

THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF SPORT

Jovan Bazić¹

¹Faculty of Teacher Training, University of Priština-Kosovska Mitrovica, Serbia

UDK 316.323

SUMMARY

In this paper we evaluated the basic viewpoints on the mutual relations between contemporary sport and society. Sport is a global social phenomenon which is determined by a variety of different processes, including: the fast development of the industrial society and capital, an increase in leisure time, the development of a liberal democracy and the media. A special feature in these relations is the overall globalization process in today's world. The basic structure of this paper is made up of two functional parts. In the first part we indicate the dominant theoretical-methodological paradigms in studying sport in social sciences, especially sociology: functionalism, conflict theory in society, interpretive and postmodern theory. In the second part of the paper we analyze the dialectics of contemporary relations between sport and society, where special attention is dedicated to the distribution of social power between sport, capital and the media at the local and global level. At the local level especially, there is a pronounced influence of politics on sport, which is realized through various mechanisms of government power, as well as other political subjects. The most solid bonds between sport and society on both levels are maintained by capital and the media, which know no boundaries. Through ownership and mechanisms of financing sports clubs and associations, athletes and athletic events, an entire network of capitalist relations in sport was created. Sport has become one of the most important factors of television programs, the internet and social networks, which has led to an enormous growth in profit and popularity of sport, but also to great changes in the social relations between people.

Key words: society, sport, capital, politics, the media, globalization.

Correspondence author

Jovan Bazić
jovan.bazic@pr.ac.rs

INTRODUCTION

Sport is a multi-dimensional and complex global social phenomenon. There are numerous and very different theoretical determinations of sport in which we start from various criteria of how it is understood, but, in essence, sport is an institutionalized game in which the result is the point of the game. Sport is a civilizational cultural heritage, and the connections between sport and society are very complex. We can see various social aspects in sport: political, economic, cultural, anthropological, psychological, pedagogical, esthetic and legal. In addition, in sport we can note some other dimensions such as: the biological, medical and technical. Sport has long ago become a great challenge for researchers in social sciences, especially for sociologists. The first studies on sport as a socio-cultural phenomenon, and the social essence of sport, emerged back in the beginning of the 20th century (H. Stenner, *Sport and culture*, 1910; and A. Rissea, *Sociology of sport*, 1921). Already by 1960 approximately 800 publications on sport as a social phenomenon were published,¹ and later even more. In the studies on the relationship between sport and society during the 20th century, most attention was given to research into sport as a relatively autonomous social sub-system and the social functions of sport. Today the connections between sport and society are much more complex and they are an incessant source for studying the connection between sport and global society, and their mutual dependence on global economy and capital, political structures and ideologies, the cultural icons and sub-cultures, the interest of a lazy society, quick technological and social changes, highly-sophisticated means of mass communication, social networks and violence. And some authors ascribe a quasi-religious character to sport.²

The goal of this paper is not to offer wholesome responses to all the cited questions, nor to by abstracting the complex structure of the connections between sport and modern society, offer another general narration, but instead to, through a qualitative dialectic analysis make a cross-section and indicate two key questions which are often overlooked in many studies. The first is to indicate the dominant paradigms of contemporary theoretical viewpoints on the relationship between sport and society; and the second, to analyze the dialectics of the relationship between sport, politics and capital at the local and global level. That is

¹ Zoran Žugić & Krešimir Delija. „Sociologija športa kao multiparadigmatska znanost: između scijentizma i novih spoznaja“. *Revija za sociologiju*. 38 (1997), 1-2, 83.

² Ljubodrag Simonović. *Filozofski aspekti modernog olimpizma* (Beograd: Lorka, 2001), 9.

why the analyses in this paper are based on the theoretical analysis of the relevant literature on the relations between sport and society, as well as one's own understanding of these relations.

THEORETICAL PARADIGMS OF CONTEMPORARY VIEWS ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN SPORT AND SOCIETY

The basic theoretical paradigms within which we analyzed the relations between global society and sport as its sub-system or sport as a global social phenomenon are mostly reduced to: functionalism, the conflict, interpretive and postmodern paradigm. However, some authors like Graham Scambler ascribe great significance to: feminist theories which deal with gender in society, where there is a clear indication of the subjugation of women in sport; as well as figurational sociology, which deals with questions of mutual dependence among people and the role of social coercion in the increase of public control in society, and thus in sport.³ Furthermore, even our eminent sport sociologist, professor Koković, points to an even broader spectrum of theoretical approaches to studying sport, such as: the social-historical, analytical, structuralist, phenomenological and interactionist approach.⁴ All these theoretical paradigms are relevant for the analysis of various aspects of the relations between sport and society, but, at the same time, they are subject to criticism which abounds in sociological literature. On this occasion, criticism is abstracted so that we could as honestly as possible indicate the idiosyncrasies of the basic paradigms.

Functionalism is a dominant theoretical paradigm in sociology. Its roots stem from Comte and the beginning of the 19th century, and then through the work of Durkheim to Parsons and Merton in the second half of the 20th century. In the functionalism, the theoretical-methodological approach sport is determined as a factor of the social and cultural system. The holistic approach, which consists of functionalism, helped sociologists to consider sport as a social institution and "to deal with sport as a reflection of the overall society and its complex relations with other institutions in more detail".⁵ That is why, according to Scambler, "several analysts appropriated Durkheim's perspective that sport can best be understood

³ Grejiam Skembler. *Sport i društvo: istorija, moć i kultura* (Beograd: Clio, 2007), 247-256.

⁴ Dragan Koković. *Sociologija sporta* (Beograd: Sportska akademija, 2000), 35-41.

⁵ John W. Loy and Douglas Booth. "Functionalism, sport and society". In Jay Coakley and Eric Dunning (eds), *Handbook of Sports Studies* (London: Sage, 2000), 14.

as a symbolic overview of the social and personal identity".⁶ In that context, even Maguire indicates that sport might inspire a sense of "holiness" and that sports teams might be accepted as "totems" since sport is surrounded by many rituals and taboos.

The opening and closing ceremonies, the awards ceremonies, ritual handshakes with the opponent or a bow in his direction, jerseys, symbols of fame and trophy chambers celebrating the winners or heroes and heroines of the past, all this indicates the holiness of sport.⁷

The rituals and taboos which are a constituent part of sports activities, according to some of Durkheim's followers shed light on society and the social order for the individual, shape the experience of the past, present and future. Functionalism, especially structural functionalism, was most present in the sociology of sport during the 1960s and 1970s, preceded by Parsons and Merton. They set the foundations for most of the basic analyses of sport. Starting from Parson's general theory of action, Kalevi Heinilä presented "football as a social system". According to Scambler, Heinilä claims that the rules of football "fit quite well into Parson's functional preconditions and imperatives". This can be explained in the following way: "the rules of training are in the function of adaptation, the technical rules of football improve the realization of goals; the rules of judging contribute to integration; and the rules of competition and selection fulfill the conditions for latency, that is, pattern maintenance".⁸ This one, like other "microfunctionalist" studies, indicates how certain sports, including sport in general, represent social systems. From the standpoint of the role of sport in society, the analyses of Günther Lüschen which have proven to be quite relevant, are, at the same time, founded in Parson's functionalism. Lüschen's basic premise is that in "non-learned cultures" the role of sport was universal, religious and oriented towards the community, while exercise was considered to be good preparation for warfare, while in contemporary society sport played the biggest role in maintaining the cultural pattern and integration.⁹ Beginning with these considerations of Lüschen, Stevenson Christopher and John Nixon, according to Scambler, reached the conclusion that contemporary sport "has five basic functions":

⁶ G. Skempler. *Sport i društvo...*, 230-231.

⁷ Grant Jarvie and Joseph Maguire. *Sport and Leisure in Social Thought* (London: Routledge, 1994), 20.

⁸ G. Skempler. *Sport i društvo...*, 233.

⁹ Günther Lüschen. "The interdependence of sport and culture". *International Review of Sport Sociology*. 2, 1967, 127-142. Према: G. Skempler. *Sport i društvo...*, 234.

(1) the socio-emotional, as sport contributes to the maintenance of socio-psychological stability; (2) the function of socialization, since sport facilitates the transfer of cultural beliefs and norms; (3) the integrative function, as sport contributes to the harmonious integration of various individuals and groups; (4) the political function, as sport serves ideological needs; (5) the function of social mobility, as sport acts as a source of movement forward.¹⁰

The conflict paradigm finds its inspiration in Marx's theories of human potential and alienation, a capitalist means of production and historical materialism. This paradigm was then developed in a neo-Marxist theory and ideology. Hired labor in capitalism, to which Marx and his followers paid quite a great deal of attention, was a great inspiration to the considerations of the position of sport in capitalism beginning with the end of the twenties century. Thus, Grant Jarvie and Joseph Maguire indicate that: "Athletes, teams, music stars and movie heroes and heroines work under the watchful eye of capitalists and the product of their work remains the property of the one who possesses the means of production".¹¹ As a result, in capitalism there is constant conflict between capitalists and workers. In that context, Jean-Marie Brohm pointed out that, from a social standpoint, sport can only be understood as an expression of interest in imperialist capital, and as an example of that he cites the Olympic Games. Brohm sees sport as a rational organization of human achievement, and that with the help of sport the maximum is exerted from the human body.¹² Like Brohm, Bero Rigauer indicates that sport under the conditions of industrial capitalism is a constituent part of the superstructure (culture and ideology) and that it reproduces all the features of social behavior that is built into the capitalist organized processes of work, marketing, rationalization, scientific research, communication and socialization. Then, "on the one hand, the central ideological function of sport consists of transfer based on founded (economic) superstructural relations and the mutual dependence into the actual life of society. On the other hand, its purpose is to, in an ideological way, obfuscate structural correspondence and thus enable its existence as a socially independent field".¹³ In the relation between sport and capital, John Hargreaves sees a hegemony of capital and indicates that such a relation might take on various forms: (1) the

¹⁰ G. Skembler. *Sport i društvo...*, 234.

¹¹ G. Jarvie and J. Maguire. *Sport and Leisure...*, 92.

¹² See: G. Skembler. *Sport i društvo...*, 239.

¹³ Bero Rigauer. "Marxist theories". In Jay Coakley and Eric Dunning. (eds) *Handbook of Sports Studies* (London: Sage, 2000), 41-42.

desire to achieve as great a profit as possible; (2) sports which cannot make a profit, in order to survive, obtains money from the local community; (3) sport can stimulate the indirect input of capital, as in the case when there is a market opening in which goods and services can be sold (sports equipment, betting shops, etc.); (4) the contribution of sport to the indirect accumulation of capital by the creation of the possibility of advertising and making sponsorship contracts; and (5) sport can attract investments behind which there are no economic reasons, when, for example, the directors of football clubs strive for prestige or entertainment.¹⁴ We should bear in mind that the economic and non-economic motives which Hargreaves points to often intertwine and that they can exist simultaneously.

The interpretive paradigm is directly connected with the driving force, and so some theoreticians consider that sociology of sport is dominated by this paradigm.¹⁵ The interpretive paradigm originates from Webber's thoughts on the subject matter of sociology, according to which the goal of sociology was to understand social activities so as to determine the cause-effect reasons for the direction and effects of the action. What stems from it is that as action is social if the one who participates in it and who gives it a subjective sense takes into consideration the behavior of others and in that way manages to "focus its direction". These ideas are contained in Heinrich Rickert's neo-Kantian philosophy and were applied to the study of the relation between society and sport in the work of Peter Donnelly, Allen Guttmann and others. Guttmann, starting from Webbers' ideas on the difference between traditional and contemporary society, developed a model of the relationship between sport and society as a relationship between a microcosm in which we can recognize the characteristics of a macrocosm, and they include: secularism, equality, specialization, rationalism, bureaucratic organization and quantification. In addition to these shared characteristics, Guttmann added striving for records to sport. All of these elements of contemporary social order are systematically tied and mutually dependent.¹⁶ In the light of interpretive sociology, in addition to studies on sport, cultural studies were developed as well, whose influence on sport was quite significant, and where, according to Donnelly, sports sub-cultures and socialization dominated. The main topic of sports sub-cultures was the evaluation of sports careers in social circumstances, and then changed patterns of social development and

¹⁴ G. Skemler. *Sport i društvo...*, 240-241.

¹⁵ Peter Donnelly. "Interpretive approaches to the sociology of sport". In Jay Coakley and Eric Dunning. (eds) *Handbook of Sports Studies* (London: Sage, 2000), 85.

¹⁶ Allen Guttmann. *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 80-81.

hooliganism. When analyzing the relations between socialization and sport, studies were carried out on the motives of English teenagers based on which they, upon completing their education, continue or stop taking part in sport; and how wives and mothers are affected by their husbands' and children's playing tennis.¹⁷

The postmodern paradigm is based on the theories which emerged towards the end of the 20th century, first in the circle of the French poststructuralists, as an expression of an attempt to seek new theoretical responses to the problems of contemporary society and the simultaneous criticism of the widespread construal of society.¹⁸ The men usually referred to as the forefathers of these ideas include Jean-François Lyotard, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and Jean Baudrillard. In the beginning they were interested in the function of language and the extralinguistic reality by means of language, which was inherited directly from the structuralists, and then they focused on the criticism of traditional philosophical, especially Marxist, viewpoints on many social issues. In the case of the postmodernists, relativity was established as the central paradigm, which is why it is understandable that the definition of postmodernism is that it is a "mixture of deliberately vague and fluid ideas".¹⁹ The views of Geneviève Rail on the connection between sport and postmodernism are very interesting.²⁰ She states three theses on the topic. The first one indicates the "implosion of art and sport", since postmodern art, as she says, has become fragmentary and ironic, which at the same time includes "high" and "low" culture. What has also become a part of that art are the "television kaleidoscopic mosaics, generally known characters and various symbols of consumer capitalism". As a result, sport, along with its signs and symbols, has taken on the features of art. On the other hand, at the same time sport implements and reproduces postmodern art and esthetic forms and becomes a means of hyperconsumption. In her second thesis Rail indicates the "implosion of the body and sport", where she points out that the body will "disappear under the burden of social forces" until people are able to renew their own selves which have been "lost in the culture and structures of modern times". In that context she indicates that the limbs of athletes are only an extension of their personality and identity and that they "undergo a process of alienation and

¹⁷ G. Skembler. *Sport i društvo...*, 246.

¹⁸ Ljubiša R. Mitrović. *Tvorci novih paradigmi u sociologiji* (Beograd: Institut za političke studije, 2008), 79.

¹⁹ Geneviève Rail. "Postmodernism and sport studies". In Joseph Maguire and Kevin Young, (eds) *Theory, Sport and Society* (London: Elsevier, 2002), 180.

²⁰ Geneviève Rail. "Seismography of the postmodern condition: three theses on the implosion of sport". In Geneviève Rail. (ed.) *Sport and Postmodern Times* (New York: State of New York Press, 1988), 155-156.

become the object of excessive commodification". And the third thesis she defined as "the implosion of personalities and sport". Here Rail indicates that the modern model, which is used in the mediation of sport, improves culture thanks to the fact that it is "opposed to mediation", since it encourages fetishism, esthetic popularism, fragmentation, shallowness and "wipes away the history which we find in postmodern culture".²¹ From these hypotheses, as well as other similar considerations, we can see that the postmodern approaches promote relativization and reevaluation of many ideas and conceptions which are rooted in enlightened culture and sport.

DIALECTICS OF CONTEMPORARY RELATIONS BETWEEN SPORT AND SOCIETY

The game of power between sport, politics and capital makes up the essence of the relations and processes between sport and contemporary society. What we are predominantly referring to is social power which in sport is most explicitly expressed through the symbiosis of political and economic power. Political power, ever since Thomas Hobbes has been understood as the ability to realize certain policies despite possible resistance.²² This is why political power is expressed as the energy of government and authority, which is mostly organized by and strongly manifested through the state. In addition, economic power is also a form of social power, but its sources are to be found in capital, that is, material wealth and property.²³ The energy of economic power manifests itself in the process of acquiring and placing capital in the function of its increase and the creation of profit. The basic interactions between sport and society function through the triad of sport, political power and capital, as do their derivatives which originate from these relations. These interactions, or to be more precise, dialectical relations between sport and society are expressed at the local and global level of their mutual relations, and they are most strongly bound by capital, since it knows no boundaries. The mass media are protruding more and more into this coordinate system, which profiles the sports environment and creates new cultural patterns.

²¹ Ibidem.

²² For more information see: Jovan Bazić & Mihailo Pešić. *Sociologija* (Leposavić: Učiteljski fakultet u Prizrenu-Leposavić, 2012), 302-305.

²³ Rajko Kulić & Dragan Koković. *Društvo i sport: sociologija i sociologija sporta* (Novi Sad: Old commerce, 2009), 272-274.

At the local, that is, state level of relations between sport and society, which function within their mutual interactions and very complex relations, the influence of politics, capital and sport are especially emphasized. The influence of the state is realized during the process of defining and focusing certain policies in order to realize ideologically shaped social interests and goals in sport. The ideas and concepts of such policies are changeable, both due to changes in the social needs and goals, and also due to changes in the government. Every new government carries with it a certain ideological concept of understanding social needs, interests and views of political goals of the state in which it is trying to realize them. For their realization the state provides various mechanisms: (1) a normative organization (a constitution, laws, and by-laws); (2) financing sport (from the state budget and income of the local communities); (3) building sports facilities and providing various conditions for sports activities (spatial, technical, material, etc.); (4) providing educational curricula and creating conditions for school sport; and (5) the direct involvement of politicians in sport (membership on boards of clubs and sports associations).²⁴

Apart from these direct influences, the state can also indirectly influence sport through promoting positive social values, such as: preserving health and nurturing a healthy lifestyle, nurturing the competitive and team spirit, educating children and the young in accordance with sports ethics, etc. Basically, by promoting these values and the systematic endeavors to include them in the behavior of young people, what we are dealing with is an instrumentalization of sport in the process of socialization and its reduction to political socialization, which is of great importance for the formation of political awareness and for building political unity in the state. In the complex process of political socialization, interest in sport is acquired, it develops and changes under the influence of many agents (the family, school, peer groups, the media, clubs and various sports organizations, sports events and fan groups). Political cohesion is the crucial issue of all the forms of political organization, and what most directly depends on it is the strength and firmness of political loyalty, especially towards the state and nation. Sport significantly encourages a patriotic mood and influences the strengthening of political cohesion through various forms and content, including: (1) the success achieved by athletes at international competitions, as well as any accompanying manifestations which are organized during these occasions (congratulations given from the representatives of government and their receiving the athletes in public, a public celebration of success, great media attention, etc.); (2) sports championships and competitions

²⁴ Jovan R. Bazić, Veroljub S. Stanković & Petar D. Pavlović. „Studenti o politici i nacionalnoj identifikaciji u sportu“, *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini*. 44, 2 (2014), 28.

at the national level and establishing connections between sports clubs and fans; (3) various sports parades and ceremonies, where intonation and singing of the state anthems takes the central spot; (4) public speeches made by athletes and their messages to the media; and (5) direct inclusion of athletes in politics (in political parties and their reaching important functions in state organizations), where they with their authority and personal success consolidate the legitimacy of the government, encourage patriotism and remind us of national unity.²⁵ In the processes of socialization and the building of political cohesion, through sports activities and because of them, as well as in their future co-functioning and conflict, a sports culture is made along with different cultural patterns which are characteristic for certain political communities. This is why sport represents a mobilization force and makes up a constituent part of ideological structure. In addition to the state, various social organizations and association influence sport,²⁶ as well as local communities and the mass media.

Sports competitions, especially football games, often become the ground on which reflections of the social-political events and turmoil, as signs of protest or support for a certain type of politics are manifested through: the audience chanting and singing, shouting out slogans, waving flags, etc. That is why the meeting place of politics and sport in everyday life is clear even in fan groups, which make up a specific sub-cultural system where we find the manifestation of various feelings and types of behavior (patriotism, nationalism, racism, hooliganism and violence). These occurrences are most pronounced in times of crisis and in societies with an unstable political climate. On the other hand, sports events are increasingly dominated by the interests of politics and business. This decreases the point of a competition, during which sports values were meant to be expressed (freedom, courage, spontaneity, skill, self-initiative, solidarity, respect for the opponent) and the unpredictability of the outcome, from which stems the true satisfaction and desire for new challenges. Thus, bearing in mind that sport is suitable for influencing the masses, youth and culture, politics often expresses all its power through the instrumentalization of sport and its own affirmation, the building of stability in society and control of social processes and events.

Capital in sport is the bloodline in contemporary relations between sport and society. At the same time, capital is the strongest bond between sport and society at the local and global level, since it knows no spatial, state, temporal or

²⁵ Veroljub Stanković i Jovan Bazić. „Studenti, sport i politika“. *Teme*. 37, 2 (2013): 845-846.

²⁶ For more information see: Sandra Radenović. *Sport i društvo: sociologija sa sociologijom sporta, sociologija sporta* (Beograd: Fakultet sporta i fizičkog vaspitanja, 2017), 111-113.

any other type of boundary. Capital has its own logic of continuous increase and the constant search for space where this generic function will most optimally be performed. During the twentieth century, and especially in the globalized world of “disorganized capitalism” sport and capital were quickly recognized, and made sense of their joint existence. Through ownership and the mechanisms of financing sports clubs, athletes and sports events, an entire network of capitalist relations in something that is increasingly more often recognized as “the sports industry”.²⁷ The value of this industry in 2011 was estimated at 450 billion euros and the market of sports equipment at 135 billion euros.²⁸ Their value is constantly increasing and the media play an important role in it, which by advertising products of the biggest world brands during sports competitions, significantly influence their sales and acquisition of profit, as well as the increased development of these companies.

At the global level the relations between sport and society function all over the planet and break all the state and other local frameworks, where the mutual influence of capital, the media, politics and sport are particularly emphasized. The basic relation is that of mutual dependence of sport and the global economy and capital, quick technological changes, highly sophisticated mass-media communication, social networks, global ideologies (democracy, pacifism, feminism, human rights, etc.). This can best be seen, in its pure form, through the development of the modern Olympic Games, which are a synonym for the globalization of sport, and then through the development of international tournaments (world championships, Universiades, various continental championships, tennis tournaments, athletic marathons in metropolises, etc.). All the global sports events are dominated by capital, which like an amalgam binds and determines all the social relations in sport. Capital recognized the immanent desire for achieving exceptionality and the best possible results in sport as an exceptional opportunity for growth, and turned sport into the most profitable area in which increasing profit is readily available. That is why it seems that Scambler was right when he said that “sport is not longer a part of capitalism, but instead capitalism is a part of sport”.²⁹

The revival of the Olympic Games historically corresponds with the imperialist phase of capitalism, established liberalism and rapid technological changes which were generated by the second phase of the industrial revolution.

²⁷ Igor Radošević, Bojana Ostojić & Ana Gavrilović. „Izvori finansiranja u sportskoj industriji“. *Vojno delo*. 3 (2016): 255-264.

²⁸ Ibidem, 255.

²⁹ G. Skembler. *Sport i društvo...*, 8.

Furthermore, on the eve of the revival of the Olympic Games, in the second half of the nineteenth century, processes which made a very relevant contribution to the globalization of sport clearly emerged in English sport: (1) a codification of the rules in many sports was carried out, so that football, rugby, tennis and track and field “took on their current form”; (2) English sport underwent an expansion on the European and American continent; and (3) national and then international sports associations began to be founded at the beginning of the twentieth century.³⁰ In that context, what is quite interesting are the conclusions of Guttmann where he indicates that the spreading of contemporary sport and the tempo of industrialization are closely bound together, which could clearly be seen in the first five most industrially developed industrial countries at the time (Great Britain, France, USA, Germany and Sweden).³¹ Which is why Simonović was right to point out that contemporary sport “emerged with the development of industrial capitalism“ and „from their very beginnings was tied with the mechanisms of investment, circulation and increase of capital“:

When capital entered its final phase of development (“the consumer society”), the complete commercialization of sport took place: instead of national flags, the Olympic Games were dominated by the logos of capitalist companies. Instead of *religio athletae*, the spirit of money reigned; instead of a “church”, the Olympic Games became a “fairground”; instead of being the manifestation of “holiness” of Olympic ideals, athletes are “circus gladiators”; instead of the gentlemen from the IOC being “the keepers of the Olympian spirit”, they have become unscrupulous traders who have turned the Olympic Games into a dirty “business” worth billions of dollars.³²

Already on the occasion of the organization of the Olympic Games all the elements emerged which would later accompany these games, and what was established was a basic matrix of relations between sport and society. With a strong political and financial support of rich countries, the International Olympic Committee was formed (1894), and soon after the first Olympic Games in the new era were held (Athens, 1896). Since then it is possible to recognize the influence of politics in sport, through political conditioning and boycott of the games for political reasons, the promotion of political regimes and ideologies, the promotion of symbolic features of politics (the anthem, flag, a coat of arms). In that context, what is interesting is the conclusion of William J. Baker, who indicates that the “contemporary Olympic Games were from the beginning accompanied by war

³⁰ For more information see: G. Scambler. *Sport i društvo...*, 51-83.

³¹ A. Guttmann. *From Ritual to Record...*, 61-62.

³² Lj. Simonović. *Filozofski aspekti...*, 14.

flags, military marches, patriotic songs and nationalistic rivalry³³. Later, with the development of society and profitable relations in sport, technological innovations, the sports industry and the media, the Olympic matrix was perfected and introduced into other international competitions, when other political occurrences emerged (racism, nationalism, boycott, sanctions, etc.). The most important role in that was played by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) which was from the start tied to the political elites of the most developed countries in the world and which nurtured the values of a capitalist society. Later all the international sports associations, no matter how much they represented sports interests, through various mechanisms, expressed a global politics and economic power which they used to profile sport, as well as the ties and relations which were established between sport and society.³⁴

A very important role was played by the media in the globalization of sport, in the beginning by the press and radio, and then television and the internet. By selling the rights to televise live broadcasts of the Olympic Games, from 1960 there has been a continued inflow of vast capital into sport.³⁵ The sales of rights to broadcasting games is of a more recent date, but their part in sport is growing increasingly, so much so that only in the budget of the International Olympic Committee do they make up as much as 53 percent of the overall income.³⁶ As a result, sport is becoming increasingly more present in the media, which led to the emergence of television channels meant solely for sport. At the same time, sponsorship is developing at an increasingly rapid rate, as an exceptionally significant form of capital placement in contemporary sport. It was the multinational companies that produce sports equipment that first saw their role in this. This is why they are in a constant rush to get involved in various types of sport and with elite athletes in various disciplines who will wear their brand name. All this leads to a chain reaction, and so the media and capital take over a key role, not only in international competitions, but also national tournaments

³³ William J. Baker. *Sports in the Western World* (Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield, 1982), 251.

³⁴ Today, in addition to the International Olympic Committee, the following associations also function: 18 different Olympic organizations; 66 international sports federations; 34 European sports federations, as well as many other federations on other continents; and 25 different professional and other organizations which are directly tied to sport. (This information is available on the website *Adresar sporta Republike Srbije*: <http://www.adresarsporta.rs/index.php/medunarodni-linkovi>, accessed on 15.01.2018).

³⁵ From the first sales to the rights to televise the Olympic Games in Rome (1960) which cost 400 thousand dollars, the price later grew exponentially, in order for approximately 7,4 billion dollars to be paid for the rights to televise the Games in Rio de Janeiro. According to: Jelena R. Ilić, Veroljub S. Stanković & Ivan B. Petrović. „Mediji i sport - mogu li jedni bez drugih“, *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini*. 46, 2 (2016), 107.

³⁶ I. Radošević, B. Ostojić & A. Gavrilović. *Izvori finansiranja...*, 261.

and in various leagues. This is how sport has become the main part of television programs, which has led to the increased publicity of sports competitions and athletes, as well as the creation of sports idols but, at the same time, the increase in the profit from commercials during the broadcasting of sports events, the increase in the price of sponsorship deals, earnings at betting shops, the manufacture of video games which simulate various types of sport, etc. This has led to sport becoming an easy, cheap and available means of entertainment. In addition, television broadcasts of sports events influence the promotion of new technologies in sport, the discovery of new tourist destinations, the increase in safety risks, but also planetary changes in the social relations among people. This can clearly be seen among young people, their interests, and their behavior in accordance with the new cultural patterns which are imposed by television and sport.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Sport is a civilizational cultural heritage, and the ties between sport and society are very complex. Sport contains various social aspects: political, economic, cultural, anthropological, psychological, pedagogical, esthetic and legal. Also, sport is a global social phenomenon which is determined by numerous processes, which are dominated by: the development of the industrial and liberal society, the growth of capital and free time, the development of democracy and the media, as well as the overall globalization processes in the modern world. The relations between sport and society are very complex and they are an unending source of study of the connection between sport and global society and its mutual dependence on the global economy and capital, political structures and cultural icons and sub-cultures, the interests of a lazy society which strives towards pleasure and extensive consumption, highly-sophisticated means of mass media communication, social networks and violence.

The dominant theoretical-methodological paradigms, within which we evaluated the relations between the global society and sport as its sub-system or sport as a global social phenomenon include: *functionalism*, where sport is determined as a factor of the social and cultural system, and so in that context its role in society is analyzed as well; *the conflict paradigm*, in which sport is primarily seen as a constituent part of the superstructure of society and as such reproduces all the features of social behavior which are built into the capitalist work process; *the interpretive paradigm*, which recognizes in sport all the characteristics of contemporary society (secularism, equality, specialization, rationalism, a bureaucratic organization, quantification, but also a striving for records); and *postmodernism*, which relativizes the relations between sport and

society and questions many of the ideas and concepts which are rooted in the culture of enlightenment and sport.

From the standpoint of a dialectic approach to the social aspects of sport, it could be concluded that the essence of the relations and processes between sport and contemporary society is made up of the game of power between sport, politics and capital. What is at stake here is a social power which in sport is most explicitly expressed through a symbiosis of political and economic power. The mass media are penetrating this coordinate system more frequently, profiling the sport environment and creating new cultural patterns. The basic social relations in sport function between sport, political power and capital, as do their derivatives which stem from these relations.

At the local level of the relations between sport and society, what is especially emphasized is the *influence* of the state on sport, which is visible through: (1) defining and realizing politics in sport in order to achieve certain social interests and goals (the normative organization of sport, financing and providing various conditions for sports activities); (2) designing educational curricula, ideological profiling of school sport and the creation of the necessary conditions for its development; (3) direct involvement of politicians in sport; and (4) the indirect influence on sport through the promotion of positive social values (the education of children and youths in accordance with sports ethics and ruling ideological patterns). Except for the state, various social organizations and associations also influence sport (political parties, non-government organizations, interest groups, fan groups, etc.), local communities and the media.

Capital represents the bloodline of sport in contemporary relations between sport and society. It is the most solid connection between sport and society at the local and global level, since it knows no spatial, state, temporal or any other type of boundary. This, in its purest form, is most easily seen in the development of the modern Olympic Games, which are a synonym for the globalization of sport, and then in the development of other international tournaments. In the globalized world, sport and capital quickly found each other and found a purpose to their joint existence. Through ownership, trade and the mechanisms of financing sports clubs, athletes and sports events, an entire network of capitalist relations was created. The media played a very important part in that, in the beginning the press and the radio, and then later on television and the internet. Sport has become one of the most important factors on television programs, which has led to: an increase in profit from advertisements during broadcasts of sports events, an increase in the price of sponsorship deals and profits to be made at betting shops, the production of games which simulate various sports, etc. Thus, sport has become an easy, cheap and available type of entertainment. On the other hand, television broadcasts of sports events have led to: great publicity of sports competitions and athletes, the promotion of new

technologies and sports equipment companies, an increase in safety risks, but also to global changes in the social relations among people, expressed through the shaping of sports idols and sub-cultures, as well as the profiling of opinions and types of behavior in accordance with new cultural patterns. With the introduction of sport into television broadcasting, the internet and social networks, a great transition of sport from the sports fields to the world of the media and hyperreality has taken place, but also of people from the working world and freedom into the world of leisure and slavery to the multimedia screens and consumer dictates.

REFERENCES

1. Baker William J. *Sports in the Western World*. Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield, 1982.
2. Bazić Jovan, Pešić Mihailo. *Sociologija*. Leposavić: Učiteljski fakultet u Prizrenu-Leposavić, 2012.
3. Bazić R. Jovan, Stanković S. Veroljub, Pavlović D. Petar. „Studenti o politici i nacionalnoj identifikaciji u sportu“, *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini*. 44, 2 (2014): 25-46.
4. Donnelly Peter. „Interpretive approaches to the sociology of sport“, In Coakley Jay and Dunning Eric (eds). *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage, 2000.
5. Guttmann Allen. *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
6. Ilić R. Jelena, Stanković S. Veroljub, Petrović B. Ivan. „Mediji i sport - mogu li jedni bez drugih“, *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini*. 46, 2 (2016): 99-124.
7. Jarvie Grant, Maguire Joseph. *Sport and Leisure in Social Thought*. London: Routledge, 1994.
8. Kulić Rajko, Koković Dragan. *Društvo i sport: sociologija i sociologija sporta*. Novi Sad: Old commerce, 2009.
9. Koković Dragan. *Sociologija sporta*. Beograd: Sportska akademija, 2000.
10. Loy W. John, Douglas Booth. „Functionalism, sport and society“, In Coakley Jay and Dunning Eric (eds), *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage, 2000.
11. Lüschen Günther. „The interdependence of sport and culture“, *International Review of Sport Sociology*. 2 (1967): 127-142.
12. Mitrović R. Ljubiša. *Tvorci novih paradigmi u sociologiji*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije, 2008.
13. Radenović Sandra. *Sport i društvo: sociologija sa sociologijom sporta, sociologija sporta*. Beograd: Fakultet sporta i fizičkog vaspitanja, 2017.
14. Radošević Igor, Ostojić Bojana, Gavrilović Ana. „Izvori finansiranja u sportskoj industriji“. *Vojno delo*. 3 (2016): 255-264.
15. Rail Geneviève. „Postmodernism and sport studies“, In Maguire Joseph, Young Kevin, (eds). *Theorij, Sport and Society*. London: Elsevier, 2002: 179-210.
16. Rail Geneviève. „Seismography of the postmodern condition: three theses on the implosion of sport“. In Rail Geneviève (ed). *Sport and Postmodern Times*. New York: State of New York Press, 1988.

17. Rigauer Bero, „Marxist theories“. In Coakley Jay, Dunning Eric (eds). *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage, 2000.
18. Simonović Ljubodrag. *Filozofski aspekti modernog olimpizma*. Beograd: Lorka, 2001.
19. Skemblem Grejam. *Sport i društvo: istorija, moć i kultura*. Beograd: Clio, 2007.
20. Stanković Veroljub, Bazić Jovan. „Studenti, sport i politika“. *Teme*. 37, 2 (2013): 843-856.
21. Žugić Zoran, Delija Krešimir. „Sociologija športa kao multiparadigmatska znanost: između scijentizma i novih spoznaja“. *Revija za sociologiju*. 38, 1-2 (1997): 83-92.

INTERNET SITES

22. *Adresar sporta Republike Srbije*, <http://www.adresarsporta.rs/index.php/medunarodni-linkovi>, (accessed on 15.01.2018).

ДРУШТВЕНИ АСПЕКТИ СПОРТА

САЖЕТАК

У овом раду се разматрају основна гледишта о међусобним односима савременог спорта и друштва. Спорт је глобални друштвени феномен који је детерминисан мноштвом различитих процеса, као што су: убрзани развој индустријског друштва и капитала, повећање слободног времена, развој либералне демократије и медија. Посебно обележје у овим односима чине свеукупни глобализацијски процеси у данашњем свету. Основну структуру овог рада чине два функционална дела. У првом делу се указује на доминантне теоријско-методолошке парадигме у изучавању спорта у друштвеним наукама, особито у социологији: функционализам, конфликтне теорије о друштву, интерпретативне и постмодернистичке теорије. У другом делу рада се разматра дијалектика савремених односа између спорта и друштва, при чему се нарочита пажња посвећује дистрибуцији друштвене моћи између спорта, капитала, политике и медија на локалном и глобалном нивоу. На локалном нивоу, нарочито долази до изражаја утицај политике на спорт, који се остварује кроз различите механизме државне власти, као и других политичких субјеката. Најчвршће везе између спорта и друштва на оба нивоа одржавају капитал и медији, који не познају никакве границе. Кроз власништво и механизме финансирања спортских клубова и асоцијација, спортиста и спортских догађаја, створена је читава мрежа капиталистичких односа у спорту. Спорт је постао један од најважнијих чинилаца телевизијских програма, интернета и друштвених мрежа, што је довело до енормног раста профита и популарности спорта, али и до великих промена у социјалним односима међу људима.

Кључне речи: друштво, спорт, капитал, политика, медији, глобализација.

СОЦИАЛЬНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ СПОРТА

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье мы оценили основные точки зрения на взаимоотношения современного спорта и общества. Спорт - это глобальное социальное явление, которое определяется множеством различных процессов, в том числе: быстрым развитием индустриального общества и капитала, увеличением досуга, развитием либеральной демократии и средств массовой информации. Особенностью этих отношений является общий процесс глобализации в современном мире. Основная структура этой статьи состоит из двух функциональных частей. В первой части обозначены доминирующие теоретико-методологические парадигмы в изучении спорта в социальных науках, особенно социологии: функционализм, теория конфликтов в обществе, интерпретационная и постмодернистская теория. Во второй части статьи анализируется диалектика современных отношений между спортом и обществом, где особое внимание уделяется распределению социальной энергии между спортом, капиталом и СМИ на локальном и глобальном уровне. На местном уровне особенно ярко выражено влияние политики на спорт, которое реализуется через различные механизмы государственной власти, а также другие политические субъекты. Наиболее прочные связи между спортом и обществом на обоих уровнях поддерживаются капиталом и средствами массовой информации, которые не знают границ. Благодаря собственности и механизмам финансирования спортивных клубов и ассоциаций, спортсменов и спортивных мероприятий была создана целая сеть капиталистических связей в спорте. Спорт стал одним из важнейших факторов телевизионных программ, интернета и социальных сетей, что привело к колоссальному росту прибыли и популярности спорта, а также к большим изменениям в социальных отношениях между людьми.

Ключевые слова: общество, спорт, капитал, политика, СМИ, глобализация.

Received on 18.01.2018.

Accepted on 19.02.2018.