APPENDIX 6: MEASUREMENT OF ETHNICITY

The majority of rates calculated in this report rely on the division of numerators (e.g. hospital admissions, mortality data) by Statistics NZ Estimated Resident Population denominators. Calculation of accurate ethnic-specific rates relies on the assumption that information on ethnicity is collected in a similar manner in both the numerator and the denominator, and that a single child will be identified similarly in each dataset. In New Zealand this has not always been the case, and in addition the manner of collecting information on ethnicity has varied significantly over time. Since 1996 however, there has been a move to ensure that ethnicity information is collected in a similar manner across all administrative datasets in New Zealand (Census, Hospital Admissions, Mortality, Births). The following section briefly reviews how information on ethnicity has been collected in national data collections since the early 1980s and the implications of this for the information contained in this report.

1981 Census and Health Sector Definitions

Earlier definitions of ethnicity in official statistics relied on the concept of fractions of descent, with the 1981 census asking people to decide whether they were fully of one ethnic origin (e.g. Full Pacific, Full Māori) or if of more than one origin, what fraction of that ethnic group they identified with (e.g. 7/8 Pacific + 1/8 Māori). When prioritisation was required, those with more than 50% of Pacific or Māori blood were deemed to meet the ethnic group criteria of the time [1]. A similar approach was used to record ethnicity in health sector statistics, with birth and death registration forms asking the degree of Pacific or Māori blood of the parents of a newborn baby/the deceased individual. For hospital admissions, ancestry-based definitions were also used during the early 1980s, with admission officers often assuming ethnicity, or leaving the question blank [2].

1986 Census and Health Sector Definitions

Following a review expressing concern at the relevance of basing ethnicity on fractions of descent, a recommendation was made to move towards self-identified cultural affiliation. Thus the 1986 Census asked the question “What is your ethnic origin?” and people were asked to tick the box or boxes that applied to them. Birth and death registration forms however, continued to use the “fractions of blood” question until 1995, making comparable numerator and denominator data difficult to obtain [1]. For hospital admissions, the move from an ancestry-based to a self-identified definition of ethnicity began in the mid-80s, although non-standard forms were used and typically allowed a single ethnicity only [2].

1991 Census and Health Sector Definitions

A review suggested that the 1986 ethnicity question was unclear as to whether it was measuring ancestry or cultural affiliation, so the 1991 Census asked two questions:

1. Which ethnic group do you belong to? (tick the box or boxes which apply to you)
2. Have you any NZ Māori ancestry? (if yes, what iwi do you belong to?)

As indicated above however, birth and death registrations continued with ancestry-based definitions of ethnicity during this period, while a number of hospitals were beginning to use self-identified definitions in a non-standard manner [2].

1996 Census and Health Sector Definitions

While the concepts and definitions remained the same as for the 1991 census, the ethnicity question in the 1996 Census differed in that:

- The NZ Māori category was moved to the top of the ethnic categories
- The 1996 question made it more explicit that people could tick more than one box
- There was a new “Other European” category with 6 subgroups

As a result of these changes, there was a large increase in the number of multiple responses, as well as an increase in the Māori ethnic group in the 1996 Census [1]. Within
the health sector however, there were much larger changes in the way in which ethnicity information was collected. From late 1995, birth and death registration forms incorporated a new ethnicity question identical to that in the 1996 Census, allowing for an expansion of the number of ethnic groups counted (previously only Māori and Pacific) and resulting in a large increase in the proportion of Pacific and Māori births and deaths. From July 1996 onwards, all hospitals were also required to inquire about ethnicity in a standardised way, with a question that was compatible with the 1996 Census and that allowed multiple ethnic affiliations [2]. A random audit of hospital admission forms conducted by Statistics NZ in 1999 however, indicated that the standard ethnicity question had not yet been implemented by many hospitals. In addition, an assessment of hospital admissions by ethnicity over time showed no large increases in the proportions of Māori and Pacific admissions after the 1996 “change-over”, as had occurred for birth and death statistics, potentially suggesting that the change to a standard form allowing for multiple ethnic affiliations in fact did not occur. Similarities in the number of people reporting a “sole” ethnic group pre- and post-1996 also suggest that the way in which information on multiple ethnic affiliations was collected did not change either. Thus while the quality of information available since 1996 has been much better than previous, there remains some concern that hospitals continue to undercount multiple ethnic identifications and as a result, may continue to undercount Pacific and Māori peoples [2].

2001 Census and Health Sector Definitions
The 2001 Census reverted back to the wording used in the 1991 Census after a review showed that this question provided a better measure of ethnicity based on the current statistical standard [1]. The health sector also continued to use self-identified definitions of ethnicity during this period, with the Ethnicity Data Protocols for the Health and Disability Sector providing guidelines which ensured that the information collected across the sector was consistent with the wording of the 2001 Census (i.e. Which ethnic groups do you belong to (Mark the space or spaces that apply to you)?)

2006 Census and Health Sector Definitions
In 2004, the Ministry of Health released the Ethnicity Data Protocols for the Health and Disability Sector [3] with these protocols being seen as a significant step forward in terms of standardising the collection and reporting of ethnicity data in the health sector [4]. The protocols stipulated that the standard ethnicity question for the health sector was the 2001 Census ethnicity question, with respondents being required to identify their own ethnicity, and with data collectors being unable to assign this on respondent’s behalf, or to transfer this information from another form. The protocols also stipulated that ethnicity data needed to be recorded to a minimum specificity of Level 2 (see below) with systems needing to be able to store, at minimum, three ethnicities, and to utilise standardised prioritisation algorithms, if more than three ethnic groups were reported. In terms of outputs, either sole/combination, total response, or prioritised ethnicity needed to be reported, with the methods used being clearly described in any report [3].

The following year, Statistics New Zealand’s Review of the Measurement of Ethnicity (RME), culminated in the release of the Statistical Standard for Ethnicity 2005 [5], which recommended that:

1. The 2006 Census ethnicity question use identical wording to the 2001 Census
2. Within the “Other” ethnic group, that a new category be created for those identifying as “New Zealander” or “Kiwi”. In previous years these responses had been assigned to the European ethnic group
3. All collections of official statistics measuring ethnicity have the capacity to record and report six ethnicity responses per individual, or at a minimum, three responses when six could not be implemented immediately
4. The practice of prioritising ethnicity to one ethnic group should be discontinued.

At the 2006 Census however, a total of 429,429 individuals (11.1% of the NZ population) identified themselves as a New Zealander, with further analysis suggesting that 90% of the
increase in those identifying as New Zealanders in 2006, had arisen from those identifying as New Zealand European at the 2001 Census [6]. In 2009 Statistics NZ amended the Standard to reflect these issues [7] with the current recommendation being that future Censuses retain the current ethnicity question (i.e. that New Zealander tick boxes not be introduced) but that alongside the current standard outputs where New Zealander responses are assigned to the Other Ethnicity category, an alternative classification be introduced which combines the European and New Zealander ethnic groups into a single European and Other Ethnicity category for use in time series analysis (with those identifying as both European and New Zealanders being counted only once in this combined ethnic group [7].

The Current Recording of Ethnicity in New Zealand’s National Datasets

In New Zealand’s national health collections (e.g. National Minimum Dataset, Mortality Collection and NZ Cancer Registry), up to three ethnic groups per person are stored electronically for each event, with data being coded to Level 2 of Statistics New Zealand’s 4-Level Hierarchical Ethnicity Classification System [8]. In this Classification System increasing detail is provided at each level. For example [3]:

- Level 1 (least detailed level) e.g. code 1 is European
- Level 2 e.g. code 12 is Other European
- Level 3 e.g. code 121 is British and Irish
- Level 4 (most detailed level) e.g. code 12111 is Celtic

Māori however, are identified similarly at each level (e.g. Level 1: code 2 is Māori vs. Level 4: code 21111 is Māori).

For those reporting multiple ethnic affiliations, information may also be prioritised according to Statistics New Zealand’s protocols, with Māori ethnicity taking precedence over Pacific > Asian/Indian > Other > European ethnic groups [3]. This ensures that each individual is counted only once and that the sum of the ethnic group sub-populations equals the total NZ population [2]. The implications of prioritisation for Pacific groups however are that the outcomes of those identifying as both Māori and Pacific are only recorded under the Māori ethnic group.

For those reporting more than 3 ethnic affiliations, the ethnic groups recorded are again prioritised (at Level 2), with Māori ethnicity taking precedence over Pacific > Asian/Indian > Other > European ethnic groups (for further details on the prioritisation algorithms used see [3]. In reality however, less than 0.5% of responses in the National Health Index database have three ethnicities recorded, and thus it is likely that this prioritisation process has limited impact on ethnic-specific analyses [3].

Undercounting of Māori and Pacific Peoples in National Collections

Despite significant improvements in the quality of ethnicity data in New Zealand’s national health collections since 1996, care must still be taken when interpreting the ethnic-specific rates presented in this report, as the potential still remains for Māori and Pacific children and young people to be undercounted in our national data collections. In a review that linked hospital admission data to other datasets with more reliable ethnicity information (e.g. death registrations and Housing NZ Corporation Tenant data), the authors of Hauora IV [9] found that on average, hospital admission data during 2000–2004 undercounted Māori children (0–14 years) by around 6%, and Māori young people by around 5–6%. For cancer registrations, the undercount was in the order of 1–2% for the same age groups. While the authors of Hauora IV developed a set of adjusters which could be used to minimise the bias such undercounting introduced when calculating population rates and rate ratios, these (or similar) adjusters were not utilised in this report for the following reasons:

1. Previous research has shown that ethnicity misclassification can change over time, and thus adjusters developed for one period may not be applicable to other periods [10].
2. Research also suggests that ethnic misclassification may vary significantly by DHB [10], and thus that adjusters developed using national level data (as in Hauora IV) may not be applicable to DHB level analyses, with separate adjusters needing to be developed for each DHB.

Further, as the development of adjusters requires the linkage of the dataset under review with another dataset for which more reliable ethnicity information is available, and as this process is resource-intensive and not without error (particularly if the methodology requires probabilistic linkage of de-identified data), the development of a customised set of period and age specific adjusters was seen as being beyond the scope of the current project. The reader is thus urged to bear in mind that the data presented in this report may undercount Māori and Pacific children to a variable extent (depending on the dataset used) and that in the case of the hospital admission dataset for Māori, this undercount may be as high as 5–6%.

**Ethnicity Classifications Utilised in this Report and Implications for Interpretation of Results.**

Because of inconsistencies in the manner in which ethnicity information was collected prior to 1996, all ethnic-specific analysis presented in this report are for the 1996 year onwards. The information thus reflects self-identified concepts of ethnicity, with Statistics NZ’s Level 1 Ethnicity Classification being used, which recognises 5 ethnic groups: European (including New Zealander), Māori, Pacific, Asian (including Indian) and Other (including Middle Eastern, Latin American and African). In order to ensure that each health event is only counted once, prioritised ethnic group has been used unless otherwise specified.
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