

Summary of cognitive test findings – Sprint 4

Summary of top findings and recommendations (WIP)

Top of minds issues and recommended changes for Sprint 5 forms.

Detailed notes on all questions are included below this table.

Across Dwelling and Individual Forms		
Question	Key findings	Recommended changes for Sprint 5
License to Occupy (DF and IF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of understanding of the term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change wording to include explanation of term in Q wording. Include guide notes for sprint 5 Change question order to filter out owners with mortgage etc.? Remove from full form and test with targeted groups expected to have a license of occupy e.g. retirement home residents. Content to review need for this variable. More research and expert information needed.
	Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of understanding of the term. comments on DF. comments on the IF. chose not to answer. yes on the DF, yes on the IF. 	
Dwelling Form Questions		
Question	Key findings	Recommended changes for Sprint 5
Cold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subjective Double-barrelled question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “In winter, is this dwelling difficult to heat and/or keep warm?” (wording from Deprivation Q’s in HES – check this)
	Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Double-barrelled question. partially crossed out answer, answered too cold part of question. 	
Rooms question	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question wording doesn’t match the task Respondent reactions to “caravans” on the list People confused by not listing bathrooms 	Change question wording to match the task
	Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents not entering 0 into rooms they don't have, just leaving blank. • [redacted] comments on bathrooms 	
Amenities/telecoms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusing instruction around "count, don't count" with respondents entering numbers of amenities etc., rather than checking responses. 	Change instruction to "include, don't include"
	<p>Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [redacted] comments on the word "amenities", were unsure what it meant. • Nobody put #'s instead of marks, unlike in the cog testing. • [redacted] comment on cell phone going with respondent when they leave the house. 	
Dwelling	Key findings – Mass testing	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some respondents unclear/didn't like the word "dwelling". 	
Individual Form Questions		
Question	Key findings	Recommended changes for Sprint 5
Address questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address burden and confusion • Some difficulty following routing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All routing references to say "usual address given in Q4" rather than just the Q number • Route people past address 1 year ago if usual address and address 5 years ago are the same.
	<p>Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusion over "usual" address – students putting in parents address as usual address. • Q27 lack of clarity around "household" – which household? • Problems remembering 5 years ago address. • Some non-response. 	
Second Residence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulties with reference period. Not clear to respondents whether "30 days a year" refers to the past 12 months or the calendar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the reference period in the question wording

	<p>year e.g. 2016. Also respondents not sure whether 30 day rule is referring to total days or consecutive days.</p> <p>Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing</p> <p>Some respondents entering their term time address as a second residence and their parent’s address as their usual residence.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the position of this question so it is after the usual residents routing.
Household members	<p>Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commented on how to mark step-family members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the order of Q27 and Q28
Employment	<p>Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q47 had a job, just didn’t work in the last 7 days. Either on holiday or shift/seasonal work and not working that week. • Routing takes them to a question about seeking employment in the last 4 weeks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Income	<p>Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q45 - comments on not sure where to put scholarship money/money from parents. • Q45 and 46 respondent not sure if to include overseas income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for matrix format (caution, needs further testing) • People forgetting “health problem” context by the time they get to the last questions e.g. language, people with English as second language screening in • People not reading second part of question (qualifier – e.g. even with glasses, even with a hearing aid etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of matrix format in the form for Sprint 5 with WG long set as the alternative version. • Check with content regarding examples of people who screened in/out

	<p>Key findings – Preliminary Mass testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comments. Remembering and concentrating are different. • Respondent forgetting the “health problem” context, questions whether this refers to a diagnosis/ongoing issue. • Item non-response for 4/5 questions - same person 	
Gender Identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Order of gender identity and babies born alive question problematic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put babies born alive before gender identity question • Re-word routing instruction on babies born alive (details TBC)
Occupation and task/duties?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effort respondents put into answering these questions is high. Is burden justified by need? • Question examples are encouraging generic response e.g. Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with content to refine the question examples.
Voluntary work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concepts need refinement • Burden on respondents to provide number of hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include some examples in the question • Elaboration of what is in and out of scope- discuss with content • “voluntary work” implicit connotations, can we use term “voluntary activities” or “volunteering” • Use alternative version for Sprint 5 form (includes explanatory note)

Dwelling form

Household Grid

- Confused by note about babies in Q1. One respondent put a dash thru the two boxes to indicate no babies, based on the mark oval instruction which was thought to pertain to the babies instruction.
- Question instruction very wordy and confusing
- Not clear if instruction about marking responses relates to just this question, would be clearer if instruction was given prior to and separately from question.
- Almost missed indicating relationships

License to occupy

- Didn't understand what this meant, people included rental agreements and mortgages

- Duplicated routing instruction unnecessary

Number of rooms

- Counted total rooms in head, and then confused they were asked number of bedrooms
- Wondered “where is my bathroom?” on the list
- Confused about “open-plan”
- Didn’t mark zeros to rooms not applicable as per instruction
- Caravans in the list of rooms has generated some comment, people think it is odd to count these as ‘rooms’

Heating

- Evidence of multiple ticking what is intended to be a single response.
- Lack of ‘open fire’ in the list commented on. A respondent marked ‘wood burner’ to mean ‘open fire’ but had some dissatisfaction with that as a response.

Telecommunications

- Marked the number of each item rather than ticking
- Commented that cell-phones weren’t available to household as they are a personal item, also not attached to the dwelling like a fixed land-line so seemed weird to include here
- Question too wordy and confusing
- One needed more instruction that this was her personal property, not provided as part of the house and excluding neighbours in joined dwelling. Changing question text from “here” to ‘here in this dwelling’ would help.

Amenities

- Marked the number of amenities e.g. 5 drinkable tap water outlets (including outside hoses), and 1 cooker.
- Some confusion with amenities in the question text, consider deleting it and perhaps adding some wording to refer to the given list.
- One respondent knows quite a few people who would object to answering this question, eg someone illegally using a cooker in a sleep out is a fire hazard (and suspicious of why we’re collecting it). Also many Christchurch people living in poor conditions without these amenities due to quake damaged housing and having no better options. Recommended making this optional.

Cold, damp, mould

- Commented on subjectivity of these questions, especially cold question
- Comment “anything that has condensation on the windows – that’s what I consider to be damp”.
- Would everyone know what an A4 is?

Individual form

Sex and gender:

- Comments around whether or not there will be a 3rd option
- Sex and gender questions spaced far apart – order effect need exploring
- Respondents not understanding / noticing the difference between sex and gender
- Why offering 3rd option for gender but not for sex?

Gender identity:

- Suggested gender fluid as category
- No reaction from respondents, no comment or confusion that both sex and gender questions (probably didn't notice difference between sex and gender)
- Positive about 3rd category, thought it was progressive thinking
- Lots Neutral responses/reactions to this
- Wonder how people "gender diverse" people would feel about category

Sexual orientation:

- English as second language and didn't understand "heterosexual"
- Male respondent happy with term "heterosexual" but thought term straight was a bit prejudiced
- Weird that you could select "prefer not to say" for this but not for gender question
- Some uncomfortableness (surprise at inclusion), and giggling at the question
- "Oh wow!, really?"
- a-sexual option suggested, considered to be as prevalent as bisexual

Address questions:

- Fatigue with number of address questions, asked "are there going to be a lot of these kind of questions?"
- Difficulty following routing for address questions, having to turn page and refer back (lots of references to previous questions)
- Balance between tick boxes for addresses and complex routing
- Difficulty for respondent where they had no second residence but a tick box is available in address 5 and 1 year ago for the possible second residence address.
- Reference to "at the address given in 4" – preference expressed for, 'at my usual address'
- Can we route people past address 1 year ago if usual address and address 5 years ago are the same?
- Option "not living in NZ" for address 5 years ago – instruction for overseas talks about "where you usually live" but should be in past tense.
- Address 5 years ago, difficult for some respondents to recall 5 years ago.
- Conceptually lots of address questions about "usual" addresses (now, 5 years, 1years), when got to census night address was a conceptual switch which was difficult.

Second address:

- Reference period for second address confusing for respondents, asked for clarification – 30 days a year, clarify period e.g. 2016, last 12 months, only the last year? Is it a one-off stay or usually stay for 30 day or more?
- Thought 30 days was OK to calculate, a bigger number would be more difficult. Not entirely sure of street number. Suggested testing with first year tertiary students who had not necessarily established their usual and second address yet. Saw usual address note (“Students and overseas ...” and felt that changing this to “School and tertiary students ...” might help draw attention to it and repeat it in the second address question.

Ethnicity

- Can I choose NZ European? – long term NZ residents, who moved from south Africa to NZ (mixing nationality and ethnicity)
- NZ Pakeha option wanted (| |)
- NZ European old-fashioned, term new Zealander would be daughter’s preference
- Would like refusal option
- Maori descent – ticked only NZ European ethnicity (maybe thought they could only select one) – maybe move instruction to start of question (mark space or spaces that apply)
- Didn’t like the wording “from a Maori”, tried “from a Dutch person” and “from a Japanese person” to hear if that sounded correct. Would prefer “Are you of Maori descent”. (Studying Maori culture and society at university, was told that you could only mark one ethnicity so was pleased to see the ability to mark more than one, and realised it may have been many years ago that this was the case).

Language

Would have entered “Chinese” but examples prompted them to be more specific e.g. Cantonese and Mandarin.

Disability

- People only reading first part of question , e.g. not reading “even if wear glasses”
- One respondent felt they would understand these questions better if they comma was removed from question text.
- Confused about question logic e.g. relevance of wearing glasses
- Respondent with partial hearing loss read and re-read hearing question several times. Some hearing loss, but didn’t use a hearing aid. Hypothesised that if they did use a hearing aid they would have “no difficulty” so marked this as their response.
- Interpretation of questions was that they were about health of the elderly, not enough about health of general population and mental health issues/communication.
- Thought self-care question might be offensive to other people – concerned about disabled people taking offence
- Asked “what does usual language mean?” – How are people who have English as a second language going to interpret this?
- A respondent originally interpreted ‘usual language’ as their colloquial language, the way *they* speak. R resolved we probably meant English but thought the wording was odd.

- Second language respondent – marked some difficulty, due to English language barrier (have people forgotten health context intro by this point in the questions?)
- Preferred alternate question format: less to read, easier to respond

Religion

- People marked religion they were brought up with rather than what they practice
- Other – spiritual marked by respondent

Living arrangements:

- Hovered over “same-sex” category
- Nearly marked ‘same sex wife’ before reading further and finding the de facto category as a better option. Can we try re-ordering categories to group opposite-sex categories together then same sex. I think this will reduce cognitive load.
- Mistakenly marked “same sex” instead of opposite sex category
- Not clear what “civil union” meant – has a different meaning in different countries (like de-facto elsewhere)
- Confusion over civil union term
- Lack of understanding of the term ‘civil union’ – Include explanation and consider redoing order and grouping of terms for ease of reading.
- Most people able to find their category
- Liked to be able to specify they were in same-sex marriage – found it affirming
- Person who lived alone was annoyed at having to read the whole list before finding their response space.

Step families:

- No conceptual issues with step families, but some confusion with reference to “household” after answering “second residence” question and/or other address questions ie: “what address are you referring to when you say household?”
- Weren’t terms they would use at home or in social situation but recognised the legal terms for purposes of completing form
- Felt that relationship was normal father-son relationship, didn’t like or use the term step-son. A bit of an emotional topic
- Didn’t know whether children would name their step-brother/sister as a step sibling, would just say brother/sister
- Assumption that you have some step-family relationships in the labels of the response categories/question
- Not a consistent understanding of what a step relation was. Felt that a parent’s partner would be a step-parent even though no formal/legal relationship
- By this stage of questionnaire, expressing fatigue

Travel to education

- No major issues – but they were study from home students

- Interpreted “usually” travel as one mode, read the note to find out how to answer. Note worked for them.
- One respondent marked 2 responses for travel, wasn’t reading the instructions, only main question text

Education address

- Struggled with educational institute address, but could look it up on their phone
- Recommended that we delete street number as no-one would know it

Smoking:

- Missed routing on Q33
- Q34: Questioned relevance of information when she smoked over 40 years ago

Legal relationship status:

- Didn’t understand civil union term
- R felt that the question wording assumed a state of affairs, that it was expected that someone would be in some kind of legal relationship.

License to occupy

- No-one knew what this term meant
- Like a “driving license?”
- Realised meaning must be different when they got to individual form, from dwelling form
- Lots of people thought rental agreements fell into license to occupy as legal agreement between landlord and renter.
- One respondent mentioned the only context they’d ever heard of license to occupy was in retirement home settings, but wondered how widely known that was.
- One respondent lives in a community co-op owned by the Charities Commission and run by a trust (not a family trust) and guessed that they didn’t make mortgage payments. Need to add ‘family’ to ‘trust makes mortgage payments question’.

Secondary School qualification

- Couldn’t find their qualification in the response options, missed it and needed interviewer’s help to find.
- Marked ‘other’ and wrote “certificate”, when prompted re-read categories and chose the level 3 option.
- Some evidence that people are not noticing the ‘secondary school’ part of this question. People are surprised by what is **not** in the list and then go back to reread question. Suggest emphasis on secondary school.

Highest qualification

- Marked three not one

Income

- You/yourself wording was problematic for one respondent. Couldn't really understand what it was getting at and suggested simply 'you'. (R lived alone, not in a relationship)
- Is Kiwisaver income? It's not money I can spend but it is something that is paid to me. One R spent a long time resolving this and in the end chose not to count it.
- Marked 'other govt benefit' thinking of Inland Revenue, for families especially low income. Didn't know if this was Working for Families tax credits.
- Looked where to include three scholarships, asked and decided on 'other'.

Workplace address

- Left question blank, saying "I work for clients and their home addresses are confidential". When asked whether she would be comfortable marking the 'work away from home' oval she was happy to do this.

Usual hours

- Include bubble to mark zero?

Volunteering

- Hard to work out hours – 4 week period too long, manual calculations as week-to-week it was different
- One person took a long time to work out and was getting concerned about accuracy
- Being involved with multiple different orgs would mean hard to calculate hours
- Some people didn't count helping family in "other people and households" but some people did
- Excluded volunteer activities at schools
- Helping sick neighbours or caregiver role for "other people"
- Assumed it had to be formal arrangement of volunteering
- Orgs – community gardens etc.
- Altruistic element – do we count volunteer commitments to performing arts etc. which people do for own enjoying (hobby or volunteer activity)

General comments

Fatigue:

- At Q40 started showing fatigue
- Fatigue over address questions
- Q42 so many options, too much to read

Response error

- Ticking instead of marking –
- Confusion about “Print in CAPITALS” and marking responses instruction: does this apply to all questions? Would be clearer if instruction was presented prior to and separate from question i.e. top of forms.
- Q40 missed “secondary” specification, and had to reread question. Suggested it would be clearer if highlighted e.g. bold
- Didn’t see three rows for name on DF, so wrote across the top row of Person 1&2 fields, then her daughter’s across Person 3&4.
- DF – marking x instead of -. No mark instruction on DF.
- Not marking other but writing it in.
-

