



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



## Report on EU-wide consultation on recommendations to policy makers

## AUTHORS

*SportsEconAustria Institute of Sport Economy:* Günther Grohall

*Sheffield Hallam University:* Themistoklis Kokolakis

*SportsEconAustria Institute of Sport Economy:* Anna Kleissner

*Croatian Olympic Committee:* Alma Papić

## CO-AUTHORS

*Sheffield Hallam University:* Robbie Millar

*Institute of Economic Structures Research:* Gerd Ahlert

*Papageorgiou University Hospital:* Eleftherios Tsiridis

*Papageorgiou University Hospital:* Eustathios Kenanidis

*Mykolas Romeris University:* Vilma Čingienė

*HAN University of Applied Sciences:* Jelle Schoemaker

*HAN University of Applied Sciences:* Willem de Boer

*Public University of Navarre:* Fernando Lera-López

*Public University of Navarre:* Andrea Ollo López

*Public University of Navarre:* Antonio Gómez Gómez-Plana

## LINGUISTIC VERSIONS

Original: EN

## ABOUT THE PUBLISHER

Manuscript completed in November 2022

© Croatian Olympic Committee, 2022

The Croatian Olympic Committee asserts copyright over all material in this work. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, or by any means, without permission in writing from the Croatian Olympic Committee.

This document is available on the Internet at:

<https://evisproject.eu/publications/>

This document was produced as an intellectual output of the project entitled 'Economic dimension of volunteering in sport' (EVIS) co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

## DISCLAIMER

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



## Collaborative Partnership on Economic Dimension of Volunteering in Sport

Croatia	Croatian Olympic Committee	Alma Papić
Austria	SportsEconAustria Institute for Sport Economy	Günther Grohall
Austria	SportsEconAustria Institute for Sport Economy	Anna Kleissner
UK	Sheffield Hallam University, SIRC	Themistoklis Kokolakis
UK	Sheffield Hallam University, SIRC	Robbie Millar
Croatia	Ministry of Tourism and Sport	Marija Crnković
Croatia	Ministry of Tourism and Sport	Roberta Karadža
Germany	Institute of Economic Structures Research	Gerd Ahlert
Greece	Papageorgiou University Hospital	Eleftherios Tsiridis
Greece	Papageorgiou University Hospital	Eustathios Kenanidis
Lithuania	Mykolas Romeris University	Vilma Čingienė
Netherlands	HAN University of Applied Sciences	Jelle Schoemaker
Netherlands	HAN University of Applied Sciences	Willem de Boer
Spain	Public University of Navarre	Fernando Lera-López
Spain	Public University of Navarre	Andrea Ollo López
Spain	Public University of Navarre	Antonio Gómez Gómez-Plana

## Table of Contents

<b>About the consultation .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Target groups.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Objective of the consultation .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Consultative process .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Consultation synopsis .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Response of stakeholders .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Consultation outcome.....</b>	<b>13</b>

## About the consultation

This document presents the results of the consultation that took place on the 20<sup>th</sup> of October 2022 in Vienna, focusing on the topic of the effect of sport volunteering on the economy and wellbeing, and presenting recommendations for more effective governance. This report presents an analytical framework for the identification of target groups, followed by an identification of the objective of the consultation. Then it proceeds to a description of how the consultation was organised and it gives a synopsis of the discussions that took place. It finishes with the policy recommendations that were discussed, the response of the stakeholders and the final outcome. It is worth pointing out that stakeholders were in agreement with the recommendations and expressed interest in applying this research to their countries.

**Date:** 20 October 2022

**Topics:** policy making, sport, volunteering, economy, wellbeing economy, governance

**Organisers:** SportsEconAustria Institute of Sport Economy, Federal Ministry on Arts, Culture, Civil Service and Sport (Austria)

## Target groups

Stakeholders, identified as the most relevant stakeholders, were the group with low interest and high power in sport-related policy making (See: Diagram 1. Stakeholders' matrix), and as such they were targeted in the consultation. For clarification, a high interest stakeholder is a person such as 'EU MS Local Government Sport Department – Decision Maker, Policy Formulator' as opposed to 'EU MS Local Government – Decision Maker, Policy Maker' who can be classified as low interest, and hence more relevant to this research. Similarly, stakeholders with high power are persons such as 'EU Council – Decision Maker, Policy Maker, Legislator' as opposed to people working in grassroots sport organisations. More examples can be found in Diagram 1 below.

The impact on policy makers was dependent on the level of interest and involvement of the group of stakeholders with high interest and high power, which is why the national ministry of sport was involved in the process. Stakeholders with low interest and low power were invited to consultations, including the scientific community that was invited for their ability to contribute to future work aimed at evidence-based policy-making.

The main target group were public authorities, identified as the policy-makers at national, regional and local levels in the EU Member States. The state administration of sport is carried out at central level by the Ministry of Sport (AT, BE, HR), or in specific cases by other central government bodies, e.g. Ministry of the Interior (DE), Ministry of Culture (EL, LT), Ministry of Health, Wellbeing and Sport (NL), Ministry of Education and Sciences (ES), Department of Culture, Media and Sport (UK). They regulate the national system i.e., create the legal, financial, and administrative regulatory framework for the functioning of the national sport systems.

Local and municipal public authorities (including regional in some countries) are equally important because they provide funding for the programmes and activities implemented by the grassroots sport organisations and for the construction of sport infrastructure. Consequently, they create additional funding rules which further influence the system of sport.

Active participation in the consultation was in the interest of public authorities to help them use the resources for evidence-based policy making and increase the quality of policies that they make. Their involvement would have contributed to increasing the quality of public policies and of the basic principles of good governance:

1. Good governance is accountable: Accountability is a fundamental requirement of good governance. It includes the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for the consequences of decisions made on behalf of the community.
2. Good governance is transparent: People should be able to follow and understand the decision-making process. This means that they will be able to clearly see how and why a decision was made.
3. Good governance is effective and efficient: Decision-makers should implement decisions and follow processes that make the best use of the available resources to ensure the best possible results for their community.

Diagram 1. Stakeholders' matrix

		INTEREST	
		HIGH	LOW
POWER	HIGH	<p>EU MS Local Government <b>Sport Department</b> – Decision Maker, Policy Formulator</p> <p>EU MS Regional Government <b>Sport Department</b> – Decision Maker, Policy Formulator</p> <p>EU MS Government <b>Ministry of Sport</b> – Decision Maker, Policy Formulator</p> <p>EU Council – Decision Maker, Policy Maker, Legislator</p> <p>EU EC Commissioner for Education, Culture, Youth and Sport – Decision Maker, Policy Formulator</p> <p>EU EC DG EAC <b>Sport Unit</b> and <b>EACEA</b> – Decision Maker, Policy Formulator</p>	<p>EU MS Local Government – Decision Maker, Policy Maker</p> <p>EU MS Regional Government – Decision Maker, Policy Maker</p> <p>EU MS Ministries (other than Ministry of Sport) – Decision Maker, Policy Maker</p> <p>EU MS Government – Legislator, Decision Maker, Policy Maker</p> <p>EU MS Parliaments – Legislator, Decision Maker, Policy Maker (MPs)</p> <p>EU Parliament – Legislator, Decision Maker, Policy Maker (MEPs)</p> <p>EU European Commission DGs/Agencies (other than Sport Unit and EACEA) – Decision Maker, Policy Maker</p> <p>EU MS Different public institutions working in the field of volunteering (general, not only sport-related)</p> <p>Media</p>
	LOW	<p>Higher education institutions in the field of sport economics science</p> <p>Research institutes in the field of sport economics science</p> <p>Grassroots sport organisations (leisure sport)</p> <p>Sport clubs (competitive sport)</p> <p>National Federations</p> <p>Olympic Movement (i.e. International Olympic Committee, European Olympic Committees, National Olympic Committees)</p> <p>National Non-Governmental Sport Governing Bodies (e.g. NOCs, Confederations)</p> <p>Volunteers in sport</p>	<p>Higher education institutions in the field of sport-related science</p> <p>Research institutes in the field of sport-related science</p> <p>European Confederations</p> <p>International Federations</p> <p>Athletes' organisations and syndicates</p> <p>EU MS Health institutions</p> <p>Non-Governmental organisations for volunteering</p> <p>General public</p>

## Objective of the consultation

To ensure applicability and transferability of the outputs of the project ‘Economic dimension of volunteering in sport’, it was necessary to ask for the feedback of external stakeholders on research results and recommendations to policy makers.

The structural character of volunteering in the European sport systems had to be taken into account by adopting a double-track approach, involving all relevant institutions and actors, by creating the evidence-base for policy making in the framework of Sport Satellite Accounts and wellbeing economics in sport, and by supporting the public authorities and sport governing organisations to use that data when designing and implementing policies and programmes. That was the reasoning behind the EU-wide consultation with stakeholders. Consultation was the opportunity to present and discuss the main research findings with the external stakeholders to gain their input and use it in the production of the recommendations to policy makers and of the study on the economic impact of volunteering in sport.

## Consultative process

Consultation was organised by one of the key partner organisations in the project – SpEA. To attract the most relevant target groups and to increase the impact of the consultative process, the organiser has carried out the consultation in cooperation with the national ministry of sport. The Ministry, as public authority, ensured the visibility of the consultation, its attractiveness, and it has enabled the distribution of invitations to other public authorities at both national and international levels, contributing to raising the profile of the event. That enabled the main organiser to focus on inviting the representatives of the sport sector and the scientific community in Europe. Rounds of invitations were sent out repeatedly until a satisfactory response rate was achieved (57 registrations). Registrations were received through an online form from participants in eight European countries (11% public authorities). Registrations for virtual participation were the highest, with 17% registering for participation in person.

Consultation was conducted as a hybrid event with participants present in person and online. It was opened by Philipp Trattner, Director General Sport, Federal Ministry on Arts, Culture, Civil Service and Sport. The moderator was Guenther Grohall, Senior Researcher, SportsEconAustria Institute for Sport Economy. Together with Themis Kokolakis, PhD, (Sheffield Hallam University, Sport Industry Research Group), the two researchers presented the main research findings and draft recommendations to policy makers.



The conference started at 14:15 with a welcome speech of the representative of the Federal Ministry on Arts, Culture, Civil Service and Sport (Trattner). This was followed by the presentation of empirical results. Each presenter had 20-30 minutes to present the main research findings. Their presentations are in Annex 1.

After the presentation of research results, draft recommendations to policy makers were presented and discussed with participants. The conference closed at 15:45.

## Consultation synopsis

The following is the synopsis of the discussion with participants in relation to the attached material presented in the consultative event.

### **1. Welcome and opening by the Federal Ministry on Arts, Culture, Civil Service and Sport (Trattner)**

Volunteering is the most important part in sport federations in Austria. The aging population could pose a problem for volunteering. Volunteers also play a substantial role for organising sport events (e.g. championships).

### **2. Introduction and Presentation of empirical results on the economic impact of volunteering in sport (Grohall)**

Mr Grohall presented the topic of shadow price of volunteering in sport, which was one of the main goals of the project. First, two types of effects are differentiated: the shadow price of sport volunteers (not visible) and visible effects of sport volunteers (intermediary goods and services used by volunteers). Mr Grohall explained how the data was collected, using a survey in the EU-8 (AT, DE, EL, ES, HR, LT, and NL). The data was compared to secondary data sources, but Mr Grohall pointed out, that some sources differ dramatically (some by a factor of 1.6) to the survey results. He further continued to present which activities are carried out by volunteers as well as various approaches on how to evaluate the labour hours. Results about the aggregate shadow price of volunteer labour for the EU-8 were presented (43.6 bn euros). It was pointed out that compensations for the volunteers must be subtracted from the shadow price. The highest compensations were recorded in the case of Germany. In 2009, the production of intermediate goods and services generated 57.7 bn euro in the EU-8 (visible effects of volunteering).

### **3. Presentation of the effects of volunteering in sport on wellbeing and social capital (Kokolakakis)**

The pre-recorded presentation about monetizing the impact of volunteering on wellbeing and social capital was not audible for online participants. Therefore, Dr Kokolakakis presented it on live stream. The

results are based on a non-random sample (in the sense that we have a split of the sample between sport volunteers and the rest of the population) of sport volunteers and non-sport-volunteers. Sport-volunteers are 20% happier than non-sport-volunteers. Social capital was measured in two different ways. The first, SC1, focuses on community and trust. Under SC1, sport volunteers have 22% more social capital compared to the remaining population. The second, SC2, focuses on the importance of friends, families and active participation in different groups. According to this approach, volunteers have 44% more social capital than the remaining population. Dr Kokolakakis empathised that sport volunteers are much more actively engaged outside of sport clubs too.

The monetary compensation results point to the comparability of the two different approaches of measuring social capital (SC1 and SC2), because the monetary values associated with them are relatively similar. The amount of satisfaction from sport volunteering is approximately worth one monthly salary per year. A gender inequality was identified: males are more often volunteering and therefore also obtain more benefits from volunteering (e.g., through more social capital). Further income and work inequalities were also identified: People with higher incomes are overrepresented in the group of sport volunteers, whilst people with lower incomes are underrepresented. Similarly, people who are active already (working full time or students) are more often active in volunteering while unemployed persons, people working half-time and retired people are engaged less often as volunteers.

#### **4. Presentation of the draft recommendations to policy makers (Grohall)**

Mr Grohall mentioned that the final results will be presented at a final conference in Brussels on the 28<sup>th</sup> of November. He further presented the following draft recommendations:

1. Shadow price 1: It is recommended that the socio-economic activity of volunteering should be integrated and made visible in the National Accounts.
2. Shadow price 2: It is recommended that sports policy and legislation maintain the framework conditions that favour the involvement of volunteers in sport, in order to retain the scope/number of services provided by sport clubs to citizens.
3. Wellbeing 1: It is recommended to invest into increasing the number of volunteers in sport to maximise the associated benefits.
4. Wellbeing 2: It is recommended to develop policies, create additional funding opportunities, and implement actions to increase the presence of women, unemployed and people of lower income to become volunteers in sport. This could be achieved by developing and using specific

training programmes to prepare them for the most demanding aspects of sport volunteering (managerial or governance activities).

5. General 1: It is recommended that new policies, administrative and bureaucratic demands placed upon sport clubs should be assessed ex-ante concerning their impact on volunteering in sport.
6. General 2: It is recommended to develop a registry for volunteers in sport to enable evaluation and monitoring of trends.
7. General 3: It is recommended that the EU Member States use the EVIS methodology to quantify the economic impact of volunteering in sport.

#### **5. Discussion with participants about the recommendations to policy makers (Grohall)**

**Question (from physically present audience): Were the replies mentioned before (590 answers) concerning only the year 2019 or gathered since 2019 until now?**

Answer (Grohall): The questions asked for data about 2019, but the questionnaire was distributed much later, so all data and answers refer to the year 2019.

**Question (online): Was the survey only conducted in the eight EU countries, or also in other European countries?**

Answer (Grohall): Distribution of the survey took place only in the eight EU countries, but the questions were not specifically adapted to the eight countries.

Mr Grohall mentioned that results from this project (people who are already working full time are comparatively overrepresented in volunteering) compare to another interesting fact of the impact of major sport events on sport participation, namely that this impact is higher among the existing participants ie., people who were already active before the event are doing more sport, but inactive people are not as easily motivated to start participating. He asked the audience whether this repeating pattern is a problem in sport and if yes, how it should be addressed.

**Question (online): How can we conduct the same research in our country? Where can we find instructions, and who can help us with it?**

Answer (Grohall): There will be a project report including a project manual with instructions for the calculations and a final conference by the end of November in Brussels. Methods and details will be made available for everyone in order to be able to replicate the calculations for your own country.

**Question (online): Do you plan to organise a workshop, where we can learn how to implement research in our country?**

Answer (Grohall): There will not be a dedicated workshop, but the conference in Brussels, where we can show how the methodology works. Also, the manual and a detailed description of the methodology will be published.

**Question (online): Can you explain again how you calculated the volunteers received additional monthly salary?**

Answer (Kokolakakis): There are three main variables: Income, subjective wellbeing or social capital, and volunteering. The question is how income changes, if there is a theoretical change (increase) of the level of volunteering, while holding subjective wellbeing constant (at the same level). The question becomes: by how much should income be reduced, if volunteering rises, so that subjective wellbeing stays the same? The answer to this question is called the income compensation. This is also a representation of the value given to sport volunteering: If people value sport volunteering highly, an increase in volunteering increases subjective wellbeing a lot. At the same time there needs to be a big counteractive force in income in order to compensate the increase in wellbeing. Dr Kokolakakis emphasised that this is a politically encouraging result: people have comparative value systems in terms of subjective wellbeing and social capital in all eight considered countries.

**Question (online): Do you think that the value of volunteering has increased over time?**

Answer (Grohall): Different factors increase the value of volunteering: more hours (volume of volunteering), and better qualifications (more efficient labour as volunteer). The question highlights the need for a good database about volunteering, in order to be able to evaluate whether such trends exist.

**Question (Anna Kleissner): When are the final results available? Where will the final report be made available?**

Answer (Grohall): The research will be finalized by the end of 2022. Corresponding documentation will be published early 2023.

**Question (online): Do you think these results could apply to a North American context?**

Answer (Grohall): Some aspects are quite similar between the countries in the survey, e.g., concerning the most time-consuming tasks for sport volunteers (administration and coaching). Nevertheless, in some

aspects the countries differ a lot from each other. Generalizations of the results to a different sample might be difficult, also due to cultural and economic differences. The concept of EVIS can be directly translated and used in North America, but the European end results might not be transferable easily.

## Response of stakeholders

In total, the consultation on recommendations to policy makers received 41 replies (nine participants in person and 32 online) from at least 14 organisations (several participants did not state their organisation) based in five countries (Austria, Croatia, Germany, Greece, and the United States of America).

In terms of type of organisations, the majority are non-governmental sport organisations, followed by public authorities and universities/scientific community.

Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with recommendations to policy makers, or to propose a different recommendation, express their views and opinions on any matter related to the presented research results and recommendations to policy makers.

In addition, ten participants from the EVIS partner institutions were present, three physical and seven online.

## Consultation outcome

Participants were in a unanimous agreement with the proposed recommendations to policy makers in its entirety as they were presented and formulated.

[evisproject.eu](http://evisproject.eu)