

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



CHARACTERISTICS OF EUROPEAN SPORTS CLUBS

Christoph Breuer, Svenja Feiler, Ramon Llopis-Goig and
Karsten Elmore-Østerlund

SIVSCE REPORT
SOCIAL INCLUSION AND VOLUNTEERING IN SPORTS CLUBS IN EUROPE

Characteristics of European sports clubs

A comparison of the structure, management, voluntary work and social integration among sports clubs across ten European countries

Christoph Breuer, German Sport University Cologne, Germany

Svenja Feiler, German Sport University Cologne, Germany

Ramon Llopis-Goig, University of Valencia, Spain

Karsten Elmoose-Østerlund, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Rahel Bürgi, Lamprecht und Stamm Sozialforschung und Beratung AG, Switzerland

Elien Claes, KU Leuven, Belgium

Angela Gebert, Lamprecht und Stamm Sozialforschung und Beratung AG, Switzerland

Sylwia Gocłowska, Josef Pilsudski University of Physical Education in Warsaw, Poland

Bjarne Ibsen, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Markus Lamprecht, Lamprecht und Stamm Sozialforschung und Beratung AG, Switzerland

Siegfried Nagel, University of Bern, Switzerland

Geoff Nichols, University of Sheffield, England

Szilvia Perényi, University of Debrecen, Hungary

Monika Piątkowska, Josef Pilsudski University of Physical Education in Warsaw, Poland

Jeroen Scheerder, KU Leuven, Belgium

Ørnulf Seippel, Norwegian School of Sports Sciences, Norway

Hanspeter Stamm, Lamprecht und Stamm Sozialforschung und Beratung AG, Switzerland

Dirk Steinbach, Führungsakademie des DOSB, Germany

Jan-Willem van der Roest, Mulier Institute, the Netherlands

Harold van der Werff, Mulier Institute, the Netherlands

Characteristics of European sports clubs. A comparison of the structure, management, voluntary work and social integration among sports clubs across ten European countries

Christoph Breuer, German Sport University Cologne, Germany

Svenja Feiler, German Sport University Cologne, Germany

Ramon Llopis-Goig, University of Valencia, Spain

Karsten Elmosé-Østerlund, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Contributors:

Rahel Bürgi, Lamprecht und Stamm Sozialforschung und Beratung AG, Switzerland. Elien Claes, KU Leuven, Belgium. Angela Gebert, Lamprecht und Stamm Sozialforschung und Beratung AG, Switzerland. Sylwia Gocłowska, Josef Pilsudski University of Physical Education in Warsaw, Poland. Bjarne Ibsen, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark. Markus Lamprecht, Lamprecht und Stamm Sozialforschung und Beratung AG, Switzerland. Siegfried Nagel, University of Bern, Switzerland. Geoff Nichols, University of Sheffield, England. Szilvia Perényi, University of Debrecen, Hungary. Monika Piątkowska, Josef Pilsudski University of Physical Education in Warsaw, Poland. Jeroen Scheerder, KU Leuven, Belgium. Ørnulf Seippel, Norwegian School of Sports Sciences, Norway. Hanspeter Stamm, Lamprecht und Stamm Sozialforschung und Beratung AG, Switzerland. Dirk Steinbach, Führungsakademie des DOSB, Germany. Jan-Willem van der Roest, Mulier Institute, the Netherlands. Harold van der Werff, Mulier Institute, the Netherlands.

University of Southern Denmark, 2017

Department of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics,

Centre for Sports, Health and Civil Society.



ISBN 978-87-93496-63-7

Cover foto: Nils Rosenvold/DGI Fotoarkiv

Print: Digitaltryk, Odense



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication only reflects the views of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of content

Summary	5
A short introduction to the SIVSCE-project	9
1 Introduction	13
2 Structural characteristics of European sports clubs	15
2.1 Club size (membership numbers).....	15
2.2 Type of sports club (single vs. multisport club).....	18
2.3 Sport offers	19
2.4 Foundation years.....	20
2.5 Community size.....	23
2.6 Sports facilities	24
3 Management of sports clubs in Europe	26
3.1 Clubs' opinions on governance, management and values (philosophy)	26
3.1.1 Average values.....	26
3.1.2 Distribution of philosophy items.....	28
3.2 Finances	32
3.2.1 Balance.....	32
3.2.2 Revenue.....	33
3.2.3 Expenditure.....	35
3.2.4 Direct public subsidies.....	36
3.3 Problems	38
3.3.1 Average size of problems	38
3.3.2 Distribution of problem items.....	41
3.3.3 Existential problems.....	47
4 Importance of volunteers for European sports clubs	50
4.1 Volunteers in sports clubs	50
4.2 Paid staff in sports clubs.....	52
4.3 Development of volunteers and paid staff	55
4.4 What clubs do to recruit and retain volunteers.....	57
4.5 Club boards' opinions on volunteers	62
4.5.1 Average opinion on volunteers.....	62
4.5.2 Distribution of club boards' opinions on volunteers	64

5 Social integration in European sports clubs	68
5.1 Population groups within sports clubs	68
5.2 Boards' opinions on social integration	72
5.2.1 Average opinion on social integration	72
5.2.2 Distribution of the item on social integration	74
5.3 Initiatives for different population groups	78
6 Method	85
6.1 Data collection	85
6.1.1 Online survey	85
6.1.2 Samples and response rates	87
6.2 Data preparation and analyses	94
7 Appendix: Details on sampling procedures and comments on representativity of all participating countries	96
7.1.1 Belgium (Flanders)	96
7.1.2 Denmark	102
7.1.3 England	104
7.1.4 Germany	107
7.1.5 Hungary	108
7.1.6 Netherlands	111
7.1.7 Norway	113
7.1.8 Poland	114
7.1.9 Spain	116
7.1.10 Switzerland: The Swiss sport club survey 2016	119
8 References	124
9 Questionnaire	126

Summary

The results presented in this report stem from the largest comparative study of sports clubs in Europe, the SIVSCE project. As part of the project, a questionnaire was developed and translated into the national languages of the ten countries included in the project. The surveys were conducted as nationwide surveys, and a total number of 35,790 sports clubs participated. The four main topics of the questionnaire were: structure, management, voluntary work and social integration. The summary – as well as the report – will be structured according to these topics.

Structure

Most European sports clubs are small. In fact, more than half have 100 members or fewer, whereas only one in ten sports clubs has more than 500 members. Most small clubs (with 100 members or fewer) are found in Spain (77%), Hungary (74%), Poland (72%) and Switzerland (68%), whereas most large clubs (with more than 500 members) are found in the Netherlands (30%) and Germany (19%). In that connection, it is worth mentioning that more sports clubs have experienced an increase in total membership within the last five years (36%) than have experienced a decrease (20%). The highest proportion of clubs with increasing membership numbers are found in Poland (49%), Spain (46%), Hungary (45%) and England (44%). Germany is the only country in which slightly more clubs report a decrease (26%) than an increase (25%) in membership numbers.

Two thirds of the sports clubs are single sport clubs in the sense that they provide only one sport for their members. Most single sport clubs are found in the Netherlands (91%), Belgium (Flanders) (87%) and England (85%), whereas these clubs make up a smaller proportion of clubs in Germany (58%) and Norway (66%). The most commonly offered sport is football, which one in five clubs offer to its members. Besides football, a mixture of team ballgames and (semi-)individual sports are popular in all or most countries, but there are also examples of sports that are only popular in one country – e.g. Nordic skiing, which one in five Norwegian clubs offer to its members.

The population of European sports clubs contains a mixture of (very) old and young clubs. One in five sports clubs were founded before 1945, and almost one in three have been founded since the turn of the millennium. A lot of young clubs (founded since 2000) can be found in Spain (73%), Poland (64%) and Hungary (48%).

With regard to facility usage, two thirds of the clubs use public facilities for their activities, while one third use their own facilities. The highest proportion of clubs that use public facilities can be found in Poland (91%), whereas the lowest proportion can be found in the Netherlands (55%). The Netherlands is also the country with the highest percentage of clubs that use their own facilities (53%), followed by Germany (49%). Among the clubs that use public facilities, 64% report that they have to pay a usage fee. This percentage is highest in the Netherlands (96%), England (90%) and Belgium (Flanders) (89%) and lowest in Denmark (41%) and Spain (48%).

Management

The vast majority of sports clubs sets high value on the social aspects connected to doing sport. Almost nine out of ten clubs (88%) mainly agree that they set high value on companionship and conviviality. Sporting success and competitions are also important for more than half (57%) of the clubs. With regard to the democratic aspect, more than three out of four clubs (78%) predominantly agree that they involve members in decision making, while a little less than half (47%) of the clubs delegate decisions from the board to committees. Finally, long-term planning also seems to be relatively frequently used by clubs. Two out of three clubs predominantly agree that they engage in long-term planning.

Most European sports clubs have relatively small revenues and expenditures, while a minority of larger clubs within specific sports have relatively large revenues and expenditures. The highest average amounts of revenues per member are found in Swiss (€ 478) and Norwegian (€ 450) sports clubs, while the lowest revenues per member are found in Hungarian clubs (€ 25). Direct public subsidies (financial support) on average make up 16% of the total revenues in clubs. However, this figure is very different between the countries. It is lowest in the Netherlands (5%) and England (6%) and highest in Poland (41%) and Hungary (28%). Most of the clubs (three in four) have reported a surplus in 2014, but being non-profit organisations, these surpluses will stay within the clubs for the benefit of the members.

Sports clubs in Europe generally seem to be in relatively good shape. However, some challenges are worth mentioning. Seen through the eyes of the sports club representatives, the main challenges are connected to either human resources (to recruit and retain members and volunteers), or to the availability of sports facilities and the financial situation of the club. It is particularly clubs in Germany, Denmark and Switzerland that find the recruitment and retention of members and volunteers to be a challenge, while facilities and finances primarily challenge clubs in Poland, Hungary and Spain. Overall, one in four clubs claims to have at least one problem that threatens its existence. Most clubs face existential challenges in Poland (38%), Germany (36%), Switzerland (35%) and Hungary (34%), while fewest clubs are threatened by such challenges in Belgium (Flanders) (9%) and the Netherlands (13%).

Voluntary work

Sports clubs in Europe are – across borders – primarily run by volunteers. On average, there is one volunteer in a fixed position for every five members and one secondary volunteer (not in a fixed position) for every six members. Most of the volunteers in fixed positions work within administration and management (48%), followed by sport and training (30%), sport and competition (12%), and other tasks (10%). Within the last five years, the development in the numbers of volunteers in the clubs has been mainly stable. One in five clubs have experienced an increase in the number of volunteers, while 15% have experienced a decrease. For the remaining two thirds of clubs, the development has been relatively stable. We find most clubs with increasing numbers of volunteers in Hungary (31%) and Spain (29%), while the country in which the highest amount of clubs experiences a decrease is Germany (23%).

Even though sports clubs are primarily run by volunteers, there are also clubs in all countries that hire paid staff (staff that receive taxable pay). On average, there is one paid member of staff for every 50 members in the clubs. This figure is considerably higher in Poland than in the other countries. In Poland, there is one paid member of staff for every twenty members. Paid staff are mainly found within sport and training (65%). One in ten clubs have a paid manager (full or part time) in a leading position within the club. This is most common in England (19%) and Norway (17%) and least common in Switzerland and Belgium (Flanders) (3%). As was the case for volunteers, the development in the number of paid staff has also mainly been stable within the last five years. However, there are more clubs that have experienced an increase in the number of paid staff (17%) than clubs that have experienced a decrease (6%). The highest number of clubs that have experienced an increase can be found in Switzerland (28%), while the highest number of clubs that have experienced a decrease can be found in Spain (14%).

When working to recruit and retain volunteers, sports clubs seem to work quite similarly across borders. More than half of the clubs (57%) mainly recruit through existing networks of current volunteers and members, while almost the same percentage (55%) uses verbal encouragement towards volunteers. Social gatherings for volunteers are also popular among clubs (45%). A measure in which there are large deviances in the utility between countries is the possibility for volunteers to gain qualifications paid for by the club. One in three clubs report to be using this measure, but it is not very common among clubs in Poland (7%), Hungary (13%) and Spain (13%). Finally, a little more than one in ten clubs (13%) claim not to do anything in particular to recruit and retain volunteers.

Among the sports club representatives, there is large support for the idea that voluntary work should (continue to) play an important role in sports clubs. More than half of the clubs (57%) predominantly agree that sports clubs should be run exclusively by volunteers. However, the support is different between countries. The highest support is found among clubs in Switzerland (84%) and Germany (75%), while the lowest support is found in Poland (24%) and Hungary (41%). Other than that, it is worth mentioning that a little more than two thirds of clubs (68%) generally find their members to be passionate and dedicated to the work that needs to be done in the clubs and that two thirds of the clubs report having a low turnover rate of volunteers. Finally, almost nine out of ten clubs (88%) find that all members can be volunteers regardless of their qualifications.

Social integration

In the survey, clubs were asked to estimate the percentage of members within the following three population groups: People with disabilities, people with a migration background, and the elderly (65+ years). With regard to people with disabilities, half of the clubs reported having members from within this group (which in the survey included both physically and mentally disabled people). The highest number of clubs with members from within this group was identified in England (74%) and Germany (71%), while the lowest number was found among clubs in Switzerland (27%) and Poland (30%). With regard to people with a migration

background, two thirds of the clubs reported having members from within this group. The countries in which the highest percentage of clubs has members from within this group are Norway (79%), the Netherlands and Germany (both 78%), while the lowest percentage is found among Polish clubs (26%). The elderly are represented in almost seven out of ten clubs (69%). The representation is highest among clubs in Germany (93%), the Netherlands (89%) and Denmark (81%), while it is lowest in Poland (43%), Spain (46%) and Hungary (57%).

Besides reporting the representation of members within selected population groups, the clubs were asked if they were taking 'special initiatives' (e.g. activities, teams, cooperation, reduced membership fee, etc.) to integrate people from within six population groups. The results show that the most common are specific programmes targeted at children and adolescents (59%), low income people (42%) and women and girls (33%). Fewer clubs take special initiatives for the elderly (25%), people with disabilities (20%) and people with a migration background (18%). Low income people are a priority among sports clubs in Hungary and Poland (67%), but less so among clubs in Denmark (17%) and Norway (23%). People with disabilities receive special attention in 39% of Hungarian clubs, while only 8% of Danish clubs have special initiatives for people that belong to this group. There are also large variations across the countries when it comes to initiatives to integrate people with a migration background. Almost half of all clubs in Switzerland (49%) have special initiatives for this group, while the percentage is far lower in the Netherlands, England (6% each) and Denmark (7%).

More than two thirds (68%) of the clubs are working to offer sport to as many population groups as possible. When asked more specifically about the integration of socially vulnerable groups, the figure drops to 52%, and of these, the most clubs that predominantly agree with the statement are in Spain (72%), Hungary (63%) and Germany (61%), while relatively fewer clubs in Denmark (31%) and Belgium (Flanders) (38%) claim to work for the integration of socially vulnerable groups.

A short introduction to the SIVSCE-project

The ‘Social Inclusion and Volunteering in Sports Clubs in Europe’ (SIVSCE) project is a collaborative partnership co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union. The project has been, and will be, implemented in 2015, 2016 and 2017. This chapter provides a brief overview of the project.

Purpose

There is only a limited amount of knowledge on the political conditions for, and structural characteristics of, sports clubs that promote social inclusion and volunteering in sport. Most of the existing knowledge is, furthermore, context-specifically tied to individual member states within the European Union. This project seeks to provide comparative knowledge across ten European countries, convert it into specific suggestions for action, and disseminate this knowledge to politicians and sports professionals across Europe. The main aim is to promote social inclusion and volunteering in sports clubs in Europe.

Work packages and project output

The project is implemented in seven work packages (WPs):

- WP1: A collection of sports club policies in the participating countries.
- WP2: An online sports club survey conducted in each of the participating countries.
- WP3: An online member and volunteer survey conducted in at least 30 sports clubs in each country.
- WP4: Overall analysis of the results from the three studies conducted in WP1, WP2 and WP3.
- WP5: A collection of examples of best practice in relation to social inclusion and volunteering.
- WP6: Creation of a handbook with suggestions for sports policies, club management and the like, capable of promoting social inclusion and volunteering in sports clubs.
- WP7: A broad dissemination of findings and suggestions (e.g. European and national conferences).

The project generates the following output:

- 5 reports (one for each WP 1 to 5)
- A handbook (WP6)
- A European conference and ten national conferences (WP7)

Partners

The project includes eleven partners from ten countries dispersed across Europe, as illustrated in the map below. The representation of countries from different parts of Europe ensures that project findings will be of broad relevance to nations across Europe.




Fig. 1: Map of partners in the SIVSCE project.

Jointly, the group of partners in the project represents vast knowledge about and experience with studies within the research field of sports participation, sports policies, sports organisations and sports clubs. For basic information about the project partners and their roles please consult the introductory report to the project (Elmose-Østerlund et al., 2016).

Central concepts

Particularly central to the project are the following three concepts: Sports clubs, social integration, and volunteering. These are described below.

Sports clubs

Sports clubs are generally considered to be participated in voluntarily, and led by volunteers, as opposed to paid employees. They are therefore part of the voluntary sector of leisure provision; in contrast to the private and public sectors. Even though they share this common characteristic, the population of sports clubs in Europe is highly diverse on a number of structural characteristics and it is therefore extremely difficult to present a clear and unambiguous

definition. Instead, researchers have suggested seven characteristics of an 'ideal type' sports club: 1) voluntary membership, 2) orientation towards the interests of members, 3) democratic decision-making structure, 4) voluntary work, 5) autonomy, 6) a non-profit orientation and 7) solidarity (Heinemann & Horch, 1981; Ibsen, 1992).

Social integration

In the project we have used the concept 'social integration' as a more broad term than social inclusion. We distinguish between three – interrelated – dimensions of social integration that draw attention to different aspects of the concept that are relevant to sports clubs (Elling, De Knop & Knoppers, 2001; Esser, 2009).

1. *Structural integration*: The representation of various social groups in the membership, relative to the population.
2. *Socio-cultural integration*: The ability of individuals to know and master dominant values and norms (assimilation) and the acceptance of multiculturalism (pluralism).
3. *Socio-affective integration*: Participation in social life and the formation of social networks (interaction) and the degree of identification and emotional devotion (identification).

Volunteering

In this project, we define volunteering or voluntary work by five central characteristics: 1) voluntary activities, 2) unpaid or paid for with a symbolic amount, 3) carried out for people other than one's own family, 4) for the benefit of other people 5) and having a formal character (organised or agreed) (Ibsen 1992).

Theoretical framework

This project is not guided by a single theoretical approach to the study of sports clubs. However, it does subscribe to the understanding that sports clubs are relevant objects of study themselves. In order to understand how sports clubs function and why, it is necessary to study the central characteristics of clubs. At the same time, sports clubs cannot be understood as detached from their environment, since the environment sets the framework in which sports clubs function and develop. Finally, sports clubs have come to exist due to members combining their resources to realize shared interests, which means that sports clubs primarily exist to serve the interests of their members.

In light of the above, this project departs from a multilevel model for the analysis of sports clubs (Nagel, 2007). The multilevel model takes into account the environment of sports clubs (macro level), sports club characteristics (meso level) and the characteristics of members and volunteers (micro level).

More information

Project progress, publications, articles and information about conferences can be found at the project website: <http://www.sdu.dk/SIVSCE>. For more detailed information about the project, please consult the introductory report (Elmose-Østerlund et al., 2016), which is also available on the project website.

1 Introduction

This report represents the second output from the project ‘Social Inclusion and Volunteering in Sports Clubs in Europe’ (SIVSCE). The first report (WPI) built on a collection of sports club policies in the ten participating countries with the aim of elucidating potential associations between the conditions that the governmental and political framework establishes on the one hand and social inclusion and volunteering in sports clubs on the other hand (cf. Ibsen et al., 2016).

The aim of studying sports clubs in Europe from an empirical and comparative perspective was recently initiated in the book *Sport Clubs in Europe* (Breuer, Hoekman, Nagel & Van der Werff, 2015), in which most of the researchers that have participated in this report contributed. But while the different chapters of the aforementioned book were based on national data, this report is based on collected data using the same questionnaire and sampling method among sports clubs in the ten European countries participating in the project. This study is thus the first to allow a comparative analysis across ten European countries.

The results included in this report come from an online survey carried out among a total sample of 139,659 sports clubs. The invitation to answer the questionnaire was sent by e-mail to the chairperson of the sports clubs in each country (Chapter 6 provides detailed information on the method of the survey and Chapter 7 includes a detailed description of the sampling procedure applied in each country). The online questionnaire included comparable questions referring to the structural characteristics of the sports clubs and the main issues related to the management of them, as well as different questions about attitudes, activities and goals for social inclusion and volunteering in the clubs. A total of 35,790 sports clubs participated in the survey, of which the results are summarised in the next chapters.

This report represents the outcome of almost two years of intensive work that started in January 2015. The aims, the methodological design of the survey and a first draft of the questionnaire were discussed and qualified by the researchers from all ten countries participating in the project at the first partner meeting. After this first meeting, the team in charge of work package 2 prepared the final version of the questionnaire and sent it to the rest of the partners for translation into each of the participating countries’ language. The fieldwork for the survey was implemented by the German Sport University for most of the participating countries and was launched in September 2015. Two reminders were sent to the sports clubs not replying to the first invitation and the fieldwork finished two weeks after the second reminder was sent out in November 2015. Once the fieldwork was finished, all the answers from the sports clubs were assembled in one data file, followed by data cleaning and analysis.

This report is structured as follows: in Chapter 2, the structural characteristics of European sports clubs are described and discussed, considering aspects such as club size (membership), type of sports club, foundation year, community size and sports facilities. The same state typology that was used in the first report of the SIVSCE project (Ibsen et al., 2016) is used for interpreting the results. In Chapter 3, a wide set of issues and values related to the management of the clubs are described in order to get an overview of how sports clubs are run across Europe. This includes different aspects on club philosophy (value), finances, and problems related to human resources, the financial situation, the availability of sports facili-

ties, demographic issues, and local competition from commercial sport providers. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the importance of volunteers for sports clubs in Europe, in which their presence and development is broadly described, as well as the measures to recruit and retain volunteers, and the club board's opinion on voluntary work. The other main topic of this research project – the social integration in European sports clubs – is dealt with in Chapter 5, which is based on the concept of social integration that was explained in the introductory report to this whole project (Elmose-Østerlund et al., 2016). This chapter provides information on the population groups within sports clubs, the board's opinions on social integration, and the different initiatives taken by the sports clubs for different population groups. Chapters 6 and 7 present the methodological details of the survey.

2 Structural characteristics of European sports clubs

2.1 Club size (membership numbers)

The average size of European sports clubs in terms of membership numbers amounts to approximately 240 members and varies widely across the countries: while Dutch sports clubs have approximately 410 members on average, in Poland the average number of members amounts to 112. Between 300 and 400 members on average are found in sports clubs in Denmark, Germany and Norway. However, it has to be noted that the median is much lower in all countries included, meaning that there are probably very few clubs with large membership numbers. In Denmark and England, for example, half of all clubs have a maximum membership number of 112, which is clearly below the mean values of both countries (see Table 1). The variation among club sizes might be a possible explanation for differences in clubs with regard to volunteering and social inclusion, of which the results will be presented in Chapters 4 and 5.

Table 1: Number of members and proportion of members by gender

Country	Number of members			Gender (share in %)	
	mean ¹	std. dev.	median	Male	Female
TOTAL ²	239.3	-	-	65.2	34.8
Belgium (Flanders) ³	145.8	184.2	76.0	66.6	33.4
Denmark	320.3	1,446.0	112.0	60.6	39.4
England	246.2	447.4	112.0	65.9	34.1
Germany	364.5	1,023.7	163.0	62.5	37.5
Hungary	127.7	318.5	50.0	68.5	31.5
Netherlands	409.5	403.0	270.0	62.0	38.0
Norway	377.6	842.6	199.0	60.2	39.8
Poland	111.8	218.2	60.0	72.4	27.6
Spain	168.8	1,520.1	45.0	70.0	30.0
Switzerland	121.1	348.2	58.0	63.6	36.4

¹ The mean might be affected by some outliers in the sample, e.g. in Denmark and England (for further methodological information on the samples in the different countries, see Chapter 7).

² The total values in this report are calculated as average values of the average country values.

³ The data from Flanders differs slightly in this report and in the country-specific report due to different data cleaning methods, resulting in a slightly different number of members.

More consistent is the pattern of the proportion of male and female members: in all participating countries the proportion of male members is larger than the proportion of females. The spread is approximately two thirds men and one third women, with Norway (39.8%) and Denmark (39.4%) as universal welfare states having the largest proportion of females among their club members. On the other hand, sports clubs in Poland (27.6%) and Spain (30%) have the smallest proportion of female members. The spread of two thirds men and one third women is also reflected in the total mean values (see Table 1).

When looking at the distribution of club size by categories of membership numbers, it is again clear that the average number of members is affected by a small number of large clubs. For example, 55% of sports clubs in the Netherlands report having less than 300 members. In Spain and Hungary, around half of all clubs state that they count less than 50 members (see Fig. 2), which is also reflected by the median (see Table 1).




Fig. 2: Club size displayed in categories.

The proportion of small clubs is also relatively large in Switzerland: 68% of all clubs report having 100 members or less. In Belgium (Flanders), the situation is similar: nearly 60% of all clubs report having 100 members or less. In Poland, this even applies to more than 70% of the clubs, whereas in Denmark and England 46% of all clubs report having 100 members or less. In Germany and Norway, around one third of all clubs are small clubs with up to 100 members. The proportion of very large clubs, with more than 2,500 members, is small (around 1%) in all countries (see Fig. 2).

Regarding the development of membership numbers, the majority of European sports

clubs agree that the number of members has stayed relatively stable during the last five years. Interestingly, more clubs across all countries in fact report a moderate to large increase in membership numbers, rather than a moderate or large decrease. In Germany, Denmark and Switzerland, nearly every fifth club reports a moderate increase, whereas this applies to around one quarter of the sports clubs in all other countries. On the other hand, Spain is the country with the largest proportion of clubs (10%) reporting a large decrease of membership numbers, with simultaneously around twice as many clubs (19%) reporting large increases in membership numbers. Most stable with regard to membership numbers seems to be the situation in sports clubs in Switzerland, Germany and Norway, with around half of all clubs reporting unchanged numbers of members within the last five years (see Fig. 3).




Fig. 3: Membership development within the last five years.

What has to be noted when displaying the estimation of the development of membership numbers by European sports clubs is that some clubs in the different countries were unsure about this question. This is reflected by the proportion of clubs answering with “don’t know”. Although this category is not displayed in Fig. 3, it will shortly be explained here. Particularly sports clubs in Spain were unsure about the membership development: 7% of Spanish clubs stated that they do not have an answer to this question. In England and Poland, this applied to around 2% of all clubs, whereas the share of “don’t know” answers was 1% or less in all other countries.

2.2 Type of sports club (single vs. multisport club)

The majority of European sports clubs tend to be single sport clubs with one main sports activity. For all included countries, the split between single sport and multisport clubs is roughly three quarters single sport clubs to one quarter multisport clubs. However, in the Netherlands more than 90% of Dutch sports clubs are single sport clubs. In Belgium (Flanders) and England, this share amounts to 87% and 85%, respectively, while in Poland and Denmark, around three out of four clubs are single sport clubs. In Switzerland and Spain, nearly 80% of all clubs are run as single sport clubs. Around one third of Hungarian and Norwegian sports clubs are multisport clubs, meaning that they are divided into sections that cover different sports. In Germany, more than 40% of the clubs are multisport clubs that offer more than one particular sport (see Fig. 4).




Fig. 4: Single sport vs. multisport clubs.

2.3 Sport offers

An overview of the 15 most often provided sports across the European sports clubs in the ten surveyed countries can be seen in Table 2 and Table 3. Across the countries, the most often provided sport by European sports clubs is football. On average, every fifth club in Europe offers football. Looking at the different countries, around 30% of the clubs in Norway, Poland and Germany stated that they offered football to their members. In the Netherlands, every fourth club offers football, whereas in Denmark, Spain and Switzerland, less than 20% of the clubs offer football⁴.

Table 2: Most often provided sports by the sports clubs across the countries (proportion of clubs in %; Part 1).

Sports	TOTAL	Belgium (Flanders)	Denmark	England	Germany	Hungary
Football	20.3	18.1	15.4	5.9	29.5	21.2
Gymnastics (all sorts)	8.6	7.3	14.7	7.9	23.4	1.8
Volleyball	7.2	6.6	4.5	2.4	15.8	6.2
Track & Field	7.1	4.4	2.3	1.2	11.5	8.6
Shooting sports	6.8	3.3	8.6	2.4	9.7	6.2
Swimming	6.7	5.2	5.9	8.4	6.6	9.0
Cycling	6.2	12.4	5.5	1.7	5.6	9.4
Tennis	5.9	4.4	5.9	2.8	14.0	5.3
Fitness/Aerobic	5.8	3.4	4.5	3.8	15.0	4.8
Handball	5.6	0.7	8.0	0.9	7.4	8.3
Basketball	5.5	3.3	1.4	11.6	4.7	6.5
Table tennis	5.3	3.5	3.3	5	17.0	9.5
Walking/Nordic Walking	4.7	6.8	2.6	0.3	11.1	3.3
Badminton	4.6	5.0	12.5	2.8	10.0	2.3
Dancing	4.0	7.2	6.9	2.8	9.6	3.8

Apart from football, gymnastics is often provided by European sports clubs, with Germany having the highest proportion (around 23%). Moreover, a mixture of individual sports, such as swimming, track and field, cycling, tennis and table tennis, and team sports like volleyball, handball and basketball are found among the 15 most often provided sports across sports clubs in Europe.

⁴ With regard to England, it has to be noted that football clubs were not invited through the individual links, but only took part through the open link. Therefore, it can be assumed that the percentage of football clubs is higher in the population of English sports clubs than in the sample. The most recent estimate (2015) is that football accounts for 33 % of all clubs in England that are affiliated to an NGB recognised by Sport England.

Table 3: Most often provided sports by the sports clubs across the countries (proportion of clubs in %; Part 2).

Sports	Netherlands	Norway	Poland	Spain	Switzerland
Football	24.5	30.9	30.0	12.3	14.7
Gymnastics (all sorts)	4.0	7.6	4.5	5.2	9.1
Volleyball	5.7	5.6	12.3	3.4	9.7
Track and Field	4.5	13.2	7.0	9.3	8.9
Shooting sports	1.4	7.8	7.4	3.2	18.3
Swimming	4.5	9.0	8.9	5.8	3.6
Cycling	2.2	5.8	3.5	11.2	5.0
Tennis	13.2	2.8	4.1	2.1	4.0
Fitness/Aerobic	2.1	6.8	2.7	3.9	11.2
Handball	4.2	16.2	3.7	3.4	3.0
Basketball	3.6	5.2	5.6	8.4	4.3
Table tennis	2.4	3.6	4.5	1.3	2.8
Walking/Nordic Walking	2.0	6.8	1.4	9.3	3.4
Badminton	2.0	2.8	2.1	1.3	5.5
Dancing	2.1	3.0	0.6	1.8	2.1

Apart from the above-mentioned most often provided sports across the countries, there are country-specific sports offered by the clubs in the different countries. For example in Norway, Nordic skiing is a popular sport, with around 18% of the Norwegian clubs stating that they offer Nordic skiing. In Poland, around 9% of the clubs offer fighting and combat sports and in Hungary, nearly 7% of the clubs offer karate. In Belgium (Flanders), nearly 8% of the clubs offer fighting and combat sports. In Switzerland, nearly every tenth club offers floorball, which is provided by 4% of Norwegian sports clubs. Cricket is provided by 4% of the English sports clubs. In Hungary and Spain, Futsal is a sport offered by around 4% of the clubs. Korfball is provided in particular by Dutch sports clubs (around 6%). In Spain, 5% of the clubs offer roller skating.

2.4 Foundation years

Sports clubs in Europe can look back at a long history. Especially in conservative welfare states like Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands, in social democratic welfare states like Norway and Denmark and in England as a liberal welfare state, a remarkable percentage of today's existing clubs were founded before 1930. This percentage is highest for Germany and Switzerland, with nearly one third of all clubs in these two countries being founded before 1930. Looking at England, it is interesting to observe that around one fifth (20%) of the clubs are traditional sports clubs with their foundation years before 1930, while an even larger proportion of sports clubs (28%) has been founded more recently, since 2000. The largest proportion of very old sports clubs founded before 1900 can be found in Switzerland (14%).

In Germany and England, every tenth sports club was founded within this period, whereas no such old clubs exist in Poland and Spain. Spanish clubs are found to be the youngest among the European sports clubs, with nearly three quarters of the clubs being founded since 2000 (see Fig. 5 & Fig. 6).




Fig. 5: Foundation years.

In Belgium (Flanders), the majority of sports clubs were founded between 1946 and 1989. Likewise, in the Netherlands, close to 60% of the clubs were established within this time period. Looking at post-communist countries like Hungary and Poland, the highest number of clubs have their foundation years after the fall of the communist-led governments. In Hungary, 23% of clubs were founded in the period between 1990 and 1999, while 48% have been established since 2000. Similarly, in Poland three quarters of all clubs have been founded since 1990 (see Fig. 5).

Taking a look at clubs that have been founded since the turn of the millennium in all countries, it can be seen that such “young clubs” are mainly found, as already mentioned, in Spain (73%), Poland (64%) and Hungary (48%). On the other side, only 7% of all Dutch sports clubs, 11% of Swiss sports clubs, and 13% of German sports clubs are younger clubs. In Belgium (Flanders), Denmark, England and Norway, roughly three quarters of all sports clubs can be categorised as “older clubs”, meaning that they were founded before the year 2000 (see Fig. 6).

Structural characteristics of European sports clubs




Fig. 6: Old vs. young sports clubs.

Interestingly, the younger clubs that have been founded since 2000 are mainly single sport clubs (around 82% of the total; see Table 4). In Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Norway and Poland, in particular, the share of single sport clubs is much larger among those younger clubs than among clubs that were founded before the turn of the millennium. The opposite is the case for sports clubs in Spain: Whereas 86% of the older clubs are single sport clubs, only around 75% of the younger clubs were founded as single sport clubs. This means that more multisport clubs have been founded in Spain since 2000 than before that year. No big differ-

Table 4: Old vs. young sport clubs differentiated by single- and multisport clubs (share of club in %).

Country	Old club		Young club	
	Single sport club	Multisport club	Single sport club	Multisport club
TOTAL	74.9	25.1	82.0	18.0
Belgium (Flanders)	87.2	12.8	86.8	13.2
Denmark	75.1	24.9	83.7	16.3
England	85.1	14.9	84.4	15.6
Germany	55.2	44.8	77.1	22.9
Hungary	66.0	34.0	73.0	27.0
Netherlands	90.5	9.5	90.8	9.2
Norway	58.1	41.9	89.2	10.8
Poland	66.9	33.1	76.6	23.4
Spain	86.0	14.0	74.8	25.2
Switzerland	78.6	21.4	83.2	16.8

ence is found between the spread of single sport and multisport clubs with regard to older and younger clubs in Belgium (Flanders), England and the Netherlands (see Table 4).

2.5 Community size

Sports clubs in Europe are situated in different surroundings, like rural areas or large metropolitan areas. However, the distribution of community sizes where the sports clubs are situated varies across the countries. In Belgium (Flanders), the largest proportion of sports clubs (44%) are located in communities with less than 20,000 inhabitants and a further 34% of the clubs have their location in middle-sized communities with 20,000 to 50,000 inhabitants. In Switzerland, a large proportion of sports clubs are situated in even smaller communities: 43% of the clubs have their home in villages with less than 5,000 inhabitants and 36% are situated in middle-sized communities with 5,000 to 19,999 inhabitants. In contrast to that, more than 30% of the sports clubs in England, Hungary, Poland and Spain are situated in communities or cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants. One third of German and Norwegian sports clubs have their home in communities with 5,000 to 19,999 inhabitants. Interestingly, even very small villages or communities with less than 500 people living there are home to 6% of the sports clubs in Denmark, Norway and Poland, 3% of English sports clubs, and 2% of clubs in Hungary, Spain and Switzerland (see Fig. 7).




Fig. 7: Size of the communities where the clubs are situated.

2.6 Sports facilities

With regard to the use of club-owned and public-owned sports facilities, it is evident that in all countries of this study, the proportion of clubs using public facilities is higher than the proportion of clubs using their own sports facilities. On average, one third of European sports clubs are in possession of their own facilities and 68% state that they use public sports facilities. Looking at the different countries, the proportion of clubs using public sports facilities is highest for the post-communist countries Poland and Hungary. In Poland, around 91% of clubs make use of public-owned facilities, while nearly three quarters of Hungarian sports clubs use such facilities. Also, around 70% of sports clubs in Denmark and Norway make use of publicly provided sports facilities. The lowest proportion of sports clubs making use of public infrastructure is found in the Netherlands. Here, the proportion of sports clubs using club-owned and public-owned facilities is nearly the same (53% and 55%). With more than half of all Dutch sports clubs using their own facilities, the Netherlands is a pioneer in terms of club-owned facilities, followed by Germany, Norway and England, where more than 40% of clubs make use of their own sports infrastructure. In Switzerland, one third of all sports clubs use their own facilities. Spain represents the country with the smallest proportion of clubs in possession of club-owned sports facilities. Only every tenth club uses its own sports infrastructure in Spain (see Fig. 8). What is striking is that in some countries, the sum of the proportions of using public and own facilities is less than 100%. A possible reason could be that clubs in these countries also use privately owned sports facilities (e.g. this applies to 41% of Danish sports clubs). Another reason could be that for sports activities like walking, run-




Fig. 8: Use of club-owned and public-owned facilities.

ning, or cycling, no specific sports facilities are needed. Such sports are particularly popular in Belgium (Flanders).

European sports clubs are frequently obligated to pay fees for the usage of public sports facilities. On average, 42% of all clubs are liable to pay a usage fee, which is equivalent to 64% of the sports clubs using public sports facilities. However, there are big differences between the countries regarding the obligation to pay usage fees (see Table 5). In the Netherlands, nearly 96% of all clubs using public facilities have to pay a fee. This means that more than half of all Dutch clubs are obliged to pay for using public facilities. In England and Belgium (Flanders), around 90% of clubs making use of public infrastructure are liable to pay. On the other side, for the universalist states like Denmark and Norway, the percentage of clubs having to pay a fee when using public facilities is much lower, namely around 41% and 53%, respectively. Also in Germany and Spain, only around half of the clubs that use public facilities have to pay for it, which reflects about one third of all Spanish and German sports clubs. The requirement to pay a fee can be related to the welfare state typology outlined in the WPI report (Ibsen et al., 2016).

Table 5: Usage fee for public facilities.

Country	Liabile to pay a usage fee (proportion of clubs that use public facilities, in %)	Liabile to pay a usage fee (proportion of all clubs, in %)
TOTAL	64	42
Netherlands	96	53
England	90	51
Belgium (Flanders)	89	57
Hungary	63	46
Poland	56	51
Switzerland	54	36
Norway	53	37
Germany	51	33
Spain	48	31
Denmark	41	29

3 Management of sports clubs in Europe

3.1 Clubs' opinions on governance, management and values (philosophy)

3.1.1 Average values

To get an impression of how sports clubs are run across Europe, the clubs were asked about their opinion on different management issues and values that the clubs follow. An overview of the club boards' opinions on six items related to these issues is displayed in Fig. 9. The items were measured on a scale from 1 = *don't agree at all* to 5 = *totally agree*.⁵ Interestingly, social aspects seem to be very important to most sports clubs across the countries. This is supported by the result that the mean value of the item "*Our club sets high value on companionship and conviviality*" is larger than four in all countries but Hungary ($M = 3.8$; mean across all countries $M = 4.3$). The strongest agreement with this item comes from sports clubs in Spain ($M = 4.7$) and Belgium (Flanders) ($M = 4.6$). In contrast to the importance of social aspects within club life, the picture is different when asking clubs whether they set high value on sporting success and competition. Although most clubs tend to agree with this item, the average values are lower here. The least average importance of sporting success is stated by sports clubs in Germany and Norway ($M = 3.1$), closely followed by sports clubs in Belgium (Flanders), Denmark and Switzerland ($M = 3.3$), as well as Spain ($M = 3.4$). Rather important is sporting success for sports clubs in Poland ($M = 4.1$), Hungary ($M = 3.9$), the Netherlands ($M = 3.8$) and England ($M = 3.7$). The results show that there seem to be differences particularly between the two post-communist states (Poland and Hungary) and most conservative states (Germany, Belgium (Flanders), Switzerland), as well as social democratic states (Denmark and Norway).

Democratic structures exist in particular in sports clubs in Spain ($M = 4.3$), Switzerland ($M = 4.2$) and the Netherlands ($M = 4.2$). This is displayed by the fact that clubs in these countries most often aim to involve their members when they have to make important decisions. A slightly lower involvement of members is found in clubs in Denmark ($M = 3.7$), Belgium (Flanders) ($M = 3.7$) and Poland ($M = 3.8$). On the other hand, committees are not very commonly used in sports clubs in Hungary, Poland, Germany and Belgium (Flanders). Most often, decision making is delegated from the board to committees in Danish and Norwegian sports clubs, i.e. in social democratic welfare states. The situation of sports clubs across Europe is quite homogeneous regarding long-term planning and the monitoring of set plans (see Fig. 9).

⁵ In Switzerland, the two items "Our club delegates decision making from the board to committees" and "Our club monitors the degree of implementation of its plans" were not part of the data collection.




Fig. 9: Club boards' opinions on management issues (1 = don't agree at all to 5 = totally agree).

3.1.2 Distribution of philosophy items

Taking a closer look at the distribution of the clubs' management and philosophy items, interesting details can be observed. The largest proportions of clubs totally agreeing that their club aims to involve members when making important decisions are found in Spain and Switzerland, but in the Netherlands, even more clubs agree or totally agree when these are combined (89%). In Belgium (Flanders) and Germany, about one quarter of the clubs neither agree nor disagree, whereas in Poland, 14% of the clubs state that they disagree, meaning that members are rather uninvolved in important decisions within these clubs. The smallest proportion of clubs that disagree with this statement are found in the Netherlands: only 2% of all clubs do not involve members in decision making (see Fig. 10).




Fig. 10: Club boards' opinions on "Our club aims to involve members when making important decisions".

A different result is displayed for the distribution of agreement with the item "Our club delegates decision making from the board to committees". In Hungary, more than half of all clubs state that they disagree, meaning that such clubs do not delegate decisions. Completely different is the situation in sports clubs in Norway, England and Denmark where more than 60% of the clubs state that they delegate decisions from the board to committees (see Fig. 11).




Fig. 11: Club boards' opinions on "Our club delegates decision making from the board to committees".⁶

Long-term planning is particularly popular in English sports clubs: More than 80% of the clubs state that they agree with having engagement in long-term planning. Sports clubs in Denmark are rather undecided with regard to long-term planning, with more than one third of all clubs being unable to give a clear statement of whether long-term planning is part of the clubs' management. The situation in Germany, Belgium (Flanders) and Switzerland is similar. In Switzerland, every fifth sports club states that long-term planning is not applied, representing the largest proportion of disagreement compared to clubs in the other participating countries (see Fig. 12).

The monitoring of the implementation of plans is pretty similar across the countries. What stands out here is the total agreement of 42% of Hungarian clubs, whereas in all other countries, between 12% (Netherlands) and 25% (Spain) totally agree that the club monitors the implementation of its plans (see Fig. 13).

⁶ This item was not part of the data collection in Switzerland. The same applies to the item "Our club monitors the degree of implementation of its plans" (see Fig. 13).




Fig. 12: Club boards' opinions on "Our club engages in long-term planning".




Fig. 13: Club boards' opinions on "Our club monitors the degree of implementation of its plans".

Setting a high value on companionship and conviviality is very important to the majority of European sports clubs. In Spain, almost three quarters of all clubs state that they fully agree here. In Belgium (Flanders), Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway and Spain, more than 90% of the clubs agree or totally agree, showing the great importance of social aspects within sports clubs. Interestingly, the proportion of clubs that are undecided is nearly the same in Germany and Hungary, but in Hungary the proportion of clubs that do not put a high value on companionship and conviviality is larger than in Germany (12% vs. 6%). In Spain, none of the clubs taking part in the survey disagreed with this item (see Fig. 14).




Fig. 14: Club boards' opinions on "Our club sets high value on companionship and conviviality".

With regard to the importance of sporting success and competition, a diverse picture across the countries is displayed. Whereas 85% of Polish sports clubs and about 70% of sports clubs in England, the Netherlands and Hungary agree that sporting success is important for the club, 40% of Norwegian clubs and about 30% of the clubs in Germany and Spain do not put a high value on success in sporting competitions. Interestingly, about one third of all clubs in Belgium (Flanders), Denmark, Germany and one fourth of the clubs in the Netherlands and Switzerland do not have a clear opinion here (see Fig. 15).




Fig. 15: Club boards' opinions on "Our club sets high value on sporting success and competition".

3.2 Finances

3.2.1 Balance

The overall financial situation of European sports clubs is reflected in the profit and loss calculation of the clubs that is generated by subtracting the total expenses from the total revenues. It appears that in 2014, approximately three quarters of the sports clubs in all countries had at least a balanced profit-and-loss account (also reflected by the total mean value of all included countries), with the exception of Belgium (Flanders) and Switzerland. Whereas in Belgium (Flanders), even more than 85% of all clubs were able to write black figures, the proportion of clubs with at least a black zero amounted to roughly 66% in Switzerland, meaning that about one third of Swiss sports clubs were not able to break even in 2014. In the remaining countries, the proportion of clubs with a positive balance ranges between 72.3% in Poland and 79.7% in Hungary. In social democratic states, including Denmark and Norway, and in conservative countries like Germany and the Netherlands, the proportion of clubs writing black figures in 2014 amounts to approximately 77% (see Table 6).

Table 6: Balanced profit-and-loss account in 2014.

Country	Positive balance (proportion of clubs in %)	Negative balance (proportion of clubs in %)
TOTAL	76.0	24.0
Belgium (Flanders)	85.2	14.8
Hungary	79.7	20.3
Netherlands	77.6	22.4
Germany	77.0	23.0
Norway	77.0	23.0
Denmark	76.2	23.8
England	74.7	25.3
Spain	73.4	26.6
Poland	72.3	27.7
Switzerland	66.4	33.6

3.2.2 Revenue

3.2.2.1 Revenue per member

Taking a look at the actual revenue that is generated by sports clubs, the total amount of revenue in each club was divided by the number of members in the respective club, so that the ratio ‘revenue per member’ can be used to compare revenue generation across the countries⁷. The mean calculated for all countries amounts to € 307 per member in the year 2014 (see Table 7).

What becomes very clear is that there are large differences in revenue generation between countries. Whereas in Switzerland and Norway, the clubs generated more than € 450 per member in the year 2014, the lowest per capita revenue was generated by Hungarian sports clubs, with an average of almost € 25. Moreover, taking a look at the median instead of the mean, it can be seen that half of all clubs in the different countries generate less revenue per member. For example in Spain, the average revenue per member amounts to € 322, but half of the clubs only earn a maximum of € 94 per member per year. Similar patterns can be found in Switzerland, Poland, Denmark, Germany and Belgium (Flanders), where the standard deviations reflect a large dispersion of revenue per member (see Table 7).

⁷ To make revenue comparable in terms of currency, the € was used here. For countries not having the €, the average exchange rate for 2014 was used to calculate €-values for all countries (for the actual exchange rates, see method in section 6.2).

Table 7: Revenue per member in 2014.

Country	Revenue per member in 2014 (in €)		
	mean	std. dev.	median
TOTAL	307.3	-	-
Switzerland	478.4	1,274.1	272.7
Norway	450.3	734.1	273.6
England	382.7	865.4	167.9
Poland	364.2	1,327.8	143.4
Spain	321.8	1,781.6	93.8
Denmark	298.5	1,653.5	136.8
Netherlands	278.7	632.8	220.8
Germany	248.7	1,333.0	120.3
Belgium (Flanders)	224.4	1,117.0	108.7
Hungary	24.8	167.2	0.1

3.2.2.2 Revenue distribution

Investigating the distribution of revenues by categories, large differences can be observed between the European sports clubs. What particularly stands out is that a very large majority of sports clubs in Hungary, namely 90% of all clubs, had total revenues of no more than € 1,000 in the year 2014. Contrary to that, more than one third of all Norwegian sports clubs gained revenues of more than € 100,000 annually⁸. A similar large proportion of Dutch clubs also had revenues of more than € 100,000. In Germany and Switzerland, the revenue distribution is rather balanced between the categories. Approximately every tenth sports club in Germany received revenues in each of the following ranges: € 5,001 to € 10,000, € 10,001 to € 15,000, € 20,001 to € 30,000, and € 30,001 to € 50,000. In Switzerland, the same proportion applies to all the revenue ranges € 10,000 to € 15,000 and € 50,000 to € 100,000. What is interesting regarding the revenue distribution among English sports clubs is the fact that about one quarter of the clubs in England received more than € 100,000, and at the same time, a similar proportion of clubs received € 5,000 or less⁹. In Spain, more than half of all clubs had annual revenues of up to € 5,000 and in Belgium (Flanders) this applied to more than 40% of the clubs. About half of all Polish sports clubs received a maximum of € 10,000 and only 6% of clubs in Poland received more than € 100,000 in 2014 (see Fig. 16)¹⁰.

8 For Norway, it has to be noted that the share of very large clubs with more than 1,000 members is overrepresented in the sample which might bias the financial results here. For more information on sample representativeness, see Chapter 7.1.7.

9 Similar to Norway, the overrepresentation of a few large clubs in the English sample might bias the results at this point (see Chapter 7.1.3 for more details).

10 Overall, when looking at revenue and expenditure of sports clubs across Europe, it has to be taken into account that the price levels differ widely between countries, which might very likely have an impact on the finances of sports clubs as well.




Fig. 16: Revenue distribution in 2014.

3.2.3 Expenditure

3.2.3.1 Expenditure per member

Similar to ‘revenue per member’, the ratio ‘expenditure per member’ has been calculated. The mean across all countries amounts to € 335 per member in the year 2014. The highest expenditure per member can be found in sports clubs in Poland, with an average of more than € 490 in 2014. However, half of all Polish clubs only had a maximum of € 145 expenditure per member. Similar patterns are found across the countries, although the standard deviation, i.e. the dispersion of expenditure per member, is largest in Danish sports clubs. Similar to revenue per member, Hungarian sports clubs also show the smallest average expenditure per member, with about € 28 (see Table 8).

Table 8: Expenditure per member in 2014.

Country	Expenditure per member in 2014 (in €)		
	mean	std. dev.	median
TOTAL	335.4	-	-
Poland	492.3	2,396.0	144.7
England	465.6	1,914.7	154.1
Switzerland	462.5	777.1	267.4
Norway	409.1	648.8	255.1
Denmark	388.1	5,335.6	130.0
Spain	327.4	1,779.0	100.0
Netherlands	319.8	1,193.0	212.8
Germany	244.7	1,340.5	114.8
Belgium (Flanders)	216.9	1,098.8	100.0
Hungary	27.5	175.9	0.1

3.2.3.2 Expenditure distribution

Regarding the expenses of European sports clubs, similar patterns to the revenue distribution can be observed. A special case is again Hungary, where 90% of the sports clubs had expenses of up to € 1,000 in 2014. The largest proportions of clubs with expenses of more than € 100,000 are found, like for revenues, in Norway (32%) and the Netherlands (35%). But also, almost one quarter (24%) of English sports clubs report annual expenses above € 100,000. In Spain, half of all sports clubs had expenses of up to € 5,000, with as many as 22% of the clubs only having expenses of less than € 1,001. The proportion of clubs with expenses of up to € 1,000 amounts to 19% in Belgium (Flanders), 7% in Denmark and Poland, 6% in Germany and Norway, 4% in England, 3% in the Netherlands, and only 2% in Switzerland. Roughly every fourth sports club in Denmark, Poland, Belgium (Flanders) and England had expenses between € 1,001 and € 5,000 in the year 2014. In the Netherlands, more than half of all clubs spent € 50,000 or more (see Fig. 17)¹¹.

3.2.4 Direct public subsidies

Non-profit sports clubs have the possibility of receiving public support. This can be indirect support, e.g. in the form of tax exemptions or through the possibility of using public sports facilities (Heinemann, 2005; Horch, 1994), or direct financial support in the form of monetary subsidies. The average revenue proportion from public subsidies amounts to approximately 16% across all countries. A country comparison of the proportion of direct public subsidies relative to all revenue the sports clubs received in 2014 shows that in Poland and Hungary, the two post-communist states, the proportion of direct public funding is outstandingly high. In Poland, almost 41% of the total revenues came from public money and in Hungary, the proportion amounts to nearly 28%. The other extreme is found in sports clubs in England and

¹¹ Looking at correlations between the level of expenditure and the need to pay usage fees for public facilities, positive and significant correlations are only found in Germany and Poland, but not in any of the other countries.

the Netherlands. Here, the proportion of direct public subsidies only amounted to 6% and 5%, respectively. In the two social democratic states, direct public subsidies on average amounted to a proportion of 17% in Norwegian sports clubs and 15% in Danish clubs. Swiss sports clubs reported a similar amount of direct public support relative to all revenue. In Spain and Germany, the amount of public subsidies made up about one tenth of all revenue the clubs received in 2014 (see Table 9).




Fig. 17: Expenditure distribution in 2014.

Table 9: Revenue proportion of direct public subsidies.

Country	Direct public subsidies (proportion of revenue in %)
TOTAL	16
Poland	41
Hungary	28
Norway	17
Denmark	15
Switzerland	14
Belgium (Flanders)	13
Spain	11
Germany	9
England	6
Netherlands	5

3.3 Problems

3.3.1 Average size of problems

It should be noted that the situation of sports clubs in Europe is not without problems. Problems are related to human resources, including the recruitment and retention of volunteers on the board level, coaches and instructors, officials and referees, as well as members (see Fig. 18). Furthermore, clubs face problems in the light of the financial situation, the availability of sports facilities, the number of laws, orders and directives facing sports clubs, the demographic change in the regions, and local competition from commercial sports providers (see Fig. 19). The problems were measured on a 5-point-scale with $1 = no\ problem$ to $5 = a\ very\ big\ problem$.

The recruitment and retention of members is a comparatively big problem for sports clubs in Switzerland ($M = 3.1$) and Denmark ($M = 3.0$). In contrast, sports clubs in Belgium (Flanders) state that the membership problem is smaller on average ($M = 2.0$). Regarding the recruitment and retention of volunteers on the board level, which is one of the main topics of this report, the mean across all countries is $M = 2.7$. The situation is particularly tense in Germany ($M = 3.4$), Switzerland ($M = 3.0$), and Denmark ($M = 3.0$). Here again, sports clubs in Belgium (Flanders) ($M = 2.1$) and also in Spain ($M = 2.2$) face smaller challenges on average. The same is true for the recruitment and retention of coaches and instructors, as well as referees and officials: whereas the situation with regard to these problems is particularly difficult for German and Swiss sports clubs, clubs in Belgium (Flanders), Spain and also the Netherlands face smaller problems here. All problems related to human resources are medium-sized in sports clubs in England, Poland, Norway and Hungary (see Fig. 18).

Looking at the financial situation of the sports clubs (see Fig. 19), a different picture is displayed regarding problems in this field. What stands out is that the two post-communist countries, Hungary ($M = 3.6$) and Poland ($M = 3.5$), face the largest challenges due to the financial situation of the clubs. Financial problems are also higher on average in Spanish sports clubs than in the clubs of the remaining countries. Very few financial challenges are reported by sports clubs in Belgium (Flanders) ($M = 1.6$), the Netherlands ($M = 1.8$) and Switzerland ($M = 1.9$).

Problems related to the availability of sports facilities are highest on average in Hungary ($M = 3.3$), Spain ($M = 3.1$) and Poland ($M = 3.0$). In comparison to these three countries, the Netherlands ($M = 1.8$), Germany ($M = 2.1$), Belgium (Flanders) ($M = 2.1$) and Switzerland ($M = 2.2$) face substantially smaller problems here (see Fig. 19).

With regard to the number of laws, orders and directives, clubs in Hungary ($M = 3.0$) and Poland ($M = 3.0$) report having the biggest problems, closely followed by German ($M = 2.6$) and Spanish ($M = 2.5$) sports clubs. Interestingly, Dutch sports clubs only report very small problems due to bureaucratic issues (see Fig. 19).

Demographic changes in the different regions of the European countries seem to affect the sports clubs across the countries differently. Whereas sports clubs in Germany, Hungary and Poland report medium-sized problems here ($M = 2.5$), the situation is much better in the remaining countries. The least problems due to demographic changes are perceived by sports clubs in Belgium (Flanders) ($M = 1.4$) and England ($M = 1.5$; see Fig. 19).




Fig. 18: Problems of sports clubs (Part 1; 1 = no problem, 5 = a very big problem).




Fig. 19: Problems of sports clubs (Part 2; 1 = no problem, 5 = a very big problem).

The important position of non-profit sports clubs across Europe is underlined by the fact that local competition from commercial sports providers is only perceived as an – on average – smaller problem in most of the participating countries. The competition from commercial sports providers is, however, perceived as a medium-sized problem by sports clubs in Poland ($M = 2.5$) and Hungary ($M = 2.4$; see Fig. 19).

At the end of this paragraph it seems timely to underline that the results presented above are the challenges as they are viewed by the chairpersons of the participating sports clubs. This means that demographic change and competition from commercial sports providers are potentially among the main challenges of sports clubs – they were just not viewed as major challenges by the vast majority of the clubs themselves at the time the survey study was conducted.

3.3.2 Distribution of problem items

After having presented the average size of the different problems sports clubs have to face, taking a look at the distribution of these problems delivers some interesting additional information. The following figures are therefore sorted in descending order by the proportion of clubs that perceive very big problems in the different areas.

With regard to the problem of member recruitment and retention, it gets very clear that this problem is biggest in Switzerland and Denmark. In Switzerland, 13% of the sports clubs state that they have very big problems related to winning or retaining members. In Denmark, nearly every tenth club perceives very large challenges here. About one third of the clubs in Germany, Hungary, Poland, Norway and the Netherlands perceive a medium-sized problem in this area. In contrast, 45% of Flemish sports clubs see no problem at all with recruiting or retaining members. This shows that the problem varies widely in size across the countries (see Fig. 20).

The recruitment and retention of volunteers on the board level is by far the largest problem for German sports clubs. More than one fifth of the sports clubs report very large problems here, and a further third of the clubs state that they have big problems. The proportion of clubs that report very large challenges due to the recruitment and retention of volunteers amounts to 15% in Switzerland, 12% in Denmark, 7% in Poland and the Netherlands, 5% in Norway, England, Hungary, and Spain and only 4% in Belgium (Flanders). In Spain and Belgium (Flanders), more than 60% of the sports clubs report no problems or only small problems related to the recruitment and retention of volunteers on the board level. In England, this applies to more than half of all sports clubs (see Fig. 21).




Fig. 20: Distribution of the problem "Recruitment/retention of members".




Fig. 21: Distribution of the problem "Recruitment/retention of volunteers on the board level".

Pertaining to the two further human resources problems (recruitment and retention of coaches/instructors, as well as referees/officials), the largest proportions of clubs reporting big or very big problems are found in Germany and Switzerland: nearly 40% of the clubs state that they have (very) big problems in the field of coaches/instructors. In Poland and Denmark, this applies to about 30% of the clubs. With regard to referees/officials, as many as 43% of clubs in Germany are facing large challenges here. In England, Poland, the Netherlands and Norway, every fifth club has (very) big problems in the field of referees/officials. In contrast, more than 60% of the clubs in England, Belgium (Flanders) and Spain report no problems or only small problems related to coaches and instructors, and in Spain and Belgium (Flanders), even more than 70% state that they have only small problems or no problems in recruiting and retaining referees/officials (see Fig. 22 and Fig. 23).

A different picture regarding the severity of problems is displayed for the financial situation of sports clubs across the countries. Here, one quarter of sports clubs in Hungary and Poland report very big problems and even more than half of all clubs in these two countries have big or very big financial problems. In countries that have to struggle more with problems related to human resources, like Germany and Switzerland, only 4% and 3% of the clubs, respectively, have very big financial problems (see Fig. 24).

A similar picture is displayed with regard to the availability of sports facilities. Here, the largest proportions of clubs with very big problems in this area are found in Spain (29%), Hungary (23%) and Poland (20%), whereas only 9% of clubs in Switzerland, Denmark and Belgium (Flanders), 8% of German clubs, and 4% of Dutch sports clubs report very big chal-




Fig. 22: Distribution of the problem "Recruitment/retention of coaches/instructors".




Fig. 23: Distribution of the problem "Recruitment/retention of referees/officials".

lenges due to the availability of sports facilities. In Norway, 40% of the sports clubs report no problems at all, and in England this proportion amounts to 31% (see Fig. 25).

The number of laws, orders and directives is no problem at all for more than half of all sports clubs in the Netherlands and Belgium (Flanders). In Switzerland, 41% of the clubs state that they have no problems here, in England this applies to 39% of the clubs and in Norway to 38%. Interestingly, in Germany one quarter of the clubs state that they have no problem at all, whereas it is also one quarter that report big or very big problems due to bureaucratic burdens. In Hungary and Poland, as many as every third club has big or very big problems due to laws, orders and directives (see Fig. 26).

Demographic change is clearly a large challenge for sports clubs in three countries, namely Hungary, Poland and Germany: more than 20% of the clubs here report big or very big problems due to changes in demography. In the remaining countries, the majority of clubs state that they have no problems at all in this area. In Belgium (Flanders), even more than three quarters of the clubs report no demographic problems, and in England this applies to two thirds of all sports clubs (see Fig. 27).

Local competition from commercial sport providers is clearly the largest challenge in the two post-communist states Hungary and Poland. Whereas in all other countries, at least half of all clubs state that there is no problem at all in this area, the proportion of Hungarian clubs without a problem is 35%, and in Poland it is even smaller, namely only 21% (see Fig. 28).




Fig. 24: Distribution of the problem "Financial situation of the club".




Fig. 25: Distribution of the problem "Availability of sports facilities".




Fig. 26: Distribution of the problem “Number of laws, orders, directives”.




Fig. 27: Distribution of the problem “Demographic change in the region”.




Fig. 28: Distribution of the problem “Local competition from commercial sport providers”.

3.3.3 Existential problems

There are a substantial number of European sports clubs that report at least one existential problem, meaning that the clubs feel threatened in their existence due to at least one problem. On average, this applies to 26% of the clubs (see Table 10).

Table 10: Proportion of clubs with at least one existential problem.

Country	Club has at least one existential problem (proportion of clubs in %)
TOTAL	26
Poland	38
Germany	36
Switzerland	35
Hungary	34
Spain	33
Denmark	21
Norway	19
England	18
Netherlands	13
Belgium (Flanders)	9

Proportionally, the highest number of clubs that feel threatened due to at least one problem is found in Poland, with 38% of the clubs stating that they have at least one existential problem. In Germany, Switzerland, Hungary and Spain, about one out of three clubs feels that its existence is endangered. Clubs in Denmark, Norway and England report existential problems less frequently, and the proportions of Dutch (13%) and Flemish¹² (9%) sports clubs with one existential problem threatening the clubs' existence are lowest (see Table 10).

Taking a closer look at the problems that threaten the existence of sports clubs, a diverse picture is displayed across the countries. Regarding the recruitment and retention of volunteers on the board level, it can be observed that 15% of sports clubs in Germany, 11% of clubs in Switzerland and 8% of Danish sports clubs feel their existence is threatened due to this problem. Compared to the other countries, the proportion of sports clubs feeling threatened through the recruitment and retention of members, coaches and instructors, as well as referees and officials, is highest in Switzerland. In Poland, nearly one tenth of the clubs feel threatened due to problems connected to the recruitment and retention of coaches or instructors, and in England this applies to 5% of the clubs¹³ (see Fig. 29).

In Poland, Hungary and Spain, problems related to the clubs' financial situation, the availability of sports facilities, and the number of laws, orders and directives facing sports clubs are reported considerably more often as existential problems than in other countries. In England, the largest existential problem is the availability of sports facilities: 9% of the clubs feel threatened here. Moreover, 6% of English clubs report existential problems due to the financial situation. Apart from the named problems, 6% of the sports clubs in Hungary and Poland feel threatened through demographic changes in the regions. In Germany, the latter applies to 4% of the clubs (see Fig. 30).

12 However, it needs to be noted that the question regarding existential problems was phrased slightly differently in the survey in Flanders. Therefore, the comparison of Flemish sports clubs with those of the other countries regarding existential problems should be treated carefully. Besides, the data from Flanders differs in this report and in the country-specific report due to this difference.

13 This result for England may reflect the requirement of clubmark accreditation to have certain numbers of coaches with particular accreditations. Thus, this result may be affected by the high proportion of clubmark clubs in the sample (see section 7.1.3 for more details).




Fig. 29: Proportion of sports clubs with existential problems (Part 1).




Fig. 30: Proportion of sports clubs with existential problems (Part 2).

4 Importance of volunteers for European sports clubs

4.1 Volunteers in sports clubs

Voluntary staff are essential for European non-profit sports clubs to function well. However, the number of volunteers working for the clubs varies across the countries. To make the results comparable between countries, not the average number of volunteers, but the average proportion of volunteers relative to members is reported here. In Spain, Hungary, the Netherlands and Denmark, there is one volunteer for approximately every five members. This is slightly above the total average. In England, Belgium (Flanders), Norway and Poland this average percentage is slightly below 20%. It appears that voluntary commitment within a fixed position is lowest among German and Swiss sports clubs, where on average 13% and 14% of the members are volunteers (see Table 11). This can also be a hint as to why sports clubs in Germany and Switzerland in particular report comparatively large problems with regard to the recruitment and retention of volunteers on the board level (cf. Section 3.3). However, it should be noted that in Switzerland and Germany, next to Spain and Belgium (Flanders), clubs report a higher proportion of secondary volunteers. Secondary volunteers refer to volunteers that may be volunteering only sporadically for the club without having a fixed position (e.g. helping at sporting events, festivals, chauffeur service, renovations, etc.). In comparison, English sports clubs state that merely 6% of their members commit to a sporadic voluntary engagement (see Table 11).

Table 11: Volunteers in fixed positions and not in fixed positions (proportion relative to members, sorted in descending order by the proportion of volunteers in fixed positions).

Country	Volunteers in fixed positions	Volunteers not in fixed positions
	Proportion relative to members (in %)	
TOTAL	19	16
Spain	23	18
Hungary	22	16
Netherlands	21	13
Denmark	20	14
England	20	6
Belgium (Flanders)	19	18
Norway	19	16
Poland	18	13
Switzerland	14	25
Germany	13	17

Within their roles as volunteers in fixed positions, the clubs' volunteers fulfil different tasks within sports clubs that can be assigned to four areas: 1) Administration and management (e.g. board and committees, club leaders, etc.), 2) Sport and training (e.g. coaches, instructors, group and team leaders, etc.), 3) Sport and competition (e.g. referees, officials, etc.), and 4) Other tasks (e.g. maintenance, facilities, etc.). Looking at the distribution of volunteers between the four areas, it can be seen that in relation to the total number of volunteers in fixed positions, the largest proportion of volunteers fulfil administrative or management tasks. These volunteers are mostly volunteers on the board level. In Germany, two thirds of all volunteers are engaged in this area, whereas roughly half of all voluntary positions belong to administration and management in Belgium (Flanders), Denmark, Hungary, Poland and Spain. In the Netherlands, about 30% of the volunteers belong to this area. A similar proportion of Dutch volunteers (28%) fulfil tasks in the field of sport and training. In Denmark, England, Norway, Spain and Switzerland, more than 30% of the volunteers work in this field, i.e. mainly as coaches and instructors. The proportion of volunteers in the area of sport and competition is highest in sports clubs in the Netherlands (17%) and Norway (16%). Other tasks make up the smallest proportion of all volunteers in sports clubs in England, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Spain and Switzerland (see Fig. 31).




Fig. 31: Club areas being operated by volunteers in fixed positions (proportion of volunteers in the four areas relative to all volunteers of the club, in %).

4.2 Paid staff in sports clubs

A small number of European sports clubs also employ paid staff (taxable payments) in the above-mentioned four areas. However, relative to members, the proportion of paid staff is much lower than the proportion of volunteers presented above. In Poland, the proportion of paid staff relative to members is just under 5%. In Spain and Hungary, the proportion of paid staff relative to members amounts to 3% and 2%, respectively. In sports clubs in Germany, England, Denmark and Belgium (Flanders), paid staff make up between 2% and 1% of the members. The lowest proportion of paid staff relative to members is found in sports clubs in the Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland, with paid employees amounting to less than 1% relative to members (see Table 12).

Table 12: Paid staff (proportion of paid staff relative to members).

Country	Paid staff (Proportion relative to members, in %)
TOTAL	2
Poland	5
Spain	3
Hungary	2
Germany	2
England	1
Denmark	1
Belgium (Flanders)	1
Netherlands	1
Norway	1
Switzerland	1

Taking a look at the distribution of paid staff within the four working fields of sports clubs (see Fig. 32), clear differences can be observed compared to the volunteer distribution (cf. Fig. 31). Whereas volunteers in most countries are predominantly assigned to the field of administration and management, paid staff are particularly employed in positions related to the area of sport and training. In all countries except for England, Norway and Spain, paid employees in this field account for more than 60% of all paid staff. In Belgium (Flanders), Poland and Switzerland, about three quarters of all paid staff members work as coaches, instructors or the like. In the Netherlands, the proportion reaches 82%. Apart from that, paid staff in the area of administration and management make up about one third of all paid employees in English and Norwegian sports clubs, one fifth in sports clubs in Denmark and approximately one quarter in Hungarian sports clubs. Paid staff in the field of sport and competition are not very common. The largest proportion is found in Spain, where one tenth of paid employees work as referees or officials for the clubs. Other tasks, such as maintenance or facility management, involve about one fifth of all paid employees in German and English sports clubs (see Fig. 32).




Fig. 32: Club areas being operated by paid staff (proportion of paid staff in the four areas relative to all paid staff of the club in %).

Apart from paid staff in the four different areas, a number of clubs also employ a paid manager in a leading position. Such managers can be employed either full-time or part-time by the clubs. Table 13 gives an overview of the proportion of sports clubs that do have a paid manager (differentiated between full-time and part-time) compared to those that do not have such a person. It is clear that the great majority of all sports clubs across the countries refrain from paid employment in a leading position. The proportion of clubs without a paid manager varies between 81% in England and 98% in Switzerland. In England and Norway, more than one in ten clubs employ a full-time paid manager and about 7% of the clubs have a paid manager in a part-time position. In Hungary, about 9% of the clubs are led by a paid manager in a full-time position, and in Poland and Spain this applies to approximately 5% of all sports clubs. A full-time paid position is very uncommon in sports clubs in Switzerland and the Netherlands (only in less than 1% of clubs in each country). In Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium (Flanders) and Switzerland, more clubs have a paid manager in a part-time position than in a full-time position (see Table 13). Overall, it becomes clear that paid employment is not a frequently used method in non-profit sports clubs across the ten investigated countries. This underlines the importance of voluntary work for the clubs.

Importance of volunteers for European sports clubs

Table 13: Paid manager existent in the club (differentiated by full-time and part-time).

Country	Full-time	Part-time	No paid manager
	Proportion of clubs (in %)		
TOTAL	5	4	91
England	12	7	81
Norway	10	7	83
Hungary	9	6	85
Poland	5	4	91
Spain	5	3	92
Denmark	4	4	92
Germany	2	5	93
Netherlands	1	5	94
Belgium (Flanders)	1	2	97
Switzerland	1	2	97

Taking club size in terms of membership numbers into account when displaying the proportion of clubs with a paid manager (either full-time or part-time), a pretty clear pattern across the countries can be observed: with increasing club size, the proportion of clubs that have employed a paid manager increases. This is particularly clear in Denmark and Germany where the proportion of clubs with a paid manager increases from one club size category to the next, whereas for example in England, the proportion of clubs with a paid managing position is largest in clubs with between 1,001 and 2,500 members (cf. Table 14).

Table 14: Paid manager existent, by club size (proportion of clubs in %; Part 1; n.a. = not available).

Club size (members)	Belgium (Flanders)	Denmark	England	Germany	Hungary
Less than 50	1	1	7	2	5
50-100	3	2	10	2	13
101-300	3	5	16	4	31
301-500	6	9	33	7	41
501-800	4	28	41	11	60
801-1,000	20	36	40	21	40
1,001-2,500	17	46	62	38	40
> 2,500	n.a.	52	50	76	100

For the Netherlands, Poland and Spain, no values are available for the large club size categories, since no large clubs were part of the sample (see Table 15).

Table 15: Paid manager existent, by club size (proportion of club in %; part 2; n.a.=not available).

Club size (members)	Netherlands	Norway	Poland	Spain	Switzerland
Less than 50	1	2	4	5	0
50-100	1	7	5	9	1
101-300	1	5	9	5	4
301-500	2	21	52	33	11
501-800	5	47	40	44	13
801-1,000	12	55	n.a.	n.a.	20
1,001-2,500	33	73	n.a.	n.a.	17
> 2,500	n.a.	67	n.a.	n.a.	38

4.3 Development of volunteers and paid staff

Regarding the development of volunteers, at least 60% of all European sports clubs (except England where the proportion is 56%) are in agreement that within the last five years the number of volunteers has been relatively stable. The total mean value amounts to 65% (see Fig. 33). Also, 10% or even more of the European clubs report a moderate increase in volunteers. In fact, in nearly all countries a higher proportion of sports clubs mention a moderate increase than a moderate decrease, except for Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands. 23% of German sports clubs and 18% of Dutch and Swiss sports clubs state that the number of volunteers showed either a moderate or large decrease, while 12% of the clubs in Germany and Switzerland indicate a moderate or large increase. In the Netherlands, this proportion amounts to 17%. For Germany and Switzerland, this result is in line with the perceived severity of the problem related to the recruitment and retention of volunteers (see section 3.3).¹⁴

With regard to the development of paid staff within the last five years, the vast majority of clubs across the countries have the impression that the number of paid staff has been mostly unchanged. On average, this applies to 78% of all clubs. The largest increase is found in Switzerland, with 28% of the clubs registering a moderate or large increase (see Fig. 34)¹⁵.

¹⁴ What should be noted is the proportion of clubs that were unsure about the development of volunteers. In Spain, 12 % answered “don’t know”. Don’t know answers in the other countries: Flanders & Poland: 4 %; England & Denmark: 3 %; Hungary: 2 %; Germany, the Netherlands & Norway: 1 %.

¹⁵ The share of sports clubs being unsure about the development of paid staff was even higher than for volunteer development. In Spain (32 %), Denmark (26 %), Flanders (25 %), the Netherlands (18 %), England and Norway (15 %), Germany and Poland (8 %), and Hungary (7%), the number in brackets displays the clubs that answered with “don’t know”. This might be attributed to the fact that having paid staff is pretty uncommon for European non-profit sports clubs (see section 4.2).

Importance of volunteers for European sports clubs




Fig. 33: Development of volunteers within the last five years.




Fig. 34: Development of paid staff within the last five years.

4.4 What clubs do to recruit and retain volunteers

To cope with the challenge of recruiting and retaining volunteers, European sports clubs are taking different initiatives and measures. Although some of these initiatives are frequently used across the countries, there are still differences between countries with regard to the frequency of usage. For example, the majority of sports clubs (on average 57%) in most of the participating countries, except for Belgium (Flanders) (46%), Poland (34%) and Spain (25%), recruit volunteers through existing networks of current volunteers and members. This applies to roughly three quarters of sports clubs in Denmark, Norway, England and the Netherlands. In Germany, 60% of the clubs make use of existing networks and in Hungary 57%. A further measure that is frequently used in the different countries is the focus on verbal encouragement and motivation. On average, 55% of the clubs use this method. For instance, in Germany, Belgium (Flanders), the Netherlands, Norway and England, at least 60% of the sports clubs attempt to encourage and motivate their volunteers verbally. In contrast, this measure is only applied in 38% of Hungarian sports clubs, 42% of Swiss clubs, 45% of Polish clubs, and 46% of sports clubs in Denmark and Spain. The importance of social values is underlined by the fact that sports clubs in Switzerland (69%) and Germany (66%) in particular arrange parties and social gatherings for volunteers to strengthen group identity. However, such measures are less frequently applied in Poland (23%), Hungary (31%) and Spain (32%). Besides the above-mentioned measures, members and parents of children who are members are expected to contribute with voluntary work. Particularly Swiss, Dutch, Norwegian and Polish sports clubs trust on the contribution of their members and parents of members. A further measure to recruit and retain volunteers is paying for the training and qualification of them. Sports clubs in Germany, Belgium (Flanders) and the Netherlands (conservative states), Norway and Denmark (social democratic countries), as well as England (a liberal welfare state), make use of this motivational measure. In contrast, this measure is only rarely used by sports clubs in the post-communist states Poland and Hungary, as well as Spain as the only Latin state (see Fig. 35). A measure that is used by 36% of Danish sports clubs and 29% of the sports clubs in Norway, England and Belgium (Flanders) is providing benefits in kind for the volunteers. Moreover, around one quarter of English and Danish clubs have a staff member that is responsible for volunteer management. A similar proportion of clubs in these two countries try to recruit volunteers from outside the club. Almost one in five clubs in Switzerland and England have a written strategy for volunteer recruitment. This is not very common in Poland, Germany, Hungary and Norway (see Fig. 36). It should also be mentioned that some European sports clubs have not yet initiated any particular measures to recruit and retain volunteers¹⁶.

16 In Switzerland, the items “The club mainly recruits through the networks of current volunteers and members”, “Other measures” and “The club does not do anything in particular” were not part of the data collection. Moreover, data for the rest of the items was collected on a 5-point scale from 1 = does not apply at all to 5 = applies completely. For this analysis, agreement is operationalised when at least category 4 was marked.

Importance of volunteers for European sports clubs




Fig. 35: Measures to recruit and retain volunteers (Part 1).




Fig. 36: Measures to recruit and retain volunteers (Part 2).

The specific measures and initiatives to recruit and retain volunteers were described above and are displayed in Fig. 35 and Fig. 36. Generally, the great majority of all sports clubs across the countries (on average 88%) use at least one of the measures to recruit and retain volunteers. In England, the Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland, more than 90% of the clubs have at least one measure installed. In Spain and Hungary, approximately every fifth sports club does not use any of the described initiatives for the recruitment and retention of volunteers (see Fig. 37).




Fig. 37: At least one initiative existent¹⁷.

The number of measures to recruit and retain volunteers increases with increasing club size. This tendency can be seen particularly for Belgium (Flanders), England, Germany and the Netherlands, where the average number of initiatives increases from one club size category to the next. But also in the other countries, larger clubs use more initiatives than smaller clubs. In England, for example, clubs with less than 50 members have on average 2.5 measures to recruit and retain volunteers, whereas the number of initiatives amounts to an average of six in clubs with more than 2,500 members (see Table 16 and Table 17).

¹⁷ In Switzerland, this question was formulated slightly differently from the rest of the countries: The question was phrased on a 5-point scale from 1 = does not apply at all to 5 = applies completely. For this analysis, one initiative is existent when at least category 4 was marked in one of the items.

Importance of volunteers for European sports clubs

Table 16: Number of initiatives, by club size (Part 1; n.a. = not available).

Club size (members)	Belgium (Flanders)	Denmark	England	Germany	Hungary
	Mean				
Less than 50	1.9	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.3
50-100	3.0	3.1	3.6	3.0	2.5
101-300	3.8	4.1	4.4	3.5	2.6
301-500	4.6	4.8	4.4	3.8	2.8
501-800	4.3	5.0	4.6	4.1	1.8
801-1,000	4.2	5.5	4.5	4.1	3.8
1,001-2,500	5.2	5.0	5.1	4.1	2.5
> 2,500	n.a.	5.8	6.0	4.3	1.0

For the Netherlands, Poland and Spain, no values are available for the large club size categories, since such clubs were not part of the sample (see Table 17).

Table 17: Number of initiatives, by club size (Part 2; n.a. = not available).

Club size (members)	Netherlands	Norway	Poland	Spain	Switzerland ¹⁸
	Mean				
Less than 50	1.3	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.7
50-100	2.9	2.9	2.4	2.5	3.0
101-300	3.7	3.9	2.3	2.7	3.3
301-500	4.4	4.6	2.7	2.3	3.5
501-800	4.8	4.7	2.0	2.9	3.1
801-1,000	5.0	5.4	n.a.	n.a.	2.6
1,001-2,500	5.4	5.0	n.a.	n.a.	2.8
> 2,500	n.a.	4.3	n.a.	n.a.	3.5

¹⁸ In Switzerland, the question was formulated on a 5-point scale. Here, the categories 4 = applies and 5 = applies completely were used as one dummy variable which reflects the existence of initiatives. In contrast to the other countries, only 9 instead of 10 initiatives were part of the survey.

4.5 Club boards' opinions on volunteers

4.5.1 Average opinion on volunteers

With regard to the importance of volunteers for European sports clubs, the club boards were asked for their opinion on five items related to volunteers.¹⁹ On a scale from *1 = don't agree at all* to *5 = totally agree*, the strongest and most homogeneous agreement across the countries is reached for the question about whether all members can be volunteers regardless of their qualification. German ($M = 4.6$), Hungarian ($M = 4.5$), Norwegian ($M = 4.4$) and Spanish ($M = 4.4$) sports clubs show the strongest agreement. But also the average values in the remaining countries are fairly high, with the lowest mean value ($M = 3.9$) reached in Poland. The total average value amounts to $M = 4.3$ (see Fig. 38).

Agreement also exists between countries with regard to the turnover rate of volunteers. Most clubs in the different countries agree that the turnover rate of volunteers is rather low (total average is $M = 3.7$). The mean values range between $M = 3.5$ in the Netherlands and $M = 3.9$ in Germany (see Fig. 38). This shows that the same volunteers seem to keep their position for a long time in clubs of all countries. However, this might also lead to volunteer problems, particularly when volunteers on the board level have reached an age when they do not want to continue their voluntary work in this position. In Germany, studies have shown that the position of being president of a club is often filled with people aged 60 years and older (Breuer, Feiler & Wicker, 2013). Also, the period or term in leading voluntary positions (chairmen and directors) in German sports clubs is on average the longest compared to other positions on the board (Breuer & Feiler, 2015).

Pertaining to the attitude of members, there is also strong agreement between the sports clubs in the different countries ($M = 3.8$). In particular, Hungarian ($M = 4.3$) and Swiss ($M = 4.1$) sports clubs strongly agree that their members demonstrate passion, dedication and energy for the work that needs to be done. On the other hand, clubs in Germany ($M = 3.3$) and Denmark ($M = 3.5$) on average report less agreement here (see Fig. 38). This might be one reason for the difficulties in recruiting volunteers from within the club structure in these two countries (also see section 3.3).

The importance of volunteers for sports clubs is once again underlined by the opinion of the clubs on the question of whether clubs should be exclusively run by volunteers ($M = 3.6$). Here, the agreement of Swiss ($M = 4.3$) and German ($M = 4.1$) sports clubs is strongest, followed by Danish ($M = 3.8$) and Flemish ($M = 3.7$) sports clubs. The previous sections have shown that paid staff are not very common in non-profit sports clubs and the results here show that clubs put great value on a club operating solely through voluntary work. Exceptions are clubs from Poland ($M = 2.6$) and Hungary ($M = 3.0$), which indicate less agreement for having an exclusively voluntary-operated club management. This confirms the results of the section on paid staff, where it was shown that clubs in these two post-communist countries employ more paid staff than the other countries (see section 4.2).

In line with the expectation of clubs being run by volunteers, the clubs do not agree that members are considered to be customers who cannot be expected to contribute with voluntary

¹⁹ In Switzerland, the item "All members can be volunteers regardless of their qualifications" was not part of the data collection. Therefore, no result is displayed here in Fig. 38.

work ($M = 1.9$). Most likely, sports clubs in Belgium (Flanders) and Poland have this opinion, although the average agreement is also rather low in these countries ($M = 2.2$). Sports clubs in Norway ($M = 1.6$) and the Netherlands ($M = 1.7$) report the least average agreement to this question (see Fig. 38).




Fig. 38: Club boards' opinions on volunteers (1 = Don't agree at all, 5 = totally agree).

4.5.2 Distribution of club boards' opinions on volunteers

In Fig. 38, the average values of agreement of the clubs' boards to questions on volunteers were displayed. In this section, the distributions of the five categories of the items are further described. It becomes very clear that the vast majority of clubs do not consider members to be customers who cannot be expected to contribute with voluntary work. What is interesting, though, is that the countries which showed the strongest average agreement to this item, namely Poland and Belgium (Flanders), do not have the highest proportion of clubs that completely follow this opinion. Instead, 6% of Spanish sports clubs totally agree that members cannot be expected to contribute with voluntary work, whereas in Poland and Belgium (Flanders), this applies only to 3% of the clubs. Interestingly, nearly 80% of all Spanish clubs do not agree (at all) to this statement. Disagreement is only greater in English, Dutch and Norwegian sports clubs. The greatest disagreement, displayed as the percentage of clubs, comes from sports clubs in Norway, where nearly 90% of all clubs state that they don't agree or don't agree at all to this statement (see Fig. 39). As was shown earlier, about 45% of the sports clubs in Norway expect members and parents of children that are members to contribute with voluntary work (cf. Fig. 35). Thus, this is in line with the results here.




Fig. 39: Club boards' opinions on "Our club considers members to be customers who cannot be expected to contribute with voluntary work".

In contrast to the results of the item above, the great majority of all clubs are of the opinion that all members can be volunteers regardless of their qualification. This shows that clubs think that everybody in the club can take on a voluntary task or position. In Hungary and Germany, about two thirds of the clubs completely agree with this statement. Agreement is displayed by more than 80% of the clubs in all participating countries, with the largest proportions of disagreement (15%) displayed in sports clubs in Poland, closely followed by Danish (11%) sports clubs (see Fig. 40).




Fig. 40: Club boards' opinions on "All members can be volunteers regardless of their qualifications".²⁰

With regard to a low turnover rate of volunteers, the strongest agreement was reported by Norwegian and English sports clubs. In both countries, more than 70% of the clubs agree or even totally agree with this statement. Although agreement is also fairly strong in sports clubs in Spain (65%), about one in five Spanish sports clubs disagree, meaning that volunteers change more often in about 20% of Spanish clubs. Total agreement, meaning few changes in voluntary position, is found in almost one third of Hungarian sports clubs and about one quarter of sports clubs in Germany and Spain. In Switzerland, more than one in five clubs have low volunteer turnover rates (see Fig. 41).

²⁰ No data available for Switzerland.




Fig. 41: Club boards' opinions on "Our club has a low rate of turnover of volunteers".

Members who are passionate about the work that needs to be done are particularly found in Hungarian sports clubs: here, 83% of the clubs agree or totally agree with this statement. It is interesting that German sports clubs are quite undecided about this statement. Although a slightly larger proportion of clubs totally agree that members are passionate than is the case in Denmark, the proportion of clubs that agree is much lower here, and the percentage of clubs that are undecided is largest in Germany (43%). Also, nearly one out of five clubs do not agree with this statement, showing that German members seem to be the least motivated for voluntary work, compared with the other countries (see Fig. 42). This might also explain why the largest problems in this field are with sports clubs in Germany.

Pertaining to the management of the club, three quarters of sports clubs in Germany agree that clubs should be run exclusively by volunteers. This proportion is the second largest compared to the other countries and this expectation is only larger in Swiss sports clubs, where 84% expect that the club is run exclusively by volunteers. Apart from these two conservative countries, more than 60% of the sports clubs in Denmark and Belgium (Flanders) put high value on a solely voluntary-organised club management. In contrast, more than half of all Polish sports clubs and also nearly 40% of the clubs in Hungary show no agreement with this statement. Thus, voluntary structures seem to be less intended by the post-communist states (see Fig. 43).

Importance of volunteers for European sports clubs




Fig. 42: Club boards' opinions on "Our club's members demonstrate passion, dedication and energy for the work that needs to be done".




Fig. 43: Club boards' opinions on "Our club should be run exclusively by volunteers".

5 Social integration in European sports clubs

5.1 Population groups within sports clubs

One of the main aims of this research project is to give an overview on social integration in European sports clubs. Detailed information on the concept of social integration is explained in the introductory report to this whole project (Elmose-Østerlund et al., 2016). In the sports club survey, the clubs were asked about the approximate membership proportion of different population groups. These groups included people with disabilities²¹, people with a migration background²², and the elderly, i.e. people who are 65 years or older. According to statistics of the European Union on demographic changes, the groups consisting of migrants and the elderly in particular have increased over recent years (Eurostat, 2015b). Looking at the results for the percentage of people with disabilities that are members of sports clubs, large differences between the countries can be observed. On average, half of all clubs state that they have no members with disabilities (see Fig. 44).




Fig. 44: Percentage of members with disabilities.

²¹ Including physically as well as mentally disabled persons.

²² People that are foreigners or at least one of their parents is a foreigner, or people belonging to an ethnic minority.

More than 70% of the clubs in Switzerland and Poland report not having any members with disabilities. In Hungary, this applies to about two thirds of the sports clubs. In Denmark, Belgium (Flanders) and Spain, more than half of all clubs are not used by people with disabilities. In Germany and England, 64% of the clubs estimate that between 1 and 10% of the members are disabled. In Norway and the Netherlands, this applies to almost 60% of the clubs. In Switzerland and Poland, one in four sports clubs state that they have a membership proportion of disabled people of between 1 and 10%. Especially in Hungary and England, there seem to be some clubs that particularly focus on people with disabilities: 4% of the English clubs and 3% of the Hungarian clubs estimate having a membership proportion of disabled people of more than 75% (see Fig. 44).²³

The large differences in the percentages of sports clubs that have members with disabilities can seem somewhat surprising, given that data on the representation of members with disabilities within the populations generally do not show large variations between countries (Eurostat, 2015a). Hence, the differences found cannot be explained solely or even mainly by differences in the representation of people with disabilities within the populations of the ten countries.

The membership percentages of people with a migration background show a different picture compared to people with disabilities (see Fig. 45).




Fig. 45: Percentage of members with a migration background.

23 What should be noted is that in some countries, clubs were unsure about the estimated percentage of people with disabilities in the clubs. In Germany and Spain, 3 % of the clubs answered with “don’t know”. In Flanders, Denmark, England and Hungary, this was the case for 2 % of the clubs. In the Netherlands, Norway and Poland, only 1 % of the clubs could not give an answer.

Whereas in Poland, about three quarters of the sports clubs estimate that they do not have any people with a migration background among their club members, this is only the case for approximately every fifth club in Norway, the Netherlands and Germany and every fourth club in England and Switzerland. A membership proportion of migrants of between 1 and 10% is reported by 62% of Dutch sports clubs, 59% of clubs in Norway, and about 55% of the clubs in England. In Poland, one out of four clubs has a membership proportion of migrants within this range. In Switzerland and Germany, 18% and 17% of the clubs, respectively, report that they have approximately a membership proportion of migrants of between 11 and 25%. In Norway, this applies to 16% of clubs and in Spain to 14%. Clubs with a membership proportion between 26 and 50% are scarce across the countries. 8% of clubs in Switzerland report having that many migrants among their members. Here, 4% of sports clubs also have a membership proportion of migrants of more than 50%. In Belgium (Flanders), 5% of the clubs have a membership that consists more than half of people with a migration background (see Fig. 45)²⁴.

With the reservation that the definitions of migrants do not exactly match between this survey and the Eurostat survey, it does, however, seem that there is some correspondence between the representation of people born outside the country in question within the population on the one hand and the percentage of sports clubs having migrants in their membership on the other. At a population level, Poland, Hungary and Denmark are the countries with the relatively lowest proportion of people born outside their country within the population (Eurostat, 2015b). These are also the countries with the lowest proportions of clubs that have migrants in their membership.

A third population group the clubs were asked about were the elderly, i.e. people aged 65 or older²⁵. What becomes clear from the results is that this population group is more frequently represented within sports clubs across the participating countries than the first two population groups described (see Fig. 46). The elderly make up between 16% and 21% of the total population in the ten participating countries. The proportion of this population group has increased over the last ten years (Eurostat, 2015b). Nevertheless, there are still large differences between the countries, particularly regarding the proportion of clubs that do not have any elderly persons among their club members. This applies to more than half of all clubs in Poland and Spain and more than 40% of the Hungarian sports clubs. In contrast, only 7% of sports clubs in Germany, 11% of Dutch sports clubs, and 19% of Danish sports clubs estimate that they do not have any people aged 65 or older among their members.

Approximately one third of the clubs in Poland, Spain and Denmark report that they have membership proportions of the elderly of between 1 and 10%. In England, Norway and the Netherlands, this applies to more than 40% of clubs and in Belgium (Flanders) and Hungary to almost 40%. Clubs that report that they have membership proportions of the elderly ranging between 11 and 25% are particularly frequent in Germany (33%), Switzerland (23%) and the Netherlands (22%). But also in Denmark (17%), Norway (16%) and England (16%), seniors make up this membership proportion. A membership percentage of the elderly between

24 Similar to the estimation of people with disabilities, some clubs were also unsure with regard to the estimation of people with a migration background. In England and Spain, 5 % of the clubs stated “don’t know”, in Hungary it was 4 %, in Germany 3 %, and in the rest of the countries 2 % each.

25 In Switzerland, the elderly were measured as the group of 60+ instead of 65+.

26 and 50% is also often found in Germany and Switzerland. In England, Denmark and the Netherlands, every tenth club estimates such membership proportions of the older age group and in Norway, Hungary, Belgium (Flanders) and Spain, this applies to about 5% of clubs. Interestingly, 22% of Danish sports clubs report that more than half of their members belong to this older age group. Such high percentages of the elderly among members are not found in any of the other countries (see Fig. 46)²⁶. The reason for this is that a number of sports clubs in Denmark are essentially sports clubs for the elderly, in that the clubs solely or primarily target this age group, for instance by having sports activities that are particularly popular among this age group.




Fig. 46: Percentage of the elderly (65+) among members.

26 Regarding the percentage of the elderly, fewer clubs across countries were unsure. In England and Spain, 2 % of the clubs answered with “don’t know”, and in the other countries it was 1 % each.

5.2 Boards' opinions on social integration

5.2.1 Average opinion on social integration

Asked for their opinion on topics related to social aspects within sports clubs, the average agreement values of the club boards are displayed in Fig. 47.²⁷ Strong agreement is found in relation to the item *“Our club tries to offer sports to as many population groups as possible”*. This shows the integrative and open nature of sports clubs across Europe. The total average across all countries amounts to $M = 3.8$. In particular, clubs in Hungary ($M = 4.3$), Spain ($M = 4.2$), England ($M = 4.4$) and Norway ($M = 3.9$) show strong agreement with this item. The average agreement in the remaining countries is fairly similar (between $M = 3.4$ and $M = 3.7$). The average agreement with regard to the item *“Our club strives to help socially vulnerable groups become better integrated into our club”* is a little less ($M = 3.5$), but still fairly strong in Spain ($M = 3.9$), Hungary ($M = 3.9$) and Germany ($M = 3.9$). The least average agreement is stated by clubs in Norway ($M = 3.2$), Denmark ($M = 3.2$) and Belgium (Flanders) ($M = 3.3$).

The attitude of the clubs pertaining to economic compensation for the responsibility of clubs in relation to the inclusion of different population groups ($M = 2.8$) is a little more diverse. The strongest agreement, i.e. a request for economic compensation, comes from sports clubs in Norway ($M = 3.2$), Germany ($M = 3.1$), Poland ($M = 3.1$) and the Netherlands ($M = 3.0$). In contrast to that, the other countries are not all that much of the opinion that economic compensation would be necessary. In particular, clubs in Spain ($M = 2.3$) and Hungary ($M = 2.2$) rather disagree here (see Fig. 47).

Offering special programmes related to health sports is an important topic. The commitment to health sports is biggest in sports clubs in Hungary ($M = 4.5$) and Spain ($M = 4.3$). But also in England ($M = 4.0$) and Norway ($M = 4.2$), sports clubs are keen on offering health enhancing physical activity programmes. On the other hand, the least engagement is found in German ($M = 2.7$) and Swiss sports clubs ($M = 3.1$). But it is not only special programmes particularly developed for health enhancements that are provided by the sports clubs. The sports disciplines themselves can help to improve health. Clubs that are convinced that the sports activities they offer have such health-enhancing character are especially common in Hungary ($M = 4.7$) and Spain ($M = 4.6$). But the agreement is also strong on average in the other countries (see Fig. 47), showing that the great majority of sports clubs in Europe are convinced that the sports they offer are good for people's health.

²⁷ The items *“Our club strives to help socially vulnerable groups become better integrated into our club”*, *“Our club needs to be economically compensated to take responsibility for the inclusion of different population groups”* and *“Our club feels that our sport discipline(s) is/are suitable as health-enhancing physical activity”* were not part of the survey in Switzerland.




Fig. 47: Club boards' opinions on social integration (1 = Don't agree at all to 5 = totally agree).

5.2.2 Distribution of the item on social integration

As the description of the average opinion has already shown, clubs in Spain and Hungary are particularly keen on helping socially vulnerable groups become better integrated in the clubs. This completely applies to about one third of the clubs in both countries. In contrast, in Norway, Belgium (Flanders), Denmark and the Netherlands, approximately every tenth club totally agrees with this statement. Particularly noteworthy here is that about one quarter of the clubs in Norway do not agree (at all) with this, meaning that striving for the integration of vulnerable population groups is not among the first items on the agenda of Norwegian clubs. More than half of all Danish sports clubs have no clear opinion on this issue (see Fig. 48).




Fig. 48: Club boards' opinions on "Our club strives to help socially vulnerable groups become better integrated into our club".²⁸

The need for economic compensation in return for taking over responsibility for the different population groups is particularly prevalent in sports clubs in Norway. Here, 44% of the clubs agree or totally agree with this item (see Fig. 49). It could be that such compensation has not been received frequently so far and this might also be a reason why Norwegian sports clubs strive less frequently to integrate socially vulnerable population groups (see Fig. 48). What also stands out is that clubs in Hungary and Spain in particular predominantly do not agree that economic compensation should be received by the clubs. In the other countries, the pro-

²⁸ This question was not part of the survey in Switzerland.

portion of clubs that are undecided on this question ranges from 26% in Norway to 47% in Belgium (Flanders) (see Fig. 49).




Fig. 49: Club boards' opinions on "Our club needs to be economically compensated in return for taking responsibility for the inclusion of different population groups".²⁹

Offering sports to as many population groups as possible seems to be a key aim of most of the clubs across the countries. More than half of all clubs agree or totally agree with this item, with the highest total agreement being found among sports clubs in Hungary (57%) and the lowest in the Netherlands. However, in the Netherlands, a total of 65% agree or totally agree, whereas this proportion is lowest in Switzerland (53%). Likewise, it is also in Switzerland where the highest proportion of clubs does not aim to integrate many different population groups: 22% of clubs do not agree, or even do not agree at all to this question. In Germany, a similar percentage of clubs (20%) disagree and in Poland, this applies to 15% of clubs. In Denmark and Belgium (Flanders), about 30% of clubs are undecided with regard to this club goal (see Fig. 50). These results show that diversity among sports clubs in Europe seems to be high with regard to their aims and goals.

²⁹ This question was not part of the survey in Switzerland.




Fig. 50: Club boards' opinions on "Our club tries to offer sports to as many population groups as possible".

With regard to health-enhancing physical activity programmes, a great majority of Hungarian sports clubs totally agree to be committed to offering such programmes. This applies to two thirds of the clubs in Hungary. In Spain, half of the clubs show commitment in the health sports sector, with special programmes to enhance health. In contrast, one in five clubs in Germany state that they do not have special programmes to improve health. In Switzerland, this applies to 15% of clubs (see Fig. 51). Nevertheless, sports clubs in Germany are also convinced that the sports disciplines that they offer have health-enhancing effects. More than 70% of clubs agree or totally agree with this item. Agreement with the latter question, i.e. that the sports disciplines are suitable as health-enhancing activities, is highest in Spain, Hungary, Norway and England (see Fig. 52)³⁰.

30 This question was not part of the survey in Switzerland.




Fig. 51: Club boards' opinions on "Our club is committed to offering health-enhancing physical activity programmes".




Fig. 52: Club boards' opinions on "Our club feels that our sport discipline(s) is/are suitable as health-enhancing physical activity".

5.3 Initiatives for different population groups

European sports clubs aim to offer a welfare-oriented sports supply to many different population groups (see previous section). To get further insight into this topic, the sports clubs were asked whether they offer special initiatives to increase participation among the following population groups: 1) women and girls, 2) children and adolescents (up to 18 years), 3) the elderly (65+), 4) people with disabilities, 5) people with a migration background or from an ethnic minority, and 6) low income people³¹.

The results show that specific programmes are most commonly targeted at children and adolescents (59%), low income individuals (42%), as well as girls and women (33%). Fewer special initiatives are being taken for the elderly (25%), people with disabilities (20%), and migrants (18%). However, there are fairly large differences with regard to the provision of such programmes between countries. Initiatives for low income people are particularly strong in the two post-communist countries of Poland and Hungary. Here, about two thirds of all clubs state that they have such special offers available. Also, special initiatives for low income people are common in Swiss sports clubs: 57% state that they offer such programmes. In Germany and Spain, more than 40% of clubs are particularly concerned for this population group. In contrast, only 17% of Danish clubs and 23% of clubs in Norway report that they have special programmes for people with a lower income (see Fig. 53).

Children and adolescents are an important membership group within sports clubs. They make up large proportions of the total members. In Hungary, Poland and Germany, more than 70% of clubs have taken special initiatives to increase the participation of this group. Swiss (64%) and Norwegian (61%) sports clubs are also fairly keen to offer programmes for the youngest. In Spain, 56% of the clubs offer programmes for children and adolescents. The provision of programmes for this population group is a bit lower in the Netherlands, England, Denmark and Belgium (Flanders). Here, less than half of clubs state that they have programmes to increase youth participation.

Women and girls are a special focus group for sports clubs in Switzerland (64%) and Hungary (61%), whereas Danish (12%) and Flemish (14%) sports clubs provide special programmes to foster participation within this group less frequently. Besides the commitment of Swiss sports clubs to women and children, the clubs are also particularly committed to the elderly (56%). In Germany and Hungary, 38% and 40% of clubs, respectively, report that they offer programmes for the older age groups (see Fig. 53).

What is striking are the big differences between countries with regard to special initiatives for people with disabilities and people with a migration background. Generally, these groups are not addressed frequently by sports clubs across Europe – at least not when clubs are asked if they take “special initiatives” to include these groups. Hungarian clubs are the exception with regard to programmes for the disabled: 39% of clubs offer programmes, whereas less than one in ten clubs in Denmark have special initiatives to increase sports participation of people with disabilities. People with a migration background are a special focus group for

31 In Switzerland, this question was formulated slightly different from the rest of the countries: “Our club strongly wants to enable sports for a) children and adolescents; b) girls and women; c) elderly (65 +); d) disabled people; e) low income-people; f) people with a migration background”. The question was phrased on a scale from 1 = does not apply at all to 5 = applies completely. For this analysis, the categories 4 and 5 were used for clubs in Switzerland.

almost half of all Swiss sports clubs and about one third of clubs in Hungary, but only 6% of clubs in England and the Netherlands (see Fig. 53).




Fig. 53: Initiatives for different population groups to increase participation.

Those clubs that stated that they have initiated special programmes to increase participation among different population groups were further asked what these programmes looked like in detail³². Most frequently named were targeted sports activities, meaning activities that were especially created for the population groups under investigation. Here, sports activities in particular for women and girls, as well as children and adolescents, are frequently provided by the clubs (see Fig. 54 and Fig. 55). Activities for children and adolescents are offered by more than half of clubs in Germany and Poland, by 47% of clubs in Hungary, and 44% of Norwegian sports clubs (see Fig. 55). Also popular are targeted sports activities for women and girls, whereas only few clubs offer such sports activities for people with a migration background or for ethnic minorities. Such programmes for migrants and ethnic minorities are particularly rare in Belgium (Flanders), Denmark, England, the Netherlands and Poland (see Fig. 58).




Fig. 54: Clubs offering initiatives to women/girls.

The existence of special teams for different population groups is also most common for children and adolescents. Here, about one third of German sports clubs have such teams, and in Denmark and Poland, every fourth club offers the possibility for young people to play in special youth teams (see Fig. 55). Sports teams for women and girls exist particularly in sports clubs in Hungary, Norway, Germany and England (see Fig. 54). In Germany and Denmark, every tenth club also gives the elderly the opportunity to play in their own teams (see

32 These questions were not part of the survey in Switzerland.

Fig. 56). Special teams for people with a migration background or ethnic minorities and low income people are fairly uncommon in nearly all sports clubs across the countries (see Fig. 58 and Fig. 59), with the exception of Hungary and Spain for both population groups, as well as Poland with regard to low income people. Teams for people with disabilities are found most often in the Netherlands and Norway, where 8% and 7% of clubs have offers for disabled people to practice sports in special teams (see Fig. 57).




Fig. 55: Clubs offering initiatives for children/adolescents.

Cooperation with sports organisations with regard to the integration of the population groups described can be found most often in Polish and Hungarian sports clubs. Sports clubs in these two countries work together with other sports organisations, particularly pertaining to children and adolescents, women and girls, as well as low income people (see Fig. 54, Fig. 55 and Fig. 59). In the remaining countries, collaborations can be found particularly in the field of programmes and offers for children and adolescents. Here, more than 10% of clubs (except for Dutch clubs where the percentage is slightly lower) report to be involved in such cooperation (see Fig. 55).




Fig. 56: Clubs offering initiatives for the elderly (65+).

Similar to collaborations with other sports organisations, collaborating with the municipality / local government in the field of children and adolescents is also most common for sports clubs in Poland (40%) and Hungary (28%). But also in Belgium (Flanders) and Spain, almost every fifth club works together with public institutions in this field (see Fig. 55). In Poland and the Netherlands, collaborations to increase the participation of low income people are found in 28% and 21% of the clubs, respectively (see Fig. 59). In contrast, cooperation between sports clubs and the municipality / local government is less common across the countries with regard to the elderly (see Fig. 56) and people with a migration background or stemming from an ethnic minority (see Fig. 58). Except for Hungary, Poland and Spain, only 5% or less of the clubs in the remaining countries collaborate with the community in terms of the elderly and migrants. People with disabilities are part of the cooperation between clubs and public institutions mainly in Hungary, where about one in ten clubs state that they cooperate with the municipality / local government. On the other hand, such cooperation is scarce in Germany and Denmark (see Fig. 57).

A clear pattern can be detected across the countries with regard to the offer of concessionary membership fees. Such fees exist especially for children and adolescents, as well as low income groups (see Fig. 55 and Fig. 59). This underlines the important role that non-profit sports clubs, which aim to give everybody the possibility of participating in sports, even those that cannot afford to spend a lot of money, can potentially play for social integration. To the degree that sports clubs actually live up to this purpose, they can be viewed as being different

from other sport providers, like for example commercial fitness centres that most often have a for-profit focus.




Fig. 57: Clubs offering initiatives for people with disabilities.

Special efforts to compensate disabled people and to give them the chance to participate in sports, for example by providing special equipment or adapting buildings and sports facilities, are found in almost one in ten sports clubs in Hungary, Norway and Spain. Such adaptations or specialised equipment for disabled people are less often found in sports clubs in Denmark and Poland, where 2% and 4% of the clubs state that they have such offers for the disabled (see Fig. 57).




Fig. 58: Clubs offering initiatives for people with a migration background or from an ethnic minority.




Fig. 59: Clubs offering initiatives for low income people.

6 Method

6.1 Data collection

6.1.1 Online survey

To collect data on volunteering and social integration from sports clubs in the ten European countries involved in this project, it was decided to use nationwide online surveys. To invite sports clubs to take part in the surveys, all partners had to collect information on the population of sports clubs in their respective country. In order to be able to invite the sports clubs to participate in the survey study, e-mails were needed to directly address the individual clubs. More information on sampling procedures in the different countries can be found in detail in Chapter 7.

Some of the ten partner countries decided not to take part in central data collection, but rather they decided to collect the data for the SIVSCE project as an integral part of existing sports club surveys. This was the case for Belgium (Flanders), Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland. For the other countries, data collection was carried out centrally from Germany as the responsible partner for this work package.

Before setting up the surveys, the instrument, i.e. the questionnaire, was developed by the whole project group. The questionnaire was subsequently set up in English by the partners responsible for WP2. As the next step, the questionnaire was translated into the different languages by the partners from the different countries. The surveys were set up centrally for those partner countries that had decided to take part in central data collection. This applied to Denmark, England, Hungary, Norway, Poland and Spain. In these cases, the country surveys were set up by the German partner in the different languages. All partners that took part in the central data collection then tested the country surveys in the respective languages to check for any translation mistakes and for plausibility. Those partners that collected the data independently received a code plan to make sure that the questions were formulated and coded in the same way as in the centrally set-up surveys.

The invitation e-mails for the central data collection were sent out from Germany to sports clubs in Denmark, England, Hungary, Norway, Poland and Spain at the end of September, or at the latest by mid-October 2015. The invitation e-mails gave some general information on the project and the e-mail to every single sports club contained a personalised link to the online questionnaire of the respective country. With the help of the individual links, clubs were able to interrupt the survey at any point and start again later at this same point. This procedure allowed the clubs to search for data and information which they did not have immediately to hand (for example, the exact numbers of members or finances).

The clubs had approximately two months to fill in the survey. The exact time periods of the surveys are displayed in Table 18 for those countries taking part in the central data collection and Table 19 for countries that had set up their own online survey.

Table 18: Survey period of the countries taking part in central data collection.

Country	Start online survey	Date of 1 st reminder	Date of 2 nd reminder	End online survey
Denmark	30.09.2015	22.10.2015	17.11.2015	29.11.2015
England	04.09.2015	15.10.2015	16.11.2015	29.11.2015
Hungary	07.10.2015	09.11.2015	18.11.2015	29.11.2015
Norway	14.10.2015	02.11.2015	16.11.2015	29.11.2015
Poland	30.09.2015	26.10.2015	16.11.2015	29.11.2015
Spain	15.10.2015	03.11.2015	16.11.2015	29.11.2015

Although the data collection in Germany and the Netherlands was not part of the central data collection, the time periods of the surveys were almost congruent with those of the central data collection. In the Netherlands, data collection was conducted as part of the *Sport Club Monitor* (see section 7.1.6) and in Germany, the data collection was integrated in the online survey of the *Sport Development Report* (see section 7.1.4). Data collection in Belgium (Flanders) started in June 2015 as part of the *Flemish Sport Club Panel* (see section 7.1.1) and the collection of data in Switzerland took place in spring 2016 as part of the *Swiss Sport Club Survey* (see section 7.1.10).

Table 19: Survey period of the countries not taking part in central data collection.

Country	Start online survey	Date of 1 st reminder	Date of 2 nd reminder	Date of 3 rd reminder	End online survey
Belgium (Flanders)	03.06.2015	19.06.2015	30.06.2015	-	01.09.2015
Germany	17.09.2015	19.10.2015	17.11.2015	-	08.12.2015
Netherlands	24.09.2015	08.10.2015	22.10.2015	12.11.2015	18.11.2015
Switzerland	02.03.2016	04.04.2016	09.05.2016	-	31.05.2016

During the survey periods, two reminders were sent out to clubs that had not started the survey at this point in time. Both reminders significantly increased participation across the countries. The peaks within the surveys in countries of central data collection correspond to the starting dates and the two reminders that were sent out (see Fig. 60). In the Netherlands, three reminders were sent (see Table 19).




Fig. 60: Course of the data collection in countries taking part in the central data collection.

6.1.2 Samples and response rates

An overview of the samples and response rates of the surveys in the different countries is given in the following tables of this section. Firstly, the samples and participants of the countries that took part in the central data collection are displayed (Table 20 to Table 25) and afterwards the remaining countries and their survey overviews are presented (Table 26 to Table 29).

In Denmark, about 15,000 sports clubs exist, of which 11,857 were invited via e-mail to take part in the survey (for further detailed information see section 7.1.2). 303 of the contacted Danish sports clubs could not be reached via e-mail due to different reasons (e.g. false e-mail address, full mailbox, club does not exist anymore), or some of those clubs refused to take part in the survey. The final sample (sample II) therefore amounted to 11,554 Danish sports clubs, of which $n = 3,631$ took part in the survey. With regard to the total population of Danish sports clubs, this is a proportion of about one quarter of all sports clubs. Of the clubs that were originally contacted (sample I), 30.6% took part in the survey and in relation to the final sample, the response rate of sports clubs in Denmark was 31.4% (see Table 20).

Table 20: Danish sample.

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	15,000		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	11,857	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	303		
Sample II	11,554		100.0
Realised Interviews	3,631		
Participation (in %)	24.2	30.6	31.4

In three countries that took part in the central data collection, namely England, Poland and Hungary, the partners decided to distribute, in addition to the individual links directly sent to clubs, an open link to the survey to increase participation. This open link was spread through different networks. Although overall participation could be slightly increased through the open link to the survey, there are some downsides to this procedure. Firstly, there is no control of whether clubs might have taken part more than once in the survey (this is not possible with the individual links). Secondly, based on participants from the open surveys, no response rates can be calculated. In Table 21, information on participation in the English survey is given, but only about the clubs that had responded to the survey through an individual link. In this way, $n = 667$ clubs out of a total population of 62,398 clubs (also see section 7.1.3 for more details) took part in the English survey, with $n = 145$ additional answers from the open survey. The total number of realised participations thus amounted to $n = 812$ in England (also see Table 30).

Table 21: English sample (without open survey participants).

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	62,398		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	2,876	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	199		
Sample II	2,677		100.0
Realised Interviews	667		
Participation (in %)	1.3	23.2	24.9

In Hungary, no information on the total number of existing sports clubs is available. For the survey using individual links, 7,172 e-mails were sent out to Hungarian sports clubs. The

number of bounces was fairly high with 1,502 and reduced the size of the final sample to 5,670 sports clubs. Of these, n = 1,071 clubs took part in the survey (plus n = 151 from the open survey link). Based on the directly contacted clubs, the response rate in Hungary was 18.9% (see Table 22).

Table 22: Hungarian sample (without open survey participants).

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	-		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	7,172	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	1,502		
Sample II	5,670		100.0
Realised Interviews	1,071		
Participation (in %)	-	14.9	18.9

In Norway, about 8,100 sports clubs exist, of which a sample of 2,000 clubs was taken for the SIVSCE club survey (for more information, see section 7.1.7). Due to a small number of bouncing e-mails, the final sample amounted to 1,958 Norwegian sports clubs. A total of n = 601 clubs took part in the survey, which is a proportion of 7.4% of the population of sports clubs in Norway. The response rate related to the final sample was 30.7% (see Table 23).

Table 23: Norwegian sample.

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	8,072		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	2,000	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	42		
Sample II	1,958		100.0
Realised Interviews	601		
Participation (in %)	7.4	30.1	30.7

In Poland, a total number of 14,009 sports clubs could be identified (cf. section 7.1.8). For the survey using individual links, 10,457 e-mails were sent out to Polish sports clubs. Similar to Hungary, the number of e-mails that could not be delivered was relatively high with 1,562 and reduced the final sample size to 8,895 sports clubs. Of these, n = 583 clubs in Poland took

part in the survey (plus $n = 85$ from the open survey link). In relation to the total population, a proportion of approximately 5% of the clubs in Poland took part in the survey. Based on the directly contacted clubs, the response rate amounted to 6.6% (see Table 24).

Table 24: Polish sample (without open survey participants).

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	14,009		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	10,457	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	1,562		
Sample II	8,895		100.0
Realised Interviews	583		
Participation (in %)	4.8	5.6	6.6

In Spain, 65,458 sports clubs are registered (see section 7.1.9). For this study, 8,372 clubs were invited to take part in the survey. The final sample amounted to 6,045 sports clubs, of which $n = 870$ clubs took part in the survey. This is a proportion of 1.3% of the population of sports clubs in Spain. The response rate related to the final sample was 14.4% (see Table 25).

Table 25: Spanish sample.

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	65,458		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	8,372	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	2,327		
Sample II	6,045		100.0
Realised Interviews	870		
Participation (in %)	1.3	10.4	14.4

Data collection in the Netherlands was not part of the central collection, but was a part of the *Sport Club Monitor*, which uses a sport club panel of about 2,000 sports clubs (see section 7.1.6). The final sample comprised 2,027 Dutch sports clubs, of which 1,103 took part in the survey. Relative to the whole population of sports clubs in the Netherlands (28,870), this was a proportion of 3.8%. With regard to the sample, more than one half of the clubs participated in the survey (see Table 26).

Method

Table 26: Dutch sample.

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	28,870		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	2,028	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	1		
Sample II	2,027		100.0
Realised Interviews	1,103		
Participation (in %)	3.8	54.4	54.4

In Belgium (Flanders), 23,460 sports clubs are registered with Sport Flanders, the Flemish sports administration. Initially, 10,681 sports clubs were invited to take part in the SIVSCE survey, which was part of the *Flemish Sport Club Panel* (also see section 7.1.1). Due to 775 bounced e-mails, the final sample size was reduced to 9,906 Flemish sports clubs. Of these, $n = 1,002$ clubs took part in the survey, which corresponds to a response rate of 10.1% (see Table 27).

Table 27: Flemish sample.

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	23,460		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	10,681	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	775		
Sample II	9,906		100.0
Realised Interviews	1,002		
Participation (in %)	4.3	9.4	10.1

The data collection in Germany was integrated in the survey of the *Sport Development Report* (see section 7.1.4). From the population of 90,240 sports clubs in Germany, 78,794 clubs were contacted via e-mail and invited to take part in the survey. Of these, approximately 3,000 clubs could not be reached, which reduced the final sample to 75,845 clubs. A total of $n = 20,546$ participants took part in the survey which equals a response rate of 27.1% and a total proportion of 22.8% of the whole population of German sports clubs (see Table 28).

Table 28: German sample.

	N	Proportion of sample I (in %)	Proportion of sample II (in %)
Population	90,240		
Sample I (contacted clubs)	78,794	100.0	
False e-mail addresses, person is not part of the club anymore, club no longer exists/or in the process, refusal	2,949		
Sample II	75,845		100.0
Realised Interviews	20,546		
Participation (in %)	22.8	26.1	27.1

In Switzerland, $n = 5,335$ sports clubs took part in the club survey, which was run separately from the surveys in the other countries. Related to the approximately 19,500 sports clubs that exist, 27.4% of these clubs took part in the survey. The e-mail addresses were checked for correctness before sending out invitations to the sports clubs. Therefore, there are no bounces found in Switzerland. For more details on the conduct of the Swiss survey, see section 7.1.10. The response rate, based on the sample size of 15,082 clubs, was 35.4% (see Table 29).

Table 29: Swiss sample.

	N	Proportion of sample (in %)
Population (all existing clubs)	19,487	
Sample	15,082	100.0
Realised Interviews	5,335	
Participation (in %)	27.4	35.4

Having presented detailed information on the sample sizes and number of participants in the different countries, Table 30 gives an overview of the total number of participants across the countries. It can be seen that a total of $n = 35,790$ European sports clubs took part in the survey. Within this sample, sports clubs from Germany make up more than half. The second largest number of sports clubs comes from Switzerland (14.9%) and about every tenth club in the sample stems from Denmark. Due to these rather unbalanced participation numbers and also the heterogeneous nature of sports clubs across the countries, this report does not present average values for the whole sample, but only country-specific results, which can easily be compared with each other.

Table 30: Total sample³³.

Country	N	Proportion within total sample (in %)
Belgium (Flanders)	1,002	2.8
Denmark	3,631	10.1
England	812	2.3
Germany	20,546	57.4
Hungary	1,222	3.4
Netherlands	1,103	3.1
Norway	601	1.7
Poland	668	1.9
Spain	870	2.4
Switzerland	5,335	14.9
Total	35,790	100.0

Apart from the total numbers of participants, it is also interesting to take a look at those participants that completed the survey, the so-called finishers. On average, 15.6% of the clubs taking part in all countries finished the survey. The highest finisher rates are found in the Netherlands (42.8%), Switzerland (29.2%), Denmark (24.4%) and Norway (22.1%). In Poland, Belgium (Flanders) and Spain, less than 10% of the clubs fully completed the questionnaire (see Table 31).

Table 31: Sample sizes and finishers of the survey³⁴.

Country	Sample size	Finishers	Finisher rate (proportion of final sample in %)
Belgium (Flanders)	9,906	681	6.9
Denmark	11,554	2,815	24.4
England	2,677	449	16.8
Germany	75,845	10,712	14.1
Hungary	5,670	672	11.9
Netherlands	2,027	868	42.8
Norway	1,958	432	22.1
Poland	8,895	369	4.1
Spain	6,045	434	7.2
Switzerland	15,082	4,411	29.2
Total	139,659	21,843	15.6

33 N includes responses from individual and open links for England, Hungary and Poland.

34 For England, Hungary and Poland, the final sample size refers to the individual links; the finishers also include those surveys that have been completed using the open link.

The number of finished surveys compared to the total number of participants reflects that the number of drop-outs in all countries should not be underestimated, although the drop-out rate varies between countries. In Spain, about half of all clubs that had started filling in the survey did not finish it. In Germany, this applies to 47.9% of all participants and in Hungary to 45%. On the other hand, the lowest is the drop-out rate of clubs in Switzerland, with only 17.3% of all participants stopping the survey before the end (see Table 32).

Table 32: Drop-out of participants.

Country	Number of drop-outs	Drop-out rate (in %)
Belgium (Flanders)	321	32.0
Denmark	816	22.5
England	363	44.7
Germany	9,834	47.9
Hungary	550	45.0
Netherlands	235	21.3
Norway	169	28.1
Poland	299	44.8
Spain	436	50.1
Switzerland	924	17.3
Total	13,947	39.0

Overall, it has to be noted that there are some limitations, particularly with regard to a selection bias of clubs in the different countries. The information available on clubs in the different countries was diverse, which made it hard to follow the same selection process in all ten countries. Moreover, language problems might have occurred, since the questionnaire was translated from English to the different native languages for the online surveys, but there was no re-translation back to English to check for possible translation barriers.

6.2 Data preparation and analyses

The preparation of all country data sets was conducted in the same way with regard to coding, plausibility checks, and calculation of new variables. With the exception of data from Switzerland, all country data sets were merged to one big data set for the data analyses.

Firstly, and for almost all included variables, descriptive statistics were computed to give an overview of the means and distributions of the variables. To do so, the data set was split by the country variable so that results were displayed for all countries that were included in the merged data set. In this way, comparisons between countries were easily possible. Since the Swiss data were not merged into the big data set, the descriptive results were delivered by

the partners from Switzerland.

With regard to financial data, the currency displayed in this report is €. Therefore, €-values were calculated for countries not having the €, namely England, Denmark, Norway, Poland, Hungary and Switzerland. For calculating €-values, the average exchange rate for each country was used (see Table 33).

Table 33: Exchange rates.

Currency	€ Exchange rate (2014 average)
British Pound	1.24
Danish Krone	0.134
Norwegian Krone	0.119
Polish Zloty	0.239
Hungarian Forint	0.00324
Swiss Franken	0.823

7 Appendix: Details on sampling procedures and comments on representativity of all participating countries

7.1.1 Belgium (Flanders)

Jeroen Scheerder, Elien Claes, Jeroen Meganck, Jan Seghers, Hanne Vandermeerschen & Steven Vos

Belgium (Flanders) collected the requested data for WP2 through an existing survey strategy (Flemish Sport Club Panel, FSCP). The FSCP is a repeated cross-sectional research tradition on sports clubs in Flanders and the Brussels Capital Region in Belgium. Data of the FSCP were gathered by means of a standardised questionnaire over three waves (2009, 2012, 2015), including the WP2-instrument in third wave of the Flemish Sport Club Panel provides an interesting opportunity in terms of data collection. An online survey was developed (Flemish Sport Club Panel 3.0, FSCP3.0) containing the questions of WP2. Consequently the coordination of the data collection rested with the researchers in Flanders and the invitation emails including an individual link to the sport clubs were sent out in Flanders and not through the central survey system. This survey is the third wave of the Flemish Sport Club Panel (FSCP3.0).

Survey procedure

For the Flemish Sport Club Panel it was decided from the first wave of the survey to contact sport clubs through the municipalities. The sport services of the selected municipalities (see below) and the Flemish Community Commission (VGC) received an introductory letter by e-mail. The aldermen of sport of the municipalities received an invitation by post. In the Annex to this letter was a description of the objectives and design of the study, the objectives of the research and how the research would be carried out.

Through this process the interpretation of the term ‘sport club’ was left to the municipal sport services. This implies that in our sample both ‘traditional’ sport clubs, and socio-cultural associations with sport activities – like animal sport, finch sport, pigeon racing etc. - may be included. The organizations included in the survey did not need to be recognized or subsidized by the municipality. Non-recognized associations may therefore be part of the sample. In this way, we seek to involve the widest possible range of sport clubs in the sample in order to obtain an accurate picture of the diversity of sport clubs in Flanders. This process constitutes an added value compared to, for example, a survey that would be organized through the sport federations. In the latter case clubs that are not affiliated with a federation would fall by the wayside.

Municipalities that were willing to cooperate in the Flemish Sport Club Panel were asked to (1) disseminate a letter of introduction, by email or by post to the sport clubs in the municipality; or (2) to provide contact information (postal and / or email) of the clubs in their

municipality so the researchers of the KU Leuven could dispatch the letters of introduction to the sport clubs. In the introduction letter, the investigation was briefly explained and the sport clubs were asked to participate in the online survey with the URL for the questionnaire in the text.

Selecting the sample

Socio-economic profile of the municipalities

To make scientifically sound statements about the organization and functioning of the sport clubs in Flanders, the socio-economic profile of municipalities is taken into account when composing the sample. Use is made of the so-called 'Belfius format', which distinguishes sixteen municipality profiles that can be reduced in turn to six types of municipalities. This typology contains 'richer' information than a classification of municipalities that is limited to geographical and / or population characteristics. Thus, the Belfius format considers, amongst others, socio-economic, morphological, demographic, cultural and financial characteristics of municipalities. Below we give a brief overview of the six types of municipalities according to the Belfius format:

1. Residential municipalities: Residential municipalities have a level of income that is above the regional average and have a rather low center function. They are characterized by a medium-sized population. This type of municipality encompasses four subtypes of municipalities.
2. Rural municipalities: These municipalities are characterized by a low level of urbanization. Within this cluster three groups of municipalities are located.
3. Municipalities with a concentration of economic activity: Municipalities in this group differ mainly from other municipalities for their industrial activities. Within this group, a division can be made into three subtypes of municipalities.
4. Semi-urban and metropolitan municipalities: The group of semi-urban and metropolitan municipalities consists of (semi) urban municipalities with lower average incomes and / or a demographic decline. Within this cluster of municipalities are divided into two subtypes.
5. Central municipalities: Central municipalities have great appeal because of their central function. A distinction is made between medium-sized cities, major cities and regional towns.
6. Tourist municipalities: Tourist municipalities are mainly characterized by their tourist character. The eight municipalities in this group are all coastal municipalities.

The total sample of FSCP3.0 contains 153 municipalities which is half of the total number of municipalities in Flanders (N = 308). To ensure the representativeness of the sampling, again the socio-economic profile of the municipalities was taken into account here (see Table 34). Hereby account has been taken of an equal distribution by population category (number of inhabitants per municipality) and by province.

Table 34: Sample of municipalities: classification of Flemish municipalities on the basis of their socio-economic profile. Comparison between Flanders and the sample of municipalities in FSCP3.0/WP2.

	FSCP3.0/WP2 (N=153)	Flanders (N=308)
RESIDENTIAL MUNICIPALITIES	27,5%	26,9%
in rural areas	8,5%	8,1%
in the suburbs	9,2%	8,8%
agglomeration municipalities with tertiary activity	5,2%	5,5%
residential suburbs with high incomes	4,6%	4,5%
RURAL MUNICIPALITIES	31,4%	31,5%
small agricultural municipalities	10,5%	10,7%
very rural municipalities with strong aging	9,2%	8,8%
rural or urbanized rural municipalities with strong demographic growth	11,8%	12,0%
MUNICIPALITIES WITH A CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	12,4%	13,0%
rural and agricultural municipalities with industrial activity	5,9%	6,5%
urbanized rural municipalities with industrial activity and population growth	2,6%	2,6%
cities and metropolitan municipalities with an industrial character	3,9%	3,9%
SEMI-URBAN OR METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITIES	13,7%	13,6%
little urbanized municipalities with demographic decline	7,2%	6,8%
highly urbanized municipalities with low incomes	6,5%	6,8%
CENTRAL MUNICIPALITIES	12,4%	12,3%
medium-sized cities	7,8%	7,8%
regional cities	2,6%	2,6%
major and regional cities - capitals	2,0%	1,9%
TOURIST MUNICIPALITIES	2,6%	2,6%
coastal municipalities	2,6%	2,6%

From cooperation with municipalities to responses of sport clubs

The sample of FSCP3.0/WP2 builds on the samples of the previous waves of FSCP (FSCP1.0 in 2009 and FSCP2.0 in 2012). The sampling procedure of FSCP3.0/WP2 is shown schematically in Fig. 61. In compiling the FSCP1.0-sample 60 municipalities were asked to cooperate. To compensate for the expected drop-out from the clubs of FSCP1.0, the sample of the second wave was extended and 30 new municipalities were contacted. For FSCP2.0 sport clubs from a total of 90 municipalities were involved in the sample. This resulted in 651 sport clubs that participated in the first Flemish Sport Club Panel (FSCP1.0) and 580 sport clubs participated

in the FSCP2.0-survey. To increase the number of respondents in the survey, it was decided to further extend the sample in the third wave, and 63 new municipalities were involved. The total sample of FSCP3.0 contains 153 municipalities. For various reasons - think of sport clubs who have stopped their operation, clubs that can no longer be reached or are no longer interested to participate in the study - it was decided to re-contact all municipalities. In accordance with the previously described procedure, the cooperation of the municipalities was asked to disseminate the call itself or to provide the contact addresses of the local sports clubs so that the researchers themselves could contact the clubs.

In FSCP1.0, FSCP2.0 and FSCP3.0 efforts were made to include sport clubs in the Brussels Capital Region. To reach these clubs we appealed to the Flemish Community Commission (VGC, the hub of the Flemish Community in the Brussels Capital Region (BCR). It gives form and content to the Capital from the point of view of Dutch-speakers and is the competent authority for issues relating to culture, education, well-being and health).

A total of 4 063 invitations were sent out to sport clubs by the Flemish Community Commission and the municipalities that choose to disseminate the invitations themselves. Contact details of 6 618 sport clubs were provided by the municipalities that choose option (2), invitations to these sport clubs were sent out by KU Leuven.

A total of 9 906 sport clubs were addressed to participate in the survey (10 681 emails were sent to sport clubs, but included bounces). After having sent the invitation and two reminders,




Fig. 61: Sampling procedure: from cooperation with municipalities to participation of sport clubs.

1 002 sport clubs had participated in the survey, which compares to a response rate of ten per cent. Of the 1 002 respondents, 681 clubs completed the entire survey. The survey period started the third of June 2015 and ended the first of September 2015.

Representativeness of sport clubs

In Flanders sport clubs are registered by Sport Flanders, the Flemish sport administration. Practical information (among others location, sport branches, contact details, etc.) is available of about 18 000 sport clubs in Flanders who are members of a recognized Flemish sport federation and 5 000 clubs that are not affiliated to a sport federation. With the help from these data, we can examine the representativeness of our group of respondents in terms of geographical spread and in terms of sport-related characteristics.

Geographical spread

Table 35 shows the geographical distribution of the surveyed clubs based on their administrative office. Here a division is made between the five Flemish provinces, and also the Brussels Capital Region is included. The province of Antwerp is clearly the most strongly represented among the surveyed clubs. Sport clubs in the province of Limburg and West Flanders are underrepresented.

Table 35: Geographical distribution of sport clubs in the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample compared to the distribution in Flanders.

Province	FSCP3.0/WP2 (N=967)	Flanders (N=22 427)
Antwerp	36,1%	26,0%
Brussels Capital Region	3,7%	0,8%
Limburg	14,3%	14,0%
East Flanders	16,3%	25,0%
Flemish Brabant	18,4%	13,8%
West Flanders	11,2%	20,4%

Source: own processing based on FSCP3.0.

Table 36 gives an overview of the socio-economic profile of the location of the administrative office of sport clubs in the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample compared to the distribution on Flanders. The results indicate that sport clubs in central municipalities, highly urbanized municipalities and in residential municipalities are slight overrepresented, while the sport clubs in rural municipalities and tourist municipalities are underrepresented.

Table 36: Socio-economic profile of the location of the administrative office of sport clubs in the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample compared to the distribution in Flanders.

Classification of Flemish municipalities on the basis of their socio-economic profile	FSCP3.0/WP2 (N=967)	Flanders (N=22 427)
Central municipalities	32,6%	30,3%
Municipalities with a concentration of economic activity	11,5%	12,9%
Rural municipalities	16,8%	19,8%
Semi-urban or metropolitan municipalities	12,7%	13,7%
Highly urbanized municipalities	2,4%	0,8%
Tourist municipalities	1,4%	2,3%
Residential municipalities	22,6%	20,1%

Source: own processing based on FSCP3.0.

Sport-related characteristics

The representativeness of our group of respondents is examined with regard to the type of sport club, the sport branches and the affiliation to a recognized/subsidized sport federation (see Table 37 - Table 39). No data are available regarding the size of sport clubs in Flanders.

Table 37: Proportion of single sport clubs versus multisport clubs in the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample compared to the distribution in Flanders.

Type of sport club	FSCP3.0/WP2 (N=967)	Flanders (N=22 427)
Single sport club	86,9%	89,4%
Multisport club	13,1%	10,6%

Source: own processing based on FSCP3.0.

Table 38: Percentage of single sport clubs by sport (top ten) in the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample compared to the distribution in Flanders.

Type of sport club	FSCP3.0/WP2 (N=865)	Flanders (N=20 841)
Football (indoor and outdoor)	18,0%	29,7%
Martial arts	10,9%	4,8%
Cycling	8,8%	14,5%
Volleyball	5,7%	4,6%
Gymnastics	4,5%	2,2%
Tennis	4,4%	2,4%
Badminton	3,4%	2,2%
Basketball	3,4%	1,8%
Dancing	3,4%	2,5%
Swimming	3,4%	1,6%

Source: own processing based on FSCP3.0.

Table 39: Proportion of sport clubs that is affiliated with a recognized/subsidized sport federation in the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample compared to the distribution in Flanders.

Member of a recognized/subsidized sport federation	FSCP3.0/WP2 (N=890)	Flanders (N=18 235)
Yes	89,6%	77,7%
No	10,4%	22,3%

Source: own processing based on FSCP3.0.

The results indicate that the multisport clubs are slightly overrepresented in the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample (see Table 37). If we focus solely on the single sport club and analyze the sports that are offered, we note that football and cycling clubs are underrepresented in the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample. Martial arts clubs are clearly overrepresented (see Table 38). In the FSCP3.0/WP2-sample nine in ten sport clubs is affiliated with a recognized sport federations. This proportion is higher compared to the distribution of all sport clubs in Flanders (see Table 39).

7.1.2 Denmark

Karsten Elmoose-Østerlund & Bjarne Ibsen

In Denmark, there is not a complete register of sports clubs, but it is estimated that the total number of clubs is around 15,000. In our sample for the SIVSCE club survey (WP2), we relied on a register of clubs that are members of one or more of the three main sports organisations in Denmark, including the two major organisations – DIF and DGI – and the organisation for company sports – Firmaidrætten. At the time the data was drawn from their register (July 2015), a total of 11,856 clubs were included in the register. These clubs were initially all included in the SIVSCE club survey.

Following the estimates that there are a total of 15,000 sports clubs in Denmark, of which 11,856 were included in the SIVSCE club survey, about four out of five Danish sports clubs were given the opportunity to participate in the survey. We do not have reliable data on the differences between the clubs included and the clubs that were not included in the sample. However, we would argue that the clubs not included are typically smaller and less oriented towards competitive sport as they are not members of a sports organisation. Other than that, our knowledge on the differences is relatively limited. Nevertheless, with four out of five Danish sports clubs included in the sample, we are likely to get reliable information about Danish sports clubs from the sample.

During the survey period, emails to club representatives (most often the chairperson) were sent directly from the survey system. One invitation and two reminders were sent to non-respondents during the survey period. A number of emails were returned because the email address in the register was not sufficiently updated, so some of the clubs could not be reached. In other cases, we were contacted by club representatives telling us that they were no longer

connected to the club. In most instances, they were helpful in guiding us in reaching the correct person in the respective clubs.

After having sent the invitation and two reminders, a total of 3,631 clubs had replied to the survey, yielding a response rate of 31% (a figure that would be higher if it was adjusted for emails not reaching the club representatives). Of the 3,631 respondents, 2,815 completed the entire survey, which is equivalent to one in four clubs that were contacted.

With more than two thirds of the Danish sports clubs included in the sample not responding to the survey, some selection is likely to have happened, which can potentially affect the representativity of the results presented for Danish sports clubs. However, this sort of selection it is not untypical in surveys in the field of social sciences.

With the help from data already present in the database from which the clubs were sampled, we can examine whether any selection has happened with regard to club size and sports. With regard to club size, the sample of responding clubs is relatively similar to the total sample of clubs. We do, however, see a tendency towards small clubs being slightly underrepresented among the responding clubs compared to the total sample. Particularly clubs with less than 50 members are underrepresented in that they make up 35% of the total sample and only 28% among responding clubs. On the contrary, we see that clubs with 200 members or more make up a larger proportion of the sample of responding club (33%) compared to the total sample (26%). Nevertheless, clubs of all sizes are well represented in both the total sample and the sample of responding clubs (see Table 40).

Table 40: Distribution of members within all registered Danish clubs and the sample.

Members	Distribution in total sample (n=11,646)	Distribution among responding clubs (n=3,631)
Less than 50 members	35	28
50-99 members	20	19
100-199 members	19	20
200-499 members	16	19
500-999 members	7	9
1000 members and more	3	5

With regard to sports, there seem to be only few major differences in the representation of the different sports between the total sample and the sample of responding clubs. Naturally, within some of the sports, there are so few clubs in total that there is half or double the number of clubs in the sample of responding clubs compared to the total sample. But this does not change the general picture.

Among the sports clubs included in the sample there are some “atypical” clubs, mainly due to the inclusion of sports clubs connected to the sports organisation for company sports, Firmaidrætten. Within company sports, there are what could be called “regional clubs” that is primarily for people doing company sport, even though they are open to the general public. All the people who participate in sports activities in the workplace that are connected to the

“regional club” are registered as “activity members” within the “regional club”. So, in some ways these clubs become umbrella organisations for activities taking place locally and often connected to the workplace. The “regional clubs” are sports clubs, so they should generally be included in the analysis. They are relatively few in number (around 80 in the total sample), and therefore no special considerations are generally needed – except for in questions with absolute numbers. This is first and foremost with regard to the size of the clubs. The largest of these clubs have more than 70,000 members, and seven clubs have more than 10,000 members – figures that are very atypical for Danish clubs. When calculating the mean size of sports clubs in Denmark, these clubs have enough members to significantly boost the mean number of members in Danish sports clubs. So, on the one side, these “regional clubs” belong in the sample and should be included in the analysis, but in questions with absolute numbers, especially club size, they might need to be considered as outliers to get a “realistic” mean size of Danish sports clubs.

7.1.3 England

Geoff Nichols

As points of reference for the sample in England, three estimates are used:

- a) Sport England’s figures on the number of clubmark accredited clubs. This estimate is accurate.
- b) Sport England’s 2015 estimate of the number of sports clubs, by sport. This estimate is limited by restriction to formal clubs within the national governing body (NGB structure), the ability and willingness of NGBs to provide this information, and ambiguity over definition of ‘a club’. It is the best estimate available.
- c) The Sport and Recreation Alliance’s 2013 survey of sports clubs, which estimated club size. This estimate is limited by the representativeness of this sample of 2,909 clubs, conducted in 2013. Results were weighted by the number of clubs in each sport, apart from results reporting the number of clubs with Clubmark accreditation. 92% of this sample was from England, thus over-representing within the United Kingdom, but increasing comparability with the SIVISC survey.

Comparisons with the points of reference show the following results:

12,000 English clubs have clubmark accreditation. From Sport England estimates, there are 62,398 clubs in England, so 19% have clubmark. In the SIVSCE sample, 45.2% had clubmark and 16.4% were aiming at it. Thus clubmark clubs are considerably over-represented.

Table 41 compares the percentage of clubs by sport in the SIVSCE sample (12 most frequent sports) with the percentage in the 2015 Sport England estimate. Although all the sports in the SIVSCE sample are over-represented (apart from football and cricket), the overall sam-

ple gives a balance of team and individual sports, and sports where the club may have a club house as a focal point for social activities (e.g. cricket, Rugby) and clubs where it will not (i.e. orienteering, table tennis, basketball). The distribution of clubs by sport greatly under-represents football. Football clubs may vary in size and level of organization. Football clubs need to be affiliated to the NGB to play in a formal league; however this will not represent teams who only meet to play in a more informal league, possibly commercially organized, out of the NGB structure. However, these will not be included within our definition of a club. A more representative sample for football might have reduced the average club size as the average size of football clubs in the SARA survey (see below) was 40 adult participating members.

Table 41: Distribution of sports within the SIVSCE sample and registered with Sport England.

Sport	SIVSCE %	Sport England %
Basketball	11.6	1.3
Football	5.9	33
Golf	5.3	3.1
Motorsports - land	8.3	Not included
Rowing	6.6	0.9
Sailing	5.0	1.2
Swimming	7.9	1.7
Table Tennis	5.0	0.35
Gymnastics / trampoline	5.7	1.8
Rugby League	9.5	0.6
Rugby Union	11.0	3.4
Cricket	4.0	8.6
Orienteering	4.0	0.01

Table 42 compares selected results of the SIVSCE survey with the SARA survey of 2013. The size of club by membership is slightly bigger. The SARA sample was weighted to make it representative by sport (apart from the clubmark percentage). This suggests that the SIVSCE sample over-represents bigger clubs. The percentage with clubmark is only slightly higher in the SIVSCE sample – this was not weighted in the SARA survey. This is close to being similar to the SARA sample, as the number of clubmark accredited clubs has risen since. However, as above, this over-represents clubmark clubs overall.

Table 42: Selected results of the SIVSCE survey 2015 and SARA survey 2013.

	SIVSCE	SARA
Clubmark accredited (in %)	45.2	41
Adult members sport participating – mean	92.7	82
All members, adult and junior	246	204
Volunteers	25 [in fixed positions]	24 [all]
Average numbers of paid staff	1	1
Paid manager full time, part time	12%, 7%	-

The number of clubs with a paid manager appears high (12% full time, and 7% part time). The question was:

..... *Does your club have a paid manager (in a leading position of the club)?*

Possibly, clubs included paid managers who organize coaching sessions or run facilities. The sample estimate of clubs with a paid manager is likely to be increased by the 5.3% of golf clubs – all of which have paid staff. The 8.6% of motorsport clubs is unrepresentative by sport, but these are normally run by volunteers. The two types of rugby clubs will normally own facilities so may employ staff to manage them.

In the England survey one club has over 2,500 members. Three clubs have 1,001 – 2,500 members. These are untypical. There is one large motor sport club in the sample (BARC), which we think is an umbrella organization that runs circuits which will have several paid staff and a massive turnover.

Implications for SIVSCE club survey results based on the descriptions above:

The over-representation of clubmark clubs will increase the average club size, the number of volunteers and paid staff, and clubs which have a written strategy for volunteer development (15%). These clubs are more likely to have formal procedures for managing volunteers, some of which, such as having a role responsible for this, are required by clubmark. Clubmark clubs will certainly be very inclusive in terms of disabled participants in particular - they will probably have to have Equity Policies, have completed Disability Inclusion Training etc. Clubmark clubs are more likely to have an expanding membership. Results show the sample is more likely to be experiencing an expansion of members than a decline. This is counter to a national trend of participation in clubs decreasing. However, the number of clubs in England appears to have declined from 2009 to 2015, possibly as much as from 85,000 in 2009 to 62,000 in 2015, although this is not a precise estimate because of changes in the ways clubs were counted in the two estimates. It is possible that while club participation is falling, club membership per club is increasing. The SIVSCE sample shows a slight balance towards increasing numbers of volunteers rather than a decrease. Again this may reflect the more organized clubs in the sample. Similarly – it shows a balance towards increasing paid staff. Clubmark accreditation greatly helps clubs bid for grants from Sport England and these

grants will also have conditions to develop inclusiveness.

Over-representation of golf, and possibly rugby, will increase the number of clubs with paid staff. This will also increase the club size. The considerable under-representation of football clubs has also increased the average size.

The inclusion of a few very big clubs will greatly increase the average membership and turnover figures.

The results on the number of club members with a migration background, which means their parents were born in a different country, are unreliable as respondents will not be able to answer accurately.

7.1.4 Germany

Christoph Breuer & Svenja Feiler

The German survey took part as an integral part of the so-called “Sport Development Report” (SDR) which is a nationwide online survey of sports clubs that takes place every two years since 2005. The objective of the SDR is to provide policy-makers in organised sports as well as decision-makers in sports politics and administration with managerial and political information (knowledge of argumentation and knowledge of action). This project is financed by the 16 land sports confederations, the German Olympic Sports Confederation (DOSB), as well as the Federal Institute of Sport Sciences (BISp). The central methodological idea is to create a panel design, which means that the same sports clubs should be questioned on their situation every two years. Therewith, six conducted waves so far of the SDR (2005/06, 2007/08, 2009/10, 2011/12, 2013/14, & 2015/16) present systematic information about the sports clubs’ development for the first time.

As part of the data collection for the sixth wave of the Sport Development Report in 2015, all questions from the SIVSCE questionnaire were integrated in this survey. The German survey was carried out from September 17th 2015 to December 8th 2015. The sample was based on the e-mail addresses of sports clubs that were provided by the federal sports confederations. Out of the 90,240 existent sports clubs in Germany (DOSB, 2015), 78,794 addresses were made available and these clubs were contacted via e-mail. Sports clubs that could not (due to false e-mail addresses) or would not participate for whatever reasons were taken out of the sample (2,949). Altogether, n=20,546 interviews could be realised, which equals a response rate of 27.1%.

In the Sport Development Report, the data are weighted according to membership size. However, since it was decided not to weigh the data of any of the countries for this study, the weighting of German clubs was renounced. This leads to a slight over-representation of large clubs and underrepresentation of smallest clubs within the German sample (see Table 43).

Table 43: Distribution of members within all German clubs and the final sample.

Members	Proportion in the population (in %)	Proportion in the data set (in %)
1-100	47.10	36.50
101-300	29.20	30.60
301-1,000	19.50	25.50
1,001-2,500	3.60	6.30
More than 2,500	0.60	1.10

7.1.5 Hungary

Szilvia Perényi

The SIVSCE project was a first time ever undertaken in Hungary in which sports clubs were approached directly by a scientifically designed thematic research using anonymous questionnaires. Due to the pioneer nature of such surveying activity several challenges were needed to be handled including the availability of clubs' profiles and contact information, database of clubs' electronic contact information, the willingness of clubs' for participation in the survey and the clubs' lack of experiences in answering anonymous surveys.

In order to secure the database for the sampling procedure of SIVSCE project a series of actions were taken. Several sport umbrella organisations were directly contacted with inquiries for email addresses including the Hungarian Olympic Committee and its organisation called National Sportinformation System, the National Federation of Hungarian Sport Clubs, and the National Organisations' registrar. Due to the inefficient number of contact information gained from this activity (below 300), the Central Statistical Agency was contacted. According to the Central Statistical Agency over 12,000 sports non-profit organisations were registered in Hungary at the time of the SIVSCE project, however, their electronic contact detail was not fully available; their accuracy was also in question as it may have included inactive organisations as well. It was concluded that at the time of the start of the SIVSCE project there was no existing comprehensive database of electronic contact details of Hungarian sports clubs and sport non-profit organisations that could serve as a base for the SIVSCE data collection activity. Therefore, the database to serve the needs of SIVSCE project must have been created in which the available sources from sports organisations and the Central Statistical agency was used, and assisted by a systematic data collection procedure targeting sports clubs throughout Hungary using federations' and sport clubs' websites.

For the internet based data collection procedure a written guideline and standardized template in Excel were developed. University students were called and selected for assisting in data collection who participated in briefings and info sessions for the introduction of developed data collection guidelines. Continuous coordination of data collection through desk-top

and personal assistance was provided. After the management of submission of datasets, data was merged and cleaned than the final database built.

The aim was to collect as many and as diverse sport club pool as possible in Hungary targeting to satisfy the minimum request of 2,000 clubs of the project. Desk-top internet search was applied in data collection with a systematic approach taking clubs' 1) geographical distribution by municipality and 2) sport specific distribution by sport federation and sport disciplines into consideration. A hundred sports clubs were aimed to be collected in each of the 20 municipalities of Hungary, and also in each of the 95 different sports in respect to name of organisation, phone number, email address, type of sport, president's name, homepage link. This collecting methodology was expected to collect minimum of 2,500-3,000 sport club email addresses and expected to represent a geographic and sport type distribution of sports clubs in Hungary.

The electronic contact information received from the sports organisations, the Central statistical Agency and gained from the systematic search was collated in a single data base. As a result, through the overall data search 7,000 email addresses were collected in addition to the 3,000 email addresses received from the Central Statistical Agency, and to the 300 received from sport umbrella organisations. All three data sets were merged and cleaned; in case of duplets in the new merged file, entries from the more recent selected database was kept (entry from the central statistical agency was deleted as it is from 2013).

Hungary participated in the central survey system of the SIVSCE project, however, due to the protection of contact information required by law in regards to email addresses received from the Central Statistical Agency and from sport umbrella organisations, questionnaires' to Hungarian sports clubs were sent out locally from a designated email address in personalized emails that included questionnaire links and clubs IDs.

Hungary has received originally 7,720 links and ID codes, but finally links and IDs in numeric order from 1 to 7,172 were used during the first invitation of clubs. Links and IDs that were successfully sent out, bounced back or not successful in sending due to wrong data entry were tracked and categorized. Wrong data entry of emails were corrected, and IDs used during next turns of invitation for clubs. Out of the 7,172 links and IDs all together 5,670 links and IDs were sent out successfully and 1,502 links and IDs were bounced or failed to be sent due to wrong data entry.

Table 44: The summary result of the first invitation (09.10.2015) was as follows:

Column	Category	Number of entry	Description
Sent	0	1,015	not sent out successfully, bounced
	null	487	not sent out successfully, wrong data entry
	1	5,670	sent out
Total		7,172	

During the course of the data collection period reminder letters were sent out in Hungary (09.11.2015, 18.11.2015) to those links and IDs that were paired with an email address suc-

cessfully used in the survey, but performed “not completed” or “finished with break” status. Parallel media announcements were published to national and regional media, and also on the website of the Hungarian Olympic Committee.

Due to the low response rate of Hungarian clubs, during the last week of November an open questionnaire link was circulated to 95 national sports federations with a personalised letter asking them to forward the survey invitation to their clubs. Some of the clubs notified their federation in case they already filled out the survey, which may create a base for the conclusion that clubs did not perform duplicate entries so the open link responses did not result in duplicate answers, therefore completed questionnaires through the open link may relevantly be included in the Hungarian survey evaluations.

Table 45: The summary result of the Hungarian survey was as follows:

Invitation rounds	Invitations successfully sent	Bounced	Arrived	Completed	Suspended	Participated
First				162		
Second				298		
Third				107		
Subtotal				567	503	1,071
Open links				151		
Total	7,172	1,502	5,670	718		

The goal of reaching a geographical balanced distribution for sports clubs may have been successful based on the distribution of clubs completing the survey, as they represent clubs from all size of settlements, and from a very diverse variety of club size and sports types, furthermore, both single and multisport clubs, old and young clubs were represented in the sample. The question whether the participants of the survey represent the sports club composition of Hungarian sports clubs cannot be answered because no existing survey was conducted and no central statistics of sports clubs are presently available.

In summary it can be stated that the survey in Hungary was conducted with several difficulties such as no available database of clubs email addresses and low willingness of clubs to answer the survey. Both can be considered to be a result of the fact that such an anonymous questionnaire was first time ever sent to sports clubs in Hungary from an external party and not from sport or other authorities. Considering the difficulties and challenges and the efforts made to conduct the survey the Hungarian survey result can be considered a success, however cannot be considered a representative sample of the distribution of Hungarian sports clubs along with any descriptive variables.

7.1.6 Netherlands

Harold van der Werff

In the Netherlands there are approximately 29,000 sport clubs (28,870; Statistics Netherland 2012), of which the majority (2014: 24,727; NOC*NSF 2015) is a member of a sports federation that is affiliated to the national Olympic committee NOC*NSF. To monitor developments in the domain of sport clubs, regarding some general characteristics (e.g. type of sports and size) and topics like members, staff, volunteerism, finances, policies and bottlenecks the Mulier Institute and the national Olympic committee NOC*NSF - supported by the Ministry of Public Health, Welfare and Sports - started the Sport Club Monitor. Every year there is an omnibus questionnaire and/or a mere thematic one. Between 2000 and 2016 there were eleven omnibus surveys. For many years the panel consisted of 1,200 sport clubs. In 2015 this number was increased to over 2,000 clubs. The panel is a representative sample of sport clubs in the Netherlands.

For the SIVSCE questionnaire the Sport Club panel was the logical choice. At September 24th 2,030 clubs were invited to participate in the survey. In the invitation letter send by email the clubs were informed about the purpose of the survey and the link to the questionnaire was embedded in the invitation. The questionnaire and all correspondence with the sport clubs was in Dutch. If the respondent had any questions he could contact the Mulier Institute. Almost all contact persons in the panel are board members. To increase the response the clubs were promised that they would receive the results of the survey, presenting their answers and the answers of all other Dutch sport clubs that participated in this survey. Furthermore three reminders were sent to sport clubs who did not start or finish the questionnaire at that moment.

On November 18th the questionnaire was closed. In total 868 sport clubs did fill in the whole questionnaire, resulting in a response of 43 per cent. In addition there were 235 clubs who started the questionnaire, but did not finish the whole questionnaire. Some of them did only skip the last question in which they were asked whether they had any final comments. It was decided by the WP-2 coordinators that all responding sport clubs should be included in the data analysis which increases the number of respondents to 1,103 and the total response to 54%. On average surveys for which the Sport Club Panel are used have an response of about 40%, but normally for those surveys only sport clubs that have answered at least approximately two third of the questionnaire are included in the analysis.

In contradiction to most other country members of the SIVSCE project the Mulier Institute did not choose to use the survey tool that was provided by the German country member. Instead in the Netherlands the Mulier Institute asked 2Gather, a private organisation, to program the questionnaire, send the invitation and reminders, and provide a data file. The main reason for the Mulier Institute to program the questionnaire by its regular programming subcontractor was that the institute promise the panel members never to hand over their contact information to third parties, its subcontractor excluded. Before the invitation was send to the panel members the questionnaire was checked intensively by three employees of the Mulier Institute.

The country members of the SIVSCE project were given the opportunity to add a limited number of additional questions, provided these questions would match the topics of the SIVSCE project. The Mulier Institute included four easy to answer questions regarding volunteering. In addition six questions in which the respondent was asked to divide 100 points over four categories were added. This was a significant extension of the questionnaire. Before these questions appeared on the screen the respondent was informed that they had finished the SIVSCE questionnaire and that there were some extra questions which would take another five minutes of their time. 661 respondents did also answer these questions. This procedure gave the respondent a free choice to finish the questionnaire or continue. It also resulted in gathering the additional data without having to contact the panel twice in a short period of time.

Apart from the results of the Sport Club Monitor only a few characteristics of sport clubs are known. Every three year Statistics Netherlands publishes some results. Table 46 shows that in the Sport Club Panel smaller clubs are underrepresented and big clubs are overrepresented.

Table 46: Size of sport clubs in the Netherlands (number of members; per cent).

	Population (2012)	Response group (2015)
50 members or less	36	9
51 - 100 members	20	13
101 - 200 members	18	19
201 - 300 members	9	13
301 - 400 members	5	9
401 - 500 members	3	7
501 members or more	9	29
Total	100	100
Average	193 members	410 members

Source: Statistics Netherlands 2016.

This fact has been known for many years and therefore for each Sport Club Monitor survey a weight factor is calculated. In the last year the Mulier Institute has been trying to recruit more smaller clubs, but practise shows that these club are more reluctant to participate in the monitor, expecting that they would gain few benefits in relation to the costs in time and efforts. Still, the Mulier Institute continues to look for more smaller clubs.

According to Statistics Netherlands (2016) 12% of the Dutch sport clubs in 2012 have at least one paid employee. In the response group 52% has one or more paid employees, especially for sport technical activities (trainer, coach, team leader). This difference can be explained for some part by the overrepresentation of big clubs. Another explanation can be that the definition of a paid employee used in both surveys differ.

When comparing the distribution by sport Table 47 shows that the distribution of sport clubs in the Sport Club Panel differ from the distribution of sport clubs affiliated to NOC*NSF.

Table 47: Proportion of Dutch sport federations with at least 1,000 sport clubs (number of sport clubs; per cent).

	Population (2012)	Response group (2015)
Soccer	13	25
Tennis	7	13
Billiards	6	1
Equestrian sports	5	1
Gymnastics	4	4
Volleyball	4	5
Bridge	4	0

Source: Member Counts 2014 (NOC*NSF 2015)

The survey sample is as good as it gets in the Netherlands. Though the sample is not as representative regarding size and sports as we would like it to be it represents a good reflection of Dutch sport clubs in general.

7.1.7 Norway

Ørnulf Seippel

In Norway *The Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sports* (NIF) register all sports clubs taking part in sports competitions. As a start, researchers then received an excel-file with information on all the active clubs (8072) in NIF's registers: club names, zip codes/city, email-addresses and number of members. There is also a considerable number (approx. 3000) of company sport clubs not being included in the study, simply because they are different from the idea of sports clubs in the SIVSCE project. Because NIF was concerned with survey fatigue among their clubs, we agreed on making a sample of 2000 of these clubs. At this first level, the quality of the sample then is good, reflects the universe very well, and should give reliable information.

The first invitation to participate in the survey was sent to the clubs (leaders), and the procedure was administered from the SIVSCE-partners in Germany. The invitation nevertheless appeared to come from NIF and NSSS (Norwegian School of Sport Sciences). The invitation to the survey was sent out on October 14th 2015. Two reminders were sent on the 2nd and 16th of November 2015, respectively.

601 of 2000 clubs responded, which gives a response rate of 30.0. This is as could be expected (perhaps even a little better) and comparing the distribution of the size of the clubs in the final sample with the "true" distribution in the clubs (and the main sample) shows some minor deviations: too many of the smallest (less than 50 members), some medium sized (200-

499) and largest (1000+) clubs, too few from the smaller (50-99 and 100-199) clubs (see Table 48). It is difficult to say why we got this skewness's and how they might influence on the findings. However, the overall result should be that this is a relative reliable sample of sport clubs.

Table 48: Distribution of members within all registered Norwegian clubs and the sample.

Members	Distribution in Clubs (N=8,072)	Distribution in sample (N=2,000)	Distribution in final sample (N=601)
Less than 50	31.2	29.6	37.1
50-99	18.1	18.5	9.5
100-199	19.4	20.0	14.1
200-499	19.2	19.5	23.8
500-999	8.2	8.8	8.5
1000 +	4.0	3.7	7.0

7.1.8 Poland

Monika Piątkowska

In order to conduct surveys at sport clubs, there was acquired a database (n=20,839³⁵) from REGON register (National Register of Economic Units), kept by the Polish Central Statistical Office (CSO), on the basis of the number of the Polish Classification of Activity - PKD 9312z, assigned to sport clubs. Data included in REGON register are reported and updated by economical units and are not subject to additional verification. Due to that, the database included also organisational entities which had not been unregistered. The database was updated and supplemented by email addresses. The research was conducted on the sample of 8,895 sport clubs.

In 2014 there were 14,009 sports clubs active in Poland (CSO, 2015, p. 47). Their number fell slightly – by 2.1%, compared to 2012 (see Table 49). In the period 1994-2014 the total number of clubs increased almost fivefold (starting from 1994 student and religious sports clubs started to arise in Poland). The number of persons practising sports increased more than twice at the same time. In 2014 there were over 941 thousand members and 919 thousand persons practicing sports in sports clubs. In comparison with the year 2012 there was a slight increase both in the number of members of sports clubs (by 2.2%), as well as the number of persons practising sports (1.4%).

³⁵ As of 30.04.2015.

Appendix

Table 49: Basic information on sport clubs in 2012 and 2014.

Specification	Absolute numbers	
	2012	2014
Sport clubs	14,307	14,009
AZS sports clubs (academic)	82	80
LZS sports clubs (rural)	2,508	2,556
SZS sports clubs (school)	108	79
Student sport clubs (UKS)	6,370	5,923
Religious sports clubs	77	57
Other sport clubs	5,162	5,314
Members (in thousands)	922	941
Persons practising sports (in thousands) of which	907	919
Females	222	229
Aged up to 18	641	644
Coaches	14,527	15,739
Instructors	24,393	24,046
Other persons running sport classes	10,601	9,212

Source: CSO, 2015, p. 47.

Men were predominant in persons practising sports, women constituted 24.9% of the total. The percentage of females practising sports increased by 3 percentage points in comparison to 2012. Over 70% of persons practising sports were persons aged up to 18. The proportion of girls in total youth practising sports was similar to the proportion of women in total persons practising sports and amounted to 28.8% (see Table 50).

Table 50: Distribution of members within all Polish clubs and the final sample.

Specification	CSO (2015)	WP2
Sex		
Males	75.1	72.4
Females	24.9	27.6
Age		
Aged up to 18	70.1	n.a.
18 and over	29.9	n.a.
Most frequently played sports (top 6)		
Football	38.6	30.0
Volleyball	8.8	12.3
Basketball	4.5	5.6
Athletics	4.4	7.0
Swimming	4.0	8.9
Handball	3.8	3.7

Source: CSO, 2015, p. 27, 30 and WP2 data set.

7.1.9 Spain

Ramon Llopis-Goig

In Spain, is not available a complete register of sport clubs existing in the country, although we can make some considerations about the representativeness of the results obtained at the SIVSCE WP2 survey. Previously, however, some particularities of the Spanish case must be taken into account:

- First, in Spain there are a total of 65,458 federated clubs, that is, clubs which are registered to their corresponding sport federations (CSD, 2016). The CSD reports are an up-to-date and highly credible source of statistical information, but they do not cover all of the sports clubs in Spain because not all clubs are members of sports federations.
- Second, it should be noted that in Spain, due to the decentralization of power, the task of registering sport clubs corresponds to the regional governments of the seventeen Autonomous Communities (regions) in which is divided the country. One possible solution to that respect would be to aggregate the information from the general association registers for each autonomous community. But this alternative, however, seems unsuitable, given that the autonomous communities use different ways of classifying associations. We must also bear in mind that this type of register does not make use of an updating procedure and associations that cease to exist do not always delete their listing from the register. In fact, some of these registers do not have the email of the sport clubs registered and only in recent years have started to ask for them to the new clubs entering to the register.

Thus, for obtaining the emails with which to make the sample, I contacted the Sport Governing Bodies of the Autonomous Communities. This was a difficult and long process that demanded a huge effort in terms of making phone calls and meetings in order to explain the aims and characteristics of the project and the survey. It made the process more complicated the fact that in May 2015 were regional elections in Spain; consequently, during the previous months was very hard to sure the information because the caretaker character of the regional governments after the dissolutions of the Chamber of Representatives. After the elections there were important changes in Chambers and then in the composition of the regional governments and this didn't help to collect the information.

With regard to the data finally obtained, it should be noted the next limitations:

- First, sport clubs lists were gathered up for six out seventeen Spanish Autonomous Communities (Andalusia, Madrid, Rioja, Asturias, Valencia and Navarra). These regions represent 46.9% of the overall population of the country. The rest of regions didn't have emails of the sport clubs in their registers or simply were not interested in participating in the survey. Thus, the lists of sport clubs we have had access represent about half of the population in Spain which means that the Spanish sample has a terri-

torial representation bias.

- Second, a total number of 8,608 emails of Spanish sport clubs were achieved, but it should be noted that these 8,608 emails did not correspond to the total number of sport clubs from the regions participating. For example, Asturias provided 313 emails but its register has 2,014 sport clubs since there are 1,701 sport clubs without email. There is, therefore, a second bias that we could call availability of emails bias. Taking into account that, in general, some Autonomous Communities have recently started to ask for email to each new club wanting to register, we must suppose that the sport clubs with email included in the registers are the most recently created ones.
- Third, the number of emails sent to the Spanish sport clubs was 8,372 as 236 were incorrect. But the final sample without bounces was 6,045. The participants were 870 (response rate = 14.4%) and the finishers 434, what means that the finishers rata was 7.2%. This ratio is lower compared to the one obtained in other European countries in the same survey but it is above the commonly observed in other similar studies in Spain. Anyway, we have, therefore, a response bias.

Overall, these three biases force to be extremely careful with the interpretation of the results referred to Spain.

Finally, although the aspects previously discussed, the results of the survey don't seem very far of those obtained –for example– in the 2015 Sports Participation National Survey (CSD, 2015).

The next table shows in its first column data relative to the most practised sports in Spain, while the second one includes the percentages relative to the Sport Clubs survey (WP2-SIVSCE). By comparing both we can draw the next two conclusions:

- First, the sport activities in the first positions of the WP2 SIVSCE survey coincide roughly with those in the sports participation survey. It is true that the former register higher percentages than the last, but it is also true that these first activities are mainly practised by the people on their own and without linking to sport clubs (i. e. gymnastics, running, cycling and swimming).
- Second, the spot activities with the lower percentages in the list of sport activities practised in Spain are the same in the same positions in the WP2 SIVSCE list.

Appendix

Table 51: Comparison between most practiced sports in Spain and clubs represented in the SIVSCE sample.

	CSD (2015)	SIVSCE WP2
Gymnastics (all sorts), fitness/aerobic, etc.	37,6	12,3
Running and track and field	28,5	19,7
Cycling	22,2	11,2
Swimming	18,2	5,8
Apparatus gymnastics, bodybuilding, weightlifting	17,7	8,4
Football	14,2	12,3
Mountaineering and hiking	10,5	11,4
Padel	7,9	2,4
Tennis	4,1	2,1
Basketball	4,1	8,4
Table tennis	2,3	1,3
Volleyball	2,2	3,4
Martial arts	2,2	4,1
Chess	2,1	2,6
Boxing	1,7	1,8
Motorsports (land)	1,9	2,9
Handball	1,2	3,4
Equestrian sports	1,0	2,1
Boules and skittles	0,9	0,9
Hunting	0,8	0,8
Golf	0,6	0,5
Squash	0,6	0,2
Rugby	0,6	1,1
Triathlon	0,6	5,0
Rowing	0,5	0,6
Skiing Nordic	0,5	1,8
Surfing (incl. Windsurfing, Kite surfing)	0,4	1,1
Sailing	0,4	0,6
Motorsports (water)	0,4	0,2
Aeronautical sports	0,3	1,0

7.1.10 Switzerland: The Swiss sport club survey 2016

Markus Lamprecht, Rahel Bürgi, Angela Gebert, Adrian Fischer, Hanspeter Stamm

In Switzerland, the sport club survey was carried out in two stages. At the end of 2015 all member associations of Swiss Olympic were interviewed and asked for the addresses of their affiliated clubs that were the object of a club survey in spring 2016. Thus, the universe of the club survey consisted of all clubs affiliated to a member association of Swiss Olympic. Swiss Olympic is the umbrella organisation of Swiss Sport and includes Olympic as well as Non-Olympic sports. At the end of 2017 the Swiss Wrestling Association³⁶ will also join Swiss Olympic, and as a consequence there will no longer be any relevant sport association outside of the umbrella organisation. However, according to estimates there are about 5000 sport clubs that are not part of an association. These clubs are not included in the club survey. Yet, it can be assumed that most of these clubs are (very) small and operate at the intersection of formal clubs and informal groups.

Sport association survey

On December 4, 2015, all 85 associations affiliated to Swiss Olympic were invited by e-mail to participate in an online association survey. In addition, the Swiss Wrestling Association was interviewed even though it will only become an official member of Swiss Olympic in 2017. A total of three reminders were sent on January 11, January 29 and February 8, 2016, and in some instances associations were also contacted by telephone. The survey ended on March 16, 2016 and had a response rate of 100 per cent. However, two of the 86 associations have aborted the interview prematurely, and a further two associations have not fully answered all questions. The remaining 82 associations have completed the questionnaire reliably and as thoroughly as possible. In some instances, however, some questions were left open because the association was lacking data or did not have the corresponding offers.

76 associations have used the German version of the questionnaire and 10 the French version. On occasion of the so-called “association talks” held between Swiss Olympic and the individual associations the results of the survey were discussed. In some instances, the data were supplemented and adapted on this basis.

Following the survey the associations were asked for the addresses of their affiliated clubs. As incentives for providing the addresses the associations were informed about the study and promised specific analyses at the level of the association. Thanks to these measures and to the persuasion skills of Swiss Olympic’s Nicole Kilchenmann and Judith Conrad most of the associations have in fact delivered the addresses of their clubs (see club survey below).

Club survey

The clubs (i.e. the persons responsible for clubs) were contacted by e-mail in several waves between the beginning of March and the end of May 2016. Clubs that had not participated or formally declined participation after the invitation mail were sent one to two reminders. The invitation mail and the reminders were signed by the Swiss Sport Observatory’s study direc

³⁶ Swiss Wrestling is a traditional form of wrestling only practiced in Switzerland.

tor, Markus Lamprecht, and by Swiss Olympic's director, Roger Schnegg, and contained an internet link that led to individualised online questionnaires. Responses were saved directly into a data bank, and it was possible to interrupt and continue the completion of the questionnaire at any time. This rendered possible the completion of different parts of the questionnaire by different persons at different times (e.g. president, treasurer etc.).

The survey was carried out in German, French and Italian. There were several accompanying measures to increase the response rate such as FAQs on the websites of the Sport Observatory and Swiss Olympic and special information and motivation letters sent by the sport associations. During data collection support was provided to sport clubs that contacted the study team by e-mail. These measures resulted in a good response rate and a comparatively low rate of dropouts from the long and challenging questionnaire. Even though the questionnaire was completed (nearly) fully and reliably by most participants, extensive data controlling exercises were necessary. These included the search for and eventual correction of gaps, inconsistencies and errors. This kind of control and correction is inevitable in online surveys. For a general discussion of pros and cons of online surveys in organised sport see Lamprecht, Fischer & Stamm (2012) and Breuer (2009).

The basic population of the club survey consists of all Swiss sport clubs that are affiliated to one of the 85 (i.e. 86 from 2017) associations that make up Swiss Olympic. The following nine associations were not able to deliver addresses, and consequently it was not possible to contact their clubs: Auto Sport Switzerland, Cevi Switzerland, Scout Movement Switzerland, Swiss Association for University Sports, Swiss Association for School Sports, Swiss Amateur Weightlifting Association, Swiss Boules Association, Swiss Association of Non-Commissioned Officers, Swiss Bowling Association. These associations either have no affiliated clubs, do not have a member directory or have voiced privacy concerns. With respect to the number of lacking clubs only the two youth associations (Scouts and Cevi) with a total of about 770 clubs and about 55'000 mostly juvenile members are relevant.

Table 52 shows that, according to the association survey, a total of 18,478 clubs are affiliated to the 77 participating associations. However, only 17,557 addresses of clubs or persons responsible for clubs, respectively, were provided. During the initial control phase a number of clubs had to be excluded because e-mail addresses were lacking, erroneous, incomplete or had been supplied more than once. In addition, in some instances addresses of (regional) associations, clubs registered outside of Switzerland or veteran associations had been provided. These addresses were also excluded. Finally, some clubs are affiliated to more than one association, and in a few other instances one person appeared to be responsible for more than one club. In these instances, one address was deleted. The invitation e-mail was finally sent to 15,082 addresses.

Table 52: Overview of response rates of the club survey.

		response rate (%)	in % of all clubs
Number of clubs affiliated to the 86 associations (according to the association survey)	19,487		100.0
Number of clubs affiliated to the 77 participating associations (according to the association survey)	18,478		94.8
Number of e-mail addresses provided by associations (before control)	17,557		90.1
Number of valid e-mail addresses provided by associations (after control)	15,082	100.0	77.4
Number of clubs having logged into the online questionnaire	6,627	43.9	34.0
Number of clubs having completed the questionnaire in part	5,335	35.4	27.4
Number of clubs having (almost) fully completed the questionnaire	4,411	29.2	22.6

Of these 15,082 clubs, 6,627 (44%) have at least once logged into the questionnaire. The remaining clubs did not respond even after two reminders. Fig. 62 shows how the response rate developed in the course of the study. After the initial invitation mail, 2686 persons had completed the questionnaire at least partially. After the first reminder response increased by another 1,843 clubs, and the second reminder resulted in 806 additional responses. In total, 5,335 persons responsible for a club have completed parts of the questionnaire. This corresponds to a response rate of 35 per cent that is slightly below the 37 per cent of 2010 but is still good for an online survey (see Table 52).




Fig. 62: Response rates of the club survey at different points in time.

Not all participants that have started completing the questionnaire have finished the task, however. The questionnaire was quite long and demanding. On average, a person responsible for a club had to sacrifice 30 to 60 minutes of her or his time, and in many instance it became necessary to ask other club officials for specific information (e.g. the treasurer).

As a result, only 4,411 persons have completed the full questionnaire (see Table 52). Fig. 63 shows at which time during the completion of the questionnaire people stopped giving answers. From the figure it is evident that most dropouts happened at the beginning of the survey. The detailed questions referring to the number of members in different categories appear to have been the cause of a particularly large number of dropouts. After these questions dropouts develop continuously, no other question has caused comparable breaks in the curve as the question referring to the number of members. In other words: Persons who had managed to complete the first fifth of the survey stood a very good chance to finish it.




Fig. 63: Dropouts of the survey as a function of the questionnaire (number of persons that have answered the corresponding questions).

We can only speculate on the reasons why persons responsible for a club have decided not to participate in the survey or not to finish it. Feedbacks concerning the invitation mails suggest that a number of mails did not reach recipients or were caught in spam filters. The later appears to have been the case with some of the reminders in particular. In addition, a large part of the contacted persons do not appear to have had the time or did not feel like answering a questionnaire they assessed as complicated and long. Finally, some addresses may have been wrong, some clubs might have ceased to exist and in some instances the persons contacted may no longer have been in charge of a club. Such issues have in some instances been reported to the study team.

As opposed to our guesswork regarding participation in the survey there is some good evidence regarding the representativeness of the data submitted. Table 53 offers a comparison of some results from the general association survey with corresponding results from the club survey. The table suggest that participating clubs are on average somewhat bigger than clubs in general. (Very) small clubs have less frequently participated in the club survey than mid-sized and large clubs. With respect to the structure of members, however, there are no sub-

stantial differences between the association and the club surveys. The proportion of female club members is marginally bigger in the club survey than in the association survey but there is no difference in the proportion of juvenile and adolescent members. In addition, there are no statistically significant differences between clubs that did not finish the survey and clubs that have completed the questionnaire.

Table 53: Comparison of structural features of clubs according to the association and the club survey.

	Association survey	Club survey partially completed	Club survey (almost) fully completed
Average size of club (number of active members)	101	121	123
Proportion of women	36%	33%	34%
Proportion of active members aged less than 20 years	37%	37%	36%

8 References

- Breuer, C. (Eds.) (2009): *Sportentwicklungsbericht 2007/2008: Analyse zur Situation der Sportvereine in Deutschland*. Köln: Sportverlag Strauss.
- Breuer, C., & Feiler, S. (2015). *Sport Development Report 2013/2014. Analysis of the situation of sports clubs in Germany. Abbreviated Version*. Cologne: Sportverlag Strauß.
- Breuer, C., Feiler, S., & Wicker, P. (2013). Situation und Entwicklung des ehrenamtlichen Engagements in Sportvereinen. In C. Breuer (Ed.), *Sportentwicklungsbericht 2011/2012. Analyse zur Situation der Sportvereine in Deutschland* (pp. 116-150). Köln: Sportverlag Strauß.
- Breuer, C., Hoekman, R., Nagel, S., & Werff, H. v. d. (2015). *Sport clubs in Europe. A cross-national comparative perspective*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- CSD (2015). *Encuesta de Hábitos Deportivos en España* [Sports Participation Survey in Spain]. Madrid: Subdirección General de Estadísticas del Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte del Gobierno de España. <http://www.mecd.gob.es/servicios-al-ciudadano-mecd/estadisticas/cultura/mc/ehc/2014-2015/presentacion.html>
- CSD (2016). *Anuario de Estadísticas Deportivas* [Yearbook of Sports Statistics]. Madrid: Subdirección General de Estadística y Estudios, Secretaría General Técnica del Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. <http://www.csd.gob.es/csd/estaticos/estadisticas/AED2016.pdf>
- CSO (2015). *Physical Education in Poland in the years 2013 and 2014*. Rzeszów: Social Surveys and Living Conditions Department, Statistical Office.
- DOSB (2015). *Bestandserhebung 2015*. Frankfurt: Deutscher Olympischer Sportbund.
- Elling, A., De Knop, P., & Knoppers, A. (2001). The social integrative meaning of sport: A critical and comparative analysis of policy and practice in the Netherlands. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 18(4), 414-434.
- Elmose-Østerlund, K., Ibsen, B., Breuer, C., Feiler, S., Llopis-Goig, R., Nagel, S., et al. (2016). *Introduction to the project "Social inclusion and volunteering in sports clubs in Europe" (SIVSCE)*. Odense: University of Southern Denmark, Department of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics.
- Esser, H. (2009). Pluralisierung oder Assimilation? Effekte der multiplen Inklusion auf die Integration von Migranten [Pluralization or Assimilation? Effects of Multiple Inclusion on the Integration of Immigrants]. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 38(5), 358-378.
- Eurostat (2015a). Employment of disabled people. Statistical analysis of the 2011 Labour Force Survey and ad hoc module. Luxembourg: European Union.
- Eurostat (2015b). *People in the EU: who are we and how do we live?* Eurostat Statistical books. Luxembourg: European Union.
- Heinemann, K. (2005). Sport and the welfare state in Europe. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 5(4), 181-188.

- Heinemann, K. & Horch, H. D. (1981). Soziologie der Sportorganisation. *Sportwissenschaft*, 11, 123-150.
- Horch, H.-D. (1994). Does government financing have a detrimental effect on the autonomy of voluntary associations? Evidence from German sports clubs. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 29(3), 269-285.
- Ibsen, B. (1992). *Frivilligt arbejde i idrætsforeninger [Volunteering in sports clubs]*. Copenhagen: DHL/Systeme.
- Ibsen, B., Elmoose-Østerlund, K., Nichols, G., Breuer, C., Claes, E., Disch, J., et al. (2016). *Sports club policies in Europe. A comparison of the public policy context and historical origins of sports clubs across ten European countries*. Odense: University of Southern Denmark. Department of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics, Centre for Sports, Health and Civil Society.
- Lamprecht, M., Fischer, A. und Stamm, H. (2012): *Die Schweizer Sportvereine: Strukturen, Leistungen, Herausforderungen*. Zürich: Seismo.
- Nagel, S. (2007). Akteurtheoretische Analyse der Sportvereinsentwicklung. *Sportwissenschaft*, 37(2), 186-201.

9 Questionnaire

The first section contains questions regarding your club (e.g. size and activities).

1. How many members does your club have at the moment?

If you cannot give exact numbers, please give approximate numbers.

Total number of members: _____

Thereof male: _____

Thereof female: _____

2. Within the last five years, has the number of members increased, decreased or been stable?

	Large decrease (more than 25%)	Moderate decrease (11-25%)	Roughly unchanged (+/- 10%)	Moderate increase (11-25%)	Large increase (more than 25%)	Don't know
Members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. When was your club founded (e.g., 1963)? _____

4. What is the size of the city, town or village where your club is based?

City with...	
less than 500 inhabitants	<input type="checkbox"/>
500-4,999 inhabitants	<input type="checkbox"/>
5,000-19,999 inhabitants	<input type="checkbox"/>
20,000-49,999 inhabitants	<input type="checkbox"/>
50,000-99,999 inhabitants	<input type="checkbox"/>
100,000-499,999 inhabitants	<input type="checkbox"/>
500,000 inhabitants and more	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Is your club a single sport club with only one main sports activity, or is it a multisport club divided in branches representing different sports?

Single sport club Multisport club

1. Please tell us which sport activities your club offers (please tick the boxes). If your activity is not listed below, please use the "other" option to fill in the activity. (Country adaptations possible here)

Sports programmes	
Apparatus gymnastics	<input type="checkbox"/>
Badminton	<input type="checkbox"/>
Basketball	<input type="checkbox"/>
Billiards	<input type="checkbox"/>
Boules	<input type="checkbox"/>
Boxing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Canoe/Kayak	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chess	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curling	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cycling	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dancing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Diving	<input type="checkbox"/>
Equestrian sports	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fencing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fighting/combat sport	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fishing sports	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fisball	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fitness/Aerobic	<input type="checkbox"/>
Football	<input type="checkbox"/>
Golf	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gymnastics (all sorts)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Handball	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health sports, health promotion and primary prevention (e.g., preventing falls for the elderly, cardiovascular sports, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hiking	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hockey	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ice hockey	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ice speed skating	<input type="checkbox"/>
Judo	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lifeguard swimming	<input type="checkbox"/>
Motorsports (land)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Motorsports (water)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rehabilitation/tertiary prevention (e.g., therapeutic programmes, sports programmes for stroke patients, sports programmes for cancer patients, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rowing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sailing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shooting sports	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skating alpine	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skating nordic	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. How many other volunteers (both members and non-members who do not have fixed positions or roles in the club) have been working for your club in 2014 (e.g. helping with the organisation of sport events, festivals, competitions, parties or the like, solved other practical tasks, etc.)?

If you cannot give an exact number, please give an approximate number.

Number of other volunteers who do not have a fixed position: _____

9. Does your club have a paid manager (in a leading position of the club)?

yes, full time yes, part time no

10. Within the last five years, has the number of volunteers and paid staff working for your club increased, decreased or been stable?

	Large decrease (more than 25%)	Moderate decrease (11-25%)	Roughly unchanged (+/- 10%)	Moderate increase (11-25%)	Large increase (more than 25%)	Don't know
Volunteers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Paid staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. What measures is your club taking to recruit and retain volunteers? Please tick the box if a statement applies to your club.

Initiatives	
The club has a volunteer or paid staff member with specific responsibility for volunteer management	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club has a written strategy for volunteer recruitment	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club mainly recruits through the networks of current volunteers and members	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club tries to recruit volunteers from outside existing club members (e.g. through advertising vacant positions on the webpage, social media profile such as Facebook, or through newspapers)	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club encourages and motivates its volunteers verbally (talking with the volunteers, convincing them to carry on, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club rewards its volunteers with benefits in kind (e.g. no payment of membership fee, reduced membership fees, subsidised sport equipment etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club pays for volunteers to take training or gain qualification (e.g. courses, licences, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club arranges parties and social gatherings for the volunteers to strengthen group identity	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club informs members that they are expected to contribute with voluntary work	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club informs parents of children who are members that they are expected to contribute with voluntary work	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other measures, please name: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
The club does not do anything in particular	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sports programmes	
Skittles	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sports for disabled/people with chronic diseases	<input type="checkbox"/>
Surfing (incl. Windsurfing, Kite surfing)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Swimming	<input type="checkbox"/>
Table tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>
Track and Field	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trend sports (e.g., Slack line, Parkour, Freerunning)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Triathlon	<input type="checkbox"/>
Volleyball	<input type="checkbox"/>
Walking/Nordic Walking	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water ski/Wakeboarding	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wrestling	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, such as: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, such as: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, such as: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>

The next section contains questions regarding volunteers and paid staff in your club.

In the following, please give information on the people that work in your club, both on a voluntary basis as well as paid staff. When differentiating between volunteers and paid staff, use the following guidelines (Country adaptations possible here):

Volunteers do not receive taxable pay from the club, but they can receive non-taxable remunerations and other club benefits. Paid staff receives taxable pay from the club.

7. Please fill in below how many volunteers and paid staff work in your club in fixed positions or roles in the areas of administration and management, sport and training, sport and competition, as well as in other areas.

If you cannot give an exact number, please give an approximate number.

Club areas	Number of volunteers in fixed positions	Number of paid staff in fixed positions
Administration and management (e.g. board and committee members, club leaders, etc.)	_____	_____
Sport and training (e.g. coaches, instructors, group- and team leaders, etc.)	_____	_____
Sport and competition (e.g. referees, officials, etc.)	_____	_____
Other tasks (e.g. maintenance, facilities, etc.)	_____	_____

12. Please state in how far the following statements represent the opinion of your club's board.

	Totally agree	Agree	Undecided	Don't agree	Don't agree at all
Our club considers members as customers that cannot be expected to contribute with voluntary work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
All members can be volunteers regardless of their qualifications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our club has a low rate of turnover of volunteers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our club's members demonstrate passion, dedication and energy for the work that needs to be done.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our club should be run exclusively by volunteers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The next section contains questions on the inclusion of various population groups in your club.

13. How high would you estimate the percentage of your club members belonging to the following population groups?

	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	More than 75%	Don't know
People with disabilities*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People with migration background**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Elderly (65+)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Popup-Windows in the online questionnaire:

* Physically as well as mentally disabled persons

** People that are foreigners or at least one of their parents is a foreigner or people belonging to an ethnic minority.

14. Does your club have special initiatives (e.g. activities, teams, cooperation, reduced membership fees, etc.) to increase participation among the following population groups (multiple answers possible)?

Population groups	Yes	No
Women, girls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Children and adolescents (until 18 years)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Elderly (aged 65+)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People with disabilities*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People with migration background**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low income people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Popup-Windows in the online questionnaire:

* Physically as well as mentally disabled persons

** People that are foreigners or at least one of their parents is a foreigner or people belonging to an ethnic minority.

Filter if yes:
15. Please indicate which initiatives your club takes for the different population groups (multiple answers possible).

Population groups (if ticked yes before)	Targeted sport activities	Special teams for this group only	Cooperation with sport organisations	Cooperation with municipalities/local government	Concessionary membership fee (reduced or funded)	Special efforts to compensate disabled (e.g. specialised equipment or adaptations to buildings)
Women, girls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Children & adolescents (until 18 years)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Elderly (aged 65+)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
People with disabilities*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People with migration background**	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Low income people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Popup-Windows in the online questionnaire:

* Physically as well as mentally disabled persons

** People that are foreigners or at least one of their parents is a foreigner or people belonging to an ethnic minority.

16. Please state in how far the following statements represent the opinion of your club's board.

Our club ...	Totally agree	Agree	Undecided	Don't agree	Don't agree at all
Our club ...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
strives to help socially vulnerable groups* become better integrated into our club	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
needs to be economically compensated to take responsibility for the inclusion of different population groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
tries to offer sports to as many population groups as possible	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
is committed to offering health-enhancing physical activity programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
feels that our sport discipline(s) is/are suitable as health-enhancing physical activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Socially vulnerable groups include people with a migration background, ethnic minorities, people with a physical or mental disability, low income groups, etc.

The next section contains questions on the management, finances and problems of your club.

17. Please state in how far the following statements represent the opinion of your club's board.

Our club...	Totally agree	Agree	Undecided	Don't agree	Don't agree at all
aims to involve members when making important decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
delegates decision making from the board to committees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
engages in long-term planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
monitors the degree of implementation of its plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
sets high value on companionship and conviviality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
sets high value on sporting success and competition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. How serious are certain problems in your club at the moment? If the problem is a very big problem, please indicate whether this problem threatens the existence of your club.

	In our club, this is ...				and the problem threatens the existence
	no problem	a small problem	a medium problem	a big problem	
Recruitment/retention of members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recruitment/retention of volunteers on the board level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recruitment/retention of coaches/instructors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recruitment/retention of referees/officials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financial situation of the club	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Availability of sport facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Number of laws, orders, directives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Demographic change in the region	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local competition from commercial sport providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Does your club possess own sport facilities?

yes no

20. Does your club use public sport facilities (including school sports facilities)?

yes no

Filter: if yes:

21. Does your club have to pay a fee for the use of public sports facilities (including school sports facilities)?

yes no

22. Below we would like to ask you for information regarding the financial resources and expenditures of your club in the year 2014.

If you cannot give exact numbers, please give approximate numbers.

What was the total revenue of your club in the year 2014? € _____

What was your club's total expenditure in the year 2014? € _____

23. How big was the revenue share your club received from public funding (e.g. from the state, municipalities, sports organisations, EU) in 2014?

If you cannot give an exact share, please give an approximate share. _____%

24. What is the membership fee per month in your club for the following members?

If you cannot give an exact fee, please give an approximate average fee for members belonging to the following age groups:

Children (until 14 years) _____ €/Month

Adolescents (15 to 18 years) _____ €/Month

Adults: _____ €/Month

The End

You have almost reached the end of the questionnaire. We have one last question: Within the project on social inclusion and volunteering in sports clubs in Europe there will also be a survey of club members in the springtime of 2016. This will ask about their experience of volunteering in the club. Would your club be interested in letting the members participate in such a study? In return, you will receive a summary of responses made by your club members, although individual responses will remain anonymous.

If you are interested in taking part in this survey of members, please give an email-address on which we can contact you.

Contact email-address for member survey: _____

You have now reached the end of the questionnaire. Thank you very much for taking part in the sports club survey!



Deutsche
Sporthochschule Köln
German Sport University Cologne

Institut für Sportökonomie
und Sportmanagement
Institute of Sport Economics
and Sport Management



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

 **DOSB FÜHRUNGS-
AKADEMIE**

u^b


**UNIVERSITÄT
BERN**

UNIVERSITAT
DE VALÈNCIA



NIH NORGES
IDRETTSHØGSKOLE

 **mulier institute**



KU LEUVEN

SDU 