



Honors College Theses

4-4-2022

An Examination of Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Effects on Sport Participation and Sport Preference from Adolescence into Early Adulthood

Crystal A. Fields
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Behavior and Behavior Mechanisms Commons](#), [Health and Physical Education Commons](#), [Leisure Studies Commons](#), [Organization Development Commons](#), [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), [Sports Sciences Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fields, Crystal A., "An Examination of Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Effects on Sport Participation and Sport Preference from Adolescence into Early Adulthood" (2022). *Honors College Theses*. 694.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses/694>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

An Examination of Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Effects on Sport Participation and Sport Preference from Adolescence into Early Adulthood

An Honors Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in the
Department of Health Sciences and Kinesiology

By
Crystal Fields

Under the mentorship of Dr. Gregg Rich

The aim of this study was to understand how hierarchical leisure constraints prohibited sport participation and influenced sport preferences during individuals' adolescent years, and how these constraint effects may change during their early twenties. A sequential quantitative-qualitative mixed methods design was employed to (1) identify general changes in constraint effects on participation (i.e., quantitative) and then (2) better understand how sport preferences may be impacted by these constraint effects on participation (i.e., qualitative). A sample (n=70) of female (n= 26) and male (n=44) Georgia residents between the ages of 20-25 representing various ethnicities, backgrounds, and income levels participated in the study. Eight of the participants were interviewed following their completion of the online questionnaire. Online questionnaire data capturing past and present sport participation constraints were analyzed using two-tailed dependent sample t-tests, while the eight semi-structured interviews were analyzed through a constant comparative thematic analysis. Results indicated that perceived interpersonal constraint effects strengthened among individuals from adolescence into early adulthood. Structural constraints pertaining to timing and scheduling of sports, and the accessibility to sports were also perceived by individuals to be slightly more challenging to negotiate. Following qualitative analysis of semi-structure interviews, multiple themes were identified that related to hierarchical leisure constraints and perceived behavior control. To better validate and improve the generalizability of findings, future research should conduct similar studies with focus towards a specific sport or consider various socioeconomic and demographic factors.

Thesis Mentor: _____

Dr. Gregg Rich

Honors Director: _____

Dr. Steven Engel

April 2022
Department of Health Sciences and Kinesiology
Honors College
Georgia Southern University

Acknowledgments

The completion of this thesis could not have been possible without the assistance, participation, and guidance of Dr. Gregg Rich. Thank you for mentoring me, teaching me, and supporting me throughout the entirety of this process. Your kindness and teachings are greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank Dr. Daniel Czech and Dr. Jody Langdon for their motivation and helping hand throughout this process as well. Additionally, I would like to thank the University Honors Program and the Department of Health Sciences and Kinesiology for this incredible opportunity to present my undergraduate research.

Introduction.....	4
Literature Review.....	6
Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Theory.....	6
Hierarchical Leisure Constraints and Sports Participation	7
Leisure Constraints and Sport Preference	8
Considering Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) with HLC and Sport Preference	9
Research Purpose	10
Methods.....	12
Sample and Data Collection Procedures.....	12
Quantitative Instrument Measures	13
Quantitative Instrument Measures	14
Intrapersonal Constraint Measures	14
Interpersonal Constraint Measures	14
Structural Constraint Measures.....	15
Qualitative Instrument Measures	16
Results.....	16
Quantitative Analysis Findings.....	16
Intrapersonal Factors.....	16
Interpersonal Factors.....	17
Structural Factors	18
Qualitative Analysis Findings.....	20
I Prefer Sports Where I Fit (Related to Intrapersonal Constraints)	20
I'm too old to be new to a sport	20
I have the skills for it	21
I Prefer Sports that Fulfill Social Needs (Related to Interpersonal Constraints)	23
I Must Be Selective with What I Play (Related to Structural Constraints).....	24
I must be selective because of time.....	25
I must be selective due to costs.....	26
Discussion	27
Socialization and Sport Preference	28
Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions	29
References.....	31

Introduction

Sport participation has received significant research interest across a variety of academic disciplines—with good reason. Sport participation serves as a leisure form of physical activity, which can improve musculoskeletal health, control body weight, and reduce the symptoms of depression, while also decreasing the likelihood of some cancers, type 2 diabetes, and cardiovascular disease (World Health Organization, 2016). Furthermore, participation in team sports has been found to produce numerous positive social, psychological, and psychosocial health outcomes, with evidence that it may be more effective than individual sports in ensuring continued engagement in physical activity by adults (Andersen et al., 2019).

Individuals' levels of sport participation can be influenced by both sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors. In the United States, substantial disparities exist regarding how, and how often, individuals engage in physical activity when considering sex, race/ethnicity, and income level (Armstrong et al., 2018). More specific to sport participation, correlations have been found between individuals' social background variables and their levels of sport participation. For instance, individuals from a higher socioeconomic status (SES), are more likely to participate in leisure sports than individuals from a lower SES (Perks, 2020; Scheerder et al., 2005; Wheeler et al., 2019; Wilson, 2002; Xia et al., 2020). Those with higher income earnings are more likely to actively engage in multiple sports, afford sports fees, and other playing necessities. Those from lower-income households are less likely to be able to afford costs associated with sport participation. Consequently, children from lower SES families are less likely to participate in organized sports than children raised in higher SES families. For

example, children raised in families with higher SES are 10 to 11% more likely to participate in sports clubs than children raised by unskilled workers, with partial explanation for this club participation discrepancy being attributable to factors such as cultural resources, immigrant origin, school(s) attended, and social context lived during adolescence (Anderson & Bakken, 2019).

Differences in sport participation related to sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors are likely to influence individuals' sports preferences as well. Many individuals have their greatest interest in sports in late elementary school or middle school, with that interest level waning over time (King, 2020, January 13). Therefore, socialization effects—particularly those from parents and other family members—could be expected to influence both sport participation and sport preference, with there being a strong anticipated correlation between them. For instance, Haycock and Smith (2012) found that individuals are likely to inherit sporting habits and values from parents who actively invested in their sport experiences as an aspect of their family-based leisure relationships.

However, there is little to no understanding for how sport socialization effects related to sport participation change as individuals enter adulthood and transition into new social environments (e.g., college) and how those changes may influence sport preference. Thus, the relationship between sport socialization and sport preference during this life transition period—particularly with consideration to actual sport participation—warrants research attention. One way to examine possible changes during this transition period is by investigating changes in hierarchical leisure constraint effects (Crawford & Godbey, 1987).

This paper proceeds as follows. First, the theoretical frameworks for the sequential mixed-method study are introduced and examined with respect to sport participation and preference. Then, the three hypotheses being employed for the quantitative data analysis are stated. Afterwards, the research purpose and subsequent research questions for the overall study are presented prior to communication of the methods being implemented. This paper then concludes by presenting and discussing the results, their implications, study limitations, and possible avenues for future research.

Literature Review

In the following literature review, descriptions and applicable background for Hierarchical Leisure Constraint (HLC) Theory and the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) are provided, as both are foundational theories for the framework employed in this study.

Hierarchical Leisure Constraint Theory

Hierarchical Leisure Constraint (HLC) theory, which was first introduced by Crawford and Godbey (1987), describes and explains the relationship between constraints, leisure activity preferences, and subsequent leisure involvement. Intrapersonal constraints are self-imposed restrictions that consist of internal psychological states such as anxiety, fatigue, and perceived skill. Interpersonal constraints result when individuals are discouraged from leisure activity because of perceived difficulties with social interactions and relationships with such context, including lack of companionship during activity participation. Structural constraints include external, situational, or environmental barriers that discourage or prevent

participation in sport and leisure activities. These barriers include lack of financial resources, work, and weather.

Research using HLC theory has found that these three constraints are influential in determining both activity preferences and participation (Godbey et al., 2010). Crawford and Godbey (1993) suggested that eventual leisure behavior was dependent upon successful negotiation of these constraint levels. These constraints are hypothesized to be negotiated hierarchically from intrapersonal to structural. Since then, HLC theory has maintained its explanatory viability for leisure behavior. Moreover, Godbey et al. (2010) concluded that the HLC framework is cross-culturally relevant and could be employed to examine forms of behavior other than leisure, with potential for contextual expansion of the theory (Godbey et al., 2010).

Hierarchical Leisure Constraints and Sports Participation

There is evidence that sport participation **is** strongly influenced by hierarchical leisure constraints. Whether an individual struggles with accessibility, financial resources, anxiety, or social interaction restrictions, these constraints all have the potential to impact participation. While some constraints may have more impact on participation than others, all three types of leisure constraints are important in determining participation outcomes among individuals.

Generally, structural constraints are the constraint type most likely to prohibit sport participation among individuals, while interpersonal constraints are also prohibitive, but to a lesser degree. Intrapersonal constraints are much less likely to prevent sport participation than the other two constraint types of HLC theory, as they would be the first types of constraints negotiated (Crawford & Godbey, 1993). From a structural constraint

perspective, individuals perceive their leisure activities to be primarily constrained from issues pertaining to accessibility and serviceable facilities (Drakou et al., 2020; Halforty & Radder 2015). However, interpersonal constraints possess a more significant role in sport participation decisions among athletes who have suffered adverse childhood experiences (ACE). Interpersonal constraints are more likely to influence the sport participation choices of athletes who have experienced or have been a victim of violence (e.g., parental, neighborhood); have been raised in an environment of financial hardship; have witnessed parental domestic violence, divorce/separation; have co-resided in a household with an adult who suffers from mental health or substance abuse; or have received unfair treatment as a result of their race/ethnicity (Brown et al., 2020). Within the context of student-athletes, nearly two-thirds have endured at least one ACE that resulted in positive correlations between ACE and anxiety, depression, perceived stress, injury/health problems, and substance use (Brown et al., 2020). Significant associations between all levels of ACE exposure and decreased sport participation have been identified in studies examining youths between 10 and 17 years of age (Noel-London et al., 2021).

Leisure Constraints and Sport Preference

Like sport participation, sport preference may be influenced by all three constraints. Structural constraints, including schools offering few sports options, can lead to individuals preferring certain sports over others. Income and social status can also influence sport preference. For example, those individuals from low-income families may not have access to sports with more expensive equipment needs (e.g., ice hockey and golf). Furthermore, patterns of involvement in sports are influenced by how individuals

are socialized. Whether it be the culture, values, surroundings, or experiences from which the athlete was engaged as an adolescent, these factors impact sports involvement (Kremer-Sadlik & Kim, 2007). These factors could also affect sport preference.

Interpersonal constraints, including lack of companionship for activity participation, can lead athletes to prefer individual sports that do not involve teammates. Intrapersonal constraints, including anxiety or perceived skill, may result in athletes preferring sports that allow them to more easily negotiate those constraints.

Considering Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) with HLC and Sport Preference

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) is used to understand individuals' intentions to engage in behaviors (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). TPB is an extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) that expands the theory by incorporating the concept of perceived behavioral control. The theory suggests that individuals' intentions to perform certain behaviors are driven by a) their attitudes towards behaviors, b) subjective norms relating to the behaviors, and c) perceived behavioral controls. Individuals' attitude towards behaviors refers to whether individuals possess a favorable or unfavorable evaluation of them. Social and environmental surroundings influence subjective norms by referring to individuals' beliefs about approval or disapproval of behaviors, and how those beliefs would be perceived among peers and others of personal importance. Perceived behavior control refers to an individuals' perceptions of how difficult it would be to enact specific behaviors.

The findings of Alexandris et al. (2007) suggest that TPB explains the mediation effects of HLC Theory, indicating that the inclusion of perceived behavior control is representative of HLC factors. Therefore, the effects of hierarchical leisure constraints

are captured by TPB, with perceived behavioral control mediating their influence upon intentions. TPB states that individuals' intentions to perform certain behaviors are driven by their attitudes towards them. Furthermore, the attitudes towards certain behaviors could be influenced by leisure constraints. Social differences in youths' sport participation behaviors can also be identified when considering the SES of their parents (Scheerder et al., 2005). The intention to perform a behavior are most likely to be discouraged by interpersonal and structural constraints. Structural and interpersonal constraints such as income, SES, and lack of companionship influence patterns of involvement, achievement, and accessibility of sport activities. Findings from extant literature suggest that factors such as race, home behaviors, beliefs, and parental SES status all are related to children's achievement (Davis-Kean, 2005). As stated by Kremer-Sadlik and Kim (2007), the beliefs, home behaviors, culture, surroundings, and values can also influence involvement in sports. Therefore, individuals are more likely to be socialized and have preferences for certain sports reflective of their cultures, surroundings, and/or experiences.

Research Purpose

There is a lack of existing research that examines how constraints influence sport preference relative to sport socialization as individuals transition from being adolescents into adults. The purpose of this study is to understand how the effects of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints discourage or prohibit sport participation as individuals transition from adolescence into early adulthood, with active consideration of sociodemographic backgrounds and socialized sports. By understanding what factors

prevent youths from participating in certain sports, strategies can be developed to negotiate and overcome these issues.

Furthermore, sport affinity is strongest for most individuals in late elementary to middle school (King, 2020, January 13). With socialization being so important when young individuals leave home, constraints on sport participation may be influenced by new social environments. To my knowledge, extant literature does not include research studies that examined what constraint change across this important life-stage threshold and why. This study intends to address this gap by examining hierarchical leisure constraint effects on sport participation and from adolescence into early adulthood. By using a mixed-method approach to sample a group of Georgia sports participants between 20 and 25 years of age, constraints will be considered from both past (i.e., adolescent) and current day (i.e., early adulthood) contexts. The use of this approach is employed to identify if changes in sports participants' constraints effects change as they enter adulthood and whether those changes have sport preference implications. HLC theory, with consideration to TPB, was used as the theoretical framework and lens from which all analyses were conducted. Consequently, the following research questions guided this study:

RQ1. What changes in constraints will affect participation from adolescence into early adulthood?

RQ2. How are sport preferences impacted by constraint effects on participation?

To identify possible changes in sport participation constraints (i.e., RQ1), the quantitative portion of this study will test the following three hypotheses:

H1) There will be statistically significant differences between interpersonal leisure constraints from adolescence to early adulthood.

H2) There will be statistically significant differences between intrapersonal leisure constraints from adolescence to early adulthood.

H3) There will be statistically significant differences between structural leisure constraints from adolescence to early adulthood.

Then, themes for explaining sport participation constraint effects on sport preference will be identified through qualitative analysis of follow-up interviews (i.e., RQ2).

Methods

This study will utilize a sequential quantitative-qualitative mixed methods design. A questionnaire was distributed across several social media platforms to permanent Georgia residents from 20-25 years of age to identify how socialization may impact sport preference from both adolescent and early adulthood contexts. Qualitative data collection and analysis from follow-up interviews occurred after quantitative data collection and analysis. Participants who were willing to be individually interviewed were asked questions based on their survey responses to better understand how constraints and actual participation behaviors were influencing sport preferences. More specifically, the quantitative data was analyzed to answer the first research question, while analysis of the qualitative data was used to find themes that helped answer the second research question.

Sample and Data Collection Procedures

Participants for this study were chosen by convenience sampling through *Reddit.com*. Professional groups that were minority-focused were invited to participate in

the study. All participants were between 20 and 25 years of age with a history of sport participation. Sociodemographic characteristics of the 70 participants who completed the survey were documented and compared. The mean age of participants was 21 and 48.6% were middle class. Education levels varied, with 52% of participants' highest level of education being some college while 22% of participants' highest level of education was a bachelor's degree. The remaining participants' highest level of education were either some high school or less (1%), GED (11%), associate degree (4%), or a graduate degree (10%). Approximately 50% of participants were college students. Some demographic characteristics slightly changed from childhood to adulthood. 6% of participants stated that they were lower class as adolescents, where 8% now state that they are lower class. Additionally, 42% of participants stated they were middle class as adolescents, where 49% reported that they are middle class.

A purposeful sampling approach was adopted for qualitative data collection, with those survey respondents who provided an email contacted for follow up interviews. Eight survey respondents participated in follow-up interviews. All participants either grew up in an upper-middle-class household (n=1), middle-class household (n=6), or lower-class household (n=1). Additionally, most interviewees reported that they still rely on their parents since they are college students. There were a total of five females and three males, all of whom—with the exception of one doctoral student—were undergraduate students.

Quantitative Instrument Measures

Questionnaire items used to survey participants were adopted from prior studies (i.e., Andersen & Bakken, 2019; Halford & Radder, 2015; Hubbard & Mannell, 2001).

All items adopted for the study had previously been found to be reliable and valid. The questionnaire also included vetting questions, demographic questions, and sport background questions. Qualtrics software was used to build, distribute, and collect data from questionnaire respondents. If survey respondents were willing to be interviewed following completion of the questionnaire, they were to provide their email address were indicated within it. Semi-structured interviews were used to ask questions to better understand how HLC and actual sport participation may influence sport preferences

Quantitative Instrument Measures

The quantitative instrument measures are provided in the following section by constraint type (i.e., intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural). All items representing hierarchical leisure constraints were measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). Consequently, lower item scores indicated less challenge in negotiating intrapersonal constraints, while higher item scores were indicative of greater challenge in their negotiation. Questions were asked from both an adolescent and early adulthood context.

Intrapersonal Constraint Measures. Six items were adopted from Halforty and Radder (2015) to measure intrapersonal constraints, consisting of: (1) Playing sports is too tiring; (2) I'm afraid of playing sports because I feel as if I might get hurt; (3) I am not confident enough to play sports; (4) I do not enjoy sports offered locally; (5) I am not interested in participating in sports; (6) I do not like any of the sports activities offered to me.

Interpersonal Constraint Measures. Three items were adopted from Hubbard and Mannell (2001) to measure interpersonal constraints, consisting of: (1) I don't have

friends or acquaintances with whom to participate in sporting activities; (2) People with whom I would participate in sporting activities with schedules are different than mine; (3) The people I would participate in sporting activities with live too far away.

Structural Constraint Measures. Sixteen items (Drakou et al., 2008; Halfordy & Radder, 2015) were adopted to measure structural constraints within the current study that captured the following constraint constructs: lack of time, lack of access, and lack of facilities. Time and scheduling items representing lack of time will consist of the following three questions: (1) Do you ever have to miss practice due to no one having time to pick you up; (2) Does your practice schedule fit in with your working schedule; (3) Are you too busy with work to attend practices. Accessibility items representing lack of access will consist of the following five questions: (1) Are you offered different opportunities to participate in any sports; (2) Do you struggle with transportation to and from practice; (3) Do you own a source of transportation to go to and from practice; (4) Do you struggle with the cost of transportation to take you to and from practice; (5) Do you struggle with paying for the cost of your sporting fees. Items representing lack of facilities will consist of the following eight questions: (1) Do you participate in any sporting activities offered locally; (2) Do local areas around you offer a variety of sports; (3) Are the athletics offered locally well-funded; (4) Is the sporting equipment poorly kept in local areas; (5) Is the sporting equipment outdated/inadequate; (6) Is there a sufficient amount of equipment for every team member; (7) Is there limited sporting equipment for team members; (8) Are the practice areas overcrowded.

Qualitative Instrument Measures

Semi-structured interviews were conducted given that my study was exploratory in nature. Interviews were conducted until reaching data saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), where no new codes were being produced. Interviews were conducted through *Zoom.us*, a platform for video and audio conferencing, with each interview lasting between 30- 45 minutes. The transcript provided by zoom was used for constant comparative thematic analysis of data (Charmaz, 2014). Please refer to Appendix A for the interview guide used.

Results

Quantitative Analysis Findings

Analysis of quantitative data was conducted through use of two-tailed, dependent sample t-tests, comparing mean averages of perceived adolescent and early adulthood constraint effects.

Intrapersonal Factors

When examined as a construct, intrapersonal constraints from adolescence ($M = 2.07$, $SD = 0.78$) and early adulthood ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.99$) were statistically insignificant, $t(69) = 0.75$, $P = .455$. Therefore, there was no perceived change found in how individuals navigated their intrapersonal constraints from adolescence as they entered early adulthood. The mean averages suggest that, in general, psychological conditions that were internal to the individuals' sporting activities were perceived by them to have little impact on their sport participation choices. When intrapersonal constraint items were analyzed individually, one item (i.e., I'm afraid of playing sports because I feel as if I might get hurt) was found to possess a statistically significant

difference of constraint effects between adolescence ($M = 1.90$, $SD = 1.09$) and early adulthood ($M = 1.02$, $SD = 0.17$), $t(69) = 1.99$, $P < .001$. When comparing mean averages, however, this finding would suggest, at best, that individuals were not concerned about getting hurt from sports when they were adolescents—and even more so as young adults. Thus, H1 was not supported by the results.

Interpersonal Factors

When examined as a construct, interpersonal constraints from adolescence ($M = 1.91$, $SD = 0.89$) and early adulthood ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 0.88$) were statistically significant, $t(69) = 7.07$, $P < 0.001$. Thus, confirming support for H2. The differences in mean averages suggesting that, in general, interpersonal constraints were perceived to be more challenging for individuals to negotiate as young adults than when they were adolescents.

When examining the three indicator items for the interpersonal construct individually, all demonstrated statistical significance between adolescence and early adulthood scores of $P < .001$. When asked if they did not have friends or acquaintances with whom to participate, individuals perceived greater challenges in finding friends with whom to participate as young adults ($M = 2.42$, $SD = 1.25$) than they did as adolescents ($M = 1.76$, $SD = 0.94$), $t(69) = 4.31$, $P < .001$. When asked if people with whom they would participate in sports had different schedules, individuals perceived that their schedules were more difficult to coordinate with others as young adults ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 1.07$) than when they were adolescents ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 1.08$), $t(69) = 6.91$. When asked if they were too far away from those with whom they would participate in sports, individuals perceived that distances between them and others with whom they would participate in sports were more difficult to overcome as young adults ($M = 2.74$, $SD =$

1.16) than when they were adolescents ($M = 1.97$, $SD = 1.05$), $t(69) = 4.97$, $P < .001$.

Consequently, from these results, individuals are likely to find it more difficult to coordinate opportunities for sport participation with their friend groups as young adults.

Structural Factors

Structural constraints were conceptualized into three factors using collective mean averages: time and scheduling, accessibility, and facilities. A statistically significant difference was found between adolescence ($M = 1.93$, $SD = 0.95$) and early adulthood ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 0.89$) time and scheduling constraints, $t(69) = 3.63$, $P < .001$, and with adolescence ($M = 1.75$, $SD = 0.71$) and early adulthood ($M = 1.94$, $SD = 0.73$), $t(69) = 2.71$, $P < .01$. However, the difference of the facilities constraint for adolescence ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 0.81$) and early adulthood ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 0.78$) was statistically insignificant, $t(69) = 1.60$, $P = 0.11$.

When examining the three indicator items for the time and scheduling constraints construct, two of the three indicators were statistically significant between the two life stages. When asked if their practice schedule did not fit with their work schedules, individuals' responses suggested that they perceived this constraint for sport participation more difficult to negotiate as young adults ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.18$) than adolescents ($M = 2.04$, $SD = 1.08$), $t(69) = 3.73$, $P < .001$. Also, when asked if they were too busy to attend practices, individuals' responses suggested that they perceived themselves more likely to be too busy to attend practices as young adults ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.20$) than when they were adolescents ($M = 1.96$, $SD = 0.99$), $t(69) = 4.84$, $P < .0001$. A statistically nonsignificant difference was found between individuals' perceptions of someone being

able to pick them up from practices as adolescents ($M = 1.8$, $SD = 0.96$) and young adults ($M = 1.73$, $SD = 0.88$), $t(69) = -0.57$, $P = 0.57$.

While the accessibility construct was statistically significant, when examining its five indicator items individually, only two were statistically different between the two life stages being compared. Based on results from the data analysis, individuals perceived there to be less opportunities for them to participate in different sports as young adults ($M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.19$) compared to when they were adolescents ($M = 2.04$, $SD = 1.07$), $t(69) = 3.20$, $P < .01$. They also perceived that they were less likely to have their own means of transportation to practice as young adults ($M = 1.71$, $SD = 0.98$) than when they were adolescents ($M = 1.41$, $SD = 0.65$), $t(69) = 2.45$, $P < .05$. Items pertaining to costs and general access to transportation and paying participation fees were statistically insignificant, suggesting that these constraint types were similar between the two life stages.

Although the facilities constraint construct was statistically insignificant between the two life stages examined, two of its indicator items did possess statistically significant differences. Individuals perceived that they were more likely to participate in local sport offerings when they were adolescents ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.45$) than as young adults ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 1.39$), $t(69) = -2.24$, $P < .05$. With the age range representing a large portion of undergraduate college students, these differences may be attributable to individuals playing sports both on campus and in their hometowns. Also, individuals perceived areas for practicing their sports more overcrowded as young adults ($M = 2.76$, $SD = 1.04$) than when they were adolescents ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.02$), $t(69) = 3.48$, $P < .001$. This difference may possibly be attributable to a large portion of the sample being college

students too, as the campus recreation centers may be overcrowded at the times when they have availability to use them.

Qualitative Analysis Findings

In total, eight participants were interviewed for the semi-structured interviews. Analysis of the interview's transcriptions identified several themes relating to sports preference and indicating perceived behavior controls as conceptualized through TPB.

I Prefer Sports Where I Fit (Related to Intrapersonal Constraints)

Individuals preferred sports where they felt a sense of belonging. If they were unable to find a personal fit with a sport, then they were unlikely to pursue it. Sub-themes related to this broader theme would be "I'm too old to be new to a sport," or "I have the skills for it."

I'm too old to be new to a sport. The statement "too old to play" or "if I played it when I was a kid" were common responses when asked why they were not engaged in other sports, or what affected the type of sports they chose when a variety of opportunities were available.

"I felt like I was kind of too old to kind of learn a new sport" (Interviewee 6)

"Once you get locked into that sport, then like you know you're locked in so"

(Interviewee 6)

"If I would have been more involved in like probably baseball towards any other sport probably would have like liked it now, but since when I was a kid since it

was mainly football [and] basketball that's really what I'm interested in still now" (Interviewee 7)

"She wanted us to focus on tennis, so I didn't get to do other sports really"
(Interviewee 1)

Additionally, participants felt that since they played a particular sport for so long and became comfortable with the sport, that they were not open to trying to learn the rules of a new sport. This idea also explains TPB and the participant's intention to either engage or not engage in a new sport. The individual's perceived behavioral control or their perception of the ease or difficulty of engaging in a new sport influences their thinking that they are too old to play. Therefore, because they believe that they are too old to learn how to play a new sport, their perception of difficulty influences their attitude of whether to engage in it. In the same way, attitude towards the sport can affect favorability as well. This is shown in the quoted segment with interviewee 8, as their attitude towards the sport was influenced by their personal beliefs about their ability to play the sport. Therefore, because the individual felt as if they were not good enough, they began to develop an unfavorable attitude towards the sport and eventually changed sport preferences and subsequent participation.

I have the skills for it. In the same way, socializing influences from important others and their beliefs toward a specific sport can also affect the individual's intention to engage in another sport and their perceived power and ability to branch out and try

something new. When asked if the sports that the participants engaged in growing up influenced the type of sports that they played currently, nearly all interviewees stated yes.

“It was all mental I was just like I don't know I just felt like I wasn't good enough, so I just that's what kind of made me lead on to try track.” (Interviewee 8)

“Definitely, because I already have a background and things like pickleball and racquetball because tennis is the same motion” (Interviewee 1)

“Definitely yep, I was wanting to see if there were anything related to archery”
(Interviewee 2)

“It was just something that like it was in my comfort zone, and I know I can do it, so I just stuck with it.” (Interviewee 6)

“It was all mental I was just like I don't know I just felt like I wasn't good enough, so I just that's what kind of made me lead on to try track.” (Interviewee 8)

These quotes evidence how influenced the individual's intention to engage in another sport revolves around their perceived ability to play the sport successfully. Either the participants learned to play sports with skill sets similar to sports they had previously played as an adolescent, or they simply continued playing the same sports from their youth. They perceived themselves to have more control to participate in sports in which

they had preexisting background, discouraging efforts to engage in new sports. Many of the individuals did not perceive themselves capable of learning and playing a new sport.

I Prefer Sports that Fulfill Social Needs (Related to Interpersonal Constraints)

There was an ongoing theme among interviewees in which their preference in sports was solely due to their friend groups and having someone on the team with whom they could socialize.

“I think that's why I did archery over soccer was just because I felt like I didn't have a lot of friends there. It was always a possibility I wouldn't know anybody on the team.” (Interviewee 2)

The theme was found across several interviews where interviewees either felt more comfortable trying a new sport or staying in a sport due to friends. Companionship not only was seen to affect preference, but it also impacted participation as well. Interviewees either quit sports entirely due to a lack of friends participating in it, or they were afraid to participate in other sports due to the opinions of peers.

“It made it more secluded and less open to try new things like I would be shunned a little bit different if tried a sport that wasn't as popular or notarized in my city. Versus now like, I can go out to my school's RAC or gym and try new sports and be accepted and welcome in verses back then I wouldn't be.” (Interviewee 5)

“I was driven to the point where like I almost quit the sport entirely and I wasn't the only one... It was just like that favoritism and just like everything that was like happening.” (Interviewee 6)

The quote above from interviewee 5 shows how the opinions and actions of others towards engaging in sports caused this interviewee to be closed off from trying a new sport (i.e., perceived behavior control). These themes illustrate how environmental factors, perceived subjective norms, and peers can both influence and discourage sport participation. Since most people with whom the participant socialized were perceived to be disapproving of their engagement in new sports, it affected their willingness to try participating in new sports.

I Must Be Selective with What I Play (Related to Structural Constraints)

Few structural constraints were referenced in interviews that influenced sport preferences. Interviewees did, however, communicate that there were better opportunities for them while students in college to participate in various sports, with many activities free for them. Most participants stated that intramural sports and free equipment rentals for playing sports at campus facilities allowed them to stay physically active and try new sports.

“We go golfing a lot more now we use our RAC more to play new sports like lacrosse and things like that like soccer you know try new sports versus just football and basketball all of the time.” (Interviewee 5)

“It was offered and I took advantage of it.” (Interviewee 4)

“I think, just like being in college like you have a lot of options for that, too, and I think that influences that more.” (Interviewee 3)

When asked if the participant engaged in a sport because it was offered at their school, the interviewee stated that it was offered by their school, and they took advantage of the opportunity. Additionally, participants stated that their college recreation department made it easier and more affordable to access equipment and play multiple sports respectively.

I must be selective because of time. However, with many of the interviewees being full-time college students, they expressed the challenges of participating in sports while balancing responsibilities associated with jobs and schoolwork, all while finding time to rest. Ultimately, this made it necessary for many interviewees to be selective regarding the sports they played.

“I work like 25 hours a week and I’m taking 16 credit hours so anytime I have outside of that I’m either cooking or cleaning or sleeping.” (Interviewee 1)

“It also makes it harder as like you get further into college, since you have a lot more work to do.” (Interviewee 3)

In a similar way, the majority of participants stated that trying to balance schoolwork and sports as a youth caused so much mental stress that they eventually quit

the sport. In some cases, individuals were motivated to quit playing sports. Therefore, regardless of the many opportunities to engage in sports, some individuals expressed disinterest.

“Maintaining my grades because, I was a straight-A student but like what it cost me to do that was like probably my sanity.” (Interviewee 6)

“I could easily just go to the RAC and hoop which I do sometimes, but I just you know I really don't feel like it.” (Interviewee 7)

I must be selective due to costs. Another theme that was prevalent was limiting the type and number of sports played because of their costs. Some interviewees stated that they were forced to choose between two sports because their parents could not afford to pay for both. In other situations, some interviewees played certain sports simply because it was more affordable, easier to access, and popular in their area; suggesting that social class and income influence sport preferences.

“That was like the cheapest and so we only played one sport just cause like that was like really all we could afford.” (Interviewee 6)

“It was more accessible, easier to get to, popular you know everyone in the city played the sport or watched the sport, so if I was to participate in the sport, I'll be looked at as a regular person or like versus like playing a new sport I'd be seen as different or not as regular, you know.” (Interviewee 5)

Sport participation was also affected by financial problems as adolescents. One interviewee stated that because their parents did not donate money to the booster club—or, did not donate as much as other teammates' parents—they were not given any playing time. Additionally, another interviewee stated that they had to quit a sport because their school did not offer the equipment necessary for playing it.

“Another reason why I didn't play as much at my high school team was because my parents never donated that much money to the booster club. Other girls parents, they owned businesses so they could sponsor the team and stuff like that, and donate more money so those girls got to play more” (Interviewee 6)

“My senior year I didn't play my whole season, because my school couldn't provide me with adequate equipment to safely and adequately play a game and practice, so I had to quit my team that year.” (Interviewee 5)

Discussion

Findings from the study found no substantial changes in how individuals perceive intrapersonal constraints. These findings suggest that changes in interpersonal constraints from adolescence to early adulthood do not affect sport participation differently. There was, however, a statistically significant relationship between perceived interpersonal constraint effects from adolescence into early adulthood, confirming the second hypothesis. Findings suggested that interpersonal constraints were slightly more difficult

to negotiate as individuals became young adults. These changes may be caused by individuals attending colleges and moving into new social environments. When considering qualitative analysis of interviews, those with fewer friends preferred individualized sports or did not play sports that required teamwork. However, those who did change sport participation behaviors as a young adult often referenced the presence of friends willing to play their new sports. Additionally, results indicated that individuals were more likely to struggle managing their time and coordinating sport participation opportunities with others. This is likely related to many young adults being college students and learning to manage their new responsibilities while trying to remain active in sports.

Lastly, findings from interviews suggest that college-aged students were more likely to engage in new sports due to easy accessibility to university sport and recreation facilities, with increased opportunities offered by the school to engage in different sports. These findings support the third hypothesis, stating differences between structural constraints as individuals transition from adolescence into early adulthood.

Socialization and Sport Preference

There was a significant relationship between socialization, sports preference, and participation. Findings suggest that most individuals prefer sports that are similar or the same as the sports in which they were socialized as adolescents. This shows that sport socialization encourages preferences towards sports that are similar or the same as sports played during adolescence. Additionally, thematic analysis of the interviews found that most individuals categorize football, basketball, softball, and track and field as basic and easily accessible sports. This common perception may be due to these sports being easily

accessible in neighborhoods or school districts in which they were raised. Also, socialization with a sport as an adolescent influenced the type of sports individuals preferred or engaged in as young adults. Many individuals either played the same sport or played sports with similar in skill set requirements, resultingly limiting their capability of trying to play a new sport. Changes in sociodemographic factors including income, social class, and areas stayed affected both sports participation and preference. Changes in age did not particularly affect sports preference. However, opportunities available, independency, and multiple sources of income due to age affected sport preference and participation.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

The use of mixed methodologies combining a qualitative questionnaire analyzed with a quantitative semi-structured interview and thematic analysis was a strength of the present study. It allowed me to examine differences in constraint effects between life stages (i.e., quantitative), while delving further into how those changes could affect sports preference (i.e., qualitative). Age range restrictions for participation in the study were a strength, as it allowed researchers to examine shifts in social class and sports preference, from childhood to adulthood. Delimiting the research to consider individuals from one state was a strength, although with this also caused difficulties with recruitment. Recruitment was done via social media platforms, allowing for a wide range of participants from different states and age ranges. Calling for new members was innately challenging because individuals either did not fall within the age range or were not permanent Georgia residents. Additionally, several individuals who did not meet the survey requirements were vetted from completing it. Perceived subjective norms and

failure to accurately capture social class levels due to question design were also a limitation.

Given that the study only included Georgia residents, it would be useful to repeat the study in a larger region. Additionally, it would be useful to focus on specific sports and demographics. Increasing the age range would also be useful to identify how sport preferences change once an individual leaves college and enters the workforce. Studies investigating socialized sports and the relationship to demographics and preference would also be warranted.

References

- Alexandris, K., Barkoukis, V., & Tsormpatzoudis, C. (2007). Does the theory of planned behavior elements mediate the relationship between perceived constraints and intention to participate in physical activities? A study among older individuals. *European Review of Aging and Physical Activity*, 4, 39–48.
- Anderson, P. L., & Bakken, A. (2019). Social class differences in youths' participation in organized sports: What are the mechanisms? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 54(8), 921-937.
- Armstrong, S., Wong, C. A., Perrin, E., Page, S., Sibley, L., & Skinner, A. (2018). Association of physical activity with income, race/ethnicity, and sex among adolescents and young adults in the United States. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 172(8), 732–740.
- Brown, B. J., Jenson, J. F., Hodgson, J. L., Schoemann, A. M., & Rappleyea, D. L. (2020). Beyond the lines: Exploring the impact of adverse childhood experiences on NCAA student-athlete health. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 8–38.
- Davis-Kean, P. E. (2005). The influence of parent education and family income on child achievement: The indirect role of parental expectations and the home environment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19(2), 294-305.
- Drakou, A., Tzetzis, G., & Mamantzi, K. (2008). Leisure constraints experienced by university students in Greece. *The Sport Journal*, 11(1).
- <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A210520253/HRCA?u=anon~264b45fa&sid=googleScholar&xid=ca27bd6e>

- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge.
- Godbey, G., Crawford, D. W., & Shen, X. S. (2010). Assessing Hierarchical Leisure Constraints Theory after Two Decades. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42(1), 111–134.
- Halforty, G. A., & Radder, L. (2015). Constraints of participation in organised sport: Case of senior undergraduate students at a new generation university. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 37(3), 97–11.
- Haycock, D., & Smith, A. (2012). A family affair? exploring the influence of Childhood Sport Socialisation on young adults' leisure-sport careers in north-west England. *Leisure Studies*, 33(3), 285–304.
- Hubbard, J., & Mannell, R. C. (2001). Testing competing models of the leisure constraint negotiation process in a corporate employee recreation setting. *Leisure Sciences*, 23(3), 145–163.
- King, B. (2020, January 13). *Fueling interest on their terms: Millennial and Generation Z sports fans are creating their own game-day experiences and showing loyalty to teams and leagues that support and simplify that process*. Sport Business Journal. <https://www.sportsbusinessjournal.com/Journal/Issues/2020/01/13/In-Depth/Fueling-interest.aspx>.
- Kremer-Sadlik, T., & Kim, J. L. (2007). Lessons from sports: children's socialization to values through family interaction during sports activities. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 35–52.

- Noel-London, K., Ortiz, K., & BeLue, R. (2021). Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) & youth sports participation: Does a gradient exist? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 113, 104924.
- Perks, T. (2020). Trajectories of sport participation among children and adolescents across different socio-economic categories: Multilevel findings from the national longitudinal survey of children and youth. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 37, 264–268.
- Scheerder, J., Vanreusel, B., Taks, M., & Renson, R. (2005). Social stratification patterns in adolescents' active sports participation behaviour: a time trend analysis 1969–1999. *European Physical Education Review*, 11(1), 5–27.
- Somerset, S., & Hoare, D. J. (2018). Barriers to voluntary participation in sport for children: a systematic review. *BMC Pediatrics*, 18(47), 1–19.
- Wendling, E., Flaherty, M., Sagas, M., & Kaplanidou, K. (2018). Youth athletes' sustained involvement in elite sport: An exploratory examination of elements affecting their athletic participation. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 13(5), 658–673.
- Wheeler, S., Green, K., & Thurston, M. (2019). Social class and the emergent organised sporting habits of primary-aged children. *European Physical Education Review*, 25(1), 89-108.
- Wilson, T. C. (2002). The paradox of social class and sports involvement. *International Review for The Sociology of Sport*, 37(1), 5-16.
- World Health Organization [WHO]. (2009). *Global health risks: Mortality and burden of disease attributable to selected major risks*. WHO Press.

Xia, M., Hu, P., & Zhou, Y. (2020). How parental socioeconomic status contribute to children's sports participation in China: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 48, 2625-2643.

APPENDIX A**SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE***Initial Open-Ended Questions / Student Background*

To start, may you tell me how it was for you growing up?

- **If they mention a constraint:** Would you say [constraint here] had an impact on your sporting activity?
 - If so, how?
- **If they don't mention a constraint:** How did that have an impact on your sporting activity?

Would you say your childhood was better or worse compared to others in your community?

- Could you explain why?

Was it easier or harder for you to stay active in sporting activities?

- Could you explain why?

Were certain sports easier to access or offered more in the area you were raised?

- **If they say yes:** Could you tell me those sports?
 - Would you say this affected the types of sports you preferred?
- **If they say no:** Why do you think some sports in your area were not as easy to access or were not offered more than others?
 - Would you say this affected the types of sports you preferred?

Did any of the schools that you attended as a child offer a variety of different sports/ or opportunities to engage in different sports?

- **If they say no:** How did not having a wide range of sports or opportunity to engage in different sports impact your participation?
 - Did this cause you to favor more sports that were easier to access?
- **If they say yes:** How did having a wide range of sports/ and or opportunities to engage in different sports /impact your participation?
 - Did you find yourself favoring one sport more than others? If so, why?

What was your biggest challenge playing sports growing up?

- **If they mention a constraint:** Would you say [constraint here] had an impact on your sporting activity/ or the type of sports you engaged in?

- What do you think would have been different sport participation/ activity wise, if you did not have to worry about [constraint here]?

What did you learn from that challenge/obstacle?

- How did you apply that learned lesson to your sport participation/ activity?
- Does that learned lesson still apply to you today?

Did you have any insecurities or doubts that may have affected or still do affect your sport participation? If so, what are they?

- How did that affect your participation in sport?
- Did you favor a particular sport due to that doubt or insecurity?

Past and Present Sports Interest

Would you say that your financial standing now is better, the same, or worse than your parents growing up?

- **If better:** Do you feel that you have more options and opportunities to engage in other sports?
- **If same:** Have you noticed a difference in the options or opportunities available to engage in other sports?
- **If worse:** How is your engagement/ or participation different?
 - How does your financial standing today influence your participation in sports?
 - How did your parents financial standing influence your participation in sports?

Would you say that the type of sports you grew up around and engaged in as a child are the same or different now?

- **If different:** What caused you to engage in different sports now instead of the sports, you grew up playing?
 - Why do you think you were not able to engage in these sports growing up?
- **If same:** What was your reasoning in not engaging in other sports as you grew older?

Do you feel that the types of sports you engaged in as a child influenced the types of sports you prefer now?

- Why do you feel this way?

Do you play any sport now that you didn't play growing up?

- **If yes:** What are they, and why did you choose these sports?
- **If not:** Why not?

Do you face any challenges today regarding sport activity/ or participation?

- **If yes:** What is your biggest challenge and how has that impacted your sport preference/ or participation?
- **If no:** What do you think is the main reason for this?

Closing

Is there something else not discussed in this interview that you think I should know to better understand your relationship with the types of sports you participation in and or prefer?

Do you have any questions? Is there anything you would like to ask?

APPENDIX B**LIMITATIONS, DELIMITATIONS, ASSUMPTIONS****Limitations**

1. There are no previous research studies revolving around constraints and preference in leisure activities.
2. The sample selection may be small due to few people having the motivation to complete the survey.

Delimitations

1. The participants of this study will be within the 20–25-year age range.
2. A follow up interview with participants after a few years passed to report any update or change in sport preference and activities will not occur.

Assumptions

1. Adolescents classified as lower class did not participate in sports or play the most expensive sports.
2. As the adolescent entered adulthood and their hierarchical ranking increased, so did their sport participation, allowing a change in the sports preferred.
3. All participants answered the survey and interview questions honestly.

APPENDIX C

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Anderson, P. L., & Bakken, A. (2019). Social class differences in youths' participation in organized sports: What are the mechanisms? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 54(8), 921-937.

Throughout this study, research revolved around the theory that social class influences adolescent participation in sports. However, how it directly influences sports participation is unknown, which is what this study aims to investigate. The purpose of this study was to examine whether there are social class differences in participation rates in club-organized sports, and what causes these differences. To collect information, data from the Young in Oslo survey were used to map out the living conditions of teenagers in the area. Between thirty to thirty-three schools participated, twenty-two of the city's public schools, and eight out of eleven private schools. Within the schools, participation ranged between the ages of sixteen and eighteen. These participants complete a voluntary questionnaire. The dependent variable of the study was participation in organized sports activities. The independent variables were social class background determined by the participant's mother's and/or father's occupation. Other independent variables included family affluence, type of residence, and perceived family economy. The data was analyzed quantitatively, using the information on parental education and the number of books at home as two separate indicators of the cultural resources of the household. The results of the study showed that 26% of all youth in Oslo aged 16–18 were participating in club-organized sport, a figure that was slightly below the national level (29%). Those

raised by parents in in-service class positions had a 10–11 percentage point higher probability of participating in sports clubs than children of unskilled workers. The study suggests that cultural resources, immigrant origin, and the social context in which the adolescents live, and what school they attend, only partially explained this relationship. The findings of the study were important to me because, they show that sociological factors such as family size, family structure, and culture all play a role in the participation of sports. This information can be used in my study to determine if the same factors influence the type of sports these youths choose to participate in.

Brown, B. J., Jenson, J. F., Hodgson, J. L., Schoemann, A. M., & Rappleyea, D. L.

(2020). Beyond the lines: Exploring the impact of adverse childhood experiences on NCAA student-athlete health. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 8–38.

Within this study, two theories provided a foundation for the study. The first theory was the BPSS systems metatheory. This theory states that the whole person is comprised of biological, psychological, and sociocultural domains that are inextricably linked and systemically connected. The second theory, the toxic stress theory, is a general theory to conceptualize the relationship between toxic stress and negative health outcomes. The purpose of this cross-sectional study was to examine the prevalence of, and interplay among, adverse childhood experiences, spirituality, and biopsychosocial health outcomes in a sample of NCAA student-athletes. It was hypothesized in the study that adverse childhood experiences would significantly predict student-athletes

biopsychosocial health and that spirituality would serve as a protective factor against the effect of adverse childhood experiences on biopsychosocial health outcomes. For this study, Division I, II, and III NCAA student-athletes, over the age of 18, representing 20 sports across 53 universities completed an online quantitative survey that assessed for adverse childhood experiences, injury/physical health concerns, anxiety, depression, stress, social support, substance use, and spirituality. The independent variables of the study were adverse childhood experiences, sex, race, school attended, and NCAA division. The dependent variables were anxiety, depression, perceived stress, social support, injury/health problems, and substance use. The results of the study indicated that nearly two-thirds of student-athletes endorsed at least one adverse childhood experience. The study also showed positive relationships between adverse childhood experiences and anxiety, depression, perceived stress, injury/health problems, and substance use, and a negative relationship with social support while controlling for sex, race, school, and division. Lastly, the study found that spirituality had a significant negative effect on anxiety, depression, perceived stress, injury/health problems, and substance use, and a positive effect on social support. The results of this study are important because biopsychosocial health outcomes experienced by athletes as a result of adverse childhood experiences could be more common in certain sports. This could indicate that certain sports are most common in athletes depending on their childhood and what they've experienced. Which is important to the topic that I plan on studying.

Davis-Kean, P. E. (2005). The influence of parent education and family income on child achievement: The indirect role of parental expectations and the home environment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19(2), 294-305.

Within this study, the process of how socioeconomic status, specifically parents' education, and income, indirectly relates to children's academic achievement through parents' beliefs and behaviors were examined. The overall purpose of this study was to address socioeconomic issues by testing a cross-sectional model of how parent education influences child development during middle childhood. There were two hypotheses of the study. The first one stated that parents' education and family income influence children's achievement indirectly through their association with parents' educational expectations and parenting behaviors that stimulate reading and constructive play and provide emotional support at home. The second hypothesis stated that these predictive relations will be similar across racial groups. The subjects of this study consisted of 868 8–12-year-olds, divided equally among genders. This sample of subjects was 49% non-Hispanic European American and 47% African American. Within the study, family process models of the impact of family income and education on the home environment and child outcomes for children in middle childhood were tested. A more multidimensional indicator of the home environment that separates parents' academic, emotional, and educational activities to get a more nuanced picture of how SES might influence the home environment was used. A national sample with great diversity in family income and education was also included within the study. The results supported the hypothesis that there is a relationship between reading behaviors and achievement,

and the hypothesis that parents' socioeconomic status, beliefs, and home behaviors are related to their children's achievement. The results also indicate that being European American is related to higher achievement. The findings of this study are important because if factors such as race, home behaviors, beliefs, and parental socioeconomic status all are related to children's achievement they could also be related to sport participation and sport preference.

Drakou, A., Tzetzis, G., & Mamantzi, K. (2020). Leisure constraints experienced by university students in Greece. *The Sport Journal*, 21(2).

This study aimed to investigate students' leisure constraints, identify students' profiles, and explore the effects of gender, residence, participation in physical activities, and health habits on the intensity of constraints experienced. The theory used in this research was Crawford and Godbey's leisure constraints theory. The theoretical background helped with investigating factors that inhibit or prohibit participation and enjoyment in leisure. The participants of this study included university students in Greece. These students were given self-report questionnaires, which were distributed at student clubs and in teaching classrooms, between December 2005 and February 2006. Within the study, the constraints were identified as the dependent variable while health habits were the independent variable. The Alexandris and Carroll's scale was used to measure experienced (or perceived) constraints. The scale comprised 39 statements, classified in seven dimensions, or constraint categories, about students' current participation in leisure activities. The results of this study found that that students

perceived their leisure activities to be constrained by, mainly, accessibility and facilities. Results also found that students from small cities reported significantly more constraints arising from lack of company during leisure activities. Lastly, the results found that students who ate more healthily perceived fewer constraints on leisure activities than did students who paid no attention to nutrition. The results of this study were important because it shows that students from smaller cities typically experience more constraints. This is important to my study because if students from smaller cities experience more constraints, I will be able to identify if this is due to sociodemographic factors as well as if it affects sport preference.

Godbey, G., Crawford, D. W., & Shen, X. S. (2010). Assessing Hierarchical Leisure Constraints Theory after Two Decades. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42(1), 111–134.

The purpose of this article was to examine the status of the hierarchical leisure constraints theory regarding issues including clarification and elaboration of some aspects of the original model, review of studies that have used or examined the model and the extent to which they are confirmatory, critiques of the original model by various authors, and avenues for further research. The leisure constraints models were first presented by Crawford and Godbey in 1987 and were later expanded in 1993 and were widely adopted as an important lens through which leisure behavior is viewed. The original model of the study was concerned with describing and explaining the relationship between constraints (intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural) and leisure activity preferences, as well subsequent leisure involvement.

These constraints were seen as the leading factors that influence activity preferences, related both to both preferences and participation. However, the 1993 model of this study suggested that eventual leisure behavior was dependent upon successful negotiation of these constraint levels. Since then, the constraints theory remained stable over this span, and the changes of the model reflected changes in how interconnections among the factors were reviewed. Conclusions from this article show that the model is cross-culturally relevant, that the model may examine forms of behavior other than leisure, and that there is a high potential for the theory to be expanded to advance leisure constraints research to the next level. These findings are crucial to my study because they will be used to see how the constraints of this theory not only affect participation but influence sport preference.

Halforty, G. A., & Radder, L. (2015). Constraints of participation in organised sport:

Case of senior undergraduate students at a new generation university. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 37(3), 97–11.

The present study aimed at determining the constraints that prevent students from continuing participation in organized sport at a South African university, by using the constraints theory. The study investigated the factors that prevent students who have participated in organized sports at school from continuing to play those sports in college. Potential participants were required to answer 2 screening questions to determine their eligibility to participate in the survey. Firstly, they had to be part of a sports team at school that competed against other schools, and secondly, they

should not have participated in a sports league or competed as part of a team during the 10 months preceding the date of data collection. The chosen participants of this study consisted of 283 senior undergraduate students based at three campuses of a university located in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. A quantitative research approach and a cross-sectional survey were adopted for the study to collect data for the study. The data was collected utilizing an interviewer-administered survey and a structured questionnaire. There were two sections of the questionnaire. Part A of the questionnaire required respondents to indicate how strongly they disagreed or agreed with 27 5-point Likert scale items that measured constraints to participation in organized sport. Part B of the study contained 5 questions that captured respondents' gender, age, available money to spend on leisure, the country in which they finished their schooling, and home language. The results of the study found that students mostly experience structural constraints. Interpersonal constraints seem to play a lesser role, while intrapersonal constraints are of little importance. An Analysis of Variance confirmed significant differences for 'accessibility', 'socializing activities' and 'facilities' relative to the amount of money available for leisure. The findings of the study are important because they show which constraints prevent or prohibit sport participation the most. My study would be able to show whether these same constraints influence sport participation for those who do play sports.

Hubbard, J., & Mannell, R. C. (2001). Testing competing models of the leisure constraint negotiation process in a corporate employee recreation setting. *Leisure Sciences*, 23(3), 145–163.

The purpose of the article was to test competing models of the leisure constraint negotiation process by examining the relationships among leisure constraint, negotiation, motivation, and participation. Within this article, it was argued that there were several competing models of how constraint, negotiation, and motivation could be interconnected and, in turn, linked to participation. These models were examined in an attempt to clarify further the nature of the constraint negotiation process. The companies used in this study were selected from a list of companies that provided employee wellness services. They were also chosen because they had comparable wellness programs, services, and facilities, and they offered the same types of worksite fitness and physical recreation programs. To collect data, a self-administered questionnaire was sent by interoffice mail to a random sample of employees in each company, and the employees returned the completed questionnaires by interoffice mail or by placing them in drop boxes located at the worksite. 186 employees from the head offices of the two insurance companies, the manufacturing company, and the fast-food restaurant chain who participated in the study were used for the present analysis. They were selected because they were aware of the recreation services and programs available at their respective worksite employee recreation centers, and they indicated, in response to a question on the questionnaire, that they wished either to start participating, maintain their current level of participation, or increase it. The dependent variable of this study was participation while the constraint, negotiation, and constraint X negotiation variables were the independent variables. A negotiation-buffer model was used to test and compare the constraint negotiation models using the

independent and dependent variables. The results of this study showed that the respondents all had expressed at least a minimal level of interest in participating and they were homogeneous concerning employees of companies that provided similar worksite recreation programs. This showed that these circumstances likely ensured that constraints, negotiation, and motivation were measured at the same level of a specific city. This means responses weren't reports of general experiences or states but were anchored to a very specific type of leisure activity and context. This article is important in my study because how the constraints were observed, utilizing a questionnaire, will be used within my study.

Noel-London, K., Ortiz, K., & BeLue, R. (2021). Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) & youth sports participation: Does a gradient exist? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 113, 104924.

The underlying aim of this study was to examine the associations between adverse childhood experiences and sport participation in adolescents. The study investigated whether adverse childhood experiences are an important factor in understanding sport participation in youth. Sport participation among youth aged 10-17 years of age with and without adverse experiences within their childhood was examined. 23,557 youth were included in the study, with 12,454 being boys and 11,303 being girls. A 2017-2018 dataset of the National Survey of Children's Health survey was used to examine the association between these two groups of youths. Models for the study were adjusted for sociodemographic and child health covariates including physical activity, gender, age, BMI, race/ethnicity, parent-reported child health, parental educational attainment, family

structure, health insurance coverage, year, and mental health conditions. Adverse childhood experiences within the youths included financial hardship, parental death, parental imprisonment, parental divorce or separation, the child witnessing parental domestic violence, the child witnessing neighborhood violence or victim of violence in the neighborhood, co-residing with an adult in the household who suffers from mental health and/or substance abuse challenges, and or whether child experienced unfair treatment as a result of race/ethnicity. The results of this study indicated that out of 23,557 youths, 21.9% reported 1 ACE, 10.1% reported 2 ACEs, and 14.3% reported 3 or more adverse childhood experiences. The study also showed significant associations between all levels of ACE exposure and decreased sport participation. The study concluded that adverse childhood experience exposure in adolescents is associated with reduced odds of sport participation. The findings of this study are important to me because I would be able to tie in adverse childhood experiences in my study with athletes to see if these experiences influenced their sports preference.

Perks, T. (2020). Trajectories of sport participation among children and adolescents across different socio-economic categories: Multilevel findings from the national longitudinal survey of children and youth. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 37, 264–268.

This study explores the sport participation trajectories of children across different socioeconomic status categories to assess the possibility of changes in the socioeconomic status sport participation relationship as children age. 4,858 children aged 6 to 9 were

used in this study. The data used in this study come from the microdata file of the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY), which was accessed through the Canadian Research Data Centre Network. The independent variable was socioeconomic status while the dependent variables were organized and unorganized sport participation. The control variables of this study were age, gender, and region. multilevel growth curve modeling was used to examine the sport participation trajectories of children over time. The results of the study suggest that as children age the socioeconomic status effect on sport participation persists over time. This article is important to the topic that I plan to study because the results show that socioeconomic status does affect sports participation. Further research in my study can determine if socioeconomic status also affects sport preference.

Scheerder, J., Vanreusel, B., Taks, M., & Renson, R. (2005). Social stratification patterns in adolescents' active sports participation behaviour: a time trend analysis 1969–1999. *European Physical Education Review*, 11(1), 5–27.

This study aimed to examine whether adolescents' leisure-time sports participation is socially stratified and whether possible stratification patterns have changed over the last decades. This study investigated two questions: whether youth sports participation behavior is socially stratified according to social background, and second, whether social changes in stratification patterns have occurred over the last two to three decades. The population for the study consisted of four random samples of high school boys and girls in Flanders who were exposed to a standardized questionnaire in

1969, 1979, 1989, or 1999 to measure sport participation. The 1969/1979–1999 data allow for a time-lag analysis of active sports involvement among teenage boys and girls. At each time interval, the same standardized questionnaire was used to collect information on participation in leisure-time sports activities and the sociocultural background of the teenagers and their families. The respondent's family, the parental socioeconomic status, the level of urbanization of the dwelling area, the family size as well as parental sports participation are taken into account. The parental socioeconomic status is based on three basic variables: father's level of education (8 categories), mother's level of education (8 categories), and father's professional status (9 categories). To determine whether a relationship exists between youth sports participation and sociocultural characteristics, bivariate, as well as multivariate statistical techniques, were used within the study. The results of this study indicated that social background variables remain relevant to analyze constraints on leisure-time sports participation. The study also indicated that parental sports participation, gender, and school programming still determine the respondents' active involvement in sports. The results of this study were important because they indicate that social background plays a role in sport participation. This is important to my study because further research will be done to see if social background also plays a role in sports preference, just as it does with sport participation.

Wendling, E., Flaherty, M., Sagas, M., & Kaplanidou, K. (2018). Youth athletes' sustained involvement in elite sport: An exploratory examination of elements affecting their athletic participation. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 13(5), 658–673.

The main purpose of this study was to extract the principal components of a large set of items that were the results of an amalgamation of intra- personal, interpersonal, and external barrier elements to identify the underlying components affecting sports participation, as perceived and experienced by elite youth athletes engaged in travel sport in the US. There were several hypotheses of this study. The first hypothesis was that interpersonal relationships and intrinsic and self-determined extrinsic motivations would be positively related to sport enjoyment. The second hypothesis was that these two factors would also be negatively related to intentions to quit the current sport and sports altogether. The last hypothesis was that pressures from parents and coaches, external barriers, and non-self-determined extrinsic motivations would be negatively related to sport enjoyment and that those three factors would also be positively related to intentions to quit the current sport and sports altogether. For this study, 1258 travel/elite youth sports athletes from the USA, 566 boys and 692 girls, between the ages of 10 and 18 years of age were chosen. Of these participants, 40% of them specialized in one sport only, and about 90% of them were involved in team sports, including basketball, lacrosse, baseball, softball, soccer, and volleyball. The rest of the participants were involved in swimming, tennis, and archery. A six-component solution was proposed for this study, including college and professional aspirations and competence beliefs, coach and peer relationships, pressures from parents and coach, intrinsic and self-determined extrinsic motivation, external barriers, and non-self-determined extrinsic motivation. A multiple regression analysis was also used in the study by predicting elite youth athletes' enjoyment of sport and intentions to quit their current sport, or sport altogether. This was

determined using three separate two-step hierarchical multiple regression analyses. The results of the hierarchical regression analyses indicated that 28% of the variance in sport enjoyment was explained by all retained components. The study results also demonstrate that a combination of interpersonal relationships, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation can create an environment that promotes sustained participation in elite youth sport. Lastly, the results of this study indicated that participation may be negatively affected by barriers through their positive influence on intentions to quit the sport. The findings of this study are important to me because the results show that extrinsic motivations and intrinsic motivations promote sports participation. This is important because money can be seen as an extrinsic motivation to play sports. Some athletes engage in sports to help their household as a way to earn money. This can play a role in the type of sport that an athlete chooses to play. This why this article is important to the topic that I plan on studying.

Wheeler, S., Green, K., & Thurston, M. (2019). Social class and the emergent organised sporting habits of primary-aged children. *European Physical Education Review*, 25(1), 89-108.

Within this study, patterns of participation in organized sports of children coming towards the end of primary school were examined proving the purpose of this study. This study hypothesized that emergent sporting habits had a relationship to social class gradients. The study examined two social class groupings: under-class and middle class. The middle-class grouping was broken down into three more categories: lower-middle-

class, mid-middle-class, and upper-middle-class. The data for this study were generated via 90 semi-structured interviews with parents and children (40 boys and 23 girls) from 62 families, together with a Family Information Questionnaire. The participants were recruited through twelve primary schools. The schools were selected based on several characteristics: the number of pupils eligible for free school meals; the number of pupils with special educational needs; Key Stage 2 examination results, the Office for Standards in Education/Independent Schools Inspectorate report information, and the Indices of Multiple Deprivation for the school catchment areas. The independent variable of the study was the class of the parents while the dependent variable was the inclusion of the child in sports. The results of the study found that those under-class children who engaged with organized sports took part in a relatively low range of different activities on a couple of separate occasions during the week provided by their primary school. The results also found that all of the lower-middle-class children engaged with organized sports, taking part on several occasions during the week in several different yet conventional sports. Some were provided by their primary schools, but many were not. The mid-middle-class children engaged extensively with organized sports, taking part on most days during the week in a broad repertoire of different sports. Some were provided by their primary schools, but many were not as well. The higher their social class grouping, the more likely the children were to take part in a greater number, wider variety, and different types or categories of organized sports regularly. The findings from the study suggest, therefore, that the greatest need is to be found in schools in under-class areas where availability and cost are especially important factors in participation. The findings of this study are important to me because they show that the location of the

school, as well as the class of the children that attend the school, has an impact on the type of sport, the variety, and the participation.

Wilson, T. C. (2002). The paradox of social class and sports involvement. *International Review for The Sociology of Sport*, 37(1), 5-16.

In this study, the main purpose of the research was to see if cultural and economic capital promotes sports involvement and if they play a role in delaying prole sports involvement. There are two hypotheses of the study. The first one being that both cultural and economic capital independently promote sports involvement in general. The second hypothesis is that both cultural and economic capital will retard involvement in 'prole' sports. The overall problem that is under investigation in this study is whether both the cultural and economic capital promotes certain sports and retard others. To get to the bottom of this problem, a survey was conducted with a sample of Americans. How they were picked was not indicated in the study. The independent variables of the study were participant's cultural capital and economic capital status. The dependent variable was sports involvement. The survey asked American respondents to indicate if they had engaged in each of a list of leisure-time activities during the previous year. Two of the activities related to sports involvement generally: attendance at any sports event and participation in any sport. One pertained to a particular genre of 'prole' sport: attendance at an auto, stock car, or motorcycle race. The impact of both economic and cultural capital on sports involvement was also assessed. The data were analyzed qualitatively using an analytic approach. The results of the study show that those who are richest in

cultural capital and those richest in economic capital are most likely to be involved in sports generally. However, those richest in cultural capital are least likely to be involved in 'prole' sports, and economic capital has no bearing on 'prole' sports involvement. The findings of this study are important to me because they show that the amount of education, appearance, and intellect plays a more important role in the type of sport involvement than those with large numbers of monetary resources. These cultural capitals all vary with how and where an individual was raised. Those with higher cultural capitals tend to come from a higher class than those with lower cultural capitals. This is why those with a higher cultural capital are least likely to be involved in working-class sports.

Xia, M., Hu, P., & Zhou, Y. (2020). How parental socioeconomic status contribute to children's sports participation in China: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 48, 2625-2643.

The purpose of this study to investigate factors that predict junior high school students' sports participation, identify the mechanisms underlying transmission of social resources, and assess the mediating effects of classmate support and parental involvement on the relationship between parental socioeconomic factors and kids' sports participation. The researchers of this study proposed three hypotheses. The first hypothesis was that parental socioeconomic status was positively associated with children's sports participation. The second hypothesis was that classmate support acted as a mediator between parental socioeconomic status and kids' sports participation. The last hypothesis was that parental involvement acted as a mediator between parental socioeconomic

factors and children's sports participation. Thus, the research problem being investigated was if parental socioeconomic status influences sport participation in high schoolers, if classmate support influences sport participation, and if parental involvement influences sport participation. The study consisted of four sampling stages. The first stage selected twenty-eight countries throughout the country. In the second stage, four junior high schools were selected with grade seven and/or nine. Within the third stage, four classes were selected, including two grade seven classes and two grade nine classes. Lastly, all students, parents, and teachers were surveyed in the fourth stage. The independent variable of this study was parental socioeconomic status, while the dependent variable was the children's sport participation. The study also had two mediating variables, which were classmate support and parental involvement. The study adopted multiple linear regression methods to examine their predictions. The results of the study found that parental socioeconomic status is significantly and directly correlated with junior school students' sports participation. The study also found that parental socioeconomic status has a significant indirect effect on sports participation through classmate support and parental involvement. The findings of this study seem important to me because they show that the children's parental economic status influences participation in sports, which can be further investigated to see if it also influences sport preference. Therefore, this study is important to the topic that I plan to study.