Socioeconomic inequalities in sport participation:

pattern per sport and time trends

Viviane Richard MSc. (VivianeAdissa.Richard@hcuge.ch)[a], Giovanni Piumatti PhD. (Giovanni.Piumatti@fondazioneagnelli.it)[b], Nick Pullen PhD (Nicholas.Pullen@hcuge.ch).[a], Elsa Lorthe R.M., PhD. (Elsa.Lorthe@hcuge.ch)[a], Idris Guessous MD., PhD. (Idris.Guessous@hcuge.ch)[c,d], Nicola Cantoreggi PhD.(Nicola.Cantoreggi@unige.ch)[e], Silvia Stringhini PhD. (Silvia.Stringhini@hcuge.ch)[a,f]

a. Unit of Population Epidemiology, Division of Primary Care Medicine, Geneva University Hospitals, Rue Jean-Violette 29, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland
b. Fondazione Agnelli, Via Giuseppe Giacosa, 38, 10125 Turin, Italy
c. Department of Health and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Rue Michel-Servet 1, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland
d. Division and Department of Primary Care Medicine, Geneva University Hospitals, Rue Gabrielle-Perret-Gentil 4, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland
e. Institute of Global Health, University of Geneva, Chemin des Mines 9, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland.
f. University Center for General Medicine and Public Health, University of Lausanne, Rue du Bugnon 44, 1011 Lausanne, Switzerland

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Silvia Stringhini
silvia.stringhini@hcuge.ch
Unité d'épidémiologie populationnelle
Rue Jean-Violette 29
1205 Genève
Switzerland
+41 22 305 58 61

WORD COUNT

Abstract: 250 words
Text: 2966 words

KEYWORDS

Social inequalities, Sports, Life style

ABSTRACT

Background

Sport participation is an important component of a healthy lifestyle and is known to be more common among privileged individuals. However, few studies have examined socio-demographic patterns of participation by type of activity. This study aims at quantifying socio-economic inequalities in sport participation by sport type, and to analyse their trend over 15 years.

Methods

We used 2005-2019 data from the Bus Santé study, a yearly population-based cross-sectional survey of Geneva adults. Sport participation was defined as reporting at least one sporting activity over the previous week; educational level, household income and occupational position were used as indicators of socio-economic position. Socio-economic inequalities in sport participation, and their trend over time, were examined using the relative and slope indexes of inequality (RII/SII).

Results

Out of 7769 participants (50.1% women, mean age 46 years old), 60% participated in a sporting activity. Results showed that the higher the socioeconomic circumstances, the higher the sport participation (RII=1.78; 95% Confidence Interval (CI): 1.64-1.92; SII=0.33; 95%CI: 0.29-0.37 for education). Relative inequalities varied per sport e.g., 0.68 (95%CI: 0.44-1.07) in football participation and 4.25 (95%CI: 2.68-6.75) in tennis/badminton participation for education. Yearly absolute inequalities in sport participation tended to increase between 2005 and 2019 for household income (β=0.01; P-value=0.024).

Conclusion

We observed strong socio-economic inequalities in sport participation in Geneva, with different magnitude depending on the type of sport. These inequalities seemed to increase over the 2005-2019 period. Our results call for tailored measures to promote the participation of socially disadvantaged populations in sporting activities.

KEY MESSAGES

- Sport participation is associated with higher socioeconomic conditions. Research on the patterning of inequalities per sport type and on their trend over time remains scarce.
- There are high growing socioeconomic inequalities in sport participation in Geneva. Inequalities in sport participation are heterogeneous and lower in sports practised in group.
- Tailored sport promotion measures are needed for disadvantaged populations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Physical activity has important health benefits[1–4] and the World Health Organization recommends that adults engage in at least 150 minutes of moderate-intensity physical activity per week, 75 minutes of vigorous physical activity, or a combination of both[5]. However, in high-income countries, a meaningful share of the population does not participate in sufficient physical activity to meet these guidelines[6]. This is thought to contribute to the burden of non-communicable diseases[7].

As a specific type of physical activity, sport can represent an interesting way of balancing the lack of movement of many daily occupations, with additional benefits such as a positive impact on mental health and social cohesion[3,8]. The determinants of sport participation have been widely studied and favourable socio-economic conditions are consistently associated with higher sport participation[9–11]. Indeed, privileged individuals may have more psychosocial, financial and neighbourhood resources, as well as a higher health literacy to establish healthy behaviours[9–11].

In most studies examining the social patterning of physical activity, sport participation is analysed globally, whereas different patterns could exist as per sport type[12]. For example, United-States and Australian studies found that privileged socio-economic conditions are associated with higher general sport participation, but that this relationship is reversed for team sports participation[12,13]. A French study obtained similar results, with higher education and income being associated with individual sport participation, but not with team sport participation[14]. These differences are usually explained by socio-cultural factors or by the fact that group activities are more affordable compared to other sports. Very few epidemiological studies stratified the association between socio-economic conditions and sport participation by type of sport, while a more detailed understanding of this relationship would help in designing tailored and effective promotion strategies, especially for disadvantaged populations.

The evolution of the association between socio-economic conditions and sport participation also remains unclear, as some studies report increasing inequalities over time[15,16], while others do not find significant trends[17–20]. In sum, the evolution of social inequalities in sport participation seems context- and time-dependent. Furthermore, gender-specific analyses are rare and inconsistent[15,17,19], and recent data is lacking, with very few estimates after 2012[16,20].

The goal of the present study is to evaluate the association between socio-economic conditions and participation in different sports; and to analyse its evolution over a 15 years study period in the canton of Geneva, Switzerland.

2. METHODS

Study population

Data came from the Bus Santé study, an ongoing yearly population-based cross-sectional survey conducted since 1993 in Geneva, an urban Swiss canton[21]. Every year, an age- and sex-stratified random sample of about 1000 non-institutionalized residents aged 20-75 years (35-75 years before 2012) provided by the local authorities was recruited through an initial invitation letter. Non-respondents were contacted with up to seven phone calls and two additional letters. Participants completed socio-demographic, lifestyle and health questionnaires, and attended a medical check-up, during which questionnaires were verified by a trained research nurse[21]. The Bus Santé study was approved by the Institute of Ethics Committee of the University of Geneva. All participants signed a written informed consent.

In the present study, we included participants of the Bus Santé surveys between 2005 and 2019. Average annual participation rate (number of participants/number of eligible invited persons) was 36.8% [range: 29.0-47.0%]. These estimates are conservative since it was not possible to identify if participants unreachable by phone [annual range: 18.1-54.9%] did not want to participate or did not receive the invitation letters.

We further selected participants who were physically capable of engaging in a sporting activity; physical incapacity being defined as an affirmative answer to either of the questions: "*Over the 4 last weeks, did you have difficulties showering or bathing, getting dressed, getting in/up from your bed or a chair, using the toilets or eating?*" and "*Over the 4 last weeks, did you have difficulties shopping or doing routine household chores?*". Since individuals aged 20-34 years old were only recruited from 2012 onwards in the Bus Santé study, participants were divided into two subgroups for the following analyses: 1) participants aged 20-75 years old recruited between 2012 and 2019 for the analyses by sport category, and 2) participants aged 35-75 years old recruited between 2005 and 2019 for the time trend analyses (Supplementary 1).

Measures

Outcome

The main outcome was sport participation, overall, by sport category and by sport type, reported in a dedicated subsection of a validated physical activity frequency questionnaire (PAFQ)[22], and defined as the participation in at least one sporting activity in the week preceding the Bus Santé appointment. The 17 different sport types proposed in the PAFQ were grouped into five categories based on the need for facilities, equipment and/or partners: 1) Outdoor individual sports, requiring no specific facilities and minimal equipment (running, brisk walking, racing bicycle); 2) Individual sports requiring access to facilities but minimal equipment (strength training/weight lifting, swimming, ice-/roller-skating); 3) Racket sports and martial arts, requiring access to facilities, some equipment and partners (judo/karate, tennis/badminton, squash); 4) Group sports, requiring access to facilities and minimal equipment, usually practiced in group or team sessions (dance, European football, handball, gymnastics); 5) Special sports requiring longer trips to reach specific places or facilities and significant equipment (golf, downhill/water skiing, cross-country skiing, diving). Participants could report participation in more than one sport type or category.

Explanatory variables

Socio-economic conditions were separately measured with education, household income and occupational position. Based on the main milestones of the Swiss education system, the educational level was divided into lower secondary (ISCED 2011 levels 0-2), upper secondary (ISCED 2011 levels 3-4) and tertiary (ISCED 2011 levels 5-8)[23]. Categories of gross monthly household income were adjusted by the number of people living in the household using the OECD-modified scale[24]. The result was split into four categories: <3000 CHF, 3000-4999 CHF, 5000-6999 CHF and ≥7000 CHF. Finally, participants reported their current occupational position in one of the following four categories: manual worker, manual self-employed worker, non-manual worker, and non-manual manager.

Covariates

The following demographic and health characteristics were considered as covariates: age at the moment of the interview, sex, and country of birth (Switzerland, Southern Europe, Western Europe, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, Other), as well as health indicators such as self-reported health (very good, good, medium, poor, very

poor), body mass index (BMI), active smoking and presence of a chronic disease (diabetes, hypertension, or cardiovascular disease).

Statistical analyses

Socio-economic inequalities in sport participation were estimated using the relative and slope indexes of inequality (RII and SII). These regression-based measures summarise the outcome difference between the socio-economic extremes, while taking intermediate categories into account[25]. The RII evaluates the relative difference: a RII of 1.1 is interpreted as a 10% higher outcome prevalence in the most privileged socio-economic group compared with the least privileged one. The SII measures the absolute difference: a SII of 0.1 means that the prevalence of the outcome is 10 percentage points higher in the most privileged socio-economic group than in the least privileged one.

To compute these indexes, each category of the ordinal socio-economic variables was translated into a numerical rank equal to the proportion of participants with lower socio-economic conditions, and added as the independent variable in the models. The SII was based on linear regressions, while the RII was computed with generalized linear models following a quasi-Poisson distribution; robust standard errors were calculated. A first minimal model was adjusted for potential demographic confounders such as age, sex, an interaction between age and sex, and country of birth; a second full model further included the above-defined health factors to disentangle the effect of the health status in the association between socio-economic conditions and sport participation.

To evaluate the evolution of inequalities over time between 2005 and 2019, the participants' visit year was added in the above-described models, both as a main effect and as an interaction term with all other covariates. The coefficient of the interaction between the socio-economic rank and the year (β) was used to give an estimation of the time trend in inequalities. A sensitivity analysis was performed by removing years that may overly influence the regression.

Complete case analyses were performed by excluding observations with missing data on the examined variables. Analyses per sport category and of trends over time were performed on the entire resulting sample, as well as with a sex stratification. All analyses were performed with R-4.0.3 and significance level was set to 5%; p-values of descriptive analyses were adjusted for multiple comparisons with the Bonferroni method.

3. RESULTS

Of the 8425 individuals taking part in the survey between 2012 and 2019, we excluded 656 who were physically unable to engage in sporting activities (Supplementary 1). Therefore, the study population for the main analyses consisted of 7769 participants, with a mean age of 46 years old (SD: 14.2 years), 50.1% being women (Table 1). A total of 4660 (60.0%) participants reported engaging in at least one sporting activity over the last week. Individual outdoor sports were the most practised, reported by 2368 (30.5%) participants, while racket sports and martial arts were only practised by 490 (6.3%) participants. Sport participation was more common among younger participants, born in Switzerland or in Western Europe, with a good self-reported health, a normal BMI, no chronic disease, no smoking, and higher socio-economic conditions ($P<0.001$; Table 1).

Table 1 Demographic and health characteristics according to participation in sport categories, among adults aged 20 to 75 years, 2012-2019, Geneva

	Total	Sport participation											
		All		Individual outdoor[a]		Individual with facilities[a]		Racket/Martial arts[a]		Group[a]		Special[a]	
	n (%[b])	n (%)	P-value[c]	n (%)	P-value[c]	n (%)	P-value[c]	n (%)	P-value[c]	n (%)	P-value[c]	n (%)	P-value[c]
Total	7769 (100.00)	4660 (60.0)		2368 (30.5)		1866 (24.0)		490 (6.3)		1964 (25.3)		662 (8.5)	
Sex (n=7769)													
Men	3823 (49.2)	2333 (61.0)	0.068	1309 (34.2)	<0.001	967 (25.3)	0.010	350 (9.2)	<0.001	733 (19.2)	<0.001	399 (10.4)	<0.001
Women	3946 (50.8)	2327 (59.0)		1059 (26.8)		899 (22.8)		140 (3.5)		1231 (31.2)		263 (6.7)	
Age (n=7769)													
20-34	1885 (24.3)	1244 (66.0)	<0.001	682 (36.2)	<0.001	600 (31.8)	<0.001	154 (8.2)	<0.001	500 (26.5)	<0.001	138 (7.3)	0.006
35-49	2735 (35.2)	1707 (62.4)		944 (34.5)		679 (24.8)		187 (6.8)		627 (22.9)		273 (10.0)	
50-64	2125 (27.4)	1187 (55.9)		577 (27.2)		407 (19.2)		108 (5.1)		533 (25.1)		173 (8.1)	
65-75	1024 (13.2)	522 (51.0)		165 (16.1)		180 (17.6)		41 (4.0)		304 (29.7)		78 (7.6)	
Country of birth (n=7757)													
Switzerland	3815 (49.1)	2430 (63.7)	<0.001	1177 (30.9)	0.06	989 (25.9)	<0.001	282 (7.4)	<0.001	1021 (26.8)	0.001	376 (9.9)	<0.001
Southern Europe	1123 (14.5)	556 (49.5)		312 (27.8)		201 (17.9)		34 (3.0)		250 (22.3)		44 (3.9)	
Western Europe	1097 (14.1)	699 (63.7)		366 (33.4)		283 (25.8)		76 (6.9)		280 (25.5)		140 (12.8)	
Eastern / South-Eastern Europe	394 (5.1)	240 (60.9)		115 (29.2)		110 (27.9)		27 (6.9)		114 (28.9)		28 (7.1)	
Other	1338 (17.2)	735 (54.9)		398 (29.7)		283 (21.2)		71 (5.3)		299 (22.3)		74 (5.5)	
Self-perceived health (n=7762)													
Very good	2235 (28.8)	1574 (70.4)	<0.001	877 (39.2)	<0.001	660 (29.5)	<0.001	182 (8.1)	<0.001	644 (28.8)	<0.001	250 (11.2)	<0.001
Good	4376 (56.3)	2572 (58.8)		1254 (28.7)		998 (22.8)		265 (6.1)		1103 (25.2)		362 (8.3)	
Medium	1078 (13.9)	482 (44.7)		218 (20.2)		197 (18.3)		41 (3.8)		209 (19.4)		45 (4.2)	
Poor	62 (0.8)	23 (37.1)		12 (19.4)		9 (14.5)		0 (0.0)		7 (11.3)		4 (6.5)	
Very poor	11 (0.1)	6 (54.5)		5 (45.5)		1 (9.1)		1 (9.1)		1 (9.1)		1 (9.1)	
Body mass index[d] (n=7654)													
Under/normal weight (<25kg/m^2)	4638 (59.7)	3033 (65.4)	<0.001	1612 (34.8)	<0.001	1226 (26.4)	<0.001	308 (6.6)	0.051	1308 (28.2)	<0.001	438 (9.4)	<0.001
Overweight (25-29.9 kg/m^2)	2274 (29.3)	1254 (55.1)		613 (27.0)		482 (21.2)		149 (6.6)		501 (22.0)		182 (8.0)	
Obesity (≥30 kg/m^2)	742 (9.6)	329 (44.3)		125 (16.8)		136 (18.3)		32 (4.3)		140 (18.9)		38 (5.1)	
Chronic disease (n=7769)													
No	6088 (78.4)	3849 (63.2)	<0.001	2009 (33.0)	<0.001	1583 (26.0)	<0.001	419 (6.9)	<0.001	1619 (26.6)	<0.001	542 (8.9)	0.025
Yes	1681 (21.6)	811 (48.2)		359 (21.4)		283 (16.8)		71 (4.2)		345 (20.5)		120 (7.1)	
Smoking (n=7761)													
No	6105 (78.6)	3785 (62.0)	<0.001	1963 (32.2)	<0.001	1515 (24.8)	0.002	394 (6.5)	0.359	1600 (26.2)	<0.001	543 (8.9)	0.031
Yes	1656 (21.3)	871 (52.6)		403 (24.3)		350 (21.1)		96 (5.8)		362 (21.9)		119 (7.2)	
Educational level (n=7691)													
Tertiary	4003 (51.5)	2721 (68.0)	<0.001	1413 (35.3)	<0.001	1093 (27.3)	<0.001	335 (8.4)	<0.001	1112 (27.8)	<0.001	459 (11.5)	<0.001
Upper secondary	3088 (39.7)	1661 (53.8)		811 (26.3)		687 (22.2)		142 (4.6)		727 (23.5)		185 (6.0)	
Lower secondary	600 (7.7)	229 (38.2)		114 (19.0)		70 (11.7)		11 (1.8)		100 (16.7)		11 (1.8)	
Household income[e] (n=6927)													
≥7000 CHF	1962 (25.3)	1367 (69.7)	<0.001	738 (37.6)	<0.001	542 (27.6)	<0.001	173 (8.8)	<0.001	531 (27.1)	0.001	266 (13.6)	<0.001
5000-6999 CHF	1806 (23.2)	1157 (64.1)		551 (30.5)		464 (25.7)		126 (7.0)		475 (26.3)		193 (10.7)	
3000-4999 CHF	1953 (25.1)	1065 (54.5)		548 (28.1)		377 (19.3)		93 (4.8)		473 (24.2)		114 (5.8)	
<3000 CHF	1206 (15.5)	563 (46.7)		258 (21.4)		238 (19.7)		51 (4.2)		256 (21.2)		38 (3.2)	

Occupational position (n=5429)													
Non-manual manager	1584 (20.4)	1097 (69.3)	<0.001	628 (39.6)	<0.001	442 (27.9)	<0.001	147 (9.3)	<0.001	360 (22.7)	<0.001	229 (14.5)	<0.001
Non-manual worker	2606 (33.5)	1664 (63.9)		841 (32.3)		671 (25.7)		179 (6.9)		708 (27.2)		220 (8.4)	
Manual self-employed worker	249 (3.2)	135 (54.2)		60 (24.1)		43 (17.3)		13 (5.2)		62 (24.9)		14 (5.6)	
Manual worker	990 (12.7)	441 (44.5)		260 (26.3)		161 (16.3)		27 (2.7)		155 (15.7)		33 (3.3)	

[a] Sport categories: Individual outdoor (running, brisk walking, racing bicycle); Individual with facilities (strength training/weightlifting, swimming, ice-/roller-skating); Racket/martial arts (judo/karate, tennis/badminton, tennis, squash); Group (dance, football, handball, gymnastics); Special (golf, downhill/water skiing, cross-country skiing, diving). Participants can engage in several sports.

[b] Percentages calculated on the total number of participants (7769). Missing categories are not shown, therefore percentages may not add up to 100%. The numbers of observations without missing values are provided in the headline of each variable.

[c] P-values from Chi-Square tests of sport participation adjusted for multiple comparisons with the Bonferroni method

[d] Body mass index categories according to the World Health Organization classification[26]

[e] Gross monthly household income adjusted for the number of people living in the household according to the OECD-modified scale[24]

In line with the descriptive analysis, the RII and SII estimations showed that the higher the socio-economic conditions, the higher the sport participation, whichever the sport category ($P<0.05$; Fig. 1, Supplementary 2-4). For overall sport participation, results of the minimally adjusted model indicated that sport participation was 1.78 times (RII=1.78; 95% CI: 1.64-1.92) and 33 percentage points (SII=0.33; 95% CI: 0.29-0.37), higher among participants with the highest educational level compared to those with the lowest one. These inequalities were lower when adjusted for health-related factors (RII=1.56; 95% CI: 1.45-1.69 and SII=0.26; 95% CI: 0.21-0.30). The same magnitude of results was observed when using household income or occupational position as indicators of socioeconomic circumstances. Relative inequalities were more important for racket/martial arts (RII=3.58; 95% CI: 2.43-5.27) and special sports (RII=4.47; 95% CI: 3.20-6.25) than for group sports (RII=1.76; 95% CI: 1.50-2.06), while the highest absolute inequalities could be observed in the overall sport participation. In analyses stratified by sex, inequalities were similar among men and women, except for group sports where they were higher among women (Supplementary 2-3).

-- Figure 1 –

When stratifying by specific type of activity, for most sports, a higher educational level was associated with higher sport participation. With the minimally adjusted model, sports such as tennis/badminton (RII=4.25; 95% CI: 2.68-6.75) showed high inequalities compared to football (RII=0.68; 95% CI: 0.44-1.07), the only sport where the direction of inequalities seemed reversed, although not significantly (Fig. 2). The same magnitude of results was observed when using the household income and the occupational position as indicators of socioeconomic conditions, apart from substantially higher inequalities in golf participation (Supplementary 5).

-- Figure 2 –

Over the 2005-2019 period, for which data was available only for participants aged 35 to 75 years old, the RII and SII showed persistent inequalities. An increasing but non-significant trend could be observed (Fig. 3), for both the yearly change of the RII ($\exp(\beta)=1.01$; $P=0.184$) and of the SII ($\beta=0.01$; $P=0.099$) for education. Absolute income inequalities significantly increased over time ($\beta=0.01$; $P=0.024$), especially among women ($\beta=0.02$; $P=0.012$; Supplementary 6). Since the comparatively low inequalities observed between 2005 and 2007 (Fig. 3, Supplementary 7) could overly influence these results, a sensitivity analysis was performed by removing these years. When analysing the 2008-2019 period, increasing income inequalities in sport participation were only significant among women (RII: $\exp(\beta)=1.03$; $P=0.033$ and SII: $\beta=0.02$; $P=0.021$; Supplementary 6).

-- Figure 3 –

4. DISCUSSION

This study conducted on a randomly selected sample of the Geneva population showed strong socio-economic inequalities in sport participation among adults, with privileged socio-economic conditions being associated with higher sport participation. These inequalities were consistently observed with different socio-economic indicators, as well as after sex and sport stratification. Relative inequalities were higher for racket and special sports than for group sports, while the highest absolute inequalities were observed in the overall sport participation. Income inequalities in sport participation tended to increase over the 2005 to 2019 period.

These results are in line with the existing literature[9–11], and more specifically with other populational studies, that quantified educational inequalities in sporting inactivity in Germany in 2012 (RII=3.4; SII=0.4)[15] and in Sweden in 2014(RII=2.0; SII=0.1) [27]. The high relative inequalities found in the racket, and special sports reflect findings from studies showing that participation in these sports is more common among privileged groups[28,29]. On the other hand, group sport participation seemed to present lower socio-economic inequalities, as previously observed[12,13]. Our results further showed that inequalities in group sport participation were lower among men than women. In fact, sports included in the group sport category (football, handball, gymnastics, and dance) were unequally practised according to gender. Stratifying this category by sex highlighted the higher socio-economic inequalities in gymnastics and dance, which were more practised by women, compared to football and handball, which were popular among men. It shows that analyses by specific sport are relevant to study socio-economic inequalities in sport participation in detail.

Part of the association between socio-economic position and sport participation might be explained by health conditions, as previously observed[30]. Indeed, socio-economic inequalities in sport participation were slightly attenuated when taking health indicators into account. Socio-economic disadvantage is related to poorer health, which may in turn decrease the likelihood of engaging in a sporting activity[30].

Income inequalities in sport participation seemed to increase between 2005 and 2019, especially among women. This is in line with studies finding an increase in socio-economic inequalities in sporting inactivity between 2003 and 2012 in Germany[15] and in health between 1990 and 2010 in Switzerland[31]. Contrary to our results, Galobardes et al.[17] did not observe any trend in socio-economic inequalities in physical inactivity over the 1994-1999 period in Geneva, which suggests that the increasing trend noticed in our study is quite recent. In a context of widening inequalities in income following the 2008 Great Recession[32], it might be that sport

activities became relatively less affordable for disadvantaged people. In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, it highlights the need for further research to disentangle, and if appropriate to mitigate, the impact of crises on health behaviours.

Because of the positive health impact of leisure-time physical activity, such as sport[2,3,33], our findings are of concern in terms of health inequalities in the population. Our results call for measures encouraging sport participation specifically targeting underprivileged groups, both because they need it the most and because they may not fully benefit from population-level interventions. In Geneva, affordable and quality sport facilities and programs are available to all[34]. Although necessary, such structural measures, especially when relying on wilful behaviours, may not be adapted to limit social inequalities. Indeed, disadvantaged groups may be less aware of the availability of such possibilities, and less likely to make sense of associated recommendations and follow them[35]. Additionally, individuals with lower socioeconomic conditions have been shown to face specific barriers to physical activity such as fatigue, health-related restrictions or financial limitations, their main motivations being enjoyment, health benefits and social interaction or support[36]. To ensure an equitable uptake, targeted interventions should hence aim at reducing these barriers while capitalizing on positive aspects of sport participation. A possibility could be to involve members of underprivileged groups in the delivery of or referral for financially accessible sport sessions[37]. Promoting sporting activities that are already practised in socially disadvantaged communities, while drawing on group interactions and highlighting health benefits could also improve the acceptance of such measures. Finally, it seems important to propose achievable and enjoyable activities that are adapted to the participants needs and abilities beyond their socioeconomic conditions, for instance by also taking their age, gender and health condition into account[36].

This study presents some limitations. Despite the random selection process, individuals with a lower secondary educational level were underrepresented in the sample (7.7% vs 25.4% in the Geneva population)[38]. As health consciousness may be related to a greater interest in epidemiological research, we cannot exclude that underprivileged participants in our study engaged in more sporting activities, than non-participants from similar socio-economic backgrounds. This could lead our results to underestimate socio-economic inequalities in sport participation. On the other hand, social desirability bias related to healthy behaviour was found to be particularly pronounced among privileged individuals[39]. Consequently, they may be more prone than disadvantaged people to over-report sport participation, which in turn could lead to an overestimation of inequalities. The overall prevalence of sport participation may be overestimated, both because of the underrepresentation of

disadvantaged individuals who are less likely to engage in a sporting activity, and because of the potential social desirability bias related to the use of self-reported data. Finally, as we assessed sport participation over the previous week, we cannot exclude a seasonal effect in the practice of sporting activities such as skiing or running. However, the effect on our results was thought to be negligible as appointment timing was random over the year.

This study also has major strengths. It relied on a population-based design with a random selection, targeting a large age range. The sizeable sample enabled stratification by sport and sex. Inequalities in sport participation were estimated using three different socio-economic indicators and their evolution over time was measured over 15 years. Finally, we were able to exclude people with reduced mobility to restrict our analyses to individuals able to engage in sporting activities.

5. CONCLUSION

This study showed that sport participation is consistently higher among socio-economically advantaged individuals, although the size of inequalities differs according to the type of sport. Group sports showed the lowest relative inequalities, while sizeable inequalities were observed in racket and special sports. These results call for tailored strategies to promote sport participation among socially disadvantaged populations.

6. STATEMENTS & DECLARATIONS

Funding

The Bus Santé study is funded by the General Directorate of Health, Canton of Geneva, Switzerland, and the Geneva University Hospitals. None of these institutions participated in the analyses or interpretation of results.

Competing interests

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Author Contributions

All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation and data collection were performed by Giovanni Piumatti. Additional material preparation and analysis were performed by Viviane Richard who also wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors critically revised the first draft of the manuscript and approved the final one.

Ethics approval

The Bus Santé study was approved by the Institute of Ethics Committee of the University of Geneva (ID 10-030R).

Consent to participate

Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Acknowledgement

We thank the Bus Santé team who collected the data, as well as the participants for their invaluable contribution to the study.

Licence statement

The Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work, an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our licence.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which Creative Commons licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

7. REFERENCES

1 Penedo FJ, Dahn JR. Exercise and well-being: a review of mental and physical health benefits associated with physical activity. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 2005;**18**:189–93. doi:10.1097/00001504-200503000-00013

2 Warburton DER, Nicol CW, Bredin SSD. Health benefits of physical activity: the evidence. *CMAJ* 2006;**174**:801–9. doi:10.1503/cmaj.051351

3 Eime RM, Young JA, Harvey JT, *et al.* A systematic review of the psychological and social benefits of participation in sport for adults: informing development of a conceptual model of health through sport. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2013;**10**:135. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-10-135

4 Reiner M, Niermann C, Jekauc D, *et al.* Long-term health benefits of physical activity – a systematic review of longitudinal studies. *BMC Public Health* 2013;**13**:813. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-813

5 World Health Organization. WHO guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. 2020.

6 Marques A, Sarmento H, Martins J, *et al.* Prevalence of physical activity in European adults — Compliance with the World Health Organization's physical activity guidelines. *Prev Med* 2015;**81**:333–8. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.09.018

7 Hallal PC, Andersen LB, Bull FC, *et al.* Global physical activity levels: surveillance progress, pitfalls, and prospects. *The Lancet* 2012;**380**:247–57. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60646-1

8 Moschetti K. The Determinants of Sport Participation in Switzerland. Swiss J. Sociol. 362 259-276. 2010.

9 Beenackers MA, Kamphuis CB, Giskes K, *et al.* Socioeconomic inequalities in occupational, leisure-time, and transport related physical activity among European adults: A systematic review. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2012;**9**:116. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-9-116

10 Gidlow C, Johnston LH, Crone D, *et al.* A systematic review of the relationship between socio-economic position and physical activity. *Health Educ J* 2006;**65**:338–67. doi:10.1177/0017896906069378

11 Kirk MA, Rhodes RE. Occupation correlates of adults' participation in leisure-time physical activity: a systematic review. *Am J Prev Med* 2011;**40**:476–85. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2010.12.015

12 Eime RM, Charity MJ, Harvey JT, *et al.* Participation in sport and physical activity: associations with socio-economic status and geographical remoteness. *BMC Public Health* 2015;**15**:434. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1796-0

13 Greendorfer SL. Social class influence on female sport involvement. *Sex Roles J Res* 1978;**4**:619–25. doi:10.1007/BF00287205

14 Karusisi N, Thomas F, Méline J, *et al.* Spatial accessibility to specific sport facilities and corresponding sport practice: the RECORD Study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2013;**10**:48. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-10-48

15 Hoebel J, Finger JD, Kuntz B, *et al.* Changing educational inequalities in sporting inactivity among adults in Germany: a trend study from 2003 to 2012. *BMC Public Health* 2017;**17**:547. doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4478-2

16 Gugusheff J, Foley BC, Owen KB, *et al.* Trends in Walking, Moderate, and Vigorous Physical Activity Participation Across the Socioeconomic Gradient in New South Wales, Australia From 2002 to 2015. *J Phys Act Health* 2020;**17**:1125–33. doi:10.1123/jpah.2020-0070

17 Galobardes B, Costanza MC, Bernstein MS, *et al.* Trends in Risk Factors for Lifestyle-Related Diseases by Socioeconomic Position in Geneva, Switzerland, 1993–2000: Health Inequalities Persist. *Am J Public Health* 2003;**93**:1302–9. doi:10.2105/AJPH.93.8.1302

18 Ding D, Do A, Schmidt H-M, *et al.* A Widening Gap? Changes in Multiple Lifestyle Risk Behaviours by Socioeconomic Status in New South Wales, Australia, 2002–2012. *PLOS ONE* 2015;**10**:e0135338. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0135338

19 Hanibuchi T, Nakaya T, Honjo K. Trends in socioeconomic inequalities in self-rated health, smoking, and physical activity of Japanese adults from 2000 to 2010. *SSM - Popul Health* 2016;**2**:662–73. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2016.09.002

20 Scholes S, Bann D. Education-related disparities in reported physical activity during leisure-time, active transportation, and work among US adults: repeated cross-sectional analysis from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys, 2007 to 2016. *BMC Public Health* 2018;**18**:926. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-5857-z

21 Guessous I, Bochud M, Theler J-M, *et al.* 1999–2009 Trends in Prevalence, Unawareness, Treatment and Control of Hypertension in Geneva, Switzerland. *PLOS ONE* 2012;**7**:e39877. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0039877

22 Bernstein M, Sloutskis D, Kumanyika S, *et al.* Data-based Approach for Developing a Physical Activity Frequency Questionnaire. *Am J Epidemiol* 1998;**147**:147–54. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a009427

23 UNESCO Institute for Statistics. International Standard Classification of Education ISCED 2011. 2012.

24 OECD. What are equivalence scales? *OECD Proj Income Distrib Poverty*http://www.oecd.org/economy/growth/OECD-Note-EquivalenceScales.pdf via www.oecd.org/social/inequality.htm

25 Mackenbach JP, Kunst AE. Measuring the magnitude of socio-economic inequalities in health: An overview of available measures illustrated with two examples from Europe. *Soc Sci Med* 1997;**44**:757–71. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(96)00073-1

26 World Health Organization (WHO). Obesity□: preventing and managing the global epidemic□: report of a WHO Consultation on Obesity, Geneva, 3-5 June 1997. Published Online First: 1998.https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/63854 (accessed 14 Sep 2020).

27 Szilcz M, Mosquera PA, Sebastián MS, *et al.* Time trends in absolute and relative socioeconomic inequalities in leisure time physical inactivity in northern Sweden. *Scand J Public Health* 2018;**46**:112–23. doi:10.1177/1403494817713123

28 Shrestha S, Kestens Y, Thomas F, *et al.* Spatial access to sport facilities from the multiple places visited and sport practice: Assessing and correcting biases related to selective daily mobility. *Soc Sci Med* 2019;**236**:112406. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112406

29 Stone G. Some meaning of american sport. *Proc Natl Coll Phys Educ Assoc Men* 1957;**60**:6–29.

30 Cerin E, Leslie E. How socio-economic status contributes to participation in leisure-time physical activity. *Soc Sci Med* 2008;**66**:2596–609. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.02.012

31 Hu Y, Lenthe FJ van, Borsboom GJ, *et al.* Trends in socioeconomic inequalities in self-assessed health in 17 European countries between 1990 and 2010. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2016;**70**:644–52. doi:10.1136/jech-2015-206780

32 Eurofound. Income inequalities and employment patterns in Europe before and after the Great Recession. 2017.

33 Arem H, Moore SC, Patel A, *et al.* Leisure Time Physical Activity and Mortality: A Detailed Pooled Analysis of the Dose-Response Relationship. *JAMA Intern Med* 2015;**175**:959–67. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.0533

34 Mutter O, Guinand L. Concept cantonal du sport - Genève. 2013.

35 White M, Adams J, Heywood P. How and why do interventions that increase health overall widen inequalities within populations? *Soc Inequal Public Health* 2009;:65–80.https://doi.org/10.1332/POLICYPRESS/9781847423207.003.0005

36 Pedersen MRL, Hansen AF, Elmose-Østerlund K. Motives and Barriers Related to Physical Activity and Sport across Social Backgrounds: Implications for Health Promotion. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**:5810. doi:10.3390/ijerph18115810

37 O'Mara-Eves A, Brunton G, Oliver S, *et al.* The effectiveness of community engagement in public health interventions for disadvantaged groups: a meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health* 2015;**15**:129. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1352-y

38 OCSTAT. Niveau de formation et qualifications□: statistiques cantonales. Off. Cant. Stat. https://www.ge.ch/statistique/domaines/apercu.asp?dom=15_03 (accessed 30 Apr 2021).

39 Hebert JR, Ebbeling CB, Matthews CE, *et al.* Systematic Errors in Middle-Aged Women's Estimates of Energy Intake: Comparing Three Self-Report Measures to Total Energy Expenditure from Doubly Labeled Water. *Ann Epidemiol* 2002;**12**:577–86. doi:10.1016/S1047-2797(01)00297-6

LEGENDS OF FIGURES

Fig. 1 Relative and slope indexes of inequality (RII/SII) and 95% confidence intervals of sport participation among Geneva adults aged 20 to 75 years old, according to the educational level, stratified by sport category. Generalized linear model following a quasi-Poisson distribution for the RII and linear model for the SII. Minimal model, adjusted for age, sex, an interaction between age and sex, and country of birth. Sport categories: Individual outdoor (running, brisk walking, racing bicycle, n=2338); Individual with facilities (strength training/weightlifting, swimming, ice-/roller-skating, n=1866); Racket/martial arts (judo/karate, tennis/badminton, squash, n=488); Group (dance, football, handball, gymnastics, n=1939); Special (golf, downhill/water skiing, cross-country skiing, diving, n=662). N=7689

Fig. 2 Relative index of inequality (RII) for educational level, stratified by specific sport among Geneva adults aged 20 to 75 years old. Generalized linear model following a quasi-Poisson distribution adjusted for age, sex, an interaction between age and sex, and country of birth. N=7689

Fig. 3 Relative and slope indexes of inequality (RII/SII) and 95% confidence intervals of sport participation according to the educational level, per year, among Geneva adults aged 35 to 75 years old. Generalized linear model following a quasi-Poisson distribution for the RII and linear model for the SII. Minimal model adjusted for sex, age, an interaction between age and sex, and country of birth. N=9711


Relative index of inequality (RII)
RII
7.0
6.0
5.0
4.0
3.0
2.0
1.0
All
Individual outdoor
Individual with facilities
Racket/martial arts
Group
Special
Slope index of inequality (SII)
SII
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0.0
All
Individual outdoor
Individual with facilities
Racket/martial arts
Group
Special
Sport category


Handball (n=31)
Football (n=281)
Squash (n=52)
Strength training (n=1142)
Ice-/roller-skating (n=57)
Bicycling (n=512)
Brisk walking (n=925)
Running (n=1432)
Gymnastics (n=1283)
Swimming (n=849)
Dance (n=505)
Judo/Karate (n=90)
Golf (n=114)
Downhill skiing (n=374)
Tennis/badminton (n=357)
Diving (n=83)
Cross-country skiing (n=124)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
Relative index of inequality


Relative index of inequality (RII)
RII
2.50
2.00
1.50
1.00
0.50
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
Slope index of inequality (SII)
SII
0.50
0.25
0.00
-0.25
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
Year