

## Family Determinants of Sports Consumption in the Sociological Aspect\*

### Rodzinne uwarunkowania konsumpcji sportowej w aspekcie socjologicznym

Zbigniew Dziubiński

Józef Piłsudski University of Physical  
Education of Warsaw, Poland

[zbigniew.dziubinski@awf.edu.pl](mailto:zbigniew.dziubinski@awf.edu.pl)

ORCID 0000-0001-9764-1338

Received: 29 Mar 2025

Revised: 20 Aug 2025

Accepted: 30 Oct 2025

Online First: 10 Nov 2025

**Abstract:** The aim of the work is to characterise the family as a social group reproducing attitudes and behaviours in the field of sports. More precisely, to show the family socio-cultural variables that determine sports consumption. The work presents the basic social issues that have a decisive impact on the participation of the family in sports consumption, namely the types of families, their structure, power, but also the types of families and the differences and inequalities that exist between them. The work is of a review-theoretical nature, in which existing empirical data constituting scientific theories, as well as data generated by earlier social researchers, were used. To solve the formulated research problem, the method of critical analysis of literature was used, but also, as a kind of auxiliary, the inductive and deductive method and the synthetic and analytical method. The conducted analyses show that the positioning of families in the social structure is of fundamental importance from the point of view of preparing the younger generation for sports consumption. The high position of the family in the social structure in terms of class, status and strata, the high position in social stratification in terms of access to such social resources as education, profession, wealth and social prestige, is a circumstance that favours socialisation to sports consumption and, in a sense, guarantees the participation of the family and its members in sports culture. The low position of the family in the social structure adversely affects the process of socialisation to sports consumption and, in some cases, makes it a socialisation to not participate in it.

**Keywords:** family, sports consumption, sociological conditions

**Abstrakt:** Celem pracy jest charakterystyka rodziny jako grupy społecznej reprodukcją postawy i zachowania w dziedzinie sportu. Precyzyjniej zaś, ukazanie rodzinnych zmiennych społeczno-kulturowych, które determinują konsumpcję sportową. W pracy zostały przedstawione podstawowe kwestie natury społecznej, które mają decydujący wpływ na uczestnictwo rodziny w konsumpcji sportowej, a mianowicie chodzi o typy rodzin, ich strukturę, władzę, ale także o rodzaje rodzin i występujące między nimi różnice i nierówności. Praca ma charakter przeglądowo-teoretyczny. Zostały w niej wykorzystane dane empiryczne zastane, konstytuujące teorie naukowe, ale także dane wytworzone przez wcześniejszych badaczy społecznych. Do rozwiązania sformułowanego problemu badawczego została wykorzystana metoda krytycznej analizy literatury, ale także, niejako pomocniczo, metody indukcyjna i dedukcyjna oraz metody syntetyczna i analityczna. Z przeprowadzonych analiz wynika, że usytuowanie rodzin w strukturze społecznej ma podstawowe znaczenie z punktu widzenia przygotowania młodszego pokolenia do konsumpcji sportowej. Wysokie ułożenie rodziny w strukturze społecznej w wymiarze klasowym, stanowym i warstwowym, wysokie ułożenie w stratyfikacji społecznej w wymiarze dostępu do takich zasobów społecznych, jak wykształcenie, zawód, bogactwo i prestiż społeczny, stanowi okoliczność sprzyjającą socjalizacji do



This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

\* Scientific work prepared as part of the activities of the University Research Project of the University of Physical Education in Warsaw UPB No. 11 entitled: „Social aspects of sport and physical culture practices in the cultural perspective of tradition, history and modernity” for the years 2025-2026.

konsumpcji sportowej i w jakimś sensie gwarantuje udział rodziny i jej członków w kulturze sportowej. Niskie ułożenie rodziny w strukturze społecznej niekorzystnie wpływa na proces socjalizacji do konsumpcji sportowej, a w niektórych przypadkach czyni z niego socjalizację do nieuczestniczenia w niej.

**Słowa kluczowe:** rodzina, konsumpcja sportowa, socjologiczne uwarunkowania

## INTRODUCTION

Family is unanimously recognized by sociologists as a social microstructure, a basic institution present in all types of societies, regardless of whether it is a traditional, modern or postmodern society. Everyone is born into a family, and it is the first environment of life. The structure of the family, the system of organisation, the way of functioning and the cultural, social and economic capital are very diverse. Regardless of the differences, we treat the existence of the family as something natural and obvious (Traver 2022; Lang 2020).

Regardless of the transformations of the family and its position in the social structure, it remains the basic group, implementing various and fundamental tasks of a biological-reproductive, socio-cultural, socialisation-care and psychological nature. Sociology is interested in the family in two ways. On the one hand, as a social group and its internal structure, the nature of the relations between its members, but also the functions it fulfils. It is also analysed as a primary group, which, according to Charles Horton Cooley, the forerunner of symbolic interactionism, is characterised by a strong bonding of its members through personal relationships and informal cooperation (Cooley 1962, 23). On the other hand, as an institution reproducing human beings in a controlled manner and the historical and cultural variability of the family (Pearce 2020).

The family is a group and a social institution in which sport is present to a greater or lesser extent, just as education, politics, economics, economy, religion, art, health care and others are present. This presence of sports in the family can manifest itself in many ways, namely the family home can be saturated with sports themes, or it can be marginalised or almost absent, household members can cultivate sports traditions in the family or not, they can actively practice sports or lead a lifestyle that does not include sports activity, they can participate directly or indirectly in sports events as spectators or fans or treat this type of participation as uninteresting and unnecessary, they can participate in competitive or professional or amateur

sports, general or recreational. Family members can practice various sports disciplines or participate in various forms of movement, these can be institutionalised, individual or family-based. The motivation for participating in sports can also be different, which can be a consequence of an internal need and the desire to pursue one's passions, but can also be a type of pressure from a closer (e.g. family) or wider social environment (Lenartowicz 2019, 267-277). The participation in sports of household members may be related to professional work as an instructor, teacher, coach, president, sports journalist, referee, scout, sports doctor, activist, etc., with work as a volunteer, steward, member of the security team, ball boy or with activities within the initiatives of various groups or fan organisations. Participation in sports may be accompanied by the realisation of various values, the cataloguing of which is extremely difficult, and perhaps impossible. Without going into detailed teleological or axiological analyses, all goals and values accompanying sports participation can be divided into autotelic and instrumental, but, according to another typology, proposed by Stanisław Ossowski, into felt and recognized or ceremonial and every day or, according to Antonina Kłoskowska, into objective (vital), recognized, felt and realised, i.e. expressed in action (Krawczyk 1997, 61-81).

In the literature on the subject, sports consumption is most often understood in a narrow way and is associated with direct participation in sports events at the stadium or sports hall and participation via mass media. In the broad, economic understanding of the concept, sports consumption also includes the purchase of goods in the form of clothing, footwear and sports equipment. This type of consumption is also interesting for sociologists due to the symbolic meaning of the purchased sports goods (Giulianotti 2002, 25-46; Baudrillard 2006). For the purposes of our analyses, I propose that sports consumption be treated in a broad way, which we can call anthropological and also include active, active, practical participation in sports in all forms, varieties, types and contents. Therefore, by this type of consumption we will understand the active use of sports offers according to needs, interests and expectations. Consumption of this type may concern recreational sports, health sports, sports for the elderly, children and youth, universal sports, for everyone, amateur sports, but also competitive, professional and spectacular sports (Lenartowicz 2012).

In the initial characterisation of the key concepts of work, such as the concepts of family and sports consumption, we can clearly see that they have many specific connections,

approximations, conditions, dependencies and penetrations. This is because the family is a primary micro social group characterised by a higher or lower level of sports habitus (Bourdieu and Passeron 2006) and sports consumption, differentiated by the choices, attitudes and social practices of its members.

## 1. PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE, MATERIAL AND RESEARCH METHOD

The aim of the work is to characterize the family as a social group reproducing attitudes and behaviours in the field of sports. More precisely, to show the socio-cultural variables that determine sports consumption. The basic social issues that have a decisive impact on the participation of the family in sports consumption will be presented, namely the types of families, their structure, power, but also the types of families and the differences and inequalities between them. Classical theories of social divisions will be used for this purpose: the dichotomous Marxist theory, the Weberian theory of social divisions and the American theory of social stratification. Scientific theories will be supplemented with the results of empirical research conducted by both Polish and foreign researchers. The basic function of the family, which is related to socio-cultural reproduction, will also be presented. The concept of family socialisation, primary socialisation, which plays a fundamental role in the process of preparing the young generation for sports consumption, will be used for this purpose (Dziubiński 2019, 145-158).

The work is of a review-theoretical nature, in which existing empirical data constituting scientific theories will be used, but also data generated by earlier social researchers. To solve the formulated research problem, the method of critical analysis of literature will be used, but also, as if auxiliary, the inductive and deductive method and the synthetic and analytical method.

## 2. FAMILY AS AN OBJECT OF INTEREST FOR SOCIOLOGY

In common opinion, the family is considered to be the basic, fundamental and constitutive element of every society, as the oldest and most durable element of social organisation. The family is most often associated with marriage, the ordering of sexual

relations, the reproduction of the species, socio-cultural reproduction, as well as with kinship and the household (Adamski 1984; *The Sociology of the Family* 1999). In many societies, especially pre-modern ones, as well as in some ethnic groups and environments, especially those with high religious or ideological saturation, it is surrounded with exceptional reverence and respect (Szlendak 2000, 312).

In sociological theory, attention devoted to the family is focused on the following three areas of issues. Firstly, it is primarily about the family as a microstructure, i.e. a small social group, secondly, as a universal and common social institution controlling the process of species reproduction and thirdly, as a primary group. Family members as a small social group are connected by marriage and blood ties (kinship), but also often by adoption, a system of dependencies and social interactions. They are elements of a common household and each of them plays a specific social role, including spouse: husband or wife, father or mother, child: son or daughter, but also grandfather and grandmother or other, closer and more distant relatives or in-laws. It would seem that the most durable and identity-giving element of the family is marriage. However, in-depth analyses indicate that this is not the case, because marriages increasingly often break up and end in divorce. The bonds between parents and children and between siblings are definitely more durable and integrated. Recognition of the family as a universal social institution results from its constitutive role for society and from the fact, as pointed out by social anthropologists, that it belongs, despite the enormous differentiation in terms of ritualisation and its manifestations, to the few cultural universals that occur in societies known to us. It is characterised by a relatively permanent system of activities aimed at meeting the needs and expectations of its members (*Romantic Passion* 1995). The family is also analysed by sociologists as a primary group, which is characterised by a small number of people, ensuring frequent direct interactions, long-term, calculated for a long common existence, a strong social bond between its members and an informal division of duties in a common family household. The family is the process of biological reproduction of the species, children are born in it, but there is also a process of socio-cultural reproduction, called socialisation in sociology, in which children are introduced into the social life and culture of this society and the axionormative system of the closer and more distant community is passed on to them (Cohen 2018).

In the sociological literature devoted to the issue of family, attention is drawn to the diversity of models of both marriages and families functioning in different types and forms of societies (Tyszka 1979). Various criteria for classifying families are used, including the most common typology of families based on size and composition, the structure of the marital relationship, the kinship system and the inheritance system, and power relations (Randall and Scott 2000). Another criterion for classifying families may be the structure of marriage. Monogamous families are most often distinguished, in which we are dealing with a sexual relationship between one man and one woman, but also polygamous families, in which the sexual relationship involves a larger number of people. In the literature on the subject, families are also classified according to the power relations present in them. A patriarchal family is distinguished, in which power is held by men. Such a family is sometimes called male-centric and is the object of criticism by feminist movements and circles. A matriarchal family is also distinguished, in which power is held by women (Williams, Sawyer and Wahlstrom 2008).

Numerous studies aimed at understanding the family have allowed for a better understanding of it and a cataloguing of the functions and goals that society sets for it. The family is a kind of micro-society, in which almost all phenomena and processes characteristic of the broader society occur. Researchers draw attention to and emphasize the importance of the following functions: emotional-sexual, biological reproduction of the population, educational-socialisation, protective-care, stratification or allocation, economic-economic, integration-control, recreational-social or expressive (Tyszka 1995, 3-10; Newman 2008).

It should be noted that the above-mentioned functions are given different meanings in individual families, with some functions manifesting themselves with greater and others with lesser force. The functioning of the family is significantly determined by the culture of the closer and more distant social environment. In a caste society, the position in the social structure is determined by the place in the traditional system of stratification. In an open postmodern society, the position of the family and its members is determined to a small extent by inherited characteristics, but above all by achieved characteristics related to education, power, wealth, profession and social prestige (Dziubiński 2016, 15-41).

### 3. EVOLUTION OF THE FAMILY

In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in Euro-American societies, families ceased to be treated as a contract between parties, ensuring economic and social stability, ordering sexual relations and securing the process of raising children, but became to a greater extent a place of erotic love between spouses and intensified parental feelings towards offspring. This happened, among others, due to socio-cultural changes, liberalisation of people's lives and the sexual revolution (Giddens 1992; *The Sociology of the Family* 1999). Changes in sexual customs and gender relations are closely related to the atomisation of the family community and individualisation and questioning the so-called “traditional biography” in favour of “modern biography”, for which the material is not exclusively drawn from the family source. The family ceased to be “the whole world” of a person, a place of birth, upbringing, learning, growth, development, work, care, old age and death, in which the principles of solidarity and community of needs dominated, and became only a part of this world. This was due to the development of capitalism, which undermined the previous rhythm of life and the need for a family in its traditional form (Hardyment 1999, 14).

Over time, marriages were concluded as a result of personal decisions of the young, and the motive was romantic considerations. Due to the lengthening of life, marriage ceased to be a couple raising a large number of children, and became a relationship based on feelings. A fairly clear division of a man's life occurred into the sphere of public affairs and matters related to professional work and the sphere of family life. The family home became a place of rest for a man, and the role of the father faded into the background, while the issue of his earning and financial security of the family came to the fore. The foundation of male identity was not the position of the father and the resulting relations with children, but the position of the husband and the resulting relations with the wife. The patriarchal power of the father, resulting from tradition, weakened more slowly than the actual changes in power in the family, which passed into the hands of the mother. This was largely the result of the abandonment of absolute monarchical power in favour of a democratic system (Gills 1996, 188).

In industrial society, after the production activity, which was almost entirely devoted to men, had been moved outside the family home, the woman was almost entirely connected to



the functioning of the private sphere of the family and burdened with reproductive, caregiving and educational duties. The role of the mother became more important than the role of the wife. The mother took over the place of the head of the household, not only in the social but also symbolic dimension. As child mortality decreased, the emotional attitude towards them also changed. They became the object of investment, not only emotional, but also organisational and economic. Children ceased to be only a source of benefits but were associated with increasingly significant costs. A new category of childhood also emerged as a period of life from which gainful employment was excluded (Zelizer 1989).

In the postmodern era, which falls on the last three decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the years of the third millennium, we are dealing with changes that are downright revolutionary in nature. This also applies to the family, which is of interest to us here, in which changes occur as a result of socio-cultural influence related to the development of science, and especially medical science, the dissemination of modern technologies, the dominance of rationality, individualism, pragmatism, consumerism, hedonism and convenience. These and other trends promote the separate treatment of sexual life, marriage and procreation, which in traditional society were strongly interconnected.

In the family, the twilight of patriarchal power is increasingly noticeable, which is largely limited by the state. It limits not only paternal power, but also parental power by introducing appropriate legislation, family courts, the institution of the children's rights advocate and many others. The husband's power is being radically limited as a result of, among other things, the emancipatory aspirations of women gathered in feminist movements and organisations. There has been a reduction in gender differences and inequalities in many aspects of life. Women are well-educated, have high professional competences and aspirations in the social and political sphere. The changes discussed are in line with the applicable formal regulations in the national, European and global dimension and are consistent with the basic principles of democracy and the concept of human rights. Women taking up professional work is becoming common and enables them to gain independence as well as a sense of self-worth, which gives them satisfaction and fulfilment. A woman is no longer perceived as a person solely responsible for the household, which has given rise to the need to equally burden both spouses with these duties. In this way, a partnership family was born, which operates according to the



“do it yourself” project and everything that happens within it is discussed, negotiated and agreed (Bernardes 1997).

In postmodern societies, the situation of the child in the family has changed dramatically. Due to the emergence of pension systems, the child ceased to be an investment providing parents with existential security in old age, and its well-being became the primary goal of the family. The child gained autonomy in the family, the parents' obligations towards the child began to dominate over rights, and new social categories of “childhood” and “teenagers” emerged, which were associated with certain social privileges and a lack of duties characteristic of adults. Children became a costly investment, requiring increasingly greater financial outlays, which consequently protect children from social degradation and ensure a high position on the labour market. The concepts of “high-quality” or “high-test” children appeared. The state has an increasing influence on the process of family reproduction. It controls the family through legislation guaranteeing the equality of parents and respect for the rights of the child, social legislation guaranteeing financial support for children in the family (Chris 2005).

Despite the changes taking place in the family related to its structure, power, positioning of its members, methods of financial security, organisation of reproduction, etc., the family in postmodern societies is valued and important, it is perceived as a place of the highest trust, security, harmonious cooperation, strong interpersonal bonds, respect, empathy and love. However, it should be noticed that the family is also a place of dangerous tensions, disintegration of bonds, physical violence, psychological abuse, suffering, rape and sexual harassment. Concepts such as “battered child syndrome”, “toxic parents”, “overprotective mothers” or “marital rape” are appearing with increasing frequency in discussions about the family. Such families are described in sociology as deviant, dysfunctional, oppressive or pathological. An extremely dangerous phenomenon in terms of consequences is the demographic collapse in European societies, which consists of a drastic decrease in the number of births. This situation has been going on for many years, and it is a situation in which generations are not being renewed, which means that more people die than are born. This not only causes the shrinkage of these societies, but also huge disruptions and complications in all areas of life (Hakim 1999, 25-50).

#### 4. THE FAMILY'S POSITION IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND ITS SPORT CONSUMPTION

When looking for the relationship between the position of the family in the social structure and sport, we notice that not all criteria of family differentiation have the same weight and significance for sociological analyses. For example, for our sociological analyses, the differences between families that are biological in origin, such as the height, eye or hair colour of its members and inherited family assets or noble or aristocratic titles and distinctions, are of lesser importance. On the other hand, the focus is on those differences that have their social consequences and concern positions, roles, and social divisions and inequalities. These differences not only divide families into better and worse ones but consequently differentiate them in terms of the level of sports culture and position in the social sports structure (Bourdieu 1978, 819-840).

In a sociological, macro-social perspective, families can be analysed in the context of social divisions in two ways, namely in a structural and gradational sense. In the first case, families are analysed as structurally related elements that make up a specific social whole. In the second, they are considered elements differently located on the scale of access to some valued social resource, in other words, they are arranged hierarchically within a specific category. An extremely important category, necessary to explain the issue of interest to us, is profession, which plays an extremely important, differentiating role in (post)modern society, but also helps to define the processes of social mobility. The discussed differentiations and social inequalities of families, treated as inequalities in life chances, are related to access to economic, cultural, educational, etc. resources, including sports resources. Access to valued social resources, including the resource of sports culture, can be analysed in the context of unequal access of families to these goods, but also the possibility of access to the community of families unequally distributed goods (Giddens 1973, 346).

Analysis of participation in sports consumption from the perspective of the Marxist theory of social divisions does not exhaust the issue but only shows certain tendencies that indicate class (economic) determinations of families. Max Weber, observing the development of European societies, noticed that the Marxian, bipolar and polarised class model is far from

precise, because it does not take into account those social categories that do not belong to the working class or the capitalist class. Weber, unlike Marx, did not limit his theory of social divisions to distinguishing one, economic criterion, but indicated that there are more and distinguished a material criterion – economic (division into classes), but also immaterial criteria, such as social prestige (division into estates) and power (division into parties).

Continuing the analysis of the undertaken issue, we can state that the location in the class or social layer significantly determines the participation of the family in sports consumption. The access of the family to social resources, such as education, wealth, profession, power, prestige, recognition and social respect, conditioned by class or layer, has a great influence on the participation of the family in sports consumption. It should be noted that access to each of these goods is important for the participation of the family in sports consumption, but access to all of them constitutes a huge multi-source force that somehow determines this participation. Numerous studies show that in meritocratic societies, access to these goods is complex, which means that well-educated people who hold high professional positions are usually wealthy, occupy a high position in the hierarchy of power and enjoy social respect. The opposite is the case for poorly educated families, those who do not work or work in professions that do not enjoy social recognition, are usually poor, have no access to power and do not enjoy social prestige. Therefore, we can say that a high position of families on the social stratification ladder clearly increases the probability of their participation in sports consumption, while a low position complicates and limits this participation (Eitzen and Sage 1991; Bourdieu 1978, 819-840).

The presented relationship is confirmed by numerous empirical studies conducted in the Polish society, as well as in other European and non-European societies. These studies clearly demonstrate that the position of family members, especially parents, in the social structure has a significant impact on the process of children's socialisation into sports consumption. This relationship is as follows: the higher the family and its members occupy and thus have access to the most valued social resources, such as wealth, education, power, prestige, etc., the more effective the process of sports consumption. The opposite is true for parents with a low position in the social structure (Organista and Lenartowicz 2019, 116-135; Lenartowicz, Dziubiński and

Jankowski 2017, 195-210; Fredricks and Eccles 2005, 3-31; Green, Wheeler and Johansen 2023, 615-636).

## 5. FAMILY SOCIALISATION FOR SPORT CONSUMPTION

Socialisation is the subject of interest of psychology, which focuses on personality development, cultural anthropology, which analyses the processes of transmitting culture, but also sociology, which analyses issues related to the regularities and similarities of human behaviour and the mechanisms of grounding the axiological-normative order. Socialisation understood in this way consists of both intended actions, called upbringing, carried out by such agencies as family, kindergarten, school, sports club, church or community centre, as well as unintended actions, i.e. those that affect the individual in their closer and more distant environment, and here we mean peer groups, acquaintances, work teams, information obtained within mass culture, family and social events, educational, political, social or economic and economic experiences. During socialisation, the individual learns and acquires values, patterns and norms of behaviour and emotional reactions, motor, interactional, intellectual and social competences, but also shapes their personality and identity (Tillmann 1996).

In the literature on the subject, two stages of socialisation are distinguished. Primary socialisation and secondary socialisation are usually distinguished, which differ not only in the nature of the course, introduction to other spheres of social life, but also in the time period of its occurrence in the life of the individual (Berger and Luckmann 1983, 202-249). The difference also lies, which is of particular importance from the point of view of our analyses, in the level of family involvement in its course. In the case of primary socialisation, the family is, metaphorically speaking, the whole world for the child, while in secondary socialisation its role is usually also significant, but definitely smaller due to the appearance of significant others from outside the family (Cromdal 2006, 462-466).

The birth of a child is closely related to the beginning of primary socialisation, which takes place in the family environment and the people who are its members. The key role is played by parents, who create a kind of total social environment that affects the child through all possible channels. Other family members may participate in this socialisation, but their role

is usually much smaller. It is also important to know that in the light of sociological theory, a person comes into the world without any social and cultural competences, in this respect, metaphorically speaking after John Locke, they are a “blank slate”. This means that they are not equipped with any knowledge and skills thanks to which they could understand the world around them and function within it. Genetic transmission is only a biological framework, a range of possibilities, the content of which depends entirely on the influence of the social environment. It is pointed out that the task of science is to detect the limitations resulting from biological heritage, to determine in what way and to what extent these boundaries can be shifted and modified (Kunicki-Goldfinger 1993, 86).

Just as in childhood, as a result of primary socialisation, an individual becomes a member of society, so too, by analogy, they become a member of a sports community. Socialisation for sports consumption can take different courses. It can be total and extremely intensive socialisation, fully preparing the child to move competently in the world of sports, but it can also be socialisation in which matters of participation in sports consumption are on the complete periphery. However, it must be added that regardless of the intensity of socialisation to participate in sports consumption, it takes place in every family, and the differences result from its intensity. During this primary socialisation, the child learns basic motor activities, control over their body, use of toys or specific equipment, cooperation with others, learns, metaphorically speaking, the ABC of sports, its basics in the physical-motor, emotional and social dimensions. For this reason, this type of family socialisation is the most important in the life of an individual, because it concerns the foundations of social and sports competences that shape the child's identity and awareness (Dziubiński 2022, 370-396).

During primary socialisation for sports consumption, a characteristic fundamental, basic or essential personality is formed. This is a personality characteristic of a given sports culture and sports institutions. It constitutes the subsoil, the basis and the canvas of value systems and emotional attitudes common to members of the surrounding community, on the basis of which personalised, individualised forms of the modal sports personality are created (Kardiner 1975, 86; Inkeles and Smith 1984, 434). Primary socialisation takes place in a special emotional climate, saturated with cordiality and love. The child is connected to the parents by an emotional bond, which creates a space for transmitting knowledge about the society and its culture and

their rules and principles to the child. This situation causes the child to mechanically take over from the parents all the transmitted content and skills related to sports culture, but also sports values and norms, attitudes and ways of behaving in the field of sports. Sports culture passed on to a child by parents is without alternative, the only possible one at all, to which the child is somehow condemned, which means that they live in a sports culture created by their parents (Kenyon and McPherson 1973, 303-332).

Based on the sociological theory of socialisation, we can say by analogy that primary socialisation to sports culture transforms over time into a more diverse socialisation in the context of sources of influence. The appearance in the child's consciousness of the concept of the generalised other is a sign of the individual entering the stage of secondary socialisation. It consists in the individual discovering universally respected regularities regarding sports consumption, discovering that it is not only the parents who are active in sports, but that this results from more general patterns. For example, families belonging to the upper class, enjoying social recognition and high in the social hierarchy, have a kind of obligation to participate in it if they do not want to expose themselves to negative social sanctions. Therefore, the discovery or awareness by an individual of a certain social obligation, the need to respect general social rules in the scope of participation in sports consumption, constitutes a kind of caesura for entering the stage of secondary socialisation (Warde 2006, 107-122).

Secondary socialisation occurs after family socialisation, thanks to which the individual has internalised the ABC of sports culture and on this basis learns to use it. Secondary socialisation introduces the individual to individual segments of the community and sports culture, the individual learns how to play roles occurring in sports, what is the scenario of the role of a participant in a game of hide-and-seek, a competitor in a sports club, a volunteer, an instructor, a coach, a scout, a referee or a club president. In secondary socialisation, not only parents are significant others, but there is a wider range of them. Regardless of this, secondary socialisation for sports consumption is built on primary socialisation. The role of parents is of course decreasing, but regardless of this, they have a very significant influence on their children's further preferences and choices regarding participation in sports consumption (Dziubiński 2019, 145-158).

## CONCLUSION

In contemporary societies, there is no single, universal type of family, but these primary social groups and social institutions come in many forms, types and shapes. They differ in terms of numbers, structure, division of power, inheritance, but also in ways of thinking, values, norms and patterns of behaviour. Families differ in their location in the social structure. Using the Marxist theory of social divisions, we can say that working-class families are located lower, while bourgeois families are located higher. According to Weber's more complex theory, families are not only differentiated by access to economic resources, but also by class affiliation, prestige and social recognition, and by access to power resources. Families also differ due to their different locations in social stratification due to such features as education, profession, wealth, power or social prestige.

The multifaceted analysis of the family allowed for the confirmation of certain social regularities that explain the issue of sports consumption by families and their individual members. It follows that the location of families in the bourgeois class, in a class with advantages on the free market, in a state that enjoys social respect and recognition, as well as in a high layer in terms of wealth, education, power, profession and social prestige, favours the participation of families in sports consumption. This is confirmed by both sociological theories and individual empirical studies conducted by Polish and foreign researchers. The situation is reversed when we are dealing with families that constitute the so-called social bottom, which means that they are located in a low class, low status and low social layer. This situation is intensified by the lack or limited access to valued and desired social resources related to education, wealth, profession, power or social prestige. Such a situation limits the possibilities of participating in sports consumption, and in some cases is alienating and exclusive.

The family, as it results from sociological theory, is also an institution whose basic functions, apart from biological reproduction, include teaching the child the ABCs of social life, introducing them to culture, to the world of values, norms and patterns of behaviour. In other words, it is about inculturation, according to social anthropologists, or socialisation, according to sociological terminology. The process of family socialisation, primary socialisation, is given



great importance in sociological theory, because it is considered the key to the survival and development of society and its culture.

The general socialisation process consists of domain-specific socialisation processes. One of them is the process of socialisation to participate in sports consumption, to get to know the world of sports and to acquire the skills to move around in it. This involves both the acquisition of sports values, norms, principles and patterns of behaviour relating to both active participation as part of social practice and direct or indirect participation in its spectacular segment, but also through the purchase of sports goods and services and the use of offers made by the sports and tourism industry.

The analyses carried out show that the position of families in the social structure is of fundamental importance from the point of view of preparing the younger generation for sports consumption. The high position of the family in the social structure in the dimension of class, status and stratification, the high position in social stratification in the dimension of access to such social resources as education, profession, wealth and social prestige, constitute a circumstance conducive to socialisation to sports consumption and in a sense guarantees the participation of the family and its members in sports culture. The low position of the family in the social structure adversely affects the process of socialisation to sports consumption and, in some cases, turns it into socialisation into non-participation.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.

#### REFERENCES:

- Adamski, Franciszek. 1984. *Socjologia małżeństwa i rodziny* [Sociology of Marriage and Family]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 2006. *Spółeczeństwo konsumpcyjne: jego mity i struktury* [The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures]. Translated by Sławomir Królak. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sic!
- Berger, Peter and Thomas Luckmann. 1983. *Spółeczne tworzenie rzeczywistości* [The Social Construction of Reality]. Translated by Józef Niżnik. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Bernardes, Jon. 1997. *Family Studies. An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1978. "Sport and social-class." *Social Science Information* 17 (6): 819-840.

- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 2006. *Reprodukcja. Elementy teorii systemu nauczania* [Reproduction: Elements of a Theory of the Educational System]. Translated by Magdalena Fuszara. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Chris, Jenks. 2005. *Childhood*. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, Philip. 2018. *The Family: Diversity, Inequality, and Social Change*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Cooley, Charles Horton. 1962. *Social Organization. A Study of the Larger Mind*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Cromdal, Jakob. 2006. "Socialization." In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, edited by Keith Brown, 462-466. North-Holland: Elsevier.
- Dziubiński, Zbigniew. 2016. "Struktura społeczna a sport." In *Kultura fizyczna a struktura społeczna* [Physical culture and social structure], edited by Zbigniew Dziubiński and Michał Lenartowicz, 15-41. Warszawa: AWF, SALOS RP.
- Dziubiński, Zbigniew. 2019. "Socjalizacja do kultury fizycznej." In *Socjologia kultury fizycznej* [Sociology of physical culture], edited by Zbigniew Dziubiński, Zbigniew Krawczyk and Michał Lenartowicz, 145-158. Warszawa: AWF.
- Dziubiński, Zbigniew. 2022. *Socjologia sportu i olimpizmu* [Sociology of Sport and Olympism]. Warszawa: AWF, SALOS RP.
- Eitzen, Stanley D. and Georg H. Sage. 1991. *Sociology of North American Sport*. Madison: Oxford University Press.
- Fredricks, Jennifer A. and Jacquelynne S. Eccles. 2005. "Family Socialization, Gender, and Sport Motivation and Involvement." *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 27 (1): 3-31.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1973. *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*. London: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1992. *The Transformation of Intimacy. Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gills, John. 1996. *A World of Their Own Making. Myth, Ritual, and the Quest for Family Values*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Giulianotti, Richard. 2002. "Supporters, Followers, fans, and flaneurs: A taxonomy of spectator identities in football." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 26 (1): 25-46.
- Green, Ken, Sharon Wheeler and Patrik Johansen. 2023. "Sport, children and socialization." In *The Oxford Handbook of Sport and Society*, edited by Lawrence A. Wenner, 615-636. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hakim, Catherine. 1999. "Models of the Family, Women's Role and Social Policy. A New Perspective from Preference Theory." *European Societies* 1: 25-50.
- Hardyment, Christina. 1999. *Rodzina* [Family]. Translated by Karolina Bober. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.
- Inkeles, Alex and Anthony D. Smith. 1984. "W stronę definicji człowieka nowoczesnego." Translated by Tadeusz Gosk. In *Tradycja i nowoczesność* [Tradition and modernity] edited by Joanna Kurczewska and Jerzy Szacki, 432-465. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
- Kardiner, Abram. 1975. "Osobowość podstawowa." Translated by Bogdan Chwedończuk. In *Elementy teorii socjologicznych: materiały do dziejów współczesnej socjologii zachodniej* [Elements of Sociological Theories: Materials for the History of Contemporary Western Sociology], edited by Włodzimierz Derczyński, Aleksandra Jasińska-Kania and Jerzy Szacki, 85-103. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- Kenyon, Gerald and Barry McPherson. 1973. "Becoming Involved in Physical Activity and Sport: A Process of Socialization." In *Physical Activity: Human Growth and Development*, edited by Lawrence Rarick, 303-332. New York: Academic Press.
- Krawczyk, Zbigniew. 1997. "Sport." In *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku. Kultura fizyczna, sport* [Encyclopedia of Polish culture of the 20th century. Physical culture, sports], edited by Zbigniew Krawczyk, 61-81. Warszawa: Instytut Kultury.
- Kunicki-Goldfinger, Władysław. 1993. *Znikąd donikąd* [From nowhere to nowhere]. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Lang, Diana. 2020. *Parenting and Family Diversity Issues*. Iowa: State University Digital Press.
- Lenartowicz, Michał, Zbigniew Dziubiński and Krzysztof W. Jankowski. 2017. "Aktywni Polacy: dwie dekady uczestnictwa w sporcie i rekreacji ruchowej: próba wyjaśnienia zmian." [Active Poles: two decades of participation in sports and active recreation: an attempt to explain the changes] *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 61 (2): 195-210.
- Lenartowicz, Michał. 2019. "Kultura fizyczna w rodzinie." In *Socjologia kultury fizycznej* [Sociology of physical culture], edited by Zbigniew Dziubiński, Zbigniew Krawczyk and Michał Lenartowicz, 267-277. Warszawa: AWF.
- Lenartowicz, Michał. 2012. *Klasowe uwarunkowania sportu i rekreacji ruchowej z perspektywy teorii Pierre'a Bourdieu* [Class determinants of sports and physical recreation from the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu's theory]. Warszawa: AWF.
- Newman, David. 2008. *Families: A Sociological Perspective*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Humanities.
- Organista, Natalia and Michał Lenartowicz. 2019. "Klasa społeczna a poziom i zróżnicowanie rodzinnej aktywności sportowo-rekreacyjnej." [Social class and the level and diversity of family sport and leisure practices. Qualitative study results] *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej* 15 (3): 116-135.
- Pearce, Elizabeth B. 2020. *Contemporary Families: An Equity Lens*. Albany, Oregon: Linn-Benton Community College.
- Randall, Collins and Coltrane Scott. 2000. *Sociology of Marriage and the Family: Gender, Love, and Property*. Chicago: Cengage Learning.
- Romantic Passion. A Universal Experience?*, edited by William Jankowiak. 1995. New York: Columbia University Press.
- The Sociology of the Family. A Reader*, edited by Graham Allan. 1999. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Szlendak, Tomasz. 2000. "Rodzina." In *Encyklopedia socjologii* [Encyclopedia of sociology]. Vol. 3, 312-321. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Tillmann, Klaus-Jürgen. 1996. *Teorie socjalizacji. Społeczność, instytucja, upodmiotowienie* [Theories of socialization. Community, institution, empowerment]. Translated by Grzegorz Bluszczyk. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Traver, Amy. 2022. *Sociology of the Family*. New York: CUNY Queensborough Community College.
- Tyszką, Zbigniew. 1979. *Socjologia rodziny* [Sociology of the family]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Tyszką, Zbigniew. 1995. "Rodzina w krajach cywilizacji postindustrialnej." [Family in post-industrial civilization countries] *Problemy Rodziny* 4: 3-10.

- Warde, Alan. 2006. "Cultural capital and the place of sport." *Cultural Trends* 15 (2-3): 107-122.
- Williams, Brian K., Stacey C. Sawyer and Carl M. Wahlstrom. 2008. *Marriages, Families, and Intimate Relationships: A Practical Introduction*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Zelizer, Viviana. 1989. "Pricing the Priceless Child: From Baby Farms to Black-Market Babies." In *Family in Transition. Rethinking Marriage, Sexuality, Child Rearing, and Family Organization*, edited by Arlene S. Skolnick and Jerome H. Skolnick, 103-110. New York: Longman Higher Education.