**Original progress posts**

by Sean McAteer - Tuesday, 31 October 2017, 10:33 PM

I am currently getting together articles for my literature review, I have read about 7 so far and I have collected another 9. I've found that in the crossover area of Twitter and sport there seems to be a 'core' group of articles that everybody references.

For assignment 2 I will be doing the qualitative one so I am also reading the course units on qualitative analyses and the SPSS survival manual.

I am using RefWorks for my references and that has been a big help as I have found in previous years that I end up having to track down loads of references for articles and putting them in Harvard format just before I submit an assignment...that is a nightmare.

Next week I hope to get started on assignment 2 and have read most of the articles that I have saved.

by Sean McAteer - Thursday, 9 November 2017, 10:14 AM

This week I have started to put together my literature review. I needed to start putting it together as I found that it helped me focus on specific topics in my research area and therefore be more selective in the papers I was reading.  I decided on subheadings for the review and focused on papers that related to those areas. Prior to this approach, I found that it was easy to end up reading papers that were only connected to my area in the loosest sense and the number of papers to read was growing exponentially.

I have also started on assignment 2. I found this to be very interesting and has helped me think more about my research project and how I will categorise and analyse the data.  e.g. will the data be categorical or continuous as this will affect what tests I can perform on the data.

By the end of this week I hope to have the bulk of assignment 2 finished and have a draft of the literature review.

by Sean McAteer - Wednesday, 15 November 2017, 11:54 AM

Here is the first draft of my literature review.

**Literature review**

Just like any other consumer-facing industry, the world of professional sports has seen a lot of disruption from the rise of social media. (Force 2016)

Quickly becoming a normal way to communicate, this has transformed the way sports are reported (Schultz & Sheffer, 2010) and consumed (Clavio & Kian, 2010), allowing athletes the freedom to interact directly with their fans and enabling them to become rulers of their own domain (Hambrick et al, 2010). It is argued that the rapid revolution social media has achieved in sport may be unrivalled regarding impact compared with any other industry (Sanderson, 2011)

Sports and Twitter

Twitter has been particularly dominant in the digital-media-sport landscape and has been embraced by the sporting world at amazing speed. We have now reached the point where it is unusual to watch a sports event, attend a live match, or even read a sport-related article without a Twitter reference mentioned. In 2015South America's Copa America soccer championship generated 14 billion impressions. The women's soccer world cup generated 9 billion impressions. Wimbledon generated 8 billion Impressions over two weeks, and the champions league final generated 834 million impressions in one day. (Laird 2015) (Twitter defines an "impression" as how many times a tweet is seen online, both on Twitter and off.)

Research surrounding Twitter use in sport has been conducted from a variety of perspectives. Clavio and Kian (2010) used an internet-based survey to ascertain the demographics, uses, and gratifications of a retired athlete's Twitter followers. Clavio and Walsh (2014) surveyed Division 1 college sports fans and found that social media should not be viewed holistically due to distinct variability between what attracts fans to Facebook and Twitter. Hull (2014) explored how professional golfers participating in the Master's tournament used Twitter during the week of the event. Basing the research on self-presentation theory the author conducted a content analysis of 895 tweets by 39 golfers. Lebel and Danylchuk (2012) compared male and female athletes' tweets relayed by all professional tennis players. Hambrick et al. (2010) used content analysis to place 1,962 tweets by professional athletes into one of six categories: interactivity, diversion, information sharing, content, promotional, and fanship. Pegoraro (2010) investigated athletes' use of Twitter and found that athletes are talking predominantly about their personal lives and responding to fans' queries through Twitter. The results indicate that Twitter is a powerful tool for increasing fan-athlete interaction. Professional cyclist Lance Armstrong once invited his fans to meet him for a ride around Dublin after completing the Tour of Ireland. 1,000 fans showed up hours later (Cromwell, 2009). Serena Williams even asked her Twitter followers for pregnancy advice, “Any tips on how to turn over at night? I'm having trouble from going from my left ....to my right.... to my left side,” She received over 1200 replies.

**Female Athletes media coverage**

Researchers have found female athletes are considerably underrepresented in terms of the amount of media coverage they receive in comparison with their male counterparts (Kane & Maxwell, 2011). While Cooky (2015), found a decline in the amount of coverage of female athletes from 1989 to 2014. In 2014, only 3.2% of network television coverage focused on women’s sports. The lack of representation of women in media’s coverage of sport contributes to the perception of sport as a male domain. (Birrell, 2000)

The media maintain notions of sport as a male domain through displays of masculinity, strength, and power. On the other hand, when women athletes receive coverage, they are consistently portrayed in ways that emphasize their femininity through caregiver roles and sexuality versus their athletic competence (Cooky et al., 2015). When sports media actually do cover female athletes, they often describe their physical appearances and attire, delve into their personal lives and relationships, trivialise their accomplishments and athleticism, and focusing on perceived psychological weaknesses (Hardin et al, 2007).

Online coverage of women in sport.

A study of gender-related descriptors employed within articles on men’s and women’s basketball produced surprising results, as it contradicted many of the findings previous sport media researchers cited to justify the presence of hegemonic masculinity. The researchers found that there were a significantly higher proportion of descriptors about the positive skill level/accomplishments and psychological/emotional strengths in women’s basketball articles than those on men’s basketball. (Kian et al. 2009). In another study, Cunningham (2003) found university websites provided more coverage of women's tennis than men's tennis. A further analysis of NCAA college websites, Cooper (2008) concluded that coverage of male and female athletes in the same sport was mostly equal.

An exploratory study analysing online media and print media for the 2007 US Open tennis tournament found that online media to be less likely to re-enforce the traditional stereotypes of male and female athletes than newspapers. (Kian and Clavio, 2011)

This suggests that there is a greater opportunity for women to expand their coverage in the online world rather than the traditional mainstream media.

While it is clear that mainstream media feminise and sexualize sportswomen (Douglas & Jamieson, 2006; Kim et al., 2006), it seems thatthere is a greater opportunity for women to take control of their image and expand their coverage in the online world rather than the traditional mainstream media.

Further examination into how female athletes engage in strategic self-presentation compared to their male counterparts when they control the output themselves (i.e. their own social media account) is necessary.

**Self-Presentation Theory**

Goffman’s (1959) theory of self-presentation suggests that individuals present themselves in manners in which they wish others to view them. Goffman alludes to life being a “drama,” and the two types of self-presentation depicted by individuals as daily life “performances” are front-stage performances and back-stage performances. In front-stage performances, individuals are especially concerned with the impression they create in the minds of others. On the other hand, in back-stage performances individuals are more candid, often sharing information as if no audience or an audience of familiar people were present (Goffman, 1959).

Research on the self-presentation of athletes suggests that athletes engage in back-stage performances on social-media platforms (Hambrick et al., 2010). Professional cyclists offered insights into the terrain and conditions of the event route, adding a level of personal knowledge for fans that journalists would not have necessarily focused on. (Kassing and Sanderson 2010).

When it comes to front-stage performances, Krane et al. (2010) investigated female college athletes’ self-presentation preferences. They found that female athletes wanted to be portrayed in ways that emphasized their power and strength. Support for the preferences of female athletes to be portrayed as powerful athletes was found in later research by Lebel and Danylchuk (2014).

Krane et al. (2010) found their qualitative study demonstrated how these women were driven toward masculine behaviours for their sport while at the same time they tried to stay in the feminine role off the field of play. As one athlete in the study said, “If you're an athlete, then you have to transform into entirely someone else when you come off the field.” This corresponds to Goffman's (1959) front-stage/back-stage performances theory.
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Serena Williams 2017. https://twitter.com/serenawilliams/status/887491335980298240?lang=en

by Sean McAteer - Monday, 20 November 2017, 11:14 AM

Cheers Liam,

without specifying headings I'd still be adding papers to the 'to read list'. They really helped me focus and be a bit ruthless in what I kept and what I decided to discard.

Hi Seán,

whether Goffman's ideas are still relevant is a very good question. Arundale (2010) argues that Goffman’s work, is now outdated and should be modernised to include progress in research and technology, but Miller (2012) says that electronic interaction is a natural addition to what Goffman posited. He says that even though electronic communication is apparently limited in the depth of information it provides compared with face-to-face interaction, there is still enough room for information about the self to be given off in the way people use the medium, in what they say as well as what they don't say.

I think that Goffmans work is still relevant and I agree with Oram (2009) where he says ' Goffman’s approach certainly applies online, because our postings, even our instant messages, are more deliberate acts than our informal behaviours in real life. Although some participants play at being flippant and spontaneous on Facebook walls and microblogs, they must have greater consciousness of their effects on the viewer than most dinner table guests or concert attendees. Our online personas, therefore, conform even more closely to Goffman’s idea of everyday life than our everyday life does. '

Thinking about it now, this is something that I should address in the literature review.

Thanks for the question.

Seán.

by Sean McAteer - Thursday, 23 November 2017, 11:00 AM

Hi all,

I put up the literature review earlier this week. Having to put a draft up really focused me and helped me sort out all that I had read. Seán's question on whether Goffman's theory from 1959 is still relevant has given me another paragraph to add to the lit review for the next draft.

I've spent the last two days getting the research proposal document ready. After a few emails to Mary Galvin, she steered me out of the maze (and potential trouble) to a point where I'm happy with the direction of my research. Having been someone who has done all the modules with next to no interaction with tutors / supervisors I assumed I would take the same path with this one. I soon found out that this was a dangerous plan. I have found Mary's advice to be invaluable (as was John McCarthy's at the initial workshop) and having listened to fellow students it seems that this is one module where you really need to keep in contact with your supervisor / tutor.

Next week I plan to finish the last part of assignment 2 and tidy up the SPSS output file...at the moment it's an absolute mess.

Seán

by Sean McAteer - Thursday, 30 November 2017, 11:08 AM

Hi Gareth,

There are quite a few tools to help access the Twitter API. The one I'm going to use is a python library called 'Tweepy'.

It doesn't take a lot of code to get a person's public tweets. An example of python code to get the last 100 tweets from Serena Williams is:

import tweepy

from tweepy import OAuthHandler

import simplejson as json

ACCESS\_TOKEN = "YOUR ACCESS TOKEN HERE"

ACCESS\_SECRET = "YOUR ACCESS SECRET HERE"

CONSUMER\_KEY = "YOUR CUSTOMER KEY HERE"

CONSUMER\_SECRET = "YOUR CUSTOMER SECRET HERE"

auth = OAuthHandler(CONSUMER\_KEY, CONSUMER\_SECRET)

auth.set\_access\_token(ACCESS\_TOKEN, ACCESS\_SECRET)

api = tweepy.API(auth)

public\_tweets = api.user\_timeline(screen\_name = 'serenawilliams', count = 100)

with open('PATH TO OUTPUT FILE/data.txt', 'w') as outfile:

    for tweet in public\_tweets:

         print (tweet.text.encode('utf8'))

        json\_str = json.dumps(tweet.\_json)

        outfile.write(json\_str)

 You just need your own Twitter account and then  you can get the API Keys and Tokens from https://apps.twitter.com/app/new

The data that it gets is certainly not 'clean'. It returns hashtags, emojis, links, etc as well as the tweets. So the data will need to be cleaned up before it is analysed.

After the data is cleaned I'll have my dataset of tweets categorised by person.

Thanks for the question,

Seán.

by Sean McAteer - Friday, 8 December 2017, 10:08 AM

Hi Gareth,

I am going for a year of tweets.  I felt that anything less than this wouldn't be fully reflective of the group I'm looking at. For example, in tennis, the Australian Open starts in January and in golf the FedEx cup finishes in late September. The months in between are full of major sporting events and sports people are likely to be most active during this time. Then there's Christmas when they will all send out a flurry of tweets (pardon the pun!).

I hope this will give me a dataset of tweets that is reflective of the people I am looking at.

Regards,

Seán.

by Sean McAteer - Thursday, 30 November 2017, 11:22 AM

Hi Maureen,

Thank you very much for the positive comment on the literature review. Every time I think I've got the review down I find something to add or change or I question if I'm going in the right direction at all!

I hadn't thought about the self-defence side of Twitter. The analysis I'll be doing on the data will be in the form of Cluster Analysis. With this kind of analysis, the data will be divided into groups (clusters). The hope is that any data within a group be related to data within the same group and different from the data in other groups. The greater the similarity within a group and the greater the difference between groups, the more meaningful the groups will be and if meaningful groups are found, then the clusters should capture the natural structure of the data.

Doing this type of analysis only came up after talking with my supervisor. So I'm reading papers on it now so that I can add it to the literature review.

It will be very interesting to see if this type of commentary does indeed show up.

Seán.

by Sean McAteer - Thursday, 7 December 2017, 12:46 PM

Hi all,

First post this week as its been chaos in work...everybody seems to want to be finished by the 15th this year. I think I'll be the only one in the office for the week before Christmas!!

Last week was all about submitting the research ethics and proposal forms. As is always the case, you think it's all done and then you tweek something, then before you know it you're rewriting the whole thing and questioning your sanity. Anyway, I finally got it submitted and received ethics approval.

Then I had to get assignment 2 submitted. I was doing the statistics part and I had most of it done some time ago but hadn't got back to it until last weekend. I submitted it on Monday after another bout of last minute changes and additions.

This week college work has had to take a back seat but now I plan to get stuck into the literature review again. I am pretty happy with it as it stands but I feel that I should make some reference to the methodology that I'll be using to analyse that data. I know that I'll cover this in detail in the methodology section of the final paper but as there's very little research on 'self-presentation' on social media I feel I should at least address it.

The Christmas break can't come soon enough...but there's the draft lit review to have in by January 2nd. It'll be an interesting Christmas.

Regards,

Seán

by Sean McAteer - Friday, 8 December 2017, 4:05 PM

Hi David,

Thanks for the link to NCapture and KeyHole. I tried NCapture before but had a few problems with it. It kept telling me that 'You have reached the limit of the number of requests Twitter allows individuals to make in a 15-minute interval.' After a lot of trying I got it to work only for the message to appear again very soon. Probably just something I was doing wrong as many people seem to use it without a problem.

 I stuck with Python as I'm used to it and most of my analysis will be done with it. Also, most of the third party offerings that I reviewed only provided a limited service (e.g. 7 days of tweets) before you had to pay.

Thanks for the links David I hope your project is going well.

Regards,

Seán.

by Sean McAteer - Sunday, 10 December 2017, 12:31 PM

The second draft of the Literature review.

**Literature review**

Just like any other consumer-facing industry, the world of professional sports has seen a lot of disruption from the rise of social media. (Force 2016)

Quickly becoming a normal way to communicate, this has transformed the way sports are reported (Schultz & Sheffer, 2010) and consumed (Clavio & Kian, 2010), allowing athletes the freedom to interact directly with their fans and enabling them to become rulers of their own domain (Hambrick et al, 2010). It is argued that the rapid revolution social media has achieved in sport may be unrivaled regarding impact compared with any other industry (Sanderson, 2011)

Sports and Twitter

Twitter has been particularly dominant in the digital-media-sport landscape and has been embraced by the sporting world at amazing speed. We have now reached the point where it is unusual to watch a sports event, attend a live match, or even read a sport-related article without a Twitter reference mentioned. In 2015South America's Copa America soccer championship generated 14 billion impressions. The women's soccer world cup generated 9 billion impressions. Wimbledon generated 8 billion Impressions over two weeks, and the champions league final generated 834 million impressions in one day. (Laird 2015) (Twitter defines an "impression" as how many times a tweet is seen online, both on Twitter and off.)

Research surrounding Twitter use in sport has been conducted from a variety of perspectives. Clavio and Kian (2010) used an internet-based survey to ascertain the demographics, uses, and gratifications of a retired athlete's Twitter followers. Clavio and Walsh (2014) surveyed Division 1 college sports fans and found that social media should not be viewed holistically due to distinct variability between what attracts fans to Facebook and Twitter. Hull (2014) explored how professional golfers participating in the Master's tournament used Twitter during the week of the event. Basing the research on self-presentation theory the author conducted a content analysis of 895 tweets by 39 golfers. Lebel and Danylchuk (2012) compared male and female athletes' tweets relayed by all professional tennis players. Hambrick et al. (2010) used content analysis to place 1,962 tweets by professional athletes into one of six categories: interactivity, diversion, information sharing, content, promotional, and fanship. Pegoraro (2010) investigated athletes' use of Twitter and found that athletes are talking predominantly about their personal lives and responding to fans' queries through Twitter. The results indicate that Twitter is a powerful tool for increasing fan-athlete interaction. Professional cyclist Lance Armstrong once invited his fans to meet him for a ride around Dublin after completing the Tour of Ireland. 1,000 fans showed up hours later (Cromwell, 2009). Serena Williams even asked her Twitter followers for pregnancy advice, “Any tips on how to turn over at night? I'm having trouble from going from my left ....to my right.... to my left side,” She received over 1200 replies.

Female Athletes media coverage

Researchers have found female athletes are considerably underrepresented in terms of the amount of media coverage they receive in comparison with their male counterparts (Kane & Maxwell, 2011). While Cooky (2015), found a decline in the amount of coverage of female athletes from 1989 to 2014. In 2014, only 3.2% of network television coverage focused on women’s sports. The lack of representation of women in media’s coverage of sport contributes to the perception of sport as a male domain. (Birrell, 2000)

The media maintain notions of sport as a male domain through displays of masculinity, strength, and power. On the other hand, when women athletes receive coverage, they are consistently portrayed in ways that emphasize their femininity through caregiver roles and sexuality versus their athletic competence (Cooky et al., 2015). When sports media actually do cover female athletes, they often describe their physical appearances and attire, delve into their personal lives and relationships, trivialise their accomplishments and athleticism, and focusing on perceived psychological weaknesses (Hardin et al, 2007).

Online coverage of women in sport.

A study of gender-related descriptors employed within articles on men’s and women’s basketball produced surprising results, as it contradicted many of the findings previous sport media researchers cited to justify the presence of hegemonic masculinity. The researchers found that there were a significantly higher proportion of descriptors about the positive skill level/accomplishments and psychological/emotional strengths in women’s basketball articles than those on men’s basketball. (Kian et al. 2009). In another study, Cunningham (2003) found university websites provided more coverage of women's tennis than men's tennis. A further analysis of NCAA college websites, Cooper (2008) concluded that coverage of male and female athletes in the same sport was mostly equal.

An exploratory study analysing online media and print media for the 2007 US Open tennis tournament found that online media to be less likely to re-enforce the traditional stereotypes of male and female athletes than newspapers. (Kian and Clavio, 2011)

This suggests that there is a greater opportunity for women to expand their coverage in the online world rather than the traditional mainstream media.

Further examination into how female athletes engage in strategic self-presentation compared to their male counterparts when they control the output themselves (i.e. their own social media account) is necessary.

Self-Presentation Theory

Goffman’s (1959) theory of self-presentation suggests that individuals present themselves in manners in which they wish others to view them. Goffman alludes to life being a “drama,” and the two types of self-presentation depicted by individuals as daily life “performances” are front-stage performances and back-stage performances. In front-stage performances, individuals are especially concerned with the impression they create in the minds of others. On the other hand, in back-stage performances individuals are more candid, often sharing information as if no audience or an audience of familiar people were present (Goffman, 1959).

Research on the self-presentation of athletes suggests that athletes engage in back-stage performances on social-media platforms (Hambrick et al., 2010). Professional cyclists offered insights into the terrain and conditions of the event route, adding a level of personal knowledge for fans that journalists would not have necessarily focused on. (Kassing and Sanderson 2010).

When it comes to front-stage performances, Krane et al. (2010) investigated female college athletes’ self-presentation preferences. They found that female athletes wanted to be portrayed in ways that emphasized their power and strength. Support for the preferences of female athletes to be portrayed as powerful athletes was found in later research by Lebel and Danylchuk (2014).

Krane et al. (2010) found their qualitative study demonstrated how these women were driven toward masculine behaviours for their sport while at the same time they tried to stay in the feminine role off the field of play. As one athlete in the study said, “If you're an athlete, then you have to transform into entirely someone else when you come off the field.” This corresponds to Goffman's (1959) front-stage/back-stage performances theory.

Goffmans theory is now nearly 60 years old, is it still relevant? Arundale (2010) argues that Goffman’s work, is now outdated and should be modernised to include progress in research and technology, but Miller (2012) says that electronic interaction is a natural addition to what Goffman posited. He says that even though electronic communication is apparently limited in the depth of information it provides compared with face-to-face interaction, there is still enough room for information about the self to be given off in the way people use the medium, in what they say as well as what they don't say.

Oram (2009) says ' Goffman’s approach certainly applies online, because our postings, even our instant messages, are more deliberate acts than our informal behaviours in real life. Although some participants play at being flippant and spontaneous on Facebook walls and microblogs, they must have greater consciousness of their effects on the viewer than most dinner table guests or concert attendees. Our online personas, therefore, conform even more closely to Goffman’s idea of everyday life than our everyday life does. '

Conclusion

While mainstream media still views sport as a male domain, the online world seems to afford a more equal footing for female athletes. Twitter is a powerful tool for increasing fan-athlete interaction (Pegoraro 2010) and allows the athlete themselves to control the output. This research will explore the 'tweets' of top athletes and try to see, are there any differences in the ways in which male and female sportspersons represent themselves online?

**References**

Arundale, R. 2010. Face as emergent in interpersonal communication: an alternative to Goffman. In: Bargiela-chiappini F. and Haugh M (eds.) Face, communication and social interaction. London: Equinox Publishing, pp.33-54.

Clavio, G. and Kian, T. 2010. Uses and Gratifications of a Retired Female Athlete’s Twitter Followers. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 3(4), pp. 485-500

Clavio, G. and Walsh, P. 2014. “Dimensions of Social Media Utilization among College Sport Fans.” *Communication & Sport*, 2 (3), pp. 261–281.

 Cooper, C. 2008. NCAA Website Coverage: An Analysis of Similar Sport Team Gender Coverage on Athletic Department's Home Web Pages. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sports*, 1(2), pp.227-241

Cunningham, G. 2003. Media coverage of women’s sport: A new look at an old problem. *Physical Educator*, 60(2), p.43

Cromwell, G. (2009). Armstrong's tweet turns out more than 1,000 riders for a jaunt around Dublin. VeloNews. [Online]. Available from: http://www.velonews.com/2009/08/news/armstrongs-tweet-turns-out-more-than-1000-riders-for-a-jaunt-around-dublin\_97144 [Accessed 1 November 2017]

Force, J. 2016. Social Media Trends in Sports Marketing [Online]. Available from: https://sysomos.com/2016/08/26/social-media-trends-sports-marketing/ [Accessed 9 November 2017]

Hambriek, M., Simmons, J., Greenhalgh, G. and Greenwell, T. 2010. *Understanding  Professional Athletes' Use of Twitter: A Content Analysis of Athlete Tweets.* International Journal of Sport Communication, 2010, 3, pp. 454-47

Haferkamp, N., Eimler, S., Papadakis, A. and Kruck, J. 2012. Men are from Mars, women are from Venus? Examining gender differences in self- presentation on social networking sites.  *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 15(2), pp.91-98.

*Gender stereotypes in Facebook profiles: Are women more female online? (PDF Download Available)*. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295402737\_Gender\_stereotypes\_in\_Facebook\_profiles\_Are\_women\_more\_female\_online#pf6 [accessed Nov 23 2017].

Hardin, M., Simpson, S., Whiteside, E and Garris, K. 2007. The Gender War in U.S. Sport: Winners and Losers in News Coverage of Title IX. *Mass Communication and Society*, 2(10), pp. 211-233

Hull, K. 2014. “A Hole in One (Hundred Forty Characters): A Case Study Examining PGA Tour Golfers’ Twitter Use during the Masters.” *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 7 (2), pp. 245–260.

Kian, M. and Clavio, G. 2011. A Comparison of Online Media and Traditional Newspaper Coverage of  the Men’s and Women’s U.S. Open Tennis Tournaments. *Journal of Sports Media*, 6(1), pp. 55-84

 Kian, M., Mondello, M. and Vincent, J. 2009. ESPN—The women’s sports network? A content analysis of internet coverage of march madness. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 53(3), pp.477–495.

Kane, M. and Maxwell, H. 2011. Expanding the boundaries of sport media research: Using critical theory to explore consumer responses to representations of women’s sports. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25(3), pp. 202-216.

Kassing, J. W., & Sanderson, J. (2010). Fan-athlete interaction and Twitter: Tweeting through the Giro: A case study. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 3(1), pp. 113–128.

 Laird, S. 2015.The top 15 sporting events that blew up Twitter in 2015 [Online]. Available from: http://mashable.com/2015/12/07/2015-top-sports-events-twitter/#jsSMyHwK\_Sqz [Accessed 9 November 2017]

Lebel, K. and Danylchuk, K. 2012. HowTweet It Is: A Gendered Analysis of Professional  Tennis Players' Self-Presentation on Twitter. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 5(4), pp. 461 -480

Manago, A., Graham, M., Greenfield, P. and Salimkhan, G. 2008. Self-presentation and gender on MySpace. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 29(6), pp.446–458

Mehdizadeh, S. 2010. Self-Presentation 2.0: Narcissism and Self-Esteem on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking,* 13(4), pp.357-364

Miller, H. 2012. The presentation of self in electronic life: Goffman on the Internet [Online] Available from:  http://www.dourish.com/classes/ics234cw04/miller2.pdf

Newman, T., Peck, J., Harris, C. and Wilhide, B. (2017). Social media in sport marketing. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.

Oram, A. 2009 What sociologist Erving Goffman could tell us about social networking and Internet identity. [Online] Available from: http://radar.oreilly.com/2009/10/what-sociologist-erving-goffma.html

Pegoraro, A. 2010. “Look Who’s Talking – Athletes on Twitter: A Case Study.” International Journal of Sport Communication 3 (4): 501–514.

Sanderson, J. and Kassing, J. 2012, Tweets and blogs: Transformative, adversarial, and integrative developments in sports media. *Sports Media: Transformation, Integration, Consumption.* Taylor and Francis, pp. 114-127.

Serena Williams 2017. https://twitter.com/serenawilliams/status/887491335980298240?lang=en

Shultz, B. and Sheffer, M. 2010. Paradigm Shift or Passing Fad? Twitter and Sports Journalism. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 3(4), pp. 472-484

R-bloggers 2017. Clustering Search Keywords Using K-Means Clustering [Online] Available from: http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hub\_feeds/1981/feed\_items/274117 [Accessed 20 November 2017]

**Posts made to other students.**

by Sean McAteer - Wednesday, 1 November 2017, 1:04 PM

Hi Liam,

Your area of research is very interesting. I see that you have statistics such as:

 'Frequency of Use: This showed a clear connection between usage and age with 40% of 55–64 yr. olds online every day with only 13% of 65-74 yr. olds online every day. Again, gender was also a factor with more men than women online'.

Have you looked at how the era in which people were born affects their interaction with technology e.g. I would think that when our generation gets to 65 / 75 the gap between young and old for awareness and frequency of use will drop dramatically. Do you think your study will show a closing of this gap in relation to Segrist's study?

by Sean McAteer - Thursday, 2 November 2017, 2:22 PM

Hi David,

I'm on a similar track to you. I'm doing a Gendered self presentation on twitter, analysing feeds of men and women tennis and golf players. It is good to know that were are all in the same boat with regards to preparing for multiple assignments. In regards to the amount of papers to read and sift through, Liam Mulcahy shared this link which you may have seen but I'll include it here just in case you haven't: http://phdtalk.blogspot.ie/2011/01/how-to-handle-large-amount-of.html  I have found points 1, 3 and 4 to be most beneficial.

Best of luck with the reading,

Sean.

by Sean McAteer - Wednesday, 8 November 2017, 10:53 AM

Hi David,

Thanks for the link to the article 'Nonverbal Behaviour and Self-Presentation'. It's definitely one that will make the literature review.

Are you planning on sorting your data into different categories? I am using categories such as:

The engager - Interaction with fellow athletes, friends, etc.

The promoter - promoting sponsorship, upcoming competitions, fan sessions, etc.

The informer - sharing of Web apps, content, links, etc.

 As my data will be from Twitter it be predominantly text based and yours, from Instagram, will be predominantly image based but would the categories be the same or similar?

Sean.

by Sean McAteer - Friday, 10 November 2017, 10:58 AM

Hi Oisin,

It's a very good topic for research as it affects us all. At the HSA introductory workshop we had to go out and discuss our ideas. I was at John McCarthys table and I think you were at the same table. John mentioned about research into how logos on websites can influence user trust. I found that paper and hopefully it will be of use to you when looking at website design.

Lowery, P. 2014. A Picture is Worth a Thousand Words: Source Credibility Theory Applied to Logo and Website Design for Heightened Credibility and Consumer Trust*. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 30(1), pp. 63-93.

I also came across a paper titled, 'What Makes Web Sites Credible? A Report on a Large Quantitative Study' in which they list a lot of questions they used in their survey so this might help you in wording your survey.

Fogg et al. 2001. What Makes Web Sites Credible? A Report on a Large Quantitative Study. [Online] Available from: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.94.3917&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Also Stanford University have a web page, 'Stanford Guidelines for Web Credibility'. It has 10 guidelines and links to plenty of research.

https://credibility.stanford.edu/guidelines/

Good luck with the work and I hope some of this helps in the preparation for your paper.

Sean.

by Sean McAteer - Tuesday, 14 November 2017, 11:28 AM

Hi Louis,

I heard you talking at the workshop last Saturday and you said that you run your own business, so hopefully this research will be a real help to you in the future. I remember from the module 'CB The Systems Development Life Cycle' that one of the most important factors in implementing a new information system was requirements gathering. It was also listed as one of the main reasons why IT projects fail. Are you following your information system through the full development lifecycle or are you concentrating on the usability side?

Sean.

by Sean McAteer - Friday, 24 November 2017, 1:47 PM

Hi Liam,

Great job on the first draft of the literature, I found that it flowed well and you could clearly see the path you were following.

I remember you saying that you were initially looking at exploring motivation and adoption separately but later you felt that separating them could add in too much work. From the conclusion part of your literature review, it seems that you are focusing on motivation. Have you any plans to incorporate adoption or is that for another day?

Seán.

by Sean McAteer - Monday, 27 November 2017, 11:07 AM

Hi Derek,

I have to agree with you that the online submissions seem to be a question of hitting the numbers...its Thursday and I have one more submission to get in by the weekend! Sometimes I find that I could post four or five times about my own progress and it would probably be helpful to others but I have to give two pieces of constructive criticism so I end up concentrating on that instead.

I certainly agree that the time the supervisors are will give up is fantastic and invaluable for this module.

As for the SPSS assignment, I found that as I was using the software I ended up using a few core functions and I think these functions will be the ones needed down the line. I found Pallant's book, 'SPSS survival manual' very helpful  and I also used this website:

http://www.statisticshowto.com/spss-how-to-index/

Good luck for the week ahead,

Seán