

# Change of Society Values and the Effects on “Sports for All”

 George F. Zarotis<sup>1\*</sup>, Walter Tokarski<sup>2</sup>
<sup>1</sup>University of the Aegean, Faculty of Human Sciences, Rhodes, Greece

<sup>2</sup>German Sport Universities, Cologne

**DOI:** [10.36348/jaspe.2020.v03i05.001](https://doi.org/10.36348/jaspe.2020.v03i05.001)
**Received:** 30.04.2020 | **Accepted:** 08.05.2020 | **Published:** 10.05.2020

**\*Corresponding author:** Dr. George F. Zarotis

## Abstract

Changes in politics, the economy and the social sphere directly or indirectly affect the social value system. The change of society values is mainly attributed to changes in value structures at work. The Protestant work ethic, which places the meaning of life at work, sees moral value as an end in itself, and puts the fulfilment of duty above the enjoyment of existence, gradually loses its relevance. To the same extent that work loses its function and value, sport experiences a fundamental revaluation. Sport becomes an integral part of every person's role. With the sportization of living conditions, sport becomes a social model. The ultimate goal of this research is to examine the causes of changes in society values and their effects on sports / mass sports. The method adopted for the study was a literature review. On the occasion of the present study, it is found that the changing value of sports in society has created new "directorial forms" in sports. So, for example, in leisure time modern sports also serve as a presentation of the independent lifestyle. This impulse finds its expression through an additional gain of aesthetic dimension, which is externally observed in athletic shoes, sports sweaters, sports bags, sports accessories, etc. The expression of individualized values in sports is closely related to the reduction of access routes for sports. This is not only due to the growing number of opportunistic and active athletes, but also to the development of new sport types. New sports such as Windsurfing, paragliding, free climbing or Bungee jumping are in line with the new orientations of values and try to match individualized hedonistic desires in sports. Sport types are multiplying, and leading the sports system, as already described, to an unprecedented complexity. The overall sports system basically becomes more open. This creates completely new access to sports. Sports forms are multiplying and leading the sports system, as already described, to an unprecedented complexity. The overall sports system basically becomes more open. This creates completely new access to sports. The initial selectivity of sports is increasingly losing its importance, so new groups of people such as the elderly, overweight, women or the disabled have more access to leisure sports and widespread sports. Due to the qualitative changes in sports socialization, strong new sport roles have become possible. With the isolation and selection of certain incentives, sport is now more easily accessible. The motivation that previously prevailed in leisure sports and in widespread sports is losing its charm, so some writers talk about the unathleticism of sports or the non-athletic sports. Instead, in sports / mass sports, one seeks pleasure, spontaneity and social contacts.

**Keywords:** Change of values & society, sports for all.

**Copyright @ 2020:** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use (NonCommercial, or CC-BY-NC) provided the original author and source are credited.

## INTRODUCTION

Our society is constantly changing. Changes in politics, the economy and the social sphere directly or indirectly affect the social value system. These internal changes in society are described in general terms such as *change*, *change of values*, *change of structures*, *social change*, and *differentiation of society*. However, the consequences of social differentiation due to the complex and at the same time dynamic form of society have not been adequately described so far [1]. How difficult it is to "capture change in a closed theory" is shown by the different characterizations of society as

industrial society, postmaterialist society, service society, leisure society, etc. [2]. In this *process of changing values*, the factors that probably affect the value hierarchies and can cause changes must be named. Sport as a subsystem of society is open and dynamic. In this context, the sports system reacts sensitively to change processes. Thus, social changes result in differences in sports, because the two systems are a network of close mutual relations. Thus, the reasons for the changes in sports are largely the factors that generally affect leisure time. In addition to the shifting importance between work and leisure time as well as the increasing leisure time compared to working

time, these reasons include increased social welfare. Digel describes sport as a "... social system that is constantly evolving into a multifaceted network of relationships with other social systems through functional differentiation" [3]. In this sense, the presentations of the sports landscape so far can be instantaneous images at the most. Modern sports as a subsystem, which depends on other subsystems such as free time and work, hides a great dynamic. In the meantime, it has evolved in itself into a very complex feature system. Processes with changes in the sports landscape that have broad implications are characterized as *changes in sports values*, borrowing the term from the already described change in social values [4, 3]. In the traditional understanding of sport, which prevailed until the early 1980s, "sport was understood as a normal occupation of the body." The sporting practice was uniquely regulated and referred to performance; some performance goals were sought at different levels. Competition or performance comparison was the organizational culmination. A prerequisite for achieving a performance was often long, arduous and hard training [5].

This performance orientation gives sport an exclusive character. Sports image in the public was associated with above-average physical performance and special abilities. "Sports" and "athletes" were an independent category. With that in mind, the "non-athlete" first had to overcome initial fears to enrol in a club. The "uniformity of sport" contains a "homogeneous understanding of athletic roles" and a "homogeneous sportsmanship", which are based on structures of values such as camaraderie, justice, modesty, social spirit, solidarity, equal opportunities, willingness to provide help, etc. [4].

Sport was established as an association institution, where common morale and common interests are self-evident. The resources of the association are voluntary participations, honorary administration, exploitation of the existing state infrastructure as well as sponsorships and grants. In this form of sport, performance criteria play no role, it is rather a public good [5].

## METHODOLOGY

The present study is a bibliographical review study that presents the critical points of the existing knowledge about the "change of society values and the effects on Sports for All".

There is no specialized and comprehensive research in this area. This study attempts to fill this gap and may be a useful aid for those who will make similar efforts in the future. The main objective of the bibliographical review is to integrate the study into the "body" of the subject in question. The review of the current study refers to clearly formulated questions and uses systematic and explicit criteria for the critical

analysis of a published paper by summarizing, sorting, grouping and comparing.

## Bibliographic Review Study

### Change of society values and the effects on "Sports for all"

This research will refer to sports and sports clubs in the context of social change and it will be based on the following scheme:

- First of all, there will be a small flashback to the last 50 years, which will make clear the change that sport has undergone - to the extent given, somewhat briefly.
- Then there will be a small reference to the sports clubs, which were not unaffected by this change.
- Finally, there will be an attempt to link the changes that have taken place with the challenges of the future, where there's not only reference to sports and sports clubs, but also a short explanation of the special role of Sports Science.

Firstly, as regards the change that sport has undergone.

What are the facts that make up the evolution of the last 50 years? A few titles: The last 50 years there has been

- intense orientation towards free time in the service society,
- higher pay for less work,
- increasing life expectancy
- increasing globalization and networking of life sectors,
- more and faster communication routes,
- fewer children and increased career orientation,
- Europeanization and finally.
- sportization of the society.

A rapid development, which played an important role in sports and also participated in the rapid change that took place. We can roughly distinguish three periods of evolution, and in particular the period from the 1950s to the 1970s, in which caring for one's shape and socio-cultural orientation led to this change, after that the period of the 1980s, when alternative forms of play and movement were causing a sensation, and lastly the period of the 1990s, in which - as we say - the "patchwork of sports culture" that we know today emerged. The motto being: "Everything is possible!" In the 1950s and 1960s, competitive sports were the means of national identity. The competition between political systems in the East and the West defined very strongly the image of sport. A traditional perception of sport prevailed, the characteristics of which were: discipline, performance, competition, adaptation, standardization, solidarity and orientation to the result. The top athletes were mostly still amateurs; the degree of commercialization at that time was still very low. However, the 1970s brought about a change: With the increase of personalization, new pedagogical ideals emerges; human self-determination is increasingly advertised, hedonistic values such as

entertainment, enjoyment of life, consumption etc. become more important and keep pace with the aforementioned traditional values. In the field of sports, competitive sports still hold a prominent position, as before, the struggle between the political systems continues. In 1972, the Olympic Games in Munich underline the emphasized social importance of sports. However, criticism of the traditional conception of sports is intensifying, leisure time sport is being introduced as a concept (in 1976 the first German book on leisure time sports was introduced) and as a sport model that contradicts that of performance sports. Widespread sports are gaining momentum and are finding loyal supporters in sports clubs and associations. The idea of widespread sports is being transferred socially and is gaining ground with special campaigns, e.g. with the Trimm-Dich actions of the DSB. Although to this day the concept of leisure sports is avoided in clubs and associations, because it emphasizes individuality and challenges standardization as well as the regularity of sports, what is included in leisure sports is advertised under the roof of widespread sports. In the 1980s, this development advanced, and still continues to this day, in the 21st century. New forms of play and movement are being tested, elements from the Far East are being introduced as well as new holistic transmission methods, the body is being rediscovered and physical experience, sports and health become an issue, good physical condition is the incentive to become active. Orientation to the experience at all levels is the main motivation for the individual's actions; self-organization outside of organized sports becomes an example of an alternative culture of leisure time movement and sport. The motto is: try, experiment, get involved, everything is possible. Even non-athletic sports become athleticism. People seek movement in all situations of life, at all ages and all over the world. Of course, this development was possible because both society and its members, the people, changed in those 50 years. Unfortunately, many people in positions of authority in sport associations and those in charge of sports have not realized this common fact. Personalization, self-determination, experience orientation, activity, body consciousness are social forms that are also reflected in sports, but are not primarily caused by it. Sport is part of this society, it participates in social change and every state of sport - as well as society itself - is an unstable balance, which during evolution transitions into another balance. Neither in society nor in today's sports do we find unique value systems. The pluralism of values is announced. In both creations many and multifaceted values can be realized, even if, due to the fact that they are not comprehensible, sometimes we cannot see them. And this is a positive thing: all people today have the opportunity to find within our society their individual identity, their own lifestyle and their personal meaning of life. Thus, sport as an important social sector is also open to anyone. The personal sports world of each one, as regards the field from performance to entertainment,

is already a reality – that is how the relationship between sport via sport clubs and sport that people organize on their own is represented today. The same people, who claimed or claim for themselves the advantages of the social developments described above, use completely different arguments in the sports club: they had long seemed indifferent to what was happening in society and to people, their main concern, that is, the old and tested perception of sports - as mentioned above: discipline, performance, competition, adaptation, standardization, solidarity and outcome orientation - remained constant, even as regards widespread sport, for which clubs and associations have been very supportive and continue to favour it. But for a long time now, no one has thought of bringing the sports clubs closer to people rather than the people closer to sports clubs. Meanwhile, another way of thinking prevailed. This change in mindset was also caused by the activities of major sports clubs and associations, that partially with unique blends of competitive and performance sports, widespread sports and leisure sports, touristic elements, health and well-being oriented offerings, and care offerings in the social-pedagogical field, as well as a mix of traditional sport club and physical education/leisure centres have successfully responded to changes in society, lifestyle and sports motivation. For some time now, many sports clubs and associations are dealing with the issue of their operation as a service provider, and realize the need for professional work as well as the introduction of Management and Marketing. So far so good, but what exactly should club and associations do to stay in the foreground? Sometimes the right questions help approach solutions. If one follows the discussions, today the vast majority of those in positions of authority in sport associations agree that sports clubs need to change. A minority insists, as before, that sports clubs as traditional and collective communities must continue to exist, even at the risk of their members leaving or dying.

Question: Can the future of sport clubs be here? Those who understand the need for change, often act with extreme care. Their proposals are more within the limits of the system. We can base our efforts on that. We must first examine the simple possibilities, that is, starting from the current situation and the offerings of a sport club, we need to start considering certain changes. It is said for example, that new sports should be included in the sport club's offerings while at the same time clubs are being warned against following every fashion, every trend or every individual interest and adapting their offerings according to them. When society is presented as described above, how can one not follow these fashions, trends and interests? Hundreds of new sport clubs are established in Germany each year. They are small or very small sport clubs and the range of their offerings is determined solely by the interests of their limited membership. If these interests cease to exist then the club will not

function any more. At the same time, it is emphasized once again that sport clubs must fulfil a number of important social and political tasks, such as society, solidarity etc. What happens when people don't want to achieve these fulfilments in the context of sport clubs offerings? Social developments demonstrate that this is happening. The main reason people don't participate in organised sports is that they don't seek to connect with society through them. As described above, the individual sports world plays a decisive role for them. It is said that we must approach increasingly new target-groups. Which are those new target-groups? Haven't we done everything to reach all the possible target-groups in the past? Why haven't we approached people who don't exercise or rather those who don't play a sport? Have we reached a certain level of satiety in sports? Can't there be further increase? On the other hand: Why do young people leave clubs, even though according to all research they are the group most represented in sports? According to research they leave for the following reasons: minimal or no joint definition, very few freedoms, manipulation, their interests are not taken into account, the club's policy is strongly focused on results, entertainment isn't promoted enough and the club offers very few modern sports or none at all. What about the elderly? Elderly sports are considered very promising for the future. Nevertheless, we haven't yet seen any increase in the number of older or elderly people doing sports, despite the proven positive effects.

Sports managers obviously believe that clubs should offer traditional sports and at the same time follow modern sports trends. The question is whether this is possible in this way or perhaps only with restrictions. That means making an opening between new needs and traditional offerings, which is not that simple. How should this opening be made? What is the right combination? Both types of sports are necessary if we are to offer 'better sports'. Is the sport club which can combine these, the best for modern society, or are there other possibilities? Does everything need to happen under one roof and when under which roof? What works in the big sport clubs doesn't necessarily work in the majority of other clubs. Certainly, the offers of new sports, in particular, shouldn't be provided on their own but could be offered through partnerships. In the future, cooperation, even with commercial institutions, should be self-evident. Also, new sport offers don't necessarily have to involve new sports and sports trends. They can also include the presentation of old sports offers. Many new sport offers and new sports are sometimes not so new. Often, what's new, is the form of directing and the novel experiential content. Offers should not be limited to the purpose. If the purpose is met, the socio-cultural offers can increase public interest for a club. Why shouldn't the sports club offer language or computer learning classes? Why shouldn't it provide advice on nutrition and health, why shouldn't it organize joint visits to theatres? There should be freely available spaces, namely spaces that

the individual can freely configure and use, ranging from the allocation of spaces for inline skating or beach volleyball to the availability of sports facilities for non-members of the club, for the performance of coaches and exercise supervisors and why not, for hosting musical or gastronomic events, for example. In particular, combining sports with other leisure time activities could offer a special attraction. Therefore, we should aim to open up sports clubs. Nowadays, sports have become a service. Some clubs see it that way. In today's modern society people are searching for sports worlds oriented to their lifestyle. Sports clubs are part of society; they cannot and should not be excluded. What prevents a sport club from creating, in addition to traditional sports teams, interest-oriented groups, which are self-funded and organized according to the lifestyle of those who think in this manner? Clubs should not be afraid of self-organized groups, instead, they should live with them. Knowing that these groups may have a short lifespan shouldn't be an obstacle. Anyone who is courageous enough to create such a group also has the courage to abolish it. We accept that people are mainly looking for creativity, body feeling and an intense experience from their chosen sports. They want to experience joy, fun and a feeling of well-being during exercise. They have to adapt their physical exercise to their lifestyle and practice sports not for life but only for a short time. Therefore the change in athletic behaviour becomes the norm. This does not simplify the operation of a sport club. A simple solution would be appropriate for the club but not for the members the club wants to acquire and maintain [1].

### Sports Science

Sports science is an aggregate science. It unites spiritual, social, physical and medical, scientific as well as didactic-methodical views and perspectives. In recent years, the individual branches of Sports Science that refer to theoretical and social sciences have become more important. These are mainly concerned with the phenomenon of sports in connection with the processes of social change, the sports system and individual sports and what has been done so far. Initially they are researching the motivations for sports, then the athletic behaviour and sports experience, the differentiation of sports, the social and individual effects of sports and then they reach up to Fair-Play, violence and xenophobia. This is undoubtedly worth acknowledging. However:

- There has been no regular, systematic report on athletic behaviour until today. It would be very important for planning and policy.
- There is very little research on sports clubs that would be important for the functioning of the sports system and for adapting the activities of the clubs to the general social developments.
- Sometimes sports officials in communities, clubs and associations are not very willing to accept the results and proposals of Sports Science.



Also, there is very little systematic research on lifestyle and leisure time, because for most people sport is associated with the concepts of leisure time and lifestyle. To achieve the best results it is essential to know one's competitors (specifically other leisure time activities) and the given conditions (specifically lifestyle changes). There are very few sports scientists who deal with the dark sides of sports, for example doping, injustice, disintegration, violence, xenophobia and racism. In the future we need to tackle those issues. Sports Science makes no sense unless it addresses the current issues and problems of sports. Sports, sports clubs and sports associations would benefit no one if they gave up on the possibilities of Sports Science [1].

### **The evolution of sports in Europe**

If we take into account the general research and assessments about leisure time and sports, then 70% to 80% of Germany's population participates in sports. Thus, the population's participation in the sports system would be huge. Similar estimates are available for other European countries, although the percentages are lower. It is extremely difficult, no matter how strange it may seem, to find the exact numbers of people participating in sports in individual European countries. Only a part of those people exercise in clubs, the rest of them remain in the dark. The German Sports Federation considers that in Germany there are as many people participating in non-organized sports as there are in organized. This would correspond to an estimated participation in sports of 60%, of which half (30%) is exercising in sport clubs. Today, Germany is considered a sporting country in Europe and around the world. As mentioned above, many studies show higher participation rates in Germany. But other research, which raises the opposite question, namely "Do you exercise sports?" seems to prove that 60% is a completely realistic percentage because in these surveys more than 30% answer negatively. According to the official statistics of the European Union, it seems that after Finland and England, Germany is the third country with the highest percentage of participation in sports, followed by France, the Netherlands and Sweden. At the same time, after Sweden, Austria and Luxembourg, Germany has the highest level of organized sports [6]. After France and England, there are two countries, which compared to Germany have a larger number of sports clubs. Spain and Italy follow on the ranking list. It is also noteworthy that these major countries of the European Union - despite a large number of sports clubs - with the exception of Germany, have a relatively small degree of organization, while this ratio is reversed in smaller states. The relative numbers of general participation in sports are too high for the European Union. 30% is realistic. Unfortunately, there are almost no data on the development of participation in sports in recent years. From the little available information the following image is formed [7]:

**Belgium:** In 1987, just over 1 million people were members of a sports club. Consequently, until today we have an increase of 40%. In Belgium, in particular, interest in racquet sports has grown exponentially. There is also a significant increase in unorganized sports. There is no reduction in the importance of sports clubs, but there is a growing differentiation.

**Denmark:** There are insufficient data about the developments in Denmark. It is estimated that the level of organization in Danish sports has doubled from 1970 to 1983. There are estimates which show an organization degree of 36%. It is noteworthy that in the relevant literature is mentioned a large number of people who practice sports in clubs and at the same time outside clubs, but this is true for most European countries.

**Germany:** In Germany there is a steady increase in sports participation. Popular sports make up - in contrast to the image presented by the media to the public - only 10% of the sports practiced in total. In Germany, three to four thousand new sports clubs are established each year, which are mainly small clubs with 50 to 100 members. However, the major clubs, which make up the 6%, make more than 50% of the sports offers [8].

**Finland:** Here, too, data on developments in recent years and decades are insufficient. However, all central sports organizations report a steady increase in the establishment of clubs as well as in the number of their members.

**France:** In the 1950s and 1960s, participation in sports was consistently low compared to the general population. But since the 1970s, the organization level has increased significantly, although even today, with a percentage of 17%, it is low for such a large country. The high number of sports clubs is explained by the fact that more than three quarters of them are clubs of a certain sport.

**Greece:** There are no known data as regards the development of sports.

**Great Britain:** The large number of sports clubs - as in France - is explained by the fact that a great deal of them concern a certain sport. Often the clubs are just small groups, which do not have the official legal form of a recognized club.

**Ireland:** Here, too, the data are insufficient. It is reported that some sports in the last two decades have shown significant growth, such as e.g. tennis, which only between 1980 and 1983 increased by 3.2%. Adventure sports are another area that is booming in Ireland today.

Italy: In 1983, 8.8 million people played sports in Italy, of which 4.3 million were members of a sports club. Today, about 14 million people play sports; 6 million of them are members of sports clubs. Taking into account these comparative figures, it is particularly evident that unorganized sports have increased significantly, which is generally the case in Europe as well.

Luxembourg: There are no known data as regards the development of sports.

Netherlands: There are no known data as regards the development of sports.

Austria: According to the literature, in 1983, 49% of the population was in some way athletically active. In 1992, the percentage was 63% of the population. There are no more recent data.

Portugal: There are no known data as regards the development of sports.

Sweden: The 39,000 sports clubs that exist are divided in half into sports clubs and Company Sport Clubs. The numbers that concern the development of sports are not known.

Spain: From 1975 to 1985, the general participation of the population in sports increased from 22% to 34%. Nothing more is known.

In addition to the question of the exercise frequency, the type of sport also plays an important role in assessing the participation of the population in sports. In public discussions as well as in the literature on the Sports Science of the past, there is a lot of talk about the differentiation of sports. This is in line with general developments in society. If we were to summarize these two developments, we might say, "The logic of lifestyle regulates the evolution of sports" [9]. According to the above, basic changes in the relationship between lifestyle, identity search and people's perception play an important role in these developments. Flexibility, mobility, dynamics and individuality have greatly changed sports in the last 25 years and will continue to determine future developments respectively. The characteristics of the modern sports are: variety of movement forms, non-conciseness of the varieties and forms of offers as well as constant change. The sports' structural differentiation that emerges today from this development is performance sports, widespread sports and leisure sports. This differentiation actually exists only in Germany; other European countries do not have this distinction. For example, in English, anything that is not performance sport is characterized as "Recreational Sport". In contrast, for us in Germany, leisure time sports and widespread sports are expressions of different forms and qualities of sports or physical activities that involve movement as a game:

1. Widespread sports is a central concept for different, in terms of content and method, activities in sports clubs and organizations,
2. In contrast, leisure time sports describe sports in the context of other institutions and non-organized sports (sports during free time).

Current developments concern these two categories of sports: indoor sports, outdoor sports, street sports, at the beach, in nature, experiential sports, extreme sports, adventure sports, scary sports, fitness, healthcare, popular sports and booming sports – so the question "why is there such a distinction" is justified. However, anyone who is familiar with this debate knows that political power games play a role here. In essence, it is found that:

1. the monopoly of organized sports has been abolished by differentiation, without this to become a setback, as it was often feared (and this was the case throughout Europe),
2. access to sports has been facilitated,
3. for each lifestyle group there is an appropriate type of sport and physical activity available,
4. it can thus be ascertained that every human being - as referred to in Article 1 of the European Sports Charter - has the opportunity to play sports, while according to Article 2 of this Charter, as sport is meant every kind of physical movement: "Sport means all forms of physical activity which, through casual or organized participation, aim at expressing or improving physical fitness and mental wellbeing, forming social relationships or obtaining results in competition at all levels" [1].

The general participation plan - or scientifically expressed: the universal participation [10] of the population to sports - is not a new idea. It was first born and conceived in 1966, in the European Council, in the sense of "Sports for All", and in 1968 a working group was set up to develop guidelines on this issue. Six years later, the working group presented the draft of a political program, which was officially published in 1975 as the "European Charter of Sports for All", and a year later it was voted by the Ministers of Sports meeting [10]. The political orientation of this Charter is set out in Article 1: "Everyone has the right to exercise sports." Under this article, conditions must be created in Europe so that the entire population can be exercised regularly without discrimination by gender, age, occupation or income [10]. The "European Sports Charter" presented in 1993 is also governed by the spirit of the "Sports for All" Charter, where Article 6 explicitly mentions sports for all. Thus, there was a general appreciation of widespread sports and sports in general, which until then was of less importance to sports organizations. The legalization of such a policy, which seeks the wider participation of the population in sports, on the one hand refers to the acceptable

individual benefits of sport, on the other hand to strong social – especially positive social, educational and cultural – results.

However, due to the fact that the Charter functions only as a guideline, it is simply a requirement and ultimately only a political recommendation. In the Charter's comments, sport is understood as free, spontaneous physical activities, which are exercised in free time and their function is recreation, entertainment and relaxation [10]. Consequently, four groups of activities are mentioned, which are in the forefront: competitive games, outdoor sports, aesthetic-oriented forms of exercise, and fitness exercises. This is how a broad conception of sport is attributed, as it has been differentiated in advanced societies. At the same time, the close connection with other individual sectors of society is pointed out: the social, preventive, therapeutic, economic and health orientation is mentioned separately.

### Sports for All

Behind the term "Sports for All" is a large number of programs and names. There are the Trim movements in Norway, Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands, the Trimm movement in Germany, the Sports for All movement in England (in 1995 it appeared as such and was replaced by the programs "Raising the game" and "Sporting Nation"), the Physical Fitness and Sports movement in the United States as well as the Come Alive movement in New Zealand. In Australia it was named Be in it, in Spain and Brazil Deportes para Todos etc. Exemplary programs include "Trimm-Concept" (Scandinavia and Germany), "Participation" (Canada), "Spielfest" and "Meeting point" programs as well as actions like "active together" and "Sports are more beautiful in the sports club". To the promoters of the Sport for All movement is attributed the increase in participation in sports, as well as its differentiation from the 70's policy of Sports for All [11].

An analysis of the Sports for All programs in 1993 [11] showed that the initial campaigns, which were carried out once and partially experimentally, became permanently structured and scientifically based programs. The promoters, in particular, consider that three types of campaigns, which are on three different levels, are promising success:

1. Big Scale Campaigns in the media for sports advertising
2. Regular campaigns for certain sports in clubs, private gyms, etc., in order to give a special incentive
3. Unique events, such as game festivals, to convince those who are already interested.

The analysis shows [11] five important trends within the wide range of program activities:

1. promotion of traditional sports in Trimm-edition, which can be carried out as individual sports, where the individual undertakes responsibilities
2. promotion of new sports
3. promotion of traditional sports with the use of games
4. promotion of various forms of physical movement in combination with music
5. promotion of sports combinations

The Sports for All program is mainly aimed at non-athletes' target groups from the social strata of a part of the population, who in all - and not only European - countries have essentially the same characteristics: unemployed, disabled, those who have dropped out of school, women, the elderly, ethnic minorities, parents with young children and those belonging to the lower classes, where the idea of lifelong sport is very important. At the same time, health, as one of the principal variables when the campaigns Sports for All began, was the main focus since 1975, presented in a broader sense such as well-being and quality of life. Related examples are the French initiative "Parkour's du Coeur", the German "Trimming 130", the Belgian "Ik sport keiveiling" (safe sport), the Dutch "How to cope with sports injuries".

The promoters of the Sport for All movement, of course, realize the increasingly changing social conditions of demographic, economic, social and political nature, as well as the changes that are taking place in people's lifestyles. They demand that these conditions will be taken into account when future campaigns are planned. At this point, the discussion about Sports for All matches the general discussions in society about sports. After all, was the idea of Sports for All successful for everyone or not? To close this subject, here are some brief remarks.

(1) What has undoubtedly been most successful in the Sports for All campaigns is the general advertising of sports and the documentation of movement of any kind as an important element of lifestyle. At the same time, however, if we look at sports measures in many countries, we see a decline in the state's funding for sports and sports facilities. This is a development that contradicts the European Charter "Sports for all". And the requirement that the individual should participate economically to a greater extent when exercising sports does not necessarily promote sport, if we consider the living conditions of some of the defined target groups.

(2) Participation in sports is highly varied in various European countries. What matters is not the level of organization in sports, but rather the general participation: the numbers are relatively high for almost

all countries, which in the first place simply means that there is a positive attitude towards sports in these countries. Whether in practice people exercise regularly is of secondary importance. In this area lie the dynamics that are important for increasing real participation in sports. Regarding this fact, critics talk about the 'Sports for all' myth and the "Sports for all" fantasies [12]. After all, there is no country in the world that more than 10 to 15% of its population exercises regularly and intensively. If that were the case, the biggest change of the last few decades would be in the field of those who play sports, think of doing it, or are sometimes convinced. However, even critics do not dispute that the greatest progress "sports for all" brought lies in the provision of sport possibilities for the disabled and the elderly.

(3) But there is a completely different critique: in the United States some people claim that Sports for all is the "capitalistic interpretation of a socialistic idea." These capitalistic interpretations are also jogging, private gyms, home training, etc., as they appear commercially. The question is whether this was and is indeed desirable. The developments in the field of sports in recent decades have obviously escaped these critics. While sports in clubs account for about 25-30% of the population, in the meantime many people have indulged in unorganized sports and offers from private businesses for exercise and recreation. Juetting [13] estimates the percentage of people who do not exercise at 40%, but it is likely to be higher. In one study, Juetting [13] found that up to 90% of respondents expressed a desire to play sports. The high esteem of sports in society led Rittner to the following interpretation: "Sports become an integral part of the role of every human being." With the "sportization of living conditions", sports become a "social model" [9]. The changing of sports' value in society has created new "directorial forms" in sports. So, for example, in leisure time modern sports also serve as a presentation of the independent lifestyle. This impulse finds its expression through an additional gain of aesthetic dimension, which is externally observed in athletic shoes, sports sweaters, sports bags, sports accessories, etc. The expression of individualized values in sports is closely related to the reduction of access routes for sports. This is not only due to the growing number of opportunistic and active athletes, but also to the development of new sport types [14]. New sports such as Windsurfing, paragliding, free climbing or Bungee jumping are in line with the new orientations of values and try to match individualized hedonistic desires in sports.

Sports forms are multiplying and leading the sports system, as already described, to an unprecedented complexity. The overall sports system basically becomes more open. This creates completely new access to sports [15]. The initial "selectivity" of sports is increasingly losing its importance, so new

groups of people such as the elderly, overweight, women or the disabled have more access to leisure sports and widespread sports. "Sports activities are not possible without the transition from classical sports socialization, without taking on symbolic and essential sports roles" [16]. Due to the qualitative changes in sports socialization, strong new sport roles have become possible. With the isolation and selection of certain incentives, sports are now more easily accessible. It is striking that the primary or basic motivations that were originally associated with traditional sports, such as performance, pleasure, and health, are subject to differentiation. They undergo an extensive assessment in the form of new organization forms and new types of sports. The performance incentive, which previously prevailed in leisure sports and in widespread sports, is losing its charm, so some writers talk about the *unathleticism of sports* or the *non-athletic sports*. Instead of these, one now seeks pleasure, spontaneity and social contacts in sports; "... in addition, its new members, especially women and older people, are introducing their interests and needs to it" [17]. While the motivation for pleasure in traditional sports was in a symbiotic relationship with performance, although in peripheral standards, after the change in the understanding of sports, it became independent. So, for example, movement in leisure sports gains a bigger role. Thus, Rittner sees an *indiscipline* in sports, which in turn favours "fraudulent sporting interests." They pursue to direct orientation to hedonistic values and require enjoyment, adventure, intensity, alternation, and the expression of emotional needs [4, 18]. In addition to the orientation to pleasure, also the appreciated health motivation brings about innovation in sports. Wellness centres are an example of such charming offers, providing flexible forms of participation and visual equipment. They can satisfy the desires for "exclusive body shaping, individual autonomy as well as individual health" [9]. Pleasure, health, well-being, balance, euphoria and good looks are among the values that dominate sports today. Modernization, efficiency, and individual autonomy are reflected on the body that is the subject of demonstration [19]. "The body serves in the search for individual concepts and becomes a feature of social status, the formation of which is oriented to the values of the modern culture, namely the youthful body, wellness, fitness, mobility and athleticism" [9].

## CONCLUSIONS

Postmaterialist society is a succinct presentation of the change in social values and has a catalytic effect on today's debate. An accordingly significant effect has the loss of the importance of the values that derive from the puritanical view of the world and which have been preserved until this century. These postmaterialist values could be experienced mainly in leisure time. Therefore 'leisure time' can be seen as a central factor in the general change of social values. Social change and increased leisure time have



led to a new conception of the idea of sport. We are talking about a change in sports that can be experienced empirically, and this is because the expansion of sports range and the multiplication of organization forms have led sports to become a mass movement. Sports are no longer just for high performance; there are also sports for better health and occupation of leisure time. This made sports more attractive to everyone. Demand change for more types of sports, but more specifically for another way of experiencing sports resulted in a change of the supply structure. The exclusivity of many types of classical sports has been limited by new popular types of sports. The demands of life in modern industrial societies and their impact on health are the reason that more and more people are looking after their physical well-being and seeking out offers that aim at better health. New sports forms that appeared, such as aerobics, wellness, jogging and walking, are also due to health motivation. But also traditional sports such as swimming, cycling, and gymnastics come alive again, seen from a healthy point of view. The market is no longer dominated by traditional sports, which are adapted to performance and competition, but by a non-negligible number of commercial businesses that offer exercise activities, which try to meet the multifaceted needs and desires of the people.

## REFERENCES

1. Zarotis, G., Tokarski, W., Kontakos, A., & Katsagolis, A. (2011). Free time. Physical activity, Health and Quality of Life. Athen/Zefyri: Diadrasi.
2. Anders, G. (1990). Sport im Wandel komplexer Gesellschaften. In: Anders, G. (Hrsg.): Vereinssport an der Wachstumsgrenze? – Sport in der Krise der Industriegesellschaften. Witten: Am Steinberg May.
3. Digel, H. (1990). Wertewandel im Sport – Eine These und deren begriffliche, theoretische und methodische Schwierigkeiten. Anders, G. (Hrsg.): Vereinssport an der Wachstumsgrenze? – Sport in der Krise der Industriegesellschaften. Witten: Am Steinberg May, 73-96.
4. Rittner, V. (1984). Gesamtgesellschaftliche Entwicklungen und ihre Auswirkungen auf den Sport. In: Kultusminister Nordrhein-Westfalen (Hrsg.): Sportentwicklung. Einflüsse und Rahmenbedingungen. Koeln: Greven Verlag, 44-51
5. Heinemann, K. (1989). Der „nicht-sportliche“ Sport. In: Dietrich, K. & Heinemann, K. (Hrsg.): Der „nicht-sportliche“ Sport. Schorndorf: Hofmann Verlag.
6. Tokarski, W., & Steinbach, D. (1998). Spuren, Sport und Europa – Europa und der Sport. Edition Sport & Freizeit 6. Aachen: Meyer & Meyer.
7. Tokarski, W. (1998). Lokale und kommunale Sportstrukturen in Europa: Vereine und Vereinsforschung – eine Annäherung. In: Europaeische Akademie des Sports (Hrsg.): Lokale und kommunale Sportstrukturen in Europa. Akademieschriften 12. Velen: Selbstverlag.
8. Juetting, D. (1998). Sportvereine als Nonprofit-Organisationen. In: Europaeische Akademie des Sports (Hrsg.): Lokale und kommunale Sportstrukturen in Europa. Akademieschriften 12. Velen: Selbstverlag.
9. Rittner, V. (1988). Sport als oekonomisches Interessenobjekt. In: Digel, H. (Hrsg.): Sport im Verein und im Verband. Schorndorf: Hofmann Verlag, 158-187.
10. Hartmann-Tews, I. (1996). Sport fuer alle? Schriftenreihe des Bundesinstituts fuer Sportwissenschaft 91. Schorndorf: Hofmann
11. Remans, A. (1993). Sport-for-All Campaigns in Europe: An Overview. Brussels: Clearing House.
12. Standeven, J., Hardmann, K., & Fischer, D. (eds.) (1991). Sport for all – into the 90s. Aachen: Meyer & Meyer.
13. Juetting, D. (1990). Freizeit – Konsumieren oder Selbstgestalten? In: Agricola, S., Haag, A. & Stoffers, M.: Freizeitwirtschaft – Maerkte und Konsumwelten. Erkrath: Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Freizeit.
14. Opaschowski, H. W. (2008). Einfuehrung in die Freizeitwissenschaft (5. Aufl.). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag fuer Sozialwissenschaften.
15. Dietrich, K., Heinemann, K. & Schubert, M. (1990). Kommerzielle Sportanbieter: Eine empirische Studie zu Nachfrage, Angebot und Beschaeftigungschancen im privaten Sportmarkt. Schorndorf: Hofmann Verlag.
16. Rittner, V. (1985). Sport und Gesundheit - Zur Ausdifferenzierung des Gesundheitsmotivs im Sport. In: Sportwissenschaft, 15, 136-154.
17. Grupe, O. (1988): Von der Verantwortung der Person und der Verpflichtung der Organisation. In: Deutscher Sportbund (Hrsg.): Menschen im Sport 2000. Schorndorf: Hofmann Verlag.
18. Breuer, C., & Rittner, V. (2002). Berichterstattung und Wissensmanagement im Sportsystem. Konzeption einer Sportverhaltensberichterstattung fuer das Land Nordrhein-Westfalen. Koeln: Sport & Buch Strauss.
19. Hradil, S. (2002). Vom Wandel des Wertewandels – Die Individualisierung und eine ihrer Gegenbewegungen. In: Glatzer, W., Habich, R. & Mayer, K. U. (Hrsg.), Sozialer Wandel und gesellschaftliche Dauerbeobachtung (31-48). Opladen: Leske & Budrich.