

Scientific article

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SPORT AND ATHLETES' BEHAVIOUR ON FORMING PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES

UDK 796.01:316.663 ; 796.071.2:316.644(497.11)"2015"

**Sretenka Dugalić<sup>1</sup>**

Faculty of Physical Culture and Sports Management,  
Singidunum University, Belgrade, Serbia

**Abstract:** Sport was created out of physical education, which eventually led to the elements of competition and recreation. Sociological characteristics of sport theoretically lean on: 1/ needs, 2/ physical activity and energy of an athlete, 3/ realization of supreme social values, 4/ accomplishment of athletes as individuals, 5/ sport is always public and social, 6/ sport is essentially a game of emotions and pleasure, 7/ sport is aimed activity of society, 8/ sport has certain tasks from the aspects of society, 9/ sport has its own appearance (from friendship to social conflicts). These characteristics have contributed to the phenomenon of role models in sport who have a great influence on the audience. The aim of this paper is to study the origin of the activities of celebrities who are role models of individuals. It has been proved that sport, fashion, entertainment and the media, as well as culture, do not produce the same intensity of attraction, as examinees are more inclined to successful athletes who focus the credibility of their promotional strength on certain personal characteristics. The research conducted in 2015 includes 229 examinees and a questionnaire, with 85 examinees interviewed by docs.google.com in 2014. The research results can contribute to better understanding of global tendencies in society, especially those which come from sport and sociology of sport. Apart from social benefit, the research offers the benefit of product endorsement.

**Keywords:** *social values of sport, sociology of sport, identification with celebrities, shaping the attitudes under the influence of famous athletes*

---

<sup>1</sup> ✉ [sdugalic@singidunum.ac.rs](mailto:sdugalic@singidunum.ac.rs)

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are many definitions of sports in scientific papers: in sport, observers consequentially become participants as sport has the power to motivate people to be active (Gidens, 2007, 668). According to Krsmanović (2006, 193), sport is a general term for sports activity, it is a psycho-physical activity of individuals and groups (specific exercises: training and competition), accomplished in independent forms of motoric exercises (game, competition and sport in schools and for recreational purposes), directed towards the highest achievements of athletes (results, successes, audience and sports market), with the aim of satisfying humanistic needs. These needs and achieved success of athletes are appealing to the wider audience, so this paper will study the direction and intensity of causal phenomena that are produced by sport and athletes in contemporary society. Sport can be classified as: recreation, competition and school sport. The functions of sport that satisfy individual needs are: educational, biological - health, hedonistic - utilitarian, affiliative and recreational, while those which satisfy general functions are: health, defense, prevention, economy and aesthetics (Krsmanović, 2006, 261).

Athletes are the carriers of sports activities. The usage of sport is multifunctional: 1/ to provide faster and better development of an organism, especially for children, through sports games and sport in schools; 2/ to affect the development of positive psychological characteristics in order to have a developmental- therapeutic influence on young athletes; 3/ sport is a good 'entrance' to the social life, it develops communication skills, broadens social mobility and prepares athletes for working and family profession. Sport is a cultural phenomenon, and the greatest significance and influence on sport today is presented by mass culture (this corresponds with Krsmanović, 2006, 389): mass culture creates mass sport and vice versa.

Theoretical approaches to sport can be: socially-historical, analytical, functionalist, structuralist, phenomenological, interactional. Of all the values related to sport (especially the moral ones), this paper highlights those that have a motivational function, that can be adopted as positive and motivational according to the research results, that are presented by athletes, and that potential examinees would like to adopt and use as gained social norms. The social status of sport includes subsystems: socializing, institution and sanctions. The term of social mobility is closely connected with sport, as well as the causal influence of mass society and the media on sport, where the creation of role models has a special place. According to Koković (2009, 89), the economic dimension of sport includes: sport and money; sport and sponsorship; sport and promotion. In the model of commercialism, the often mentioned 'uselessness of sport' is transformed into the orientation towards maximum profit (Koković, 161). The political dimensions of sport are: the

levels of mixing sport and politics, sport as a means of state policy and sport in the function of desintegration.

The first task of sport on the individual level is self-realization of an athlete, while on the social level the task is the need of society for supreme athletes and achievements as a method of showing off. Therefore, sport should be based on a man's freedom, individuality, humanity and creativity (Krsmanović, 2006, 198). The structure of sport as a social phenomenon includes: people, athletes, specific system of sports institutions, sports policy and the system of sport values. Sociology studies horizontal and vertical structure of sport in order to explain current behaviour and to predict new behaviour patterns of groups that shape attitudes, norms and behaviour modeled by successful and famous athletes. The additional value of sport is the fact that sport clubs (club as an organizational system) represent a perfect model of organization of social life, as organization has an important role in our lives. According to Gidens (2007, 373), organization can be defined as wide joining of people for the purpose of accomplishing certain goals. Having in mind that people are social beings, joining all forms of social organizing triggers some controversial issues (conflicts etc); sport helps interest groups to deal with these issues and to become more effective and efficient in that way. Clubs as a sport model are promoted as a new social model due to their usefulness and advantage that they have over outdated organizational forms (Leadbeater, 1997).

Sport studies economic, cultural, anthropological, political, moral, legal, pedagogical, historical, aesthetic, technical, biological and medical aspect. Social functions of sport are manifests: they are connected with objective consequences intended and recognized by participants in a system. The functions can also be latent: those that are not even recognized or intended, and yet they have their performance. The lines of anthropological function of the study of sport are the following: 1/ the studies give answer to the question what all people have in common when it comes to the creativity attraction of sport, though in different ways, depending on their nationality, class or gender; 2/ anthropological understanding of sport represents its connection to something different than itself: religion, work, ritual, myth or politics; 3/ anthropology studies how much the modernity of sport is connected with the archaic mentality and collective sensibility (Koković, 2000, 107).

Athletes are characterized by personality traits: persistence, self-control, determination, courage, introversion, practicality, emotional stability, autonomy and individuality. These traits contribute to the creation of real moral personality of an athlete, if they are connected with moral values: modesty, honesty, persistence, collectivity, militancy and responsibility (Krsmanović, 2006, 427). In the study whose results are shown in this paper, examinees are encouraged to evaluate the offered personality traits and to highlight those they find to be the most important. In this way, it is assumed that the examinees

would like to imitate their role models. The imitation model is based on social cognitive theory of personality (Bandura, 1977), on the processes of learning, cognitive processes, social influences and interactive effect on specific behaviour in specific situations. The personality theory takes into consideration endogenous and exogenous factors. The paper studies and explains exogenous factors (the exposure of an individual to certain contents that he/she acquires by learning, testing and repeating). According to Bakić (1975, 52), knowledge, skills, motives and emotions are acquired in the process of socialization.

Searching for answers to various questions in sport, sociology has defined a special sociological discipline, the sociology of sport. The first papers based on sociology of sport appeared in the beginning of XX century, and it is said that it was created as a special science in the sixties (Krsmanović, 2006, 135). According to this author (Krsmanović, 155), sociology of sport is a theoretical and empirical scientific discipline that studies sport as a social and cultural phenomenon, searching the validity of social development of sport, its structure and elements significant for its functioning in social system and for satisfying humanistic needs of people. The subjects of sociology of sport are (Krsmanović, 161): the structure of sport, determinism in sport, validity in sport, cultural 'field' of sport, the relationship between sport – society - individual, independence of sport and interdisciplinary relationships in sport. Sociological characteristics of sport theoretically lean on: 1/ needs; 2/ physical activity of athletes; 3/ realization of supreme social values; 4/ realization of an athlete as an individual; 5/ sport is always public and social; 6/ sport is a basic game of emotions and satisfaction; 7/ sport is a target activity of society; 8/ sport has certain tasks from the aspect of society, and 9/ sport has its own appearance (from friendships to social conflicts).

Verified answers in the study process regarding the following issues are the scope of sociology of sport: 1/ sport as an agent and product of society and social development; 2/ the role of sport in overall social life and 3/ social position of participants in sport. Sociology is a discipline which has important practical implications; it can contribute to social critical judgment and practical social reforms in many ways. Firstly, improved understanding of the given group of social circumstances often offers the opportunity to control them. At the same time, sociology provides the means by which sensibility regarding other cultures is increased, allowing that the functioning is based on the awareness of different cultural values. In practice, this means that circumstances that will appear as a result of accepting certain functioning programme can be studied. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, sociology provides the possibility to understand one's own personality, offering groups and individuals the opportunity to change the conditions of their own lives (Gidens, 2007, 21). This assumption has its usage in sport in many ways, as group polarization and the possibility of using positive values as main motivational incentives

have developed skills of an individual by mutual competitive fight inside and outside these groups. Sociology perceives this process as a way of creating role models, shaping attitudes etc. As a special scientific field, sociology studies the ways in which our bodies fall for social influences (Gidens, 2007, 156). Reversibly, it also studies social influences on our bodies. Social and natural forces help to shape patterns of our health and illnesses, which is visible in the fact that certain groups of people have better health than others (Gidens, 2007, 180); or they pay more attention to health (and sport) than, for instance, fashion or culture... The study in this paper specifically highlights this aspect of the advantage of sport, in order to answer the question of how and why sport in contemporary society, as a complex social phenomenon, has its expansion with unexpected varieties, usages, challenges and perplexities.

Sociology of sport should discover general legitimacies in specific areas of sport, which means discovering the existing constant and general connection between phenomena which characterize sport (Krsmanović, 2006, 174). The attitude of wider social community to sport and social relations in sport are an inexhaustible source of research. Sociology of sport is a theoretical and empirical science which studies social phenomena connected to sport and its social function; it studies the influence of society on sport, but the feedback (the influence of sport on society) as well. Sociology studies sport in order to know more about society (Koković, 2000, 10). Sociological approach to sport has elements such as: man as an agent and carrier of certain activities; the role as expected behaviour; and sport event (match) which gathers agents. Participants in sport are: players, intermediaries, physical education pedagogists, coaches, officials, referees, sport press, sponsors, supporters, owners, suppliers, contractors of sport facilities... Social and commercial relations are created between them, and this paper explains those tight relations that exist between people (supporters, audience) and athletes. Practical opportunities of sociology of sport lean on two functions: value- acculturative and applied function. The first function refers to research regarding the social role of sport in transforming contemporary culture and personality (based on philosophy, history, psychology, pedagogy, sociology etc). It refers to humanistic interpretation of sport and finding its permanent values, connected with the world of social ideals and patterns of social behaviour with the aim of forming the desired patterns of reflexive, expressive and active personality.

## METHODOLOGY

Studies in sport are necessary and justified as sport affects society and vice versa, with special reference to the comparison of behaviour with specific cultural patterns (Krsmanović, 2006, 320). The newest phase of sport development is characterized by obvious ambivalence: sport is developed in

the direction of massive scales and amateurism, while, on the other hand, it definitely enters professionalism due to competitions, which lead to a new phase- commercialism. This is why sociology of sport closely corresponds with fields such as sport management and sport marketing.

This paper applies methodology of combined comparative and historical research. The usage of comparative research in the historical context is a secondary analysis, as it is in the function of the main method - questionnaire. This method is useful for studying social changes such as globalization, which specifically affects sport, due to its highlighted competition. Therefore, the paper uses general scientific methods of cognition (statistical method and modeling method for defining similarities between phenomena, characteristics of sport and system of sport), special methods: analysis and synthesis, then historical and descriptive method. The following techniques have also been used: scientific observation, questionnaire and scaling (Thurston scale of attitudes which is used for measuring different social attitudes, interests, characteristics and acts, with a scale from 1 to 10), and descriptive Likert scale where verbal categories are defined on the intensity scale from 1 to 5, as well as graphic methods where examinees' attitudes are measured by circling signs + and - (yes, no). The starting hypothesis is: there is no significant difference in the attitude of examinees regarding the background of celebrities who are seen as role models. Other hypotheses refer to studying the characteristics which are owned by successful athletes and which motivate examinees, shaping their role models, attitudes and decisions. The incentive for this study is the fact that, since the beginning of 2015, Serbia has won 42 medals in numerous sports in all categories in international competitions, out of which 24 are gold medals (Bjelinić, Radulović, 2015).

## STUDY RESULTS

According to the population list from 2011, Belgrade has 1.659.440 inhabitants, out of which 1.426.710 are aged 15 or more (from 6.161.584, or 23,15%), more specifically: 666.315 men and 760.395 women (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia). This study includes 229 inhabitants of Belgrade in 2015 who were examined by a questionnaire. The previous study was conducted in 2014, when 85 questionnaires were handed in and analyzed (Dugalić, Ivić, 2015). The structure of inhabitants is shown in Table 1. Descriptive statistics offers the following data: according to the gender structure of examinees, out of 229, 129 are men (56,33%), and 100 are women (43,67%). The examinees are divided into six age groups, and most of them are aged 15-21 (27, 95%) and 22-28 (27,51%, all together: 55,46%). If we take into consideration employment status, most of them are employed: 108 (48,21%), and 90 of them are unemployed (40,18% of students, housewives, senior citizens...).

**Table 1.** *Structure of examinees according to gender, age and working status*

|                          |                | Number | %     | Valid % | Cumulative % |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------|-------|---------|--------------|
| <b>Gender Structure</b>  |                |        |       |         |              |
| Valid                    | Male           | 129    | 56.33 | 56.33   | 100.0        |
|                          | Female         | 100    | 43.67 | 43.67   |              |
|                          | Total          | 229    | 100.0 | 100.0   |              |
| <b>Age Structure</b>     |                |        |       |         |              |
| Valid                    | 1 (< 15)       | 1      | 0.4   | 0.44    | 0.44         |
|                          | 2 (15-21)      | 64     | 27.95 | 27.95   | 28.35        |
|                          | 3 (22-28)      | 63     | 27.51 | 27.51   | 55.86        |
|                          | 4 (29-35)      | 31     | 13.54 | 13.54   | 69.40        |
|                          | 5 (36-42)      | 28     | 12.22 | 12.22   | 81.62        |
|                          | 6 (> 42)       | 42     | 18.34 | 18.34   | 100,0        |
|                          | Total          | 229    | 100.0 | 100.0   |              |
| <b>Employment Status</b> |                |        |       |         |              |
| Valid                    | 1 (employed)   | 108    | 47.16 | 48.21   | 48.6         |
|                          | 2 (unemployed) | 26     | 11.35 | 11.61   | 59.82        |
|                          | 3 (inactive)   | 90     | 39.30 | 40.18   | 100.0        |
|                          | Total          | 224    | 97.81 | 100.0   |              |
| Missing                  | System         | 5      | 2.18  |         |              |
| <b>Total</b>             |                | 229    |       | 100.0   |              |

### **The analysis of the activities of celebrities**

With the aim of accepting or denying the starting hypothesis that there are no significant differences in arithmetic mean given for various activities of celebrities who affect individuals, the examinees are asked the first question: in which measure does the activity of a celebrity affect their decision to buy a product. The following answer is given: out of 211 valid answers which refer to sport (18 are missing), absolutely the highest number of examinees - 62 (27,07%) give the highest score to sport (5), while 46 examinees (21,8%) give the lowest score (1).

When it comes to entertainment and the media, out of 206 valid answers (23 are missing), absolutely and relatively the highest number of examinees (60; 29,13%) give these activities the lower score, while the lowest number of examinees (19; 9,22%) give the highest score. If we take a look at fashion, out of 203 valid answers (26 are missing), absolutely and relatively the highest number of examinees (62; 30,54%) give the lowest score, while 32; (15,76%) examinees

give the highest score. Culture is marked with the lowest score by 54 examinees; 26,47% out of 204 valid answers (25 are missing). The attitudes are significantly divided here, so we can have additional analysis in order to have more specific details about marks which characterize the group of people who are into fashion. In order to prove that more variables affect favoritism of activities of celebrities who are the examinees' role models, a one-way analysis of variance has been used, which includes gender, age and employment status (Table 2).

**Table 2.** *Analysis of variance: gender, age and employment status according to the activities of celebrities*

|  | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|--|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------|
| <b>Activity/Sport</b>                        |                |    |             |       |       |
| Gender                                       | 3,486          | 4  | 0.871       | 3.717 | 0.006 |
| Age  | 19,185         | 4  | 4.796       | 2.202 | 0.070 |
| Employment status                            | 6,095          | 4  | 1.524       | 1.740 | 0.143 |
| <b>Activity/ Entertainment and the Media</b> |                |    |             |       |       |
| Gender                                       | 0,199          | 4  | 0.050       | 0.198 | 0.939 |
| Age  | 7,341          | 4  | 1.835       | 0.850 | 0.495 |
| Employment status                            | 2,312          | 4  | 0.578       | 0.646 | 0.631 |
| <b>Activity/ Fashion</b>                     |                |    |             |       |       |
| Gender                                       | 4,443          | 4  | 1.111       | 4.825 | 0.001 |
| Age  | 28,458         | 4  | 7.115       | 3.479 | 0.009 |
| Employment status                            | 13,424         | 4  | 3.356       | 4.009 | 0.004 |
| <b>Activity/ Culture</b>                     |                |    |             |       |       |
| Gender                                       | 1,011          | 4  | 0.253       | 1.016 | 0.400 |
| Age  | 13,597         | 4  | 3.399       | 1.572 | 0.183 |
| Employment status                            | 2,489          | 4  | 0.622       | 0.693 | 0.597 |

The Table above leads to the conclusion that there are statistically significant differences between examinees who have marked sport as an activity of celebrities who affect their buying decisions; which depend on gender, but not on the age groups or employment status. If we analyse activities: entertainment, the media and culture, we can conclude that there is no significant difference in arithmetic mean of the analyzed variables. Men and women, regardless of their age and employment status, equally evaluate celebrities who deal with entertainment and the media. When it comes to fashion, the study results show that there is significant difference between examinees who prefer celebrities from this field of activity, paying attention to gender, age and employment status, and those differences are mostly visible in fashion. In other words, different genders differently evaluate



activities of celebrities such as sport and fashion (and similarly when it comes to culture, entertainment and the media). Regarding fashion, the deviations in attitude can mean that there are other factors on which these affinities are based, so we could suggest some new studies which would brighten and define these causal relationships apart from buying habits. When we include average numeric values given to the activities of celebrities who affect buying habits of the examinees, then we can range them: 1/ sport (3,20); 2/ culture (2,92); 3/ fashion (2,79); and 4/ entertainment and the media (2,57). The last activity is given averagely the lowest mark, which means that the examinees see entertainment and the media differently. However, it can be assumed that the results regarding entertainment and the media would be different if the study would include examinees from rural areas and other regions. The analysis of sport as an activity of celebrities who affect the attitudes of the examinees shows that there is a difference in these attitudes. In the second part of the paper, we will explain the factors of personality that affect the attitudes and decision making of the examinees.

### **The motives of the examinees to follow tennis**

The next question that we want to answer is which are the motives of people to follow tennis, which is chosen due to its great popularity in Serbia, owing to significant competition results and the exactness of measuring these results. In continuation of the paper, we offer the answers of the examinees to one of five given answers to the question 'what I enjoy most about tennis is...', and they are ranged by intensity from 1 to 5: out of 208 examinees (21 invalid answers), the highest number (97; 46,6%) of the examinees claim that they follow tennis because they enjoy the matches. The highest number of examinees also give the highest score to the statement that they enjoy following a certain tennis player (male or female), but this number is much lower when compared to just following tennis matches: 57 (27,4%).

Out of 198 examinees who enjoy playing tennis (as amateurs/ for recreation/ professionally), with 31 missing answers, absolutely and relatively the highest number (85; 42,9%) of examinees give this answer the lowest score (1). This can mean that the examinees actually do not play tennis at all, as the second-ranked relative score with the highest score (5) is maximal (36 examinees or 18,2%). Out of 198 valid answers (31 are missing), only six examinees (3%) give the highest score (5) to the statement that they enjoy imitating a certain celebrity in tennis (for example, copying his/ her dress code, i.e. sport style), while the highest number of examinees (125; 63,1%) give the lowest score (1). This shows that there is an even linear trend in attitudes of the examinees and that they are usually led by the motive of imitating famous athletes. Out of 194 examinees (35 answers are missing), the highest number (134; 69,1%) of examinees do not agree with the statement that they enjoy copying a certain style of playing tennis, while

only seven examinees (3,6%) completely agree with this statement. Therefore, the imitation of style of playing tennis, or the imitation of their personality is not a clear characteristic of the examinees.

In order to study this influence inside different groups better and to gain valid conclusions, apart from descriptive statistics, we have also used a one-way analysis of variance (shown in Table 3), which shows that there are significant differences in the attitudes of the examinees who enjoy the game of tennis (taking into consideration their gender, age and employment status) and those who copy the style of playing tennis (taking into consideration their gender and employment status).

**Table 3.** *One-way ANOVA analysis of variance for variable: What I enjoy most about tennis is....*

|                        | <b>Gender</b> | <b>Age</b> | <b>Employment status</b> | <b>Sig.</b> |
|------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Enjoy watching matches | 0.672         | 0.174      | 0.623                    | 0.672       |
| Follow tennis          | 0.847         | 0.551      | 0.852                    | 0.847       |
| Play tennis            | 0.009         | 0.016      | 0.009                    | 0.009       |
| Imitate                | 0.508         | 0.569      | 0.414                    | 0.508       |
| Copy                   | 0.005         | 0.082      | 0.035                    | 0.005       |

**The question regarding the feeling of the examinees that the behaviour of a famous tennis player on the court and outside the court is important to them**

Out of 214 valid answers (15 are missing), absolutely and relatively the highest number of examinees (73; 34,1%) give the lowest score to this statements (I completely disagree). This result is in accordance with the previous study (Agrawal and Kamakura, 1995), and the study from 2014 (Dugalić, Ivić, 2015, 57-66), and it shows that the examinees are not that susceptible to identification with famous athletes as it might seem at first glance.

When answering the following questions, the examinees had in mind a specific male or female tennis player. The statements refer to examining the attitudes of personalities (with the help of five-scale Likert scale), such as: this person is pleasant and kind, likeable, honest and reliable, and I want to be friends with this person (average values of statements are shown in Table 4). Relatively highest number of examinees (89; 41,6%) give the highest score to the statement 'this person is pleasant and kind': 'I completely agree' (5). When it comes to being likeable, out of 206 examinees (23 answers are missing), also absolutely and relatively the highest number of them (73; 35,4%) agree with this statement (score 5). Regarding the characteristics of famous tennis players, such as honesty and reliability, it turns out that out of 204 examinees, also absolutely and relatively

the highest number (58; 28,4%) completely agree with this statement and give the highest score to these characteristics. Out of 205 examinees, absolutely and relatively the highest number of them (85; 41,5%) would be friends with famous tennis players, which can be proved by the statement: I completely agree (the highest score). Another value is given by those examinees who have given this statement the average score (3). Even cumulatively 75,6% of examinees give the average score or higher than average. So, we can conclude that the examinees have given higher average value of 3.5 to the chosen tennis player being pleasant and kind (3.77), to the possibility of being friends with this person (3.59), to the chosen tennis player being likeable (3.56), and then there are honesty and reliability (3.39), while the behaviour of tennis players in the court and outside the court have the lowest average value of 2.62.

**Table 4.** *The feelings regarding famous tennis players  
(the reasons why the examinees prefer a certain tennis player)*

| Statement   | Number of answers | Missing answers | Average values |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| The behaviour of tennis players in the court and outside the court is important | 214               | 15              | 2.62           |
| This person is pleasant and kind  | 214               | 15              | 3.77           |
| This person is likeable   | 206               | 23              | 3.56           |
| This person is honest and reliable  | 204               | 25              | 3.39           |
| I would be friends with this person   | 205               | 24              | 3.59           |

This equalization of attitudes exists for the examinees of all age and gender groups, regardless of their employment status, as shown in Table 5. We can conclude that the highest number of examinees do wish to be friends with celebrities a lot. In the continuation of this paper, we will explain why this is the case and on which personality traits these role models are based. This is important as the highest number of examinees claim that whether they want to be identified with famous tennis players and to imitate their style is not highly valued (Dugalić, 2015).

**Tabela 5.** *Analysis of variance: variables: gender, age, employment status and the desire to be friends with famous tennis players*

|                   | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|-------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Gender            | 0.560          | 4  | 0.140       | 0.557 | 0.694 |
| Age               | 3.124          | 4  | 0.781       | 0.358 | 0.838 |
| Employment status | 2.064          | 4  | 0.516       | 0.575 | 0.681 |

**The characteristics of famous tennis players which, according to the statements of the examinees, affect their buying decisions**

The following set of answers is shown in Table 6, and it refers to evaluating seven characteristics of famous tennis players (with the help of Thurston scale whose statements are graduated so that they represent a type of interval scale ranging from 1 do 10): attractiveness, beauty, elegance, modernity, professionalism, experience, intelligence or none. By using descriptive statistics, the following answers are given: out of 212 examinees, absolutely and relatively the highest number of examinees (56; 26,4%) give the highest score to attractiveness (10). Out of 210 valid answers, absolutely and relatively the highest number (62; 29,5%) give the highest score: 10 to beauty. We can assume that the examinees in both cases had female tennis players in mind. The next characteristic evaluated by the examinees is elegance: out of 212 examinees, relatively the highest number of them (66; 31,1%) give the highest score to this trait (10), while even 66,5% give the score ranging from 7 to 10. Modernity as a characteristic of famous tennis players is also given the highest score (10) by 70 examinees; 33,3%, out of 210 valid answers. Symptomatically, professionalism of famous tennis players is marked by 214 examinees as the highest value (129; 60,3%) (and cumulatively 81,3% of examinees ranging their scores from 8 to 10). Experience has similar results: out of 214 valid answers, relatively the highest number of examinees (102; 47,7%) give this characteristic the highest score (10), and cumulatively even 166 or 77,6% give scores ranging from 8 to 10. This also refers to intelligence, which is given the highest score (10) by 112 examinees; 52,8% in 212 valid answers. If we add further highest ranging scores to this (8-10), we can conclude that 169 (79,7%) examinees consider famous tennis players to be very intelligent.

**Table 6.** *The characteristics of famous tennis players which affect buying decisions of the examinees*

| Statement       | Number of answers | Missing answers | Average values |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Attractiveness  | 210               | 19              | 6.42           |
| Beauty          | 212               | 17              | 6.40           |
| Elegance        | 212               | 17              | 7.15           |
| Modernity       | 210               | 19              | 7.19           |
| Professionalism | 214               | 15              | 8.62           |
| Experience      | 214               | 15              | 8.30           |
| Intelligence    | 212               | 17              | 8.39           |

Taking into consideration all the above-mentioned, we can conclude that absolutely and relatively the highest number of examinees have given the highest

scores to all characteristics that are offered. Among them, the top ranged ones (the first result is based on mark 10 in %, and second one is based on marks 8-10 in %) are: professionalism (60,9%, 81,3%), intelligence (52,8%, 79,7%), experience (47,7%, 77,6%), modernity (following trends- 33,3%, 56,6%), elegance (31,1%, 56,1%), attractiveness (26,4%, 46,7%); beauty, which is the lowest when it comes to its relative values (29,5%, 43,3%). So, according to the range, the examinees have given scores higher than 7.5 to the following characteristics: professionalism (8.62), intelligence (8.39) and experience (8.30), and lower scores have been given to the following characteristics: modernity (7.19) and elegance (7.15), and the lowest score is given to attractiveness (6.42) and beauty (6.40). In order to define precisely which characteristics are the most important to the examinees, they have been given an additional question to choose two characteristics out of the whole set of characteristics, with the option: none of the above given characteristics can affect my buying decision (Table 7). In this way, by analyzing the examinees' statements (with the assumption that characteristics which overlap are excluded), the following characteristics have been separated by range: professionalism, attractiveness, elegance, beauty, modernity, intelligence and experience.

**Table 7.** *The choice of the examinees: two characteristics of famous tennis players*

|  | Number | Valid % | Cumulative % |
|--|--------|---------|--------------|
| <b>The choice of the examinees: the first out of two choseon ones</b>  |        |         |              |
| None   | 47     | 20,52   | 20,52        |
| Professionalism  | 54     | 23,59   | 44,11        |
| Attractiveness   | 43     | 18,78   | 62,89        |
| Elegance   | 38     | 16,59   | 79,48        |
| Beauty   | 23     | 10,04   | 89,52        |
| Modernity  | 14     | 6,11    | 95,63        |
| Intelligence   | 7      | 3,06    | 98,69        |
| Experience   | 3      | 1,31    | 100,0        |
| Total  | 229    | 100,0   |              |
| <b>The choice of the examinees: the second out of two choseon ones</b> |        |         |              |
| None   | 76     | 33,19   | 33,19        |
| Professionalism  | 40     | 17,47   | 50,66        |
| Intelligence   | 38     | 16,59   | 67,25        |
| Experience   | 29     | 12,66   | 79,91        |
| Elegance   | 18     | 7,86    | 87,77        |
| Modernity  | 17     | 7,42    | 95,19        |
| Beauty   | 11     | 4,81    | 100,0        |
| Total  | 229    | 100,0   |              |

The other characteristic in range is: professionalism, intelligence, experience, elegance, modernity and beauty. By crossexamining answers (total percentage), we can conclude that the list of priority characteristics of famous tennis players is the following: professionalism (42,5%); elegance (25,3%); intelligence (20,4%), attractiveness (19,5%), beauty (15,4%); experience (14,5%) and modernity (14,3%). This leads us to the conclusion that the examinees give certain characteristics to famous tennis players, but when they evaluate their own affinities- the results are different. In any of the above-mentioned cases, the most recognizable characteristics on the list are professionalism, intelligence, experience and elegance, which are marked by the highest number of the examinees > 56,1%. These are also the characteristics that give validity to famous athletes (tennis players) which is used for promotional purposes in various industries. Also, 36 examinees (16,3%) think that none of these characteristics can affect their decisions regarding buying a product. The examinees have described their qualitative statements in some words, for: 1/ N. Đoković: charisma and charm; honesty and justness; the best celebrity; his becoming mature in reactions; successful, humane, supreme tennis player, 2/ A. Ivanović: no luck in love, but great style; unobtrusiveness, subtlety; outer attraction, elegance and professionalism; I like beauty and professionalism, everything else is secondary, 3/ M. Sharapova: I would marry her (no given reason).

As the study of personality characteristics refers to specific male/female tennis player, the following ranking has been made out of 221 valid answers: 1/ N. Đoković (Serbia, number one, 16.150 points), 2/ R. Federer (Switzerland, number three, 7.015 points), and 3/ R. Nadal (Spain, number five, 5.675 points), which corresponds with ATP list ([www.atpworldtour.com/en/rankings/singles](http://www.atpworldtour.com/en/rankings/singles), 2016). When it comes to female tennis players whose names have been offered in the questionnaire, among the top ones on WTA list are: S. Williams (1; 9.030 points), M. Sharapova (23; 2.141 points), A. Ivanović (16; 2.560 points)... ([www.wtatennis.com/singles-rankings](http://www.wtatennis.com/singles-rankings), 2016). The examinees have chosen three best female tennis players, but not according to their competition rankings (A. Ivanović, M. Sharapova, S. Williams). It seems that some other marks had a bigger influence on the examinees than the results, primarily nationality, beauty, attraction, elegance, modernity... Even though she was ranked 23rd on WTA, M. Sharapova earned mostly from tennis tournaments (apart from unsurpassed R. Federer in competitions for men) and from endorsement (Badenhausen, 2013).

## DISCUSSION

All sport associations (regardless of the origin of their capital and ownership) included into mutual information system are characterized by: 1/ place (location)- they shape some kind of mutual base between families,

family connections - nation, government, market; 2/ interest - the members of these associations have mutual interests; 3/ organization (for example voluntary associations are initiated by private entities, by self-organization and it is implied that products bought by groups will be used by their members etc.); 4/ functions - these associations survive on sports market by combining functions: values (an organization is formed around certain values and norms), interests (an organization is formed around the process of creating services for its members) and services themselves. These elements of marketing management and information management system of sport are incorporated into society by the influence of the media more than in some other areas. Yiannakis (1989, 103) claims that sociology of sport significantly contributes to the development of sport marketing management by: 1/ conceptualization, design and implementation of market research regarding sport products; 2/ instrumental development; 3/ interpretation of a discovery by expansions (in advance and afterwards) and explaining the existing familiar base; 4/ the success of promoting by offering significant bases, especially regarding lifestyles; 5/ the development of general IT base (the characteristic of target markets); 6/ research and identification of new markets; 7/ introducing social orientation in organizations. The studies that are conducted are aimed at interpreting discoveries by expanding the existing bases of sport and cognition of lifestyles, especially the so-called sport style, which have a multifunctional usage in promotion and other areas.

Sport products are the most common products by which celebrities have an influence on the public (Dugalić, 2012, 59). The study results show that sport celebrities have the biggest influence on the examinees. This means that we can claim with 93% sureness that the inhabitants of Serbia prefer sport celebrities more than culture, entertainment (the media) and fashion celebrities. The reasons for this are most certainly supreme results achieved by Serbian tennis players in international competitions. The Serbian player N. Đoković is number one on ATP list with the highest number of points. The difference between him and the second player on the list A. Murray (who has not been mentioned by the examinees) is 7.715 points; and between him and the third player R. Federer is 9.135 points; which is greater difference than the points achieved by number five, R. Nadal, 10.475 ([www.atpworldtour.com/en/rankings/singles](http://www.atpworldtour.com/en/rankings/singles), 2016), while when it comes to female competitions, A. Ivanović is number 16, and J. Janković is number 26 ([www.wtatennis.com/singles-rankings](http://www.wtatennis.com/singles-rankings), 2016). According to Yiannakis (1989, 115), the influence of sociology of sport on marketing is interactive, due to the influence of system in market environment, by facing with consumer preferences, based on models and trends, their potential encounter with readiness of consumers to shop, cultural differences and their influence on buyers' decisions, and the fact that athletes shape tastes by their social values and attitudes, offering role models

and creating new appearance and preferences. Sport is a global phenomenon, and social relations, study of multicultural, population and job market become new specialist areas of sport theory (narrow area of social sciences), which will be even more significant in the future.

Famous athletes serve as role models due to their personality traits which are also important for promotion, apart from their sociological significance (Dugalić, 2013, 88). The scope of these traits gives the so-called stamp of validity to promotional messages, which created a special strategy known as celebrity endorsement which is scientifically explained by Kahle and Riley (2004, 109), Schwarz and Hunter (2008, 21), Katyal (2013) and Roll (2013). The usage of famous athletes in promotion has various effects (Mitrović, 2010), and the promoted products even carry certain risks (Daboll, 2011), which is why companies rather turn to sponsoring a sports event. However, if strategies are based on the research of the influence of famous athletes on consumers, as it has been explained in the paper, and if the principles of efficiency and effectiveness are applied as the basis of all rational, social and economic decisions, then certain benefits both for the company and for society can be expected. Furthermore, special social significance and popularity is given to those athletes who have humanitarian activities as UNICEF ambassadors ([www.unicef.rs/unicef-i-sport-165.html](http://www.unicef.rs/unicef-i-sport-165.html), 2016).

## CONCLUSION

Taking into consideration the study results, we can deny the starting hypothesis that there is no significant difference between different categories of examinees regarding the activities of celebrities who are role models. It is true that sport is an area to which celebrities belong and which has the biggest influence on the buying decisions of the examinees when compared to culture, fashion, entertainment and the media. The level of statistical significance  $\sigma = 0.006$  shows that in 95% the answers of the examinees who have evaluated sport are different based on their gender (it is assumed that men like sport more than women do). These differences in attitudes do not exist when it comes to categories of age and employment. The differences between groups who have chosen sport and fashion are statistically significant. The same level of significance ( $P < 0.05$ ) characterizes all main variables (gender, age and employment status), which describe fashion as an activity of celebrities. Inside these groups, there are statistically significant differences, and where there are not visible, the percentage is lower than 5%.

The highest average values are given to the statements that the chosen tennis players are pleasant and kind (3.77), that everyone would like to be friends with the chosen tennis player (3.59), and that their supporters are likeable (3.56). All examinees, regardless of gender, age and employment



status, have the same, very highlighted affinity to friendship with famous tennis players ( $P > 0.05$ ), which is understandable, having in mind their popularity. Studies have also shown that, among the examinees who play tennis, there are significant differences in attitudes of different gender and employment status ( $\sigma = 0.009$ ), and age ( $\sigma = 0.016$ ), as well as among those who try to copy the style of playing tennis from famous tennis players ( $\sigma = 0.005$  according to gender and  $\sigma = 0.035$  according to employment status). When evaluating characteristics of famous tennis players, the examinees mostly named professionalism (81.3%), intelligence (79.7%) and experience (77.6%) as those that form permanent values relevant to celebrities who appear in public. In the choice of two most important personality traits, the examinees have usually named: professionalism (absolutely and relatively highly scored characteristic) and intelligence, and then there are attractiveness and elegance.

The above-mentioned studies can help to explain the motives of examinees to prefer sport, tennis and celebrities. Apart from explaining the sociological basis of sport, the studies can also be implemented in management and sport marketing. Furthermore, the study results can help to create strategies by which the wrong choice of celebrities in endorsement will be minimal.

## REFERENCES

1. Agrawal, J. & W. A. Kamakura. (1995). The Economic Worth of Celebrity Endorsers: An Event Study Analysis, *Journal of Marketing*, 59: 56–62.
2. Anketa: *Promocija upotrebom lika sportista*, dostupno na: <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/11tu0IBoJOJSktL7ATS8ys9mTPTOmAZaIImy2yrp2fro/viewform>, 10. 7. 2014.
3. Badenhausen, K. *Federer, Sharapova Dominate 2013 List of the World's Top Earning Tennis Players*, dostupno na: [www.forbes.com/sites/kurtbadenhausen/2013/08/26/endorsements-fuel-the-worlds-highest-paid-tennis-players/](http://www.forbes.com/sites/kurtbadenhausen/2013/08/26/endorsements-fuel-the-worlds-highest-paid-tennis-players/), 26. 8. 2013.
4. Bakić, S. (1975). Sport i socijalizacija, *Sociološki pregled*, 1: 49-60.
5. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. Prentice Hall.
6. Bjelinić M. i K. Radulović (2015). *Naša zemlja ostvarila dominaciju kakvu svet ne pamti*, dostupno na: [www.kurir.rs/sport/ostali-sportovi/mnogo-smo-mocni-nema-jace-sile-od-srbije-clanak-1889213](http://www.kurir.rs/sport/ostali-sportovi/mnogo-smo-mocni-nema-jace-sile-od-srbije-clanak-1889213), 10. 8. 2015.
7. Daboll, P. (2011). *Celebrities in Advertising Are Almost Always a Big Waste of Money*, dostupno na: <http://adage.com/article/cmo-strategy/celebrities-ads-lead-greater-sales/148174/>, 29. 7. 2015.
8. Dugalić, S. (2012). Market and consumer research with respect to sports marketing, *Sport – Science & Practice*, Vol. 2 (5): 59-68.

9. Dugalić, S. (2013). Sports products and sports business. 9<sup>th</sup> *International Conference Management in Sport*. Belgrade: Faculty of Management in Sport. University Alpha & Olympic Comitee of Serbia. Proceeding, 2: 88-101.
10. Dugalić, S. & Ivić, J. (2015). Angažovanje slavnih sportista u promociji proizvoda i usluga [The Sport Celebrity Endorsement in Promotion of Products and Services], *Marketing*, 46 (3): 57-66.
11. Dugalić, S. (2015). Identification of the Auditorium with Successful Tennis Players, *Physical Culture*, 69 (2): 99-109.
12. Gidens, E. (2007). *Sociologija*. Beograd: Ekonomski fakultet.
13. Kahle, L. R. & Riley, C. (2004). *Sports Marketing and the Psychology of Marketing Communication*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
14. Katyal, S. *Impact of Celebrity Endorsement on Overall Brand*, dostupno na: [www.coolavenues.com/know/mktg/saurabh-celebrity-1.php](http://www.coolavenues.com/know/mktg/saurabh-celebrity-1.php), 2. 12. 2015.
15. Koković, D. (2000). *Sociologija sporta*. Beograd: Sportska akademija.
16. Krsmanović, V. (2006). *Sociologija sporta*. Beograd: Fakultet za menadžment u sportu.
17. Leadbeater, C. (1997). *Civic Spirit: The Big Idea for a New Political Era*. London: Demos.
18. Mitrović, U. (2010). *Marketing, sponzori i šampioni: trajna simbioza*, dostupno na: <https://umitrovic.wordpress.com/2010/08/18/marketing-sponzori-i-sampioni-trajna-simbioza/>, 25. 5. 2016.
19. Republički zavod za statistiku, *Statistički godišnjak RS*, 2014.
20. Roll, M. *Branding and Celebrity Endorsements*, dostupno na: [www.venturerepublic.com/resources/branding\\_celebrities\\_brand\\_endorsements\\_brand\\_leadership.asp](http://www.venturerepublic.com/resources/branding_celebrities_brand_endorsements_brand_leadership.asp), 5. 12. 2013.
21. Schwarz, E. C. & Hunter, J. D. (2008). *Advanced Theory and Practice in Sport Marketing*, Oxford: Elsevier Inc.
22. *Svetska muška teniska lista*, dostupno na: [www.atpworldtour.com/en/rankings/singles](http://www.atpworldtour.com/en/rankings/singles), 23. 5. 2016.
23. *Svetska ženska teniska lista*, dostupno na: [www.wtatennis.com/rankings](http://www.wtatennis.com/rankings), 23. 5. 2016.
24. *Unicef i sport*, dostupno na: [www.unicef.rs/unicef-i-sport-165.html](http://www.unicef.rs/unicef-i-sport-165.html), 23. 5. 2016.
25. Yiannakis, A. (1989). Some contribution of sport sociology to the marketing of sport and leisure organisations, *Journal of Sports Management*, 3: 103-115.