Performance of high-level Spanish athletes in the Olympic Games according to gender
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Abstract

No studies have been found that analyzed the probabilities of high-level athletes according to gender for accessing programs that promote the professionalization of sports, and participation and success in the OG in Spain. This could explain the gender differences in these parameters and the trend towards more egalitarian data in recent years. The objective of this study was to analyze the probabilities of Spanish high-level athletes for participating and achieving sporting success in the 2008, 2012 and 2016 Olympic Games (OG). Data relating to a sample of 3757 high-level Spanish athletes (2398 men and 1359 women) between 2005 and 2016 were examined. The variables of gender, having obtained a scholarship from the Association of Olympic Athletes (ADO) program, training in a High Performance Center (CAR), participation and performance in the OG were analyzed. It was found that high-level female athletes were more likely than male athletes to belong to the ADO program ($\chi^2 = 26,151; r^* = 0.083; p = 0.000$) and CAR ($\chi^2 = 13,847; r^* = 0.061; p = 0.000$), and to qualify for an OG ($\chi^2 = 22,838; r^* = 0.078; p = 0.000$), the same trend was found in the three Olympic cycles analyzed. With respect to the results in the OG, in general, no differences were found according to gender, although women were more likely to be finalists ($\chi^2 = 4,406; r^* = 0.071; p = 0.036$), and more prominently in the 2016 OG ($\chi^2 = 16,118; r^* = 0.228; p = 0.000$). The same applies to winning a medal ($\chi^2 = 5.939; r^* = 0.145; p = 0.015$), more specifically bronze at the 2012 OG ($\chi^2 = 6.215; r^* = 0.149; p = 0.013$). In conclusion, high-level female athletes in Spain have a higher percentage of access to high-level athlete support programs such as ADO and CAR, as well as participation in OG.

Introduction

The modern Olympic movement was originally founded on the pillars of sporting amateurism. Its main advocate, Pierre de Coubertin, argued that the practice of sports should be dissociated from economic profit, which led to the exclusion of professional athletes from participation in the Olympic Games (OG) during the first decades of the twentieth century. This thinking was made official in Rule 26 of the Olympic Charter [1]. It was not until 1974 when the president of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), Lord Michael M. Killanin (1972–1980), made...
an amendment to Rule 26 (By-Law Rule) modifying the eligibility criteria for Olympic athletes. Under this By-Law Rule, athletes were allowed to obtain economic and material rewards derived from their sporting performance. According to the same amendment, effective control over the selection criteria for athletes was transferred to the International Federations (IF), causing certain IF to create specific incentives aimed at the full-professionalization of their athletes and high performance [2]. Finally, in 1986, IOC’s President Juan Antonio Samaranch (1980–2001) made a new amendment allowing Olympic athletes to sign lucrative advertising contracts while declaring the OG open to all athletes, whether amateur or professional [3].

This phenomenon has led to a restructuring of the goals and objectives of sports structures in order to meet the needs of professional athletes to optimize their sports performance [4, 5]. In this regard, the professionalization of sports has provided sufficient resources for its optimization through improvements in equipment, techniques and tactics, professionalization of agents, new training methods, more efficient analysis tools, etc. [6, 7]. As a result, the characteristics of the athletes have evolved, leading to a morphological optimization, especially in those skills that are most closely related to sports performance [8–10]. As a consequence, numerous research studies have addressed the importance of sports professionalization on sports performance [11–13]. Thus, an association has been found between physical abilities, anthropometric characteristics, physiological and neuromuscular aspects [14], and the probability of athletic success in Olympic sports, which are also influenced by other aspects such as previous experience and age [15–17].

In order to seek better performance in elite sport, most nations have developed, to a greater or lesser extent, structures designed to promote sporting talent. In other cases, the promotion of high-level sport has been mostly based on college sport, as in the USA [18]. In Spain, as a result of all of the above, a regulatory framework was created that included the figure of the high-level athlete in the Sports Law of 1990 [19]. This meant that the athletes were guaranteed the necessary preparation and training to maintain their physical and technical fitness, as well as participation in official competitions for which they qualified [20]. This Law promoted the development of high-level and high-performance sports by establishing, among other measures, a public investment contribution through annual allocations included in the National Budget, which are still maintained to this day [19]. With the advent of this Law, Spain has been establishing the guidelines for high-level and high-performance athletes, for them to have sufficient and adequate human and material resources for their preparation [21]. At the same time, the Association of Olympic Athletes (ADO) program was created in 1987, with the objective of improving the performance of Spanish athletes in the Olympic Games of Barcelona ’92 [19, 22]. Subsequently, Royal Decree 971/2007 of July 13, 2007 was published, which specified the scholarships or aid granted by the Consejo Superior de Deportes (CSD, Sports Council) to live and train at the High Performance Centers (CAR). Similarly, to complete the academic and professional training of these athletes, measures such as the reservation of university places in higher education for elite athletes were approved [19]. As a by-product of all this, in recent decades there has been a progressive professionalization, technification and economic dependence in the world of sport, which especially affects elite and high-performance sports [23].

However, professionalization may not have reached both genders equally in Spain. Until the Rio 2016 Olympic Games, out of the 3649 athletes who had represented Spain, 74.6% were men, who won 67.13% of Spain’s total Olympic medals. Not in vain, in the first six Olympic editions in which Spain officially participated (1920–1952), only two women qualified (both in Paris 1924, in tennis) without obtaining any medal, while men won six medals in that period. From Rome 1960 onwards, there was an incipient presence of women in the Spanish Olympic team without ever exceeding 15% of the total number of qualified athletes and without obtaining any medal either. Barcelona 1992 was the true explosion of elite women’s sport in Spain.
Their participation reached 30% (125 out of 421 participants), winning 36% of the Spanish medals in those Olympic Games [23]. Nonetheless, since 2008, a change in this trend has been observed, as observed by the Spanish Olympic women reaching parity quotas of participation in the Olympic editions of Beijing, London, and Rio, having even surpassed the number of medals won by men in 2012 and 2016 [23, 24]. The historical performance of Spanish Olympic women must be put in context with the lack of equality for women’s sport within the Olympic movement. For example, women’s track and field events were not approved until 1928 or field hockey until 1984 [25], both disciplines in which Spanish women have won gold medals. As for the inequalities in participation, in 1920, Spain’s, first official OG, only 2.6% were women. By 1952, this percentage increased at 10.5%; in 1972 at 15%; and in Rio 2016, a total 45% of athletes were women [26].

Despite all of the above, no studies have been found that analyzed the probabilities of high-level athletes according to gender for accessing programs that promote the professionalization of sports, and participation and success in the OG in Spain. This could explain the gender differences in these parameters and the trend towards more egalitarian data in recent years. Therefore, the aim of this study was to analyze the probabilities of high-level Spanish athletes for participating and achieving sporting success in the 2008, 2012, and 2016 OG. For this, the variables of gender, having obtained a scholarship from the Association of Olympic Athletes (ADO) program and training in a High Performance Center (CAR), were analyzed.

**Materials and methods**

**Study design**

The design of this research was descriptive and cross-sectional. The STROBE statement [27] was followed for the development of the manuscript. Before the study began, approval was obtained from the institutional ethics committee (code 19.06.2015). In addition, the Spanish Olympic Games ceded the data collected to the Center for Olympic Studies of the Catholic University of Murcia, Spain, confidentially.

**Participants**

A total of 3757 high-level athletes from Spain between 2005 and 2016 (2398 men and 1359 women) participated in the present study. The sample corresponded to the sample universe. The inclusion criteria were: 1) to be a high-level athlete in Spain between 2005 and 2016, with publication of one’s name in the Official State Bulletin and the Annual Report from the Sports Council of Spain.

**Procedure**

For this study, data were collected on the participation of high-level athletes in the 2008, 2012 and 2016 Olympic Games; on the medals and diplomas obtained in these three Games, both in total and medals and diplomas separately, and for each type of metal; on participation in the finals in these Games; on obtaining an ADO scholarship; and on whether they trained at the CAR. All of these variables were collected, and scored using a dichotomous scale (yes or no) for each of the high-level athletes.

Medals are awarded for finishing in the top three of a competition. The type of metal indicates the position (1st gold, 2nd silver, and 3rd bronze). Diplomas are awarded for finishing in 4th to 8th place, inclusive. Both medalists and diploma holders are considered finalists. In both individual and team competitions, only one medal/diploma is awarded; while finalists are considered to be all the team members who have finished in the first eight positions.
The datasets generated for this study are available from the Zenodo database (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4663047).

Statistical analysis
After analyzing the normality of the variables with a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, a descriptive analysis was performed for the qualitative variables (counts and percentages). The Cramer’s V statistic was utilized for the post hoc comparison of 2x2 tables, and the contingency coefficient statistic was used for 2xn tables, showing the value of the statistic and the p value. The maximum expected value was 0.707; a low association was indicated if $r < 0.3$; a moderate association if the $r$ value was between 0.3 and 0.5, and a high association if $r > 0.5$. The statistical analysis was performed using the statistical package SPSS 21.0 for Windows. An error of $p \leq 0.05$ was established.

Results
Table 1 shows the gender differences of high-level athletes who participated in the 2008, 2012, and 2016 OG, trained at CARs, or obtained a scholarship from the ADO program. It was found that while there was a greater number of men considered as high-level athletes who participated in an OG, trained at a CAR, or obtained an ADO scholarship, among the women analyzes, it was statistically more likely for them to attend an OG, train at a CAR, or obtain a scholarship from the ADO program. The same trend was found when analyzing each of the three Olympic cycles separately, except for participation in the 2012 OG or CAR attendance in 2016; although the associations for all the variables were low.

Table 2 shows the differences between male and female Olympians with respect to winning medals, diplomas, or being a finalist in the Olympic Games. In absolute numbers, men won a higher number of medals, diplomas, or reached the finals as compared to women. The same trend was found at Beijing 2008. In London 2012, women won more medals than men. Already in Rio 2016, the number of medals and finalists was higher for women, while the number of diplomas was higher for men. However, when analyzing the results of the chi-squared test, it was found that gender did not seem to significantly influence these aspects, except for the probability of being a finalist, where there was a significantly higher percentage of women. When analyzing the differences in the relationship of these variables according to the Olympic cycle, it was found that there were significant differences in London 2012, where women won more medals in general, and specifically bronze medals, than men; and in Rio 2016, where women were finalists in a higher percentage of medals. In all cases, the association was low.

Discussion
The objective of the present research was to analyze the probabilities of Spanish high-level athletes in relation to gender, for being granted with an ADO program scholarship, training at a CAR, and/or participating and achieving sporting success in the 2008, 2012, and 2016 Olympic Games. The main finding was that women who were high-level athletes were more likely to obtain an ADO scholarship, train at a CAR, and qualify for the OG, than men. The latter may be a consequence of the two previous findings, since obtaining an ADO scholarship allows them to dedicate themselves professionally to sports [22, 24], while training at a CAR guarantees first level human, technical, and logistical resources for training [19, 28]. Both factors promote the optimization of sports performance. On the other hand, the higher percentage of high-level female athletes who obtained a scholarship from the ADO plan or trained at CAR, could be a result of the government policies related to the improvement of the role of women in Spanish society instituted in recent years, which affected the field of sports [29–31].
regard, complementary support programs in Spain such as the "Women and Sport" initiative from the Sports Council (2007) [30], the Plan for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men of the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (2003–2006) [32], the Organic Law 3/2007 of March for the effective equality between men and women (2007) [33], the Equal Opportunity Strategic Plan (2008–2011) [34], the II Plan for equality between women and men in the General State Administration and its Public Bodies (2015) [35], or the annual calls for applications for assistance to women, which provide special coverage for mothers and student athletes [30], all of which may have provided an additional stimulus for the increase in women’s sports performance. The entry of women into high-performance sports with the support of stakeholders has not only provided women with the opportunity to demonstrate their sporting competence, but as they have achieved sporting successes, the media coverage generated by these successes reinforced their role as sportswomen and women athletes [36, 37]. Comparing the results of the present research with previous studies, different authors have pointed out that

Table 1. Differences between males and females in participation in an OG, CAR training, and ADO plan scholarships, in general and according to Olympic cycles.

| Variable                  | Category | Men (n = 3757) | Women (n = 3757) | \( \chi^2 \); \( r^2 \); p |
|---------------------------|----------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Participation in OG       | Yes      | 164 (31.5%)    | 111 (24.1%)      | \( \chi^2 = 3.447; r^2 = 0.051; p = 0.063 \) |
|                           | No       | 357 (68.5%)    | 350 (75.9%)      |                           |
| Training at CAR           | Yes      | 167 (32.1%)    | 117 (41.2%)      | \( \chi^2 = 6.730; r^2 = 0.091; p = 0.009 \) |
|                           | No       | 354 (67.9%)    | 167 (58.8%)      |                           |
| ADO scholarship           | Yes      | 126 (24.2%)    | 93 (32.7%)       | \( \chi^2 = 6.804; r^2 = 0.092; p = 0.009 \) |
|                           | No       | 395 (75.8%)    | 191 (67.3%)      |                           |

OG: Olympic Games; CAR: High Performance Center; ADO: Association of Olympic Athletes

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251267.t001
Table 2. Differences between male and female Olympians in medals, diplomas and finalists overall and by Olympic cycles.

| Variable          | Category | Men (n = 499) | Women (n = 376) | \( \chi^2 \); r; p   |
|-------------------|----------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Medal or diploma  | Yes      | 90 (18.0%)    | 68 (18.1%)      | \( \chi^2 = 0.000; r = 0.001; p = 0.985 \) |
|                   | No       | 409 (82.0%)   | 308 (81.9%)     |                      |
| Medal             | Yes      | 28 (5.8%)     | 26 (6.9%)       | \( \chi^2 = 0.629; r = 0.027; p = 0.428 \) |
|                   | No       | 471 (94.4%)   | 350 (93.1%)     |                      |
| Gold              | Yes      | 9 (1.8%)      | 7 (1.9%)        | \( \chi^2 = 0.004; r = 0.002; p = 0.949 \) |
|                   | No       | 490 (98.2%)   | 369 (98.1%)     |                      |
| Silver            | Yes      | 13 (2.6%)     | 12 (3.2%)       | \( \chi^2 = 0.273; r = 0.018; p = 0.602 \) |
|                   | No       | 486 (97.4%)   | 363 (96.8%)     |                      |
| Bronze            | Yes      | 6 (1.2%)      | 7 (1.9%)        | \( \chi^2 = 0.645; r = 0.027; p = 0.422 \) |
|                   | No       | 493 (98.8%)   | 368 (98.1%)     |                      |
| Diploma           | Yes      | 62 (12.4%)    | 42 (11.2%)      | \( \chi^2 = 0.322; r = 0.019; p = 0.570 \) |
|                   | No       | 437 (87.6%)   | 334 (88.8%)     |                      |
| Finalists         | Yes      | 255 (51.1%)   | 219 (58.2%)     | \( \chi^2 = 4.406; r = 0.071; p = 0.036 \) |
|                   | No       | 244 (48.9%)   | 157 (41.8%)     |                      |

2008 OLYMPIC CYCLE (n = 285)

| Variable          | Category | Men (n = 164) | Women (n = 121) | \( \chi^2 \); r; p   |
|-------------------|----------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Medal or diploma  | Yes      | 35 (21.3%)    | 19 (15.7%)      | \( \chi^2 = 1.442; r = 0.071; p = 0.230 \) |
|                   | No       | 129 (78.7%)   | 102 (84.3%)     |                      |
| Medal             | Yes      | 14 (8.5%)     | 5 (4.1%)        | \( \chi^2 = 2.171; r = 0.087; p = 0.141 \) |
|                   | No       | 150 (91.5%)   | 116 (95.9%)     |                      |
| Gold              | Yes      | 5 (3.0%)      | 0 (0.0%)        | \( \chi^2 = 3.755; r = 0.115; p = 0.053 \) |
|                   | No       | 159 (97.0%)   | 121 (100.0%)    |                      |
| Silver            | Yes      | 7 (4.3%)      | 4 (3.3%)        | \( \chi^2 = 0.174; r = 0.025; p = 0.677 \) |
|                   | No       | 157 (95.7%)   | 117 (96.7%)     |                      |
| Bronze            | Yes      | 2 (1.2%)      | 1 (0.8%)        | \( \chi^2 = 0.103; r = 0.019; p = 0.748 \) |
|                   | No       | 162 (98.8%)   | 120 (99.2%)     |                      |
| Diploma           | Yes      | 21 (12.8%)    | 14 (11.6%)      | \( \chi^2 = 0.099; r = 0.019; p = 0.754 \) |
|                   | No       | 143 (87.2%)   | 107 (88.4%)     |                      |
| Finalists         | Yes      | 96 (58.5%)    | 58 (47.9%)      | \( \chi^2 = 3.151; r = 0.105; p = 0.076 \) |
|                   | No       | 68 (41.5%)    | 63 (52.1%)      |                      |

2012 OLYMPIC CYCLE (n = 281)

| Variable          | Category | Men (n = 170) | Women (n = 111) | \( \chi^2 \); r; p   |
|-------------------|----------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Medal or diploma  | Yes      | 27 (15.9%)    | 21 (18.9%)      | \( \chi^2 = 0.437; r = 0.039; p = 0.508 \) |
|                   | No       | 143 (84.1%)   | 90 (81.1%)      |                      |
| Medal             | Yes      | 6 (3.5%)      | 12 (10.8%)      | \( \chi^2 = 5.939; r = 0.145; p = 0.015 \) |
|                   | No       | 164 (96.5%)   | 99 (89.2%)      |                      |
| Gold              | Yes      | 1 (0.6%)      | 3 (2.7%)        | \( \chi^2 = 2.140; r = 0.087; p = 0.144 \) |
|                   | No       | 169 (99.4%)   | 108 (97.3%)     |                      |
| Silver            | Yes      | 5 (2.9%)      | 5 (4.5%)        | \( \chi^2 = 0.478; r = 0.041; p = 0.489 \) |
|                   | No       | 165 (97.1%)   | 106 (95.5%)     |                      |
| Bronze            | Yes      | 0 (0.0%)      | 4 (3.6%)        | \( \chi^2 = 6.215; r = 0.149; p = 0.013 \) |
|                   | No       | 170 (100.0%)  | 96.4 (%)        |                      |
| Diploma           | Yes      | 21 (12.4%)    | 9 (8.1%)        | \( \chi^2 = 1.269; r = 0.067; p = 0.260 \) |
|                   | No       | 149 (87.6%)   | 102 (91.9%)     |                      |

(Continued)
egalitarian demand of women in the field of sports has resulted in the entry of women into all sports structures [38, 39], although women’s access to sports management positions may still be somewhat limited [29].

Another important finding of the present research was that Spanish female Olympic athletes showed a higher probability for being finalists than male athletes in general, in particular in Rio 2016, and a higher probability for obtaining medals, especially bronze medals, in London 2012. This fact is especially significant when as Zheng et al. [40] have shown that from Barcelona 1992 to Rio 2016, the analysis of female competitions suggests that competitive balance has remained largely unchanged. Based on the results of the present research, it seems that despite women entering high-level sports later, they have done so with more strength, showing an upward trend in the achievement of great sporting success in the OG, as previous research has shown [37]. This could be due to equal access to official recognition as a high-level athlete, and to all the structures promoted by the stakeholders to favor professionalization in sports [19, 24]. This may have given Spanish athletes a competitive advantage over those from other countries without such support networks [31, 41]. Another possible reason could be that changes in aspects such as the socio-economic status of the female athlete and society’s attitudes towards gender issues in general, have influenced the Olympic success of female athletes [41]. In this sense, Spanish women have been acquiring prominence and relevance in the world of sports in recent decades, in parallel with their active incorporation into all spheres of society [30, 42]. However, future studies are needed to further analyze this trend in future OG.

Despite the achievements in women’s sports, the data from the present investigation indicate that in absolute terms, there is still a greater number of men who are considered high-level athletes in Spain, as well as ADO scholarship holders, training in a CAR, who attend OGs; who in general terms have achieved successful results in the OGs as compared to women. Previous studies have reported similar trends [43]. Gender differences in these areas may be due to the historical existence of a greater number of barriers for women seeking to achieve the status of professional athletes as compared to their male counterparts [44–46]. An example of this is that the eligibility criteria for the OG have traditionally been more restrictive

| Variable | Category | Men (n = 165) | Women (n = 144) | \( \chi^2; r^*; p \) |
|----------|----------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Medal or diploma | Yes | 28 (17.0%) | 28 (19.4%) | 0.317; r* = 0.032; p = 0.573 |
| | No | 137 (83.0%) | 116 (80.6%) | |
| Medal | Yes | 8 (4.8%) | 9 (6.3%) | 0.291; r* = 0.031; p = 0.590 |
| | No | 157 (95.2%) | 135 (93.8%) | |
| Gold | Yes | 3 (1.8%) | 4 (2.8%) | 0.320; r* = 0.032; p = 0.572 |
| | No | 162 (98.2%) | 140 (97.2%) | |
| Silver | Yes | 1 (0.6%) | 3 (2.1%) | 1.330; r* = 0.066; p = 0.249 |
| | No | 164 (99.4%) | 140 (97.9%) | |
| Bronze | Yes | 4 (2.4%) | 2 (1.4%) | 0.422; r* = 0.037; p = 0.516 |
| | No | 161 (97.6%) | 141 (98.6%) | |
| Diploma | Yes | 20 (12.1%) | 19 (13.2%) | 0.080; r* = 0.016; p = 0.777 |
| | No | 145 (87.9%) | 125 (86.8%) | |

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251267.t002

"Table 2. (Continued)"
for women, which has led to unequal opportunities for female athletes, not only for participating in the OG, but also in the access to technification and professionalization programs [47–49]. Although this matter has been evolving in recent years, there is still inequality in this area. Therefore, it seems necessary to modify the sports modalities that do not offer an equitable program for men and women, to eliminate the differences that grant more privileges to male events over female ones [48]. In this respect, it has been found that sports federations and other sports organizations should promote gender policies and create *ad hoc* programs to promote equality in all areas of sports [29, 50]. In agreement with this, previous research studies have pointed out the importance of the social context and the need for stakeholder support to enable the holistic development of the female athlete [41, 45], which allows not only their growth in sports, but also their educational progress with their inclusion in dual career programs [51, 52], and the resulting employment success during and after their active careers [53, 54]. These factors are essential for achieving the complete disappearance of the gender gap in sports [41, 53].

With respect to the limitations of the present study, the lack of data prior to 2008 for the analysis of longer-term developments, is worth noting. In addition, as most of the programs designed to eliminate the gender gap in sports are relatively new, there are no data on their ulterior impacts. These aspects need to be addressed in future research.

**Conclusions**

A higher percentage of high-level female athletes in Spain have access to high-level athlete support programs such as ADO and CAR. In addition, there is also a greater participation in the OG, and in recent years, there has been a tendency to achieve great sporting successes in these events. However, in absolute terms, the number of male Spanish athletes who consider themselves to be high-level athletes, who access athlete support programs, and who participate in the OG is still slightly higher.

**Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to thank the Spanish Olympic Committee (COE) for the provision of data for this study.

**Author Contributions**

**Conceptualization:** Alejandro Leiva-Arcas, Antonio Sánchez-Pato.

**Data curation:** Raquel Vaquero-Cristóbal.

**Formal analysis:** Raquel Vaquero-Cristóbal.

**Investigation:** Alejandro Leiva-Arcas.

**Methodology:** Alejandro Leiva-Arcas, Lucía Abenza-Cano, Antonio Sánchez-Pato.

**Project administration:** Lucía Abenza-Cano, Antonio Sánchez-Pato.

**Resources:** Alejandro Leiva-Arcas, Antonio Sánchez-Pato.

**Supervision:** Lucía Abenza-Cano, Antonio Sánchez-Pato.

**Writing – original draft:** Alejandro Leiva-Arcas, Raquel Vaquero-Cristóbal, Lucía Abenza-Cano, Antonio Sánchez-Pato.

**Writing – review & editing:** Alejandro Leiva-Arcas, Raquel Vaquero-Cristóbal, Lucía Abenza-Cano, Antonio Sánchez-Pato.
References

1. Mallon B, Widland T. The 1896 Olympic Games: results for all competitors in all events, with commentary. Jefferson: McFarland & Co; 2009.

2. Beamish R, Ritchie I. From Chivalrous ‘Brothers-in-Arms’ to the Eligible Athlete. Int Rev Sociol Sport. 2004; 39: 355–371. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798704000377

3. Crowther N. The state of the modern Olympics: Citius, altius, fortius? Eur Rev. 2004; 12: 445–460. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798704000377

4. Skinner J, Stewart B, Edwards A. Amateurism to Professionalism: Modelling Organisational Change in Sporting Organisations. Sport Manag Rev. 1999; 2: 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(99)70095-1

5. Law WW. The state, citizenship education, and international events in a global age: The 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. Comp Educ Rev. 2010; 54: 343–367. https://doi.org/10.1086/649425

6. Stefanis N. The state of the modern Olympics: Citius, altius, fortius? Eur Rev. 2004; 12: 445–460. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798704000377

7. Kellett P. Organisational Leadership: Lessons from Professional Coaches. Sport Manag Rev. 1999; 2: 150–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(99)70094-X

8. Norton K, Olds T. Morphological evolution of athletes over the 20th century: Causes and consequences. Sports Medicine. Adis International Ltd; 2001. pp. 763–783. https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200131110-00001 PMID: 11583103

9. Dopsaj M, Zuoziene IJ, Milicz R, Cherepov E, Erlikh V, Masiulis N, et al. Body composition in international sprint swimmers: Are there any relations with performance? Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020; 17: 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17249464 PMID: 33346744

10. Ruoranen K, Kienk C, Schlesinger T, Bayle E, Clausen J, Giauque D, et al. Developing a conceptual framework to analyse professionalization in sport federations. Eur J Sport Soc. 2016; 13: 55–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/16138171.2016.1153881

11. Thorpe RT, Strudwick AJ, Buchheit M, Atkinson G, Drust B, Gregson W. The Influence of Changes in Acute Training Load on Daily Sensitivity of Morning-Measured Fatigue Variables in Elite Soccer Players. Int J Sports Physiol Perform. 2017; 12: S2107–S2113. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2016-043399

12. Huebner M, Perperoglou A. Sex differences and impact of body mass on performance from childhood to senior athletes in Olympic weightlifting. PLoS One. 2020; 15: e0238369. Available: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238369 PMID: 32881924

13. García-Pallarés J, María López-Gullón J, Muriel X, Izquierdo M. Physical fitness factors to predict female Olympic wrestling performance and sex differences. J Strength Cond Res. 2012; 26: 794–803. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e31824741e7 PMID: 22207259

14. Radicchi F. Universality, Limits and Predictability of Gold-Medal Performances at the Olympic Games. PLoS One. 2012; 7: e40335. Available: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040335 PMID: 22808137

15. Houlihan B, Zheng J. The Olympics and Elite Sport Policy: Where Will It All End? Int J Hist Sport. 2013; 30: 338–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2013.765726

16. Leiva-Arcas A, Vaquero-Cristóbal R, Sánchez-Pato A, Abenca-Cano L, José Martínez-Patío M. Socio-demographic, economic and sports factors related to the participation of the Spanish Olympic. Retos. 2021; 417–424. https://doi.org/10.47197/RETOS.V0I4.85721

17. Jefatura del Estado. Ley 10/1990, de 15 de octubre, del Deporte. Madrid: Boletín Oficial del Estado; 1990.

18. Moscoso Sánchez D, Fernández Gavira J, Rodríguez Díaz A. De la democratización del deporte a la hegemonía de los mercados: el caso español. Movimiento. 2014; 20: 109–124.

19. Gómez S, Marti C, Gigante J, Opazo M. El plan ADO desde la perspectiva de deportistas, patrocinadores e institucionalidad: una evaluación basada en el diálogo entre los agentes. Madrid: IESE Business School—Universidad de Navarra; 2011.
23. Leiva A, Sánchez A. Análisis de los resultados de España en su participación en los Juegos Olímpicos de verano. In: Aragón A, Pernas J, editors. El olímpismo en España Una mirada histórica de sus orígenes a la actualidad. Barcelona: Fundación Olímpica Barcelona; 2019. pp. 295–336.

24. Leiva Arcas A, Sánchez Pato A, Martínez Patiño MJ. Impact Analysis of Ado Plan in the Spanish Olympic Results. Rev Int Med y Ciencias la Act Fis y el Deport. 2021; In press: 1–26.

25. Miragaya AM. The process of inclusion of women in the Olympic Games. Universidade Gama Filho. 2006.

26. Nunes RA. Women athletes in the Olympic Games. 2019 [cited 31 Mar 2021]. Available: http://rua.ua.es/dspace/handle/10045/85350.

27. Vandenbroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pocock SJ, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. Int J Surg. 2014; 12: 1500–1524. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.014 PMID: 25046751

28. Moreau WJ, Nabhan D. Organización y trabajo multidisciplinario en un centro olímpico de alto rendimiento en los estados unidos. Rev Médica Clínica Las Condes. 2012; 23: 343–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0716-8640(12)70320-6

29. Lerreite Cabrera MT, Martos Fernández P, Zabala Díaz M. Analysis of Spanish women's sport competition from the perspective of key players. Retos. 2015; 28: 3–8. https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v0i28.34821

30. Mujer y deporte | CSD—Consejo Superior de Deportes. [cited 26 Jan 2021]. Available: https://www.csd.gob.es/es/mujer-y-deporte.

31. Meier HE, Jetzke M, Nagm A, von Uechtritz C. Superior Sporting Performace in Athletics: Determinants and Sustainability. Soc Sci Q. 2019; 100: 1862–1898. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12684

32. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales. IV Plan de igualdad de oportunidades entre mujeres y hombres 2003–2006. Madrid: Gobierno de España; 2003.

33. Jefatura del Estado. Ley Orgánica 3/2007, de 22 de marzo, para la igualdad efectiva de mujeres y hombres. Madrid: Boletín Oficial del Estado; 2007.

34. Consejo de Ministros. Plan Estratégico de Igualdad de Oportunidades 2008–2011. Madrid: Boletín Oficial del Estado; 2007.

35. Ministerio de Hacienda y Administraciones Públicas. Resolución de 26 de noviembre de 2015, de la Secretaría de Estado de Administraciones Públicas, por la que se publica el Acuerdo del Consejo de Ministros de 20 de noviembre de 2015, por el que se aprueba el II Plan para la Igualdad entre mujeres y hombres. Madrid: Boletín Oficial del Estado; 2015.

36. Salido Fernández J. Olimpismo, género y comunicación: una aproximación al deporte femenino y a su representación en los medios deportivos. Comun y Género. 2020; 3: 173–182. https://doi.org/10.5209/cgen.68559

37. Barbero González MÁ. Rio Olympics 2016: The Eruption of Spanish Female Sport in Diario ABC. Citius, Altius, Fortius. 2017;10.1. https://doi.org/10.15366/citius2017.10.1.003

38. Tjønndal A. “Girls are not made of glass!”: Barriers experienced by women in Norwegian olympic boxing. Sociol Sport J. 2019; 36: 87–96. https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.2017-0130

39. Fasting K, Pfister G. Female and Male Coaches in The Eyes of Female Elite Soccer Players. Eur Phys Educ Rev. 2000; 6: 91–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X000061001

40. Zheng J, Dickson G, Oh T, Bosscher V De. Competitive balance and medal distributions at the Summer Olympic Games 1992–2016: overall and gender-specific analyses. Manag Sport Leis. 2019; 24: 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2019.1583076

41. Noland M, Stahler K. What Goes into a Medal: Women’s Inclusion and Success at the Olympic Games*. Soc Sci Q. 2016; 97: 177–196. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12210

42. Nuño Gómez L. La incorporación de las mujeres al espacio público y la ruptura parcial de la división sexual del trabajo: el tratamiento de la conciliación de la vida familiar y laboral y sus consecuencias en la igualdad de género. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Servicio de Publicaciones; 2009.

43. Pfister G. Outsiders: Female Coaches Intruding Upon a Male Domain? In: Pfister G, Sisjord MK, editors. Gender and sport—changes and challenges. Germany: Waxmann; 2013. pp. 71–103.

44. Lupo C, Guidotti F, Goncalves CE, Moreira L, Doupona Topic M, Bellardini H, et al. Motivation towards dual career of European student-athletes. Eur J Sport Sci. 2015; 15: 151–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2014.940557 PMID: 25145585

45. Lemmon M. Evening the playing field: women’s sport as a vehicle for human rights. Int Sport Law J. 2019; 19: 238–257. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40318-019-00148-5
46. Wheaton B, Thorpe H. Action Sports, the Olympic Games, and the Opportunities and Challenges for Gender Equity: The Cases of Surfing and Skateboarding. J Sport Soc Issues. 2018; 42: 315–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723518781230

47. Avena Koenigsberger A. Gender equality in the Olympic Movement: not a simple question, not a simple answer. J Philos Sport. 2017; 44: 329–341. https://doi.org/10.1080/00948705.2017.1359616

48. Teetzel S. Rules and reform: Eligibility, gender differences, and the olympic games. Sport Soc. 2011; 14: 386–398. https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2011.557275

49. Wilson W. The ic and the status of women in the olympic movement: 1972–1996. Res Q Exerc Sport. 1996; 67: 183–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1996.10607942 PMID: 8835997

50. Mon-López D, Tejero-González CM, Calero S. Recent changes in women’s Olympic shooting and effects in performance. PLoS One. 2019; 14: e0216390. Available: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216390 PMID: 31083662

51. Subijana CLD, Barriopedro M, Conde E. Supporting dual career in Spain: Elite athletes’ barriers to study. Psychol Sport Exerc. 2015; 21: 57–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.04.012

52. Abenza-Cano L, Leiva-Arcas A, Vaquero-Cristóbal R, García-Rocia JA, Meroño L, Sánchez-Pato A. Effect of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) on Elite Spanish Student-Athletes’ Perception of the Dual Career. Front Psychol. 2020; 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.620042 PMID: 33408676

53. Barriopedro M, López de Subijana C, Muniesa C. Insights into life after sport for Spanish Olympians: Gender and career path perspectives. PLoS ONE. Public Library of Science; 2018. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209433 PMID: 30557360

54. de Subijana CL, Ramos J, García C, Chamorro JL. The employability process of spanish retired elite athletes: Gender and sport success comparison. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020; 17: 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155460 PMID: 32751186