

Abstract

In response to claims that sport event research over emphasizes economic outcomes and mega-event contexts, this research sought to both assess a scale that measures sense of community among small-scale sport event volunteers, and empirically test if the event volunteer experience enhances sense of community. The six-factor Sense of Community in Sport Scale (SCS) was utilized to collect pre- and post-event data from a population of 253 (N=253) event volunteers. Model testing indicated all but one SCS factor, *Competition*, showed statistical fit with the event volunteer data. ANOVA analysis revealed three SCS factors, *Common Interest*, *Equity in Administrative Decisions*, and *Social Spaces*, were statistically enhanced following the event. The findings provide theoretical support for Warner and Dixon's (2011; 2013a) Sport and Sense of Community (SCS) theory and the positive social impact of small-scale sport events within a community.

Exploring Sense of Community among Small-scale Sport Event Volunteers

The survival of many sport organizations and events are highly dependent upon volunteers (Costa, Chalip, Green, & Simes, 2006; Doherty & Carron, 2003; Green & Chalip, 2004).

Specifically, volunteers serve in a variety of capacities and provide the necessary labour that enables sport managers to stage efficient and successful events. This includes not only mega-events such as the National Football League (NFL)'s Super Bowl or the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA)'s World Cup, but also local sport events such as an athletics club meet or a basketball tournament. Sport volunteerism is a phenomenon seen across the globe. For example, in Australia where 36% of the population volunteers (ABS, 2010), the most common type of voluntary organization is related to sport and recreation. In the United Kingdom volunteering increased 8.5% from 2001-2006 with a large majority of activity focused on sport (Brookes & Chason, 2011). Finally, in Canada, over 13.3 million people volunteered in a variety of capacities in 2010 and the most volunteer hours were given to sport and recreation (Vézina & Crompton, 2012).

While it is clear that volunteers are essential to the overall operational success of many events, recruiting and managing a voluntary workforce remains a challenge for many sport organizations (Cuskelly, Hoyer, & Auld, 2006; Stevens, 2008). Thus, a better understanding of the outcomes associated with volunteering is one way to assist sport managers in staging a successful event. Given that a volunteer's dissatisfaction increases when s/he feels the organization is poorly managed (Cuskelly, 1995; Rhyne, 1995), knowledge regarding volunteerism can be used to improve human resource management (HRM) practices and better recruit, retain, and organize this valuable human resource.

A growing body of literature supports volunteerism as a serious leisure activity (Laverie & McDonald, 2007; Stebbins, 1982; Williams, Dossa, & Tompkins, 1995). In particular, Green and Chalip's (2004) work on Olympic volunteerism contended that volunteering, especially in sport settings, should be understood as a leisure choice. In this way, sport event volunteers are described as serious leisure participants in that they have a defined social world with identifiable social contacts and a focused collective activity (Hoye et al., 2009; Stebbins, 1996). Further, the 'serious leisure' perspective of volunteering postulates social motives play a large role in a volunteer experience.

A common motivational factor for sport volunteers is to help their sport or their community (Coyne & Coyne, 2001; Farrell, Johnston, & Twynam, 1998; Hamm, MacLean, & Misener, 2008); however, Green and Chalip (1998, 2004) noted that such altruism may only be prompted when other social motives are present. Specifically, the opportunity to socialize and interact with other volunteers who share a common interest was found to be the primary motive for ski event volunteers (Williams et al., 1995) while meeting new friends was a strong motive for volunteers at the 1994 Winter Olympics (Elstad, 1996). That is, the social benefits that accompany the volunteering experience, such as support and belonging are fundamental to the overall experience. These studies support of the importance of expressive volunteer components (Green & Chalip, 2004; Warner, Smith, & Green, 2011) and relate closely to Green and Chalip's (2004) suggestions in two ways. First, the studies reinforce that a sense of community is inherent within sport volunteerism and that a sense of community directly influences important individual outcomes, such as personal satisfaction and commitment (Costa et al., 2006). As a result, HRM practices, including training, 'should be conceived and designed as an opportunity to build a sense

of community among volunteers and staff so as to enhance volunteer commitment and satisfaction' (Costa, et al., 2006, p. 165).

Armstrong and Giulianotti (1997) and Warner (2012) suggested sport is one of the few contexts that promotes a collective experience. Further, Putnam (2000) posited volunteering as a direct outcome of social capital, which is considered a conceptual cousin of sense of community. Interestingly, McCole, Jacobs, Lindley, & McAvoy (2012) found that sense of community is a key to retaining seasonal employees. Green and Chalip (1998, 2004) suggested a sense of community is a recognition of shared purpose and common identity that is inherent in the volunteerism experience. Given this research and the close interaction of volunteers during a short-term event, it is reasonable to assume that the small-scale sport event volunteer experience provides the social bonding opportunities needed to create a sense of community.

The importance of understanding sense of community is particularly relevant for a small-scale sport event because volunteers are better able to seek smaller-group, or subculture experiences (Costa et al., 2006). The intimate context within a small to medium sized community increases the likelihood that event volunteers may already be familiar with each other through previous activities such as sport events, sport clubs, and sport participation. Consequently, volunteers at small-scale sport events may develop a sense of community that could impact social outcomes. Eley and Kirk (2002) proposed sport volunteerism enhances several positive individual psychological outcomes, which in turn encourages pro-social and pro-citizenship behaviours. Overall the literature demonstrates a propensity for individuals to develop a sense of community around their sport experience (Costa et al., 2006; Green & Chalip, 2004; Warner & Dixon, 2011; Warner, Kerwin, & Walker, 2013) and that sense of community relates to various individual outcomes, such as commitment and satisfaction. Thus, the purpose of this paper was to (1) assess

a scale that measures sense of community among small-scale sport event volunteers and (2) empirically test if the volunteer experience enhances sense of community.

Interestingly, previous research regarding small-scale sport events has focused on the economic impact of regular intercollegiate and local club sport events within a given region (Daniels & Norman, 2003; Gibson, Wilming, & Holdnak, 2003; Wilson, 2006). While insightful, these studies demonstrate an economic as opposed to social perspective pervades small-scale event research. An exception is Small, Edwards and Sheridan (2005) who examined socio-cultural impacts of an event, albeit a festival. They argued the measurement of socio-cultural event impacts is difficult but research on this aspect of events should nonetheless be conducted. Moreover, O'Brien and Chalip (2006) noted the need for sustainable development in regards to economic, social and environmental factors as an important paradigm shift in sport event management. These recommendations provide insight regarding how to build community capacity through sustained hosting of small-scale events that enhances long-term social benefits. Based on the benefits that may be accrued from hosting multiple small-scale sport events (O'Brien & Chalip, 2006), it is sound to reason that the greater the number of events in a community the greater chance a collective sense of community may arise.

Sport, Volunteerism and Sense of Community

While the sport volunteering (e.g., Costa et al., 2006) and sport management (e.g., Kellett & Warner, 2011; Warner & Dixon, 2011, 2013a) literature clearly point to developing a sense of community as a key component to the sport experience, the presence of community among sport volunteers has received little empirical attention (cf. Costa et al., 2006; Green & Chalip, 2004). Typically, sense of community has been examined in neighbourhood settings and geographically bound localities; however, recent research has focused on sense of community developing among

athletes. In particular, work by Warner, Dixon, and Chalip (2012), and Warner et al. (2013) demonstrated a sense of community benefits both individuals and organizations. After extensive interviews and focus groups with 80 athletes, the summation of Warner and Dixon's (2011; 2013a) work generated a Sport and Sense of Community theory. The theory outlined seven factors that foster a sense of community among athletes, which include *Administrative Consideration*, *Common Interest*, *Competition*, *Equity in Administrative Decisions*, *Leadership*, *Social Spaces*, and *Voluntary Action*.

Warner et al.'s (2013) work also empirically tested the viability of the 7-factor Sport and Sense of Community theory through the creation and validation of a measurement scale. Their work in the youth sport setting supported six of the seven original Sport and Sense of Community factors (Warner & Dixon, 2011; 2013a). Specifically, *Voluntary Action* was the only item that did not hold up within their model of sense of community in sport (Warner et al., 2013). This anomaly was attributed to the youth athletes' obvious dependence on their caregivers for support, and removed this factor 'in an attempt to create a more parsimonious scale that can be applicable across sport settings' (p. 359). The authors recommended use of the 6-item SCS Scale and noted the need to continue assessing and refining the theory and scale in a variety of sport contexts. Further, they recommended sport volunteers be considered a population for future scale development in order to enhance the utility of the scale among stakeholder groups beyond direct participants (i.e., athletes). Therefore, the first purpose of this study was to assess a scale that measures sense of community among small-scale sport event volunteers. Although the authors' work was based on the athletes' experience, and while it acknowledge the importance of understanding different contextual contingencies in various sport settings (Warner et al., 2012;

Warner et al., 2013), the theory broadly posited that the identified factors were essential to initiate, facilitate, and enhance the development of community with a sport setting.

Given previous literature on sport volunteering (e.g., Coyne & Coyne, 2001; Farrell et al., 1998; Hamm, MacLean, & Misener, 2008) and sense of community and sport (e.g., Warner et al., 2011, 2012, 2013), it is clear that social factors are important in sport volunteerism. Sport event volunteers typically receive training and/or orientation prior to the event. The pre-event orientation is the first stage in the volunteer experience and offers an opportunity for event volunteers and staff to interact (Costa et al., 2006). As noted by Taylor, Doherty, and McGraw (2008), an orientation provides a socialization process whereby event personnel become acquainted with the language, expectations, and relationships associated with their new role. Individuals involved in a small-scale sport event, particularly in a small to medium sized community, may also utilize an orientation to connect or reconnect with companions and foster their collective sense of community.

In line with Manning theory (Wicker, 1979), Warner et al.'s (2012) previous work on athletes advocated that a sense of community is developed based upon the availability of roles and the utility felt by participants. For example:

‘... In organizations where there are more people than roles, there is less attachment and commitment as many people feel they are not ‘needed’ in the organization or central to its decision making. Alternatively, in organizations where there are more roles than people, often there is a strong sense of community, fuelled by reciprocity and mutual obligation’ (p. 985).

In contrast to large scale sport events where sport managers access individuals who reside beyond the boundary of the host city, small-scale sport events typically rely upon the limited-size local community to comprise its voluntary workforce. Therefore, sport volunteers assume several roles within one event. According to Manning theory, role diversity serves as a catalyst for feeling a

sense of belonging and social support. Although sense of community within a small region may exist prior to volunteer engagement, it is reasonable to assume that the multi-role nature of volunteer activities within a small-scale event provides a context may foster the sense of belonging and social support even further. Consequently, in addition to assessing the SCS in the volunteer context, the second purpose of this study is to test the following hypothesis:

H1: Small-scale sport event volunteers' sense of community will be stronger following the volunteer experience.

Method

Research Context & Procedure

Volunteers were recruited for participation from a small-scale sport event. The event was deemed small-scale based on the participant pool (~1,000 athletes), the number of volunteers (N=253 registered volunteers), and the number of paid staff (~10) associated with event operation and staging. Volunteers were trained through two mechanisms. They attended an orientation session held approximately three weeks prior to the start of the event and they received e-mail newsletters from the Volunteer Coordinator staff member during the weeks leading up to the event.

During the pre-event data collection, volunteers who agreed to participate in this study were given a questionnaire (i.e., in-person, pencil and paper) to complete during their orientation session. The purpose of the pre-event questionnaire was to gain a baseline of their sense of community prior to performing their volunteer roles at the small-scale event. Following pre-event collection, post-event data was collected during the last two days of the event competition. At this point, those who chose to participate were asked if they had filled out the pre-event questionnaire and if so, were given the post-event questionnaire (i.e., in-person, pencil and paper). Those who

indicated they did not participate in the pre-event data collection were also given the opportunity to complete a post-event questionnaire regarding their volunteer experience. The post-event questionnaire was used to gain an understanding of the individual's sense of community after performing their volunteer duties.

Participants

The population of volunteers included $N=253$ registered individuals who completed their registration through an online system. Of the total 253 volunteers, $N=141$ returned valid and usable questionnaire responses ($n=75$ pre-event and $n=66$ post-event, where $n=41$ were pre-event/post-event matched). Participants ranged in age from 18-75 years ($M=48.50$, $SD=17.69$) and were 34.8% male and 65.2% female. Participants represented volunteers assigned to a large number of non-specialist volunteer roles (e.g., parking, registration, festivals, sports information, and accreditation) and a small number of specialist roles (e.g., boat control). Approximately, 60% of the event volunteers were from the region in which the event was held, two thirds of the respondents had volunteered at another sport event, and 65% had volunteered in their community on previous occasions.

Questionnaire Design

Demographic information. Participants were asked to provide their gender, age, sport club affiliation (if applicable), place of residence, and previous volunteering experience (both in and out of sport). Additionally, in order to match pre-event and post-event data, volunteers were asked to provide their name and last four digits of their primary contact telephone number.

Sense of community. The measure of sense of community was adapted from Warner et al. (2013) Sense of Community in Sport Scale (SCS). Since the SCS scale was developed in a sport setting based on the athlete experience (i.e., Warner & Dixon, 2011, 2013a; Warner et al., 2013),

the 21-item scale was adopted with minor wording changes to represent the sport volunteer sample. For example, ‘When going to an archery event or practice, there are places where I can interact with other members’ (Warner et al., 2013), was adjusted to read, ‘When going to this [event name], there are places where I can interact with other volunteers.’ Further, the definition of the *Competition* factor was scrutinized in terms of the relevance to the sport event volunteer context. Through this review, the original definition was altered from ‘challenge to excel against internal and external rivalries’ (Warner et al., 2013) to ‘challenge to excel in the presence of internal and external rivalries’ to better accommodate both athlete and volunteer samples within a sport context. Definitions of each factor and their corresponding items are presented in Table 1. To measure each SCS item, participants were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with each statement by circling a number from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

[Insert Table 1 Here]

Results

The data were subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), basic descriptive and frequency statistics, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests to detect changes for the sense of community factors prior to and after the event. Prior to conducting the main analyses, preliminary checks confirmed no violations of normality or linearity. However, inspection of the histograms showed a negatively skewed distribution (i.e., more higher than lower values in the data range). According to West, Finch, and Curran (1995), skewness values should not exceed 2.0 and kurtosis values should not exceed 7.0. While the left tail of the distribution was slightly longer, skewness and kurtosis values for each variable were still in the acceptable range. Following these preliminary data checks, construct diagnostics were calculated (see Table 2). Further, each factor

was deemed reliable with Cronbach's alpha values greater than .70 (Lance, Butts, & Michels, 2006). Next, to confirm the factor structure of the SCS Scale, the items and factors were pre-specified, based on previous research (Warner et al., 2013), and entered into AMOS graphics. To assess the fit of the measurement model, a CFA was used to determine construct reliability and validity. To test overall fit, χ^2 goodness-of-fit, standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), incremental fit index (IFI), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), and comparative fit index (CFI) were used. Finally, difference tests were used to assess variable change between study conditions.

[Insert Table 2 Here]

Model Testing. For the CFA, maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) was used to define the model. The goodness-of-fit indices revealed that while the chi-square statistic was significant ($\chi^2/df=4.38, p=.000$), the six-factor 21-item measurement model did not fit the data. According to Kline (2005), the SRMR (.76) was in the range of an acceptable fit (albeit slightly inflated), however, the remaining fit indices were below the suggested cut-points ($\leq .90$) suggested by Hu and Bentler (1999). The reliability of the preliminary model including average variance extracted (AVE), construct reliability (CR), and Cronbach's alpha were acceptable but the fit indices revealed an overall lack of fit and a need for re-specification.

During re-specification, the lack of model fit was attributed to one factor and three items from the original SCS scale. The *Competition* factor showed poor performance in comparison to the other SCS factors. While the loadings of this factor were close to the suggested cut-points, the conceptual fit with the current volunteer sample was questionable. Based on this, and the low factor loadings, *Competition* was removed from this analysis for fit and conceptual reasons. Additional scale refinement followed Anderson and Gerbing (1988), who suggested that factor loadings (λ) should be equal to or greater than .70 in order to demonstrate a high proportion of

common variance. Of the 18 remaining items, one with a lambda (λ) value below .70 was removed. Further examination of the modification indices revealed two inflated residual values and correlations with other factors. As a result, modification indices greater than five were reviewed, and both statistical and theoretical justification for item removal was employed. For example, the item, ‘the leaders make me feel like a valued member of [event name]’, under *Administrative Consideration*, and the item, ‘[event name] provides me a place to interact with other volunteers’, under *Social Spaces* had the highest residual values and poor modification indices. The scale modifications resulted in a 5-factor model ($\chi^2/df=3.11, p=.000$) with 15 items that adequately fit the data (see Tables 2 and 3). Further, mean scores and correlations between variable are presented in Table 4.

[Insert Table 3 Here]

[Insert Table 4 Here]

ANOVA Analysis. Following the data screening and CFA, the main analyses were performed by matching the pre-event questionnaire with its post-event counterpart ($n=41$). This analysis of the paired samples showed minor (non-significant) increases among the SCS factors. Given the relatively small size of the sample generated from this small-scale sport event, the sample may have been too small to detect significant differences, thereby increasing the probability of Type II error. Therefore, it was deemed more appropriate (albeit less robust) to assess SCS factor differences by comparing all pre-event to all post-event data ($N=141$). This initial analysis revealed that all sense of community factors increased from the pre-event to the post-event condition. The largest proportional mean changes were seen for *Common Interest* ($M_{pre}=5.23, M_{post}=5.78 / 7.00$), *Equity in Administrative Decisions* ($M_{pre}=5.19, M_{post}=5.75 / 7.00$), and *Social Spaces* ($M_{pre}=5.93, M_{post}=6.33 / 7.00$). The ANOVA analyses indicated one

statistically significant difference for the SCS factors between study conditions (see Table 5; *Common Interest*). This result, again, is likely attributed to the relatively small sample size for the event. In fact, a simple power analysis (see Cohen, 1988) revealed that the analysis was slightly underpowered ($\pi=.56$) relative to the sample size ($N=141$), p -value ($p<.05$) and the magnitude of the sought effect size (i.e., moderate to large). As such, a more liberal p -value (i.e., $p<.10$) may be used to prevent Type II error (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). Collectively, these data only lend partial statistical support for hypothesis 1 – in that – sense of community was enhanced following the event and the associated volunteer experience. In terms of practical significance, the effect size for the significant difference was moderate (see Cohen, 1988).

[Insert Table 5 Here]

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to (1) assess a scale that measures sense of community among small-scale sport event volunteers and (2) empirically test if a volunteer experience enhances sense of community. In regards to the first purpose, the measure of sense of community was found to fit the data, thus verifying the SCS Scale in a small-scale sport event volunteer sample. Importantly, the confirmatory factor revealed the scale fit the data; albeit in the absence of the *Competition* factor. As noted by Warner et al. (2013), the SCS is a measurement instrument designed to assess sense of community in sport and across a variety of sport contexts. The lack of fit with the *Competition* factor may be explained by the difference between athlete and volunteer roles in sport. Athletes interact on the field of play and competition and whatever the intensity, competition is an inherent part of sport participation. However, volunteers interact off the field of play and cooperation directs much of the support work they provide to the sport activity.

This raises interesting questions about the SCS Scale. The development of a universal instrument that applies to all sport contexts, such as athlete, volunteer, administrator, or fan, is one approach. The inclusion of a *Competition* factor within the SCS Scale demonstrates both conceptual and operational insight. Normally, competitive and cooperative characteristics work in opposition yet sport offers a unique setting in which to argue that despite this dualism, social bonding as reflected by a sense of community may still develop. Alternatively, different versions of the SCS Scale may be considered. The results of this study indicated that despite significant effort to (re)operationalize the *Competition* factor in a manner that relates to the sport volunteer experience, there was no support for the factor. Competitive conditions within a sport event voluntary workforce are difficult to imagine. Situations when a sport event volunteer competes against another sport event volunteer are rare or non-existent. From a practical and operational view, a sport volunteer SCS Scale version omitting the *Competition* factor is a viable option. As noted by DeVellis (2003), when attempting to generalize a scale to multiple populations one ‘cannot assume identical instrument performance’ (p. 160), and thus the creation multiple versions of a scale for different populations or samples may be justified. Future research is needed to specifically examine the viability of the *Competition* factor and explore various instrument development options for the SCS Scale.

To serve the second purpose, ANOVA statistics revealed largest proportional mean changes for volunteers from pre-event to post-event for *Equity in Administrative Decisions*, *Common Interest*, and *Social Spaces*. With regards to *Equity in Administrative Decisions* specifically, results are aligned with Wicker’s (1979) Manning theory in that volunteer conditions, such as the utility of one’s role and the opportunity to serve multiple roles, relate to this SCS factor. This may be particularly relevant in small-scale sport events where a small

number of individuals are recruited to fill a variety of roles. For instance, volunteer assignment at the small-scale sport event for this study often involved various duties during one shift where a volunteer was rotated among transportation, parking, festival, and registration tasks. This high degree of versatility demonstrated staff confidence in volunteer capabilities and decision-making skills. Within such a de-centralized organizational structure, volunteers perceived a stronger sense of equity in administrative decisions as they have a greater chance of being involved in decision processes in small-scale events (Slack & Parent, 2006). Large-scale events involve a far greater number of volunteers where roles are specialized and authority centralized. Consequently, small-scale sport events offer a different volunteer experience than large-scale events and this contrast is noted in the results of this study. The opportunity to be directly involved in the planning and/or day-to-day activities of a sport event may motivate individuals and contribute to their overall social experience (Slack & Parent, 2006).

The proportional increase of *Common Interest* and *Social Spaces* is supported by the claim that the volunteer experience provides individuals the opportunity to interact with one another to develop a common bond and shared interest (Costa et al., 2006; Green & Chalip, 1998, 2004). Thus, the sense of community created through this small-scale sport event (via common interest and social spaces) was likely due to the environment highlighting individuals' mutual connection to the sport, community, and volunteerism. In particular, the results indicate that the opportunity to interact with individuals who share a commitment to volunteering and a common set of values increased during the sport volunteer experience. In this context, the volunteer experience strengthened common interest formed between individual volunteers. The development of common interest may support the notion that the sport volunteer experience provides volunteers and staff with a socialization process whereby individuals become acquainted with the language,

expectations, and relationships associated with their new role (Taylor et al., 2008). Further, the results underlined small-scale sport event volunteering as a *Social Space* or area where individuals can interact. This may provide one explanation for why *Social Space* increased from pre to post event samples in that volunteers were given space to explicitly connect and share their common interest with others. As indicated by the scale items, the small-scale sport event volunteer experience gave individuals physical space for which they could interact with one another on a social level. Given the relatively small number of volunteers associated with events of this size, the availability and promotion of these spaces may be particularly relevant to developing a sense of community.

Conclusion

In sum, this study demonstrated that sense of community, as measured by the SCS, increases for volunteers of a small-scale sport event. From a theoretical standpoint, the results refine and broaden Warner and Dixon's (2011, 2013a) Sport and Sense of Community theory. While this work supports five of the original six factors, it posits more research is needed especially pertaining to *Competition* as a construct within the sense of community conceptual framework. Although *Competition* continues to be noted as an environmental factor in sport settings (e.g., Kellett & Warner, 2011; Warner & Dixon, 2013b), this work highlighted the potential for multiple versions of the SCS Scale in that the *Competition* construct may be removed for versions of the scale tailored to stakeholders who are not direct participants in the sport competition or event context (i.e., volunteers, employees). The findings also demonstrated the utility of the Sport and Sense of Community theory. Sound theory both explains a phenomenon and contributes to practice within a discipline (see Chalip, 2006, Doherty, 2013; Fink, 2013; Van de Ven, 1989), consequently, this work revealed the primary factors in fostering a sense of

community for athletes are also applicable to other constituents in the sport setting (i.e., small-scale sport event volunteers). Continued research is suggested to further develop the scale in other sport samples (e.g., paid staff, volunteer boards of directors, non-competitive athletes).

Limitations

Given the relatively small population from which to draw from within this event, the sample size may have increased the presence of Type II error with the statistical analysis presented here; however, in an attempt to overcome this potential limitation more liberal analyses were performed. This provided the opportunity to dissect changes in sense of community from pre to post-event conditions, and ensured that fluctuations in the SCS factors were not overlooked. Although certainly noteworthy, this may be a limitation commonly associated with the examination of small-scale sport events. Further, the lack of fit between the model and the *Competition* factor may be a result of the context (i.e., competition is not a component of sense of community for small-scale event volunteers), as suggested above, or could even have been influenced by gender (c.f. Warner & Dixon, 2013). However, due to the relatively small sample size and the need to test the scale across multiple sport volunteer populations, the definition and items associated with the *Competition* factor should be critically reviewed before being discarded as unfit.

Practical Implications

Research must continue to explore how to better apply human resource management practices to a sport event voluntary workforce. A sense of community is fostered for small-scale sport event volunteers and this finding alone generates many useful implications to enhance volunteer recruitment, retention and assignment. Given the increase in sense of community from pre to post-event conditions during a small-scale sport event, this context may provide a more

fruitful environment in which to implement HRM practices within a volunteer workforce. Specifically, the collegial (perhaps more intimate) climate encourages staff to implement practices to support volunteers while at the same time generates a strong desire among volunteers to 'buy into' these initiatives. Recognizing the opportunity to involve volunteers in the decision-making process may enhance perceptions of *Equity in Administrative Decisions*. Although not always an option, it is important for sport managers associated with small-scale events to recognize when volunteer involvement may be necessary. For example, if there is an operational committee associated with spectator parking where issues have arisen regarding the functionality of the parking space, it may be reasonable to involve volunteers in the decision-making process regarding contingencies. This falls in line with Collins and Clark's (2003) contention that HRM practices to facilitate networking within a firm enhance performance. Given the limited resources attached to small-scale entities, it may be beneficial to rely upon volunteer-to-volunteer management to effectively serve the needs of the event and event volunteers. The success or failure of a sport event ultimately rests on its ability to serve an important function in the lives of individuals. Small-scale sport events may provide a unique context that allows volunteers to take an active role in their task-based and social-based volunteer experience, thus enhancing valuable outcomes (i.e., sense of community, volunteer retention).

With regard to *Common Interest* and *Social Space*, managers of small-scale sport events could use the orientation process to uncover what values and interests are shared by volunteers, and thus use their social spaces to promote common interest among volunteers. For instance, a short entrance survey could be given to volunteers to determine why they decided to volunteer (e.g., to give back to the sport, to give back to athletes [i.e., child, grandchild], to give back to their community). This may (for example) uncover that volunteers (on majority) are volunteering

to give back to their community. In this case, the volunteer tent/lounge could be used to actively promote contributions to the community (e.g., volunteer rewards based on community contribution throughout the event) and engage volunteers in a collective celebration of their civic engagement. This HRM strategy could simultaneously enhance two aspects of sense of community.

As discussed, O'Brien and Chalip (2006) noted the need for sustainable development within sport. Thus, it is imperative sport managers and researchers move beyond a strict focus on economic impact of large-scale sport events to investigate how social factors (e.g., sense of community, learned wisdom, knowledge-building,) associated with small-scale events can be harnessed to enhance a volunteers' desire to continue to contribute to sport events in her/his community. This propensity to contribute may be cultivated through a strong sense of community that is developed during several small-scale sport event volunteer experiences. Thus, the promotion of regular small-scale sport events in a community may enable sport managers to build capacity for sustained event hosting within a community through the long-term enhancement of a sense of community felt by volunteers (i.e., citizens).

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2010). *General Social Survey: Summary Results 4159.0*, Canberra.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423.
- Armstrong, G., & Giulianotti, R. (1997). *Entering the field: New perspectives on world football*. Oxford: Berg.
- Brookes, J., & Chason, K. (2011). *The year of the volunteer 2005*. Volunteering England.
- Chalip, L. (2006). Toward a distinctive sport management discipline. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 1-21.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Collins, C. & Clark, K. (2003). Strategic human resource practices, top management team social networks, and firm performance: The role of human resource practices in creating organizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 740-751.
- Costa, C. A., Chalip, L., Green, B. C., & Simes, C. (2006). Reconsidering the role of training in event volunteers' satisfaction. *Sport Management Review*, 9(2), 165-182.
- Coyne, B. S., & Coyne Sr, E. J. (2001). Getting, keeping and caring for unpaid volunteers for professional golf tournament events. *Human Resource Development International*, 4(2), 199-216.
- Cuskelly, G. (1995). The influence of committee functioning on the organizational commitment of volunteer administrators in sport. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 18, 254-269.

- Cuskelly, G., Hoye, R., & Auld, C. (2006). *Working with volunteers in sport: Theory and practice*. Taylor & Francis.
- Daniels, M. & Norman, W. (2003). Estimating the economic impact of seven regular sport tourism events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 8(4), 214-222.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Doherty, A. (2013). Investing in sport management: The value of good theory. *Sport Management Review*, 1, 5-11.
- Doherty, A. J., & Carron, A. V. (2003). Cohesion in volunteer sport executive committees. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(2), 116-141.
- Eley, D., & Kirk, D. (2002). Developing citizenship through sport: The impact of a sport-based volunteer programme on young sport leaders. *Sport education and society*, 7(2), 151-166.
- Elstad, B. (1996). Volunteer perception of learning and satisfaction in a mega-event: The case of the XVII Olympic Winter Games in Lillehammer. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 4(3-4), 3-4.
- Farrell, J. M., Johnston, M. E., & Twynam, D. G. (1998). Volunteer motivation, satisfaction and management at an elite sporting competition. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 288-300.
- Fink, J. S. (2013). Theory development in sport management: My experiences and other considerations. *Sport Management Review*, 1, 17-21.
- Gibson, H., Wilming, C. & Holdnak, A. (2003). Small-scale Event Sport Tourism: Fans as tourists. *Tourism Management*, 24(2), 181-190.

- Green, B. C., & Chalip, L. (1998). Sport volunteers: research agenda and application. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 7(2), 14-23.
- Green, B. C., & Chalip, L. (2004). Paths to volunteer commitment: Lessons from the Sydney Olympic Games. In R.A. Stebbins & M. Graham (Eds.) *Volunteering as leisure/leisure as volunteering* (pp. 49-67). Oxfordshire, UK: Cambi Publishing.
- Hamm, S., MacLean, J., Misener, K. (2008) Understanding the commitment and motivation of large sporting event volunteers. *International Journal of Volunteer Administration*, 25(3), 26-38.
- Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., & Bell, M. P. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effect of surface- versus deep-level diversity on group cohesiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 96-107.
- Hoye, R., Cuskelly, G., Baum, T., Deery, M., Hanlon, C., Lockstone, L., & Smith, K. (2009). The psychology of sport event volunteerism: A review of volunteer motives, involvement and behavior. *People and Work in Events and Conventions: A research perspective*, pp. 171-180.
- Kellett, P., & Warner, S. (2011). Creating communities that lead to retention: The social worlds and communities of umpires. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11, 475-498.
- Lance, C. E., Butts, M. M., & Michels, L. C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported cutoff criteria. What did they really say? *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 202-220.
- Laverie, D. A., & McDonald, R. E. (2007). Volunteer dedication: Understanding the role of identity importance on participation frequency. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 27(3), 274-288.

- McCole, D. Jacobs, J., Lindley, L., & McAvoy, B. (2012) The relationship between seasonal employee retention and sense of community: The case of summer camp employment. *Journal of Parks and Recreation Administration*, 30, 85-191.
- O'Brien, D. & Chalip, L. (2008). Sport events and strategic leveraging: pushing towards the triple bottom line. In A. Woodside & D. Martin (Eds.), pp. 318-338, *Tourism management: analysis, behavior and strategy*. CABI, Cambridge, MA.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rhyne, D. (1995). *Volunteerism in sport, fitness and recreation in Ontario*. Toronto, ON: Institute for Social Research, York University.
- Slack, S., & Parent, M. (2006). *Understanding sport organizations: The application of organization theory, 2nd ed.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Small, K., Edwards, D., & Sheridan, L. (2005). A Flexible framework for evaluating the socio-cultural impacts of a (small) festival. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 1(1), 66-77.
- Stebbins, R. A. (1982). Serious leisure: A conceptual statement. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 251-272.
- Stevens, J. (2008). Events and Volunteer Management Practices: Facilitating volunteers. In C. Mallen & L. Adams (Eds.), *Sport, recreation and tourism event management: Theoretical and practical dimensions*, p. 53-57. Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann/Elsevier.
- Taylor, T., Doherty, A., & McGraw, P. (2008). *Managing people in sport organizations*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

- Van de Ven, A.H. (1989). Nothing is quite so practical as a good theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 486-489. doi:10.5465/AMR.1989.4308370
- Vézina, M., & Crompton, S. (2012). Volunteering in Canada. *Canadian Social Trends*, 33, 1-21.
- Warner, S. (2012). Sport and community. In G. B. Cunningham and J. N. Singer (Eds.), *Sociology of sport and physical activity* (2nd ed.) (pp. 237-254). College Station, TX: Center for Sport Management Research and Education.
- Warner, S., & Dixon, M. A. (2011). Understanding sense of community from an athlete's perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25, 258-272.
- Warner, S., & Dixon, M. A. (2013a). Sport and community on campus: Constructing a sport experience that matters. *Journal of College Student Development*, 54, 283-298.
- Warner, S., & Dixon, M. (2013b). Competition, gender, and the sport experience: An exploration among collegiate athletes. *Sport, Education and Society*.
DOI:10.1080/13573322.2013.774273
- Warner, S., Dixon, M. A., & Chalip, L. C. (2012). The impact of formal versus informal sport: Mapping the differences in sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 40, 983-1003.
- Warner, S., Kerwin, S., & Walker, M. (2013). Examining sense of community in sport: Developing the multidimensional 'SCS' Scale. *Journal of Sport Management*, 27, 349-362.
- Warner, S., Smith, B., & Green, B. C. (2011). More than motivation: Reconsidering volunteer management tools. *Journal of Sport Management*. 25, 391-407.

- Warner, S., Shapiro, S., Dixon, M. A., Ridinger, L. L., & Harrison, S. (2011). The football factor: Shaping community on campus. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 236-256.
- West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). *Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies*. In Rick H. Hoyle, ed., *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications*, pp. 56-75. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications.
- Wicker, A. W. (1968). UnderManning, performances, and students' subjective experience in behavior settings of large and small high schools. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 255-261. doi: 10.1037/h0026611
- Williams, P. W., Dossa, K. B., & Tompkins, L. (1995). Volunteerism and special event management: A case study of Whistler's Men's World Cup of Skiing. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 3, 83-95.
- Wilson, (2006). The economic impact of local sport events: significant, limited or otherwise? A case study of four swim events. *Managing Leisure*, 11(1), 57-70.

Table 1

Factors, Definitions and Items Related to Measure of Sense of Community

Factors*	Items**
Administrative Consideration – <i>the expression of care, concern, and intentionality of administrators</i>	1. Leaders of [event name] care about their volunteers 2. Leaders of [event name] support their volunteers 3. I feel comfortable talking openly with the leaders of [event name] 4. The leaders make me feel like a valued volunteer of [event name]
Common Interest – <i>group dynamics, social networking, and friendships resulting from individuals being brought together by common interests</i>	5. I share similar values with other volunteers at [event name] 6. I feel like I belong when volunteering for [event name] 7. Volunteering for [event name] provides me with friends who share a strong commitment to volunteering
Equity of Administrative Decisions – <i>decisions that demonstrate all community members are treated equal</i>	8. Staff working for [event name] make decisions that benefit everyone 9. Staff working for [event name] make decisions that are fair 10. Staff working for [event name] consider everyone's needs when making decisions
Leadership Opportunities – <i>formal and informal opportunities that guide and direct others in the community</i>	11. I have influence over what [event name] is like 12. If there is a problem in [event name], I can help to solve it 13. I have a say about what goes on in [event name] 14. Being a volunteer of [event name] gives me opportunities to lead
Social Spaces – <i>common area or facility where volunteers interact with one another</i>	15. When going to [event name], there are places where I can interact with other volunteers 16. When going to [event name], I know I'll have an area where I can interact with other volunteers 17. [Event name] creates a place for me to interact with other volunteers 18. [Event name] provides me a place to interact with other volunteers
Competition – <i>challenge to excel in the presence of internal and external rivalries</i>	19. The competitiveness of [event name] helps me bond with other volunteers 20. The level of competition at [event name] enhances my enjoyment 21. Being involved with a highly competitive event is fun

Notes. * Warner & Dixon, 2011, 2013b; Warner, Dixon, & Chalip, 2013; ** Adapted from Warner, Kerwin, & Walker, 2013.

Table 2

Measurement Model Comparisons

Models	$\chi^2(df)$	SRMR	IFI	CFI	TLI
1: Six Factor Model	762.705 (57)*	.072	.810	.864	.876
2: Five Factor Model	284.797 (40)*	.056	.910	.901	.900

Note. * $p < .001$

Table 3

Measurement Model Results (standardized estimates)

Factors and Items	Factor Loading	AVE
<i>Administrative Consideration</i>		.87
Leaders of [event name] care about their volunteers	.88	
Leaders of [event name] support their volunteers	.95	
I feel comfortable talking openly with the leaders of [event name]	.70	
<i>Common Interest</i>		.77
I share similar values with other volunteers at [event name]	.84	
I feel like I belong when volunteering for [event name]	.81	
Volunteering provides me with friends who share a strong commitment to volunteering	.76	
<i>Equity in Administrative Decisions</i>		.81
Staff working for [event name] make decisions that benefit everyone	.91	
Staff working for [event name] make decisions that are fair	.82	
Staff working for [event name] consider everyone's needs when making decisions	.84	
<i>Leadership Opportunities</i>		.71
I have influence over what [event name] is like	.71	
If there is a problem at [event name], I can help to solve it	.80	
I have a say about what goes on at [event name]	.81	
<i>Social Spaces</i>		.87
When going to [event name], there are places where I can interact with other volunteers	.80	
When going to [event name], I know I'll have an area where I can interact with other volunteers	.93	
[Event name] creates a place for me to interact with other volunteers	.91	

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics

Construct	α	Correlation Coefficients				
		1	2	3	4	5
1. Administrative Consideration	.87	1.00				
2. Leadership Opportunities	.81	.683**	1.00			
3. Social Spaces	.91	.853**	.696**	1.00		
4. Common Interest	.81	.769**	.697**	.713**	1.00	
5. Equity in Admin. Decisions	.89	.751**	.666**	.741**	.696**	1.00

Note. ** $p < .001$

Table 5

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Pre-Post × Sense of Community

	Pre-Event	Post-Event	Pre → Post	Pre → Post	Pre → Post
Sense of Community	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>p-Value</i>	<i>F-Value</i>	η^2
Admin Consideration	5.93 (1.81)	6.10 (.939)	.500	.457	<i>ns</i>
Leadership Opportunities	4.84 (1.91)	5.02 (1.34)	.515	.425	<i>ns</i>
Social Spaces	5.93 (1.73)	6.33 (.860)	.090	2.89	<i>ns</i>
Common Interest	5.23 (1.88)	5.78 (1.05)	.040 ⁺	4.31	.081
Equity in Admin. Decisions	5.19 (2.13)	5.75 (1.17)	.052	3.52	<i>ns</i>

Notes. ⁺ indicates a positive and significant change.

$\eta^2 = 0.01$ (small effect), $\eta^2 = 0.06$ (moderate effect), $\eta^2 = 0.14$ (large effect)