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Introduction

• Over 40 years of Sport for All policies

• Sport as an instrument?
  o Health
  o Social gains
  o Educational advantages
  o Psychological benefits
  o ...

• Sport as a social right
  o European Sports for All charter
  o UN International charter of Physical Education and Sport
Has adolescents’ participation in organized sports democratised during last decades?
→ Time comparison

→ Focus on adolescents (secondary school)

→ Club sport

→ Flanders
Literature

• Gender differences, but diminishing
• Negative effect of age
• Socio-economic status
  o Ambivalent
  o Context?

• Few studies comparing over time
  o Contradictory findings
Theoretical framework

• Bourdieu's cultural reproduction theory


• Emancipation of women
Data

• Study on Movement Activities in Flanders (1969-...)
• Every ten years
• Two-stage sampling (schools; students)
• In this study:
  o 1989 (N=2088)
  o 1999 (N=1820)
  o 2009 (N=1420)
Method

• Multilevel logistic regression
  o Design effect?
  o Small number of schools (13 to 21) → individual level only
Variables

• **Dependent variable: club participation**
  - Yes/no
  - Last 12 months

• **Predictors**
  - Gender
  - Age
  - SES of the family (education & socio-professional status)
  - Currents sports participation of the parents
  - Club experience of the parents
  - Degree of urbanization
Club participation: evolution over time

Source: Scheerder et al., 2013
## Results (in odds ratios) – per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.94***</td>
<td>0.89***</td>
<td>0.90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club experience parents</td>
<td>2.1***</td>
<td>2.1***</td>
<td>2.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports participation parents</td>
<td>1.6***</td>
<td>1.4**</td>
<td>1.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>= boys + girls</td>
<td>= boys + girls</td>
<td>+ boys &amp; girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: girls</td>
<td>-, weaker with higher SES</td>
<td>-, weaker with higher SES</td>
<td>-, regardless of SES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results by checking interaction terms between predictor & year of measurement

→ Does the size of the effect vary in different measurements?

• Only the effect of gender and SES changed over time:
  o Interaction between gender and SES disappears
  o In 2009, overall effect of SES, regardless of gender
Summing up: evolution between 1989 – 2009?

• Status quo for the following determinants
  
  o **Age**: the older the adolescent, the less likely to partake in club organised sports
  o **Club experience of the parents**
    • Large differences!!
  o **Sports practice of the parents**
  o **No effect of degree of urbanization**
Summing up: evolution between 1989 – 2009?

- Differences:
  - SES previously affecting mainly girls
  - In 2009, SES also determining for boys
  - Gender effect itself has rather weakened
Current social stratification of adolescents’ sports participation: how large are the differences?
Adolescents’ sports participation by highest parental diploma (2009)

Source: Scheerder et al., 2013
Adolescents’ sports participation by parental income (2009)

Source: Scheerder et al., 2013
What do these results tell us? How do we go from here?
Discussion

• Problem of social justice
  o Benefits?
  o More prone to health problems and/or social exclusion
  o Scarring effect
  o ‘matthew effect’?

• Beyond preferences – inclusion/exclusion mechanisms at work

• Need for qualitative research – understanding
Implications

• Potential members...

• Beyond ‘how to get individuals into the clubs’
  Rather: how to address the needs of all adolescents?

→ adapting/Extending/differentiating club organized offer?

• Policy to support clubs?
• Levels of participation – boards?
Final remarks

• Reflection of society

• Rising social inequality (Nicaise, 2013)
Thank you for your attention!
Thank you for your attention!
Table 4. Multilevel regression results for adolescents’ participation in club-organized sports, per year of measurement (1989, 1999, 2009), in odds ratios (standard error)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>1.270*</td>
<td>1.564***</td>
<td>1.234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.142)</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (centered at 16)</strong></td>
<td>0.945*</td>
<td>0.891***</td>
<td>0.897***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.463***</td>
<td>0.610***</td>
<td>0.707**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES of the family</strong></td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>1.275*</td>
<td>1.519***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.081)</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
<td>(0.166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction female*SES</td>
<td>1.610***</td>
<td>1.349*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.206)</td>
<td>(0.176)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports practice of the parents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.550***</td>
<td>1.401**</td>
<td>1.429**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
<td>(0.164)</td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents’ experience with organized sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.093***</td>
<td>2.079***</td>
<td>2.641***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.244)</td>
<td>(0.386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance components</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>0.391***</td>
<td>0.238***</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraclass correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>