



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

Master's Thesis of Global Sport Management

Towards Social Capital:
The Impact of Sport in Building Community
Engagement

사회적 자본을 향해:
스포츠가 커뮤니티 참여 구축에 미치는 영향

2021년 8월

서울대학교 대학원
체육교육과 글로벌스포츠매니지먼트

Amjed Amin Abdelgalil Mustafa



이 논문은 문화체육관광부와 국민체육진흥공단 지원을 받아 수행된 연구임

This work was supported by Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism and Sports Promotion Foundation

Towards Social Capital:

The Impact of Sport in Building Community Engagement

Advisor: KIM Yukyoum

Submitting a master's thesis of Global Sport Management

August 2021

The Graduate School
Department of Physical Education
Seoul National University
Global Sport Management Major

Amjed Amin Abdelgalil Mustafa

Confirming the master's thesis written by

Amjed Amin Abdelgalil Mustafa

August 2021

Chair	<u>Kang, Joon-ho</u>
Vice Chair	<u>Lee, Yongho</u>
Examiner	<u>Kim, Yukyoum</u>

Abstract

Towards Social Capital:

The Impact of Sport in Building Community Engagement

Amjed Mustafa

Global Sport Management, Department of Physical Education
The Graduate School
Seoul National University

Many researches have been conducted on the impact of sport programs on the psychological and social well-being of the participants as individuals and in groups, yet the impact of those programs on the social capital development is under-examined and needs further research. Although there is a theoretical support that participation in sport should lead to formation of relationships between community members and will make them active outside the sport. The objective of this study is to test that participation in sport activities in young age will lead to an increase in social capital and positive involvement in the community in adulthood by using a correlational

research in Sudan. The data were collected from a representative sample from Khartoum state using a questionnaire developed from the National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP). The data were analyzed using descriptive and correlation analysis. The results have shown that the community engagement and social capital indicators were positively affected for participants who took part in the sport programs compared to their counterparts who did not or spent less time in those events. Results also showed that the impact of early sport participation on adult positive engagement in the community has lasted for the long-term.

Keyword : Social capital, early sport participation, community engagement, development through sport.

Student Number : 2019-29986

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
List of Tables	v
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Study Background	1
1.2 Purpose of Research	3
Chapter 2. Literature Review.....	5
2.1 Social Capital.....	5
2.2 Social Capital Definition	7
2.3 Social Capital Creation.....	9
2.4 The Exclusion in Social Capital	13
2.5 Promoting Inclusion Through Public Policies.....	17
2.6 Organizational Impacts and Linkages	24
2.7 Sport and Social Capital	27
Chapter 3. Method	33
3.1 Research Participants.....	33
3.2 Sample Size	34
3.3 Data Source	35
3.4 Variables	36
3.6 Ethical Considerations.....	37
3.5 Analysis Procedure	38

Chapter 4. Data Analysis and Findings	40
4.1 Introduction	40
4.2 Demographic Details	40
4.3 Descriptive Analysis.....	45
4.4 Age and participation in team and individual sports	47
4.5 Correlation Analysis of Team Sports and Individuals sports	58
Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusions	64
5.1 Introduction	64
5.2 Discussion.....	65
5.3 Implications	66
5.4 Limitation of the study	67
5.5 Future research	68
References	70
국문초록	78

List of Tables

Table 1. Age distribution for respondents	41
Table 2. Education levels for respondents.....	42
Table 3. Self-rated health.....	43
Table 4. Household Income.....	44
Table 5. Length of time in community	45
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics	46
Table 7. Demographic characteristics in team and individual sports	56
Table 8. Correlation Analysis I	59
Table 9. Correlation Analysis II	61
Table 10. Correlation Analysis III.....	63

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Study Background

Sport is considered among the social activities in all communities. Studies have shown that sport is used as a social vehicle bringing different individuals together which will have a positive impact on the community beside the health benefits gained through sport participation (Li & Andersen, 2008). Although sport itself does not necessarily provide the most appropriate method to tackle the society issues and obstreperous behaviors in the community, it depends on the continuous improvement of the personal and group development (Banda et al., 2005). This master thesis is concerned with the association between sport participation in early stages of adults' lives and the development of social capital within those participants. Specifically, it examines the relationship between team sport participation, volunteering activities, associational involvement and a broad range of community development.

Despite the fact number of researches were dedicated to explore the impacts of sport to individual's lifestyle, there is a lack of knowledge about impact of sport to a routine of public participation in terms of social capital (Harvey, Lévesque, & Donnelly, 2007). The term capital is widely use in an

economic framework to represent the wealth and assets that can be invested to generate more wealth, as it includes financial capital and physical capital (Piketty, 2015). Lately more types of capital have been recognized like the human capital, cultural capital and social capital (Spellerberg, 2001). The concept of social capital is about how communities interact with each other to forge positive lifestyles and identities by interacting with each other to make the community safer and more productive (Skinner, Zakus, & Cowell, 2008). There are three main theories dominate the literature, Putnam (1995), Bourdieu (1997) and Coleman (1988), therefore there is no common definition to the concept, the researcher has selected the indicators in the synthesis of Blackshaw and Long which focus on bonding and bridging to connect different individuals and groups, bringing a sense and common purpose; building social cohesion, and building norms of trust and reciprocity (Blackshaw & Long, 2005).

Putnam defines social capital as the “features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam, 2000). Putnam considers the social capital as a social feature that is present in the social interactions between individuals which makes collaborative work easier. (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000). Putnam has recognized that sport participation is one of the ways

social capital can be generated through the social interaction among the players, spectators or volunteers (Perks, 2007). Engagement and participation in sport could be challenging when the different approaches of participation do not contribute equally to the creation of social capital, as watching a game is not similar to taking part and engaging in the game (Putnam, 2000). Nevertheless, it is necessary not to exaggerate the role of sport participation in social cohesion, as Putnam described that as “the dark side of social capital” and the risk of building strong bonds among one group which will make them antagonistic against others (Putnam, 2000). Social capital could also lead to restriction of people’s freedom, exclusion of individuals outside the group if there are strong bonds are created within the members of the group and also facilitating criminal acts rather than stopping them (Aldridge, Halpern, & Fitzpatrick, 2002; Portes & Landolt, 1996).

1.2 Purpose of Research

Sport has traditionally been considered as a means to educate on appropriate personal development and build positive social capital (Lawson, 2005). Although social capital maybe built and evolved using different methods, it is mostly associated with non-profit sector. Communities are more resilient when their social capita stocks are high, this is extremely important for communities lacking infrastructure in rural and regional areas (Costello,

2003). However, there appears little evidence on the impact of the sport participation on the social capital and the contribution of sports to positive community involvement (Schulenkorf, Thomson, & Schlenker, 2011). Considering the importance of this type of capital it was very important to study the relationship between sport and social capital.

The purpose of this research is to contribute to a better understanding of sport and social capital, more specifically, on the impact of the early sport participation on people's social capital.

This research is addressing the following questions:

RQ1: What are the effects of early experiences of sport participation on the involvement in a broad range of community activities as an adult?

RQ2: Do the effects of early sport experiences on community involvement extend to later periods in the participants' lives?

Chapter 2. Literature Review

There has been significant and growing interest in social capital theory over the last few years, demonstrated by its exertion to several fields. As the social capital concept integrates several society attributes including civic involvement and social cohesion, beside the combination between sociology and economics (Claridge, 2004). The conception of the social capital integrates an opposition between the social and the capital. There is an unambiguous understanding that capital is broadly demarcated with physical characteristics of available resource and their ability to offer a contribution to utility. Therefore, the concept of social capital should include similar economic effects that are obtained from non-physical feature of the society. It is important to illustrate there are resources in the society which are not acknowledged as such due to their non-commercial nature (Fine, 2002).

2.1 Social Capital

The term social capital is applied incoherently to express a broad spectrum of phenomena across an extensive field of operations, it is difficult to find an agreed definition of social capital. Social capital -according to Blackshaw and Long (2005)- is associated to the amount and size of created connections and relationships between individuals and the quality of them (Blackshaw & Long, 2005). In the recent years there has been an increasing

involvement in social capital theory, This involvement arises from the appeal of the conception as it combines different majors with sociology and economics integrates sociology and economics, and incorporates a collection of concepts including civic tradition, civickness, community engagement and solidarity among the individuals in the same society (Adam & Rončević, 2003).

The definition of social capital is based on the discipline under study and the degree of study, as there is no there is no single definition that is agreed upon by most scholars. This has led to the development of several approaches seeking to clarify social capital. The current evolution of the approach developed from several authors include Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam with many authors accumulating to the present approach. Generally, social capital denotes to the various levels of links and ties in the society between individuals that facilitate positive consequences (Szreter, 2000). As the word capital indicates to different types of stocks, the term social capital indicates the stocks that are gained through social relationships like trust and networks that will be used by the people as a source of assistance. Social capital integrates between the social relationships and economic development that impact the people in a positive way (Adam & Rončević, 2003).

Social capital generation has been dealt with a sustainable solution for various issues related to the society including lack of financial assets, corruption and ineffective government (Boix & Posner, 1998). Moreover, social capital concept has more comprehensive approach that tackles social systems and different conditions through the different theories of the concept (Grootaert & Van Bastelar, 2002).

Although the term social capital is considered relatively new, as it has been used since the early years of the twentieth century in academic researches. However, the concepts of the term are embedded in different areas including social sciences, political science and also economics (Grootaert & Van Bastelar, 2002). There might be an analogy between the theory of social capital and moral philosophy. Both of the concepts are goal-oriented in terms of outputs process (Sampson, Morenoff, & Earls, 1999). This shows that the concept of social capital has been used for several decades by thinkers and philosophers from the eighteenth century, although the term is relatively new. Since then it has been used in various areas of studies.

2.2 Social Capital Definition

There is no definite, precise meaning for the term social capital due to various ideas and theories related to it (Dolfsma & Dannreuther, 2003). Therefore, any definition of this term will mainly depend on the discipline

under study and its nature (Robison, Schmid, & Siles, 2002). The multiple frameworks that social capital is engaged may lead to disagreement between different definitions and even inconsistency of the term (Adler & Kwon, 2002). There is no need for a cross disciplinary definition as researchers will be reformulating other discipline's definitions. The identification of conceptualization is mandatory for studies in regard to the specific discipline, as it is not important to identify the level of study for each definition (Woolcock, 1998). Other scholars have recognized that the variation of the definitions depend on the focus of the study whether it is focusing on the effects or causes of social capital (Adler & Kwon, 2002).

The concept of social capital is about the way people cooperate and collaborate to achieve mutual goals, it is about the relationships that are created among people through bonding with similar people or bridging between diverse people and how they interact with each other (Uslaner & Dekker, 2001). The research in social capital is important due to its value of it. The quality of benevolence that people have for others is very valuable intangible resource because it represents the productive benefits of sociability (Adler & Kwon, 2002). Accordingly, the various definitions of social capital term are based on the nature of the relations among actors with each other's, the links and connections that actors keep, or both of linkages (Adler & Kwon,

2002). Many authors have a significant impact on the literature. Putnam (1995) and Bourdieu (1997) have significant impact and considerable distinctions in their explanations of the concept, creating together a solid ground to the concept of social capital (Nicholson & Hoyer, 2008).

Bourdieu explained social capital as the quantity and quality of connections that actors have, and the capability of benefit from them (Blackshaw & Long, 2005). Coleman introduced the structure of the social connections that promoting the benefit of the actors. Putnam (1995) definition of social capital is “the features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for collective benefit”. Social capital depends on the individuals defining the group’s standards and norms, and not only about a group of people coming together in one place, the mutual objectives and common motives are very important characteristics that defines social (Putnam, 2004). He described that regular activities with companions lead to sustainable social capital more than individual activities (Coalter, 2007).

2.3 Social Capital Creation

Reimer (2008) has argued that different levels of divisions in between the societal levels led to the production of social capital. These divisions had been split into four types: market relations which are based on the interactions

generated from goods exchange, bureaucratic relations whether it is formal, impersonal or governed by procedures and principles, associative relations is where individuals gather to achieve a common goal and express mutual concerns, communal relations are about the various characteristics that members of a community share including ethnicity, ancestry and many others values give good sense of identity. It was emphasized that here by more effectively knowing the formed up social norms inside what a neighborhood capability, and also just how contacts as well as linkages are organized and also looked after, there could be more comprehensibility about how exactly cultural capital is established (Reimer, Lyons, Ferguson, & Polanco, 2008).

The effective construction of interpersonal capital develops as a result of the woven interactions of people in groups that are small that recognize with the bigger whole, as proposed by Putnam et al. (2004). It is also resulted where strength of good leadership maximizes the advantages for the better good. The task for leaders along with organizations is facilitating successful bonds among the little group of people, and record the various range and level of relationships within all of them. It is important to have a clear understanding which tasks work in generating community networks and the way they facilitate a chance to access new energy (Nicholson & Hoyer, 2008). It is harder in communities to grow bridging bonds among organizations and

will take more time when compared with the bonds which were created between like-minded folks. Loyalty is a result of the casual relationships developed between people, it is important to know the difference between the emerges of loyalty and the anticipations of behavior positioned on organizations (Reimer et al., 2008). If decision-makers in sports activities organizations are able to maximize and also mobilize information, there could be shared advantages for all people.

Misener and Doherty (2008) claimed that although the main reason for a relationship might be based on economic interests, interpersonal consequences will result (Doherty & Misener, 2008). Alternatively, and maybe a manifestation on the circularity on the creation activity of interpersonal capital, Reimer et al. (2008) reasoned which social capital stocks are pulled upon largely for financial drive. Nevertheless, Coalter (2008) recommended that social capital will be most beneficial for those have the strongest norms of trust and cooperation. For instance, organizing committee volunteers can help much more than common volunteers (Cuskelly, 2004).

The determination of a shared objective needs to be addressed between different individuals and groups which will lead to creation of social capital and the differences can be lowered (Putnam & Feldstein, 2009). Bridging enables the creation of bonds between several groups instead of

strengthening the variances of theirs (Nicholson & Hoyer, 2008). As a result only some bridges will make different individuals more close; often there's a need to access materials beyond the access of a team or even network, or maybe geographical barriers prevents the forming of any bonds between individuals with similar mindset (Onyx, Leonard, & Hayward-Brown, 2004). The formed bonds are determinant for the bridging which existed with intermediaries that are trustworthy and well known. Bonding is a crucial phase in creating the shared confidence, cooperation and cohesion to bridge connections across organizations (Coalter, 2008). By comparison, there is always a possibility for narrow -mindedness of people from outside the community, inhibiting inspiration and also the sustainable welfare and comfort of the neighborhood in the societies that establish good bonding social capital (Onyx et al., 2004).

The public segment might disregard the desire to produce significant strategic possibilities for its generation while there is no a solid comprehensive definition of the concept of social capital, and the political adjustments towards evaluating the results, rather compared to the process itself (Falk & Kilpatrick, 2000). Hoyer and Nicholson (2008) captured the scope of use and supply of materials that arise within the framework of financial approaches, which is an essential requirement of the overall

intention of the present study and it is important to define what mechanisms or processes are able to engender community relations between participants. They promulgated an inclusive, wider meaning of resources, that is not based on easy financial instruments or maybe unidimensional participation measurement, but more of encompassing community communications based on reciprocity and trust, in discovering the factors associated with social networking that allow the communities to be more content. Later on, an additional consideration of the literature which mainly devoted to the tools and instruments that are used in measurement of the processes and outcomes of social capital and how it is built-up in different communities (Nicholson & Hoyer, 2008).

2.4 The Exclusion in Social Capital

Social capital is able to enhance developments in a single scope. The improvements in the numbers of donors and givers whom are available to help within the society is a good representation of the benefit of social capital to the community. However, this is also able to work to eliminate some of the volunteers or people willing to volunteer, as some individuals may lack the required knowledge or skill to perform the desired job efficiently to meet up with the needs of bureaucratic procedures, and that are reluctant being engaged in committees, might turn out to be left out (Reimer et al., 2008).

There have been recent apprehensions of the officials and decision-makers to be opting to disregard the negative impacts of social capital, because it is able to result in elimination dependent on many factors ranging from social to economic (Stempel, 2005; Tonts, 2005). For example, in outlying communities, wherever the number of the community members is dwindling, there will be a lack of remaining social capital readily obtainable to assist groups of people adjust, familiarize and also handle the problems arose from the diminishing of the population (Owen, 2002). Likewise, in dealing with the requirement to revive and redevelop a community that is strongly affected by poverty, a crucial issue disregarded by officials and decision-makers would be the degree to which the specific society has people with the pertinent expertise, talents, awareness, determination, opportunities and attributes to strengthen the society through the development of social capital (Sharpe, 2006). Also one of the negative sides of developing social capital in one sector of the society is the possibility of building an exclusive organizations which have high chance to rise to corruption in the absence of public engagement which will result to lack of trust between the communities that results to distrust within towns (Eckstein & Delaney, 2002; Putnam, 2000).

As proposed by Oxoby (2009) that specific observations about entry to resources and institutions within the policy-making atmosphere influence their decision of joining in and positively participating in the organization. The higher the level of perceived inclusion, the better cultural cohesion is produced and also the higher the level of reliability and independency is established (Oxoby, 2009). Nevertheless, even where communities show very increased creation of connection between similar groups, the intolerance of people who are not part of the group serves to refute them a chance to access new ideas or skills that ensure the continued health of the neighborhood (Onyx et al., 2004). Decision makers and authorities in sport organizations have to learn that ability to access public capital helps with increased understanding and also source exchange between organizations, but which various cultural interpretations of 'cultural capital' could occur in unique forms and processes of inclusion not known by the rest (Spellerberg, 2001).

Social rejection is a method whereby something or someone excludes, as Collins suggests (2004). Sports activity, similar to any product or service cannot be accessed by everyone. The classes divisions are denied clubs (Stempel, 2005). Another exclusion is events deny access due to fee (Collins, 2004). In addition to that Collins (2004) even found the clubs usually are not constantly needed in strategic partnership to generate programs that

encourage sport events within underprivileged groups. However, inaccessible athletic organizations, whose concentration exclusively on the athletic performance will nevertheless offer interpersonal interactions between the members of theirs, who see the sport entity as the center for the community of theirs and who share a typical distinctiveness. Reimer et al. (2008) clarified the elimination ascends due to the dynamics of the rules plus components available within the society. Contrasting to linked organizations, the participants of theirs might not have any interest in, and the nonexistence to the societal networking sites and materials to dynamically do connecting events which may gain the broader society (Coalter, 2008).

There is a potential hazard of community strategies and plans to ruin existing social ties when projects are being implemented, like the shutdown of underprivileged areas to offer new bodily amenities (Putnam, 2000). The state might also modify the framework of interpersonal capital inside the targeted groups on the way to much more necessary connections on a social basis. However, if the novel method of process cannot be continued there is high possibility that people will simply cancel back to their securely towns (Carilli, Coyne, & Leeson, 2008). Nevertheless, several experts recommend that the inventory of social capital might not have lessened, but only transferred to an alternative structure separate from, the associative dynamics

of volunteerism to some market-based framework as need surpasses source is a good example of this shift (Reimer et al., 2008). The capabilities of the analysis agree with is the fact that rebuilding social capital using federal involvements will lead to the failure of these policies whether they don't enable the completely free connections of people dependent on activities, norms and relationships could provide assists to the communities which may help them (Coalter, 2007; Oxoby, 2009). In order to sustain the systems whereby social capital is generated, it is important to comprehend the extended purposes and dedication of popular volunteers meant for regional policies.

2.5 Promoting Inclusion Through Public Policies

There are many factors that can be cited to explain the growth of social capital through the formation of a network of social relations within the community, and those factors are stimuli and motivators that make individuals enter into groups and (Collins, 2004; Nicholson & Hoyer, 2008; Skinner et al., 2008). The social relations begin to take on the character of networking or interconnectedness and communication between them (Coalter, 2007). The most prominent of those factors that play a major role not only in forming social relationships, but in working on the permanence and continuity of those relationships (Blackshaw & Long, 2005; Wilson, 2000).

As Coalter (2007) stated, Social inclusion is an important factor in the growth of social capital and a true indicator is the extent of its existence, growth, and even development in society (Coalter, 2007). In a later post, Coalter (2008) showed that whenever members of society merged into one melting pot and whenever these individuals are able to mobilize their resources and achieve the maximum degree of benefit and benefit from their actions. Social inclusion is reflected in the ability of individuals to develop and create civic organizations (Coalter, 2008). Social relations that transcend their individual boundaries, and then social capital theorists assert that it represents an asset independent of the social structure and the network of social relations, but rather resides in that the network is able to be transformed into tangible and intangible assets (Gratton, Shibli, & Coleman, 2005). Nevertheless, the final outcome of the social relations that make up social capital is limited to capacity to coordinate and organize the actions of individuals in order to achieve common goals, and thus individuals are driven towards each other and form social relationships in which there is a measure of continuity and stability in order to form (Blackshaw & Long, 2005). Ironically, the individual's membership continues the group to which the individual belongs, and consequently the continuation of relations among the individuals (Coalter, 2007).

To use the sport as a tool whereby to create or even improve the health of the communities of theirs. Whilst keeping the balance between social expectations and commercial interests, developing methods for the strategic goals (Collins, 2004). It is essential for the individual to obtain rewards, opportunities, and benefits in exchange for avoiding pain and suffering, the continuity of social relations depends on the positive benefits granted to individuals and thus they seek to preserve it and consolidate the bonds of that relationship for legitimacy is a major factor in the formation of social capital.

Social capital is formed when individuals enter in forming a network of social relations within a social group that enjoys a degree of legitimacy except for the existence of controls that govern the behavior of its members, those controls become binding on the members of the group it contributes to the continuation, consolidation and permanence of social relations, and thus networking of relationships (Houlihan, 2005; Newman, 2007; Owen, 2002). The social capital is formed in such a way that social capital can be invested in achieving goals individual or group and receive rewards, grants and benefits, values play an essential role in the formation of social capital through sharing the group's values (Newman, 2007). that sharing values may be an evidence of solidarity among the participants, and that sharing in values may lead to solidarity and complementarity, but in contrast to the above, it

may be a sign of the lack of similarity, especially if we take into account other groups, then adopt group values which leads to differentiation of groups from each other, and this, in turn, leads to the occurrence of hostility, commitment to the values of a particular group may be the way to achieve a position within the group (Coalter, 2007; Collins, 2004; Houlihan, 2005).

In light of the concept of social acceptance, it can be said that individuals they will relate to each other in social relations on the basis of free choice, as members of one group are individuals who have achieved a high degree of social acceptance, which is in turn, an attraction to social life (Blackshaw & Long, 2005; Vail, 2007; Houlihan, 2005; Coalter, 2007). If the social capital depends mainly on the formation of a network of relationships.

In the social relations between individuals, acceptance is a major factor in establishing social relations between them individuals, it is not reasonable for the individuals to enter into a social relationship with the other without accepting this (Gratton et al., 2005). Desired cultural and social benefits are produced from urban regeneration, athletic involvement and improved facilities, improved positive images and tourism (Gratton et al., 2005). As Houlihan (2005) reviews, the state has exploited as well as manipulated global sport and also features a prominent role as resource provider, regulator, and a promoter, in addition to a major investor. Whether

the massive government investments are able to bring about sustainable community innovations is really a question that challenges policymakers and academics equally, while the other form will help to accumulate social capital (Blackshaw & Long, 2005; Coalter, 2007; Gratton, et al., 2005; Jackson & Sam, 2004).

The importance of it trust and the most prominent visions and perceptions that have been put forward in the heritage of social science, trust is essential to the characteristics of a society the contemporary, which has become characterized by complexity, uncertainty and risk, and confidence appears as real as the basic social life, so social life is upright without the availability of the element of confidence and the confidence element for a concept of Trust Personal (Cousens, Mallen, & Bradish, 2006; Thibault, & Kikulis, Frisby, 1999). Trust is one of the most important components of human society, and adds that without trust between people and each other, society loses its integrity, as human societies are functional and it depends on a multitude of undertakings, contracts and arrangements that a single person can do on his own (Andranovich et al., 2001). the importance of the values of loyalty and loyalty as one of the indicators for preserving relationship to the other (Andranovich et al., 2001).

Trust comes as a cultural resource for the effective development of society. Its treatment is that trust has two basic elements: beliefs, pledges, and cares (Jackson and Sam, 2004). Likewise, there are a set of societal conditions that pave the way for the emergence of a "culture of trust", namely coherence normative as opposed to disruption of norms, it provides a strong framework for the cohesion of social life. The social stability, as opposed to the radical change, societal systems remain stable if groups are represented as networks and ties (Lawson, 2005). The habits that individuals conduct in their daily life allows them to anticipate their behavior likewise, commitments and exchanges based on trust are implemented. (Jackson & Sam, 2004). Newman (2007) observed that accountability between individuals and institutions, as an exchange. The lack of a sense of responsibility, and this condition is fulfilled if both are available and there are many ways and the possibilities of accessing the method of work of institutions and positive interaction with them, and here it is important to equip standards to control behavior and ensure the safety of the regularity of procedures, and if possible individuals resort to such institutions, thus, they may be assured of a sense of safety and confidence in the absence of a violation or violation of the rules and standards established within the community (Newman, 2007).

Even trust is viewed as one of the mechanisms for reproducing social practices as well as an example of the mechanism that binds individuals through their integration into a single structure devoid of suspicion, fear and oppression, it allows us to deal with the risks inherent in this human society, which is undergoing rapid changes and transformations (Skinner et al., 2008). Trust is being viewed as a mechanism to guard against surrounding risks of society through the possibility of individuals being dependent on each other within society (Blackshaw & Long, 2005; Putnam, 1995).

Levels of trust, which are reflected in four levels: "the level of kinship," and that level reveals on high levels of trust, the level of neighborhood, and we find that confidence may weaken a little. Confidence in this the level is not absolute, but relative, as it does not reflect complete confidence, "level of confidence" in coworkers, then, "the level of confidence in state institutions." (Blackshaw & Long, 2005; Sam & Jackson, 2004). The importance of trust for social capital, where trust is considered an essential component of social capital, trust facilitates cooperation and the higher the degree of trust within society has increased the likelihood of cooperation, and cooperation in itself has generated the trust and confidence required for its sustainability (Sam & Jackson, 2004).

2.6 Organizational Impacts and Linkages

The functions of social capital at the individual level appear through the idea that a person who seeks to expand the circle of his social relations with others creates social capital that he can rely on in the future in light of the commitments and mutual expectations among individuals as well as the trust, solidarity and willingness to help each other (Houlihan, 2005; Newman, 2007). The social capital for the individual also contributes to the flow and availability of information that the individual may need. For example, a new immigrant can obtain all his information about the situation in the country of immigration through a network of social relations, in addition to benefiting from individuals with influence and influence within the country (Reese Sharpe, 2006). A network of social relations in achieving (29) goals and interests that can be achieved in light of the absence of these relationships with influential people (Diamond, 2001; Owen, 2002). With regard to the functions of social capital in relation to the group, it can be said that social capital helps in achieving group cohesion and integration in addition to enabling the group in its dealings with other groups in a harmonious and harmonious manner, and perhaps this appears in civil society institutions such as parties, unions, associations and organizations (Skinner et al., 2008). These institutions can perform their roles efficiently and effectively in a way that

serves their members. In addition to the above, social capital has societal functions in all spheres (Onyx & Bullen, 2000).

With regard to the political and economic sphere, social capital enhances the quality of life based on civil interdependence, which is necessary for the success of contemporary democratic political systems (Mason & Friedman, 2004; Palmer, 1996; Reed, 1997; Benson & Saxton, 2005). Thus, the concept of social capital has become important and vital in issues of democratization, political participation and the issue of legitimacy, for example if democracy is It requires an efficient society with a high degree of cohesion, so there is no doubt that social capital helps in this (Spellerberg, 2001; Thibault et al., 1999). As for the functions of social capital in the economic field, this is embodied through its effective role in development by stimulating collective action, cooperation, participation and exchange of information (Mason & Friedman, 2004; Benson & Saxton, 2005). Social capital helps to provide an environment in which economic growth is possible and in which productivity High, as well as the motivation to work, production and tireless pursuit of the goal (Diamond, 2001; Galaskiewicz et al, 2006; Palmer, 1996).

Social capital helps to provide an environment in which economic growth is possible and in which productivity high, as well as the motivation

to work, production and tireless pursuit of the goal (Dredge, 2006; Mason and Friedman, 2004; Reed, 1997). Many studies indicate that social capital may increase farmers' productivity by increasing the likelihood of success of agricultural extension programs and improving farmers' ability to obtain credit sources (Dredge, 2006). It can be said that societies with high levels of participation and a network of social relationships are more effective in obtaining information and more responsive to agricultural extension programs (Reed, 1997). Cousens (2006) highlighted that farmers may be increasingly exposed to unforeseen conditions and conditions in relation to the climate, agricultural pests and diseases, or marketing, in addition to farmers' exposure to problems resulting from the lack of financial resources and the inability to use new technologies. Mutual trust engenders risk management skills for farmers (Lawson, 2005). Through the network of social relations between farmers, this may contribute and facilitate the process of marketing agricultural products in light of the availability of information exchange between them (Cousens et al., 2006).

The positive results of social capital in light of its functions for the individual, group and society in the manner previously mentioned and in spite of the positive functions and results of social capital, but it can be said that it may cause negative and impediments for both the individual and the group or

the society (Collins, 2004) restrictions may be imposed on the freedom of individuals for the benefit of the group, or the group may tend to close in on itself and exclude elements that are outside it (Harvey et al., 2007; Putnam et al., 2004). The matter may reach a limit in light of the functions that the individual performs impeding the participation of some of its members in society and tasks that may affect negatively on the entity of the group, its goals and interdependence (Diamond, 2001).

2.7 Sport and Social Capital

Social relationships are the key in moving other growth-enhancing resources, and the nature and extent of inter-institutional interaction are key to development prospects, in a particular community. Social capital can be used to support or mandate the common good, and perhaps more importantly. An example of social capital in the absence of formal insurance mechanisms and financial instruments is the use of social nexus for the poor, as the basic means to protect against risks and vulnerabilities (Coalter, 2007; Skinner et al., 2008). Many protectors argue that they are elements of community norms and culture, or social capital they are fundamental to their evolution and development, yet these concepts are difficult to capture with models economic. (Hoye & Nicholson, 2008). Individuals have full confidence in their performance in accordance with a promised, even if only that wasn't

increasing their rewards (Brown, 2006; Burnett, 2006; Coalter, 2007; Jarvie, 2003; Hoye & Nicholson, Seippel, 2006).

A model has been developed that develops endogenous calculations of social capital and explores its role in the process of economic development, that is, it embodies in a simple formal way the interaction between social capital and the processes of economic production. The results obtained provide an explanation of why the late developing countries may not be able to with the liquidity of planting production patterns that have proven beneficial (Collins, 2007; Stempel, 2004; Perks, 2005). Whitford and Arcodia (2006) proposed that this model has two features of the main features that are not considered standard, the first is that it excludes the possibility of designing compliant contracts (Seippel, 2006). Successful agents critically depend on the blindness of the right agents, who are the trustworthy agents willing to fulfill their obligations even if there is no self-financial reconciliation for them (Cousens et al., 2006). The second feature that was used in the evolutionary model, despite modeling a framework applicable to a certain method, the generalization will be correct in the event that two basic conditions are met. First it is that social capital adapted relatively slowly compared to the speed of capable firms on controlling the means of production (Atherley, 2006; Brown, 2006; Perks, 2007). Social capital is

affected by the method of production that follows the company, and changes that raise profits may weaken the developmental incentives for preserving social capital (Atherley, 2006; Brown, 1995; Spellerberg, 2007; Putnam, 2007; Perks, 2006; Coalter, 2001). Social capital is considered a multi-dimensional concept, the definition of which is the most effective, and it is, as they were known, but Coleman who said that social capital is defined through its function, and it is not a single entity (Lawson, 2005). An assortment of different entities, with two common elements: any collectively consisting of some aspects of social structures, and certain actions of the supporting bodies flow within the structure (Atherley, 2006). Such an ambiguous definition makes every attempt to download scientific or empirical difficult and dangerous (Atherley, 2006; Lawson, 2005). The use of confidence measures derived from the World Values Survey leads to a breach of confidence indicators in social terms, the use of indirect indicators does not represent the main components of capital it is about the concept of social capital, and the difficulty of social, and it may be complex and cause confusion large calculate the multiple dimensions of all aspects of various social capital such as social networks (Tonts, 2005). Social capital contains the social networks and norms that support cooperation teamwork for mutual benefits creates a foundation for economic prosperity. And it has been done

presenting some empirical evidence on social capital and economic growth (Delaney & Eckstein, 2002; Gratton et al., 2005). The development of social capital through human capital formation that has been undertaken it was built from production consumption, and the predictions of the pilot model were examined for a wide range of countries.

Human capital is measured in terms of the number of years of schooling, so this is the best method to determine the level of human capital, it is the average years of school education in the base period. And from naturally, human capital formation created and developed social trust, and this tends to be said to be rising the level of generalization improves social confidence (Owen, 2002). Through generalization, it certainly improves social capital, and empirical results also indicate that the average generalization has a direct effect on social confidence and income level, and also empirical results support the assumption that social capital has a significant impact on the level of income and the rate of economic growth, but as Kilpatrick and Falk (2000) indicated, the general results indicated that an average of one additional year of schooling leads to improvement social trust in people, and that the development of human capital is crucial for the formation and development of its capital (Coalter, 2007; Reimer et al., 2008)

Chalip (2006). The traditional formation of natural capital, physical and human capital needs to be expanded.

Internal cultural and social cohesion of a society, and the standards and values that govern the interactions between people institutions, social capital is the glue that holds societies together, without which they cannot there can be economic growth or human welfare without social capital. Society as a whole (Jones, 2001; Owen, 2002). With the action to entrepreneurial governance at the neighborhood level, the improved participation of personal segment of setup pursuits has further decreased possibilities for public controversy (Jones, 2001) resulting in exclusion and also the diminution of trust. While exclusionary methods have a damaging impact on social capital development (Blackshaw & Long, 2005), the bidding & implementation arrangements do generate vertical and horizontal linkages that could not usually can be found between organizations, to attain a common objective (Putnam, 1995). Putnam has sought to achieve an actual and remarkable development in investment in social capital, and thus the occurrence of sustainable development and poverty eradication, and the results of his studies indicate that rising levels of social capital correlate with successive improvements and developments in income distribution (Whitford & Arcodia, 2006). The first step towards developing an integrated framework

regarding the nature of social capital, and its relationship with socio-economic performance, examining the factors that determine the development of social capital a look at the determinants of social capital (Coleman, 1988). The results obtained, broadening outreach and employment increases the motivation for participation groups, and enhancing the stock of social capital (Mason & Misener, 2006). In general, the individual and systemic factors indicate that the reconstruction social capital depends on opportunities to expand social participation and cooperation to broad segments society and blindness changes in the traditions of low-trust countries and weak civil societies (Andranovich et al., 2001).

Chapter 3. Method

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the research methodology for this quantitative study regarding the participation in sport for development events in relation with the social capital and values learning of the participants.

A quantitative research method will be followed using a casual-comparative design, as this study attempts to determine the relationship between the different variable which will be identified in this chapter.

3.1 Research Participants

To examine the relationship between the participation in the sport programs with the involvement in community, this dissertation analyzes data collected from residents of Khartoum state in Sudan who are considered the population of the study. To achieve proper and externally valid study participants, Brandon, Long, Loraas, Mueller-Phillips, and Vansant (2014) suggest that the use of professional recruitment services is important to achieve proper and externally validity (2014). Therefore, the researcher will use a marketing research company for to contact the participants and collect data. The sampling frame for this study was established from the 5.5 million residents in Khartoum state (CBS, 2002). Khartoum state has seven localities, the seven Khartoum localities are: Khartoum, Omdurman, Khartoum North, Sharq an-Nil, Jabal Awliya, Om Badda and Karari.. The eligibility criteria for

this study consisted of Sudanese citizens who are over the age of 18 and lived and worked in Khartoum state. Multi-stage sampling was employed. First, simple random sampling was used to draw a cluster of four localities out of seven, the four localities were Karari, Khartoum, Khartoum north and Umdurman. Then cluster sampling was used by dividing the population based on the four localities selected of Khartoum state and then applying random sampling to overcome the shortcomings of random sampling.

3.2 Sample Size

The sample size for this study was calculated based on the following factors: acceptable level of significance, power of the study, expected effect size, underlying event rate in the population and standard deviation in the population. The acceptable level of significance $p = 0.05$ or 5% which means that there is a 5% chance of erroneously reporting an effect is accepted. The false negative rate or the confidence level which is willing to accept or reject the null hypothesis is 95%. The population size for this study is the population for Khartoum state which is 5.5 million people (CBS, 2002). The response distribution is 50%. The sample size of the study group was derived using the following formula:

$$n = \frac{Z^2 P Q \times deff}{d^2}$$

From the above formula the sample size was calculated to be 385 participants. The total sample was divided between the four chosen localities according to the ratio of the number of residents in each locality.

3.3 Data Source

The data for the analysis were collected using the National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (NSGVP) (Hall, McKeown, & Roberts, 2001). The NSGVP is used to measure the social capital by measuring different indicators including the participation in the community and the time dedicated for volunteering activities to enhance the well-being of the community. Five Likert scale is used to scale responses in the survey, using five points system ranging from 1 (= strongly disagree) to 5 (=strongly agree). The questionnaire was designed in English and then translated into Arabic in order to help the interviewer to collect the data from the participants. The questionnaire was prepared online using a web-based survey tool and then sent to the interviewer through the internet for data collection. This method was selected due to its simplicity, time efficiency and it is an economical way to collect a large amount of raw data. The organization manager was contacted to have his permission in this study and he was willing to collaborate in data collection.

3.4 Variables

3.4.1 Independent Variables:

Participation in any organized team sports is the major independent variable as the major focus of this thesis is to address the impact of the youth sport participation on the participants' social capital. Since the research approach is a cross sectional study in Khartoum, thus all respondents were residents of Khartoum. The duration of the participation will vary and it will be the main independent variable. The respondents were asked a question whether or not they had participated in an organized team or individual sport event.

3.4.2 Dependent Variables:

Volunteering formally: The variable is constructed as the number of times the respondent participated in any form of unpaid volunteer activities done as part of a group or organization in the past 12 months.

Volunteering informally: This variable represents any sort of help or service the respondent has given to others completely on his own and not through an organization in the past 12 months.

Socializing with relatives: This variable represents the number of social activities the respondent conducts with his relatives and the frequency of it.

Socializing with friends: This variable represents the number of social activities the respondent conducts with his friends and the frequency of it.

Acquisition of fair play: this is a self-evaluation variable represents whether the respondent emphasizes and embodies the value of fair play with himself and his opponents.

Teamwork: this variable represents the value of teamworking whether the respondent sees himself as a cooperative member of his team and if he can get along with other people easily.

Pursuing of excellence: This variable represents the value of excellence within the respondent and whether he puts in the best performance he can.

3.4.3 Control Variables:

The following sociodemographic variables were introduced as statistical controls: age, gender, marital status, presence of child in the household less than 18 years old, education level, self-rated health, working status, household income, country of birth, length of time in the community.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

The following ethical guidelines were practiced to ensure ethical conduct is followed.

The participants for this study have been informed in a straight language the purpose of this study and the method of collecting information. The participation for this study was voluntary and it was clearly explained to the participants that there will be no negative consequences in any form if they decide not to take part in the research. All measures were taken to ensure the anonymity of the information provided by the participants.

3.5 Analysis Procedure

In this study, the researcher used computerized calculation by using the Statistical Package for Social Science software SPSS to conduct the analysis and measure the relationship between independent and dependent variables.

The data were firstly analyzed using descriptive analysis to help in presenting and summarizing the data in a constructive way. The descriptive analysis provides basic information about the variables and the distribution of the data and brings insights about the possible relationships between them (Lolle, 2007). This analysis was followed by cross-tabulations to present the entire group of respondents to show how correlations change from one variable grouping to another to find patterns and trends within raw data. The independent variables used for cross tabulations are individual and team sport participation. Correlation analysis was conducted to measure the strength of

association between the variables and the direction of the relationship. The spearman correlation test performed between sport participation as a team sport and individual sport (dependent variable), volunteering formally, volunteering informally, socializing with relatives, socializing with friends, number of volunteer organizations, number of association memberships, number of donations, amount of donations, attend to news and current affairs (independent variable) and control variables of age education house old income. The level of significance was fixed at 0.05 ($p=0.05$).

Chapter 4. Data Analysis and Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the data analysis and findings of the study. The questionnaire in this study was carefully analyzed to ensure that the data gathered was presented clearly with the aid of tables, percentages and graphs, where possible. This chapter solely focuses on presenting the gathered data in a meaningful way to facilitate the discussion, and to provide the background to the respondents by analyzing their demographic details. This is followed by the findings and analysis of data, and then summary. The findings and analysis have incorporated general and cross tabulation analysis. The chapter includes the normality test, descriptive analysis, correlation analysis and multiple regression tests. The Cronbach's alpha technique will be used for the reliability test. Factor analysis will be used to evaluate the validity of the samples. Finally, the summary of this chapter is provided.

4.2 Demographic Details

The questionnaire was distributed to the public through Google form. A total of 287 useable questionnaires were collected. There was no missing data. The main objective for descriptive analysis is to understand the profile of the respondents. Table 1 shows the sociodemographic characteristics of

respondents who did not participate in an organized youth sport compared with those who did.

Gender and Age

In this study there are a total of 152 (53.1%) male respondents and 134 (46.9%) female respondents. Respondents of all age groups (18 through to over 65) were represented except for 55-64 age group. The majority of the respondents are from the group 18-24 and 25-34 representing 45.1% and 44.8% respectively of the study. The minority of the respondents are from the age groups 55-64 years, above 65 years and 45-54 years with 1 and 6 respondents representing 2.4% of the study. The majority of the respondents are aged 18-34 representing about 89.9% of the study. This is because the questionnaire was distributed online using the social media platform Facebook. Table 1 shows the respondent's age distribution.

Table 1. *Age distribution for respondents*

Age group	N	%
18-24	128	44.8
25-34	129	45.1
35-44	22	7.7
45-54	6	2.1
65 or more	1	.3

Marital Status

The findings of this study showed that the majority of the respondents of 253 (82.2%) were single. 51 respondents (17.8%) were married.

Educational Level

The majority of the respondents are Bachelor Degree holders, with 184 (64.3%) participating in this study. Followed by 41 (14.3%) respondents with a high school degree. Diploma holders are ranked third with 34 (11.9%) respondents. While 25 (8.7%) respondents had some post-secondary education. Table 2 presents the percentage of the education levels of the respondents.

Table 2. *Education levels for respondents*

Education Level	N	%
Less than high school	2	.7
High school	41	14.3
Some post-secondary education	25	8.7
College diploma	34	11.9
University degree or higher	184	64.3
Total	286	100.0

Presence of Child

245 of the respondents (85.7%) do not have a child under the age of 18 years, while only 41 (14.3) have responded to having a child under the age 18. The result is considered logical since most of the respondents are aged from 18 – 34 years.

Self-rated health

The majority of respondents of 87 (30.4) have claimed that they have good health. Followed by 79 (27.6%) respondents claiming they have very good health and 77 (26.9%) with excellent self-rated health. While 33 (11.5%) respondents claim they have a fair self-rated health and only 10 (3.5%) with poor self-rated health. Table 4.3 shows the percentages of self-rated health of the participants.

Table 3. *Self-rated health*

	Frequency	Percent
Poor	10	3.5
Fair	33	11.5
Good	87	30.4
Very good	79	27.6
Excellent	77	26.9
Total	286	100.0

Household income

In the household income segment, 89 (31.1%) respondents have a monthly income between SDG10,000 – 19,999. Followed by the income group of SDG5,000 – 9,999 with 71 (24.8%) respondents. Ranked third is SDG20,000 – 49,999 with 52 (18.2%) respondents. 40 (14%) of respondents have high income of SDG 50,000 and above. While 34 (11.9%) of respondents have low income of less than SDG5,000.

Table 4. *Household Income*

Income	n	%
Less than 5000 SDG	21	7.3
5000-9999 SDG	39	13.6
10000-19999 SDG	35	12.2
20000-49999 SDG	42	14.7
50000 SDG or more	149	52.1

Place of birth

The number of respondents who were born out of Khartoum state were 163 (56.8%) and 124 (43.2%) respondents were born in Khartoum.

Length of time in community

Slightly over half 149 (52.1%) of the respondents had been living in their communities for more than 10 years. 42 (14.7%) had been residing in the area for 5-10 years. While 39 (13.6%) and 35 (12.2%) of the respondents had been living for 2-3 years and 3-5 years respectively. The smallest fraction

21 (7.3%) of the respondents had recently relocated to their new area for less than a year. Table 4.5 shows the percentages of the length of time respondents had spent in their communities.

Table 5. *Length of time in community*

	Frequency	Percent
Less than a year	21	7.3
2-3 years	39	13.6
3-5 years	35	12.2
5-10 years	42	14.7
More than 10 years	149	52.1
Total	286	100.0

4.3 Descriptive Analysis

Table 6 results shows that 11.5 of the respondents never participated in team sports while 88.5% of the respondents said that they have participated in team sports during their life in young age. In case of individual sports 35.3% of the respondents said that they have never participated in any individual sports while 64.7% of the respondent say they have participated in individual sports during young age in their life.

Questions were asked about informal volunteering 11.5% of the respondent replied that they have never participated in any sort of informal volunteering in the past 12 months while 88.5% responded that have participated in informal volunteering

In case of formal volunteering 31.8% of the respondent replied that they have never participated in formal volunteering while 68.2% replied that they have participated in organized formal volunteering under an organization in the past 12 months. While about number of organizations volunteered 40.6% respondent never worked in any organization and 26.2% responded have worked in 1 volunteering organization, 21% respondent have worked in 2 volunteering organizations, 8% respondent have worked in 3 organization departments, and the number gradually decreased. While asking about number of association membership 28.0% of the respondent replied that they don't have membership in any association, while 30.4 % responded have membership of 1 association, 22% respondent have association membership in 2 organization, 10.5% respondent have association membership in 3 organization, the number of associations membership decreased till 6 associations for 2 respondents representing 0.7% of the total respondents.

Table 6. *Descriptive Statistics*

	n	%
Team sport		
No	33	11.5
Yes	253	88.5
Individual sport		
No	101	35.3

Yes	185	64.7
Informal volunteering		
No	33	11.5
Yes	253	88.5
Formal volunteering		
No	91	31.8
Yes	195	68.2
Number of volunteer organizations		
0	116	40.6
1	75	26.2
2	60	21
3	23	8
4	7	2.4
5	3	1
6	2	0.7
Number of associations membership		
0	80	28
1	87	30.4
2	63	22
3	30	10.5
4	9	3.1
5	8	2.8
6	1	0.3

4.4 Age and participation in team and individual sports

Age

Table 7 shows that 4.90% responded age of 18-24 have never participated in team sports while 39.86% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 13.99% of the respondent under the age of 18-24 years have never participated in individual sports while 30.77 responded have participated in individual sports. 5.24% responded age of 25-34 have never participated in team sports while 39.86% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 16.78% of the respondent under the age of 25-34 years have never participated in individual sports while 28.32% responded have participated in individual sports. 0.7% responded age of 35-44 have never participated in team sports while 6.99% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 2.80% of the respondent under the age of 35-44 years have never participated in individual sports while 4.90% responded have participated in individual sports. 0.7% responded age of 45-54 have never participated in team sports while 1.40% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 1.75% of the respondent under the age of 45-54 years have never participated in individual sports while 0.35% responded have participated in individual sports. 0.00% responded age of 65 or above have never participated in team sports while 0.35% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of

individual sports 0.00% of the respondent under the age of 65 or above years have never participated in individual sports while 0.35% responded have participated in individual sports.

Gender

2.10% male responded have never participated in team sports while 51.05% of the male respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 15.73% of the male respondent have never participated in individual sports while 37.41% male responded have participated in individual sports. In case of female 9.44% of responded have never participated in team sports while 37.41% of the female respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 19.58% of the female respondent have never participated in individual sports while 27.27% female responded have participated in individual sports.

Marital Status

In case of married respondent 2.10% of responded have never participated in team sports while 15.73% of the married respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 7.69% of the married respondent have never participated in individual sports while 10.14% married responded have participated in individual sports. In case of unmarried respondent 9.44% of responded have never participated in team sports while

72.73% of the unmarried respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 27.62% of the unmarried respondent have never participated in individual sports while 54.55% unmarried responded have participated in individual sports.

Presence Child

In case of having no child 9.44% of responded have never participated in team sports while 76.22% of respondent having no child participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 28.67% of the respondent having no child never participated in individual sports while 56.99% responded having no child participated in individual sports. In case of having child 2.10% of responded have never participated in team sports while 12.24% of respondent having child participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 6.64% of the respondent having child never participated in individual sports while 7.69% responded having child participated in individual sports.

Education Level.

In case of having education less than high school 0.35% of responded have never participated in team sports while 0.35% of respondent having education less than high school participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 0.70% of the respondent having education less than high school participated in individual sports while 0.00% responded having

education less than high school participated in individual sports. In case of having high school education 1.75% of responded have never participated in team sports while 12.59% of respondent having high school education participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 4.55% of the respondent having high school education participated in individual sports while 9.79% responded having high school education participated in individual sports. In case of having high Secondary Education 1.05% of responded have never participated in team sports while 7.69% of respondent having Secondary education participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 4.55% of the respondent having Secondary education participated in individual sports while 4.20% responded having Secondary Education participated in individual sports. In case of having college diploma 1.40% of responded have never participated in team sports while 10.49% of respondent having college diploma participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 3.85% of the respondent having college diploma participated in individual sports while 8.04% responded having college diploma participated in individual sports. In case of having university degree or higher 6.99% of responded have never participated in team sports while 57.34% of respondent having university degree or higher participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 21.68% of the respondent having

College Diploma University degree or higher participated in individual sports while 42.66% responded having College Diploma University degree or higher participated in individual sports.

Self-rated health state

In case of having poor health state 0.70% of responded have never participated in team sports while 2.80% of respondent poor health state participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 1.40% of the respondent poor health state participated in individual sports while 2.10% responded having poor health state participated in individual sports. In case of having fair health state 2.80% of responded have never participated in team sports while 8.74% of respondent fair health state participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 5.94% of the respondent fair health state participated in individual sports while 5.59% responded having fair health state participated in individual sports. In case of having good health state 4.55% of responded have never participated in team sports while 25.87% of respondent good health state participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 11.89% of the respondent good health state participated in individual sports while 18.53% responded having good health state participated in individual sports. In case of having very good health state 1.75% of responded have never participated in team sports while 25.87% of

respondent very good health state participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 9.44% of the respondent very good health state participated in individual sports while 18.18% responded having very good health state participated in Individual sports. In case of having excellent health state 1.75% of responded have never participated in team sports while 25.17% of respondent having excellent health state participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 6.64% of the respondent of excellent health state participated in individual sports while 20.28% responded having excellent health state participated in individual sports.

Duration of living in community

In case of living in community 0.70% responded living in the same community for less than a year have never participated in team sports while 6.64% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 3.50% of the respondent living in the same community for less than a year have never participated in individual sports while 3.85% responded have participated in individual sports. In case of living in community 1.75% responded living in the same community for 2-3 years have never participated in team sports while 11.89% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 3.85% of the respondent living in the same community for 2-3 years have never

participated in individual sports while 9.79% responded have participated in individual sports. In case of living in community 1.05% responded living in the same community for 3-5 years have never participated in team sports while 11.99% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 4.55% of the respondent living in the same community for 3-5 years have never participated in individual sports while 7.69% responded have participated in individual sports. In case of living in community 2.80% responded living in the same community for 5-10 years have never participated in team sports while 11.89% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 4.55% of the respondent living in the same community for 5-10 years have never participated in individual sports while 10.14% responded have participated in individual sports. In case of living in community 5.24% responded living in the same community for more than 10 years have never participated in team sports while 46.85% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 18.88% of the respondent living in the same community for more than 10 years have never participated in individual sports while 33.22% responded have participated in individual sports.

Household Income

In case of having household income less than 5000 SDG 1.75% responded have never participated in team sports while 10.14% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 3.50% of the respondent having household income less than 5000 SDG have never participated in individual sports while 8.39% responded have participated in individual sports. In case of having household income 5000-9999 SDG 1.75% responded have never participated in team sports while 23.08% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 7.34% of the respondent having household income 5000-9999 SDG have never participated in individual sports while 17.48% responded have participated in individual sports. In case of having household income 10000-19999 SDG 3.50% responded have never participated in team sports while 27.62% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 11.54% of the respondent having household income 10000-19999 SDG have never participated in individual sports while 19.58% responded have participated in individual sports. In case of having household income 20000-49999 SDG 1.75% responded have never participated in team sports while 16.43% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 6.64% of the respondent having household income 20000-49999 SDG have never participated in

individual sports while 11.54% responded have participated in individual sports. In case of having household income 50000 SDG or more 2.80% responded have never participated in team sports while 11.19% of the respondent have participated in team sports while in case of individual sports 6.29% of the respondent having household income 50000 SDG or more have never participated in individual sports while 7.69% responded have participated in individual sports.

Table 7. *Demographic characteristics in team and individual sports*

		Team sport		Individual sport	
		No%	Yes%	No %	Yes%
Age	18-24	4.90	39.86	13.99	30.77
	25-34	5.24	39.86	16.78	28.32
	35-44	0.70	6.99	2.80	4.90
	45-54	0.70	1.40	1.75	0.35
	65 or more	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.35
Gender	Male	2.10	51.05	15.73	37.41
	Female	9.44	37.41	19.58	27.27
Marital status	Married	2.10	15.73	7.69	10.14
	Unmarried	9.44	72.73	27.62	54.55
Presence of child	No	9.44	76.22	28.67	56.99

	Yes	2.10	12.24	6.64	7.69
Educational level	Less than high school	0.35	0.35	0.70	0.00
	High school	1.75	12.59	4.55	9.79
	Secondary education	1.05	7.69	4.55	4.20
	College diploma	1.40	10.49	3.85	8.04
	University degree or higher	6.99	57.34	21.68	42.66
Self-rated health	Poor	0.70	2.80	1.40	2.10
	Fair	2.80	8.74	5.94	5.59
	Good	4.55	25.87	11.89	18.53
	Very good	1.75	25.87	9.44	18.18
	Excellent	1.75	25.17	6.64	20.28
Place of birth	In Khartoum	5.59	37.41	15.38	27.62
	Outside of Khartoum	5.94	51.05	19.93	37.06
Duration of living in	Less than a year	0.70	6.64	3.50	3.85

the

community

	2-3 years	1.75	11.89	3.85	9.79
	3-5 years	1.05	11.19	4.55	7.69
	5-10 years	2.80	11.89	4.55	10.14
	More than 10 years	5.24	46.85	18.88	33.22
Household Income	Less than 5000 SDG	1.75	10.14	3.50	8.39
	5000-9999 SDG	1.75	23.08	7.34	17.48
	10000- 19999 SDG	3.50	27.62	11.54	19.58
	20000- 49999 SDG	1.75	16.43	6.64	11.54
	50000 SDG or more	2.80	11.19	6.29	7.69

4.5 Correlation Analysis of Team Sports and Individuals sports

The bivariate Pearson correlation specifies whether a statistically significant linear relationship exists between two categorical variables, the strength of the linear relationship and the direction of the linear relationship. The spearman correlation test performed between sport participation as a

team sport and individual sport (dependent variable), volunteering formally, volunteering informally, socializing with relatives, socializing with friends, number of volunteer organizations, number of association memberships, number of donations, amount of donations, attend to news and current affairs (independent variable) and control variables of age education house old income and number of dependents shown in Table 8 and 9.

Table 8. *Correlation Analysis I*

	Team sport		Individual sport	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig.(2- tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig.(2- tailed)
Volunteering Informally	.281**	0	.168**	0.004
Number of volunteer organizations	0.079	0.182	.208**	0
Number of donations	-0.079	0.182	-0.025	0.675
Attending news and community affairs	0.1	0.092	.116*	0.05
Socializing with friends	0.021	0.728	.147*	0.013
Formal Volunteering	.176**	0.003	.186**	0.002

Number of associations membership	.127*	0.032	.156**	0.008
Amount of donations	0.105	0.078	-0.064	0.282
Socializing with relatives	0.115	0.053	.183**	0.002

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level * significant 0.05 (2-tailed).

From the Table 8 above, the correlation coefficient ($r= 0.95$, $p<0.0001$) between work-family balance and job performance is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, correlation between dependent variable and volunteering informally, volunteering formally, Number of association memberships have strong significant relationship. Similarly, the correlation coefficient ($r=0.20$ & $p = 0.00$) individual sport and Number of volunteer organizations has weak positive correlation at 0.01 significant level. And also Attend to news current affairs, socializing with relatives and Socializing with friends have positive correlation at 0.05 significant level.

When considering the relationship of age, education level, and household income in between those independent variables the following correlation coefficients in Table 9 can be depicted.

Table 9. Correlation Analysis II

	Age		Educational level		Household Income	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Volunteering Informally	-0.078	0.186	0.05	0.402	0.011	0.856
Number of volunteer organizations	-.204**	0.001	0.092	0.119	-0.022	0.714
Number of donations	-0.06	0.311	0.005	0.939	-0.001	0.99
Attending news and community affairs	.185**	0.002	0.053	0.372	-0.069	0.243
Socializing with friends	-0.109	0.065	.119*	0.044	-0.022	0.705
Formal Volunteering	-0.036	0.541	.188**	0.001	-0.07	0.24
Number of associations membership	-0.059	0.321	0.079	0.184	0.051	0.394
Amount of donations	.177**	0.003	0.022	0.708	.177**	0.003

Socializing with relatives	-0.005	0.93	0.111	0.06	-.136*	0.022
----------------------------	--------	------	-------	------	--------	-------

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the Table 9 above on correlation coefficients of dimensions of Number of volunteer organizations and age the correlation coefficient ($r=-0.20$, $p=0.001$) significant at 0.01 level. Therefore, correlation between employee Number of volunteer organizations and age has negative and strong significant relationship. Similarly, the correlation coefficient of Attend to news current affairs and age ($r= 0.18$, $p=0.002$) at 0.01 significance level showed the positive correlation between variables. The correlation coefficient of amount of donations and age ($r= 0.17$, $p=0.003$) at 0.01 significance level also showed the positive correlation between variables. In terms of this variable correlation coefficients of dimensions of socializing with friends, number of volunteer organizations and education the correlation coefficient ($r= .11, .18$, $p=0.04,0.00$) significant at 0.05 level. Amount of donations and household income shows positive relationship but socializing with relatives and household income shows negative relationship according to the significant level.

Furthermore, when looking at the correlation coefficient between job performance age, education level and household income with dependent and

number of dependents have not sufficient evidence to overcome significant level. As show in the Table 10 it means in between those variables there have not any significant relationship.

Table 10. *Correlation Analysis III*

	Team sport		Individual sport	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Age	-0.035	0.559	-0.095	0.108
Educational level	0.04	0.499	0.052	0.384
Household Income	-0.062	0.299	-0.1	0.093

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

This research is sought to contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between sports and social capital, and how the early participation in sport activities can contribute in the social capital of the community. The focus of this research revolved around the fundamental question whether a positive correlation can be created connecting the early sports participation and the building of social capital in later. In order to address the research aims findings presented in previous chapters, findings will be integrated. An analysis will be presented on how individual and team sports participation in early stages of life influenced the social capital stocks of the participants. Further, the analysis will also address how sports contribute to different levels of social capital.

To recap, the social capital concept is associated to the relationships between individuals and the quality of them, it is about the relationships that (Blackshaw & Long, 2005). This concept is about the different ways that people use to cooperate and collaborate to achieve shared goals. It is created through bridging between different individuals and the creation of bonds between several groups of individuals (Putnam & Feldstein, 2009). Since it is formed through civic and community engagement, sports bring different

individuals together and allow participants to work toward a shared objective, it allows the participants to create intense horizontal interaction (Putnam, 1993). Since there are multiple definitions for social capital and thus there are numerous methods to measure it. In this research, the indicators to measure the social capital were the community involvement in terms of respondent's participation in unpaid volunteer activities, socializing with relatives and friends, participating in associations and donating to non-profit organizations, these indicators are used to represent the community involvement and social capital.

5.2 Discussion

The findings from this study support the general proposition that youth sport participation has a positive association with adult community involvement. It confirms Putnam's claims that sport activities are a platform to create informal relationships and strengthen companionship and social relationships since it facilitates communication and social interaction (Putnam, 2000). The findings have shown that the correlation between the team and individual sports and how they positively impact the social capital. This confirms with the previous researches which highlighted that taking part in physical activity and extracurricular activities helps the participant to demonstrate a higher engagement in community activities. Since the field of

social interventions have barely been explored with a lens that contemplates the theoretical approach of the opportunities of sport to the integration and growth of participants' contribution to the social capital. The research findings have gone beyond the previous researches and examined the sport participation in early stage has long lasting impact on the person's social capital even in after several years of the participation.

The results support the argument of the potentiality of sporting events to encourage the formations of community spirit when practiced at grassroots level (Zakus, 1999).

5.3 Implications

The findings are consistent with the social capital theory and the researches conducted on social capital and predicted the use of it, which predicted that engagement in community activities is a result of the early participation in the community in early stages. The findings are contradicting the recent criticism to the social capital theory which says that the generated social capital diminish over long periods of time. The results suggest that sport is a suitable vehicle that can be used to generate social connections and create a close-knit network of people. Sports-based intervention programs can be considered for maintaining linkage with people which can result into accumulation of the social capital stocks in the long run. These findings

promote the sport-based intervention programs and give recommendations to policy makers to consider sport as an intervention tool to promote the concept of social capital, bearing in mind the potentiality of social capital to more rigorous application to tackle more underpinning issues (Lynach, 2000).

5.4 Limitation of the study

Most of the participants for this study were from the age group 18-34 whom represent 89% of the total population of the study, therefore a wider base with more participants would have uncovered more relationships and interactions among the different variables used in this study to represent the age groups that were not well represented in this study. Although the outcomes of this results indicate there is a positive impact of the youth sport participation on later community involvement overall, there could be some youth sports or specific characteristics of youth sports that inhibit adult community involvement. For instance, highly competitive sports when contrasted with recreational sport might be more likely to produce negative feelings among participants that undermine, rather than enhance, social cohesion and subsequent levels of community involvement. The mechanism of social capital building based on repeated social interactions might fails in highly competitive youth sports because of the antagonism competition generates between opponents. At the same time, competition can be a positive

aspect of the youth sport experience in that it may lead to closer bonds between teammates. These same close bonds, however, also have the potential to exclude others. As I noted earlier, this is what Putnam and others have in mind when they talk about the “dark side” of social capital. Although the strong bonds generated through competition might enhance further community involvement among some participants, these same social bonds could restrict the involvement of others. As such, although youth sports provide the impetus for later involvement for some people, they may have the opposite effect for others.

5.5 Future research

further studies are required to carefully test this alternative explanation. It would also be informative to have studies that seek to examine other aspects of Putnam’s approach to social capital not covered in the present study, such as trust in others and the possible causal role sport participation may play (or may not play) in the evolution of trust between members of a community. Ideally, studies such as these would be based on long-term panel designs in which participants were followed over a number of years, and various personality, trust, and activity measurements were collected at several points in time over the lifespan. Of course, the time and cost of longitudinal studies are considerable. The time and cost of secondary data analysis, in

comparison, are far less extensive. Therefore, these results indicating that youth sport participation is a positive predictor of adult community involvement provide the initial groundwork and support for further examination of this issue and useful directions that future research should take. Until panel studies are available, the interpretation that youth are being selected into sport, rather than accumulating social capital through sport, cannot be ruled out. As such, this attempt to assess the relationship between youth sport and adult community involvement should be viewed as preliminary. My hope is that these results provide sufficient justification to call for further research attention to the hypothesis that sport fosters social capital.

References

- Adam, F., & Rončević, B. (2003). Social capital: recent debates and research trends. *Social science information*, 42(2), 155-183.
- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of management review*, 27(1), 17-40.
- Aldridge, S., Halpern, D., & Fitzpatrick, S. (2002). Social capital: A discussion paper. *London: Performance and Innovation Unit*.
- Banda, D., Blackshaw, T., Brown, A., Choak, C., Crabbe, T., Gidley, B., . . . Slater, I. (2005). Getting to know you: Engagement and relationship building: First interim national positive futures case study research report.
- Blackshaw, T., & Long, J. (2005). What's the big idea? A critical exploration of the concept of social capital and its incorporation into leisure policy discourse. *Leisure studies*, 24(3), 239-258.
- Boix, C., & Posner, D. N. (1998). Social capital: Explaining its origins and effects on government performance. *British journal of political science*, 28(4), 686-693.
- Burnett, C. (2006). Building social capital through anActive community club'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 41(3-4), 283-294.

- Carilli, A. M., Coyne, C. J., & Leeson, P. T. (2008). Government intervention and the structure of social capital. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 21(2-3), 209-218.
- Claridge, T. (2004). Social capital and natural resource management. *Unpublished Thesis, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.*
- Coalter, F. (2007). *A wider social role for sport: Who's keeping the score? :* Routledge.
- Coalter, F. (2008). Sport-in-development: Development for and through sport? In *Sport and social capital* (pp. 59-88): Routledge.
- Collins, M. (2004). Sport, physical activity and social exclusion. *Journal of sports sciences*, 22(8), 727-740.
- Costello, P. (2003). Building social capital. *Sydney Papers, The*, 15(2), 126.
- Cuskelly, G. (2004). Volunteer retention in community sport organisations. *European sport management quarterly*, 4(2), 59-76.
- Doherty, A., & Misener, K. (2008). Community sports organisations. *Sport and social capital (1st. ed.)*. Oxford, England: Elsevier.
- Dolfsma, W., & Dannreuther, C. (2003). Subjects and boundaries: Contesting social capital-based policies. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 37(2), 405-413.

- Eckstein, R., & Delaney, K. (2002). New sports stadiums, community self-esteem, and community collective conscience. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 26(3), 235-247.
- Falk, I., & Kilpatrick, S. (2000). What is social capital? A study of interaction in a rural community. *Sociologia ruralis*, 40(1), 87-110.
- Fine, B. (2002). *Social capital versus social theory*: Routledge.
- Gratton, C., Shibli, S., & Coleman, R. (2005). Sport and economic regeneration in cities. *Urban studies*, 42(5-6), 985-999.
- Grootaert, C., & Van Bastelar, T. (2002). *Understanding and measuring social capital: A multi-disciplinary tool for practitioners*: The World Bank.
- Hall, M. H., McKeown, L., & Roberts, K. (2001). *Caring Canadians, involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Harvey, J., Lévesque, M., & Donnelly, P. (2007). Sport volunteerism and social capital. *Sociology of sport journal*, 24(2), 206-223.
- Houlihan, B. (2005). Public sector sport policy: developing a framework for analysis. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 40(2), 163-185.

- Kawachi, I., Berkman, L. F. (2000). Social cohesion, social capital and health. In L. F. Berkman & I. Kawachi (Eds.), *Social epidemiology* (pp. 174–190). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lawson, H. A. (2005). Empowering people, facilitating community development, and contributing to sustainable development: The social work of sport, exercise, and physical education programs. *Sport, education and society*, 10(1), 135-160.
- Lee, M. J., Whitehead, J., & Balchin, N. (2000). The measurement of values in youth sport: Development of the Youth Sport Values Questionnaire. *Journal of sport and exercise psychology*, 22(4), 307-326.
- Li, H. Y., & Andersen, M. B. (2008). Athletic identity in China: Examining the AIMS in a Hong Kong sample. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 6(2), 176-188.
- Lolle, H. (2007). Multiple classification analysis (MCA). Lolle, H. (2008). Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA): *Unfortunately, a nearly forgotten method for doing linear regression with categorical variables. In Symposium i anvendt statistik 2008 (pp. 103-122). Copenhagen Business School Press.*
- Newman, P. (2007). “Back the Bid”: the 2012 Summer Olympics and the governance of London. *Journal of urban affairs*, 29(3), 255-267.

- Nicholson, M., & Hoyer, R. (2008). *Sport and social capital*: Routledge.
- Onyx, J., & Bullen, P. (2000). Measuring social capital in five communities. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 36(1), 23-42.
- Onyx, J., Leonard, R., & Hayward-Brown, H. (2004). *The special position of volunteers in the formation of social capital*. *Voluntary Action*, 6(1), 59-74.
- Owen, K. A. (2002). The Sydney 2000 Olympics and urban entrepreneurialism: Local variations in urban governance. *Australian geographical studies*, 40(3), 323-336.
- Oxoby, R. (2009). Understanding social inclusion, social cohesion, and social capital. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 36(12), 1133-1152.
- Perks, T. (2007). Does sport foster social capital? The contribution of sport to a lifestyle of community participation. *Sociology of sport journal*, 24(4), 378-401.
- Piketty, T. (2015). About capital in the twenty-first century. *American Economic Review*, 105(5), 48-53.
- Portes, A., & Landolt, P. (1996). The downside of social capital. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(52), 18407-18408.

- Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6(1), 65-78.
- Putnam, R. D. (2004). *Democracies in flux: The evolution of social capital in contemporary society*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Putnam, R. D., & Feldstein, L. (2009). *Better together: Restoring the American community*: Simon and Schuster.
- Reimer, B., Lyons, T., Ferguson, N., & Polanco, G. (2008). Social capital as social relations: the contribution of normative structures. *The Sociological Review*, 56(2), 256-274.
- Robison, L. J., Schmid, A. A., & Siles, M. E. (2002). Is social capital really capital? *Review of social economy*, 60(1), 1-21.
- Sam, M. P., & Jackson, S. J. (2004). Sport policy development in New Zealand: Paradoxes of an integrative paradigm. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39(2), 205-222.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Earls, F. (1999). Beyond social capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy for Children. *American sociological review*, 64(5), 633-660.
- Schulenkorf, N., Thomson, A., & Schlenker, K. (2011). Intercommunity sport events: Vehicles and catalysts for social capital in divided societies. *Event management*, 15(2), 105-119.

- Sharpe, E. K. (2006). Resources at the grassroots of recreation: Organizational capacity and quality of experience in a community sport organization. *Leisure sciences*, 28(4), 385-401.
- Skinner, J., Zakus, D. H., & Cowell, J. (2008). Development through sport: Building social capital in disadvantaged communities. *Sport management review*, 11(3), 253-275.
- Spellerberg, A. (2001). *Framework for the measurement of social capital in New Zealand*: Citeseer.
- Stempel, C. (2005). Adult participation sports as cultural capital: A test of Bourdieu's theory of the field of sports. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 40(4), 411-432.
- Szreter, S. (2000). Social capital, the economy, and education in historical perspective. *Social capital: Critical perspectives*, 56-77.
- Tonts, M. (2005). Competitive sport and social capital in rural Australia. *Journal of rural studies*, 21(2), 137-149.
- Uslaner, E. M., & Dekker, P. (2001). The social of social capital. *Social capital and participation in everyday life*, 176-187.
- Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual review of sociology*, 26(1), 215-240.

Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and society*, 27(2), 151-208.

국문초록

사회적 자본을 향해: 커뮤니티 참여 구축에 스포츠가 미치는 영향

암제드

서울대학교 대학원

체육교육과 글로벌스포츠매니지먼트

스포츠 프로그램이 개인 및 그룹 참가자의 심리적 및 사회적 복지에 미치는 영향에 대한 많은 연구가 수행되었지만 이러한 프로그램이 사회적 자본 개발에 미치는 영향은 과소 검토되고 있으며 추가 연구가 필요하다. 스포츠에 참여하는 것이 커뮤니티 구성원들 간의 관계 형성으로 이어져야 하고 스포츠 밖에서 활동적으로 만들 것이라는 이론적지지 있다. 이 연구의 목적은 수단의 상관 관계 연구를 사용하여 어린 나이에 스포츠 활동에 참여하면 성인기에 사회적 자본이 증가하고 지역 사회에 긍정적으로 참여할 수 있는지 테스트하는 것에 있다. 데이터는 NSGVP (National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating)에서 개발 한 설문지를 사용하여

Khartoum 에서 수집했다. 데이터는 설명 및 상관 분석을 사용하여 분석했다. 그 결과, 커뮤니티 참여 및 사회적 자본 지표는 스포츠 프로그램에 참여한 참가자가 해당 이벤트에 참여하지 않았거나 더 적은 시간을 소비 한 참가자에 비해 긍정적 인 영향을 받았다. 이 결과는 조기 스포츠 참여가 지역 사회의 성인 긍정적 참여에 미치는 영향이 장기간 지속되었음을 보여준다.

주요어: 사회적 자본, 스포츠 참여, 지역사회 참여

학 번: 2019-29986