



Title: Beyond Boundaries: The Development and Potential of Ethnography in the Study of Sport and Physical Culture

Author(s): Kass Gibson, Michael Atkinson

Copyright, publisher and additional information:

Gibson, Kass and Atkinson, Michael, Beyond Boundaries: The Development and Potential of Ethnography in the Study of Sport and Physical Culture; Cultural Studies – Critical Methodologies (Journal Volume Number and Issue Number (No assigned number as of 17th July 2017) pp. xx-xx. Copyright © 2017 (Kass Gibson, Michael Atkinson). Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications

DOI:

Reference: Gibson, Kass and Atkinson, Michael (2017) *Beyond Boundaries: The Development and Potential of Ethnography in the Study of Sport and Physical Culture*. Cultural Studies – Critical Methodologies. pp. xx-xx. ISSN 1532-7086

Beyond Boundaries: The Development and Potential of Ethnography in the Study of Sport and Physical Culture

Kass Gibson and Michael Atkinson

Introduction

Klein (2014, p.71) argues anthropology contributes cross-cultural analysis, transnational orientation, and ethnographic methodology to the study of sport and physical culture.¹

Without doubt, these three elements are prominent in socio-cultural sports literature.

However, such contributions are doubtfully attributable to anthropologists of sport alone given the “benign neglect” the sub-field receives, according to Klein (2014). Indeed, ethnographic approaches to the study of sport and physical culture have been typically framed in dialogue with very traditional, and now post-structural, sociological concerns and themes regarding agency, structure, power and inequality. For example, symbolism and ritual in fandom and participation has been theorised with reference to Bourdieu (Spaaji & Anderson, 2010) and Durkheim (Birrell, 1981; Serazio, 2013) rather than anthropological scholars and studies of ritual.

Academic focus on sport and physical culture has developed primarily within physical education and kinesiology programmes. In such environments, ethnographers are increasingly required to justify their methodology rather than object of study; scholars of sport and physical culture in mainstream sociology (or anthropology) departments face the opposite problem (Atkinson, 2011; Klein 2014). As such, Sage’s (1997, p.333) observation that “there has been no notable growth in the number of sociologists who claim sport as a speciality in the past 20 years” still rings true. Therefore, while scholars studying sport are much less apologetic about their topic of study and field, a view within the academy that sees sport as “just a game” and its study as of lower scholarly merit is still evident.²

However, sport is a complex global phenomenon that represents, reflects, and

¹ We use the term physical culture here to refer to expressions of embodiment such as exercise, physical activity and fitness practices to move beyond the “empirically limiting” nature of the term sport, rather than the Physical Cultural Studies project, or physical culturalist movement (cf. Silk, Andrews, & Thorpe, 2017 p.1).

² See Grainger (2011 pp.558-559) for a discussion of this phenomena

reproduces cultural and social practices, values, and norms. Similarly, exercise and physical activity practices provide rich and nuanced sites for interrogating and understanding complex behaviours, habits, values, and practices. Both reflect empirical shifts in the academy towards attending to the position of human bodies in contemporary society. Furthermore, while definitions remain elusive (cf. Andrews, 2008), sport and exercise are bodily practices that have diffused globally from Anglo/European homes and are marked by (the pursuit of) efficiently performing bodies (Maguire, 2004; McKenzie, 2013). We begin this paper by reviewing the emergence and development (i.e., travels) of ethnographic investigation of sport and physical culture. In doing so, we highlight how the empirical site of ethnographic work belies significant changes and development in assumptions about, and theorizing of, movement practices. We demonstrate that while some anthropologists have attended to play and games in their analyses, sport and exercise have largely been ignored. Ethnographers of sport and exercise have similarly ignored anthropology. The transdisciplinary travels of ethnography in sport and exercise, then, have been marked by terminological slippage and different emphases in empirical focus on culture (Midol & Broyer, 1995). More specifically, we note how anthropologically-informed ethnographies are primarily concerned with cross-cultural analyses whereas sociologically-informed ethnographies have homed in on subcultural analyses. Following this we critically outline the emergence of Physical Cultural Studies (PCS) and framing of ethnographic investigation of sport and exercise therein. Rather than exhuming existing debates about the originality and uniqueness of the PCS enterprise, we highlight the need for the consideration of pleasure and decentering of the researcher in the future travels of ethnographic studies of sport and physical culture.

Anthropology: Games, play, body cultures, sport

Anthropologists Midol and Broyer (1995, p.203) argue that sport has not been meticulously examined within their discipline because sport is not seen as “culture in the true

anthropological sense of the word.” Historically, at least, this can be attributed to Wolf’s (1982, p.16) critical identification that “sociology studies the West, while anthropology studies the rest.” The aforementioned cross-cultural and transnational perspectives have trumped sport and physical culture as a site for ethnographic investigation (Markula, 2016). However, charges of fascination with exotic others levelled at contemporary anthropology and anthropologists are unfair. Indeed, “culture” has undergone significant and serious reconsideration, and notions of exoticism have been subject to longstanding critiques (e.g., Clifford, 1988). Nonetheless, in sport and physical culture Markula (2016) highlights exoticism frames most anthropologically oriented ethnographies of sport and exercise. Furthermore, Klein (2014) documents the illegitimacy of sport within the anthropological community, listing a number of excellent ethnographers who shifted empirical focus away from sport for the sake of their careers in anthropology. Against such a backdrop Klein (2014) describes Noel Dyck’s self-identification as a sport anthropologist as “brave.”

Despite the field-wide reluctance to engage sport as serious subject of inquiry, anthropologists have long attended to the cultural significance of games and play.³ Conceptualising sport as a type of game, Blanchard (1995) retrospectively identifies the importance of sport for anthropologists and ethnographers. Similarly, Klein (2014), focusing on the ceremonial and social functionality of games, claims Geertz’s (1973) study of cock fighting as a proto-typical ethnography of sport and example of the importance of sport (as representative of games) in conducting analyses of cultural practice writ large. Rather than demonstrating good practice or the value of attending to sport in ethnographic analyses, however, such claims are reminiscent of tactics used by sociologist of sport whereby retrospective appeal to disciplinary canon is motivated as part of (largely failed) attempts at legitimizing the field (Malcolm, 2012). As such, Bolin and Granskog’s (2003) argument that

³ See, for example, Roberts, Arth, and Bush’s (1959) tripartite classificatory system

“the anthropological study of sport has a long history under the appellation of games” (p.9) is far from compelling given they also note “sport and exercise ethnography of today is still in its infancy” (p.8).

Early ethnographic studies of sport conducted by scholars trained and/or working in anthropology departments include Frankenburg’s (1957) investigation of the connections between the football club, and village activities, friendships, and politics in North Wales, and Fox’s (1961) connection of superstition in Hopi culture to the ways in which baseball was played and the meanings it carried. From such humble beginnings (a handful of) anthropologists have addressed sport (especially baseball)⁴ to build understandings of cultural reproduction and resistance (e.g., Gmelch, 1972, 2006; Klein, 1991), nationalism(s), identity, and globalization (Archetti, 1999; Kelly, 1998, 2004; Klein, 1997, 2006; Perez, 1994), gender, sexualities, (dis)ability and the body (Atler, 1992, Brownell, 1995; Deaner & Smith, 2013; Howe, 2004, 2008; Rana, 2014; Samie, 2013), evolution (Apostolou, 2014), and childhood (Dyck, 2006).

Anthropologists have also undertaken ethnographic investigations of exercise cultures. Bodybuilding, described by Klein (1993 p.3) as a “subculture of hyperbole”, has attracted the most significant attention from anthropologists (e.g., Bolin 1992; 2003; Boyle 1995; Fisher 1997; Guthrie & Castelnovo 1992; Heywood 1998; Klein, 1993; Lowe 1998; Probert, Palmer, & Leberman 2007; Shilling & Bunsell, 2009). In pursuit of understanding gendered culture and embodiment a new anthropological literature on exercise is emergent outside of bodybuilding (e.g., Sehlikoglu & Karaks, 2016; Spielvogel, 2003). For example, Sehlikoglu’s (2016) ethnographic investigation of women-only exercise spaces in Turkey highlights the nuanced interactions between cultural and religious norms and gendered organization of bodily movements in public and private spheres of women’s lives.

⁴ e.g., Fox (1991), Gmelch, (1972, 2001, 2006), Kelly (1998), Klein (1997, 2006, 2009), and Perez (1994).

As mentioned above, Markula (2016, p.37) notes that despite significant conceptual and methodological debates that have enabled anthropologists to “view all cultures as ‘strange’, contested, temporal and emergent” anthropologically-orientated ethnographers of sport and physical culture still feel compelled to frame their studies through cross-cultural or unconventional points of difference. The accentuation of difference is most obvious in (the popularity of) analyses of bodybuilding. As such, sociologist Lee Monaghan (2014), who has also conducted extensive ethnographic investigation of bodybuilding, argues anthropologists predominantly framed bodybuilders via a perspective Richardson (2012, p.23) describes as “narcissistic, vacuous ‘muscle-headz’”. Furthermore, anthropologists’ investigations of everyday exercise practices occur cross-culturally (e.g., Spielvogel, 2003; Sehlirkoglu, 2016). In much the same way that ethnographic investigations of sport are almost exclusively conducted in, from the perspective of white, Anglo-American scholars, exotic (e.g., Adler, 1992; Brownell, 1995; Fox, 1961; Kelly, 1998; Klein, 1991) or inaccessible (e.g., Gmelch, 2001) cultures. A strong fascination with difference and non-quotidian practices dominates anthropology and underscores an imagination preoccupied with exercising Others.

In this sense, the aforementioned definitional issues of culture manifest in cross-cultural and transnational comparisons to the (ethnographic) study of sport and physical culture. For Markula (2016), such approaches are yet to shed the baggage of viewing other cultures as authentic living histories of cultural development and evolution. For us, this reflects both an anthropological fascination with difference, which faintly echoes “old” exoticism, and anthropologists’ attendance to social groups on the fringes of society. By way of comparison, studies of gyms (Crossley, 2006; Sassatelli, 2010; Smith-Maguire, 2004; Waring, 2008; Wiest, Andrews, & Giardina, 2015), aerobics classes (Parvianinen, 2011; Neville et al, 2015), and other fitness practices (Dworkin, 2001; 2003; Weedon, 2015) informed primarily by sociological and cultural studies concerns and theoretical perspectives

have mushroomed. Evidently, there is a distinct lag (but by no means complete absence, e.g., Sehlikoglu, 2016; Sehlikoglu, & Karakas, 2016) in anthropologists following suit. We agree, in hope, with Eastman (2014), who notes “anthropologists of sport may yet have something more to say about how the politics of play shape rather than merely reflect the play of politics.”

Sociology of Sport, Exercise, and Ethnography

The development of ethnographic investigations of sport occurred significantly differently amongst British academics than the (mostly)⁵ North American anthropologists mentioned above. This can be attributed to, in part, to the dominance of football (and virtual non-existence of baseball) in the British sporting landscape and its prominence in British culture (Cleland, 2015). In this sense, sociologists’ ethnographic forays were less concerned with definitional and conceptual issues regarding culture than anthropologists’ (cf. Markula, 2016) and decided to “get on with it” (Lincoln & Denzin, 2000). More specifically, as Dunn and Hughson (2016) identify, the pervasiveness of football hooliganism⁶ in Britain coincided with rising interest in Norbert Elias’ career-long theorising of the civilizing process and relationship with inter-personal violence and self-control.⁷ Elias’s figural sociology became central in the genesis of the sociological study of sport proper (Mennell, 2006) but also to the emergence of ethnographic studies of sport specifically (Dunn & Hughson, 2016). For example, John Williams, supported by Patrick Murphy and Eric Dunning, used covert participant observation to understand the antecedents and precursors to episodes of fan disorder (i.e., hooliganism) and official responses. As such, Williams, Murphy, and Dunning (1984) sought to understand the social causes of hooliganism. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the

⁵ Save, of course, Frankenburg (1957) whose aforementioned study was based in Wales.

⁶ Football hooliganism is unruly, violent, and disorderly behaviour by soccer fans. While sometimes spontaneous disorder, hooliganism is marked by racism, and organised conflict between rival gangs, or “firms” associated with football clubs. Hooliganism was so widespread in the UK during the 1970s and 1980s it was dubbed “the English disease.”

⁷ See Mennell (2015) for a discussion of the ‘discovery’ of Elias theory and Dunning (1999) for a discussion of sport

research team were unable to provide any definitive answer. Partly, according to Armstrong and Harris (1991) because – in a critique common to ethnographers - Williams, Dunning, and Murphy (1984) were not ethnographic enough.⁸ That being said, and by way of response, fan disorder became a key focus of study using a range of ethnographic practices (e.g., Armstrong, 1998; Boyle 1994; Giulianotti, 1996, 1995, 2002; Hughson, 1998; Robson, 2000; Williams, 1994). Violence, particularly in the form of boxing (and certainly not predominantly from an Eliasian perspective) was another key site in the emergence of sociologically oriented ethnographies of sport (Sugden, 1987, 1996; Waquant, 1995, 2004).⁹ Of broader import to sporting ethnography, however, was the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS), which provided both impetus and theoretical benchmarks for ethnographic inquiry beyond attendance to violence and traditional sport forms (Carrington & Andrews, 2013; Hargreaves & McDonald, 2000; Wheaton, 2017).

Sport, especially football, in Britain was germane to the CCCS' broader programme of understanding (male) working-class culture (see: Critcher, 1974; Peters, 1976; Willis, 1974). However, only Clarke (1976) engaged empirically with sport. Nevertheless, Donnelly (1985), Silk (2005), and Wheaton (2017) all point towards sporting subcultures, prompted by CCCS sensibilities, as the primary sites for the development of ethnographies of sport and physical culture.¹⁰ Contemporary commentaries from Donnelly (1985) and Donnelly and Young (1988) identified that while a number of sociologists in the late 1970s and early 1980s studied sport “seriously” (e.g., Faulkner, 1974a, 1974b; Furst 1974; Henricks, 1974; Massengale, 1974; Vaz & Thomas, 1974), ethnographic forays into sporting subcultures stemmed from dissatisfaction with such studies (notably including Eliasian scholarship such as Sheard and Dunning, 1973) rooted in observational and interview and/or survey

⁸ Indeed figurational sociologists in sport have long dealt with criticisms of their empirical “groundings” (cf. Dunning & Rojek, 1992)

⁹ See Channon & Jennings (2004) for a review of boxing and combat sport studies

¹⁰ See Donnelly (1985), Wheaton (2013), and Thorpe et al (2016) for definitional issues related to subculture and sport

methodologies.¹¹ Central to the emergence of a new “critical mass” of ethnographic studies of sport was a collective desire to develop “description of the characteristics of the subculture and behaviour of the members – the presentation of ‘insider’ information that is only accessible to the participant observer” (Donnelly & Young, 1988 p.223). From such beginnings, Silk (2005) argues early ethnographic investigations of sport primarily provided descriptive accounts of subcultural practices (e.g., Fine, 1987), careers (e.g., Donnelly & Young, 1988) and deviance (e.g., Young, 1988). Thus, just as sport did not resonate with the conceptual apparatus of anthropological framing of culture (cf. Midol & Broyer, 1995 above) the descriptive purposes of early ethnographers, and critical questioning regarding violence and deviance, resonated with sociological ways of thinking generally and contemporary trends in social theory. Subsequent development of sporting ethnographies, as recounted by King-White (2013), grew out of dissatisfaction with symbolic interactionist theorising in (sport) ethnography¹² rather than attempts to understand more than the cultural practice(s) of sport (cf. Atkinson, 2012).

King-White (2013) highlights the growth in ethnographic techniques used to build understanding of cultural intermediates (MacNeill, 1996; Silk, 2001, 2002; White, Silk, & Andrews, 2008) and sport in marginalized subcultures (e.g., Darnell, 2007, 2014; Loland, 2000; Paraschak, 1997). Marginalized “sporting” subcultures and leisure-based “action sports” were also key sites for the uptake of ethnography (e.g., Beal, 1995; Wheaton, 2000). Importantly, a central component of these developments was framing ethnography as a “civic, participatory, collaborative project” (Silk, 2005 p.71).

In the first instance this was indicative of sporting ethnographers reflecting performative turns and crises of representation brought about by way of methodological consideration of the explosion of post-modern and post-structural theorising in Anglophone

¹¹ Typical of this ilk is Goodger and Goodger (1977) who note their positions as cultural insiders in Judo, yet did not deploy ethnographic methodologies

¹² A dismissal we see as unfair (cf. Atkinson & Gibson, 2017 p.28; Prus, 1999)

academia in the mid- to late-1990s (Denzin, 1997; Richardson, 1994). As such, creative and storied presentation, particularly through auto-ethnographic research (e.g., Sparkes, 2002a, 2002b) emerged apace in sport and physical culture literature. Second, nuanced critique and consideration of the politics of evidence and the potential for ethnographic engagement to promote change meant that the emphasis of ethnographies of “privileged [sporting] subcultures” (King-White, 2013, 2017) shifted. Therefore, ethnographic investigation increasingly focused on physical cultural practices beyond sport, and addressing privileges (race, class, gender, sexuality, etc.) enjoyed and maintained - deliberately or otherwise - within sporting subcultures (e.g., Olive & Thorpe, 2011; Thorpe, 2011). In doing so, the desire to “open up the back regions, the non-public aspects of the subcultures” (Donnelly, 1985, p.546) that initiated the sporting ethnographic enterprise was decentred.

Physical Cultural Studies and (Re)consideration of Ethnography: Promises & Pitfalls

PCS as an “intellectual assemblage in constant state of becoming” (Silk, Andrews, & Thorpe, 2017 p.2) is the ferment of the organization of the study of sport, exercise and physical activity identified by Robert Hollands which “ironically pairs the social critic with those very individuals in sport science whose professional ideology reinforces ahistorical and functionalist approaches to the subject” (1984, p.73). A range of scholars deploying ethnographic methodologies and sensitivities, and actively self-identifying as engaged in the PCS “dialogic learning community” (Silk et al., 2017, p.2) has emerged recently. However, formally designated PCS research programmes have emerged in but a handful of institutional ‘groups’ (e.g., University of Bath and University of Toronto) and ‘laboratories’ (e.g., University of Maryland and University of British Columbia). Nonetheless, a common feature of the institutional homes of PCS researchers, in formally designated groups or otherwise, is their location in faculties and departments attentive to sport, exercise, and physical activity

(e.g., Maryland and British Columbia PCS laboratories are housed in Departments of Kinesiology). Direct calls and antecedents for PCS are found in Ingham's (1997) vision of Physical Cultural Studies departments, Andrews' (2008) seminal identification of kinesiology's "inconvenient truth", and a 2011 special issue of the *Sociology of Sport Journal*.¹³ Alongside aforementioned broadening of empirical sites of investigation and focus on power and privileges within such departments PCS is also a crystallization of a contextual response to the intensification of conservative ideologies within the academy. Such intensification is arguably felt more acutely (if not encountered more frequently in intra-departmental politics) given the aforementioned ironic pairing (cf. Sparkes, 2007). In such a context, imperatives to pursue research impact (narrowly conceived) and concomitant redoubling of neo-positivist philosophies of science bolsters sport and physical culture research agendas (preferably privately funded) focused on advancing athletic performance and biomedical rationale for physical activity in chronic disease prevention and management (Andrews, Silk, Francombe, & Bush, 2013; Silk, Francombe, & Andrews, 2014). Thus, for PCS protagonists - including King-White (2017) and Giardina and Newman (2011) - issues of embodiment, reflexivity, representation and interventionists agendas for ethnographic research attending to varied forms of human embodiment is what marks its methodological and empirical difference from the sociology of sport in particular. To this we would add anthropological studies of play and games. Ethnographies in this vein have addressed questions pertaining to who has the power to participate in sport (e.g., Donnelly, 2014; Laurendeau, 2011; Maddox, 2015), how sport is a site for the tactical (re)production of normative identities (e.g., De Luca, 2014; Francombe-Webb, Rich, & De Pian, 2014; Swanson, 2009), how sport involvement jibes with dominant cultural worldviews (e.g., Atkinson, 2009; Fletcher, 2014), and how the construction of privileging social and cultural

¹³ See Silk et al., (2017) and Vertinsky and Weedon (2017) for more detailed discussions of the emergence of PCS.

networks are reinforced through participation (e.g., Olive & Thorpe, 2011; Walton & Fisette, 2013). Importantly, as PCS scholars note, such developments are by no means new.

However, for proponents of ethnographic inquiry in PCS the re-articulation and reinvigoration of radically contextual critical ethnographic understandings of embodiment and corporeal representation in, through, and about sport, physical activity, and exercise practices must be mobilized in pursuit of positive and progressive cultural, political, policy, and procedural change in the hope of more equitable, safe, inclusive, pleasurable, and meaningful experiences. King-White (2017 p.491) specifically calls for PCS ethnographers to become “more emotive, pedagogical, and moving.”

A central pillar of the kind of ethnography advocated for PCS is a response to the act of using reduced and selected participant stories assembled to suit the researcher’s theoretical purposes and career development (King-White, 2013; see also Klein, 2014 above). For some, any attempt to portray a physical culture and its members academically may be viewed as an act of academic deception or thievery (van Maanen, 2001). This methodological critique is connected to pervasive theorizing in PCS about hyper-individualism, ideological implosion in the West, identity-rights movements and associated politics, and the degree to which scholars in the field have called into question (and rightfully so) how minority groups have been systematically excluded from the historical creation of knowledge about physical culture. More specifically, the methodological response is PCS scholars’ urgency to pursue ethnographic work “driven by principles of self-reflexivity, critical intervention, committed to co-creating the context for multi-vocal performances and texts, and social justice for all those participating in our studies” (King-White, 2013 p.300).

As Pringle and Thorpe (2017 p.33) note, “many contemporary ethnographers [within and outside PCS] seem to agree in the virtue of reflexivity.” However, the kind of reflexivity that King-White (2013, 2017) advocates too often becomes a self-indulgent discussion about

ethnographers between ethnographers. Here we see examples of work that Lynch (2000, p.47) would recognise as “tedious, pretentious, and unrevealing” (e.g., Newman, 2013). To be clear, ours is neither a criticism of auto-ethnography nor reflexivity in ethnography.¹⁴ When the balance is right the ethnographer provides greater insight (e.g., Bunds, 2016; Flanagan, 2014) and/or methodological lessons and ethical considerations regarding the everyday and oftentimes unavoidable challenges of doing ethnography (e.g., Atkinson, 2014; Olive & Thorpe, 2011; Newman, 2011). However, the foregrounding of reflexivity in PCS ethnographies creates a tendency for introspective hand-wringing (e.g., Bunds, 2014; Clift, 2014; King-White, 2013; Newman, 2013) or tales of self-valour (e.g., Thorpe, 2014) despite being conducted in the effort of deconstructing power and social inequality in/through/as physical culture.

Meeting the avowed interventionist and reflexive intent of PCS ethnographies means eschewing the notion of universal or generic cultural truths hidden under the guise of critical theory. More importantly, contra the claims of some PCS protagonists, it means pushing the performance of reflexivity about the nature of one’s position (identities) in the research process (e.g., King-White, 2013; Newman & Giardina, 2011) to the background. As such, it requires exploring possibilities for representing living, moving cultural processes beyond standard flat, two-dimensional textual means; viewing the social and cultural milieu of sport and physical culture as more than a breeding ground for injustice, suffering, alienation, and a host of other social problems; and, perhaps most importantly, enabling people to speak for themselves by de-centering the (hyper-reflexive) researcher. These brands of PCS ethnography require slow, meticulous and long-term approaches to the ethnographic research act (Silk, Francombe, & Andrews, 2014), a willingness to live among and like those we study

¹⁴ We count ourselves amongst the aforementioned many ethnographers identified by Pringle and Thorpe, and have used auto-ethnographic methods in our own work (e.g., Atkinson & Gibson, 2014; Gibson, 2012.)

and, as such, requires us to become a more wholly *emplaced* presence in the practice of everyday life with others (Pink, 2009).

Future Travels

Whilst the form, content, originality and direction of the emerging, inclusionary, disciplinary-spanning PCS movement are hotly debated (Atkinson, 2011), there can be no doubt that ethnographically-based PCS scholarship has, at a minimum, challenged extant thinking about the role, purpose and dominant epistemologies in studies of sport, exercise, activity and health. That said, although often unwritten as such, ethnography's enduring contribution to the study of the human condition in sport and physical culture (or elsewhere) perhaps rests on its foundational interest in unpacking the ways in which people experience embodied life daily within small groups. Each ethnographic journey shares an epistemological and ontological mandate for examining how people's experiences in the world should and must figure at the centre of theorising what it means to be a situated person engaged in a specific socio-historical context. To this end, the most beautiful, engaging, penetrating, moving, enriching and reality congruent ethnographies of PCS are conducted as embodied cultural studies in and of the *first-person*. A PCS of the first-person strives to unpack the ways by which people, in cultural contexts and social locations, experience life within small groups, institutions and highly organized human societies. For us, a first-person PCS is a humane, emotionally-sensitive, embodied and deeply interpersonal enterprise attentive to the striking similarities, rather than mass differences, of the human experience for people immersed in sport, exercise, physical activity and other movement-based leisure pursuits. First-person ethnographies PCS are fundamentally, then, about how people perform, reproduce and challenge culture through mutually oriented forms of "sporting" embodiment, but also how core questions about the human condition may be studied.

A forward thinking, ethnographically-based, physical cultural studies of the first-person must explore the possibility of human pleasure through movement as a (if not *the*) core substantive and ethnographic focus. Said differently, embodied (cultural) pleasure becomes a sense of creative agency as demonstrated in the work of, for example, Sehlirkoglu (2016). We feel that such an ethnographic enterprise requires researchers of sport and physical culture to break new ground and transgress disciplinary boundaries by pursuing theoretically-driven research with much vigour, and research beyond the comfortable subjects we so regularly study as PCS researchers. Indeed, we think it is fair to write that PCS ethnographies have almost universally homed in on the ways in which injustice, power differentials, inequality and cultural alienation are located and expressed through sport. That is to say, in studying moving bodies and their articulation in society PCS often focuses more on social structures and forces rather than on people doing meaningful, everyday, non-political, and banal things with their bodies as physical culture. Indeed, the focus on forces and structures over engaged people has become both the methodological and theoretical *lingua franca*. Further still, ethnographically documenting the pleasurable aspects of the human condition, especially beyond functional or utilitarian perspectives, appears to be a radical interventionist task (Atkinson & Gibson, 2017). Thus, despite Stebbins' definition of the ethnographic focus as, "the study of what people do to organize their lives such that those lives become, in combination, substantially rewarding, satisfying and fulfilling" (2009, xi) few PCS "first person" scholars have—save for a handful including Pringle, Rinehart, and Caudwell (2015), Gibson (2014), and Wellard (2013)¹⁵—explored first-person testimonials of the intricacies of pleasure in everyday leisure, sport, physical activity, and exercise practices. Therefore, in seeking to break new and interesting substantive and theoretical ground, ethnographies of physical culture might do well to explore how forms of sport, exercise,

¹⁵ We include – retrospectively given the emergence of PCS - Pronger (2002) to this list

dance, and play might help to proactively serve (and dare we argue, meet) the psychological, emotional, and cultural needs and desires of people. In essence, this requires realising the aforementioned retrospective credence-seeking claims for ethnographies of sport and physical culture made by Blanchard (1995) and Klein (2014). This would involve exploring human movement/training/exercise in physical cultures as forms of agency-building in a variety of manners, or the cultivation of mind-body connections for people. As Game and Metcalfe (1996) contend, such a discipline requires an orientation of passion and humanism in one's ethnographic enterprise. It requires one, at times, to speak truth (and often *many* truths), and to become more engaged with, and committed to, the outcomes of our research on people's lives. It may require (re)turning to anthropology to go beyond the sporting realm in order to (re)centre non-mainstream physical activities and 'populations.' In effect, to better understand and promote pleasure, inclusively healthy notions of the body, inclusivity, and experiences of health, wellness, varied (dis)abilities and illness. Such approaches enable both attending to potential solutions to broad gauge social problems as well as emphasising aspects of embodiment that cannot easily be explicated in discursive and academic terms.

We would add that a person-first PCS in which ethnographic epistemologies are privileged is one in which both interpersonal sensitivity between researchers and subjects, and *the social validity of the very research process itself* (i.e., is this project going to do some good for someone), are deeply engrained in and through the emplaced/embodied ethnographic research act.

PCS is the latest iteration of the contested disciplinary terrain that ethnographic study of sport and physical culture travels through. Ethnography could become, as we hope it will, an academic place where key features of the human condition revealed through sport and exercise are investigated ethnographically (such as the experience of pleasure, suffering, the quest for personal meaning, authenticity and truth, and the realization of personal agency) we

recommend that future travels of ethnography in sport and physical culture are predicated on a number of steps. All of which must go beyond definitional struggles with culture to form a bulwark against the disembodied framing of rationalised approaches to sport and physical activity.

First, it requires a researcher to be personally, affectively, cognitively, physically, and socially open *with and among* people. Second, it demands *co-presence* (thinking, feeling, interacting, working beside, pursuing intersubjectivity) with them in the practice of everyday life. Third, the practice of PCS ethnographies evolves as a concatenated effort to illuminate *the commonalities of lived experience* and the human condition, in the hopes of destabilizing conceptual and structural-material differences between people that are used, so often, as a social tool of exclusion, power, dominance and exploitation. Fourth, it asks researchers to think creatively and simultaneously about how the *pleasurable and not-so-pleasurable aspects of human existence* are apparent in physical cultural practices. Fifth, such a vision of PCS asks researchers to *allow themselves to be written*, in a liminal way, by and through the ethnographic research act; in short, to be changed (socially, emotionally, cognitively, ideologically) at times. The making of relationships that last beyond the ‘fieldwork stages’, changes to the physical body, changes to one’s mind-set, new emotional experiences are all regular parts of engaging and learning cultures. Sixth, and finally, it requires new and innovative ethnographic modes of representing the human condition as learned and constructed through fieldwork. This is what Gouldner (1975) referred to, quite some time ago, as a more humane (first-person) ethnographic research practice. The merit, hope and future of ethnographies of physical culture may just very well lay in their collective engagement with such visions of the academic enterprise.

References

- Alter, J. (1992). *The wrestler's body: Identity and ideology in North India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Andrews, D.L. (2008) Kinesiology's Inconvenient Truth and the Physical Cultural Studies Imperative, *Quest*, 60(1), 45-62.
- Andrews, D.L., Silk, M., Francombe, J. & Bush, A. (2013). McKinesiology. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 35(5), 335-356.
- Apostolou, M. (2015). The athlete and the spectator inside the man: A cross-cultural investigation of the evolutionary origins of athletic behaviour. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 49(2), 151-173.
- Archetti, E. (1999). *Masculinities: Football, polo, and tango in Argentina*. Oxford: Berg.
- Armstrong, G. (1998). *Football hooligans: Knowing the score*. Oxford: Berg.
- Atkinson, M. (2011). Physical cultural studies [redux]. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28(1), 135-144.
- Atkinson, M. (2012). The empirical strikes back: Doing realist ethnography in K. Young & M. Atkinson (Eds) *Qualitative Research on Sport and Physical Culture* (pp.23-49). London: Emerald.
- Atkinson, M. (2014). The Terrier [men]. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 31(4), 420-437
- Atkinson, M. & Gibson, K. (2014). Communion without collision: Animals, sport and interspecies co-presence.' In M. Gilbert & J. Gillett (Eds.), *Sport, Animals and Society* (pp.268-290). London: Routledge.
- Atkinson, M. & Gibson, (2017). Power and power relations in M.L. Silk, D.L. Andrews, & H. Thorpe (Eds) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Culture Studies*

- (pp.24-31). London: Routledge.
- Birrell, S. (1981). Sport as ritual: Interpretations from Durkheim to Goffman. *Social Forces*, 60(2), 354-376.
- Beal, B. (1995). Disqualifying the official: Exploring social resistance through the subculture of skateboarding. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12(3), 252–267.
- Blanchard, K. (1995). *The anthropology of sport: An introduction*. London: Bergin & Garvey.
- Bolin, A. (1992). Flex Appeal, Food and Fat: Competitive Bodybuilding, Gender, and Diet. *Play and Culture*, 5(4) ,378– 400.
- Bolin, A. (2003). Beauty or the Beast: The Subversive Soma in A. Bolin & J. Granskog, (Eds) *Athletic intruders: Ethnographic research on women, culture, and exercise* (pp.107-130). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Bolin, A. & Granskog, J. (2003). *Athletic intruders: Ethnographic research on women, culture, and exercise*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Boyle, L. (2005). Flexing the Tensions of Female Muscularity: How Female Bodybuilders Negotiate Normative Femininity in Competitive Bodybuilding. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 33(1/2), 134-149.
- Boyle, R. (1994). We are Celtic Supporters....: Questions of football and identity in modern Scotland. In R. Giulianotti & J. Williams (Eds), *Game Without Frontiers* (pp.72-102). Aldershot: Arena.
- Brownell, S. (1995). *Training the body for China: Sports in the moral order of the People's Republic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bunds, K.S. (2014). The biopolitics of privilege: Negotiating class, masculinity and relationships. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 14(5), 517-525.
- Bunds, K.S. (2016). On the messiness of activism from the inside: Global water charities,

- organizational ethnography, and the politics of change. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 38(3), 236-259.
- Carrington, B. & Andrews, D.L. (2013). Sport as Escape, Struggle, and Art in B. Carrington & D.L. Andrews (Eds) *A Companion to Sport* (pp.1-16). Wiley-Blackwell: London.
- Channon, A. & Jennings, G. (2014). Exploring embodiment through martial arts and combat sports: a review of empirical research *Sport in Society*, 17(6), 773-789.
- Clarke, J. (1976). The skinheads and the magical recovery of community. In S. Hall & T. Jefferson (Eds.), *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain* (pp.99-102). London: Hutchinson.
- Cleland, J. (2015). *A sociology of football in a global context*. London: Routledge.
- Clift, B.C. (2014). Suspect of Smiles: Struggle, Compassion, and Running to Reclaim the Body in Urban Baltimore. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 14(5), 496–505
- Critcher, C. (1974). *Football since the war: A study in social change and popular culture*. Stencilled Occasional Papers of the Birmingham CCCS Retrieved from: <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/history/cccs/stencilled-occasional-papers/9and25to37/SOP29.pdf>
- Crossley, N. (2006). In the gym: Motives, meanings and moral careers. *Body & Society*, 12(1), 23-50.
- Darnell, S. (2007). Playing with ‘race’: Right to play and the production of whiteness in ‘development’ through sport. *Sport in Society*, 10(4), 560-579
- Darnell, S. (2014). Orientalism through sport: Towards a Said-ian analysis of imperialism and ‘sport for development and peace’ *Sport in Society*, 17(8), 1000-1014

- Deaner, R.O. & Smith, B.A. (2013). Sex difference in sports across 50 societies. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 47(3), 268-309.
- DeLuca, J. (2013). Submersed in social segregation: The (re)production of social capital through swim club membership. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 37(4), 340-363
- Denzin, N. (1997). *Interpretive Ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Donnelly, M. (2014). Drinking with the derby girls: Exploring the hidden ethnography in research of women's flat track roller derby *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 49(3-4), 346-366.
- Donnelly, P. (1985). Sport subcultures. *Exercise and Sport Science Reviews*, 13, 539-578
- Donnelly, P. & Young, K. (1988). The construction and confirmation of identity in sport subcultures. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, 197-211
- Dunn, C. & Hughson, J. (2016). Ethnography in sport-related research: Influences, continuities, possibilities In G. Molnar & L. Purdy (Eds.), *Ethnographies in sport and exercise research* (pp.11-25). London: Routledge.
- Dworkin, S. (2001). "Holding back": Negotiating and glass ceiling on women's muscular strength. *Sociological Perspectives*, 44, 333-350.
- Dworkin, S. (2003). A woman's place is in the . . . cardiovascular room?? Gender relations, the body, and the gym In A. Bolin & J. Granskog (Eds). *Athletic intruders: Ethnographic research on women, culture, and exercise* (pp.131-158). Albany: Suny.
- Dyck, N. (2012). *Fields of Play: An ethnography of children's sports*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Eastman, B. (2014). Sports Integration, *Cultural Anthropology* website
<https://culanth.org/fieldsights/496-sports-integration>
- Faulkner, R. (1974a). Coming of age in organisations: A comparative study of career

- contingencies and adult socialization. *Sociology of Work & Occupations*, 1(2), 131-173
- Faulkner, R. (1974b). Making violence by doing work: Selves situations and the world of professional hockey. *Sociology of Work & Occupations*, 1(3), 288-312
- Fine, G.A. (1987). *With the boys: Little league baseball and preadolescent culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fisher, L.A. (1997). Building One's Self Up: Bodybuilding and the Construction of Identity among Professional Female Bodybuilders In P.L. Moore (Ed) *Building Bodies* (pp.135–161). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Flanagan, M.K. (2014). Sporting a Skort: The Biopolitics of Materiality *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 14(5), 506–516
- Fox, R. (1961). Pueblo baseball: A new use for old magic. *Journal of American Folklore*, 74(1), 9-16.
- Francombe, J., Rich, E. & De Pian, L. (2014). I move like you... but different: Biopolitics and embodied methodologies. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 14(5), 471-482.
- Frankenburg, R. (1957). *Village on the border: A social study of religion, politics, and football in a North Wales community*. Long Grove: Waveland.
- Furst, R.T. (1974). Boxing stereotypes versus the cultures of the professional boxer: A sociological decision. *Sport Sociology Bulletin*, 3(1), 13-39.
- Game, A. & Metcalfe, A.W., (1996). *Passionate Sociology*. London: Sage.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight. In C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (pp. 412-453). New York: Basic Books.
- Giardina, M. D., & Newman, J. I. (2011). What is this “physical” in physical cultural

- studies? *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28(1), 36-63.
- Gibson, K. (2012). 'Knight's Children: Techno-science, consumerism and running shoes.' *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 4(3), 341-361
- Giulianotti, R. (1995). Participant observation and research into football hooliganism: Reflections on the problems on entrée and everyday risks. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 9(1), 207-219.
- Giulianotti, R. (1996). Back to the future: An ethnography of Ireland's football fans at the 1994 World Cup finals in the USA. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 31, 323-344.
- Giulianotti, R. (2002). Supporters, followers, fans, and flaneurs: A taxonomy spectator identities in football. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 26(1), 25-46.
- Gmelch, G. (1972). Baseball magic. *Society*, 8(8), 39-45.
- Gmelch, G. (2001). *Inside pitch: Life in professional baseball*. Lincoln: Bison Books.
- Gmelch, G. (2006). *Baseball without borders: The international pastime*. Lincoln: Bison Books.
- Goodger, B.C. & Goodger, J.M. (1977). Judo in the light of theory and sociological research. *International Review for Sport Sociology*, 12(1), 5-34.
- Gouldner, A. (1975). *For Sociology: Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today*. London: Pelican.
- Grainger, A. (2011). Fear and (self-)loathing in academia. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 11(6), 558-564.
- Guthrie, S. & Castelnovo, S. (1992). Elite Women Bodybuilders: Models of Resistance or Compliance. *Play & Culture*, 5:401-408.
- Hargreaves, J. & McDonald, I. (2000). Cultural studies and the sociology of sport in J. Coakley & E. Dunning (Eds) *Handbook of Sports Studies*. (pp.48-60). London:

Sage.

Henricks, T. (1974). Professional wrestling as moral order. *Sociological Inquiry*, 44, 177-188

Heywood, L. (1998). *Bodymakers: A Cultural Anatomy of Women's Body Building*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Hughson, J. (1998). Among the thugs: The 'new ethnographies' of football supporting subcultures. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 33(1), 43-57.

Hollands, R. (1984). The role of cultural studies and social criticism in the sociological study of sports. *Quest*, 36(1), 66-79.

Howe, P.D. (2004). *Sport, professionalism, and pain: Ethnographies of injury and risk*. London: Routledge.

Howe, P.D., (2008). *The cultural politics of the Paralympic movement: Through the anthropological lens*. London: Routledge.

Ingham, A.G. (1997). Toward a department of physical cultural studies and an end to tribal warfare. In J. Fernandez-Balboa (Ed.), *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education, and sport* (pp. 157–182). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kelly, W. (1998). Blood and guts in Japanese professional baseball. In S. Linhard & S. Fruhstick (Eds.), *The culture of Japan as seen through its leisure* (pp. 95-111). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kelly, W. (Ed.). (2004). *Fanning the flames: Fans and consumer culture in contemporary Japan*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

King-White, R. (2013). I am not a scientist: Being honest with oneself and the researched in critical interventionist research. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 30(3), 296-322

King-White, R. (2017). *Ethnographic approaches* In M.L. Silk, D.L.

- Andrews, & H. Thorpe (Eds) Routledge Handbook of Physical Culture Studies (pp.484-494). London: Routledge.
- Klein, A. (1991). *Sugarball: The American game, the Dominican dream*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Klein, A.M. (1993). *Little big men: Bodybuilding subculture and gender construction*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Klein, A. (1997). *Baseball on the border: A tale of two Laredos*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Klein, A. (2006). *Growing the game: Globalization and Major League Baseball*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Klein, A. (2009). The transnational view of sport and social development: The case of Dominican baseball. *Sport in Society*, 12(9), 1118-1132.
- Klein, A. (2014). Anthropology of sport In J. Maguire (Ed) *Social sciences in sport* (pp.71-90). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Laurendeau, J. (2011). “If you’re reading this it’s because I’ve died”: Masculinity and relational risk in BASE jumping. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28(4), 404–420.
- Loland, N. (2000). The Art of concealment in a culture of display: Aerobicizing women’s and men’s experience and use of their own bodies. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17(2), 111–129.
- Lowe, M. (1998). *Women of Steel: Female Bodybuilders and the Struggle for Self-Definition*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lynch, M. (2000). Against reflexivity as an academic virtue and source of privileged knowledge. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 17(3), 26-54.
- MacNeill, M. (1996). Networks: Producing Olympic ice hockey for a national television audience. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 13(2), 103–124.

- Maddox, C. (2015). Studying at the source: Ashtanga yoga, tourism and the search for authenticity in Mysore, India. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 13(4), 330-343
- McKenzie, S. (2013). *Getting Physical: The Rise of Fitness Culture in America*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- Malcolm, D. (2012). *Sport and sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Maguire, J. (2004) Challenging the sports-industrial complex: Human sciences, advocacy and service, *European Physical Education Review*, 10, 299–321.
- Markula, P. (2016). Finding the field: Ethnographic research in exercise settings In G. Molnar & L. Purdy (Eds.), *Ethnographies in sport and exercise research* (pp.29-44). London: Routledge.
- Massengale, J. (1974). Coaching as an occupational subculture *Phi Delta Kappan*, 56, 140-142
- Midol, N. & Broyer, G. (1995). Towards an anthropological study of new sport cultures: The case of whiz sports in France. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12(2), 204-212
- Monaghan, L.F. (2014). ‘Postmodern’ muscle: The embodied pleasures of vibrant physicality In L.F. Monaghan & M. Atkinson (Eds). *Challenging myths of masculinity: Understanding physical cultures* (pp.15-38). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Neville, R.D., Gorman, C., Flanagan, S., & Dimanche, F. (2015). Negotiating fitness, from consumption to virtuous production. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 32(3), 284-311.
- Newman, J. (2011). [Un]Comfortable in my own skin: Articulation, reflexivity and the duality of self. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 11(6), 545-557.
- Newman, J. (2013). This pain in my neck: Living conscientization and/as paradox of

- praxis *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(4),247-260.
- Olive, R., & Thorpe, H. (2011). Negotiating the 'f-word' in the eld: Doing feminist ethnography in feminist sport cultures. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28(4), 421–440.
- Paraschack, V. (1997). Variations in race relations: Sporting events and native peoples in Canada. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 14(1), 1–21.
- Parvianinen, J. (2011). The standardization process of movement in the fitness industry: The experience design of Les Mills choreographies. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 14(5), 526-541.
- Perez, L. (1994). Between baseball and bullfighting: The quest for Cuban nationalism. *Journal of American History*, 81(2), 493-517.
- Peters, R. (1976). *Television coverage of sport*. Stencilled Occasional Papers of the Birmingham CCCS Retrieved from:
<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/history/cccs/stencilled-occasional-papers/1to8and11to24and38to48/SOP48.pdf>
- Pink, S. (2009). *Doing Visual Ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Pringle, R. Rinehart, R.E., & Caudwell, J. (2015). *Sport and the Social Significance of Pleasure*. New York: Routledge.
- Pringle, R. & Thorpe, H. (2017). Theory and reflexivity in M.L. Silk, D.L. Andrews, & H. Thorpe (Eds) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Culture Studies* (pp.32-41). London: Routledge.
- Probert, A., Palmer, F. & Leberman, S. (2007) The Fine Line: An Insight into 'Risky' Practices of Male and Female Competitive Bodybuilders. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 10(3/4), 272–290.
- Pronger, B. (2002). *Body Fascism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Rana, J. (2014). Producing health citizens: Encouraging participation in ladies-only kickboxing. *Etnofoor*, 26(2), 33-48.
- Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Roberts, J.M, Arth, M.J., & Bush, R.R., (1959). Games in culture *American Anthropologist*, 61(4), 597-605
- Robson, G. (2000). *No-one Likes Us, We Don't Care: The myth and reality of Millwall Fandom*. Oxford: Berg.
- Richardson, N. (2012). What is the 'practice' of bodybuilding? In A. Locks and N. Richardson (Eds) *Critical Readings in Bodybuilding*. New York: Routledge.
- Sage, G.H. (1997). Physical education, sociology, and sociology of sport: Points of intersection. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 14(4), 317-339.
- Samie, S.F. (2013). Hetero-Sexy Self/Body Work and Basketball: The Invisible Sporting Women of British Pakistani Muslim Heritage. *South Asian Popular Culture* 11(3), 257-70.
- Sassatelli, R. (2010). *Fitness culture: Gyms and the commercialization of discipline and fun*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Sehlikoglu, S. (2016). Exercising in comfort: Islamicate culture of Mahremiyet in everyday life. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 12(2), 143-165.
- Sehlikoglu, S. & Karakas, F. (2016). We can have the cake and eat it too: leisure and spirituality at 'veiled' hotels in Turkey. *Leisure Studies*, 35(2), 157-169.
- Serazio, M. (2013). The elementary forms of sports fandom: A Durkheimian exploration of team myths, kinship, and totemic rituals. *Communication and Sport*, 1(4), 303-325.
- Sheard, K. & Dunning, E. (1973). The rugby football club as a type of male preserve:

- Some sociological notes. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 8(1), 5-24
- Shilling, C. & Bunsell, T. (2009). The Female Bodybuilder as a Gender Outlaw. *Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*, 1(2), 141–159.
- Silk, M. (2001). Together we're one? The "place" of the nation in media representations of the 1998 Kuala Lumpur Commonwealth games. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 18(3), 277–301.
- Silk, M. (2002). Bangsa Malaysia: Global sport, the city & the refurbishment of local identities. *Media Culture & Society*, 24(6), 775–794.
- Silk, M. (2005). Sporting ethnography: Philosophy, Methodology and reflection. In D. Andrews, D. Mason, & M. Silk (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in sports studies* (pp.65–103). New York: Berg.
- Silk, M.L., Andrews, D.L., & Thorpe, H. (2017) Introduction in M.L. Silk, D.L. Andrews, & H. Thorpe (Eds) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Culture Studies* (pp.1-12). London: Routledge.
- Silk, M., Francombe-Webb, J. and Andrews, D. L., 2014. Slowing the social sciences of sport: On the possibilities of physical culture. *Sport in Society*, 17(10), 1266-1289.
- Spaaji, R. & Anderson, A. (2010). Psychosocial influences on children's identification with sports teams: A case study of Australian Rules football supporters. *Journal of Sociology* 46(3), 299-315
- Sparkes, A.C. (2002a). *Telling Tales in Sport & Physical Activity: A Qualitative Journey*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Sparkes, A.C. (2002b). Fictional representations: On difference, choice, and risk. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 19(1), 1-24.
- Sparkes, A.C. (2007). Embodiment, academics, and the audit culture: A story seeking

- consideration. *Qualitative Research*, 7(4), 521-550.
- Spielvogel, L. (2003). *Working out in Japan: Shaping the female body in Tokyo fitness clubs*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Smith Maguire, J. (2004). *Fit for consumption: Sociology and the business of fitness*. London: Routledge.
- Stebbins, R. (2009). *Personal Decisions in the Public Square: Beyond Problem Solving to a Positive Sociology*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Swanson, L. (2009). Soccer fields of cultural reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 26(4), 404-424.
- Sugden, J. (1987). The Exploitation of Disadvantage: The Occupational Sub-culture of the Boxer in J. Horne, D. Jary & A. Tomlinson (Eds) *Sport, Leisure and Social Relations*, (pp.187-209). London: Routledge
- Sugden, J. (1996). *Boxing and Society: An International Analysis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Thorpe, H. (2011). *Snowboarding bodies in theory and practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thorpe, H. (2014). Moving bodies beyond the social/biological divide: Toward theoretical and transdisciplinary adventures. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(5), 666-686.
- Thorpe, H., Olive, R., Beal, B., Booth, D., Laurendeau, J., Palmer, C., Rinehart, R.E., & Wheaton, B. (2016). Looking back, moving forward? Reflections from early action sport researchers In H. Thorpe, & R. Olive (Eds.), *Women in Action Sport Cultures Identity, Politics, and Experience* (pp. 23-44). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Mannen, J. (2001). *Tales from the Field: On writing Ethnography*. Chicago:

- University of Chicago Press.
- Vaz, E. & Thomas, D. (1974). What price victory: An analysis of minor hockey players' attitudes towards winning. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 9(1), 33-53
- Wacquant, L.J. (1995). Pugs at work: bodily capital and bodily labour among professional boxers. *Body & Society*, 1(1), 65-93.
- Wacquant, L. (2004). *Body and Soul: Notebooks of an apprentice boxer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Waring, A. (2008). Health club use and 'lifestyle:' Exploring the boundaries between leisure and work. *Leisure Studies*, 27(3), 295-309.
- Walton, T. A., & Fisette, J. L. (2013). 'Who are you?': Exploring adolescent girls' process of identification. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 30(2), 197-122.
- Wellard, I. (2013). *Sport, Fun and Enjoyment*. London: Routledge.
- Wheaton, B. (2000). "Just do it": Consumption, commitment and identity in the windsurfing subculture. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17(3), 254-274.
- Wheaton, B. (2013). Introducing the consumption and representation of lifestyle sports. In B. Wheaton (Ed.), *The Consumption and Representation of Lifestyle Sports* (pp. 1-25). Routledge.
- Wheaton, B. (2017). Subcultural formations and lifestyle sporting practices in in M.L. Silk, D.L. Andrews, & H. Thorpe (Eds) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Culture Studies* (pp.102-110). London: Routledge.
- White, R., Silk, M., & Andrews, D. (2008a). Revisiting the Networked Production of the 2003 Little League World Series: Narrative of American Innocence. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 4(2), 183-202.
- Wolf, E. (1982). *Europe and the people without history*. Berkley: University of California Press.

- Wiest, A.L., Andrews, D.L., & Giardina, M.D. (2015). Training the body for healthism: Reifying vitality in and through the clinical gaze of the neoliberal Fitness Club. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 37(1), 21-40.
- Williams, J. (1994). Rangers is a black club – ‘race’, identity and local football in England. In R. Giulianotti & J. Williams (Eds), *Game Without Frontiers* (pp.153-183). Aldershot: Arena.
- Williams, J., Dunning, E., & Murphy, P. (1984). *Hooligans abroad: The behaviour and control of English fans in continental Europe*. Leicester: University Press
- Willis, P. (1974). *Performance and meaning: Women in sport*. Stencilled Occasional Papers of the Birmingham CCCS Retrieved from:
<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/history/cccs/stencilled-occasional-papers/1to8and11to24and38to48/SOP19.pdf>
- Young, K. (1988). Performance, control and public image of behaviour in a deviant subculture: The case of rugby. *Deviant Behavior*, 9, 275-293