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Introduction

Purpose, methods and dissemination
Lack of evidence

‘There remains a lack of evidence to support policies in the area of social inclusion and volunteering in sport. To date there has been no systematic, cross-national study with a focus on the political conditions, economic and social implications and structural characteristics of sport associations, federations, clubs and other entities that promote social inclusion and volunteering in sport’.

Quote from ‘Document about sport as a platform for social inclusion through volunteering’. EU Permanent Representatives Committee, Brussels, 10 May 2017
To generate large-scale comparative data with the purpose

1. To increase our knowledge on
   - similarities and differences between countries,
   - sports clubs as vehicles for social integration,
   - the role of volunteering in sports clubs.

2. To inspire the development of ‘good practise’ in sports clubs
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Understanding Sports Clubs Development

Theoretical model

MEMBERS (micro level)
Personal characteristics, values and attitudes, interests etc.

SPORTS CLUBS (meso level)
Structural characteristics, tradition, resources, values, strategies, management etc.

SOCIETY (macro level)
Historical background, type of welfare state, political system, socio-economic environment, values etc.

Empirical data

Macro level
- ‘Structured expert descriptions’ of sports club policies and relevant historical roots and developments

Meso level
- Survey data from 35,000 sports clubs across Europe – from 600 in Norway and Poland to 20,000 in Germany
- 30 examples (clubs) of ‘good / interesting practice’

Micro level
- Survey data from 13,000 members and volunteers – from 450 in Spain to 3,100 in Denmark
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Here you can find information about SIVSCE

- Website: [http://www.sdu.dk/SIVSCE](http://www.sdu.dk/SIVSCE)

- Where you can sign up for our newsletter:
Sports clubs in Europe:
Participation, structure, organisation and values
Sports club participation in Europe

15 years and older

Eurobarometer 412: Sport and physical activity
European Commission, 2014
Common definition of a sports club

- Private, non-profit organisations
- Formally independent of the public sector
- The members participate voluntarily
- The decision-making structure is democratic
- The most important workforce is volunteering
- Primarily engaged in sports
Dimensions of sports clubs

1. The historical dimension: the age of clubs.

2. The contextual dimension: the degree of urbanisation.

3. The intentional dimension: the goals and activities in clubs.

4. The structural dimension: size and specialisation of clubs.

5. The resource dimension: the facilities and finances of clubs.

6. The democratic dimension: involvement in decision making
I. The historical dimension
(founding age, share of clubs)

---|---|---|---
Total - average | 21 | 31 | 11
Switzerland | 42 | 11 | 7
Germany | 34 | 13 | 7
Norway | 33 | 21 | 7
Netherlands | 28 | 22 | 7
Denmark | 26 | 22 | 7
England | 24 | 28 | 7
Belgium (Flanders) | 8 | 25 | 7
Hungary | 8 | 48 | 7
Poland | 4 | 64 | 7
Spain | 2 | 73 | 7
2. The contextual dimension
(community size, share of clubs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>&lt; 5000</th>
<th>5.000-20.000</th>
<th>20.000-100.000</th>
<th>&gt; 100.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - average</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The intentional dimension
(share of clubs that ‘totally agree’)

Our club sets high value on companionship and conviviality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - average</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The intentional dimension (share of clubs that ‘totally agree’)

Our club sets high value on sporting success and competition

- Total - average: 20
- Poland: 41
- Hungary: 35
- Spain: 22
- Switzerland: 19
- Netherlands: 19
- England: 18
- Belgium (Flanders): 13
- Denmark: 12
- Germany: 12
- Norway: 9
4. The structural dimension (number of members, share of clubs)

- Netherlands: 18%
- Norway: 19%
- Germany: 19%
- Belgium (Flanders): 35%
- Denmark: 27%
- England: 26%
- Switzerland: 44%
- Poland: 40%
- Hungary: 48%
- Spain: 53%
- Total - average: 32

Legend: < 51 51 - 300 301 - 500 > 500
4. The structural dimension
(single vs. multisport club, share of clubs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Multi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - average</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The ressource dimension

Direct public subsidies (proportion of revenue in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Subsidies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The resource dimension
(Possession and usage of facilities, share of clubs)
5. The resource dimension: Payment for use of public sports facilities

Liable to pay a usage fee (% clubs that use public facilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% Clubs Paying Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The democratic dimension:
‘Our club aims to involve members when making important decisions’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Don't agree at all</th>
<th>Don't agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flanders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORRELATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS
SIZE

AGE / HISTORY

POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY

STRUCTURE

CONTEXT

HISTORY

SPORTS TYPE
Point of awareness

Reflections and recommendations
Points of awareness

1. The countries can learn from each other, but it will not work to 'copy' another country's club system. Government policies, and the ability of the clubs to take advantage of them, have to be understood within their own political context (affected by history and tradition).

2. The development of local government policies has greater significance than policies at national level (typically involving national organizations)

3. Public support for sports clubs should take into account the very big differences between sports clubs

4. Volunteering and social integration in sports clubs are assumed to depend on the different organizational characteristics
Questions?
Additional slides
A: History matter

- Policies and organisational patterns have a tendency to continue, although the social conditions that led to the formation of the policies in many cases have changed
  - The popularity of different sports, how common it is to do sport in a club, the tradition for sport for all, how the public sector support sport clubs etc.
- In most of the ten countries, the role of sports clubs can be traced back to the formation of the sports system during the period after World War 2.
- In Spain, Hungary and Poland the sports system seems to be the result of a combination of the structures established under the authoritarian regimes after World War 2 and a change of organisational structures and policy governance in the years following a shift to democracy.
B: Policies matter

The limits and possibilities that the political system and the public sector provide:

- Differences in the welfare state principles and governance
  - How and how much the public sector support sports clubs
  - Access to sports facilities
  - Etc.
- Level of equality / inequality in society
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare state type</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sports club characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Liberal           | England | ▪ Average club size and age  
▪ Relative few clubs value ‘companionship and conviviality’ high  
▪ The big majority of the clubs pay a fee for the use of the public facilities, and public economic support to sports clubs is low.  |
| Conservative / Corporatist | Germany | ▪ Relatively few new sports clubs (not in Flanders), many big clubs in Germany and Netherlands, many small clubs in Flanders and Switzerland  
▪ Sporting success is valued relatively low and social values relatively high in Germany, Flanders and Switzerland  
▪ The lowest financial challenges are reported by sports clubs in Flanders, the Netherlands and Switzerland  |
| Social Democratic Universal | Norway | ▪ Have proportionally many large clubs and many new clubs  
▪ Sporting success is valued relatively low and social values relatively high  
▪ Relatively high public economic support and free access to facilities  
▪ Low involvement of members in decision making  |
| Latin             | Spain   | ▪ Many small clubs and many young clubs  
▪ Sets high value on both sporting success and social values  
▪ The clubs have averagely higher financial problems  
▪ A high share of the clubs involve their members in decisions  |
| Post-communist    | Poland  | ▪ Many small clubs and many clubs have been founded since 2000  
▪ Sporting success is valued relatively high and social values relatively low  
▪ A low share of the clubs in Poland involve their members decisions  
▪ The biggest share of clubs using public facilities and public economic support is relatively big.  |
|                   | Hungary |                             |
C: Club type matter

- The size of the club:
- The context of the club (rural versus urban society)
- The age of the club (path dependence)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club types</th>
<th>Sports club characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMALL versus BIG</td>
<td>- Small clubs are much more single sports clubs,&lt;br&gt;- social values are valued higher in small clubs than in big clubs,&lt;br&gt;- the larger the club is the lower is the probability that the club involves the members in the decision making&lt;br&gt;- public sports facilities are more common in large clubs&lt;br&gt;- public subsidies share of the clubs total revenue is higher in large clubs than in small club&lt;br&gt;- and it is first of all the small clubs that is threatened of one or more existential problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL versus URBAN</td>
<td>- Multiple sports clubs are more common in small than larger communities&lt;br&gt;- Social values are valued relatively high while sporting success is valued relatively low in sports clubs belonging to small, rural communities&lt;br&gt;- Payment for the usage of public sports facilities is more common in large, urban communities than in small and more rural communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD versus YOUNG</td>
<td>- Old clubs are bigger than young clubs (average)&lt;br&gt;- Multisport clubs are more common among old clubs young clubs&lt;br&gt;- Sporting success is valued relatively lower in old clubs than in young clubs&lt;br&gt;- Payment for the usage of public sports facilities is less common in old than young clubs&lt;br&gt;- Public subsidies’ share of the clubs total revenue is higher in older than younger clubs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>