


Social Capital: Sports and recreational club membership (adults)

Downloaded from <https://www.canterburywellbeing.org.nz/our-wellbeing/social-capital/sports-and-recreational-club-membership-adults/> on 20/05/2024 11:50 AM


Evidence suggests that people who participate in sports and recreation enjoy better health and wellbeing and have a better quality of life [32-34]. When people are more productive and healthier, society benefits, and savings are made in the health system [33].

This indicator presents data from Sport New Zealand's *Active NZ Participation Surveys* 2017 to 2021 (each year, 20,000 adults are sampled via the Electoral Roll). This indicator presents the proportion of those aged 18 years and over who are currently a member of a sport or recreation club (other than a gym or fitness centre), in Canterbury and New Zealand. Note that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Active NZ survey was paused in 2020 and there is no Active NZ 2020 full year report.




The figure shows that approximately one-quarter of Active NZ survey respondents aged 18 years and over indicated that they were current members of a sport or recreation club (other than a gym or fitness centre) in Canterbury and New Zealand, from 2017 to 2021. Overall, respondents' sport or recreation club membership appears to have been relatively stable (perhaps increasing) over the period shown.

Breakdown by ethnicity




The figure shows that the proportion of Māori and Pacific respondents, aged 18 years and over, who indicated that they were current members of a sport or recreation club (other than a gym or fitness centre) in Canterbury, increased between 2019 and 2021 (39% and 47% respectively, in 2021). Sport or recreation club membership for European and Asian respondents in Canterbury appears relatively constant for the period 2017 to 2021. There is noticeable variability in the results for Māori, Pacific, and Asian respondents due to smaller absolute numbers in the sample.

Breakdown by age




The figure shows the proportion of respondents, aged 18 years and over, who indicated that they were current members of a sport or recreation club (other than a gym or fitness centre), in Canterbury, by age group, from 2017 to 2022. The figure shows a clear pattern of higher levels of club membership for young people compared with older people. There is noticeable variability in the results for the 75+ years age group, likely due to smaller absolute numbers in the sample.

Breakdown by gender




The figure shows a pattern of a higher levels of sport or recreation club membership (other than a gym or fitness centre), in Canterbury, for male respondents compared to female respondents, in Canterbury, 2017–2021 (male 31%; female 24%, in 2021).

Breakdown by deprivation



The figure suggests an inverse relationship between respondents’ levels of sport or recreation club membership (other than a gym or fitness centre), and increasing deprivation, in Canterbury, between 2017 and 2019. However, in 2021, the pattern of lower levels of participation for the more deprived groups is less pronounced (low, 29%, medium 25%, and high 27%).

Breakdown by disability



The figure shows a pattern of a higher level of sport or recreation club membership (other than a gym or fitness centre), in Canterbury, for respondents without a disability (30%) compared with respondents with a disability (25%), in Canterbury, 2017–2021. Note that in quarter 3 of 2019, the question and method of analysis concerning New Zealanders with a physical impairment (used from 2017 onwards) were changed to be consistent with the Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability (WGSS). This change represents a shift from focusing on the presence of disease (e.g., a medical diagnosis) to focusing on the individual’s ability to function within the environment (ability to do everyday things other people can do). The ‘disabled’ populations identified by these different survey approaches will not be the same (the WGSS questions tend to identify a smaller/different population). Despite these differences, the 2017 to 2021 results are presented together in Figure 9.6 as the between-group differences at each time point are still relevant. Note: due to questionnaire changes, the 2019 year includes only half a year of data (Q3, Q4 2019).

Data Sources

Source: Sport New Zealand.
Survey/data set: Sport New Zealand’s Active NZ Participation Survey. Custom data request for Canterbury region. Access publicly available data from the Sport New Zealand website sportnz.org.nz/resources/active-nz-changes-in-participation/
Source data frequency: Annually.

Metadata for this indicator is available at <https://www.canterburywellbeing.org.nz/our-wellbeing/index-data>

REFERENCES

This is the full reference list for **Social Capital**.

- 1 Putnam RD, Leonardi R, Nanenetti R (1993) *Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 2 Rocco L, Suhrcke M (2012) *Is social capital good for health? A European perspective*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- 3 Islam MK, Merlo J, Kawachi I, Lindström M, Gerdtham U-G (2006) Social capital and health: Does egalitarianism matter? A literature review. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 5: 3.
- 4 Scheffler RM, Brown TT (2008) Social capital, economics, and health: new evidence. *Health Econ Policy Law* 3: 321-331.
- 5 d'Hombres B, Rocco L, Suhrcke M, McKee M (2010) Does social capital determine health? Evidence from eight transition countries. *Health Econ* 19: 56-74.
- 6 Folland S (2007) Does "community social capital" contribute to population health? *Social Science and Medicine* 64: 2342-2354.
- 7 Syme SL (2000) Foreword. In: Berkman LF, Kawachi I, editors. *Social epidemiology*. New York: Oxford. pp. ix-xii.
- 8 Browning CR, Cagney KA (2003) Moving beyond poverty: neighborhood structure, social processes and health. *J Health Soc Behav* 44: 552-571.
- 9 McMillan DW (1996) Sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology* 24: 315-325.
- 10 Sonn CC, Fisher AT (2005) Immigrant Adaptation: Complicating our understanding of responses to intergroup experiences. In: Nelson G, Prilleltensky I, editors. *Community Psychology: In pursuit of liberation and wellbeing*. London, UK: McMillan, Palgrave. pp. 348-363.
- 11 Gusfield JR (1975) *The community: A critical response*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- 12 Sarason SB (1986) The emergence of a conceptual center. *Journal of Community Psychology* 14: 405-407.
- 13 Pinker S (2015) *The village effect: Why face-to-face contact matters*. London: Atlantic Books.
- 14 Thoits PA (1995) Stress, coping, and social support processes: where are we? What next? *J Health Soc Behav Spec*: 53-79.
- 15 Haber M, Cohen J, Lucas T, Baltes B (2007) The relationship Between Self-Reported Received and Perceived Social Support: A Meta-Analytic Review. *American journal of community psychology* 39: 133-144.
- 16 Berkman LF, Syme SL (1979) Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: a nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. *Am J Epidemiol*. 109: 186-204. doi: 110.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112674.
- 17 Thoits PA (2011) Mechanisms Linking Social Ties and Support to Physical and Mental Health. *J Health Soc Behav* 52: 145-161.
- 18 Uchino BN, Bowen K, Carlisle M, Birmingham W (2012) Psychological pathways linking social support to health outcomes: a visit with the "ghosts" of research past, present, and future. *Social science & medicine (1982)* 74: 949-957.
- 19 Cohen S, Wills TA (1985) Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychol Bull*. 98: 310-357.
- 20 Uchino B (2006) Social Support and Health: A Review of Physiological Processes Potentially Underlying Links to Disease Outcomes. *Journal of behavioral medicine* 29: 377-387.
- 21 Schonfeld IS (1991) Dimensions of functional social support and psychological symptoms. *Psychological Medicine* 21: 1051-1060.
- 22 Ministry of Social Development (2016) *The Social Report 2016: Te pūrongo oranga tangata*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.
- 23 Ateca-Amestoy V (2011) Leisure and subjective well-being. In: Cameron S, editor. *Handbook on the economics of leisure*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 52-76.
- 24 Throsby D (2001) *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 25 Aked J, Marks N, Cordon C, Thompson S (2008) *Five Ways to Wellbeing: A report presented to the Foresight Project on communicating the evidence base for improving people's well-being*. London: New Economics Foundation.
- 26 Arts Council England (2012) *Measuring the economic benefits of arts and culture: practical guidance on research methodologies for arts and cultural organisations*: Arts Council England.
- 27 Wheatley D, Bickerton C (2017) Subjective well-being and engagement in arts, culture and sport. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 41: 23-45.

- 28 Arts Council of New Zealand, Creative New Zealand (2020) *New Zealanders and the arts. Ko Aotearoa me ōna toi. Survey findings for Canterbury residents 2020*. Wellington: Creative New Zealand.
- 29 Arts Council of New Zealand, Creative New Zealand (2020) *New Zealanders and the arts. Ko Aotearoa me ōna toi. Summary Report 2020*. Wellington: Creative New Zealand.
- 30 Directorate-General for Communication (2015) *Special Eurobarometer 437; Discrimination in the EU in 2015*. European Union.
- 31 Harris RB, Stanley J, Cormack DM (2018) Racism and health in New Zealand: Prevalence over time and associations between recent experience of racism and health and wellbeing measures using national survey data. *PLoS ONE* 13: e0196476.
- 32 Tofler IR, Butterbaugh GJ (2005) Developmental Overview of Child and Youth Sports for the Twenty-first Century. *Clinics in Sports Medicine* 24: 783-804.
- 33 Dalziel P (2011) *The economic and social value of sport and recreation to New Zealand, Research Report No. 322*.
- 34 Steptoe AS, Butler N (1996) Sports participation and emotional wellbeing in adolescents. *The Lancet* 347: 1789-1792.
- 35 Office of the European Union (2011) *European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions Second European Quality of Life Survey: Participation in volunteering and unpaid work*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. 56 p.
- 36 OECD (2007) Measuring and fostering the progress of societies, 2nd World Forum in Istanbul, Turkey, 27–30 June, 2007: Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation.
- 37 Heitmueller A, Inglis K (2004) *Carefree? Participation and pay differentials for informal carers in Britain, IZA Discussion Paper No. 1273*. Bonn, Institute for the Study of Labour.
- 38 Mellor D, Hayashi Y, Stokes M, Firth L, Lake L, et al. (2009) Volunteering and its relationship with personal and neighborhood well-being. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38: 144–159.
- 39 Dolan P, Peasgood T, White M (2008) Do we really know what makes us happy? A review of the economic literature on the factors associated with well-being. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 29: 94–122.