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• Dense network of 20 000 sports clubs (Scheerder et al, 2013b)
  → ~1 sports club for every 317 citizens

• Most popular organised leisure activity (Scheerder et al, 2013a, 2015)
  − Primary school: 50.8%
  − Secondary school: 52.2%

• Organisation
  − Mainly voluntary
  − Strongly supported by public funding & policies
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

➔ a lot of potential as a setting for HP!

But

− What is the health promotion orientation of Flemish SC?

− What motives and barriers do they perceive?

− Is this state of affairs changing?
METHODS

• Flemish Sports Club Panel  (Scheerder et al, 2015b)

• Three data collections:
  2011 - 2012 - 2015
### SAMPLES & ANALYSES

#### Overview of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original sample</td>
<td>N=199</td>
<td>N=579</td>
<td>N=1002</td>
<td>N=1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in this study</td>
<td>N=153</td>
<td>N=284</td>
<td>N=473</td>
<td>N=910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time participants</td>
<td>N=153</td>
<td>N=217</td>
<td>N=426</td>
<td>N=796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single wave participants</td>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>N=194</td>
<td>N=426</td>
<td>N=697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple wave participants</td>
<td>N=52</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>N=9</td>
<td>N=99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusion criteria**
- Youth members
- Completed at least one (sub-) index of HPSC-I or PMI or PBI

**Cross-sectional samples**

**Repeated measures**
METHODS

• Flemish Sports Club Panel  (Scheerder et al, 2015b)

• Three data collections:
  2011 - 2012 - 2015

• Online questionnaire
  – Club characteristics
  – HPSC-I - PMI - PBI
INSTRUMENTS: HPSC-I

• **Health Promoting Sports Club Index**  (Kokko et al, 2006, 2009)

• **22 guidelines**
  - Policy  8 items
  - Ideology  2 items
  - Practice  7 items
  - Environment  5 items

• **Scoring**
  - 5point Likert scale: describes the club ‘not at all’–‘very well’
  - Mean score for each (sub-)index
• **Perceived Motives Index** *(Meganck et al, 2015)*

• **4 items** *(Teixeira et al, 2012)*
  - Intrinsic
    - Contribute to health of youth
    - Take on responsibility in the community
  - Extrinsic
    - Healthy athletes perform better
    - Profile our club as healthy

• **Scoring**
  - 5point Likert scale: very weak vs very strong motive
  - Mean score for PMI
INSTRUMENTS: PBI

• **Perceived Barriers Index**  (Meganck et al, 2015)

• **8 items**  (Robinson et al, 2006)
  - Lack of internal support
    • Not a priority / Lack of interest from board / Members
  - Lack of external support
    • From sports federation / Government
  - Lack of resources
    • Knowledge & expertise / Money / Time

• **Scoring**
  - 5point Likert scale: totally disagree vs totally agree
  - Mean score for each sub-index
METHODS

• Flemish Sports Club Panel  (Scheerder et al, 2015b)

• Three data collections:
  2011 - 2012 - 2015

• Online questionnaire
  – Club characteristics
  – HPSC-I - PMI - PBI

• Contacted through sports services of Flemish communities

• One representative of the board
RESULTS: HPSC-I - CROSS-SECTIONAL

All arrows are significant changes at p<.001
RESULTS: PMI & PBI - CROSS-SECTIONAL

All arrows are significant changes at p<.001
DISCUSSION: HPSC-I

• Summary
  – 2011 → 2012: overall improvement
  – 2012 → 2015: mainly status quo

• Note
  – Even in 2015 room for improvement

• Hypothesis
  – Flemish campaign for ethical sports federation
    • Not specific for health promotion, but a lot of overlap
    • In 2011: region wide, aimed at all stakeholders in sport
    • From 2012: responsability devolved to federations
  – Regain equilibrium after change in short term?
DISCUSSION: PMI & PBI

• Summary
  – 2011 → 2012: motives down, barriers up
  – 2012 → 2015: motives recover, barriers status quo

• Note
  • Motives remain supported
  • Barriers remain around neutral

• Hypothesis
  – Resistance against top-down obligations, which are conceived as not essential for core-business?
  – Confronted with barriers when trying to implement?
• Sports clubs are open to take on this responsibility

• Not yet very active, especially in policy and practice

• Although policy efforts have been effective

• Continued support is needed, especially in expertise

• Health promotion professionals should be proactive
THANK YOU!

QUESTIONS & SUGGESTIONS?
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