THE CHILDREN’S SOCIAL HEALTH MONITOR: INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION TO THE CHILDREN’S SOCIAL HEALTH MONITOR

In New Zealand, there are currently large disparities in child health status, with Māori and Pacific children and those living in more deprived areas experiencing a disproportionate burden of morbidity and mortality [22]. These disparities were present even in the mid-2000s, when New Zealand experienced some of its lowest unemployment rates in recent decades.

New Zealand’s macroeconomic environment began to change in 2008 however, in the context of a larger global downturn, with the country officially entering a recession at the end of June 2008, after two consecutive quarters of negative growth. While New Zealand technically left the recession at the end of June 2009 (when quarterly growth reached +0.1%[244]), progress since then has been variable, with unemployment rates, and the number of children reliant on benefit recipients remaining higher than in the mid-2000s.

During 2009, as economic conditions continued to deteriorate, a Working Group made up of health professionals from a range of organisations1 formed, with a view to developing an indicator set to monitor the impact of the economic downturn on child wellbeing. The rationale was the concern that, as the downturn progressed and more families became reliant on Government assistance (e.g. unemployment benefits), some of the adaptations that families might make in response to constrained financial resources (e.g. house downsizing/increasing the number of occupants to meet rent payments, deferring heating costs to pay for groceries) might result in unintended health consequences for children (e.g. increases in infectious and respiratory diseases, exposure to family conflict). It was thus hoped that if any deterioration in child wellbeing did occur, it could be identified early, so that proactive policy responses could be put in place in a timely manner.

The indicator set developed by the Working group, the New Zealand Children’s Social Health Monitor (NZCSHM), was launched for the first time in November 2009, and has been updated annually since then. It currently comprises five Economic and four Health and Wellbeing Indicators, which are usually presented in the following order.

Economic Indicators:
- Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Page 489)
- Income Inequality (Page 491)
- Child Poverty and Living Standards (Page 494)
- Unemployment Rates (Page 503)
- Children Reliant on Benefit Recipients (Page 510)

Health and Wellbeing Indicators:
- Hospital Admissions and Mortality with a Social Gradient (Page 519)
- Infant Mortality and Sudden Unexpected Death in Infancy (Page 83)
- Injuries Arising from the Assault, Neglect or Maltreatment of Children (Page 541)
- Ambulatory Sensitive Hospitalisations (Page 146)

The following sections review each of these indicators in turn, with a view to assessing how children in the region are faring in the current economic climate.

1 The Paediatric Society of New Zealand, the Population Child Health Special Interest Group of the Royal Australasian College of Physicians, the New Zealand Child and Youth Epidemiology Service, TAHA (the Well Pacific Mother and Infant Service), the Māori SIDS Programme, the Te Tuia Well Child Consortium, the New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services, and academics from the Universities of Auckland and Otago.
**Gross Domestic Product (GDP)**

**Introduction**

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is defined as “the total market value of goods and services produced within a given period, after deducting the cost of goods utilised in the process of production” [245]. GDP is often used as a measure of the size of the economy, with nominal GDP being expressed in current dollar prices, and real GDP being expressed in constant dollar prices (i.e. the dollar value of a particular year, after adjustment for inflation).

Changes in real GDP are often used as a measure of economic growth, or the strength of the economy [245], with a recession typically being defined as two consecutive quarters of negative growth [246]. Recessions are often characterised by high unemployment, stagnant wages and a fall in retail sales, and though usually not lasting longer than a year [246], they may have significant implications for child wellbeing. New Zealand entered a recession at the end of June 2008 (after two consecutive quarters of negative growth), and technically left the recession at the end of June 2009 (although growth in the June quarter (0.1%) was extremely close to zero [244]).

The following section briefly reviews changes in New Zealand’s GDP since June 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source and Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gross Domestic Product (GDP): Percent Change from Previous Quarter</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP is the total market value of all final goods and services produced in a country in a given year, equal to total consumer, investment and government spending, plus the value of exports, minus the value of imports. A recession is defined as two consecutive quarters of negative growth (as measured by GDP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator Category:</strong> Ideal B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes on Interpretation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three approaches can be used to calculate GDP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Production Approach:</em> This method calculates what each separate producer adds to the value of final output, by deducting intermediate consumption from gross output. Value added is summed for all producers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Income Approach:</em> This approach measures the incomes received by the owners of the factors of production. These represent the returns to the labour and capital employed such as wages and salaries, and profits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Expenditure Approach:</em> This method sums the values of all final demands, that is, final consumption expenditures (of households, government and private non-profit institutions serving households), changes in inventories, gross capital formation, and net exports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptually, both the production and expenditure approaches of measuring GDP are the same. However, as each series uses independent data and estimation techniques, some differences between the alternative measures arise. The expenditure approach series has historically shown more quarterly volatility and is more likely to be subject to timing and valuation problems. For these reasons, the production-based measure is the preferred measure for short-term quarter-on-quarter and annual changes [247].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Zealand Trends**

**Production-based Measure of GDP**

In New Zealand, GDP decreased for five consecutive quarters from March 2008–March 2009, before increasing again, for five consecutive quarters, from June 2009–June 2010. GDP then briefly declined by 0.1% in the September quarter of 2010, before increasing again, by 0.6% in the December 2010 quarter, by 0.9% in the March 2011 quarter and by 0.1% in the June 2011 quarter. Economic activity for the year ending June 2011 increased by 1.5%, when compared to the year ending June 2010 [248] (Figure 151).

During the June 2011 quarter, finance, insurance and business services increased by 1.5%, and agriculture increased by 4.3%. Construction activity however fell by 4.3% [248].
Expenditure-based Measure of GDP
The expenditure-based measure of GDP, released concurrently with the production-based measure, increased by 0.1% in the June 2011 quarter. During this period, household consumption expenditure increased by 0.3%, while export volumes were down 0.5% and imports were up 1.7%. On an annual basis, expenditure on GDP for the year ending June 2011 increased by 1.6%, when compared to the year ending June 2010 [248].

Figure 151. Gross Domestic Product (GDP): Percentage Change from Previous Quarter, New Zealand June Quarter 2007 to June Quarter 2011


Summary
In New Zealand, GDP decreased for five consecutive quarters from March 2008–March 2009, before increasing again, for five consecutive quarters, from June 2009–June 2010. GDP then briefly declined by 0.1% in the September quarter of 2010, before increasing again, by 0.6% in the December 2010 quarter, by 0.9% in the March 2011 quarter and by 0.1% in the June 2011 quarter. Economic activity for the year ending June 2011 increased by 1.5%, when compared to the year ending June 2010 [248].
INCOME INEQUALITY

Introduction

There has been much debate in recent years regarding the influence of income inequalities on population health. While it is widely acknowledged that poverty plays a crucial role in shaping health disparities, authors such as Wilkinson and Marmot [249] argue that income inequality itself also plays a role, via its links to psychosocial pathways associated with relative disadvantage. They cite the Whitehall studies of British civil servants, which found that mortality increased in a stepwise manner as relative socioeconomic status decreased, with social gradients being evident even amongst those who were not poor. In addition, they note that while health inequalities exist within societies, there is little association between average income (GDP per capita) and life expectancy across rich countries. Rather, there appears to be a strong correlation between income inequality and mortality. In Wilkinson and Marmot’s view, such associations suggest that it is not absolute material deprivation which shapes health at the population level, but rather the effects such inequalities have on psychosocial outcomes such as the degree of control over work, anxiety, depression and social affiliations. In support of this argument, they cite a number of studies which demonstrate social gradients in the lack of control over work, low variety at work and a severe lack of social support, with animal experiments also suggesting that low social status, via its effects on neuroendocrine pathways, leads to atherosclerosis, unfavourable lipid profiles, central obesity, insulin resistance and raised basal cortisol [249].

Others such as Lynch [250] however, would argue that it is not the psychological effects of income inequality which play the greatest role, but rather the lack of material resources (e.g. differentials in access to adequate nutrition, housing and healthcare), coupled with a systematic underinvestment in human, physical, health and social infrastructure (e.g. the types and quality of education, health services, transportation, recreational facilities and public housing available). In Lynch’s view, the combination of these negative exposures is particularly important for the health of the most disadvantaged (who have the fewest individual resources), and that in this context, the associations between income inequality and health are not inevitable, but rather are contingent on the level of public infrastructure and resources available. While debate on the precise pathways continues, both sides of the income inequality argument agree, that reducing income inequality by raising incomes for the most disadvantaged, will reduce inequalities and improve population health [251].

The following section explores income inequalities in New Zealand since 1984 using two different measures, the P80/P20 Ratio and the Gini Coefficient.

**Definition**

1. Income Inequality as Measured by the P80/P20 Ratio
2. Income Inequality as Measured by the Gini Coefficient

**Data Source**

Statistics New Zealand Household Economic Surveys (NZHES n=2,800–3,500 households per survey) via Perry 2011 [252].

Note: The P80/P20 Ratio and Gini coefficient are monitored by the Ministry of Social Development using NZHES data [253] which was available 2-yearly from 1982–1998, and 3-yearly thereafter. Since 2007, income data have become available annually through the new NZHES Incomes Survey. The full NZHES (including expenditure data) however remains 3-yearly. For more detail on methodology used see Perry 2011 [252].

**Indicator Category** Proxy B

**Notes on Interpretation**

**P80/P20Ratio:** When individuals are ranked by equivalised household income and then divided into 100 equal groups, each group is called a percentile. If the ranking starts with the lowest income, then the income at the top of the 20th percentile is denoted P20 and the income at the top of the 80th percentile is called P80. The ratio of the value at the top of the 80th percentile to the value at the top of the 20th percentile is called the P80/20 ratio and is often used as a measure of income inequality (e.g. a P80/20 ratio of 3.0 indicates that those at the top of the 80th percentile have incomes 3.0x higher than those at the top of the 20th percentile). In general, the higher the ratio, the greater is the level of inequality [253].
Gini Coefficient: The Lorenz curve is a graph with the horizontal axis showing the cumulative % of people in a population ranked by their income. The vertical axis shows the corresponding cumulative % of equivalised disposable household income (i.e. the graph shows the income share of any selected cumulative proportion of the population). The diagonal line represents a situation of perfect equality (i.e. all people having the same income). The Gini coefficient is derived from the Lorenz curve and is the ratio of the area between the actual Lorenz curve and the diagonal (or line of equality), compared to the total area under the diagonal. When the Gini coefficient = 0 all people have the same level of income. When it approaches 1, one person receives all the income (i.e. it is an overall measure of income inequality: the higher the number, the greater the level of inequality) [254]. When comparing changes in income distributions over time, the Gini coefficient is more sensitive to changes in the more dense low-to-middle parts of the distribution, than it is to changes towards the ends of the distribution [253].

New Zealand Trends

Income Inequality: P80/P20 Ratio
In New Zealand during 1984–2010, income inequality as measured by the P80/P20 ratio, was higher after adjusting for housing costs than prior to this adjustment. The most rapid rises in income inequality occurred during 1988–1992. While income inequality also rose during 1994–2004, the rate of increase was slower. During 2004–2010, the P80/P20 ratio fell, a decline in income inequality which Perry attributes firstly to the Working for Families package (2004–2007), and secondly to a fall in higher incomes and a small rise in lower incomes (2007–2010) [252](Figure 152).

Income Inequality: Gini Coefficient
In New Zealand during 1984–2010, income inequality as measured by the Gini Coefficient, was also higher after adjusting for housing costs than prior to this adjustment. The most rapid rises in income inequality also occurred between the late 1980s and early 1990s. Using both the before and after housing cost measures, the Gini Coefficient declined between 2001 and 2007, a decline which Perry again attributes to the impact of the Working for Families package. There was a further decline in 2010, which Perry attributes to a fall in higher incomes, coupled with small gains for lower income households [252](Figure 153).

Summary
In New Zealand during 1984–2010 income inequality, as measured by the P80/P20 ratio and Gini coefficient, was higher after adjusting for housing costs than prior to this adjustment. The most rapid rises in income inequality occurred between the late 1980s and early 1990s. During the early–mid 2000s however, income inequality declined, a change Perry attributes largely to the Working for Families package. Additional falls in income inequality were seen in 2010, with Perry attributing this to a fall in higher incomes, coupled with small gains for lower income households [252].
Figure 152. Income Inequality in New Zealand as Assessed by the P80/P20 Ratio for the 1984–2010 HES Years


Figure 153. Income Inequality in New Zealand as Assessed by the Gini Coefficient for the 1984–2010 HES Years

CHILD POVERTY AND LIVING STANDARDS

Introduction
High rates of child poverty are a cause for concern, as low family income has been associated with a range of negative outcomes including low birth weight, infant mortality, poorer mental health and cognitive development, and hospital admissions from a variety of causes [255]. Further, the Christchurch Health and Development Study suggests that exposure to low family income during childhood and early adolescence may increase the risk of leaving school without qualifications, economic inactivity, early parenthood and contact with the justice system. While adjusting for potentially mediating factors (e.g. parental education, maternal age, and sole parent status) reduces the magnitude of these associations somewhat, they do not disappear completely, suggesting that the pathways linking low family income to long term outcomes are complex, and in part may be mediated by other socioeconomic variables [256]. Yet while there is much debate about the precise pathways involved, there is a general consensus that the relationship between poverty and adverse outcomes is non-linear, with the effects increasing most rapidly across the range from partial to severe deprivation [257].

In New Zealand, the Ministry of Social Development has periodically reviewed the socioeconomic wellbeing of families with children using information from two data sources:

1. The New Zealand Household Economic Survey, which can be used to assess the proportion of families with children who live below the income poverty line [258].

2. The New Zealand Living Standards Survey, which uses the Economic Living Standards Index (NZELSI) to assess the proportion of families with children who live in severe or significant hardship [259]

The following section uses information from these two data sources to assess the proportion of New Zealand children living in poverty, or exposed to severe or significant hardship in recent years.

Children Living in Households Below the Poverty Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source and Methods</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Proportion of children with equivalised disposable household income &lt; 50% or &lt;60% current median</td>
<td>Statistics New Zealand Household Economic Survey (NZHES n=2,800–3,500 households per survey) via Perry 2011 [252]. Note: Child Poverty measures are reported on by the Ministry of Social Development using NZHES data [252] which was available 2-yearly from 1982–1998, and 3-yearly thereafter. Since 2007, income data have become available annually through the new HES Incomes Survey. The full NZHES (including expenditure data) however remains 3-yearly. For more detail on methodology used see Perry 2011 [252].</td>
<td>Relative poverty measures set a poverty benchmark that rises and falls with changes in national median incomes (i.e. poverty is defined in relation to the incomes of others in the same year). Constant-value (CV) poverty measures select a median at a set point in time (e.g. 1998 or 2007) and then adjust forward and back in time for changes in consumer prices (i.e. they seek to maintain a constant buying power for the poverty benchmark over time). In his 2011 update, Perry [252] notes that in real terms, the median income in 1998 was similar to 1982 and thus there is a good case for using 1998 as the reference year for CV poverty calculations back to 1982, as well as forward from 1998. By 2007 however, the median was 16% higher than in 1998 and by 2009, 26%. Thus the reference year was changed to 2007. While reporting CV poverty figures back to 1982 using 2007 as the reference tells us what proportion were ‘poor’ back then, relative to 2007, this approach is not useful for assessing the extent of hardship ‘back then’ relative to the standards of the day. Thus in the analyses which follow, 2007 CV figures are provided from 2007 onwards, with earlier years using 1998 as the reference year. The first two figures however, report 1998 and 2007 CV figures for the entire period, in order to demonstrate the impact the change of reference year has on the poverty rates produced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Child Poverty measures are reported on by the Ministry of Social Development using NZHES data [252] which was available 2-yearly from 1982–1998, and 3-yearly thereafter. Since 2007, income data have become available annually through the new HES Incomes Survey. The full NZHES (including expenditure data) however remains 3-yearly. For more detail on methodology used see Perry 2011 [252].
Children’s Social Health Monitor Economic Indicators

**Note:** Most income poverty measures use equivalised disposable household income (i.e. after tax household income adjusted for family size and composition). Both measures can be calculated before or after taking housing costs into account. For more detail on the methodology used see Perry 2011 [252].

---

**Child Poverty Trends Using Different Poverty Measures**

**Before Housing Costs**

*Relative Poverty (Compared to Contemporary Median):* In New Zealand, relative child poverty rose rapidly during 1990–1992, a rise which Perry [253] attributes to rising unemployment and the 1991 Benefit Cuts (which reduced incomes for beneficiaries to a greater extent than the median fell during this period). During 1992–1998, relative child poverty rates then declined, a trend which Perry attributes to falling unemployment, occurring in a context where incomes for those around the poverty line rose more quickly than the median. After 1998 however, as economic conditions improved, median incomes again rose, while incomes for many low-income households with children did not, resulting in a rise in relative child poverty up until 2004. From 2004 to 2007 relative poverty rates again declined, a decline which Perry attributes to the roll out of the Working for Families package. Before housing cost, relative child poverty rates in 2010 were similar to what they were in the 1980s [252] (Figure 154).

*Fixed Line Poverty (Compared to 1998 and 2007 Median):* In New Zealand during the early 1990s, fixed line child poverty measures increased markedly, for similar reasons to those outlined above. During 1994–1998 however, child poverty rates declined, a trend which Perry attributes to improving economic conditions and falling unemployment. During 1998–2004, child poverty rates continued to fall (CV 2007 median only). Rates fell more rapidly (both CV 1998 and 2007 median) during 2004–2007, a change which Perry attributes to the Working for Families package [253] (Figure 154).

**After Housing Costs**

*Relative Poverty (Compared to Contemporary Median):* In New Zealand during 1982–2010, while trends in relative child poverty after adjustment for housing costs (AHC), were broadly similar to before housing cost (BHC) measures, one key difference was evident: that AHC child poverty rates in 2010 remained higher than in the 1980s, while BHC measures were closer to 1980s levels. In addition, during 2007–2010 using the after housing costs measure, child poverty increased from 22% to 26%. Perry [252] attributes these differences to the fact that housing costs in 2010 accounted for a higher proportion of household expenditure for low-income households, than they did in the 1980s (in 1988 16% of households in the bottom income quintile spent >30% of their income on housing; in 2007 this figure was 33%). Perry notes however, that the income-related rental policies introduced in 2000, along with later changes to Accommodation Supplements, helped reduce housing expenditure for some low income households, and that these changes contributed to reductions in AHC child poverty during 2001–2007. There were no further policy changes during 2007–2010 however, with maximum rates of assistance remaining fixed, as housing costs continued to increase. As a result, net housing expenditure rose, especially for low income households and this resulted in increases in AHC child poverty rates during 2007–2010 [252] (Figure 155).

*Fixed Line Poverty (Compared to 1998 and 2007 Median):* In New Zealand during 1984–2008, trends in fixed line child poverty after adjustment for housing costs (AHC), were broadly similar to before housing cost (BHC) measures, with the fixed line (AHC) poverty rate in 2007 being around the same as it was in the 1980s (in contrast to the relative AHC poverty rate, which was much higher than in the 1980s) (Figure 155).
Figure 154. Proportion of Dependent Children Aged 0–17 Years Living Below the Income Poverty Threshold Before Housing Costs, New Zealand 1984–2010 HES Years


Figure 155. Proportion of Dependent Children Aged 0–17 Years Living Below the Income Poverty Threshold After Housing Costs, New Zealand 1984–2010 HES Years

Child Poverty Trends: <60% of 1998 / 2007 Median, After Housing Costs

Child Poverty by Children’s Age
In New Zealand during 1984–2010, poverty rates for younger children (0–6 years and 7–11 years) were generally higher than for older children (12–17 years) (Figure 156).

Child Poverty by Number of Children in Household
In New Zealand during 1984–2010, child poverty rates for households with 3 or more children were consistently higher than for households with 1–2 children (Figure 157). (Comment: Perry notes that in 2010, children from these larger households made up 48% of all poor children [252]).

Child Poverty Trends by Household Type
In New Zealand, child poverty rates for children in both sole-parent and two-parent households increased rapidly between 1988 and 1992. In absolute terms however, poverty rose most rapidly for children in sole-parent households, with rates reaching a peak of 77% in 1996 (two-parent: rates peaked at 29% in 1994). While rates for both household types declined between 2001 and 2007, during 2007 child poverty rates for those in sole-parent households remained higher than their 1980s levels, while rates for two-parent households were similar (Figure 158). (Comment: Perry notes that one in three sole parent families live in wider households with other adults, and that children living in these “other” households have significantly lower poverty rates than those living in sole parent households, because of the greater household resources available to them [252]).

Figure 156. Proportion of Dependent Children Living Below the 60% Income Poverty Threshold (1998 and 2007 Median, After Housing Costs) by Age, New Zealand 1984–2010 HES Years

Figure 157. Proportion of Dependent Children Aged 0–17 Years Living Below the 60% Income Poverty Threshold (1998 and 2007 Median, After Housing Costs) by Number of Children in Household, New Zealand 1984–2010 HES Years


Figure 158. Proportion of Dependent Children Aged 0–17 Years Living Below the 60% Income Poverty Threshold (1998 and 2007 Median, After Housing Costs) by Household Type, New Zealand 1984–2010 HES Years

Child Poverty Trends by Work Status of Adults in Household

In New Zealand, child poverty rates for children in workless households, or where no adults worked full time, increased rapidly during 1988–1992. Poverty rates for children in these households remained elevated during the 1990s (range 66%–78%), before declining during 2001–2007. Even at their nadir in 2007, poverty rates for children in these households remained much higher than 1980s levels. In contrast, increases in child poverty for households where an adult worked full time, or was self-employed, were much less marked, with rates in 2007–2009 being similar to those in the 1980s (Figure 159).

(Comment: Perry notes that during the 1980s, children in workless households were ≈2x as likely to be in poor households; during 1992–2004 this had risen to ≈3–4x higher, and by 2007–2009 it was ≈6–7x higher[253]).

Summary: Child Poverty

In New Zealand during 1988–1992, child poverty rates increased markedly, as a result of rising unemployment and the 1991 Benefit cuts. During 1994–1998 however, rates declined, as economic conditions improved and unemployment fell. During 1998–2004, child poverty trends varied, depending on the measure used, but between 2004 and 2007 they again declined, following the roll out of the Working for Families package. For the majority of this period, child poverty rates were higher for younger children (0–11 vs. 12–17 years), larger households (3 or more children vs. 1–2 children), sole parent households and households where the adults were either workless, or where none worked full time.
Families with Reduced Living Standards

The Ministry of Social Development has undertaken three national Living Standards Surveys, in 2000, 2004 and 2008. The 2008 Survey collected information from 5000 households on their material circumstances, including ownership and quality of household durables, their ability to keep the house warm, pay the bills, have broken down appliances repaired, and pursue hobbies and other interests [258]. The following section briefly reviews the living standards of children aged 0–17 years, using the 2008 Living Standards Survey’s composite index of deprivation.

Data Source and Methods

Definition
Proportion of Children Aged 0–17 Years with Deprivation Scores of Four or More

Data Source
The Ministry of Social Development’s 2008 Living Standards Survey [258].

In the 2008 Living Standards Survey, respondents provided information about themselves and others in their Economic Family Unit (EFU). A respondent’s EFU comprised the respondent and partner (if any), together with their dependent children in the household (if any). This was a narrower concept than the census family unit which includes other family members such as adult children and parents of adult children.

In the survey, total response ethnicity was used, meaning that categories were not mutually exclusive, as one person could be in two or more categories depending on their response. When the analysis was repeated using prioritised ethnicity however, the change in classification had minimal impact on the results.

Deprivation Index Used in 2008 Living Standards Survey

In the 2008 Living Standards Survey, a 14 item material deprivation index was used to compare the relative positions of different population groups. Each item in the index assessed an ‘enforced lack’, with items being divided into two categories: ownership / participation, where an item was wanted but not possessed because of cost; and economising items, which focused on cutting back or going without in order to pay for other basic needs. The deprivation score for each respondent was the sum of all enforced lacks, with a cut off of 4+ being used as a measure of material hardship, as it represented the 15% of the population experiencing the most hardship (and was thus seen as being equivalent to the MSD’s income poverty measures).

14 Items (Enforced Lacks) Included in 2008 Living Standards Survey Deprivation Index

Ownership/Participation
- A Good Bed
- Ability to Keep Main Rooms Adequately Warm
- Suitable Clothes for Important or Special Occasions
- Home Contents Insurance
- Presents for Family and Friends on Special Occasions

Economising ‘A Lot’ (To Keep Down Costs to Help Pay for Other Basics)
- Continued Wearing Worn Out Clothing
- Continued Wearing Worn Out Shoes
- Went Without or Cut Back On Fresh Fruit and Vegetables
- Bought Cheaper or Less Meat than Wanted
- Postponed Visits to the Doctor
- Did Not Pick Up a Prescription
- Put Up With Feeling Cold to Save on Heating Costs
- Went Without or Cut Back On Visits to Family or Friends
- Did Not go to a Funeral (Tangi) You Wanted to

Proportion of Children with High Deprivation Scores

In the 2008 Living Standards Survey, 51% of Pacific children, 39% of Māori children, 23% of “Other” children and 15% of European children aged 0–17 years scored four or more on the composite deprivation index, which measured a range of “enforced lacks”, as outlined in the Methods box above. In addition, 59% of children whose family’s income source was a benefit had scores of four or more (Figure 160). When broken down by individual item, those children who scored four or more on the composite deprivation index had much higher exposures to household economising behaviours such as having to wear worn out...
shoes or clothing, sharing a bed or bedroom, cutting back on fresh fruit and vegetables and postponing doctors visits because of cost (Table 172).

Table 172. Restrictions Experienced by Children, by the Deprivation Score of their Family, NZ Living Standards Survey 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of children across the DEP scores</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2–3</th>
<th>4–5</th>
<th>6+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children per family</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforced lacks of children's items</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends to birthday party</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterproof coat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate bed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate bedrooms for children of opposite sex (10+ yr)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All school uniform items required by the school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economising 'a lot' on children's items to keep down costs to afford other basics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children continued to wear worn out shoes/clothes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postponed child's visit to doctor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not pick up prescription for children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to pay for school trip</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went without music, dance, kapa haka, art etc</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in sport had to be limited</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple deprivation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4+ of the 11 children's items above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ of the 11 children's items above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ of the 11 children's items above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children's serious health problems reported by respondent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious health problems for child in the last year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforced lacks reported by respondent in child's family</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep main rooms warm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal with meat/chicken/fish at least each second day</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut back/did without fresh fruit and vegetables</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postponed visit to doctor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One weeks holiday away from home in last year</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home computer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing and local community conditions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical condition of house (poor/very poor)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major difficulty to keep house warm in winter</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dampness or mould (major problem)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime or vandalism in the area (major problem)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NZ 2008 Living Standards Survey [258]
Summary

In the 2008 Living Standards Survey, 51% of Pacific children, 39% of Māori children, 23% of “Other” children and 15% of European children aged 0–17 years scored four or more on the composite deprivation index, which measured a range of “enforced lacks”. In addition, 59% of children whose family’s income source was a benefit had scores of four or more. When broken down by individual item, those children who scored four or more on the composite deprivation index had much higher exposures to household economising behaviours such as having to wear worn out shoes or clothing, sharing a bed or bedroom, cutting back on fresh fruit and vegetables and postponing doctors visits because of cost.
Introduction

In the quarter ending December 2009, seasonally adjusted unemployment rates rose to 7.1%, their eighth consecutive quarterly rise. Since then unemployment rates have remained in the mid-to-high 6% range, with rates in the most recent (September 2011) quarter being 6.6% [260]. Throughout this period, unemployment rates have been higher for Māori and Pacific people, young people (particularly those 15–19 years) and those without formal qualifications [145]. Such increases are of concern for New Zealand children and young people for two reasons.

Firstly, research suggests that children in families where their parents are unemployed have higher rates of psychosomatic symptoms, chronic illnesses and low wellbeing, and that while the magnitude of these associations is reduced once other potentially mediating factors are taken into account (e.g. parents’ former occupation, sole parent status, and migrant status), the associations do not disappear completely [261]. Further, research suggests that these negative effects may be mediated via the impact unemployment has on parents’ mental health, with the mental distress associated with decreased social status, disruption of roles, loss of self-esteem and increased financial strain, all impacting negatively on parents’ emotional state [261]. This in turn may lead to non-supportive marital interactions, compromised parenting, and children’s internalising (e.g. aggressive or delinquent behaviour, substance abuse) and externalising (e.g. aggressive or delinquent behaviour, substance abuse) behaviour [262].

Secondly, for young people the research suggests that unemployment leads to a range of negative psychological outcomes including depression, anxiety and low self-esteem, which are in turn associated with adverse outcomes such as heavy tobacco, alcohol and drug use, and higher mortality from suicide and accidents [263]. While social support may reduce the psychological distress associated with unemployment, the type of support provided is important (e.g. while positive support from family and friends decreases psychological distress amongst unemployed youth, parental advice may at times increase distress, as it may be perceived as pressure to find a job [263]). On a more positive note, research also suggests that this psychological distress decreases once young people find permanent employment, or return to further education [263].

The following section uses information from Statistics New Zealand’s Quarterly Household Labour Force Surveys, to review unemployment rates during the past two decades.

Data Source and Methods

Definition
Unemployment Rate: The number of unemployed people expressed as a percentage of the labour force.

Data Source

Notes on Interpretation
Unemployed refers to all people in the working-age population who during the reference week were without a paid job, were available for work and [264]:

(a) had actively sought work in the past four weeks ending with the reference week, or
(b) had a new job to start within four weeks.

Note 1: A person whose only job search method in the previous four weeks has been to look at job advertisements in the newspapers is not considered to be actively seeking work.

Note 2: Seasonal adjustment makes data for adjacent quarters more comparable by smoothing out the effects of any regular seasonal events. This ensures the underlying movements in time series are more visible. Each quarter, the seasonal adjustment process is applied to the latest and all previous quarters. This means that seasonally adjusted estimates for previously published quarters may change slightly [247].
New Zealand Distribution and Trends

Seasonally Adjusted Unemployment Rates
In the quarter ending September 2011, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate rose to 6.6%, while seasonally adjusted unemployment numbers increased from 154,000 to 157,000 (Figure 161). The number of people employed also increased (by 5,000) to reach 2,218,000 [260].

Figure 161. Seasonally Adjusted Unemployment Rates, New Zealand Quarter 1 (March) 1986 to Quarter 3 (September) 2011

Unemployment Rates by Age
In New Zealand during September 1987–2011, unemployment rates were consistently higher for younger people (15–19 years > 20–24 years > 25–29 years > 35–39 years and 45–49 years). During the year ending September 2011, annual unemployment rates were 26.1% for those aged 15–19 years and to 12.1% for those aged 20–24 years (Figure 162).

Unemployment Rates by Age and Gender
In New Zealand during September 1987–2011, there were no consistent gender differences in annual unemployment rates for young people aged 15–24 years. During the year ending September 2011, unemployment rates for those aged 15–19 years were 24.8% for females and 27.2% for males, while for those aged 20–24 years, rates were 11.5% for females and 12.5% for males (Figure 163).
Figure 162. Annual Unemployment Rates by Age (Selected Age Groups), New Zealand September 1987–2011

Figure 163. Annual Unemployment Rates by Age and Gender in New Zealand Young People Aged 15–24 Years, September 1987–2011

Source: Statistics New Zealand Household Labour Force Survey
Unemployment Rates by Ethnicity
In New Zealand during 2007(Q4)–2011(Q3) unemployment rates were consistently higher for Māori and Pacific > Asian/Indian > European people. Unemployment rates increased for all ethnic groups during 2008 and 2009, but became more static during 2010–2011(Q3) for Māori, Pacific and European people. However, rates for Asian/Indian people exhibited a general downward trend between 2010(Q2) and 2011(Q2). Thus by 2011(Q3), unemployment rates were 13.2% for Māori, 14.4% for Pacific, 7.9% for Asian/Indian and 4.9% for European people (Figure 164).

Unemployment Rates by Qualification
In New Zealand during the years ending September 1987–2011, unemployment rates were higher for those with no qualifications > school qualifications, or post school but no school qualifications > both post school and school qualifications. In the year ending September 2011, unemployment rates were 10.4% for those with no qualifications, 8.6% for those with a school qualification, 8.0% for those post school, but with no school qualifications and 4.2% for those both post school and with school qualifications (Figure 165).

Duration of Unemployment
In New Zealand during the years ending September 1987–2011, duration of unemployment varied markedly, and in a manner consistent with prevailing unemployment rates. Thus the highest proportion of people unemployed for 53+ weeks occurred during the early / mid 1990s, when unemployment rates were at their peak, while the highest proportion unemployed for only 1–4 weeks occurred in the mid–late 2000s, when unemployment rates were at their lowest (Figure 166).

Figure 164. Quarterly Unemployment Rates by Total Response Ethnicity, New Zealand Quarter 4 (December) 2007 to Quarter 3 (September) 2011

![Unemployment Rates by Ethnicity](image)

Figure 165. Annual Unemployment Rates by Qualification, New Zealand September 1987–2011

Source: Statistics New Zealand Household Labour Force Survey

Figure 166. Proportion of those Unemployed by Duration of Unemployment, New Zealand September 1987–September 2011

Source: Statistics New Zealand Household Labour Force Survey
Figure 167. Quarterly Unemployment Rates by Regional Council, South Island Regional Councils vs. New Zealand Quarter 1 (March) 2005 to Quarter 3 (September) 2011

Source: Statistics New Zealand Household Labour Force Survey
Regional Trends

Regional Unemployment Rates: Quarterly
In the South Island during 2005(Q1)–2011(Q3) unemployment trends were similar to those occurring nationally. Rates fluctuated during 2005–2008, but began to rise thereafter. Rates were lower than the New Zealand rate in Canterbury, Tasman/Nelson/ Marlborough/West Coast, and Southland throughout this period, while in Otago rates were lower during 2008–2011(Q3) (Figure 167).

Summary
In the quarter ending September 2011, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate rose to 6.6%, while seasonally adjusted unemployment numbers increased from 154,000 to 157,000. During September 1987–2011, unemployment rates were higher for younger people (15–19 years > 20–24 years > 25–29 years > 35–39 years and 45–49 years) and those with no qualifications > school qualifications, or post school but no school qualifications > both post school and school qualifications, although there were no consistent gender differences for young people 15–24 years. During 2007(Q4)–2011(Q3) unemployment rates were higher for Māori and Pacific > Asian/Indian > European people. Unemployment rates increased for all ethnic groups during 2008 and 2009, but became more static during 2010–2011(Q3) for Māori, Pacific and European people. Rates for Asian/Indian people declined between 2010(Q2) and 2011(Q2).

In the South Island during 2005(Q1)–2011(Q3) unemployment trends were similar to those occurring nationally. Rates fluctuated during 2005–2008, but began to rise thereafter. Rates were lower than the New Zealand rate in Canterbury, Tasman/Nelson/ Marlborough/West Coast, and Southland throughout this period, while in Otago rates were lower during 2008–2011(Q3).
CHILDREN RELIANT ON BENEFIT RECIPIENTS

Introduction

In New Zealand, children who are reliant on benefit recipients are a particularly vulnerable group. During 2009, 75% of all households (including those with and without children) relying on income-tested benefits as their main source of income were living below the poverty line (housing adjusted equivalent disposable income <60% of 2007 median) [265]. This proportion has increased over the past two decades, rising from 39% of benefit dependent households in 1990, to a peak of 76% in 1994, and then remaining in the low–mid 70s ever since [265], with these trends being attributed to three main factors: cuts in the level in income support during 1991, growth in unemployment (which peaked at 11% in 1991) and escalating housing costs, particularly for those in rental accommodation [266].

The vulnerability of benefit dependent children was further highlighted by the 2000 Living Standards Survey, which noted that even once the level of family income was taken into account, families whose main source of income was Government benefits were more likely to be living in severe or significant hardship and as a consequence, more likely to buy cheaper cuts of meat, go without fruit and vegetables, put up with feeling cold to save on heating costs, make do without enough bedrooms, have children share a bed, postpone a child’s visit to the doctor or dentist, go without a computer or internet access and limit their child’s involvement in school trips, sports and extracurricular activities [266]. The 2004 Living Standards Survey suggested that the picture may have worsened between 2000 and 2004, with the proportion of benefit dependent families living in severe or significant hardship increasing from 39% in 2000 to 58% in 2004 [259].

The following section reviews the number of children aged 0–18 years who were dependent on benefit recipients during April 2000–2011, using information from the Ministry of Social Development’s SWIFTT database. While the number of children reliant on benefit recipients does not correlate precisely with the number living below the poverty line (in 2004 they comprised 60% of those in poverty [267]), in the context of New Zealand’s recent rises in unemployment rates, they nevertheless reflect a particularly vulnerable group, who may have higher health needs, and as a consequence, may make a significant contribution to future health service demand.

Data Source and Methods

Definition
Children Reliant on a Benefit or a Benefit Recipient by Benefit Type

Data Source
Numerator: Number of Children Aged 0–18 years who were reliant on a Benefit or Benefit Recipient as recorded in the Ministry of Social Development’s SWIFTT database
Denominator: Statistics NZ Estimated Resident Population

Notes on Interpretation
Data were provided by the Ministry of Social Development (MSD) from their SWIFTT database which records information on recipients of financial assistance through Work and Income for 2000–2011. All figures, unless stated otherwise, refer to the number of children who were dependent on a benefit or benefit recipient as at the end of April and provide no information on those receiving assistance at other times of the year.

Note: New Zealand level trend data are for children 0–18 years, whereas Service Centre Data may also include a very small number (n=5 in 2010) who are aged 19+ years.

To be eligible for a benefit, clients must have insufficient income from all sources to support themselves and any dependents and meet the eligibility criteria for benefits. These are:

Domestic Purposes Benefit–Sole Parent (DPB-SP) and Emergency Maintenance Allowance: This benefit provides income support for sole parents living with their dependent children under 18 years, who meet an income test and are New Zealand citizens or permanent residents. To be eligible, a parent must be 18 years or older OR have been legally married or in a civil union. A 16 or 17 year old sole parent who has never been married may be eligible to receive an Emergency Maintenance Allowance. This emergency benefit can also be paid to sole parents aged 18 and over who do not meet specific criteria for DPB-SP or other benefits.

SWIFTT is the income support database developed by the New Zealand Income Support Service to calculate, provide and record income support payments and related client history [268]
**Children’s Social Health Monitor Economic Indicators**

**Unemployment Benefits**: These benefits are available to people who are available for and actively seeking full time work. Clients must be aged 18+ years or 16–17 years and living with a spouse or partner and dependent children. Those receiving unemployment benefits are subject to a full time work test, as are their spouses or partners if they have no dependent children, or if their youngest dependent child is aged 14+ years. Applicants must have continuously lived in New Zealand for two years or more. An Unemployment Benefit Hardship is available to those who do not meet these criteria but who are not successfully able to support themselves through paid employment or by other means.

**Sickness Benefit**: To be eligible for a Sickness Benefit people need to be 18 years of age, or 16–17 years of age and either 27+ weeks pregnant or living with a partner and children they support. They must have had to stop working or reduce their hours because of sickness, injury, pregnancy or disability OR, if unemployed or working part time, find it hard to look for or do full time work for the same reasons. To qualify, a person’s (and their partner’s) income must be below a certain level and they must have a medical certificate, the first of which can last for only up to 4 weeks. For pregnant women, payments may continue for up to 13 weeks after the birth of their child. At least two years’ residence is required, though a benefit may be granted in cases of hardship.

**Invalid’s Benefit**: To be eligible for an Invalid’s Benefit, people need to be 16+ years of age and unable to work 15+ hours a week because of a sickness, injury or disability which is expected to last at least two years OR their life expectancy is less than two years and they are unable to regularly work 15+ hours a week OR they are blind with a specified level of visual impairment. A doctor’s certificate is required and an applicant must be a New Zealand citizen or permanent resident and have lived in New Zealand for 10 years or more.

**Other Benefits**: In this section, Other Benefits includes DPB Women Alone and Caring for Sick or Infirm, NZ Superannuation, Veterans and Transitional Retirement Benefit, Emergency Benefits and Widows Benefit, Independent Youth Benefit, Unemployment Benefit Training and Unemployment Benefit Training Hardship, Unemployment Benefit Student Hardship. As Orphans and Unsupported Child Benefits are not means tested, they have not been included in the analysis.

**New Zealand Distribution and Trends**

**Total Number of Children Reliant on a Benefit or Benefit Recipient**

In New Zealand, the number of children aged 0–18 years who were reliant on a benefit, or benefit recipient, fell from 272,638 in April 2000, to 201,083 in April 2008, before increasing again to 234,572 in April 2011. A large proportion of this variation was due to changes in the number of children relying on unemployment benefit recipients, with numbers in this category falling from 49,499 in April 2000, to 5,289 in April 2008, before increasing to a peak of 16,380 in April 2010. Similarly the number of children reliant on DPB recipients fell from 188,216 in April 2000, to 158,173 in April 2008, before increasing again to 180,845 in April 2011 (Table 173).

**Proportion of All New Zealand Children Reliant on a Benefit Recipient**

In New Zealand, the proportion of children aged 0–18 years who were reliant on a benefit, or benefit recipient, fell from 24.9% in April 2000 to 17.5% in April 2008, before increasing again to 20.4% in April 2011. A large proportion of the initial decline was due to a fall in the number of children reliant on unemployment benefit recipients (from 4.5% of children in 2000 to 0.5% in April 2008, before increasing to 1.4% in April 2011). While the proportion of children reliant on DPB recipients also fell (17.2% of children in April 2000, to 13.8% in April 2008, before increasing to 15.8% in April 2011 (Figure 168)), the rate of decline was much slower than for unemployment benefits, meaning that in relative terms, the proportion of benefit dependent children reliant on DPB recipients actually increased, from 69.0% of all benefit dependent children in April 2000, to 77.1% in April 2011 (Table 173).

**Age Distribution**

During April 2011, the proportion of children reliant on a benefit, or benefit recipient, was highest for those 0–4 years of age. Rates then tapered off gradually during middle-late childhood and early adolescence, and then very steeply after 17 years of age (Figure 169).
Figure 168. Proportion of All Children Aged 0–18 Years Who Were Reliant on a Benefit or Benefit Recipient by Benefit Type, New Zealand April 2000–2011

Source: Numerator: Ministry of Social Development; Denominator: Statistics NZ Estimated Resident Population. Note: For Composition of Other Benefits, see Methods Section; Orphans and Unsupported Child Benefits excluded.

Figure 169. Proportion of New Zealand Children Aged 0–18 Years Who Were Reliant on a Benefit or Benefit Recipient by Age and Benefit Type, as at the end of April 2011

Source: Numerator: Ministry of Social Development; Denominator: Statistics NZ Estimated Resident Population. Note: For Composition of Other Benefits, see Methods Section; Orphans and Unsupported Child Benefits excluded.
Table 173. Number of Children Aged 0–18 Years Who Were Reliant on a Benefit or Benefit Recipient by Benefit Type, New Zealand April 2000–2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Domestic Purposes</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Invalid’s</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>All Other Benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>188,216</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>49,499</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11,120</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>187,791</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>43,245</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12,122</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>187,207</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>36,342</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13,219</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>186,184</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>30,067</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14,225</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>185,610</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>20,663</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15,053</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>180,035</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>15,134</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15,214</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>172,995</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>12,069</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>15,332</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>160,634</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>7,819</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15,247</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>158,173</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>5,289</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15,962</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>167,142</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>11,581</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>177,226</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>16,380</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15,116</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>180,845</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>15,711</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14,273</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Social Development. Note: % refers to % of children relying on benefit recipients, rather than % of all children; Other Benefits includes DPB Women Alone and Caring for Sick or Infirm, NZ Superannuation, Veterans and Transitional Retirement Benefit, Emergency Benefits and Widows Benefit, Independent Youth Benefit, Unemployment Benefit Training and Unemployment Benefit Training Hardship, Unemployment Benefit Student Hardship (Orphans and Unsupported Child Benefits excluded).
Table 174. Number of Children Aged 0–18 Years Who Were Reliant on a Benefit or Benefit Recipient by Benefit Type for Service Centres in the Nelson Marlborough, South Canterbury, Canterbury, and West Coast DHB Catchments, April 2007–2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nelson Marlborough (Blenheim, Motueka, Nelson, Richmond, and Stoke Service Centres)</th>
<th>South Canterbury (Timaru Service Centre)</th>
<th>Canterbury (Actionworks, Ashburton, Christchurch City, Hornby, Kaiapoi, Linwood, New Brighton, Papanui, Rangiora, Riccarton, Shirley, Stanmore Road and Sydenham Service Centres)</th>
<th>West Coast (Greymouth and Westport Service Centres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>DPB</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,027</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Social Development. Note: % refers to % of children relying on benefit recipients, rather than % of all children; Other Benefits includes DPB Women Alone and Caring for Sick or Infirm, NZ Superannuation, Veterans and Transitional Retirement Benefit, Emergency Benefits and Widows Benefit, Independent Youth Benefit, Unemployment Benefit Training and Unemployment Benefit Training Hardship, and Unemployment Benefit Student Hardship (Orphans and Unsupported Child Benefits excluded).
Table 175. Number of Children Aged 0–18 Years Who Were Reliant on a Benefit or Benefit Recipient by Benefit Type for Service Centres in the Otago and Southland DHB Catchments, April 2007–2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DPB</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Invalid’s</th>
<th>Other Benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago (Alexandra, Balclutha, Dunedin Central, Mosgiel, Oamaru, and South Dunedin Service Centres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,731</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southland (Gore, Invercargill and Queenstown Service Centres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Social Development. Note: % refers to % of children relying on benefit recipients, rather than % of all children; Other Benefits includes DPB Women Alone and Caring for Sick or Infirm, NZ Superannuation, Veterans and Transitional Retirement Benefit, Emergency Benefits and Widows Benefit, Independent Youth Benefit, Unemployment Benefit Training and Unemployment Benefit Training Hardship, and Unemployment Benefit Student Hardship (Orphans and Unsupported Child Benefits excluded).
South Island Distribution and Trends

Total Number of Children Reliant on a Benefit or Benefit Recipient
At the end of April 2011, there were 36,095 children aged 0–18 years who were reliant on a benefit or benefit recipient and who received their benefits from Service Centres in the Nelson Marlborough (n=5,535), South Canterbury (n=1,965), Canterbury (n=18,177), West Coast (n=1,159), Otago (n=5,198) and Southland (n=4,061) DHB catchments. While the majority of these children were reliant on DPB recipients, increases in the number reliant on unemployment benefit recipients were evident between April 2008 and April 2011 (Table 174).

Summary
In New Zealand, the proportion of children aged 0–18 years who were reliant on a benefit, or benefit recipient, fell from 24.9% in April 2000 to 17.5% in April 2008, before increasing again to 20.4% in April 2011. A large proportion of the initial decline was due to a fall in the number of children reliant on unemployment benefit recipients (from 4.5% of children in 2000 to 0.5% in April 2008, before increasing to 1.4% in April 2011). The proportion of children reliant on DPB recipients also fell, from 17.2% of children in April 2000, to 13.8% in April 2008, before increasing to 15.8% in April 2011.

At the end of April 2011, there were 36,095 children aged 0–18 years who were reliant on a benefit or benefit recipient and who received their benefits from Service Centres in the Nelson Marlborough (n=5,535), South Canterbury (n=1,965), Canterbury (n=18,177), West Coast (n=1,159), Otago (n=5,198) and Southland (n=4,061) DHB catchments. While the majority of these children were reliant on DPB recipients, increases in the number reliant on unemployment benefit recipients were evident between April 2008 and April 2011.