Perception, Privilege, and Prestige: Student-Athlete Evaluations of Institutional Branding and Athletic Resources

Maddisyn L. Gerhardt
Southern Utah University

Suggested Citation:
Gerhardt, M. L. (2026). Perception, privilege, and prestige: Student-athlete evaluations of institutional branding and athletic resources. *Utah Journal of Communication, 4*(1), 27-33. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20741670

Abstract
Resource disparities between collegiate athletic programs have long shaped student-athlete experiences, yet less is known about how athletes perceive and interpret these inequalities. Guided by the Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege, this qualitative rhetorical analysis examined how institutional branding and lived experience influence student-athletes' evaluations of athletic facilities and program quality. Data were collected from 13 Southern Utah University student-athletes through focus groups, interviews, and open-ended surveys. Participants evaluated either unaltered images of Southern Utah University facilities or identical images digitally altered with University of Utah branding. Findings revealed that athletes grounded evaluations of their own programs in lived experiences with facilities, resources, and support systems, while evaluations of unfamiliar programs relied more heavily on branding and institutional reputation. Participants consistently distinguished between recruitment and retention, emphasizing that branding may attract athletes, but long-term satisfaction depends on resources, relationships, and organizational support. The findings suggest that institutional athletic privilege operates as both a material reality and a communicative process, reinforcing inequalities through experience and perception.
Keywords: institutional athletic privilege, sport communication, student-athletes, sports branding, collegiate athletics

Resource disparities between collegiate athletic programs are well documented. Institutions with greater financial support often provide state-of-the-art facilities, advanced training technologies, and extensive athlete support services, while smaller programs frequently operate with more limited resources. The Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege (Coombs & Bagley, 2024) argues that these disparities create unequal opportunities for student-athletes and influence their athletic and educational experiences.

While structural inequalities in college athletics have received considerable attention, less research has examined how student-athletes perceive and interpret these differences. Sport communication scholars have long argued that meaning is constructed through symbols, interactions, and lived experiences rather than through material realities alone (Billings, 2016; Pedersen et al., 2007, 2025). Within athletics, visible elements such as facilities, branding, uniforms, and institutional reputation communicate messages about program quality and success. These symbolic cues may shape perceptions even when individuals have limited knowledge of a program's actual resources or support systems (Gerhardt & Coombs, 2026).

Understanding how student-athletes evaluate athletic programs is particularly important in an era characterized by increased athlete mobility, expanded name, image, and likeness (NIL) opportunities, and heightened competition for recruits. Perceptions of program quality can influence recruitment, retention, and athlete decision-making, making it important to understand whether evaluations are based primarily on lived experiences, institutional branding, or a combination of both.

The purpose of this study is to examine how student-athletes' perceptions of athletic programs are shaped by institutional branding and lived experience. Specifically,

student-athletes were asked to evaluate athletic facilities associated with different institutional brands while also reflecting on their experiences within their own athletic environments. By exploring the relationship between symbolic cues and personal experience, this study contributes to sport communication scholarship by examining how perceptions may reinforce or challenge institutional athletic privilege within collegiate athletics.

Literature Review

As collegiate athletics become increasingly influenced by resource disparities, athlete mobility, and institutional branding, understanding how student-athletes perceive athletic programs has become an important area of inquiry. Existing scholarship suggests that both structural conditions and communication processes shape how athletes evaluate their experiences and opportunities. The Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege provides a framework for understanding how unequal access to resources influences athlete outcomes, while research on contemporary student-athletes highlights the importance of institutional support, identity, and well-being. Additionally, sports branding research demonstrates how symbolic cues can shape perceptions of program quality and prestige. Together, these areas of scholarship provide a foundation for examining how student-athletes interpret athletic environments and whether those perceptions are influenced more by lived experience, institutional branding, or a combination of both.

Institutional Athletic Privilege

The Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege (Coombs & Bagley, 2024) provides a framework for understanding how disparities in institutional resources create unequal experiences for collegiate student-athletes. The theory argues that athletes at resource-rich institutions benefit from advantages such as modern facilities, advanced training technologies, specialized support staff, and comprehensive academic services. In contrast, athletes at lower-resourced programs often have limited access to these opportunities, influencing both athletic development and overall collegiate experiences.

Institutional athletic privilege extends beyond facilities and personnel. Resource-rich programs are often better positioned to attract top recruits, secure media exposure, and sustain competitive success, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of advantage (Coombs & Bagley, 2024). These structural inequalities shape not only athletic outcomes but also perceptions of program quality, prestige, and opportunity. As Coombs and Walker (2024) note, institutional athletic privilege differs from athlete privilege by focusing on advantages provided by the institution rather than benefits received by individual athletes. This distinction is particularly relevant when examining how student-athletes evaluate athletic environments and assign meaning to visible indicators of success (Gerhardt & Coombs, 2026).

The Contemporary Student-Athlete

The experiences of contemporary student-athletes are shaped by increasingly complex academic, athletic, and institutional demands. Scholars have highlighted the challenges associated with balancing athletic participation and academic responsibilities, often within highly regulated environments that place significant demands on athletes' time and attention (Posteher, 2024). Student-athletes must navigate multiple identities while meeting expectations from coaches, institutions, and governing bodies.

Recent scholarship has also emphasized the importance of athlete well-being, identity development, and institutional support (Coombs, 2025). Research suggests that perceptions of support systems, facilities, and organizational commitment influence athlete satisfaction and persistence (Kamusoko & Pemberton, 2013). At the same time, developments such as name, image, and likeness (NIL) opportunities, increased transfer mobility, and evolving governance structures have heightened the visibility of institutional differences across collegiate athletics (Coombs, 2025; Su et al., 2023).

These changes have increased the importance of how student-athletes perceive athletic programs. While material resources undoubtedly influence experiences, athletes also rely on symbolic cues when evaluating institutions. Understanding how athletes interpret these cues provides insight into how organizational inequalities are experienced and reinforced.

Sports Branding and Perception

Branding serves as a powerful communication tool within collegiate athletics, shaping how athletic programs are understood by recruits, athletes, fans, and other stakeholders. Beyond logos and visual identities, branding communicates messages about organizational values, prestige, competitiveness, and institutional commitment (Billings, 2016; Lee, 2024). Through facilities, uniforms, digital content, and storytelling, athletic departments create narratives that influence stakeholder perceptions.

A strong athletic brand can serve as a signal of quality and opportunity, particularly in recruiting environments where prospective athletes have limited firsthand knowledge of competing institutions (Lee, 2024). Brand perceptions often influence judgments about program legitimacy, success, and future potential. These symbolic associations may shape evaluations independently of actual resource levels or lived experiences.

The relationship between branding and perception is particularly relevant within the context of institutional athletic privilege. While resource disparities create tangible differences between programs, branding may amplify, reinforce, or even challenge those differences by influencing how athletes interpret athletic environments. Examining the interaction between branding and lived experience provides an opportunity to better understand how perceptions of program quality are constructed within collegiate athletics.

Existing research suggests that student-athlete

experiences are shaped by both structural realities and symbolic communication processes. The Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege highlights how institutional resources create unequal opportunities across collegiate athletics, while research on student-athletes emphasizes the importance of perceived support and organizational commitment. Sports branding further demonstrates how symbolic cues influence evaluations of programs and institutions. Together, these perspectives provide a framework for examining whether student-athletes' perceptions of athletic programs are driven primarily by lived experience, institutional branding, or a combination of both.

Methods

This study employed a qualitative rhetorical analysis design to examine how student-athletes interpret institutional branding and athletic facilities. Qualitative research is appropriate when exploring how individuals construct meaning around social phenomena (Creswell & Creswell, 2021). Because the purpose of this study was to understand how student-athletes interpret branding, imagery, and institutional associations rather than measure relationships among variables, a qualitative framework provided the most suitable methodological approach (Coombs et al., 2023).

Rhetorical analysis was selected because the study focuses on communicative artifacts, audience interpretation, and the construction of meaning through symbolic messages (Littlejohn et al., 2026). This approach has been widely applied within sport communication research to examine organizational messaging, identity construction, and audience perceptions (Coombs, 2022). By focusing on how participants interpreted visual and institutional cues, rhetorical analysis provided a useful framework for understanding the relationship between branding and perception.

Participants included current student-athletes at Southern Utah University representing a range of sports, including football, track and field, gymnastics, cheer and stunt, volleyball, soccer, and softball. Data were collected through two focus groups consisting of three participants each, two individual interviews, and open-ended survey responses. These methods generated multiple forms of qualitative data, allowing participants to articulate their interpretations and evaluations of athletic programs in their own words.

Participants were assigned to one of two conditions. The control group viewed unaltered images of Southern Utah University athletic facilities and evaluated spaces with which they were familiar. The experimental group viewed the same images, but with institutional branding digitally altered to reflect the University of Utah. This design allowed participants to evaluate identical facilities while interpreting them through different institutional identities. By holding material conditions constant and manipulating branding cues, the study isolated the influence of institutional branding on perceptions of facility quality, program prestige, and organizational standing.

Data were analyzed as rhetorical texts, with attention given to language use, evaluative judgments, framing, and recurring patterns of meaning-making. To enhance trustworthiness, the study employed data triangulation through the comparison of findings across interviews, focus groups, and survey responses (Creswell & Creswell, 2021). Investigator triangulation was also incorporated through expert feedback from Dr. Hayden Coombs and Dr. Braden Bagley, allowing multiple perspectives to evaluate emerging themes. Additionally, artificial intelligence was used as a supplementary organizational tool to assist with identifying recurring patterns and ensuring consistency across analyses. Consistent with recommendations by Coombs and Bagley (2026), all AI-assisted processes were conducted within a human-in-the-loop framework, ensuring that final interpretations remained grounded in researcher judgment and qualitative research best practices.

Results

Data were collected from 13 current student-athletes at Southern Utah University through focus groups, individual interviews, and open-ended survey responses. Participants were assigned to one of two conditions. The control group evaluated unaltered images of Southern Utah University facilities, while the comparison group evaluated identical images that had been digitally altered to display University of Utah branding. Analysis revealed notable differences in how participants interpreted athletic facilities when drawing from lived experience versus symbolic perception.

Southern Utah University Control Group

Participants who evaluated unaltered images of SUU facilities consistently discussed resource limitations as a direct component of their athletic experience. Three interconnected themes emerged: lived resource inequality, awareness of institutional hierarchy, and the influence of material conditions on athlete outcomes.

Participants described facility limitations as routine aspects of daily life. Shared training spaces, scheduling constraints, and limited access to equipment were frequently cited as barriers to preparation and development. Facilities were often characterized as functional but lacking the capacity and resources available at larger institutions. Rather than viewing these limitations as isolated concerns, athletes framed them as recurring challenges that shaped their overall collegiate experience.

At the same time, participants demonstrated a strong awareness of broader inequalities within collegiate athletics. Schools such as Utah, BYU, and Utah State were frequently referenced as examples of programs with greater resources and institutional support. Participants used facility size, technological advancements, and visible signs of investment as indicators of program status. These comparisons reflected an understanding that differences in athletic

success are often tied to institutional resources rather than individual effort alone.

When discussing retention and athlete development, participants emphasized the importance of material conditions. Access to facilities, nutrition resources, and developmental opportunities were viewed as critical factors influencing satisfaction and long-term commitment. Athletes frequently noted that limited opportunities for improvement could motivate transfers to better-resourced programs. However, participants also stressed the importance of interpersonal relationships. Team culture, coaching support, and connections with teammates often offset resource limitations and were frequently identified as reasons athletes chose to remain at SUU despite institutional disadvantages.

Collectively, these findings suggest that student-athletes experience institutional athletic privilege primarily through direct interaction with resources and support systems. Their evaluations were grounded in daily experiences rather than symbolic perceptions of prestige.

University of Utah Branding Condition

Participants who evaluated SUU facilities paired with University of Utah branding interpreted the same physical environments differently. Three themes emerged: branding as a signal of quality, perceptions of institutional hierarchy, and the distinction between recruitment and retention.

Participants frequently associated recognizable branding with higher-quality facilities and stronger athletic programs. Clean, modern, and well-maintained spaces were interpreted as evidence of institutional investment and competitive success. Although the facilities themselves were identical to those shown in the control condition, University of Utah branding influenced how participants evaluated their quality and legitimacy. Institutional reputation often served as a shortcut for assessing overall program strength.

Participants also organized athletic programs into informal hierarchical categories, frequently distinguishing between “high-major” and “mid-major” institutions. Facility appearance, perceived resource availability, and institutional recognition were commonly used to place programs within these hierarchies. Resource-rich institutions were viewed as possessing advantages that extended beyond facilities to include athlete development, competitive success, and recruiting power.

Despite the influence of branding on initial impressions, participants consistently distinguished between attraction and retention. Well-known brands and prestigious programs were viewed as highly effective recruiting tools, particularly for prospective athletes seeking visibility and opportunity. However, participants emphasized that long-term satisfaction depends on lived experiences rather than institutional reputation alone. Coaching relationships, organizational support, and day-to-day treatment were repeatedly identified as the factors most likely to determine whether athletes remained within a program. Several participants also acknowledged that resource-rich programs may retain athletes more effectively because greater resources provide additional opportunities and incentives.

These findings suggest that branding plays a substantial role in shaping perceptions of program quality, particularly when individuals lack direct experience with an institution.

Cross-Group Findings

Comparisons between groups revealed that student-athletes understood institutional athletic privilege through two distinct but related lenses. Participants evaluating their own facilities focused on material realities, emphasizing the practical effects of limited resources on training, development, and satisfaction. In contrast, participants evaluating the branded images relied heavily on symbolic cues such as institutional reputation, facility appearance, and brand recognition.

Both groups demonstrated awareness of resource disparities across collegiate athletics and recognized that certain institutions possess structural advantages. However, the source of those evaluations differed. Athletes discussing their own experiences emphasized tangible constraints, whereas athletes evaluating an external program relied on assumptions informed by branding and perceived prestige.

Across both conditions, participants agreed that branding plays an important role in attracting athletes but is less influential in determining retention. While institutional reputation and facility presentation shape initial perceptions, long-term commitment is ultimately influenced by lived experiences, interpersonal relationships, and access to meaningful resources. Together, these findings suggest that institutional athletic privilege operates simultaneously as a material reality and a communicative process, with both lived experience and symbolic branding shaping how student-athletes evaluate athletic programs.

Discussion

The findings provide support for the Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege by demonstrating that student-athletes evaluate athletic programs through both lived experiences and symbolic perceptions (Coombs & Bagley, 2024; Coombs & Walker, 2024). Participants consistently linked program quality to access to facilities, resources, and support systems, reinforcing the idea that meaning within sport is constructed through interaction and experience rather than observation alone (Pedersen et al., 2007, 2025; Krizek, 2016). Student-athletes in the Southern Utah University (SUU) condition described resource limitations as a routine aspect of their athletic experience, emphasizing shared spaces, restricted access, and facility constraints. These findings suggest that perceptions of opportunity and program quality emerge from repeated interaction with institutional

environments, supporting the argument that institutional athletic privilege is experienced as a material reality rather than an abstract concept.

Participants also demonstrated a clear awareness of the hierarchical nature of collegiate athletics. Consistent with sport communication scholarship emphasizing the influence of organizational structures on meaning-making (Sturm & Bradbury, 2024; Wenner, 2015), athletes regularly compared SUU to larger, better-resourced institutions. Facility size, technological resources, and visible investments were frequently used as indicators of institutional status. These comparisons illustrate that student-athletes actively position themselves within a broader competitive landscape and recognize how resource disparities contribute to differences in opportunity and success.

A key finding, however, was the distinction between lived experience and symbolic perception. While SUU participants evaluated facilities based on direct interaction, participants who viewed the Utah-branded images often relied on institutional reputation and visual cues when assessing program quality. Identical facilities were frequently perceived as more impressive, professional, and prestigious when paired with University of Utah branding. This finding suggests that institutional athletic privilege operates on both material and communicative levels. Direct experience shapes how athletes evaluate their own environments, while branding and institutional reputation influence perceptions of programs they have not personally experienced (Billings, 2016; Coombs, 2024). As a result, perceptions of athletic quality are influenced not only by actual resources but also by the symbolic messages communicated through branding.

The findings further extend the Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege by demonstrating how resource disparities influence athlete decision-making. Participants consistently associated access to facilities, support services, and development opportunities with long-term athletic growth. Athletes indicated that limited resources may encourage transfers, while better-resourced environments create incentives to remain within a program. These findings suggest that institutional privilege functions not simply as a condition of inequality but as an active mechanism that shapes recruitment, development, and retention decisions over time (Coombs & Bagley, 2024).

Participants also perceived resource-rich programs as possessing competitive advantages that extend beyond recruitment. Several noted that superior resources help maximize athlete development and performance, creating a self-reinforcing cycle in which successful programs continue to attract talent and generate additional success. This observation aligns with the theoretical framework advanced by Coombs and Bagley (2024) and Coombs and Walker (2024), which argues that institutional advantages contribute to the ongoing reproduction of inequality within collegiate athletics.

Branding emerged as an especially important factor in shaping initial perceptions of athletic programs. Participants frequently relied on logos, institutional reputation, and visual presentation when evaluating facilities and program quality. These findings support previous sport communication research demonstrating that branding serves as a powerful symbolic tool through which organizations communicate legitimacy, prestige, and value (Billings, 2016; Jankovic & Jaksic-Stojanovic, 2019). Even when material conditions remained constant, branding altered participant interpretations, suggesting that institutional identity functions as a perceptual shortcut when athletes evaluate unfamiliar programs.

Despite the influence of branding, participants consistently distinguished between attraction and retention. Branding and reputation were viewed as important recruiting tools capable of generating interest and attracting prospective athletes. However, participants repeatedly emphasized that long-term satisfaction depends on lived experience rather than symbolic appeal alone. Coaching relationships, organizational culture, athlete support, and day-to-day treatment were identified as more influential determinants of whether athletes remained within a program. This finding aligns with previous research highlighting the importance of environmental and relational factors in shaping student-athlete satisfaction and persistence (Kamusoko & Pemberton, 2013; Posteher, 2024).

The distinction between attraction and retention carries important practical implications. Branding can shape expectations and influence initial decisions, but those expectations must ultimately be supported by meaningful experiences and adequate resources. When symbolic messaging is not matched by material realities, institutions may struggle to retain athletes despite successful recruiting efforts. Consequently, effective sport communication strategies should complement, rather than replace, investments in athlete development and support systems.

Overall, the findings suggest that institutional athletic privilege is sustained through the interaction of structural realities and communicative processes. Resource disparities shape athlete experiences directly, while branding and institutional reputation influence how programs are perceived. Together, these forces contribute to a cycle in which athletes interpret opportunities, compare institutions, and make decisions that often reinforce existing hierarchies. Understanding this relationship provides a more comprehensive view of how inequality operates within collegiate athletics.

This study contributes to sport communication scholarship by demonstrating that institutional athletic privilege functions as both a material condition and a communicative phenomenon. While branding can influence perception, participant responses suggest that lived experiences ultimately play a greater role in shaping long-term evaluations of athletic programs. As a result, institutions seeking to improve athlete experiences should prioritize investments in facilities,

support systems, and organizational culture alongside branding efforts. Addressing both the structural and symbolic dimensions of collegiate athletics may provide a more effective path toward reducing disparities and improving student-athlete outcomes.

Conclusion

This study examined how student-athletes perceive athletic facilities, program quality, and institutional standing through the lens of the Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege. The findings suggest that student-athlete perceptions are shaped by both lived experience and symbolic communication. Participants who evaluated their own athletic environments grounded their assessments in daily interactions with facilities, resources, and support systems, while participants evaluating externally branded facilities relied more heavily on institutional reputation and visual cues. Together, these findings demonstrate that institutional athletic privilege operates as both a material reality and a communicative process.

The results also highlight the important distinction between attraction and retention. While branding and institutional prestige influence initial perceptions and recruiting appeal, long-term athlete satisfaction is more closely tied to access to resources, developmental opportunities, organizational culture, and interpersonal relationships. These findings extend the Theory of Institutional Athletic Privilege by illustrating how resource disparities not only shape athlete experiences but also influence the perceptions and decisions that reinforce existing inequalities within collegiate athletics.

From a practical perspective, the study suggests that branding alone cannot compensate for resource limitations. Athletic departments seeking to improve athlete experiences and retention should prioritize investments in facilities, support services, nutrition, and athlete development while ensuring that institutional messaging accurately reflects the realities of the student-athlete experience. Future research should examine these dynamics across multiple institutions, competitive levels, and stakeholder groups to further explore how institutional athletic privilege influences perceptions, opportunities, and outcomes throughout collegiate athletics.

References

Billings, A. C. (2016). Defining sport communication. Routledge.

Coombs, H. V. (2022). The complex identities of international student-athletes competing in the NCAA: An exploratory qualitative case study (Doctoral dissertation). https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28354.04802

Coombs, H. V. (2024). The power of sport communication: Bridging divides and inspiring change. Utah Journal of Communication, 2(2), 46–48. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13905031

Coombs, H. V. (2025). Communication and administration of intercollegiate athletics (2nd ed.). KDP.

Coombs, H. V., & Bagley, B. H. (2024). Perceptions of institutional resource inequities at FCS and low-major NCAA programs. Journal of Emerging Sports Studies. https://doi.org/10.26522/jess.v11i.5012

Coombs, H. V., & Bagley, B. H. (2026). Ethical integration of artificial intelligence in data triangulation: Enhancing rigor, reliability, and scholarly practice [White paper]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18357500

Coombs, H. V., Bagley, B. H., Barnhart, R., & Graudins, M. (2023). Sociolinguistic accommodation strategies utilized by international student-athletes and their interlocutors. Comunicação Pública, 18(35).

Coombs, H. V., & Hubka, O. (2024). Ethnography. In P. M. Pedersen (Ed.), Encyclopedia of sport management (2nd ed., pp. 325–327). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035317189.ch191

Coombs, H. V., & Walker, K. (2024). Privilege. In P. M. Pedersen (Ed.), Encyclopedia of sport management (2nd ed.). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2021). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). Sage.

Gerhardt, M., & Coombs, H. (2026). Bias perception vs. lived experience: A study of institutional branding and athletic privilege at Southern Utah University. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.21007.75680

Jankovic, M., & Jaksic-Stojanovic, A. (2019). Challenges of sports branding. Sport Mont, 17(1), 75–78.

Kamusoko, S. D., & Pemberton, C. L. A. (2013). Student-athlete wellbeing and persistence: An in-depth look at student-athlete perceptions. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 15(1), 41–61. https://doi.org/10.1179/1935739713Z.0000000003

Krizek, R. L. (2016). Sport and ethnography: An embodied practice meets an embodied method. In A. C. Billings (Ed.), Defining sport communication (pp. xx–xx). Routledge.

Littlejohn, S. W., Foss, K. A., & Oetzel, J. G. (2026). Theories of human communication (13th ed.). Waveland Press.

Lee, J. W. (2024). Brand identity. In P. M. Pedersen (Ed.), Encyclopedia of sport management (2nd ed., pp. 108–109). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035317189.ch64

Pedersen, P. M., Laucella, P. C., Miloch, K. S., & Fielding, L. W. (2007). The juxtaposition of sport and communication: Defining the field of sport communication. International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing, 2(3), 193–207.

Pedersen, P. M., Laucella, P. C., Kian, E. M., & Geurin, A. N. (2025). Strategic sport communication (4th ed.). Human Kinetics.

Posteher, K. A. (2024). Student-athlete. In P. M. Pedersen (Ed.), Encyclopedia of sport management (2nd ed., pp. 946–947). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035317189.ch553

Saldaña, J. (2021). The coding manual for qualitative researchers (4th ed.). Sage.

Sturm, D., & Bradbury, T. (2024). Communication. In P. M. Pedersen (Ed.), Encyclopedia of sport management (2nd ed., pp. 171–173). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035317189.ch99

Wenner, L. A. (2015). Communication and sport, where art thou? Epistemological reflections on the moment and field(s) of play. Communication & Sport, 3(3), 247–260.