CHAPTER 10

THE ROLE OF SPORT IN CREATING COMMUNITY[1]

Stacy Warner

***

LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this chapter students should be able to:
1. Summarize the role that sport can play in creating community.
2. Define a sense of community and the benefits of individuals experiencing a sense of community.
3. Identify the factors that have been found to foster a sense of community within sport.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the differences between a psychological and sociological perspective.
5. Define social capital, and demonstrate an understanding of how sport can aid in increasing one's social capital.
6. Identify the three primary sporting schemes that can be used to build community.

INTRODUCTION
Sport is commonly considered a realm that draws people together, a "social glue," and a key contributor to the creation of community (e.g., Spaaij, 2009; Warner & Dixon, 2011, 2013). This "community" that sport can foster and enhance is often defined in two important ways (Gusfield, 1975; Heller, 1989): that based on geographical location and boundaries, and that based on the common source of interest or activity for a collective entity. In geographically bound communities, local recreation departments or even professional teams will use sport in an effort to bring together individuals in a defined city, town, or neighborhood. Sport, in this instance, creates a point of identification or a social anchor for members who reside in a specific area. This is especially the case if sport programming or sporting events include competitions against other nearby towns, cities, or rivals. Typically, through a strong identification *and* active membership within a defined neighborhood or city represented by a sports team, individuals can experience a greater identification with their community and an enhanced sense of community.

The second way community is typically defined, is as communities of interest. This results when members all have a common interest in being active participants, athletes, or fans of a sport. A local running group or church softball league would be examples of communities of interest. Another example of a community of interest would be group of New York Yankees fans that gather at a local sports bar to watch their beloved Yankees play. These communities are often referred to as communities of interest because the groups of individuals that comprise them share a common devotion to an activity and feel a strong sense of community. Further, it is important to note that contemporary society typically develops community in this type of manner, where interests and skills, as opposed to locality, are more central to the community (Durkheim, 1933).

Regardless of the type of community that sport fosters (i.e., geographically bound or communities of interest), a common thread through both definitions of "community" is that individuals who are members of a healthy community will experience a strong sense of community (Bess, Fisher, Sonn, & Bishop, 2002). That is, individuals who are a part of a healthy geographically bound neighborhood setting or a community centered on her or his sport interests will both experience a strong sense of community. Sense of community is defined most simplistically as an environmental or community characteristic that leads to members

---

feeling a sense of belonging and attachment (Sarason, 1974). It is important to understand, though, that sense of community goes beyond just identification with a community. In other words, an individual can identify with a place or group, but a sense of community not be experienced. For instance, an individual can identify her- or himself as a resident of Greenville, NC, but that does not imply that the individual feels a strong sense of community. Or students may identify themselves as student members of their university, but not feel a sense of belonging or attachment; hence, their sense of community with the university is non-existent. In an effort to better understand the role of sport in fostering community, a deeper understanding of the term sense of community and its evolution is necessary. This section will be then followed by sections addressing the benefits of experiencing community, current trends in US society, and a look at how sport intersects with this information.

SENSE OF COMMUNITY
Seymour Sarason (1974) has been credited with first defining and coining the term "sense of community." In his book, *The Psychological Sense of Community: Prospects for a Community Psychology,* Sarason called for the development of a new discipline of community psychology with this concept at its core. Interestingly, Sarason's early work was primarily within the mental health community. It was within this setting that he became dedicated to dispelling the myth that separate residential communities and/or special classes for individuals with disabilities were a productive way to provide assistance. Rather, Sarason asserted that such environments only led to isolation and feelings of not being accepted by others, and thus denied humans of the basic need for belonging and a sense of community.

Although his work was primarily geared at advancing the way individuals thought about addressing mental health issues, Sarason soon realized a broad-based study of community psychology and this idea of a "sense of community" were important to all individuals across communities and contexts. In fact, the discipline of community psychology continues to operate with this concept at its core and under the premise that a healthy community is one in which a strong sense of community is present for individuals and the collective community (Bess et al., 2002).

At the most fundamental level, sense of community is grounded in Maslow's Theory of Motivation (1943). According to Maslow, after the primary physiological and safety needs are met, individuals have an innate desire and motivation for interpersonal interaction and to feel a sense of belonging. This center or third level of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is referred to as Love/Belonging. From an evolutionary standpoint this makes sense, as individuals who were in both intimate and social relationships were not only more likely to reproduce, but they obviously also had a greater chance of survival (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Thus, at the most basic level, Maslow's Theory of Motivation provides the foundation that supports the importance and vitality of belongingness and a sense of community to all individuals.

Considering this, it is not surprising that Sarason described the concept of sense of community as being analogous to hunger. That is, it is a fundamental need, and individuals know when they experience it and when they do not. Although an exact definition of sense of community is still heavily debated in the literature, Sarason (1974) defined sense of community as an environmental characteristic that leads individuals to perceive that support is available at the group level. That is, individuals feel a part of and support from a stable social structure.

McMillan and Chavis' Sense of Community Theory
McMillan and Chavis (1986) later advanced Sarason's work on sense of community. They suggested that sense of community was based on four components: *Membership*, *Influence*, *Integration and Fulfillment of Needs*, and *Shared Emotional Connections*. This Sense of Community Theory continues to be widely recognized, acknowledged, and accepted in the community psychology literature (Chipuer & Pretty, 1999).

Membership was defined as having to do with boundaries (e.g., dress, ritual, language, common symbol systems) that created a distinction between those who belong and those who do not belong. Sense of

belonging and emotional safety of individuals were also included as important indicators of *Membership.* Effectively, this component results in the formation of in-groups and out-groups (see Cunningham, 2007; Cunningham & Sagas, 2005). An example of this would be athletes and non-athlete groups. Athletes are more likely to feel a sense of *Membership* with other athletes based on the fact that they typically dress similar and use language and jargon associated with their sport. McMillan and Chavis acknowledged that this component was the most troublesome to researchers because a majority of the existing literature had focused on the deviant behaviors that often result from group formation, membership, and boundaries. However, McMillan and Chavis were quick to point out that this literature overlooked and almost dismissed the importance that membership and boundaries have in creating an environment where intimate social bonds and emotional safety can be found and fostered.

Influence was comprised of actions that led members to being empowered by the group and also feeling empowered to influence the group and its direction. Thus, *Influence* was bi-directional. This particular component was primarily supported by group cohesion research, which has concluded that a positive and significant relationship exists between cohesiveness and a community's influence over a member to conform (see Lott & Lott, 1965). This body of literature also supports the fact that individuals are drawn to communities where they are most likely to be influential. To use the athlete example again, an athlete who feels that they have the ability to inspire or impact their teammates would demonstrate the element of *Influence.*

Integration and Fulfillment of Needs was based on the idea that resources and support were available at the group level for individuals. Simply, McMillan and Chavis (1986) summed this up as "reinforcement" and concluded that individuals are drawn to others who can provide them with some benefit. For example, an athlete that feels as though their identity and self-esteem are reinforced through the sporting environment would be exhibiting *Integration and Fulfillment of Needs.* The authors also positioned this component as being supported by Rappaport's (1977) Person-Environment Fit research, which demonstrates this gravitation of individuals towards environments that are rewarding to them in some way.

Shared Emotional Connections was grounded in the idea that it is important for individuals to share a common history and a common set of experiences. This particular component was supported by the Contact Hypothesis (see Allan & Allan, 1971; Allport, 1954), which argues that individuals who have more contact with one another are more likely to form social bonds. An example of *Shared Emotional Connections* would be athletes experiencing a history of victories or losses together, overcoming a scandal or even an emotional loss of a loved one.

In sum, McMillan and Chavis' Sense of Community Theory has provided the foundational work for understanding how and when a sense of community developed.

Sociological View on Sense of Community
While the concept of a sense of community has its roots in community psychology, which is primarily concerned with the human mind and individual outcomes, researchers have gradually shifted to also viewing the concept from a sociological perspective. Sociologists are typically focused on social structures, social interaction, and institutional factors. In other words, sociologists are concerned with matters of society not matters of individual members. For example, Emile Durkheim, one of the most respected and prolific researchers in sociology, put forth the idea of anomie in two of his classic books, *Suicide* (1951) and *The Division of Labor in Society* (1933). Durkheim used the term anomie to describe the environmental state in which a breakdown of societal structures and regulations for individuals resulted in feelings of alienation and isolation. Durkheim concluded that anomie and anomic conditions were major contributors to the increases in longitudinal suicide trends that he observed across different societies. This empirical study of a social phenomenon demonstrated how a pure psychological approach to evaluating suicide, an issue many would consider only as an individual problem, would have missed and diminished the crucial role that social structures played in explaining the trends.

Anomie and this sociological perspective are also important to consider because, by definition, anomie is posited as being the direct opposite or antithesis of a sense of community. That is, if a person is experiencing anomie, she or he is not experiencing a sense of community and vice versa. While anomie has sociological roots and has focused on social structures and institutions, sense of community research has typically focused more on just the individual and only the individual's outcomes. This difference is most likely due to sense of community being a derivative of the psychological discipline, which typically focuses on the individual rather than social structures and institutions. Viewing sense of community through a sociological lens (similar to the sociological treatment of anomie) is essential. Understanding sense of community from a sociological perspective helps place the focus on the social structures and institutional factors that contribute to individual and group outcomes. Furthermore, this perspective highlights the important part that sport can play in fostering sense of community. When considering the benefits of experiencing a sense of community and the role sport can play in fostering it for the community as a whole, the value of sport in society becomes more evident.

Benefits of Experiencing a Sense of Community
Sense of community and the social structures that foster it are important to understand because of their potential impact on groups of individuals and communities. Research on sense of community has demonstrated it to be a vital factor in enhancing numerous quality-of-life aspects for individuals and communities. For example, greater levels of sense of community are associated with improved well-being (Davidson & Cotter, 1991). Among adolescents, individuals with higher levels of sense of community have significantly less drug use and delinquency behaviors (Battistich & Hom, 1997); this obviously has ramifications for individuals, but also benefits the community as a whole. On the other hand, a lack of community (i.e., high anomie) is associated with a host of negative outcomes, including deviant behavior (Agnew, 1997; Carter & Carter, 2007; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Hirschi, 1969) and physical and mental health decrements (Berkman, Glass, Brissette, & Seeman, 2000; Deflem, 1989). Thus, the importance and ability of fostering community to address a variety of life quality concerns and issues has been well established in literature.

Within the sport literature, numerous scholars have placed significant attention on issues related to better understanding how to retain athletes (e.g., Green, 2005; Lim, et al., 2011) and how to reduce athlete burnout (e.g., Smith, Lemyre, & Raedeke, 2007). Consequently, sport research also has shown that sense of community is related to improved retention (e.g., Berg & Warner, 2019; Kellett & Warner, 2011) and improved health (Warner, 2019; Warner, Sparvero, Shapiro, & Anderson, 2017). These studies provide evidence that increasing sense of community could aid in addressing important sport management issues. Furthermore, considering the current negative trends in relation to individuals and the lack of community in American society, sport may be able to play an important role in reversing those trends.

CURRENT US TRENDS: INDIVIDUALS AND COMMUNITY
As previously mentioned, Durkheim (1933) noted contemporary society tends to form communities based on interests and skills rather than around a geographical location or neighborhood setting. Subsequently, scholars have agreed that this type of community (i.e., community of interest) is rapidly declining in American society. Robert Putnam (2000) explicitly highlighted this fact in the popular book, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. The use of "bowling" in the title helps further capture the role that many believe sports *should* play in the creation of community. Putnam's main thesis of the book, and the title specifically, was that despite the fact that more individuals are bowling than ever before, fewer individuals are participating in bowling leagues and reaping the social benefits of being in community. He went on to further highlight how this decline in community and consequently, declining social connections and social capital, negatively impacted civic participation and social trust.

Social capital refers to the economic benefits that result from the interpersonal relationships with others in and between social networks (Mitchell, 1974). In other words, the more individuals are connected to others, the greater the chances are for them to gain access to important advice, jobs, resources, and even political clout (Kilduff & Tsai, 2007). All of these resources or social capital attributable to one's social and

professional relationships can have economic and financial benefits. Through these cooperative personal relationships, an individual who possesses social capital will have a dense social network (Warner, Bowers, & Dixon, 2012). A dense social network is one that consists of a variety of diverse social ties and connections. That is, individuals with social capital will have many non-redundant social ties (Kilduff, & Tsai, 2007) and are connected to individuals in many different social circles.

Along with this general decline of social capital and community it is not surprising that research has also demonstrated that social isolation is increasing. McPherson and colleagues' (2006) research further supports the declining trend in individuals experiencing a sense of community. This research compared data from 1985 to 2004, and verified a few noteworthy and alarming trends. McPherson and colleagues' findings indicated that the number of individuals who reported that they do not have anyone to discuss important matters with had tripled over that 20-year span. Overall, the results also signaled that individuals were making fewer social contacts through volunteer associations and neighborhoods; consequently, this helped explain why they also found that individuals had few discussion partners and confidants.

These trends are indicative of the fact that individuals are likely not experiencing a healthy community, or in other words, a community in which they feel a strong sense of community towards both the individual and collective levels (Bess et al., 2002). These trends are detrimental because they reveal that important socio-emotional needs of individuals are not being met for many individuals in the U.S. Furthermore, these trends provide direction for those wanting to use sport to improve life quality. Despite the variety of technological advances in the ability to communicate and connect with one another, current trends indicate that individuals are not reaping the benefits of community and are feeling more and more isolated. Recent work, nonetheless, has pointed towards sport becoming part of the solution to reversing these alarming trends.

CONTEMPORARY WORK IN UNDERSTANDING SENSE OF COMMUNITY

Early research on sense of community was primarily focused on neighborhood settings and continued to utilize and support McMillan and Chavis' Sense of Community Theory (1986). More recently, though, sense of community research has slowly evolved to where researchers have progressively geared their focus away from geographical neighborhood settings. These scholars are now more focused on communities of interest—the more prominent way in which community develops in contemporary society. For example, and perhaps of particular interest to sport, a study on sense of community within the workplace suggested that competition has an impact on a sense of community (Pretty & McCarthy, 1991). And more specifically, gender differences may exist among how men and women perceive competition in influencing sense of community in workplace. Pretty and McCarthy (1991) suggested that competition might promote a sense of community for males while it detracts from a sense of community for females in workplace. Consequently, such research outside of neighborhood settings could have many practical applications in various contexts including but not limited to sport contexts.

Despite the fact that numerous sport organizations explicitly state that fostering a sense of community is one of their main goals, a growing body of research exists on how and when this is accomplished through sport. Clopton (2007, 2008, 2009) along with Warner and Dixon (2011, 2013) have recently attempted to fill this noted gap in our understanding. Their research, focused on the university sport experience, demonstrates the academic and quality of life benefits of experiencing a sense of community via sport. For example, improved student retention, overall improved well-being (including evaluated mood), greater attachment to the university, increased social networking opportunities, and increased involvement with other on-campus activities were just a few of benefits of a sense of community that were identified (Warner, 2016).

BUILDING COMMUNITY VIA SPORT

The following section outlines the ways in which sport can be used as tool to build community, with a particular focus on participatory sport (i.e., actual participation in the sport), community-based sporting

events, and fanship and spectatorship. In doing so it is vital to emphasize that sport needs to be designed and managed so that the community experienced for individuals is maximized. In other words, the mere presence of sport does not instantaneously create a community.

Participatory Sport
Warner and Dixon's (2011, 2013) qualitative studies identified seven important factors that were fundamental to fostering a sense of community among athletes: *Administrative Consideration, Common Interest, Competition, Equity in Administrative Decisions, Leadership, Social Spaces,* and *Voluntary Action.* The authors theorized that these factors work in concert with one another to either facilitate the development of community with a sport setting.

Administrative Consideration involves sport personnel and staff demonstrating that they care about the athletes as people, as opposed to just recognizing them as athletes. When sport personnel and staff are intentional and sincere in offering this type of care and concern for athletes a stronger sense of community is built. Along with this it is necessary to have a Common Interest. Warner and Dixon identified this as "The group dynamics, social networking, and friendships that resulted from individuals being brought together by the common interest of the sport (and combined with a common goal, shared values or other unifying factors.)"

Warner and Dixon also found Competition to be an important factor in sport settings. This factor entails the challenge to excel against internal (e.g., competing against teammates) and external rivalries (e.g., competing against other teams). It should be noted that Warner and Dixon determined that this particular component was moderated by gender. In general, men found that internal and external competition fostered community; however, women tended to report that only external competition fostered community for them. Furthermore, women in their studies indicated that internal competition (i.e., competing against teammates) was harmful to the community.

It is also important that community members perceive Equity in Administrative Decisions. This is vital because it demonstrates to all individuals and community members that everyone will be treated fairly. Intuitively this makes sense because individuals are more likely to thrive in an environment where they perceive fairness.

Leadership Opportunities empower community members to guide and direct activities and others. When Leadership Opportunities are available individuals are more likely to buy-in to the community. If community members do not feel like they have a voice or leadership opportunities they are more likely to leave the community (Hirschman, 1970).

When trying to build community through sport, it is also important to consider the role of Social Spaces, or a common physical space for where individuals can interact. Swyers' (2005, 2010) ethnographic research on Chicago Cubs fans captured the importance of having a physical space that allows community to develop. Swyers immersed herself in the culture of being a fan at Wrigley Field and utilized participant observation and informal interviews to guide her work. Her ethnographic research demonstrated that having a certain assigned section of bleachers at Wrigley Field was imperative to the fostering of community. For athletes, this often means a Social Space away from the playing field such as locker rooms or even a designated pub or bar is essential to building community (Kellett & Warner, 2011; Warner & Dixon, 2011).

Voluntary Action involves the participation in a community when little external pressure existed. That is, when members join a community on their own free will and without tangible external incentive or peer pressure a greater sense of community in fostered. For example, if an athlete is pressured by his or her peers or parent to participant in a sport it is likely that they will not experience a strong sense of community because Voluntary Action is absent.

This line of research suggests that all the noted factors should be carefully evaluated when considering the role of sport in building community. This work also reiterates the fact that community does not always occur when sport in present. Rather the noted factors must work in concert with one another to build community within sport. In summary, in order for the community experienced to be maximized for sport participants, Warner and Dixon argued that Administrative Consideration, Common Interest, Competition, Equity in Administrative Decisions, Leadership, Social Spaces, and Voluntary Action need to be carefully balanced and implemented (Warner & Dixon, 2011, 2013; Warner, 2016).

Community-Based Sporting Events
Another way that sport and community are often intertwined is through community-based sporting events. Communities will host different participatory sporting events such as bike races, triathlons, 5K runs, and marathons or even the more spectator-based hallmark and mega-events such as the Tour de France or the Superbowl. Community members will often serve as volunteers that assist in administering the event or as active sport participants. Again, the events are typically positioned as a means of fostering a sense of community and/or community development. As a case in point, Chalip (2006a) identified "community development" as one of the five major legitimations or justifications of sport. (Health, salubrious socialization, economic development, and national pride were the other major legitimations Chalip identified.) Numerous other scholars have claimed sporting events are a means of creating social capital, civic pride, and social cohesion (e.g., Chalip, 2006b; Misener & Mason, 2006; Wood, 2006; Ziakas & Costa, 2010). Event planners and organizers will often use this point in their discourse to gain community and leader support of these events. Oftentimes the economic value and impact of a sporting event on a community is overstated (e.g., Jones, 2001; Porter & Fletcher, 2008); consequently, those promoting events are beginning to focus more on the typically immeasurable or difficult to measure and assess social benefits, such as community building.

The celebratory and festival-like atmosphere surrounding community-based sporting events often creates an energy and pride that is nearly impossible to measure, but is nonetheless important to note. This energy and pride community members develop as a result of a sporting event is often referred to as *psychic income*. For example, after hosting a marathon in their city, community members may feel a strong sense of pride that their city was showcased to runners who travel to the event. This psychic income is not tangible, but many have argued an important benefit and outcome of a community-based sporting event (see Crompton, 2004). Thus, community-based sporting events are another way sport can be utilized to foster community.

Fanship and Spectatorship
Professional and college sports team can also play an integral role in nurturing community through fanship and spectatorship. Community can be fostered through watching, cheering on, and attending events related to that sport team. This occurs simply through the fact that a specific city or region is being represented or a passionate community of interest based around supporting that team has developed. Through affiliating with a specific team, individuals begin to identity with others who share that common interest. The team becomes a central point of identification and gives community members a common cause. For example, colleges and universities have been utilizing football and Fall Saturdays in this manner. "By affiliating with that [university] team, by caring for its scores, we declare allegiance to an interest greater than oneself – the community" (Chu, 1989, p. 160). Numerous university leaders believe that football creates a point of attachment for not only students, but also for other stakeholders such as alumni and local community members.

Clopton (2008) found that a relationship did exist between college football fan identification and sense of community. However, the direction of this relationship has yet to be determined (see Warner et al., 2011). That is, does a strong sense of community lead to greater fan identification or does greater fan identification lead to a stronger strong sense of community? It is clear, either way, that football games provide an opportunity for individuals to feel membership and celebratory ritual; undoubtedly, social spaces are formed through tailgating and even designated sections of seating in the stadium (Clopton, 2007, 2009; Toma, 2003; Warner et al., 2011). Furthermore, Kelly and Dixon (2011) recently observed that creating a sense of

community was overwhelmingly the primary strategic reasoning for the university's decision to financially invest and sponsor football.

While Swyers' (2005, 2010) work highlighted the role a professional baseball team played in fostered community among fans, Smith and Ingham (2003) found that a professional sport team divided a community. In this case, the use of public subsides for a professional sports team served as a divisive issue and the professional sports team was not advantageous for fostering community. Taxpayers strongly felt that a professional sports team and facility would not be beneficial to their community. Clearly, professional sport *can* play an important positive role in a community, but this does not occur by happenstance or serendipitously (Warner & Dixon, 2011, in press; Warner et al., 2011). How sport is managed and leveraged is fundamental in determining the outcomes of sport for a community (Chalip, 2006; Sparvero & Chalip, 2007). Both professional teams and sporting events can be leveraged to ensure the maximum value to the community is achieved. Again though, it is important to emphasize this is not occurring with all professional sport teams. Along with realizing greater economic benefit to a community, Sparvero and Chalip (2007) contend that an appropriately leveraged team or sporting event would foster a welcoming social and gathering place for community members while addressing social welfare issues (Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Misener & Mason, 2009). Hence, the ability to build community through way of fanship and spectatorship, along with participatory sport and community-based sporting events, are all an important considerations when assessing the role of sport and community.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Sport can play an important function in the community; however, as highlighted in this chapter, this does not automatically occur just because sport is present. Through viewing sport and community from a sociological perspective, it becomes more obvious that the social structures, social interaction, and institutional factors within various sport settings have a significant impact on the benefit sport can provide to a community and its members. Considering current trends point to the fact that fewer individuals are reaping the social and life quality benefits of experiencing a healthy community, the onus for sport to help address this issue is becoming more evident. Through participatory sport, community-based sporting events, and/or fanship and spectatorship, sport provides an important avenue and opportunity for community building.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Should cities and local communities use tax dollars to support and/or subsidize local sport programs or events? Why or why not? What about for professional sports teams?
2. Recent trends indicate that individuals are not experiencing community and its benefits as much as in the past. What are some practical ways in which a sport in your community could be improved or managed in an effort to foster a greater sense of community?
3. Football is frequently cited as a means of fostering a sense of community on college campuses. In your opinion and in light of McMillan and Chavis' theory, does football enhance the sense of community on your campus? Why or why not? What are some factors that are either missing or particularly strong on your campus?
4. Warner and Dixon's Sport and Sense of Community Theory posited that females and males perceive competition and the competitive environment differently. And moreover, competition tends to decrease the sense of community for women yet enhance the sense of community for men. Based on your experiences in sport, do you agree or disagree with this assessment. Explain your position.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Kellett, P., & Warner, S. (2011). Creating communities that lead to retention: The social worlds and communities of umpires. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 11*, 475-498. (This article focuses on the importance of community for sport officials. The article highlights how community for these individuals, who are both important employees in our sport systems yet also tend to be avid consumers of the sport experience, is essential to their retention.)

Swyers, H. (2005). Community America: Who owns Wrigley Field?. *The International Journal of the History of Sport, 22*, 1086-1105. (Swyers' work demonstrates the role a professional sports team can play in a community. Through specifically focusing on the Chicago Cubs and Wrigley Field, Swyers emphasizes the importance of social spaces and a sense of ownership in fostering community via sport.)

Warner, S., Shapiro, S., Dixon, M. A., Ridinger, L. L., & Harrison, S. (2011). The football factor: Shaping community on campus. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 4*, 236-256. (This work assesses the community impact of adding college football at Old Dominion University in 2009. The paper challenges the popular notion that football, specifically, fosters a greater sense of community on campuses. The study also suggests that sense of community influences outcomes related to Satisfaction, Retention, Current Support of Athletics, and Future Support for Athletics.)

REFERENCES

Agnew, R. (1997). The nature and determinants of strain: Another look at Durkheim and Merton. In N. Passas & R. Agnew (Eds.), *The future of Anomie Theory* (pp. 27-51). Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Allan, T. H., & Allan, K. H. (1971). Sensitivity for community leaders. *Proceedings of the 79th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 6,* 577-578.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Battistich, V., & Hom, A. (1997). The relationship between students' sense of their school as a community and their involvement in problem behaviors. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*, 1997-2001.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 497-529.

Berkman, L. F., Glass, T., Brissette, I., & Seeman, T. E. (2000). From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium. *Social Science & Medicine, 51,* 843-857.

Berg, B., & Warner, S. (2019). Advancing college athlete development via social support. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 12*, 87-113.

Bess, K. D., Fisher, A. T., Sonn, C. C., & Bishop, B. J. (2002). Psychological sense of community: Theory, research and application. In A. T. Fisher, C. C. Sonn & B.J. Bishop (Eds.), *Psychological sense of community: Research, applications, and Implications* (pp. 3-22). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Bradish, C., & Cronin, J. J. (2009). Corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Sport Management, 23,* 691-697.

Carter, E. M., & Carter, M. V. (2007). Social psychological analysis of anomie among National Football League players. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 42,* 243-270.

Chalip, L. (2006a). Toward a distinctive sport management discipline. *Journal of Sport Management, 20,* 1-21.

Chalip, L. (2006b). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport Tourism,* 11, 109-127.

Chipuer, H., & Pretty, G. (1999). A review of the Sense of Community Index: Current uses, factor structures, reliability, and further development. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27,* 643-658.

Chu, D. (1989). *The character of American higher education and intercollegiate sport.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Clopton, A. W. (2007). Predicting a sense of community amongst students from the presence of intercollegiate athletics: What roles do gender and BCS-affiliation play in the relationship? *The SMART Journal, 4*(1), 95-110.

Clopton, A. W. (2008). College sports on campus: Uncovering the link between fan identification and sense of community. *International Journal of Sport Management, 9,* 343-362.

Clopton, A. (2009). Students as spectators: Their academic and social integration. *New Directions for Higher Education, 148,* 83-89.

Crompton, J. L. (2004). Beyond economic impact: An alternative rationale for the public subsidy of major league sports facilities. *Journal of Sport Management, 18,* 40-58.

Cunningham, G. B. (2007). *Diversity in sport organizations.* Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.

Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2005). Access discrimination in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 29,* 148-163.

Davidson, W., & Cotter, P. R. (1991). The relationship between sense of community and subjective well-being: A first look. *Journal of Community Psychology, 19(3),* 246-253.

Deflem, M. (1989). From anomie to anomia and anomic depression: A sociological critique on the use of anomie in psychiatric research. *Social Science & Medicine, 29,* 627-634.

Durkheim, E. (1933). *The division of labor in society translated by George Simpson.* New York: The Free Press.

Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide: A study in sociology translated by George Simpson and John A. Spaulding.* New York: The Free Press.

Green, B. C. (2005). Building sport programs to optimize athlete recruitment, retention, and transition: Toward a normative theory of sport development. *Journal of Sport Management, 19*, 233-253.

Gusfield, J. R. (1975). *The community: A critical response.* New York: Harper Colophon.

Hagan, J., & McCarthy, B. (1997). Anomie, social capital, and street criminology. In N. Passas & R. Agnew (Eds.), *The future of Anomie Theory* (pp.124-141). Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Heller, K. (1989). The return to community. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 17,* 1-15.

Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jones, C. (2001). Mega-events and host-region impacts: determining the true worth of the 1999 Rugby World Cup, *The International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3, 241-251.

Kellett, P., & Warner, S. (2011). Creating communities that lead to retention: The social worlds and communities of umpires. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 11*, 475-498.

Kelly, D. D., & Dixon, M. A. (2011). Becoming a "real university": The strategic benefits of adding football for NCAA Division I institutions. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 2,* 283-303.

Kilduff, M., & Tsai, W. (2007). *Social networks and organizations.* London: Sage.

Lim, S. Y., Warner, S., Dixon, M. A., Berg, B., Kim, C., & Newhouse-Bailey, M. (2011). Sport participation across national contexts: A multilevel investigation of individual and systemic influences on adult sport participation. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 11*, 197-224.

Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. (1965). Group cohesiveness as interpersonal attraction: A review of relationships with antecedent and variables. *Psychological Bulletin, 64,* 259-309.

Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50,* 370-396.

McMillan, D., & Chavis, D. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*, 6–23.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Brashears, M. E. (2006). Social isolation in America: Changes in core discussion networks over two decades. *American Sociological Review, 71,* 353-375.

Misener, L., & Mason, D. S. (2006). Creating community networks: Can sporting events offer meaningful sources of social capital? *Managing Leisure, 11,* 39–56.

Misener, L., & Mason, D. S. (2009). Fostering community development through sporting events strategies: An examination of urban regime perception. *Journal of Sport Management, 23,* 770-794.

Mitchell, J. C. (1974). Social networks. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 3,* 279-299.

Porter, P. K., & Fletcher, D. (2008). The Economic Impact of the Olympic Games: Ex Ante Predictions and Ex Post Reality. *Journal of Sports Management*, 22, 470-486.

Pretty, G., & McCarthy, M. (1991). Exploring psychological sense of community among men and women of the corporation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 19*, 351-361.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rappaport, J. (1977). *Community Psychology: Values, research, and action.* New York: Rhinehart and Winston.

Sarason, S. B. (1974). *The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, A. L., Lemyre, N., & Raedeke, T. D. (2007). Advances in athlete burnout research. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 38,* 337-342.

Smith, J. M., & Ingham, A. G. (2003). On the waterfront: Retrospectives on the relationship between sport and communities. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 20,* 252-274.

Spaaij, R. (2009). The glue that holds the community together? Sport and sustainability in rural Australia. *Sport in Society, 9,* 1132-1146.

Sparvero, E. S., & Chalip, L. (2007). Professional teams as leverageable assets: Strategic creation of community value. *Sport Management Review, 10,* 1-30.

Swyers, H. (2005). Community America: Who owns Wrigley Field? *International Journal of the History of Sport, 22*(6), 1086-1105.

Swyers, H. (2010). *Wrigley Regulars: Finding community in the bleachers?* Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Toma, D. (2003). Football U: Spectator sports in the life of the American university. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Warner, S. (2016). Sport and Sense of Community Theory. In Cunningham, G. B., Fink, J., & Doherty, A. (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of theory in sport management* (pp. 189-198). New York, NY: Routledge.

Warner, S. (2019). Sport as medicine: How F3 is building healthier men and communities. *Sport Management Review, 22*(1), 38-52.

Warner, S., Bowers, M., & Dixon, M. A. (2012). Teambuilding and cohesion: A social networking perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 1,* 53-66.

Warner, S., & Dixon, M. A. (2011). Understanding sense of community from an athlete's perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 25,* 258-272.

Warner, S., & Dixon, M. A. (2013). Sport and community on campus: Constructing a sport experience that matters. *Journal of College Student Development, 54,* 283-298. *DOI: 10.1353/csd.2013.0044*

Warner, S., Shapiro, S., Dixon, M. A., Ridinger, L. L., & Harrison, S. (2011). The football factor: Shaping community on campus. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 4*, 236-256.

Warner, S., Sparvero, E., Shapiro, S., & Anderson, A. (2017). Yielding Healthy Community with Sport? *Journal of Sport Development, 5*, 8, 41-52.

Wood, E. H. (2006). Measuring the social impact of local authority events: a pilot study for a civic pride scale. *International Journal Nonprofit Voluntary Sector Marketing, 11,* 165-179.

Ziakas, V., & Costa, C. A. (2010). Between theatre and sport' in a rural event: Evolving unity and community development from the inside-out. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 15, pp. 7-26.

***