

# Review of: "Soccer fans, stadium attendance, and interpersonal trust in the Mexican population"

Guy deBrun<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> James Madison University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

In Soccer fans, stadium attendance, and interpersonal trust in the Mexican population the author investigates whether soccer fans who frequently attend matches in-person stadium show greater interpersonal trust than those who do regularly attend matches.

The language and writing mechanics are good and the structure of the paper is adequate. The author begins by introducing social capital as a construct. The general introduction of social capital is sufficient, with coverage of the types and elements of social capital.

The connection between social capital and sports could be improved in the introduction. Greater explanation and distinction between participation in sport as an athlete vs a spectator (fan) and the connection between trust would be helpful. For example it is unclear if the Pérez Flores & Muñoz Sánchez (2018) and Duarte Bajaña & Cáliz (2005) references refer to participation or spectatorship (second paragraph under Social capital and sport). How did Usalaner (1999) differentiate between athletes and spectators? This distinction (athlete vs. spectator) is important given that the author is attempting to investigate if there is a connection between stadium attendance and trust, more attention to this would be helpful. In addition, more explanation of why attendance at matches is thought to develop trust would strengthen the paper. What is it about attendance in-person that might develop trust? How is this different from simply following the team as a fan?

The author uses an instrument adapted Integrated questionnaire for the measurement of social capital by Grootaert et al. (2003). It is helpful that the authors note that evidence of validity of the instrument has been found. Example questions and the associated scoring from the instrument would be helpful. It is hard to differentiate questions that are on a 5-point from those on a 10-point scale. In addition, displaying Coefficient Alpha for the scores is good practice and should be reported here.

I have several points of consideration regarding the research questions, hypothesis, and methodology. The stated hypothesis is not what was tested. The hypotheses that those who usually attend the stadium to watch live soccer matches are more trusting than those who do not usually attend is unclear. What do you mean by "usually"? If you are testing a hypothesis you need to be clear which groups you are comparing. You never actually test this hypothesis. The closest you get is comparing those who do not support any team and those who say they are fans. However, this was not your hypothesis. In fact, the results related to the hypothesis are descriptive. Descriptive studies have value but it should

be made clear in the introduction if that is your goal.

There are some inconsistencies in the descriptors used in the survey that are problematic. First, it appears there is a confusing redundancy in the stadium attendance question. What is the difference between “Multiple games per season”, “Sometimes”, and “All or almost all of my team’s home games”? How would I answer if I attended 5 home games? Ten home games? It seems that quantifying the responses by total number of home and away games would be more clear. In the results you use terms like “those who attend several games..” and “people who usually attend” that are inconsistent with the descriptors in the table, this is confusing.

The author uses several t-tests, as noted the hypothesis is not tested. The data is primarily descriptive in nature. However, standard items such as the standard deviation are not displayed. Santesmases Mestre, (200) is cited but not listed in the references. It is unclear how the discussion of same-team trust supports the larger research questions.

Regression may be a better data analysis method for this research. The author could ask if stadium attendance predicts trust? An advantage to regression is that the researcher could control for age, gender, and any variables thought to influence trust in the model. The results would give a more clear picture of whether stadium attendance predicts trust over and above control variables.

This paper is interesting, has merit, and a solid literature review of social-capital. However, it suffers from an unclear hypothesis and data-analysis that do not support the research questions and hypothesis. The paper could be improved with more theoretical support for why stadium attendance would foster trust. In addition, improving the data by clarifying the survey questions (descriptors) and reporting Coefficient Alpha. Finally, the use of regression would provide a clearer answer to what the author is investigating.