
Social Capital: Confidence in agencies

Downloaded from https://www.canterburywellbeing.org.nz/our-wellbeing/social-capital/confidence-in-agencies/ on 29/03/2024 10:31 PM


The confidence people have in their central and local government agencies tends to influence whether they participate in and engage with consultations and other decision-making processes.

This indicator presents the proportion of those 18 years and over agreeing or strongly agreeing that central and local government agency decisions are in the best interests of their city or district, as reported in the Canterbury Wellbeing Survey.




The figure shows that the proportion of respondents who indicated that they agree or strongly agree that central and local government agencies make decisions in the best interests of their city or district, in greater Christchurch, increased steadily from 34.6 percent in 2018 to 43.4 percent in 2020 (a statistically significant difference). However, the proportion of respondents that indicated that central and local government agencies make decisions in the best interests declined statistically significantly from 2020 to 2022 (33.3% in 2022).

Breakdown by Territorial Authority




The figure shows, across the time series, that lower proportions of Christchurch City respondents indicate having confidence in central and local government agencies' decision-making processes, compared to Waimakariri District and Selwyn District respondents (31.5%, 43.9%, and 34.4% in 2022, respectively). The difference was statistically significant for Selwyn District in 2019 and 2020, and for Waimakariri District in 2020 and 2022.

Breakdown by ethnicity




The figure shows that the proportion of Pacific/Asian/Indian respondents indicating confidence in local and central government agencies' decision-making was statistically significantly higher than for Māori respondents and European respondents at several points across the time series shown. However, the differences are not statistically significant in 2022 (39.4%; 27.6%; and 33.7%, respectively). Māori respondents had the lowest proportion reporting confidence in central and local government agencies' decision making across the time series, however, the differences between the Māori and European ethnic groups were not statistically significant.

Breakdown by age




The figure shows the proportion of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that central and local government agencies make decisions in the best interests of their city or district, for each age group. In 2022, there were no statistically significant differences between the age groups (except for the 18–24 years vs. 65–74 years group). In 2022, the proportion of respondents aged 18 to 24 years, 25 to 34 years, 35 to 49 years, 50 to 64 years, 65 to 74 years, and 75 years and over who indicated their confidence in agencies were (27.8%, 31.5%, 32.2%, 35.9%, 38.2%, and 35.4%, respectively).

Breakdown by gender




The figure shows no statistically significant difference between the proportions of male respondents and female respondents who agree or strongly agree that central and local government agencies make decisions in the best interests of their city or district between 2018 and 2022.

Breakdown by income



The figure shows the differences by income in the proportion of respondents who indicated their confidence in agencies to make decisions in the best interests of their city or district, from 2018 to 2022. In 2020 the proportion of respondents with annual household incomes $60,001–$100,000 and over $100,000 indicating their confidence in agencies were statistically significantly higher than for those with annual household incomes of $30,001–$60,000, however, in 2022, there were no statistically significant differences between the household income groups.

Breakdown by disability



The figure shows that a higher proportion of respondents without a long-term health condition or disability indicated their confidence in agencies, compared to respondents with a long-term health condition or disability (aged under 65 years and 65 years and over). However, only the difference between respondents without a long-term health condition or disability and respondents aged under 65 years with a long-term health condition or disability was statistically significant in 2022 (35.1% and 26.7%, respectively).

Data Sources

Source: Te Whatu Ora Waitaha Canterbury - formerly the Canterbury District Health Board.
Survey/data set: Canterbury Wellbeing Survey to 2022. Access publicly available data from Te Mana Ora | Community and Public Health website www.cph.co.nz/your-health/wellbeing-survey/
Source data frequency: Annually.

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

© Crown copyright 2024

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, Cageny 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.

© Crown copyright 2024 Printed on: 29/03/2024

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.

© Crown copyright 2024