to participate in an interview which is for the purpose of dissertation research in the area of intercollegiate sport experience. The purpose of this study is to learn more about the NCAA Division I softball players' athletic environment and the context in which you live and experience your day-to-day routine.

INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY

You will participate in an open-ended, audio-taped interview about the NCAA Division I softball environment and specifically your day-to-day experiences. The interview will last approximately one hour. Interviews will be in person if geographically possible, but Skype, Google+, or Fuse will be used otherwise. A pseudonym of your choice will be used in the transcription of the interview so that your identity will not be revealed. Recorded data will be destroyed once it is typed into a transcript.

RISKS

You will not be at any physical risk. Risks may include anxiety of reflecting on and talking about any negative events.

BENEFITS

You may benefit from reflecting on and talking about your experiences and you can also feel good about providing a form of advice to future college student-athletes. Your story can be beneficial to the fields of sport management, higher education, and sport sociology by helping to facilitate the creation of adaptive strategies for teaching autonomous skills necessary of success in college careers and throughout their lives.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All personal information from this interview will be kept confidential. The findings will be presented publically as a defense of dissertation by the researcher, but your pseudonym will be used in all publications and presentations. Your school or softball position will also not be recorded or written.

Participant's Initials _____

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have questions at anytime about the study or procedures you may contact:

Principal Investigator:

Kendall Rainey
Greear Gymnasium
1 College Ave.
Wise, VA 24293
276-376-4584
krainey@utk.edu

Faculty Advisor:

Dr. Joy T. DeSensi, Professor and Associate Dean
Department of Kinesology, Recreation, and Sport Studies
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
1914 Andy Holt Ave., HPER 322
865-974-1282
desensi@utk.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the Office of Research Compliance Officer at 865-974-3466.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this interview is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at anytime without penalty. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be destroyed.

CONSENT

I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I have received a copy of this form.

Participant's signature _____ Date _____

Investigator's signature _____ Date _____

Appendix C: Interview Protocol

Research Question:

How do the issues of power, social control, and personal empowerment appear within the narratives of NCAA Division I softball student-athletes?

Demographic questions:

1. What is your age and academic year?
2. What is your major?
3. What is your hometown?
4. What is your race?

Lead off question: Tell me about yourself. Tell me about your experience as a NCAA Division I student-athlete.

[*Covert categories:* time management/organization, friendships, stress, expectation of making sacrifices, family, comparing to youth/high school, structure, thrill of winning, play highlights, public eye, higher expectations, relationship with coaches, traveling, identity, sport ethic (accept risk, make sacrifices, play through pain, winning most important), NLI rights waived, CA student-athlete Bill of Rights]

Possible follow-up questions:

1. Describe a typical day for you.
 - a. Who decides most of your schedule?
 - b. Who do you spend the most time with? Describe your relationship with your teammates? Other students?
 - c. How do you feel about it?
2. Describe a typical game day.
3. Tell me about a usual team road trip.
4. Describe your recruiting process?
5. Tell me about your team rules. How do you feel about them?
6. What do you like to do when you have an hour of free time?
7. What advice would you give to an incoming freshman student-athlete at this level?
8. Tell me about your classes. How did you make your schedule/choose your classes?
9. Upon signing the National Letter of Intent you waived rights such as to your likeness and privacy under HIPPA and FERPA.
 - a. Did you know you signed that?
 - b. How do you feel about that?
 - c. Is this control necessary?
 - d. Why are you willing to give up your autonomy?
10. Do you have a car on campus?
 - a. Did you have to verify who purchased/owns it?

- b. How do you feel about that/Is it necessary?
- 11. Does your school have an apparel contract?
 - a. Where are you allowed to wear other brands?
 - b. How do you feel about that?
- 12. How often are you on camera/filmed for softball?
 - a. In what ways is the film used?
 - b. How do you feel about that?
- 13. Have you been injured while at college?
 - a. How were you taken care of?
- 14. Have you been drug tested while at college?
 - a. Tell me about the process?
 - b. How did you feel about that?
 - c. Is it necessary?
- 15. Where do you eat most of your meals?
 - a. Who decides what the menu is?
 - b. Your thoughts on the process?
- 16. Tell me about your relationship with your coaches. Other support staff?
- 17. Can you remember/describe a time you had a disagreement with a coach?
- 18. Have you ever made sacrifices for the team?
- 19. What are your career ambitions?
- 20. What extracurricular activities have you participated in?
- 21. What is your best memory playing softball? College softball?
- 22. What is your worst memory playing softball? College softball?

Debriefing questions:

- 1. Are there any further comments that you wish to make?
- 2. Is there anything I did not ask you about that you think is important?
- 3. Do you have any questions for me?
- 4. Do you have any questions about this interview process?

VITA

Kendall M. Rainey was born January 19, 1983 and is the daughter of Eddie and Sharon Rainey of Glade Spring, Virginia. She graduated summa cum laude from the University of Virginia's College at Wise in 2005 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration. Kendall graduated from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in 2007 with a Master of Science degree in Sport Studies with a concentration in Sport Management. She is currently the Associate Director of Athletics and Senior Woman Administrator at UVa-Wise.