Discussion Paper Series

RIEB

Kobe University

DP2023-05

A Comparison of Professional and Recreational Tennis Players' Self-presentation on Instagram

Vera Paola SHODA
Gian Philip R. ANTOLIN
Angela Chriselle Y. VAQUILAR

March 6, 2023

Research Institute for Economics and Business Administration
Kobe University
2-1 Rokkodai, Nada, Kobe 657-8501 JAPAN

A comparison of professional and recreational tennis players' self-presentation on Instagram

Vera Paola Shoda

Centre for Computational Social Science, Kobe University, Kobe, Japan

vshoda@rieb.kobe-u.ac.jp ; ORCiD: 0000-0002-6365-7099

Gian Philip R. Antolin

Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business, University of the Philippines, Quezon City, Philippines

grantolin@up.edu.ph; ORCiD: 0000-0002-5028-9063

Angela Chriselle Y. Vaquilar

College of Arts and Sciences, University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines

ayvaquilar1@up.edu.ph; ORCiD: 0000-0002-8816-1890

A comparison of professional and recreational tennis players' self-presentation on Instagram

This study examines the self-presentation activities of female tennis players on the social media outlet Instagram. Drawing on Goffman's (1959) theory of self-presentation, this study sought to understand whether differences existed between the adoption of Instagram by professional and recreational tennis players. Instagram accounts of 63 professional and 50 recreational Japanese female tennis players were examined using content analysis. The findings reveal significant differences in self-presentation tactics of professional and retired tennis players on the focus of the photo, brand or logo visibility, athlete's presence in their photos, the proximity of the shot, facial expression, motion, and touch. Implications for self-branding and image management of female athletes are discussed. Overall, these findings contribute to a better understanding of the Instagrammable aesthetic and female athlete's online behavior in social media.

Keywords: social media; self-presentation; impression management; women; athletes

Introduction

Studies on computer-mediated communication reveal the tremendous impact that social media technologies have had on sports (Sanderson 2011). It affected how sports are presented (Schultz and Sheffer 2010) and consumed (Clavio and Kian 2010; Kassing and Sanderson 2010). Sports events are streamed live on social media platforms, allowing fans to immerse themselves in action and share their reactions in real time. Furthermore, many athletes have embraced social media and are building their brands through their accounts. Found that athletes and sports organizations use social media to promote brand awareness (Eagleman 2013), retrieval and dissemination of information (Browning and Sanderson 2012; Sanderson 2013), interaction with fans and stakeholders (Hambrick et al. 2010; Hambrick and Kang 2015) and communication with family and friends to cope during high-pressure environments (Hayes et al. 2019).

Studies also show that social media accounts give athletes a powerful tool to shape their representation (Emmons and Mocarski 2014; Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016) unlike

traditional media, where they have limited control. Notably, female athletes gain profound benefits from social media, such as having increased exposure, control over how they wish to be represented, and the opportunity to showcase their athletic prowess and femininity. Various studies have revealed the biased coverage between male and female athletes in traditional and online media, where males receive more media exposure while females are represented with their sexual, aesthetic, and personal features (Lebel and Danylchuk 2012; Toffoletti and Thorpe 2018b). Since there is less coverage of women's sports in traditional media outlets, social media has become an important channel for female athletes (Turková, Macková, and Němcová Tejkalová 2021) since it can address this gap in coverage while also contesting and reworking mainstream gender and sexual identities in sport (Toffoletti and Thorpe 2018a). Therefore, the way female athletes interact, use, and present themselves on social media has captured the attention of scholars, leading to numerous studies analyzing their self-presentation on these platforms. Analysis of female athletes' self-presentation behavior on social media usually draws on Goffman's (1959) theory of self-presentation, where social media serves as the platform through which individuals create a public presentation of themselves (Marshall 2010). For instance, Geurin (2017) found that the perceived audience affects self-presentation activities. Furthermore, social media also helps women to resist cultural and religious norms and stereotypes (Ahmad and Thorpe 2020; Kavasoğlu and Koca 2022). Female athletes as “role models” (Pocock and Skey 2022) were found to affect how other women behave on social media (Santarossa et al. 2019).

Instagram is a visually rich social media platform for creative self-expression and social interaction and has often been utilized to examine methods of self-expression employed by female athletes (Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016). Instagram allows users to share multimedia content and interact with others through likes, comments, and direct messaging. Research on Instagram suggests that women are more engaged in using Instagram

than men and play a significant role in shaping the content and culture of the platform (B. Li et al. 2021). Female athletes use Instagram for various reasons, such as to connect with their fans, promote their athletic brand, and share their experiences (Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016). Research has shown that overall, Instagram provides female athletes with a powerful tool to reach a large and engaged audience, build their brand, and connect with fans more personally than traditional media channels (Turková, Macková, and Němcová Tejkalová 2021).

Although existing literature describes social media platforms such as Instagram as providing benefits and opportunities for female athletes, most works focus on analyzing the self-presentation of famous and high-ranking professional athletes (Bodaghi and Oliveira 2022; Geurin 2017; Lebel and Danylchuk 2012; McGannon, Graper, and McMahon 2022). Since these professional athletes only represent a small portion of the female athlete population, it is necessary to consider the analysis of the "ordinary" female athletes, such as recreational athletes (athletes not participating in competitive events). While focusing on professional athletes' self-branding strategies can help to identify the impact of social media, this article recognizes that most women using social media are those we could consider "ordinary" users (i.e., recreational athletes) whose social media posts take place in non-competitive or relatively ordinary everyday settings. Understanding the differences between the self-presentation strategies of professional and recreational athletes can help better understand what is considered photographable or Instagram-worthy among female athletes.

Literature Review

Goffman's theory of self-presentation

Goffman (1959) discussed that a person could portray multiple versions of himself in front of different people. Goffman further explains that a human being's identity is not constant; instead, it continuously evolves as he socializes with people. This work also introduced the idea of "front stage" and "backstage" performances. The former is the behavior that an individual shows when nobody is observing him, and the latter refers to the behavior that someone puts on when he is conscious that people are watching him. Thus, people follow social norms and conventions that may please their audience. The self-presentation theory is commonly used to analyze the different performances that people portray in various settings. More recently, the theory has been used to analyze social media behaviors.

Lebel and Danylchuk (2012) used Goffman's theory to conduct a gendered analysis of professional tennis players' self-presentation on Twitter. The purpose of their study was to analyze and categorize the tweets of athletes. The researchers tried to showcase the athletes' differences in social media behavior based on gender, as previous studies revealed that male athletes are featured more by the media. This study also highlighted the different types of backstage and front-stage frames that athletes used in their performances through their tweets. Smith and Sanderson (2015) also conducted a similar study that used Goffman's self-presentation theory to analyze athletes' Instagram behavior. This study specifically looked at the significant similarities and differences between male and female athletes when posting on Instagram. Through content analysis, they found that most image posts of both genders are consistent with established gender norms.

Social media provides a platform for people to express themselves freely and in a manner of their choosing. Goffman's theory provides a way of understanding people's behavior and the motives behind their tweets, posts, and captions. Based on the performances that they put out, people can control what they want to show and hide from the online world.

Female athletes' self-presentation on social media

Online environments have turned into a platform for self-presentation (Ellison, Heino, and Gibbs 2006). Various research studies reveal that most of the posts that athletes share on social media are personal. Findings of Geurin-Eagleman and Burch (2016) show that 66.8% of photo posts on Instagram by athletes from different sports fields are about their personal lives. According to Turková, Macková, and Němcová Tejkalová (2021) study on Czech female athletes, content posted on Facebook during the athletes' on-season and off-season varied. While the seasonal posts were jam-packed with sporting images and images of podium victories, the off-season content frequently represented the players' personal lives, such as glamour images of themselves as attractive ladies in fancy gowns or swimwear. Some researchers focused solely on the self-presentation of athletes using image-centric social media platforms such as Instagram (Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016; Y. Li and Xie 2020; Smith and Sanderson 2015) due to the positive impact of image content on user engagement, especially when it comes to high-quality, professionally taken photos, which increase engagement on social media (Y. Li and Xie 2020) which athletes take advantage of to boost their brand.

According to Krane et al. (2010), who researched how female college athletes desire to be photographed, female athletes want to be seen in pictures as having strength and power so that viewers will be impressed by their athleticism and physique. In their study, one of the four primary higher-order themes they developed is 'being an athlete' which is similar to one of the two themes developed by Devonport, Leflay, and Russell (2019), which is 'performing an athletic identity' that has five sub-themes: 'featured in action,' 'showing good technique,' 'wearing of kit, and use of equipment associated with their sport,' 'displaying a sporting physique' and 'demonstrating psychological assets' (p.727). The last sub-theme mentioned is similar to the second major theme in the study of Krane et al. (2010), 'psychological strength,'

which included being 'intense, focused, confident, calm and determined' (p.185). The third theme of Krane et al. (2010) is 'social identities,' which shows the importance of having other social identities, including being female, besides their sports defining them (p.186-187), and the last theme is 'Progressive interpretation of femininity' which features photos that were purposefully provocative and gave athletes a chance to express alternate ideas about what it means to be a woman (p.188). By emphasizing these themes, the athletes welcomed the opportunity to act as role models and wished to inspire younger athletes. This is consistent with the second of Devonport et al. (2019)'s two themes, 'intended messages .'As role models for younger audiences, athletes wanted to emphasize the 'importance of hard work' and encourage them to 'give the sport a go' (p.733-734).

In the Instagram posts by the female athletes where they appear, most of them are in non-sport settings (Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016), which is aligned to the fact that most of their posts are about their personal lives. However, when dressed in athletic apparel, Geurin-Eagleman & Burch's study (2016) shows that there are more photos where the female athletes are just posing for a picture and not engaged athletically.

There are few Instagram pictures of female athletes dressed provocatively or whose photos are exclusively focused on their sexual features (Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016; Smith and Sanderson 2015). As a result, Smith and Sanderson (2015) questioned if it is natural, instinctual, and anticipated for a woman to pose suggestively. In their study, the female athletes' photos in which this happened most frequently were those in which they were dressed out for an occasion or gala and posed with other women. They may not have intentionally chosen to pose a suggestive position; instead, their pose may reflect societal standards (p.234).

Smith and Sanderson (2015) also investigated other forms of presentation used by female athletes in their Instagram posts compared to male athletes. Their study found that

female athletes are more likely to upload photos of themselves showing some form of touch, frequently with friends, such as hugging one another, or items like stuffed toys or trophies won (p.353). Additionally, they discovered that most photographs featured the athlete from a distance, presenting their entire body, which indicates an athlete's vanity. They also observed that the least popular image athletes decided to post was a "selfie," a common photographic phenomenon on Instagram. In addition, athletes appeared to utilize Instagram to express a distinct aspect of their lives visually. A selfie tends to be restrictive because it concentrates only on the picture's subject. While shooting a selfie, much detail is lost, which might contradict what the athlete is attempting to convey (p.354). Finally, their research showed that female athletes were significantly more likely to show signs of licensed withdrawal, such as staring off into the distance, looking down instead of directly at the camera, lying back and appearing withdrawn, or being present in a group of people while not acting socially engaged (p.354–355).

Social media has also allowed athletes to communicate and promote a message and share marketing content (Hambrick et al. 2010). Female athletes have sought new strategies to market themselves on social media, where they convey self-love, self-disclosure, and self-empowerment (Toffoletti and Thorpe 2018a)

Purpose and Research Questions

This study aimed to analyze female tennis players' self-presentation on Instagram to understand how women use social media as a personal branding tool, discover what is considered photographable or Instagrammable, and understand whether differences exist between professional and recreational athletes.

Based on self-presentation theory and previous literature on athletes' self-presentation on social media outlets, two research questions were developed.

- **RQ1.** How are female tennis players presenting themselves and their personal brands on Instagram?
- **RQ2.** What differences exist between the self-presentation strategies used on Instagram by female professional and recreational tennis players?

Methods

To address the purpose of the study, the Instagram accounts of female Japanese professional and recreational tennis players were examined. Tennis players are categorized as professional if they are currently active or are scheduled to participate in an official tennis tournament; if not, they are categorized as recreational tennis players. A content analytic method was employed to examine Instagram posts. A content analysis method was appropriate, as the aim of the study was to identify meanings from qualitative material (Patton 2010), and it is a systematic and replicable method for analyzing content, both written and visual (Riff 2014)

Data collection

Only public accounts with more than ten posts during data collection (September 1, 2022, to October 1, 2022) were included in the study. Instagram accounts of professional tennis players were identified using a name search on Instagram. Names of Japanese female professional athletes were based on the list of professional tennis players on www.tennisexplorer.com. Upon name search and checking each account, we verified and collected 63 accounts of professional female Japanese tennis players.

On the other hand, usable Instagram accounts of recreational tennis players were identified using a hashtag search. The hashtag "#テニス女子" (tennis girl) was used. We visited each of the accounts of the Instagram posts with the target hashtag. We included the account in the final sample when the account description/biography explicitly stated that the

account owner plays tennis (non-professional or retired professional). We continued to search for usable Instagram accounts using the hashtag and inclusion criteria until we were able to get a total of 50 accounts for recreational tennis players, of which five are retired professional tennis players.

The final list of accounts has a total of 113, with 63 for professional and 50 for recreational tennis players (including five retired professional players). Finally, the ten most recent post was pulled from each of the 113 accounts, totaling 1130 photos in the sample. The procedure and sample size were consistent with previous content analytic research (Bodaghi and Oliveira 2022; Coche 2014; Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016; Lebel and Danylchuk 2012).

Codebook and Intercoder Reliability

A codebook and coding protocol was developed based on previous studies of athletes' self-presentations on social media (Bodaghi and Oliveira 2022; Emmons and Mocarski 2014; Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016; Santarossa et al. 2019). The coding categories for this study are summarized in Table 1. The following twelve variables were included: coder ID, account name, number of followers, number of accounts following, number of posts, the date the photo was taken, number of posts where the athlete's face is visible from the most recent ten posts, number of pure self-presentation photos (athlete alone in the photo) from the most recent ten posts, photo type, prop, focus, and brand visibility. If the athlete appeared in the photo, the following eight additional variables were coded: the number of people in the photo, if the athlete is looking at the camera, clothing, proximity, facial expression, motion, touch, and type of shot. Before coding the sample of photos, the primary researcher trained two coders on the content analytic method and explanation of the coding categories. To establish reliability (Riff 2014), each coder independently coded 25% of the sample (n=282).

Cohen's Kappa was calculated to determine intercoder reliability. As presented in Table 1, a strength of agreement ranged of Cohen's Kappa from "Moderate," "Substantial," and “Almost Perfect” on all variables (i.e., 0.41-0.60 Moderate, 0.61-0.80 Substantial and 0.81-1.00 Almost Perfect; (Landis and Koch 1977). After validating the intercoder reliability, the remaining 848 photos from the sample were divided evenly and coded independently.

Findings

Followers and following count and self-presenting posts

The 113 Instagram accounts in the dataset had, on average, 28,660 followers, 455 followers, and 344 posts. Professional athletes, on average, had the most followers (M=47,157, SD=345,782) and accounted following (M=483, SD=290). Recreational athletes had the least average number of followers (M=4265, SD=10,637) and following accounts (M=422, SD=302).

Analysis of the most recent ten posts of each athlete in our dataset resulted in an average number of self-presenting posts (posts where the athlete's face is visible) of 7.03 (SD=3.21) and the average number of pure self-presentation posts (where the athlete is alone in the photo) of 5.19 (SD=3.03). Professional athletes had the highest number of self-presenting posts (M=8.55, SD=1.27) and pure self-presentation posts (M=5.67, SD=2.56). Recreational athletes had the lowest number of self-presenting posts (M=5.16, SD=3.82) and pure self-presenting posts (M=4.67, SD=3.44).

Focus, photo type, use of props, and brand visibility

Pictures with the athletes as the focus were the most common, comprising 60.44% (*n*=683) of the sample. Next were family and friends (*n*=199), others (*n*=158), and lastly, scenery (*n*=90).

In analyzing the photo type, the photos in the sample were most identified as sport-related at 47.52% (*n*=537), followed by personal at 43.8% (*n*=495), and sponsored or others at 8.67% (*n*=98). No usage of props was the most common at 58.85% (*n*=665). Finally, logos or brands were found to be non-visible in most posts, comprising 57.52% (*n*=650) of the sample.

Athletes appearing in photos

Overall, athletes appeared in 907 of the photos coded, or 80.26% of the total sample. Of those, professional players appeared more often than recreational players. Professional athletes appeared in 93.01% of their photos, while recreational athletes appeared in 64.20% of theirs. Of those photos in which the athlete appeared, the most common type of shot was the full body (*n*=592) followed by half body (*n*=226), selfie (*n*=69), and headshot (*n*=31). The majority of the photos coded also showed touch (*n*=700). The most common motion was passive non-sport (*n*=384). Further looking at the facial expression of the athlete, the most common was happy with 57.43% (*n*=649), then others with 15.66% (*n*=142), and intense with 14.33% (*n*=130).

With regards to proximity, photos coded had more wide shots with 35.31% (*n*=399) then, medium with 35.72% (*n*=324), and tight with 20.95% (*n*=190). The athletes were found to look at the camera most of the time, with 61.19% (*n*=555). Athletes were also found to be alone in their photos more at 65.27% (*n*=592), followed by pair (*n*=205) and group (*n*=126). In terms of clothing, athletes were more commonly wearing their tennis uniform or tennis wear (*n*=541).

Differences between professional and recreational athletes

We used Chi-square analysis to examine the differences between the self-presentation tactics of professional female athletes and recreational female athletes. We used a 0.005 p-value

threshold for statistical significance (Benjamin et al. 2017). The Chi-square results revealed a significant difference between the player type and focus of the photo ($\chi 2 = 111.13$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$), brand or logo visibility ($\chi 2 = 27.64$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$), the athlete appearing in the photo ($\chi 2 = 146.13$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$), proximity ($\chi 2 = 24.41$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$), facial expression ($\chi 2 = 41.62$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$), motion ($\chi 2 = 55.15$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$), and touch ($\chi 2 = 13.26$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$). The findings are summarized in Table 2.

Welch's T-test results revealed a significant difference in the face visibility of professional and recreational athletes. There was a significant effect of the athlete's playing status on the face visibility (p <0.001) on their Instagram photos at the .005 level. However, no significance was found on other variables such as the number of followers ($p = 0.32$), number of accounts following ($p = 0.30$), number of posts ($p = 0.11$), and number of posts alone ($p = 0.11$).

Discussion

This study examined how female tennis players engaged in self-presentation using Instagram and the player status (i.e., professional vs. recreational) differences that emerged from their self-presentation behaviors. Previous research has found differences in self-presentation behaviors online concerning gender (Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016; Smith and Sanderson 2015), age (Bodaghi and Oliveira 2022), and sport category (i.e., individual sport and team sports) (Shreffler, Hancock, and Schmidt 2016). This research aimed to expand on the literature regarding the self-presentation of female athletes, specifically focusing on a visual social platform and player status. The findings show noteworthy points that athletes, researchers, and sports organizations can utilize.

Athlete first, female second

The first significant finding was that contrary to previous research (Geurin-Eagleman and Burch 2016; Smith and Sanderson 2015), female tennis players were found to have more sports photos exhibiting more frontstage behavior than backstage behavior. In their study, Geurin-Eagleman & Burch (2016) suggested that female athletes post more business life and sports photos to increase fan interest, engagement, and athletic credibility. Both professional and recreational tennis players had more posts categorized as sports photos than personal life photos, thus exhibiting that female athletes have improved their self-presentation tactics online. As Aria et al. (2014) suggested, showing sports-related posts is important in building a strong athlete brand. Results show that female athletes are more in control of social media and can show their prowess and strength. This finding also reinforces the idea that women athletes, when in control, prefer athletic depiction to sexualization and objectification (Kane, LaVoi, and Fink 2013; Santarossa et al. 2019; Smallwood, Brown, and Billings 2014).

The second noteworthy point was that wider shots and full body shots were most common, which supports existing literature (Smith and Sanderson 2015) suggesting that female athletes, when given a choice, prefer to display their athletic competence and power. Although a popular type of shot on Instagram, selfies were found to be not a popular choice since this type fails to capture athletic performance and competence.

Another interesting point supporting that female athletes depict themselves as an athlete first and females second on social media is that female athletes were found to look at the camera more, suggesting engagement with their audience. This behavior contradicts stereotypes of women, who are expected to avoid direct camera gaze and be unfocused and not in control (Goffman 1976). Furthermore, athletes were also found rarely to wear sexual clothing and frequently appear wearing their uniforms (i.e., tennis wear). This behavior reinforces their membership in the sport and as part of their athletic brand. However, props that are used to exhibit professional legitimacy or credibility (Emmons and Mocarski 2014)

were not found to be commonly used. This suggests that female athletes, rather than using props, express their athletic credibility through other methods.

However, research findings also reveal that female athletes were found to have more passive motion in their photos. This result is in line with previous research (Trujillo 1991) showing that females are more commonly shown in passive poses. Likewise, most photos also showed female athletes touching others or objects. Goffman (1979) describes this as the point of ritualistic touching and associates it with feminine behavior. Thus, although female athletes emphasize their athletic image on social media, they maintain their femininity.

Professional athletes as athletic brands

Professional and recreational players differed significantly in their photos' focus. Although both have more photos focusing on the athlete themselves, professional players have more photos related to their personal lives (spending time with family and friends). In comparison, recreational players have more photos on other topics. In addition, professional athletes appear more in their photos than recreational athletes. This suggests that professional athletes use social media for self-presentation and image management purposes, while recreational athletes may have other purposes which can be explored in future research.

Although athletes have fewer photos showing off their sponsors' brands or logos, there is a significant difference between professional and recreational players. Professional players have more photos where brand names or logos can be seen than recreational players. This shows that professional athletes serve as brand ambassadors and promote their sponsors' brands on their social media accounts without overemphasizing and getting in the way of building an athletic brand and competence. On the other hand, our results show that few recreational players serve as "influencers" that promote tennis-related brands.

In addition, in terms of the proximity of the shot, professional players preferred shorts with wider proximity (medium and wide). This supports the idea that professional players highlight their athletic legitimacy more by using shots that capture prowess and strength (Smith and Sanderson 2015), rather than attractiveness. Regarding facial expression, findings show that professional athletes tend to have more intense expressions than recreational athletes in their photos. This exhibits their desired credibility and perception of authenticity (Emmons and Mocarski 2014) in their sport. Lastly, although photos mainly were found to have passive motion, regarded as a feminine behavior (Goffman 1976), professional athletes had more active shots than recreational athletes. This further supports that professional athletes tend to break away more from feminine stereotypes than recreational athletes.

Conclusion

This research is an essential first step to understanding the self-presentation behavior of professional and recreational athletes and the control and opportunities that social media allows them to break away from stereotypical media representations. The results show that although some stereotypical expectations remain, female athletes have improved their self-presentation tactics online, showing them as more in control and empowered over how they want to be seen, thus enabling them to build their athletic brands.

Data availability

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Yamaoka Memorial Foundation under Grant 00018.

Disclosure

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

References:

Ahmad, Nida, and Holly Thorpe. 2020. “Muslim Sportswomen as Digital Space Invaders: Hashtag Politics and Everyday Visibilities.” *Communication & Sport* 8 (4–5): 668–691. doi:10.1177/2167479519898447.

Benjamin, Daniel J., James O. Berger, Magnus Johannesson, Brian A. Nosek, E.-J. Wagenmakers, Richard Berk, Kenneth A. Bollen, et al. 2017. “Redefine Statistical Significance.” *Nature Human Behaviour* 2 (1): 6–10. doi:10.1038/s41562-017-0189-z.

Bodaghi, Amirhosein, and Jonice Oliveira. 2022. “A Longitudinal Analysis on Instagram Characteristics of Olympic Champions.” *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 12 (1): 3. doi:10.1007/s13278-021-00838-9.

Browning, Blair, and Jimmy Sanderson. 2012. “The Positives and Negatives of Twitter: Exploring How Student-Athletes Use Twitter and Respond to Critical Tweets.” *International Journal of Sport Communication* 5 (4): 503–521. doi:10.1123/ijsc.5.4.503.

Clavio, Galen, and Ted M. Kian. 2010. “Uses and Gratifications of a Retired Female Athlete’s Twitter Followers.” *International Journal of Sport Communication* 2010 (3): 485–500.

Coche, Roxane. 2014. “How Golfers and Tennis Players Frame Themselves: A Content Analysis of Twitter Profile Pictures.” *Journal of Sports Media* 9 (1): 95–121. doi:10.1353/jsm.2014.0003.

Devonport, Tracey J., Kath Leflay, and Kate Russell. 2019. “Examining the Construction of Identity among High Performance Male and Female Athletes Using Photography.” *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 11 (5): 720–739. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2019.1614973.

Eagleman, Andrea N. 2013. “Acceptance, Motivations, and Usage of Social Media as a Marketing Communications Tool amongst Employees of Sport National Governing Bodies.” *Sport Management Review* 16 (4): 488–497. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2013.03.004.

Ellison, Nicole, Rebecca Heino, and Jennifer Gibbs. 2006. “Managing Impressions Online: Self-Presentation Processes in the Online Dating Environment.” *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 11 (2): 415–441. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00020.x.

Emmons, Betsy, and Richard Mocarski. 2014. “She Poses, He Performs: A Visual Content Analysis of Male and Female Professional Athlete Facebook Profile Photos.” *Visual Communication Quarterly* 21 (3): 125–137. doi:10.1080/15551393.2014.893752.

Geurin, Andrea N. 2017. “Elite Female Athletes’ Perceptions of New Media Use Relating to Their Careers: A Qualitative Analysis.” *Journal of Sport Management* 31 (4): 345–359. doi:10.1123/jsm.2016-0157.

Geurin-Eagleman, Andrea N., and Lauren M. Burch. 2016. “Communicating via Photographs: A Gendered Analysis of Olympic Athletes’ Visual Self-Presentation on Instagram.” *Sport Management Review* 19 (2): 133–145. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2015.03.002.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, Erving. 1976. “Gender Display.” *Gender Advertisements*, 1–9.

Hambrick, Marion E., and Sun J. Kang. 2015. “Pin It: Exploring How Professional Sports Organizations Use Pinterest as a Communications and Relationship-Marketing Tool.” *Communication & Sport* 3 (4): 434–457. doi:10.1177/2167479513518044.

Hambrick, Marion E., Jason M. Simmons, Greg P. Greenhalgh, and T. Christopher Greenwell. 2010. “Understanding Professional Athletes’ Use of Twitter: A Content Analysis of Athlete Tweets.” *International Journal of Sport Communication* 3 (4): 454–471. doi:10.1123/ijsc.3.4.454.

Hayes, Michelle, Kevin Filo, Caroline Riot, and Andrea Geurin. 2019. “Athlete Perceptions of Social Media Benefits and Challenges During Major Sport Events.” *International Journal of Sport Communication* 12 (4): 449–481. doi:10.1123/ijsc.2019-0026.

Kane, Mary Jo, Nicole M. LaVoi, and Janet S. Fink. 2013. “Exploring Elite Female Athletes’ Interpretations of Sport Media Images: A Window Into the Construction of Social Identity and ‘Selling Sex’ in Women’s Sports.” *Communication & Sport* 1 (3): 269–298. doi:10.1177/2167479512473585.

Kassing, Jeffrey W., and Jimmy Sanderson. 2010. “Fan–Athlete Interaction and Twitter Tweeting Through the Giro: A Case Study.” *International Journal of Sport Communication* 3 (1): 113–128. doi:10.1123/ijsc.3.1.113.

Kavasoğlu, İrem, and Canan Koca. 2022. “Gendered Body of Turkish Bikini Fitness Athletes on Instagram.” *Communication & Sport* 10 (4): 685–707. doi:10.1177/2167479520961370.

Krane, Vikki, Sally R. Ross, Montana Miller, Julie L. Rowse, Kristy Ganoe, Jaclyn A. Andrzejczyk, and Cathryn B. Lucas. 2010. “Power and Focus: Self-representation of Female College Athletes.” *Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise* 2 (2): 175–195. doi:10.1080/19398441.2010.488026.

Landis, J. Richard, and Gary G. Koch. 1977. “The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data.” *Biometrics* 33 (1): 159. doi:10.2307/2529310.

Lebel, Katie, and Karen Danylchuk. 2012. “How Tweet It Is: A Gendered Analysis of Professional Tennis Players’ Self-Presentation on Twitter.” *International Journal of Sport Communication* 5 (4): 461–480. doi:10.1123/ijsc.5.4.461.

Li, Bo, Olan K. M. Scott, Michael L. Naraine, and Brody J. Ruihley. 2021. “Tell Me a Story: Exploring Elite Female Athletes’ Self-Presentation via an Analysis of Instagram Stories.” *Journal of Interactive Advertising* 21 (2): 108–120. doi:10.1080/15252019.2020.1837038.

Li, Yiyi, and Ying Xie. 2020. “Is a Picture Worth a Thousand Words? An Empirical Study of Image Content and Social Media Engagement.” *Journal of Marketing Research* 57 (1): 1–19. doi:10.1177/0022243719881113.

Marshall, P. David. 2010. “The Promotion and Presentation of the Self: Celebrity as Marker of Presentational Media.” *Celebrity Studies* 1 (1): 35–48. doi:10.1080/19392390903519057.

McGannon, Kerry R., Sydney Graper, and Jenny McMahon. 2022. “Skating through Pregnancy and Motherhood: A Narrative Analysis of Digital Stories of Elite Figure Skating Expectant Mothers.” *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 59 (March): 102126. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.102126.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 2010. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. 3. ed., [Nachdr.]. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Pocock, Molly, and Michael Skey. 2022. “‘You Feel a Need to Inspire and Be Active on These Sites Otherwise . . . People Won’t Remember Your Name’: Elite Female Athletes and the Need to Maintain ‘Appropriate Distance’ in Navigating Online Gendered Space.” *New Media & Society*, January, 146144482110693. doi:10.1177/14614448211069343.

Riff, Daniel. 2014. *Analyzing Media Messages: Using Quantitative Content Analysis in Research*. 3rd ed. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203551691.

Sanderson, Jimmy. 2011. “To Tweet or Not to Tweet: Exploring Division I Athletic Departments’ Social-Media Policies.” *International Journal of Sport Communication* 4 (4): 492–513. doi:10.1123/ijsc.4.4.492.

Sanderson, Jimmy. 2013. “From Loving the Hero to Despising the Villain: Sports Fans, Facebook, and Social Identity Threats.” *Mass Communication and Society* 16 (4): 487–509. doi:10.1080/15205436.2012.730650.

Santarossa, Sara, Paige Coyne, Craig Greenham, Marcia Milne, and Sarah Woodruff. 2019. “ESPN’s #BodyIssue on Instagram: The Self-Presentation of Women Athletes and Feedback

from Their Audience of Women." *Journal of Student Research* 8 (2). doi:10.47611/jsr.v8i2.818.

Schultz, Brad, and Mary Lou Sheffer. 2010. "An Exploratory Study of How Twitter Is Affecting Sports Journalism." *International Journal of Sport Communication* 3 (2): 226–239. doi:10.1123/ijsc.3.2.226.

Shreffler, Megan B., Meg G. Hancock, and Samuel H. Schmidt. 2016. "Self-Presentation of Female Athletes: A Content Analysis of Athlete Avatars." *International Journal of Sport Communication* 9 (4): 460–475. doi:10.1123/IJSC.2016-0086.

Smallwood, Rachael R., Natalie A. Brown, and Andrew C. Billings. 2014. "Female Bodies on Display: Attitudes Regarding Female Athlete Photos in Sports Illustrated's Swimsuit Issue and Espn : The Magazine's Body Issue." *Journal of Sports Media* 9 (1): 1–22. doi:10.1353/jsm.2014.0005.

Smith, Lauren Reichart, and Jimmy Sanderson. 2015. "I'm Going to Instagram It! An Analysis of Athlete Self-Presentation on Instagram." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 59 (2): 342–358. doi:10.1080/08838151.2015.1029125.

Toffoletti, Kim, and Holly Thorpe. 2018a. "Female Athletes' Self-Representation on Social Media: A Feminist Analysis of Neoliberal Marketing Strategies in 'Economies of Visibility.'" *Feminism & Psychology* 28 (1): 11–31. doi:10.1177/0959353517726705.

Toffoletti, Kim, and Holly Thorpe. 2018b. "The Athletic Labour of Femininity: The Branding and Consumption of Global Celebrity Sportswomen on Instagram." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 18 (2): 298–316. doi:10.1177/1469540517747068.

Trujillo, Nick. 1991. "Hegemonic Masculinity on the Mound: Media Representations of Nolan Ryan and American Sports Culture." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 8 (3): 290–308. doi:10.1080/15295039109366799.

Turková, Kateřina, Veronika Macková, and Alice Němcová Tejkalová. 2021. “Space for Self-Expression: Communication of Czech Female Athletes on Social Media and Fans’ Reactions.” *AUC KINANTHROPOLOGICA* 57 (2): 147–172. doi:10.14712/23366052.2021.10.

Table 1. Coding categories

Category	Analysis options	Cohen's Kappa
Photo type	Personal / Sports / Sponsored, others	0.72
Focus	Athlete/ Family or friend(s)/ Scenery / others	0.52
Prop	Yes / No	0.71
Is the brand or logo visible?	Yes / No	0.63
Is the athlete in the photo?	Yes / No	0.89
Number of people	Solo/ Pair / Group	0.95
Is the athlete looking at the camera?	Yes / No	0.83
Clothing	Uniform / Casual, others	0.84
Proximity	Tight / Medium / Wide	0.73
Type of shot	Headshot/ Half-body / Full-body/ Selfie	0.81
Facial expression	Happy/ Intense/ Others	0.83
Motion	Active sport / Active non-sport/ Passive sport / Passive non-sport	0.76
Touch	Yes/ No	0.74

Table 2. Differences in photo types based on player status

Coding categories	Total (n)	Total (%)	Professional (n)	Professional (%)	Recreational (n)	Recreational (%)	Chi-square significance
Photo type							
Sports	537	47.52%	303	48.10%	234	46.80%	$\chi2=8.51$, df=2,
Personal	495	43.81%	260	41.27%	235	47.00%	p=0.014
Sponsored, Others	98	8.67%	67	10.63%	31	6.20%	No significance
Focus							
Athlete	683	60.44%	406	64.44%	277	55.40%	$\chi2=111.13$, df=3,
Family / Friends	199	17.61%	150	23.81%	49	9.80%	p<0.001
Other	158	13.98%	36	5.71%	122	24.40%	Significant
Scenery	90	7.96%	38	6.03%	52	10.40%	
Prop							$\chi2=4.16$, df=1,
No	665	58.85%	354	56.19%	311	62.20%	p=0.04
Yes	242	41.15%	311	43.81%	189	37.80%	No significance

Brand or logo visible?							
No	650	57.52%	319	50.63%	331	66.20%	$\chi2$=27.64, df=1,
Yes	480	41.15%	311	49.37%	169	33.80%	p<0.001
							Significant
Athlete in photo?							
Yes	907	80.27%	586	93.02%	321	64.20%	$\chi2$=146.13, df=1,
No	223	19.73%	44	6.98%	179	35.80%	p<0.001
							Significant
<u>Photos in which the athlete appeared</u>							
Number of people							
Solo	576	63.51%	353	60.24%	223	69.47%	$\chi2$=8.86, df=2,
Pair	205	22.60%	149	25.43%	56	17.45%	p=0.011
Group	126	13.89%	84	14.33%	42	13.08%	No significance
Athlete looking at camera?							
Yes	550	60.64%	353	60.24%	199	61.99%	

No	357	39.36%	233	39.76%	122	38.01%	$\chi2=0.27$, df=1, p=0.60 No significance
Clothing							$\chi2=3.63$, df=1,
Uniform	541	59.65%	363	61.95%	178	55.45%	p=0.05
Casual, Others	366	40.35%	223	38.05%	143	44.55%	No significance
Proximity							
Wide	393	43.33%	266	45.39%	127	39.56%	$\chi2=24.41$, df=2,
Medium	324	35.72%	226	38.57%	98	30.53%	p<0.001
Tight	190	20.95%	94	16.04%	96	29.91%	Significant
Type of shot							
Full body	581	64.06%	388	66.21%	193	60.12%	$\chi2=8.64$, df=3,
Half-body	226	24.92%	137	23.38%	89	27.73%	p=0.03
Selfie	69	7.61%	37	6.31%	32	9.97%	No significance
Headshot	31	3.42%	24	4.10%	7	2.18%	

Facial expression							
Happy	635	70.01%	409	69.80%	226	70.40%	$\chi2$=41.62, df=2,
Others	142	15.66%	67	11.43%	75	23.36%	p<0.001
Intense	130	14.33%	110	18.77%	20	6.23%	Significant
Motion							
Passive non-sport	365	40.24%	258	44.03%	107	33.33%	$\chi2$=55.15, df=3,
Passive sport	325	35.83%	160	27.30%	165	51.40%	p<0.001
Active sport	193	21.28%	150	25.60%	43	13.40%	Significant
Active non-sport	24	2.65%	18	3.07%	6	1.87%	
Touch							
Yes	693	76.41%	470	80.20%	223	69.47%	$\chi2$=13.26, df=1,
No	214	23.59%	116	19.80%	98	30.53%	p<0.001
							Significant