2018 Census content determination scoring sheets

Index

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Cigarette smoking behaviour – retention of existing content		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - Smoking has major health impacts on NZ's society and economy	**4.5**	18/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - Census is the only information source that can deliver low level breakdowns in geography and demography to enable targeted cessation programmes	**4**	12/15

Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need?
 	
   -   Smoking has and will continue to be an information need as long as it remains prevelent in NZ society
   -   Health data (admin) may help to inform this area in the future with detail
	3	6/10

Will the proposed change produce quality information? - Current census smoking data produces information that is considered acceptable quality	**4**	16/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? - Yes, already collected	**5**	5/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? - Other major surveys (Health Survey) use different, more detailed definitions and breakdowns		3/5

Is there general acceptance of the proposed change?
   -   There is negative acceptance of the potential removal of this content
  -   Some sense in wider society that smoking is at low levels
	4	8/10

Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Current question is already considered fine, although definition of one or more a day can be at odds with 'regularly'	**3.5**	3.5/5
Total		71.5/90

Final score (79%)

Topic: Mortgage payment amount	Weight	
Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? Problems with interpreting the data seem likely, as backed up by the experience of the ABS. Data may not be very meaningful, so uses limited in terms of assessing housing affordability patterns. 1.5 out of 5	**4**	6/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? Wide relevance but census maybe can't provide data of sufficient accuracy, depth, or the kind of information needed. The preferred measure for analysing affordability can't be collected in the census because it's too complex (as done in HES). 2 out of 5	**3**	6/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? There is an enduring need for information on housing affordablity. Mortgage payment amount does not give the full picture on this information need. 4 out of 5	**2**	8/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? There are doubts about this (may not be well answered, non-response could be significant). It would also be very difficult to check the quality during the evaluation phase. It would be hard to know if the amount was correct. Below average. 2 out of 5	**4**	8/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? No continuity because this would be new information not previously collected in the census. It wouldn't disrupt any time series information though so have given it a neutral score. 3* out of 5	**1**	3*/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? No, it wouldn't be consistent with the data from the Household Economic Survey (which is different and more detailed). It wouldn't be possible to do the same calculation. 1 out of 5	**1**	1/5

Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? Possibly not. Some respondents might find this question intrutive. 2.5 out of 5	**2**	5/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? Probably relatively easy for some (just a little thinking involved), but not easy for others (those with revolving credit, different components to their mortgage, or family trusts). 3 out of 5	**1**	3/5
Total		/90

Final score (44 %)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Languages spoken – collect additional information on language proficiency (key submission from Maori Language Commission) • very well (I can talk about almost anything in Māori) ☐ well (I can talk about many things in Māori) ☐ fairly well (I can talk about some things in Māori) ☐ not very well (I can only talk about simple/basic things in Māori) ☐ no more than a few words or phrases		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - Maori language is a tier 1 statistic - Proficiency te reo questions in Te Kupenga (but not a full population survey) - Detailed questions will mean low proficiency 'speaking' does not indicate health of the language - There is a need to understand proficiency of (Maori) language proficiency over time that sees the Maori language as just another educational subject or factor for literacy - This information across languages would help to give more information migrant populations/language proficiency - Proficiency information is crucial for effective analysis of language education	**4**	(2.5)10/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - Te Kupenga covers this quite well and is linked to census data? Which would allow analysis of Census demo/geographic detail and how census 'speaking' responses compare to detailed questions - Te Kupenga confirmed to be run again after 2018 - No government admin data on language proficiency levels - To get information language proficiency outside of Te Reo would be difficult outside of the census - Census could inform other post-censal language surveys already if necessary	**3**	(2) 6/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? - Having detailed information to understand how languages are operating in NZ will continue to be important as diversity continues/increases	**2**	(4)8/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? - Would be difficult to collect proficiency information on all relevant languages for bi-lingual people - Concepts would be difficult to accurately gauge for those with low English levels to begin with?	**4**	(2.5) 10/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? - New information - Would have to work out comparability with previous data as different concepts (analysis of Census vs Te Kupenga results shows this)	**1**	2/5

Is data consistent with other data collections? - Would be consistent with Te Kupenga - No other major language surveys?	**1**	2.5/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? - Detailed questions would be somewhat 'intrusive' given all respondents would need to answer and majority would not see value? - Non-English speakers would likely want to distinguish their proficiency - Generally accepted useful information	**2**	(4) 8/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Question is significantly more difficult conceptually than standard for self-completed questionnaire – especially given the need to distinguish terms when the main area of interest is around language proficiency - Overall question difficulty would be fine	**1**	3/5
Total		/90

Score: 56%

Topic: Step-families (new variable/new separate question) Indicator variable to get prevalence data (no detail around relationships) Position in Preliminary Views: Recommended new content Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census	Weight	
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? • Likely to be a useful social indicator and could provide insights into functioning of New Zealand's families, which is of national significance. • However the range of users of this data is not as wide as for some other variables or topics. 2.5 out of 5 3 out of 5 (wider)	**4**	10/20 12/20 (wider)
Is the census the most appropriate information source? • the census has been specifically identified as the appropriate source for getting information on prevalence • As explained in Preliminary Views, information on prevalence cannot be collected in sample surveys. • has wide geographical relevance as step-families are located throughout New Zealand, and wide relevance across the New Zealand population. • Effects on other census variables (Aug 16 Core) 3.5 out of 5 4 out of 5 (wider) 3.5 Aug 16 Core	**3**	10.5/15 12/15 (wider) 10.5/15 (Aug 16 Core)
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? • Yes. This is expected to be an on-going enduring information need. 4 out of 5	**2**	8/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? • could be quality issues, such as issues around interpretation, including interpretation by different ethnic groups • question will need to be phrased in the best way possible so that respondents understand it • Testing proving problematic. With Maori for example (Aug 16 Core)	**4**	10/20 8/20 (Aug 16 Core)

2.5 out of 5 (assuming some degree of quality issues, despite best efforts to come up with an understandable question) 2 Aug 16 Core		
Is there continuity with previous census data? • This information has not been collected before • There should be (and needs to be) little or no disruption to existing family and household information if it is a separate question, and quite separate from relationship to reference person and living arrangements 3* out of 5	**1**	3*/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? • This information does not appear to be collected in any major surveys currently. • A concept, definition, and suitable question would need to be developed. • Consistency will need to be built in to any new collections of this information in sample surveys so that prevalence information from the census fits together with well-being information from sample surveys. • There could be some degree of inconsistency due to differences in collection, such as self-completed versus interviewer administrated 3* out of 5 (assuming future collection in surveys is largely similar to the census)	**1**	3*/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? • Some respondents in step-families might find it intrusive • Others might be concerned about why this question is being asked and what the data will be used for, and be unwilling to answer • Some respondents may not think of themselves as a step-parent and be unwilling to give this as their answer. 2 out of 5 2.5 out of 5 (wider)	**2**	4/10 5/10 (wider)
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • Some respondents may have difficulty answering it 2.5 out of 5	**1**	2.5/5
Total		51/90 55.5/90 (wider) 50/90 (Aug 16 Core)

Final score: 61% (after wider group recommendations)

Final score: 57% (after Aug 16 Core rescore)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Number of children born alive – add paternity to the existing question about fertility		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - Would give new and important demographic information on this group as currently they are poorly understood - Would be used to investigate the relationship between socioeconomic status and paternity for males as in some countries this is stronger than the relationship between socioeconomic status and fertility for females but we currently don't have information to investigate this in NZ	**4**	(2) 8/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - Would give the best demographic information possible about this group - There is little practical impediment to asking males since it only requires a minor change in scope - Would be useful to provide some benchmark for future surveys that set out to investigate this - The only other way to collect this information in NZ would be to have a large stand-alone fertility survey	**3**	(4) 12/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? - This topic is of growing international importance as evidenced by work in this area in Australia and in several European and Asian countries	**2**	(3.5) 7/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? - It might be difficult to define so could have a negative effect on data quality? - Would have to state straight away that males are included in the question as well otherwise some might just read the start of the question and skip over it	**4**	(2.5)10/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? - No has never been asked about before - Don't think it will affect the data on females	**1**	3*/5
Is data consistent with other data collections?	**1**	3*/5

- No other Stats surveys ask about it - The Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey asks "How many children you have ever had? Fathered/ given birth to or adopted." - Scandinavian countries collect this information - USA CPS supplement collects this		
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? - Wouldn't be offensive or intrusive - No concerns for particular groups - Don't know if some people would see the value in collecting this	**2**	(3.5)8/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Would have to be carefully defined – is it just biological children or any children that a male has "fathered"	**1**	2.5/5
Total		53.5/90 (59%)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – study participation – collect industry training separately		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - Careerforce strongly recommended that this is included as it would help to inform their understanding of training levels across occupations and sectors within Careerforce's coverage - Auckland Council stated that this information would be useful in their analysis of work and labour force status and rates of young people who are not in employment, education or training - CERA stated that this information is of particular interest given the nature of training for rebuild trade workers	**4**	(4)16/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - Wide geographical relevance - Not sure if small area or small population data is needed - Yes census would provide the information required - Other govt departments such as MBIE ask this however there is holes in the coverage of this data - Getting this information every 5 years is probably a bit slow and those who use the data would want it more often	**3**	(3)9/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? - Yes - increasingly important to continue to upskill people in the labour force due to the high numbers of skilled migrants coming to NZ. It has also been acknowledged that New Zealand has a lack of apprentices and on the job training. - No plan for this topic in Stats future thinking	**2**	(4)8/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? - Christchurch City Council thought this information could have a negative effect on data quality as it would be difficult to define - Lack of understanding may affect response rates	**4**	(2) 8/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? - Not comparable with previous censuses as haven't asked "industry training" separately before	**1**	2/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? - GSS, HLFS and HES don't ask about industry training separately - Admin sources may	**1**	3*/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change?	**2**	(4) 8/10

- No concerns about intrusiveness or offensiveness - Respondents will be happy to answer		
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Could be difficult to define so respondents may have difficulty understanding it - People may not easily be able to know what "industry training" includes and might not know whether they are doing it	**1**	2/5
Total		56/90 (62%)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Birthplace – collect information on region of birth (national and internationally)		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - would help to better understand internal migration for pop projections, regional flows for future planning - more info on overseas migration is useful in understanding those coming from overseas - overall minor improvement in this area though?	**4**	(3) 12/20 8/20 (wider)
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - One time snapshot would greatly increase knowledge in this information gap - Sample survey would not give detail for regional analysis - Could visa/immigration info inform this?	**3**	(3.5) 10.5/15 7.5/15 (wider)
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? - Regional migration/imbalance is an important issue and probably will continue for the foreseeable future - Understanding incoming migrants and their needs is also a growing area and likely to continue	**2**	(3.5)7/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? - Detail needed would possibly mean data of average quality - Would not likely impact on existing information collected, only adding to	**4**	(3) 12/20 10/20 (wider)
Is there continuity with previous census data? - Would not remove continuity with previous data, but new information is not comparable	**1**	3/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? - Not inconsistent, concept is standard - Do not know of other significant sources	**1**	3.5/5 3*/5 (wider)
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? - Value would likely be seen in identifying regions - Mostly non-intrusive	**2**	(4) 8/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Outside of conceptualising regions/provinces, should be cognitively easy	**1**	3/5
Total		49.5/90

Score: 55% (changed after wider group discussion)

	Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Second residence – include or exclude Assumes both the address and reason for address are included		
3.5	Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? • Helps with civil emergency management • Greater understanding of children in shared custody arrangements • Greater understanding of regional population fluctuations • Housing stock information	**4**	14/20
4.5	Is the census the most appropriate information source? • Difficult to get from other sources • Needed to low levels of data for emergency planning • Maybe not wide relevance across the NZ population	**3**	13.5/15
4	Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? • Potentially in terms of changing family dynamics and home ownership	**2**	8/10
2.5 3	Will the proposed change produce quality information? • Could be a number of issues as seen by testing in Australia, such as invalid responses (wrong address, using usual address, time spent at address not computing). • Was address fatigue which saw issues with response rates • Will children's second address by filled out correctly by one parent? • Testing has shown an acceptable quality of information (Aug 16 Core)	**4**	10/20 12/20 (Aug 16 Core)
3*	Is there continuity with previous census data? • Not in the previous census	**1**	3/5
3	Is data consistent with other data collections? • No other data collected about this, but is just as address, so should be consistent with the other address categories	**1**	3/5
3.5	Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? • Not offensive, but some people may find slightly intrusive with another address question. • Most happy to attempt to answer (as in Australia) although unsure how much value they will see from it	**2**	7/10
2 2.5	Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • Depends on the exact questions asked, but a number of issues were had in Australia's testing when answering this question • Testing showing respondents having less trouble than expected (Aug 16 Core)	**1**	2/5 2.5/5 (Aug 16 Core)
	Total		60.5/90

		63/90(Aug 16 Core)

Final score (%)

67%
70% (Aug 16 Core)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census		
Collect information on sexual orientation (formally information on LGBTIQ community)		

Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy?
    - Population is currently **unknown** so decision makers cannot make decisions for this population
    - MSD support development of options to capture
    - Group is overrepresented in negative health and wellbeing statistics
    - Narrower group but more focused (Aug 16 Core)
3.5
3 (Aug 16 Core)
	4	14/20
		12/20
		(Aug 16 Core)

Is the census the most appropriate information source?
    - Likely wide geographical and demographic variation
    - Census is best/only viable source to create an initial frame for this population
    - Some organisations collect partial information in this area (Corrections, NZTA, DIA)
    - NZ health survey now asking the question (Aug 16 Core)
4.5
4 (Aug 16 Core)
	3	13.5/15
		12/15
		(Aug 16 Core)

Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need?
    - Difficult to answer without accurate information first
    - Gender diversity has become more socially acceptable
    - Snapshot in census would strongly aid future data collection in this area for Stats through IDI/sample aiding
3.5
	2	7/10

Will the proposed change produce quality information?
    - Somewhat unknown but indicator question would likely produce quality information for identifying subpopulation(s)
    - Possibly high non-response? But not of intended population
    - Would be difficult to capture all detail within subpopulation
    - Would potentially increase quality of sex question (mitigate existing two ticks for gender equality campaign)
    - Better information now more focused. LGBITQ removed (Aug 16 Core)
2.5
3.5 (Aug 16 Core)
	4	10/20
		14/20

Is there continuity with previous census data? - New information / NA 3*	**1**	3*/5

Is data consistent with other data collections?
    - Not inconsistent / NA
    - Some collection of gender by NZTA, sex/gender from DIA (passports)
	1	3*?/5
		4/5
		(Aug

- Some consistency with health survey 3* 4 (Aug 16 Core)		16 Core)

Is there general acceptance of the proposed change?
    -    Generally this would be non-intrusive and acceptable for respondents
    -    Non-inclusion reflects negatively on perception of census for many
3.5
	2	7/10

Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete?
    -    Concept may be difficult for some due to lack of knowledge of terminology
    -    Overall people would understand, especially those in the relevant group
    -    Now a more straightforward question. Tested well
3
3.5 (Aug 16 Core)
	1	3/5
		3.5/5
		(Aug 16 Core)

Total		60.5/90 62.5/90 (Aug 16 Core)

67%

69% (Aug 16 Core)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – include legally registered relationship status with no change		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - Relationship status is associated with many health and social outcomes and DHB's use this information for planning, delivering and monitoring public health services - MSD use information on nuptial rates for research and modelling. Important this information is retained for use in associated collections such as producing marital rates, ex-nuptial births and other associated statistics. - This information is hugely related with step- families and sexual orientation. Distinguishing same-sex and opposite-sex relationships coupled with de facto relationship and marriages have an important role in understanding couple relationships, family and household composition and step families.	**4**	(3.5)14 /20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - Wide geographical relevance across NZ - Census provides the information required - Is collected in the GSS, HLFS and by DIA	**3**	(3)9/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? - This information is still likely to be of high importance in the future	**2**	(3) 6/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? - Quality in 2013 was high, fit for use with the exception of civil union's data which was rated poor and not fit for use. The rest of the data on relationship status is not affected by this however.	**4**	(3.5)14/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? - Yes highly comparable with previous censuses - Real world change: legalising of gay marriage will affect comparability	**1**	4/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? - HLFS, GSS doesn't collect information on Civil Unions	**1**	3*/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? - Not intrusive or offensive - Respondents happy to answer	**2**	(4.5) 9/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Relatively easy to answer apart from the civil unions part as people have difficulty understanding what a civil union is	**1**	3/5
Total		62/90 (69%)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Post-school qualification – collect overseas qualifications separately		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - Would improve the accuracy of Universities NZ estimations of costs and benefits of obtaining a qualification at a NZ University - Would be useful to understand the post-school qualification profile of this group (Careerforce) - CERA considers this information important in the rebuild context, given the large number of internationally trained workers	**4**	(3)12/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - Wide geographical relevance across NZ - Not sure if small area or small population data is needed - Important information for small population groups	**3**	(4)12/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? - Diversity of New Zealand is increasing so important to capture information on this growing group of people	**2**	(3.5)7/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? - Could reduce coding errors as it is clear that the qualification is not from a NZ University? - Could improve quality as there will be less confusion about what these people should answer?	**4**	(4)16/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? - Just adding detail, still collecting the same information just clearly identifying whether the qualification was collected in NZ or not	**1**	3*/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? - GSS, HES, HLFS doesn't separate out overseas post-school qualification - What do MoE collect?	**1**	3/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? - Yes, collecting this information anyway just asking more detail	**2**	(3*) 6/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Will be easy for respondents to answer	**1**	5/5
Total		64/90 (71%)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Unpaid activities – Collect data on volunteering (concept needs defining) with hours		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - Volunteering is seen to make a significant contribution to economy and society so tracking accurately it is important	**4**	(3.5) 14/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - Given the scattered nature of this sector, accurate information is difficult to obtain elsewhere - Data is wanted at a local level for community resilience indication etc.	**3**	(4.5) 13.5/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? - Need to track health over time to see if declining/can address this with data but not if unknown - Sector is seeing growth in importance with aging population + also rise in internships/body corporates etc. - Future stats survey supplements will have detailed questions but not detailed demographies	**2**	(4) 8/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? - Time data is collected in other countries, so expected to be acceptable quality - Tightening of question and concept + time component will produce more indicative information for data users	**4**	(4)16/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? - This would depend exactly on the concept of volunteering used, but likely would be comparable to previous voluntary organisation indicator only if at all	**1**	1?/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? - Not really given the main data on this is from time use survey (different format) and GSS is on 'formal' unpaid work which may not correlate with census concept - There is already little comparability with current census data and other sources, so this change would not negatively affect this	**1**	3/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? - May be some concern from household caregivers - Change would likely be positively viewed as legitimising/recognising volunteering contributions	**2**	(3.5) 7/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Hours spent would require some cognitive burden in cases - Concept of volunteering also requires some thought as to what applies	**1**	2/5
Total		64.5/90

Score: 72%

Topic: <u>Housing Quality</u> (exact information to be collected is yet to be determined) Assumptions: indicator of mould, damp and amenities Preliminary View: more information required Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census	Weight	
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? • Yes, strong potential for this – poor quality housing significantly affects children's health, educational achievement, and life chances and places a major burden on the health system. • This data could inform public health interventions and help with targeting resources for maximum benefit. • Being able to reduce the negative effects of poor quality housing would be beneficial for NZ's society and economy. • Of interest to a range of data users – government agencies, councils, community groups, researchers 4	**4**	16/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? • Data needed for particular geographic areas and population groups • Housing conditions need to be analysed alongside other census variables like income, age, household composition and could link it with the Deprivation Index • But – some question as to whether the census can provide the type and depth of information needed. • There are no plans for a detailed housing survey 3.5	**3**	10.5/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? Yes: • There are major issues with the quality of NZ's housing stock that are unlikely to be solved in the near future so there's expected to be an enduring need for information on housing quality • The previously proposed WOF for rental housing looks unlikely to go ahead and issues with rental housing quality look likely to continue so this is expected to be of continuing interest and concern. 4.5	**2**	9/10

Will the proposed change produce quality information? • some data quality issues are possible, such as over-reporting by renters; under-reporting by owners • this will depend on the type of questions asked (will need to be as straightforward as possible) • But currently there is a lack of this data • Tested better than expected. Confirmed the subjective question worked (Aug 16 Core) 3 3.5 (Aug 16 Core)	**4**	12/20 14/20 (Aug 16 Core)
Is there continuity with previous census data? • Largely irrelevant, as this type of information has not been collected previoulsy or at least not for a long time • Won't disrupt anything (neutral score) 3*	**1**	3*/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? • There are likely to be differences between the data collected in the census and the data collected elsewhere • In BRANZ's House Condition Survey, the level of maintenance is measured by knowledgeable assessors. This produces a very different result to asking respondents. • Consistent with this year's GSS 3 3.5 (Aug 16 Core)	**1**	3/5 3.5/5 (Aug 16 Core)
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? • It is not expected that respondents would find housing quality questions offensive or intrusive. • Possibly some respondents might be reluctant to answer • most people would probably understand the importance of this addition to census content 4	**2**	8/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • There could be some judgement required by respondents, depending on the type of information collected. • As assuming that only questions about things known or visible to respondents could be asked so usually they should know the answer 3	**1**	3/5
Total		64.5/90

		67/90 (Aug 16 Core)

Final score (72%)

Final score (74%)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Usual address one year ago – include or exclude		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? • Help with annual population estimates. Residence 5 years ago and years at residence used currently. This is a huge limitation on annual subpopulation estimates • Value would increase more if years at current address data not collected. **4**	**4**	16/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? • Not available from any other official source. Estimates done from 5 yearly data. 4.5	**3**	13.5/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? • Difficult to obtain from admin data. Not collected before and unsure how it may be collected in the future. • Further evidence from Pop Stats (Aug 16 Core) 3.5 4 (Aug 16 Core)	**2**	7/10 8/10 (Aug 16 Core)
Will the proposed change produce quality information? • If people are willing to answer and answer correctly, information quality should be good. • Could reduce quality of other address questions if too many are asked. • Testing shows some issues with cross referencing (Aug 16 Core) 4 3.5 (Aug 16 Core)	**4**	16/20 14/20 (Aug 16 Core)
Is there continuity with previous census data? • Last collected in the 1981 Census. • Yes although has not been continuious 2.5 3 (Aug 16 Core)	**1**	2.5/5 3/5 (Aug 16 Core)
Is data consistent with other data collections? • Not inconsistent, as is a new data collection not collected elsewhere 3	**1**	3/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change?	**2**	6/10

• Would be yet another address question. Could be an issue, especially if second residence and years at current address are also collected. • Respondents may not be aware of its value and may not be willing to answer a further question. • Some trouble with routing in testing (Aug 16 Core) **3** 2.5 (Aug 16 Core)			5/10 (Aug 16 Core)
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • People should easily know the answer, although inputting may take some time. • Some issues in testing (Aug 16 Core) 4 3.5 (Aug 16 Core)	**1**		4/5 3.5/5 (Aug 16 Core)
	Total		68/90 66/90 (Aug 16 Core)

Final score (%)

76% **73% (Aug 16 Core)**

	Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Years at usual residence – include or exclude		
3.5	Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? Strongly used by local authorities for planning and understanding the community Provides longer term view on geographic mobility than usual residence 1/5 years ago Greater granularity under 5 years	4	14/20
4.5	Is the census the most appropriate information source? • Wide relevance for all local authorities at a low geographical level • Information is mapped by councils at a meshblock level	3	13.5/15
3	Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? • May be other methods to include at a later date, but likely a need for this information going forward	2	6/10
4	Will the proposed change produce quality information? • Already gives moderate to high data quality, 6.4% non response rate in 2013 • May be some rounding errors, especially for people at an address for a long time	4	16/20
5	Is there continuity with previous census data? • Yes, question has been in previous censuses	1	5/5
3*	Is data consistent with other data collections?	1	3/5
4	Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? • Has been included for some time, and nearly all submitters were supportive of its inclusion	2	8/10
2.5	Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • Mid non response rate, although can take some thought, especially if you have been at address for a long time, or what to round to	1	2.5/5
	Total		68/90

Final score (%)

76

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Number of children born alive – include with no change		

Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy?
    - Crucial for information on childlessness and child bearing which have important consequences for NZ's labour market participation, health resourcing, social well-being and aged care planning. Only information that can provide a robust basis for examining childlessness.
    - This information helps to be able to conduct detailed analysis of fertility behaviour particularly by ethnicity and this will assist in future projections of ethnicity counts
	4	(4.5)18/20

Is the census the most appropriate information source?
    - There are no other data sources, including linked administrative data, which can be used to robustly measure childlessness.
    - Could possibly be collected elsewhere
	3	(4)12/15

Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need?
 	
    - Important for retention due to NZ's changing ethnic composition and our ageing population
    - Fertility behaviour changes rapidly in environments like New Zealand with large scale migration
	2	(4.5) 9/10

Will the proposed change produce quality information?
    - Main issue has been around the sensitivity of the subject however those who marked "object to answer" have decreased from 5.8% in 1996 to only 2.8% in 2013.
    - Data quality in 2013 high: fit for purpose with minor data quality issues only
    - Non-response rate 7.5% is 2013
	4	(4) 16/20

Is there continuity with previous census data? - Yes this information has been collected in the last three censuses	**1**	5/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? - Births data doesn't collect information on overseas births to New Zealand women and doesn't provide information on childlessness.	**1**	3/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change?	**2**	(3) 6/10

- Have been issues in the past with this being too intrusive and a highly sensitive subject for some women especially those who have had miscarriages, still borns, and abortions. - Some people still not willing to answer this question however this was only 2.8% in 2013		
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Relatively easy for people to understand the question	**1**	4/5
Total		73/90 (81%)

Topic: Home heating (the topic previously known as fuels). Proposed change = changing it to main heating appliance/system actually used (ie the one used most often) instead of asking all fuels 'ever used'. Preliminary View: more information required to recommend inclusion		
Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census	**Weighting**	
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? Yes – strong indications that this data would be much more useful. wide uses relating to health, the environment, housing quality (safety), understanding changes in electricity demand, progress with energy efficiency goals. Could inform decisions of national significance. Proposed change could be seen as a way of doubling the value of this data because the appliance/system used generally also indicates the energy type, which is information currently collected. 4.5 out of 5	**4**	18/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? Yes. Relevant across NZ, small area/population group data needed. Census is only source able to provide meaningful estimates of fuel poverty for small, high-risk population groups. Doesn't change quickly, so frequency at which census can provide this information is suitable. Generally the census can provide the kind of information needed, with sufficient accuracy, although maybe not everything data users would like e.g. secondary forms of heating, which rooms heated etc. 4.5 out of 5	**3**	13.5/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? Yes – there will be an ongoing need for information on air quality, energy demand, health outcomes, progress with energy efficiency goals etc. These will be most affected by the main type of heating actually used, so proposed change supports this enduring information need. 4.5 out of 5	**2**	9/10

| Will the proposed change produce quality information?

Yes – there are not expected to be many data quality issues and there is potential for it to enhance the data quality because previous evidence shows that respondents know what heating appliance they use but may not know the fuel type (gave the appliance although the question asked for the fuel type). People seem to naturally think about their home heating in terms of the appliance rather than the fuel type.

4 out of 5	**4**	16/20
Is there continuity with previous census data?

Continuity will be lost (different data), but could build in some continuity by grouping appliance categories together to form energy type categories. Don't know how similar this data would be to the previous data. There will continuity for those who only use one type of heating and use it consistently.

2 out of 5 | **1** | 2/5 |
| Is data consistent with other data collections?

Don't seem to be other sources of national data on heating. Not much of an issue.

3 out of 5 | **1** | 3/5 |
| Is there general acceptance of the proposed change?
Yes – expect people will be willing and happy to answer, and see the value in collecting this information. Don't expect respondents would find it intrusive or offensive.

4 out of 5 | **2** | 8/10 |
| Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete?

Yes – expect most people will know the answer (easier than current question) and find this quick and easy to answer. It's consistent with how people think about their heating. Some respondents might have trouble deciding which type is their 'main' one.

3.5 out of 5 | **1** | 3.5/5 |
| **Total** | | 73/90 |

Total percentage: 81 percent

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Access to telecommunications systems – change to collect information on internet connection quality		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? - Info would understand limitations on businesses, especially in rural areas - Big government investment in UFB rollout across country, currently no good data sources on this 4	**4**	16/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? - High level of geographic detail is needed - One time snapshot would highly inform information needs in this area - Census does not/cannot provide super detailed info on ict - Other sources coming through (Aug 16 Core) 3.5 2 (Aug 16 Core)	**3**	10.5/15 6/15 (Aug 16 Core)
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? - Info on quality of internet access is a strong future need, question of whether this question would change over time - Future collection of ICT data uncertain outside of census 3.5	**2**	7/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? - Current question produces good quality - Current data is arguably too simplified so limiting analysis that can be done – change would improve this - Adding complexity may slightly affect response accuracy - Very difficult for respondent to provide quality response (Aug 16 Core) 3.5 2 (Aug 16 Core)	**4**	14/20 8/20 (Aug 16 Core)
Is there continuity with previous census data? - Detailed categories would collapse to provide comparability with previous data (unless 3g/smartphone network information was collected) - Could disrupt other internet access questions (Aug 16 Core) 4 3 (Aug 16 Core)	**1**	4/5 3/5 (Aug 16 Core)
Is data consistent with other data collections? - Dwelling telecommunications access is not commonly collected elsewhere specifically	**1**	3*/5

Is there general acceptance of the proposed change?
 	
    -   Non-intrusive on dwelling form
    -   Those who have limited connections would likely want this represented
4
	2	8/10

Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? - Some may have issues with distinguishing but overall concept would work on census style form 2.5 1 (Aug 16 Core)	**1**	2.5/5 1/5 (Aug 16 Core)
Total		65/90 52/90 (Aug 16 Core)

Score 72%

Score 58% (Aug 16 Core)

Topic: Tenure of household and tenure holder The proposed change is quality improvements – 1. <u>Licence to occupy</u> – collect this information (currently not identified in either variable) Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census		Weight	
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? • Measuring licence to occupy would support better understanding of changes in home ownership levels • Licence to occupy is different from outright ownership and becoming more common so would be good to measure/distinguish it with a separate category • Information on licence to occupy would be useful for councils (e.g. uses relating to rates rebates, dealing with natural disasters), also of interest to groups such as Age Concern, the Retirement Villages Association, researchers 3 out of 5		**4**	12/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? • Wide geographic relevance • Licence to occupy mostly affects older age groups (75 plus), but this is a large and growing group; family trusts affect both younger and older age groups • Licence to occupy data for geographic areas and particular population groups is needed – councils want to know who and where these people are, and their personal characteristics • census can provide the information quickly and often enough (this is not something that changes quickly, is more gradual) • census can provide the kind of information needed with sufficient depth (some question around accuracy) • Census seems to be the best data source to meet customers' needs 3.5 out of 5		**3**	10.5/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? • The need for this information is expected to be enduring • licence to occupy situations are expected to become more common (due to population ageing and growth in retirement			

villages) so the need to measure this will continue and probably increase • as far as is currently known, family trust ownership looks set to continue 3 out of 5	**2**	6/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? • Do not expect many data quality problems • data will be better quality because households/people with a licence to occupy will be clearly identified (currently we don't know where they are in the data and how much this is affecting the home ownership trends (probably some are in owned and some are in don't own) • might help improve quality of responding to tenure holder and possibly to the family trust(s) questions • testing very poorly (Aug 16 Core) 4 out of 5 1 (Aug 16 Core)	**4**	16/20 4/20 (Aug 16 Core)
Is there continuity with previous census data? • will be some loss of comparability over time – of concern because comparability over time is particularly important for this topic – some submitters did not support changes for this reason • Loss of comparability over time means that for changes in the data, we won't know how much of that change is real change and how much has been caused by changes in questionnaire design (longitudinal census data doesn't help – still have same issue) • One solution – cognitive testing to determine how people with a licence to occupy answered previously, work out from there how best to compare over time. Need to do this before confirming changes so we can make an informed decision • Any changes need to be done in such a way as to preserve as much comparability over time as possible. 2 out of 5	**1**	2/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? • Uncertain – may be some inconsistency • Don't know if other data collections have a licence to occupy category (HES?) • Don't think there are other national sources • Not a major issue? 3 out of 5	**1**	3/5

Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? • proposed changes should make it easier for respondents to answer, and provide a better respondent experience for those in licence to occupy and family trust situations. • Licence to occupy is very different from outright ownership so people in this situation will probably recognise the value of having a separate category for this, especially if collecting this data helps with getting rates rebates • Poor testing (Aug 16 Core) 4 out of 5 3 (Aug 16 Core)	**2**	8/10 6/10 (Aug 16 Core)
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • They may be easier to answer than currently for those who have a licence to occupy and were unsure how to answer previously • They may be easier to answer for those with a family trust • Possibly some respondents may not understand whether they have a licence to occupy, but the retirement villages could help us with this • Respondents not understanding the concept 3 out of 5 2 (Aug 16 Core)	**1**	3/5 2/5 (Aug 16 Core)
Total		60.5/90 45.5/90 (Aug 16 Core)

Final score 67%

Final score 51% (Aug 16 Core)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Disability – Washington Group questions	Weight	
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? • Can the data be used by a wide range of decision makers? • Will the data be used to inform decisions of national significance? • Will the information support NZ's key uses of data? 3.5	**4**	14/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? • Is there wide geographical relevance across NZ? • Is there wide relevance across the NZ population? • Is small area or small population data needed? • Does the Census provide information quickly and often enough? • Does the Census provide the kind of information required? • Is Census the best data source to meet customers needs? • Will the Census provide data of sufficient accuracy? • Will the Census provide data of enough depth? 3	**3**	9/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? • Will the information still be required after the 2018 Census? 4	**2**	8/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? • Are there minimal or no quality problems? • Will the proposed change give better quality data? 3	**4**	12/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? • Is it consistent and comparable with previous census data? 3*	**1**	3/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? • Is it consistent with other data collections (concepts, definitions, classifications)? 4	**1**	4/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? • Are there particular concerns for specific groups? • Is it non-intrusive? • Is it non-offensive? • Are respondents willing and happy to answer? • Do respondents feel the proposed change is of value? 3.5	**2**	7/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • Are they easy to understand and interpret? • Are they easy (simple) and quick to answer? • Do people know the answer? 2.5	**1**	2.5/5
Total		59.5/90

Final score 66% (Aug 16 Core)

Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census – Usual address five years ago – include or exclude		
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? • Used to produce 5 yearly population projections. • Is widely used as a measure of stock-flows over the intercensal period, for transition probabilities/rates, for settlement of migrants from overseas, and for historical comparisons back to 1976. 4 (Aug 16 Core)	**4**	16/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? • Not available from any other official source. • This some possibility of linking to previous census 3.5 (Aug 16 Core)	**3**	10.5/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? • Using extensively in the past and will be in the future 4 (Aug 16 Core)	**2**	8/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information? • If people are willing to answer and answer correctly, information quality should be good. • Could reduce quality of other address questions if too many are asked. • Testing shows some issues with cross referencing for respondent 3 (Aug 16 Core)	**4**	12/20
Is there continuity with previous census data? • Yes collected in previous censuses 4	**1**	4/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? • Not collected elsewhere 3	**1**	3/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? • Would be yet another address question. Could be an issue, especially if second residence and address one year ago are also collected. • Respondents may not be aware of its value and may not be willing to answer a further question. • Some trouble with routing in testing 2.5 (Aug 16 Core)	**2**	5/10
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • People should easily know the answer, although inputting may take some time. Would have higher burdon than address 1 year ago. 3 (Aug 16 Core)	**1**	3/5

Total		61.5/90 (Aug 16 Core)

Final score (%)

68% (Aug 16 Core)

Topic: <u>Travel to education</u> (new variables: means of travel and educational institution name/address) Collect on IF, separately from travel to work school and tertiary highest priority (some want pre-school too) Nearly all submitters support <u>usual</u> means of travel. Also support for capturing all modes Position in Preliminary Views: proposed new content Criteria to determine content for the 2018 Census	Weight	
Does the proposed change add value to New Zealand's society and economy? • Strong support – large gap in current data • would support transport planning/management, development of school transport policy, development of fare structures, has implications for safety of travel to school and provision of facilities within/around educational institutions • Wide range of uses and users that extend beyond transport: physical design of schools, health programmes (risk of exposure to smoking in cars, active transport initiatives), education-related uses (cross-referencing with other data), understanding family functioning and requirements placed upon them 4 out of 5	**4**	16/20
Is the census the most appropriate information source? • Yes – small area geographic data is very important for this data and the census is the best data source for this Wide relevance across NZ and the NZ population • Census can provide the type of information needed, maybe not quite everything users would like to know (such as time of travel, time spent, return travel) but can provide some key information 4 out of 5	**3**	12/15
Does the proposed change reflect an enduring information need? • Yes – the need for this data is expected to be ongoing and seems to be increasing in importance 4 out of 5	**2**	8/10
Will the proposed change produce quality information?	**4**	16/20

• Don't expect any major quality problems • would improve the quality of the transport information from the census because it would provide more complete data for understanding transport patterns and demands in different parts of NZ 4 out of 5		
Is there continuity with previous census data? • Not applicable – this is new information not previously collected • Does not disrupt anything, is a major addition 3*	**1**	3/5
Is data consistent with other data collections? • Will probably have some degree of inconsistency with data collected elsewhere such as in the Household Travel Survey For example: very short walks of less than five minutes might be excluded) but should mostly complement/add to that data 3 out of 5	**1**	3/5
Is there general acceptance of the proposed change? • Expect most respondents would be happy to answer • Expect at least some respondents would recognise the value of collecting this information, including those with unmet transport needs • Don't expect people would find it intrusive or offensive • Some parents of young children might not like having to say that their children travel to school by car (congestion issue) and could be a bit reluctant • Has tested well (Aug 16 Core) 3.5 out of 5 4 (Aug 16 Core)	**2**	7/10 8/10 (Aug 16 Core)
Would the proposed questions be easy for respondents to complete? • Generally should be fairly quick and easy to answer (am assuming only need to ask educational institution name, and not the address which would be harder) • Likely to require some thought, such as working out usual combination of modes 3.5 out of 5	**1**	3.5/5
Total		68.5/90 69.5/90 (Aug 16 Core)

76 %

77% (Aug 16 Core)