

# Measuring child poverty: Material hardship in the Household Income and Living Survey





Crown copyright ©

[See Copyright and terms of use](#) for our copyright, attribution, and liability statements.

#### **Citation**

Stats NZ (2026). *Measuring child poverty: Material hardship in the Household Income and Living Survey*. Retrieved from [www.stats.govt.nz](http://www.stats.govt.nz).

ISBN 978-1-991431-04-2 (online)

#### **Published in January 2026 by**

Stats NZ Tatauranga Aotearoa  
Wellington, New Zealand

#### **Contact**

Stats NZ Information Centre: [info@stats.govt.nz](mailto:info@stats.govt.nz)

Phone toll-free 0508 525 525

Phone international +64 4 931 4600

[www.stats.govt.nz](http://www.stats.govt.nz)

# Contents

<b>Purpose and summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Purpose .....	5
Summary of key points .....	5
<b>Background.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Collection of child poverty statistics .....	6
Measuring material hardship.....	7
Changes to material wellbeing questions.....	7
Implications of changes .....	8
<b>Developing a new methodology.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Decisions required .....	9
Assessment framework .....	9
Index options .....	10
<b>Understanding methodology changes .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Methodology for combining multiple individual spending responses .....	11
Methodology for data processing.....	11
Determining a household’s index score .....	11
Index composition .....	12
Index thresholds .....	12
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix: Detailed summary of HES to HILS design changes on items included in the DEP-17 and MH-18, including question wording.....</b>	<b>14</b>

## List of tables and figures

### List of tables

Table 1: Overview of changes made to the suite of questions on material wellbeing during transition from HES to Living in Aotearoa/HILS .....	7
---	---

## Purpose and summary

### Purpose

This paper provides information about changes to the methodology used to derive rates of material hardship in Aotearoa New Zealand. This follows the transition from the Household Economic Survey to the Household Income and Living Survey, which involved changes to the way data about material wellbeing is collected.

### Summary of key points

Stats NZ has made changes to the design of material wellbeing questions as part of the transition to the Household Income and Living Survey (HILS) from the Household Economic Survey (HES). These were first implemented in the now-discontinued Living in Aotearoa survey and carried over into HILS.

The changes were made with the intention of improving data quality, and include changes to questionnaire structure, respondent selection and eligibility, response options, and questionnaire wording. A subset of these material wellbeing questions is used to create an index for reporting on material hardship.

As a result of these design changes, Stats NZ has also changed the way material hardship is derived. In HES, a household was determined to be in material hardship if it was deprived of 6 or more items (out of 17) of the 'DEP-17' index. However, when using the same index and threshold in Living in Aotearoa, there were larger differences in hardship rates between HES and Living in Aotearoa than expected, that did not accurately reflect real-world change. Given that the material wellbeing questionnaire design is the same in Living in Aotearoa and HILS, Stats NZ concluded that a new methodology would be required to derive material hardship rates from HILS.

Stats NZ commissioned the Ministry of Social Development (MSD), as subject matter experts on material hardship and child poverty, to prepare a report which provides a recommended option or options for selection of a revised material hardship index. Of the options developed by MSD, Stats NZ selected the 'MH-18' index, with a threshold of 7 or more out of 18 items used to determine material hardship. MH-18 has 16 items in common with DEP-17. One item has been removed (doing without or cutting back on visits to local places, including the shops) and two new items have been added (having a good bed to sleep in, and access to a computer and the internet). [Appendix](#) provides a comparison between the suite of questions used in the indexes.

Stats NZ will publish the first child poverty statistics from HILS and the MH-18 index in February 2026.

## Background

This section provides the context for why Stats NZ has changed the way material hardship is measured. It outlines the obligations of Stats NZ under the Child Poverty Reduction Act 2018 (the Act), and why a new survey was designed. It also describes the changes made to the material wellbeing suite of questions during the transition to the new survey (HILS), and the implications of these changes.

### Collection of child poverty statistics

Stats NZ is required under the Act to report on 10 measures of child poverty:

- a) low income: less than 50% median equivalised disposable household income before deducting housing costs (BHC) for the financial year
- b) low income: less than 50% median equivalised disposable household income after deducting housing costs (AHC) for the base financial year
- c) material hardship
- d) persistent poverty
- e) low income: less than 60% median equivalised disposable household income before deducting housing costs (BHC) for the financial year
- f) low income: less than 60% median equivalised disposable household income after deducting housing costs (AHC) for the financial year
- g) low income: less than 50% median equivalised disposable household income after deducting housing costs (AHC) for the financial year
- h) low income: less than 40% median equivalised disposable household income after deducting housing costs (AHC) for the financial year
- i) severe material hardship
- j) low income and hardship: less than 60% median equivalised disposable household income after deducting housing costs (AHC) for the financial year and material hardship.

Since February 2020, Stats NZ has reported on nine out of these 10 measures using data collected by the Household Economic Survey (HES).

Stats NZ is required to report on the 10th measure, persistent poverty, from 2027 (using the data collection commencing July 2025). To report on persistent poverty, a longitudinal study called Living in Aotearoa was designed. Living in Aotearoa went live in 2022 and was scheduled to replace HES from 2025.

In late 2023, the Government Statistician made the decision to discontinue Living in Aotearoa due to unsustainable data collection and the ongoing cost profile of the survey. Instead, the Household Income and Living Survey (HILS), a cross-sectional survey, was established to replace HES from July 2024. HILS incorporates many of the questionnaire design updates that were made for Living in Aotearoa, including to material wellbeing questions.

Stats NZ now produces statistics on the economic wellbeing of New Zealanders, including children, using HILS.

[Developing a methodology to measure persistent child poverty using survey and admin data](#) explains how Stats NZ will measure persistent poverty without the Living in Aotearoa survey.

## Measuring material hardship

Material hardship is one of the four primary measures of child poverty outlined in the Act. Material hardship refers to a person or family lacking essential consumption items because they cannot afford them (OCC Expert Advisory Group, 2012).

Material hardship is a non-income based measure of poverty. Non-income measures provide a direct indication of the actual day-to-day living conditions of households – the basics of food, clothing, accommodation, heating, and transport, and their ability to afford other items that most people would regard as essential or near-essential.

Under the Act, Stats NZ is required to report on material hardship (measure c), severe material hardship (i), and low-income and material hardship (j).

In HES, rates for these measures were calculated using an index of 17 items called DEP-17. A household was considered to be in material hardship if they were deprived of 6 or more items, and in severe material hardship if they were deprived of 9 or more items.

## Changes to material wellbeing questions

Some of the design changes incorporated in Living in Aotearoa and HILS affect the collection of material wellbeing and hardship information.

The following table provides an overview of the changes introduced. For more information, also see [Understanding methodology changes](#).

Table 1: Overview of changes made to the suite of questions on material wellbeing during transition from HES to Living in Aotearoa/HILS

Design element	HES	Living in Aotearoa/HILS
Questionnaire structure	A single material wellbeing questionnaire module contained all material wellbeing questions.	Material wellbeing questions are split across two questionnaire modules: household spending and individual spending.
Respondent selection	A single respondent was randomly selected from eligible household members to respond to all material wellbeing questions.	A nominated 'best' person is selected to respond to the household spending module.  All eligible household members are selected to complete the individual spending module.
Eligible household member	Eligible household members were usual residents of the household aged 18 and over.	Eligible household members are usual residents of the household aged 15 and over.

Questionnaire design	<p>A suite of changes were introduced in the questionnaire design (see <a href="#">Appendix</a> for full details) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• splitting of single questions into separate or multi-part questions</li> <li>• adding a “Not applicable” response option</li> <li>• reordering response options</li> <li>• changing the reference unit (‘you’ to ‘your household’).</li> </ul>
Questionnaire wording	<p>Changes were also made to questionnaire wording for clarification, or to maintain relevance with real-world (see <a href="#">Appendix</a> for full details).</p>

## Implications of changes

The design changes were made with the intention of improving data quality, and Stats NZ anticipated that the changes would have a small impact on rates of material hardship. Because Stats NZ expected a small change, analysis of Living in Aotearoa data was not undertaken until data collection began for HILS.

Living in Aotearoa data collected in 2022 and 2023 overlaps with HES data collected in 2021/2022, 2022/2023, and 2023/2024. This overlap enabled the impact of the questionnaire changes to be quantified.

Applying the closest approximation of the HES methodology for calculating hardship on Living in Aotearoa indicated that the difference to rates of material hardship was greater than anticipated.

As the material wellbeing questionnaires are exactly the same in HILS and Living in Aotearoa, a similar level shift in the rates of material hardship could be expected to be observed between HILS and HES, if the same measurement methodology was maintained.

Stats NZ considered accepting a shift in the rates of material hardship published, and/or revising previously published figures. In consultation with MSD, it was determined that neither of these options would adequately uphold the requirements of the Act, which requires a continuous series between HILS-based material hardship rates and previously published HES-based rates, to allow for an assessment of changes in poverty over time. Stats NZ concluded that a new methodology would be required to derive material hardship rates from HILS.

## Developing a new methodology

This section describes the development of a new methodology for deriving rates of material hardship from HILS. It outlines the methodological decisions required, the framework used to assess each change in method, and the index options developed by MSD in their commissioned work. This section also introduces the chosen index, MH-18.

## Decisions required

To account for changes in survey design and preserve continuity in both the series of hardship rates and the underlying hardship **concept** being measured and reported on, several decisions were required for developing different parts of the methodology:

1. How to create a household-level response from items in the individual spending module that were answered by multiple respondents within the household.
2. How to process input data, including in the treatment of item missingness, which response codes should count towards deprivation, and index eligibility.
3. How the index should be composed (that is, which items should be included).
4. How an index score should be calculated from the included items.
5. Which threshold score should be used for estimating the proportion of households experiencing material hardship and severe material hardship.

Stats NZ took the lead on developing the methodology for decisions 1 and 2, while MSD were commissioned to prepare a recommended option, or options, for a revised Material Hardship index, scoring approach, and threshold settings (covering decisions 3 to 5).

## Assessment framework

To ensure the methodology used in HILS is robust and statistically sound, Stats NZ applied an assessment framework to each methodological decision (including for each of the three index options developed by MSD over the course of their commissioned work). The framework was based upon the Stats NZ Statistical Quality Model, and legislative requirements under the Act.

At a high level, the following assessment criteria were used:

- **Relevance:** Does the method make real-world sense and meet the needs of key users?
- **Accuracy:** Does the methodology use sound statistical techniques and accurately capture material hardship in the population?
- **Accessibility:** Can the statistics be presented in a clear and understandable manner and widely disseminated?
- **Timeliness:** Does the method have any impact on how quickly data will be available to users?
- **Interpretability:** Can the processes and methods used, including measures of quality, be fully documented and made available for users to understand the data and judge quality of fit?
- **Continuity:** Does the methodology produce estimates that show a continuous time series from HES to HILS (and beyond into subsequent HILS years), both for children and the total population?
- **Coherence/internal validity:** Is the material hardship target concept maintained?
- **Comparability:** How similar is the methodology to comparable measures internationally and domestically?

- **Child Poverty Reduction Act:** Does the methodology meet the overall purpose of the Act?

## Index options

Over the course of their commissioned work, MSD developed three index options for deriving rates of material hardship in HILS. MSD reported in detail on two options, with a recommendation for one as the preferred.

Stats NZ completed a detailed and independent assessment of all three options using the assessment criteria above – this includes independent validation of the recommended thresholds for each index. All three options were considered broadly acceptable, with two having stronger results across relevance and continuity dimensions.

The two stronger options are as follows.

MH-16	MH-18
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16-item index with 15 items in common with DEP-17</li> <li>• includes an index item for access to a computer and the internet*</li> <li>• does not include index items for contents insurance or gift giving</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18-item index with 16 items in common with DEP-17</li> <li>• includes index items for access to a computer and the internet*, and access to a good bed</li> <li>• does not include an index item for cutting back on visits to local places, including the shops</li> </ul>

\* This item combines two independent questions (and follow-up ‘reason’ questions). A household is considered deprived for this index item if they do not have access to a computer and/or they do not have access to the internet, due to the cost.

Both the MH-18 and MH-16 use the same index scoring approach as the DEP-17, where an index score for a household is simply the sum of the number of items deprived. Each of the indices considered have a threshold of 7 or more items for material hardship, and 10 or more items for severe material hardship. [Understanding methodology changes](#) provides more information about the scoring methodology of the chosen index.

Based on their own assessment criteria, MSD recommended the MH-18 index as the preferred index for measuring material hardship. The summary recommendation from MSD’s commissioned working paper follows:

“MSD recommends MH-18, 7+ as the preferred revised measure of material hardship. It is analytically sound, it provides conceptual continuity in that it measures the same level of material hardship in HILS as was measured in HES with DEP-17, 6+ (thus addressing the issue caused by the changes to the questionnaire in HILS), and its item list has strong face validity in itself and vis-à-vis the established DEP-17”.

## Accepted index

Considering all assessment criteria, with particular emphasis on interpretability and time series continuity, Stats NZ determined that the MH-18 index would be most suitable for deriving rates of material hardship from HILS.

The full details of the MH-18 index and other changes to methodology are outlined in [Understanding methodology changes](#).

## Understanding methodology changes

This section outlines the updates to the methodology for deriving rates of material hardship. It covers the methodology for combining multiple individual spending responses, data processing, index composition, index score, and index thresholds, and explains the differences in methodology between HES and HILS.

### Methodology for combining multiple individual spending responses

In the HES questionnaire, a single material wellbeing module contained all questions relevant to material wellbeing. This module was answered by a randomly selected adult (aged 18 years or over) who was a usual resident of the household.

In the HILS questionnaire, material wellbeing questions are split across two questionnaire modules: the household spending module (HSP) and the individual spending module (ISP). The household nominates the best person to respond to questions about household finances (referred to as the 'bills respondent'). All usual residents of the household aged 15 years and over receive the ISP.

These changes were made to improve the completeness and quality of the responses. However, as a result, it is not possible to fully replicate the HES methodology of sourcing all item responses from one randomly selected adult when calculating a household index score. A range of options for combining multiple individual spending responses were evaluated for use in HILS. To meet the key consideration of consistency with HES methodology, the new methodology sources all item responses (to both the HSP and ISP modules) from the bills respondent.

### Methodology for data processing

The HILS questionnaire introduced 'not applicable' as a valid response to eight of the questions in the broader material wellbeing question set.

Additionally, planned missingness (that is, intentionally blank responses) was introduced to reduce respondent burden for two questions – the respondents did not receive the question if their response could be assumed from questions asked in a previous module.

When calculating index scores, the new methodology treats 'not applicable' and blank/missing items as 'not deprived'. This is consistent with the logic of the questions and with the approach used for HES. An index score will not be calculated for a household if answers to **all** input questions are blank, 'don't know', or 'refuse' for the bills respondent (this is also consistent with the DEP-17 for HES).

### Determining a household's index score

The MH-18 uses the same approach as the DEP-17 for calculating the score of an individual index item (creation of binary 0/1 outcomes, where a score of 1 reflects experiencing deprivation), and for

calculating household index scores (the sum of deprivation scores across index items). This simple approach is highly accessible and makes real-world sense – experiencing a higher number of deprivations results in higher household score, indicating greater depth of hardship.

## Index composition

The DEP-17 used in HES is composed of 17 items relating to basic needs regarded as essential or near-essential.

HILS will use an 18-item index with 16 items in common with the DEP-17. Compared with the DEP-17, the MH-18 includes items concerning access to a computer and/or the internet and access to a good bed, while it excludes an item concerning cutting back on visits to local places, including the shops.

See [Appendix](#) for a comparison of the full list of the items included in the MH-18 index and those included in DEP-17.

## Index thresholds

The MH-18 index uses a material hardship threshold of 7 or more items, and a severe material hardship threshold of 10 or more items. The index's item set, scoring approach, and thresholds all operate in combination to produce hardship rates. The thresholds for the MH-18 index are set to ensure the same depth of hardship is being measured as with DEP-17, as shown by the reasonable continuity in hardship rates between HES and Living and Aotearoa, and between HES and HILS.

## Conclusion

Stats NZ will use the MH-18 index (with a threshold of 7 or more deprivation items) to measure material hardship from HILS.

The assessment we completed demonstrates that this methodology maintains consistency in the hardship concept being measured and ensures continuity between HILS-based rates of material hardship and the HES-based time series.

Stats NZ has determined the new methodology to be robust and statistically sound, and in combination with the full suite of design changes, is intended to improve the quality of data produced from HILS.

Stats NZ will publish the first child poverty statistics from HILS and the MH-18 index in February 2026.

## References

Children's Commissioner's Expert Advisory Group on Solutions to Child Poverty (2012). [Solutions to Child Poverty in New Zealand evidence for action](#). [PDF, 84p]. Retrieved from [www.occ.org.nz](http://www.occ.org.nz).

## Appendix: Detailed summary of HES to HILS design changes on items included in the DEP-17 and MH-18, including question wording

HES		HILS		
Question	DEP-17	Question	Module	MH-18
<b>Ownership or participation:</b> Respondents are in deprivation if they respond 'No' with 'cost' as the reason.				
<i>I'm now going to ask you about some things you may or may not have or do.</i>		<i>[No stem]</i>		
Do you have at least two pairs of shoes in a good condition that are suitable for your daily activities?	Y	Do you have at least two pairs of shoes in good condition, suitable for your daily activities?	ISP	Y
Do you have suitable clothes for important or special occasions?	Y	Do you have suitable clothes for important or special occasions?	ISP	Y
Do you have home contents insurance? <sup>RU</sup>	Y	Does this household <sup>1</sup> have home contents insurance? <sup>RU</sup>	HSP	Y
Do you have a meal with meat, fish, or chicken (or vegetarian equivalent) at least each second day?	Y	Do you have a meal with meat, seafood, eggs, or plant-based protein at least every second day?	ISP	Y
Do you give presents to family or friends on birthdays, Christmas, or other special occasions?	Y	Do you give presents to family or friends on birthdays, Christmas, or other special occasions?	ISP	Y
Do you have access to both a computer and internet connection at home? <sup>RU</sup>		<b>(Two questions combined into one item<sup>2</sup>)</b> Does this household <sup>1</sup> have access at home to a computer such as a PC, laptop, or tablet? <sup>RU</sup> Does this household <sup>1</sup> have an internet connection at home? <sup>RU</sup>	HSP	Y
Do you have a good bed to sleep in?		Do you have a good bed to sleep in?	ISP	Y
<b>Economising behaviours:</b> Respondents are in deprivation if they respond 'a lot'.				
<i>I'm now going to read out a list of things some people do to help keep costs down. This is not about choosing to spend less. It is about being forced to keep costs down to pay for other basic things that you need. Tell me if you had to do any of the following things to keep down costs in the last 12 months...</i>		<i>The next questions are about being forced to keep costs down. In the last 12 months...</i>		
... go without fresh fruit and vegetables? <sup>NA, RO, RU</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not at all</li> <li>• A little</li> <li>• A lot</li> </ul>	Y	... has this household <sup>1</sup> had to go without, or cut back on, fresh fruit and vegetables? <sup>NA, RO, RU</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes – a little</li> <li>• Yes – a lot</li> <li>• No – not at all</li> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>	HSP	Y
... buy cheaper cuts of meat or buy less meat than you would like? <sup>NA, RO, RU</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not at all</li> <li>• A little</li> <li>• A lot</li> </ul>	Y	... has this household <sup>1</sup> had to buy cheaper cuts of meat, or buy less meat than you'd like? <sup>NA, RO, RU</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes – a little</li> <li>• Yes – a lot</li> <li>• No – not at all</li> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>	HSP	Y

Measuring child poverty: Material hardship in the Household Income and Living Survey

<p>... put up with feeling cold? <sup>NA, RO, RU</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Not at all</i></li> <li>• <i>A little</i></li> <li>• <i>A lot</i></li> </ul>	Y	<p>... has this household<sup>1</sup> had to put up with feeling cold? <sup>NA, RO, RU</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Yes – a little</i></li> <li>• <i>Yes – a lot</i></li> <li>• <i>No – not at all</i></li> <li>• <i>Not applicable</i></li> </ul>	HSP	Y
<p>... do without or cut back on trips to the shops or other local places? <sup>RO</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Not at all</i></li> <li>• <i>A little</i></li> <li>• <i>A lot</i></li> </ul>	Y	<p>... to keep costs down, have you ever had to do without or cut back on visits to local places, including the shops? <sup>RO</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Yes – a little</i></li> <li>• <i>Yes – a lot</i></li> <li>• <i>No – not at all</i></li> </ul>	ISP	
<p>... delay replacing or repairing broken or damaged appliances? <sup>NA, RO, RU</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Not at all</i></li> <li>• <i>A little</i></li> <li>• <i>A lot</i></li> </ul>	Y	<p>... has this household<sup>1</sup> had to put off replacing or repairing appliances? <sup>NA, RO, RU</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Yes – a little</i></li> <li>• <i>Yes – a lot</i></li> <li>• <i>No – not at all</i></li> <li>• <i>Not applicable</i></li> </ul>	HSP	Y
<p>... postpone or put off visits to the doctor? <sup>RO</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Not at all</i></li> <li>• <i>A little</i></li> <li>• <i>A lot</i></li> </ul>	Y	<p>... have you ever had to put off going to the doctor? <sup>RO</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Yes – a little</i></li> <li>• <i>Yes – a lot</i></li> <li>• <i>No – not at all</i></li> </ul>	ISP	Y
<p>... postpone or put off visits to the dentist? <sup>RO</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Not at all</i></li> <li>• <i>A little</i></li> <li>• <i>A lot</i></li> </ul>	Y	<p>... have you ever had to put off going to the dentist? <sup>RO</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Yes – a little</i></li> <li>• <i>Yes – a lot</i></li> <li>• <i>No – not at all</i></li> </ul>	ISP	Y
<b>Freedom/restrictions:</b> Respondents are in deprivation if they respond 'very limited'.				
<i>[No stem]</i>		<i>[No stem]</i>		
<p>When buying, or thinking about buying, clothes or shoes for yourself, how much do you usually feel limited by the money available?</p>	Y	<p>When buying or thinking about buying clothes or shoes for yourself, how much do you feel limited by the money you have available?</p>	ISP	Y
<b>Freedom/restrictions:</b> Respondents are in deprivation if they respond 'no'.				
<i>[No stem]</i>		<i>[No stem]</i>		
<p>If you<sup>3</sup> had an unexpected and unavoidable expense of \$500 in the next week, could you pay it within a month without borrowing? <sup>RU</sup></p>	Y	<p>If this household<sup>1</sup> had an unexpected and unavoidable expense of \$500 in the next week, could you pay it within a month without borrowing? <sup>RU</sup></p>	HSP	Y
<b>Financial strain:</b> Respondents are in deprivation if they respond 'more than once'.				
<i>In the last 12 months, have any of the following happened to you<sup>3</sup> because of a shortage of money?</i>		<i>Because of a shortage of money, in the last 12 months has this household<sup>1</sup> ever...</i>		
<p>... you could not pay electricity, gas, rates, or water bills on time? <sup>NA, RU, S</sup></p>	Y	<p>... been late paying electricity, gas, rates, or water bills? <sup>NA, RU, S</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Yes</i></li> <li>• <i>No</i></li> <li>• <i>Not applicable</i></li> </ul> <p>If yes: <i>In the last 12 months how many times has this household<sup>1</sup> ...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Once</i></li> <li>• <i>More than once</i></li> </ul>	HSP	Y

<p>... you could not pay for car insurance, registration, or warrant of fitness on time? <sup>NA, RU, S</sup></p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>... been late paying car insurance, registration, or warrant of fitness? <sup>NA, RU, S</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul> <p>If yes: In the last 12 months how many times has this household<sup>1</sup> ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once</li> <li>• More than once</li> </ul>	<p>HSP</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>... you borrowed from family or friends to meet everyday living costs? <sup>RU, S</sup></p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>... borrowed from family or friends to meet everyday living costs? <sup>RU, S</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul> <p>If yes: In the last 12 months how many times has this household<sup>1</sup> ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once</li> <li>• More than once</li> </ul>	<p>HSP</p>	<p>Y</p>

**Abbreviations**

ISP – location of the question(s) is in the Individual Spending Module

HSP – location of the question(s) is in the Household Spending Module

**Superscripts**

NA – question includes ‘Not applicable’ as a valid response option in HILS.

RO – question has a different response order in HILS.

RU – the reference unit of question has been updated in HILS to refer to the household rather than the individual.

S – question has been split into two parts in HILS.

1. In single adult households, the question uses 'you'/'do you'/'have you', rather than 'this household'/'does this household'/'has this household'. In limited cases where a household is interviewed somewhere other than their dwelling, the phrasing is 'the household'/'does your household'/'has the household'.

2. Respondents are considered deprived of this combined item if deprived of at least one of the two input questions.

3. In HES, if a partner was living with the respondent in the same dwelling, the question phrasing was 'you or your partner'.

**Colours**

Green – column headers

Orange – item category

Grey – question introduction/stem

Blue – indicates whether the item inclusion status is different in MH-18 compared to DEP-17.

**Symbols**

Y – item is included in the index.