

## 子どものスポーツ参加における家族の影響

— スポーツ組織参加者と非参加者・比較検討 —

## Influence of Individual Family Members in Sport Involvement of Children

— in the cases of participants and non-participants in organized sport for children —

Osamu EBIHARA\* and Shinshiro EBASHI\*\*

The purpose of this study was to assess the differential role of individual family members in sport involvement of children and also to refer to analyze a comparative influence of the social systems in relation to participation in organized sport and sex as the control variable. Several indicators as the theoretical socializing agents from which have been selected the social-systems model postulated by Kenyon & McPherson (1973) were analyzed in a behavioral component and a cognitive component of sport involvement.

Data from this study were collected by a fixed-alternative questionnaires using two types of interview-methods for a systematic probability drawn from the organized sport schools as participant group and an elementary school as non-participant group in Hiroshima Prefecture, Japan.

In the behavioral component of sport involvement, parents, especially like-sex parent, were more influential for non-participants than for participants. While the influence of the siblings was a similar tendency. Compared with the four social systems, the family and the peer group were the significant socializing agencies for both cases, but the school systems were influential solely for participants while the community for non-participants in both boys and girls. Whereas in the cognitive component of sport involvement, data indicated that father was the most significant socializing agent and the most important predictor for participants and non-participants of each sex. Also there were different influences of the social systems in relation to sex, but not to the opportunity set such as participation in organized sport. For boys and girls the family was more influential agency than the other social systems. However either the community for boys and the peer group, especially opposite-sex friends, for girls was the significant influential agency respectively.

**I. Purpose**

In socialization into sport involvement, McPherson (1981) explained the process of socialization through three main elements: significant others, social situations and role learners with personal attributes. In this context the most such researches of a social learning paradigm have been focused on significant others and social situations (Kenyon & McPherson, 1973, 1974; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1973, 1976; Greendorfer, 1977). In an earlier systematic study Kenyon & McPherson (1973) utilized a system model in their analysis of socialization into sport and they further expanded this model into the two-stage social systems model. In their postulated social role-social system two-stage block-recursive model for sport socialization, role learners with personal attributes are exposed directly and indirectly to significant others (Woelfel & Haller, 1971) in a variety of social systems (e.g., home, school, play-ground, the mass-media). Furthermore, they focused on the four social sys-

\* Faculty of Education, University of Tokyo

\*\* National Institute of Physical Recreation in Kanoya

tems, that is family, peers, school and community, in the two-stage social systems model.

Although considerable attention has been paid to sport socialization and involvement to which concerned the process of elite-athletes, adults and students (Malumphy, 1970; Pcdlkiewicz, 1970; Kenyon & McPherson, 1973, 1974; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1973, 1976; Greendorfer, 1977; Yamaguchi et al., 1979), a few concerns have been recently directed toward children so as that the social process influencing their involvement has been virtually neglected (McPherson et al., 1976).

In a few existing studies dealt with children, Watson (1975) approached in a Little Athletic program in Australia and found that boys identified fathers and peers while girls identified mothers and coaches as significant evaluators of performance. Furthermore, Watson (1974, 1975, 1977) suggested that there is a decline in socialization function and power of the family in general and that although parents have lost power over their children, they are still responsible for their socialization. At the same time, the peer group and community agencies have increased their influence over the child.

Olick (1972) has also identified parents as instrumental in their son's participation in organized sport and boys as active participants in sport had parents who were likewise involved. While Olick analyzed solely on boys, Snyder & Spreitzer (1976) examined some correlations of sport participation among adolescent girls and indicated a positive relationship between parental interest, coaches' encouragement, and sport participation. They concluded that sport socialization began in childhood and continued into adolescence and that encouragement from significant others was of great importance. Also parental encouragement and actual participation by family members was a major factor in female sport involvement (Malumphy, 1970; Greendorfer, 1977).

Recently, in their analysis of children enrolled in a summer fitness program, Greendorfer & Lewko (1978) found that the father was the only significant socializing agent in the family and was the most important predictor for both boys and girls. Furthermore, compared the father with peers and teachers, each of the three social systems for boys was a significant predictor of sport involvement, whereas for girls the data indicated significant influence of fathers and peers but not of teachers.

Though most of researches concerned with the socialization into sport involvement on children were utilized a social learning paradigm such as significant others and social situations, unfortunately they were limited to focus on the social situations ascribed to organized sport programs such as Little League baseball and seasonal athletic programs. It could be assumed that significant others in various social situations surrounding a child served differential influences. Accordingly this study controlled such a social situation as participation in organized sport was designed to focus on the differential influence of significant others in either sex and the two theoretical component of sport involvement. To control such a opportunity set, this study was approached the comparative analysis to each case of participants and non-participants in organized sport for children.

## II. Method

In June-August 1980, two types of interview-methods, which adopted the individual interview-method to the lower graders while the group interview-method to the higher graders respectively, were administered to 781 children in an elementary school as non-participants group. In the same period, solely the individual interview-method were administered to 408 children who were participating in organized swimming schools as participants group. The interview-methods toward both groups were conducted under the guidance of well trained interviewers. A fixed-alternative questionnaires used in this survey was modified from the questionnaires developed by Snyder & Spreitzer (1976), Greendorfer & Lewko (1978) and Yamaguchi et al. (1979). The interviews and each questionnaire item were deliberately planned to give considerable attention to children's wordings and their intellectual level.

Table-1 presented a distribution of each sex in participants and non-participants in organized sport for

children.

Table-1. A Distribution of Each Sex in Participants and Non-participants in Organized Sport for Children

	BOYS	GIRLS	ROW TOTAL
PARTICIPANT	240	168	408
NON-PARTICIPANT	386	395	781
COLUMN TOTAL	626	563	1189

The questionnaires consisted of the behavioral component and the cognitive component of sport involvement. The former was dealt with a respondent's current active sport activities as the dependent variable<sup>(1)</sup>. The extent of each interplay with individual family members and the external socializing agents from the other three social systems was considered as the independent variable<sup>(2)</sup>. The additive indicators were theoretically selected as follows; like-sex friends and opposite-sex friends from the peer group, teachers-coaches from the school system, and neighbours from the community. As the dependent variable in the latter component, the respondent's degree of the cognitive involvement was operationalized by means of a summated scale which was composite of three areas of cognitive indicators; to each of 10 items on sport-programs of T.V. and broadcasting, sport-personalities and sport-comics. The frequency of talking about sport, games and play in formal and informal conversations with individual family members and the external socializing agents was computed as the independent variable<sup>(3)</sup>.

- 
- (1) Sample questionnaire item: How much do you play in sport and games?  
(very much, a lot, some, not much, not at all)
  - (2) Sample questionnaire item: How much does your father (mother, brothers, sisters, like-sex friends, opposite-sex friends, teachers-coaches, neighbours) play with you in sport and games?  
(very much, a lot, some, not much, not at all)
  - (3) Sample questionnaire item: How much does your father (mother, brothers, sisters, like-sex friends, opposite-sex friends, teachers-coaches, neighbours) talk about sport, games and play?  
(very much, a lot, some, not much, not at all)
- 

Several multiple regression analysis were preformed so that this study was conducted to examine comparatively the differential role of individual family members and the other socializing agents in relation to opportunity sets and sexes as the controlled variables in sport involvement of children. In each multiple regression analysis, the degree of sport involvement of children was determined to measure as the dependent variable, and the extent and the frequency of the respondent's interactions with significant others was considered as the independent variable in the appropriate component of sport involvement.

### III. Results and Discussions

Table-2 presented influence of individual family members on boys' participants and non-participants in the behavioral component of sport involvement. Father, brothers and sisters were significant socializing agents both in participant group (PG) and non-participant group (NPG). Compared with each influence of mother between PG and NPG, it was clearly a different function that mother was significantly influential for NPG but not for PG.

Both in the cases of PG and NPG, these results were accounted for approximately of 16% of the amount of the variance. Accordingly it could be determined that father for NPG interplayed with children more frequently than for PG and also was functioning as a more influential socializing agent for NPG than for PG, in spite of a similar importance of their function and power on siblings' influences for their brothers in each case. Furthermore father was the most significant socializing agent and important predictor for NPG, whereas in the case of PG the father was the second influential member next to brothers in the family. Data indicated that parents were more influential for NPG than for PG.

Table-2. Influence of Individual Family Members on Boy's Participants and Non-participants in the Behavioral Component of Sport Involvement

Regression Statistic		variable			
		Father	Mother	Brothers	Sisters
Participant	(n=240)				
	Beta	.255	.060	.290	.233
	F-value	17.270***	.990	19.113***	11.808***
	Multiple correlation coefficient = .408				
	Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = .167				
Non-Participant	(n=386)				
	Beta	.246	.088	.214	.151
	F-value	23.674***	3.035*	18.003***	8.922***
	Multiple correlation coefficient = .401				
	Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = .161				

\* Significant ( $p < .05$ )  
 \*\* Significant ( $p < .01$ )  
 \*\*\* Significant ( $p < .001$ )

As shown in Table-3, the differential patterns of parental influences between PG and NPG were remarkably recognized in the case of girls rather than of boys. These results were particularly cautious to compare PG with NPG because the comparative influence of individual family members accounted for approximately 21% of the variance for NPG but considerably less for PG ( $R^2 = 13\%$ ). As well as boys' cases, three socializing agents of mother, brothers and sisters were significantly operating to girls' active sport involvement for both PG and NPG. While in role of father, it was evidently a different pattern that father for NPG was a significant socializing agent but not for PG as well as the influence of mother in the case of boys. Furthermore mother was more influential and important for NPG than for PG.

Accordingly there was an interesting tendency for parents to have less significant influence through participation of their children in organized sport. This tendency indicated that parents who have children participating in organized sport entrusted their roles of sport socialization on their children to the organized sport systems. Especially, this entrustment was occurred in the case of opposite-sex parent who was demonstrated relatively less influential than like-sex parent. Also there was a sex stereotyping fashion of parents in each PG and NPG, especially this fashion was evidently recognized in the case of PG rather than of NPG.

In proof of the parental entrustment to the other social systems, the influence of the four socializing agencies

Table-3. Influence of Individual Family Members on Girls' Participants and Non-participants in the Behavioral Component of Sport Involvement

Regression Statistic		variable			
		Father	Mother	Brothers	Sisters
Participant	(n=168)				
	Beta	.117	.155	.174	.293
	F-value	2.249	4.092**	4.502**	13.238***
	Multiple correlation coefficient = .358				
	Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = .129				
Non-Participant	(n=395)				
	Beta	.207	.200	.237	.238
	F-value	18.652***	17.767***	24.351***	24.435***
	Multiple correlation coefficient = .461				
	Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = .213				

\* Significant ( $p < .05$ )  
\*\* Significant ( $p < .01$ )  
\*\*\* Significant ( $p < .001$ )

including the family were then analyzed. Table-4 showed influence of the social systems on boys' participants and non-participants in the behavioral component of sport involvement. These results indicated that father, brothers, sisters and like-sex friends were commonly significant socializing agents for both PG and NPG. However there was a salient difference between the school and the community so that teachers-coaches for PG and neighbours for NPG were significantly socializing agents and important predictors in each case. Furthermore, like-sex friends as the greatest influential agents for both PG and NPG must be considered in detail in each multiple regression analysis because the eight socializing agents influence explained approximately 31% of the amount of the variance for PG but 40% of the variance for NPG. However in comparison of like-sex friends' influence between PG and NPG taking the different variance into consideration, like-sex friends for NPG were tremendously influential rather than for PG. Data in this comparative study indicated that NPG had a spontaneous process of socialization interplaying with like-sex friends and neighbours while PG followed a systematic path led by their parents. Each process of sport socialization was subsequently due to the restriction of playtime and opportunity set through participation in organized sport.

While in the case of girls, as shown in Table-5, the data were accounted for the eight socializing agents influence explained approximately 35% of the variance for PG and 39% of the variance for NPG. In both cases mother, brothers, sisters and like-sex friends were significantly influential agents and important predictors. As well as in the case of boys, teachers-coaches for PG and neighbours for NPG were respectively the significant socializing agents in the externally-induced world. However there was an interesting difference between PG and NPG on influences of father and opposite-sex friends; that is girls who were non-participants in organized sport had opposite-sex socializing agents, father and opposite-sex friends in this component. In the externally-induced world, girls in NPG had extensively more active opportunity set than girls in PG so that opposite-sex friends functioned as socializing agents for NPG not for PG in spite of the similar influences of like-sex friends to both PG and NPG.

Table-4. Influence of the Social Systems on Boys' Participants and Non-participants in the Behavioral Component of Sport Involvement

Regression Statistic	variable							
	Family			Peers		School	Community	
	Father	Mother	Brothers	Sisters	Friends (like-sex)	Friends (opp.-sex)	Teachers -Coaches	Neighbors
Participant (n=240)								
Beta	.179	-.013	.266	.159	.357	.056	.082	.042
F-value	9.620***	.054	18.979***	6.196***	36.535***	1.003	2.027*	.498
Multiple correlation coefficient = .559								
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) = .313								
Non-Participant (n=386)								
Beta	.183	.059	.133	.090	.430	.058	.052	.114
F-value	17.817***	1.896	9.439***	4.333***	98.108***	1.799	1.565	6.865***
Multiple correlation coefficient = .638								
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) = .407								

\* Significant (p < .05)  
 \*\* Significant (p < .01)  
 \*\*\* Significant (p < .001)

Table-5. Influence of the Social systems on Girls' Participants and Non-participants in the Behavioral Component of Sport Involvement

Regression Statistic	variable							
	Family		Peers		School		Community	
	Father	Mother	Brothers	Sisters	Friends (like-sex)	Friends (opp.-sex)	Teachers -Coaches	Neighbors
Participant (n=168)								
Beta	-.012	.143	.207	.303	.449	.033	.149	-.073
F-value	.029	4.230***	8.038***	17.562***	40.744***	.220	4.724***	1.105
Multiple correlation coefficient = .592								
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) = .350								
Non-Participant (n=395)								
Beta	.136	.095	.151	.122	.306	.189	.051	.145
F-value	9.969***	4.780***	11.994***	7.591***	49.724***	20.279***	1.384	11.381***
Multiple correlation coefficient = .625								
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) = .391								

\* Significant (p < .05)  
 \*\* Significant (p < .01)  
 \*\*\* Significant (p < .001)

In the behavioral component of sport involvement, the results demonstrated that parents, especially opposite-sex parent, served as significant socializing agents for children of NPG rather than for PG, and that teachers-coaches for PG and neighbours for NPG were respectively significant socializing agents in both boys and girls. This patterns of the socializing agents was due to parental entrustment their roles of interplaying with children to organized sport schools. Furthermore the opportunity set for children such as organized sport was functioning so as to construct the systematic social situation for PG while NPG externally developed the spontaneous play-grounds occurred in the ludic milieu. These differences of the behavioral patterns between PG and NPG were derived from the restriction of playtime and opportunity sets through participation in organized sport.

In the cognitive component of sport involvement, relatively few studies concerned with socialization into such secondary roles, Table-6 and Table-7 presented influence of individual family members on boys and girls. There was not a different pattern of family members between PG and NPG with the exception of brothers' influence. In both cases on each sex, father was the most influential socializing agent and important predictor. While mother was operating to influence as a socializing agent for boys but not for girls. Accordingly in this component the results indicated that there was a particular fashion in accord with sex-difference but out of accord with different social situations. With regard to parental influence there was masculine predominance accounted for father as the most influential agent and for mother as less significant. However the results pointed out brothers' influence which differently functioned between PG and NPG; that is brothers were significantly influential to NPG rather than to PG on both boys and girls.

McPherson (1976) constructed and tested an axiomatic theory to explain the process whereby urban-dwelling adolescents were socialized into the role of sport consumer, and indicated that for the male cohort, the peer group, the family and the school were the most influential social systems in order of performance. For the female cohort, the family, the peer group and the community were most important.

Table-6. Influence of Individual Family Members on Boys' Participants and Non-participants in the Cognitive Component of Sport Involvement

Regression Statistic		variable			
		Father	Mother	Brothers	Sisters
Participant	(n=240)				
	Beta	.265	.147	.077	.052
	F-value	14.109***	4.269**	1.402	.611
	Multiple correlation coefficient = .388				
	Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = .150				
Non-Participant	(n=386)				
	Beta	.213	.200	.095	.063
	F-value	15.049***	12.565***	3.146*	1.362
	Multiple correlation coefficient = .410				
	Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = .168				

- \* Significant ( $p < .05$ )
- \*\* Significant ( $p < .01$ )
- \*\*\* Significant ( $p < .001$ )



Table-7. Influence of Individual Family Members on Girls' Participants and Non-participants in the Cognitive Component of Sport Involvement

Regression Statistic		variable			
		Father	Mother	Brothers	Sisters
Participant	(n=168)				
	Beta	.319	.034	.019	-.096
	F-value	10.722***	.123	.055	1.504
	Multiple correlation coefficient = .352				
	Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = .124				
Non-Participant	(n=395)				
	Beta	.243	.044	.139	.032
	F-value	18.323***	.580	6.947***	.350
	Multiple correlation coefficient = .332				
	Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) = .110				
	* Significant ( $p < .05$ )				
	** Significant ( $p < .01$ )				
	*** Significant ( $p < .001$ )				

Table-8 presented influence of the social systems on boys' participants and non-participants in the cognitive component of sport involvement. Data indicated that father, mother and neighbours were significantly the common socializing agents for both PG and NPG. Subsequently, this results were interestingly consistent with McPherson's study in the role of the family but not with of the other social systems. Inconsistency of this study with McPherson's in the external social systems would be derived from each respondent's personal attributes such as age and community size. However a salient difference between PG and NPG was occurred in their like-sex friends' function. Data indicated that like-sex friends were the most influential socializing agents for PG but not significantly for NPG. This difference was due to higher motivation and interests about sport-related matters for PG ascribed to participation in organized sport. Accordingly participation in organized sport would facilitate children's cognitions concerning sport and games to higher level.

While in the case of girls, as shown in Table-9, father and opposite-sex friends were the significant socializing agents for both PG and NPG. Either father or opposite-sex friends were the most important predictors in the appropriate case. Also taking like-sex friends' influence to NPG into consideration, for girls the family and the peer group were most important in accordance with McPherson's analysis. However in comparison between PG and NPG, there were the different tendencies in a variety of significant others. Sisters and teachers-coaches for PG and brothers and like-sex friends for NPG were significantly influential agents and important predictors in this component.

In the cognitive component of sport involvement, this results demonstrated that there were interestingly an evident sex-different pattern rather than the social situational difference. In comparison between PG and NPG, there was not clearly a different influence in the family, the peer group and the community for both boys and girls, with the exception that like-sex friends served as influential agents for boys' participants and girls' non-participants. Sex-different patterns were due to externally-orientated through participation in organized sport for boys and girls. Furthermore comparatively analyzed the social systems in relation to sex-difference, boys were

Table-8. Influence of the Social Systems on Girls' Participants and Non-participants in the Cognitive Component of Sport Involvement

Regression Statistic	variable									
	Family			Peers		School		Community		
	Father	Mother	Brothers	Sisters	Friends (like-sex)	Friends (opp.-sex)	Teachers -Coaches	Teachers	Neighbors	Community
Participant (n=240)										
Beta	.177	.126	.050	-.021	.192	-.055	.015		.119	
F-value	5.755***	3.020**	.594	.099	6.875***	.799	.048		3.269**	
Multiple correlation coefficient = .445										
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) = .198										
Non-Participant (n=386)										
Beta	.190	.134	.048	.013	-.015	.075	-.003		.184	
F-value	11.966***	4.964***	.787	.059	.066	1.661	.003		9.822***	
Multiple correlation coefficient = .449										
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) = .202										

\* Significant (p < .05)  
 \*\* Significant (p < .01)  
 \*\*\* Significant (p < .001)

Table-9. Influence of the Social Systems on Boys' Participants and Non-participants in the Cognitive Component of Sport Involvement

Regression Statistic	variable									
	Family			Peers			School		Community	
	Father	Mother	Brothers	Sisters	Friends (like-sex)	Friends (opp.-sex)	Teachers	-Coaches	Neighbors	Community
Participant (n=168)										
Beta	.271	.003	-.028	-.150	-.067	.225	.126		-.052	
F-value	7.850***	.001	.113	3.522**	.536	8.414***	2.356*		.404	
Multiple correlation coefficient = .449										
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) = .202										
Non-Participant (n=395)										
Beta	.217	-.041	.091	-.013	.128	.124	.021		.062	
F-value	14.919***	.464	2.918**	.055	5.008***	4.564***	.123		.980	
Multiple correlation coefficient = .386										
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> ) = .149										

\* Significant (p < .05)  
 \*\* Significant (p < .01)  
 \*\*\* Significant (p < .001)

significantly socialized into sport consumers in the family and the community whereas girls were socialized in the family and the peer group, especially by opposite-sex friends. In particular future researches should be given considerable attention to father's function and power in the cognitive component of the secondary sport involvement.

#### IV. Conclusion

Results from several multiple regression analysis performed in this study indicated that the different patterns of significant others were occurred in children's sport involvement by controlling the opportunity set such a participation in organized sport and sexes.

In the behavioral component of sport involvement, parents, especially opposite-sex parent, were demonstrated to entrust the roles of their children's sport socialization to the organized sport. In the case of boys teachers-coaches for PG and neighbours for NPG were evidently the different socializing agents respectively. Whereas for girls teachers-coaches for PG and father, opposite-sex friends and neighbours for NPG were operating as significant socializing agents in each case. Accordingly, through participation in the organized sport, PG constructed a systematic process of socialization into sport within the restrictive externally-induced world. While NPG developed to follow a spontaneous path of sport involvement in the ludic milieu.

Then, in the cognitive component of sport involvement, father was the most significant socializing agent and important predictor for boys and girls in PG and NPG. Furthermore the significant socializing agencies were operating to function to their cognitive involvement in relation to sex-difference rather than the opportunity set such as participation in organized sport. For boys, parents and neighbours were more influential than the other agents both in PG and NPG. Accordingly, in this component the family and the community were more important for boys. Whereas in the case of girls, father and opposite-sex friends were more influential of their cognitive performance. In general, in the cognitive component of sport involvement of children the family was a fundamental significant socializing agency, and also the community for boys and the peer group for girls, especially opposite-sex friends, were the second influential agency in the externally-induced world.

Furthermore the amount of the variance was explained in a variety of combination between theoretical component, opportunity sets and sexes. This variance should be cautiously comprehended in each multiple regression analysis. Results of this study implicated that significant socializing agencies and agents in the ludic milieu typically influenced to children's sport involvement by controlling the social situations and sexes. Future regression must be operationalized a social learning paradigm such as significant others, social situations that can be utilized a theoretical framework of socialization into sport involvement on children.

#### REFERENCES

- 1) Greendorfer, S. L. "Role of socializing agents in female sport involvement" *Research Quarterly*. 48: 305-310, 1977.
- 2) Greendorfer, S. L. & J. H. Lewko "Role of family members in sport socialization" *Research Quarterly*. 49: 146-152, 1978.
- 3) Kenyon, G. S. & B. D. McPherson "Becoming involved in physical activity and sport: A process of socialization", Parick, G. L. (ed.) *Physical Activity-Human Growth and Development*, pp. 303-332. Academic Press, 1973.
- 4) Kenyon, G. S. & B. D. McPherson "An approach to the study of sport socialization" *IRSS*. 9: 127-138, 1974.
- 5) McPherson, B. D., L. N. Guppy & J. P. McKay "The social structure of the games and sport milieu", J. G. Albinson & G. M. Andrew (ed.) *Child in Sport and Physical Activity*, pp. 161-166. University Park Press, 1976.
- 6) McPherson, B. D. "Socialization into the role of sport consumer: A theory and causal model" *Canadian Review Sociology Anthropology*. May, 165-177, 1976.
- 7) McPherson, B. D. "Socialization into and through sport involvement", Luschen, G. & G. H. Sage (ed.) *Handbook of Social Science of Sport*, pp. 246-252. Stipes Publishing Co., 1981.
- 8) Malumphy, T. M. "The college women athlete-

- questions and tentative answers” *Quest*, 14 June: 18-27, 1970.
- 9) Olick, T. D. “Family sport environment and early sports participation” Paper presented at Canadian Psychomotor Learning and Sport Psychology Symposium, Waterloo, Ont., Canada. 1972.
  - 10) Pudelkeiwicz, E. “Sociological problems of sports in housing estates” *IRSS*. 5: 73-103, 1970.
  - 11) Snyder, E. E. & E. Spreitzer “Family influence and involvement in sports” *Research Quarterly*. 44: 249-255, 1973.
  - 12) Snyder, E. E. & E. Spreitzer “Correlates of sport participation among adolescent girls” *Research Quarterly*. 47: 804-809, 1976.
  - 13) Yamaguchi, Y., M. Ikeda & Y. Kumeno “A study on sport involvement of college students: An exploratory path analysis” *Health & Sport Science*, Tsukuba University. 2: 23-30, 1979.
  - 14) Watson, G. G. “Family organization and Little League baseball” *IRSS*. 2: 5-31, 1974.
  - 15) Watson, G. G. “Sex role socialization and the competitive process in little athletics” *The Australia Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation*. 70, December: 10-21, 1975.
  - 16) Watson, G. G. “Games, socialization and parental values: Socialization differences in parental evaluation of Little League baseball” *IRSS*. 12: 17-47, 1977.
  - 17) Woelfel, J. & A. O. Haller “Significant others, the self-reflexive act and the attitude formation process” *ASR*. 26: 74-57, 1971.

本研究の目的は、組織化されたスポーツ・レクリエーション活動に参加している子どもとそうでない子どもにおいて、それぞれの家族構成員の役割を検討し、さらにはその子ども達が、社会組織より受ける影響について言及することである。そして、これらの比較検討に際しては、参加-非参加に性差を加味して分析することにした。子どもが相互作用を持ち得る重要な他者は、ケニヨンとマックファーソン(1973)の仮想社会化モデルより選択し、それらの影響を行動的要素と認知的要素に分類し、重回帰分析にて処理した。

行動的要素では、非参加者が、その両親-特に同性の親-において、参加者に比較してより強い影響を受けていることが認められた。兄弟姉妹においては、参加者・非参加者共に統計的に有意な影響を受け、類似

した傾向が認められた。さらに、四つの社会化機関を比較すると、家族と遊び集団は、参加者と非参加者の両者にとって、重要な社会化機関であったが、しかしながら、学校組織は参加者にとってのみ、また地域社会は非参加者にとってのみ、それぞれ重要な機関であった。

一方、認知的要素では、父親が参加者と非参加者のいずれの場合にも、重要な社会化の担い手であることが指摘された。この要素においては、参加形態による差異は認められず、むしろ性差が顕著に認められた。すなわち、家族は男女共に最も影響力のある社会組織であったが、他の三社会組織を比較した場合、男子にとっては地域社会が、一方女子にとっては遊び集団が、それぞれ重要な社会化機関であることが指摘できる。