DESIRED OUTCOMES

Everybody has the opportunity to enjoy a long and healthy life. Avoidable deaths, disease and injuries are prevented. Everybody has the ability to function, participate and live independently or appropriately supported in society.

Health

INTRODUCTION

Good health is critical to wellbeing. Without good health, people are less able to enjoy their lives to the fullest extent and their options are limited.

Good health has two core dimensions: how long people live and the quality of their lives. The desired outcomes recognise both aspects. As well as enjoying long lives, people want to be free from the pain, suffering and incapacity that result from injury or illness.

The desired outcomes also acknowledge that not everybody can live a fully independent life. For some people, illness or disability means they need support from families, government agencies or other networks to overcome barriers to their participation in society.

People with injuries or illness (both mental and physical) may experience barriers to participating in education, training and employment, thus reducing their economic standard of living. These barriers can also reduce people’s ability to participate in other areas of life, such as family life, socialising with friends, joining community activities and taking part in recreation and leisure pursuits, which can lead to feelings of frustration and isolation.

A range of factors affect and are affected by health outcomes, including genetic predisposition, behaviour, the physical and social environment and the availability of health services. Increasing attention is being paid to the interaction between socio-economic and health outcomes. People with low incomes, poor housing and few qualifications are likely to have disproportionately poorer health.17
INDICATORS

Six indicators are used in this chapter. Together they provide a picture of the current state of the nation’s health and the likely trends in the future. They cover the length and quality of life and include both physical and mental health. The indicators are: health expectancy, life expectancy, suicide, cigarette smoking, obesity and potentially hazardous drinking.

The first three indicators are relevant to the current state of the nation’s health. Together, they directly measure the desired outcomes relating to long and healthy lives, and people’s ability to participate in society. The last three indicators are strong predictors of future health outcomes.

Health expectancy refers to the number of years a person can expect to live independently, i.e., free of any disability requiring the assistance of another person or complex assistive device. This is a summary measure of a population’s health integrating both fatal (life expectancy) and non-fatal (disability requiring assistance) health outcomes.

Life expectancy measures the survival experience of the population: how long people live. It is an indicator of fatal health outcomes.

The suicide death rate serves as a proxy for the mental health status of the population. The indicator covers the suicide death rate for society as a whole and includes details for subsets of the population.

The links between cigarette smoking and poor health are widely recognised. For example, cigarette smoking (active and passive) is a risk factor for many cancers and respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, and has been linked with low birth weight, Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, and other adverse child health outcomes. Obesity is linked with poor health outcomes, such as an increased risk of heart attacks, strokes, type 2 diabetes and some cancers.18

The majority of New Zealanders consume alcohol at least occasionally.19 Potentially hazardous drinking is an established pattern of alcohol consumption that carries a high risk of future damage to physical or mental health, but may not yet have resulted in significant adverse effects.20 Alcohol also contributes to death and injury due to traffic accidents, drowning, suicide, assaults and domestic violence.21
Health expectancy

DEFINITION

The number of years a person could expect to live in good health if current mortality and morbidity rates persist.

The particular measure of health expectancy used here is the number of years a person could expect to live independently, i.e., live without any functional limitation requiring the assistance of another person or complex assistive device. Hence it is also described as independent life expectancy. The measure uses information from the 1996, 2001 and 2006 Disability Surveys to calculate disability-adjusted life expectancy estimates.

RELEVANCE

Health expectancy is a summary measure of a population’s health that captures both the “quantity” and “quality” of life dimensions of health. Independent life expectancy at birth is a positive measure, capturing expectations of a life free from functional limitation that requires assistance. Improvements in health expectancy reflect changes in social and economic conditions, lifestyle changes, medical advances and better access to health services.

CURRENT LEVEL AND TRENDS

In 2006, males and females had an independent life expectancy at birth of 67.4 years and 69.2 years respectively. The gap between males and females in independent life expectancy at birth was 1.8 years in 2006, a decrease of two years since 2001. For the total population, independent life expectancy at birth has improved since 1996 (an increase of 2.7 years for males, 1.7 years for females).

It should be noted that the 2006 Disability Survey reported a significant decline in the levels of disability reported in the previous survey, due to a range of methodological and other factors. Statistics New Zealand has advised that caution should be exercised when comparing the results of the 2006 Disability Survey with those from previous surveys.

Figure H1.1: Independent life expectancy at birth, by sex, 1996, 2001 and 2006

Source: Ministry of Health
Independent life expectancy for Māori was produced in the same way as for the total New Zealand population. These ethnic-specific statistics are comparable with those for the total population.

Māori males had an independent life expectancy at birth of 62.0 years in 2006. The figure for Māori females was 64.2 years, a gender gap of 2.2 years. There are large ethnic differences in health expectancy, despite a very rapid improvement in survivorship for Māori in recent years. In 2006, the gap in independent life expectancy at birth between Māori and non-Māori was 6.8 years for males and 6.2 years for females (the independent life expectancy at birth for non-Māori was 68.8 years and 70.4 years for males and females respectively).

**Figure H1.2**  
Independent life expectancy at birth, Māori and non-Māori population, by sex, 2006

Source: Ministry of Health
Life expectancy

DEFINITION
Life expectancy at birth indicates the total number of years a person could expect to live, based on the mortality rates of the population at each age in a given year or period.

RELEVANCE
Life expectancy at birth is a key summary indicator of fatal health outcomes, i.e., the survival experience of the population.

CURRENT LEVEL AND TRENDS
Based on the mortality experiences of New Zealanders in the period 2006–2008, life expectancy at birth was 78.2 years for males and 82.2 years for females. Since the mid-1980s, gains in longevity have been greater for males than for females. Between 1985–1987 and 2006–2008, life expectancy at birth increased by 7.1 years for males and 5.1 years for females. As a result, the gap between males and females in life expectancy narrowed from 6.0 years to 4.0 years over this period.

The gains in life expectancy at birth since the mid-1980s can be attributed mainly to reduced death rates for people in the late-working and retirement age groups (55–84 years). However, reduced death rates for infants (from 11.2 deaths per 1,000 live births in 1986 to 5.0 per 1,000 in 2008), for people aged 45–54 years, and for women aged 85 years and over were also significant.

Figure H2.1  Life expectancy at birth, by sex, 1985–1987 to 2006–2008

Source: Statistics New Zealand
Note: The period life table data in this graph is from complete life tables for all periods up to 2000–2002 and an abridged life table for 2006–2008

ETHNIC DIFFERENCES
There are marked ethnic differences in life expectancy. In 2005–2007, male life expectancy at birth was 79.0 years for non-Māori and 70.4 years for Māori, a difference of 8.6 years. Female life expectancy at birth was 83.0 years for non-Māori and 75.1 years for Māori, a difference of 7.9 years.

The pace of improvement in life expectancy has varied by ethnic group. For non-Māori, there was a fairly steady increase in life expectancy at birth over the period from 1985–1987 to 2005–2007, with males gaining 7.6 years and females 5.6 years. For Māori, there was little change during the 1980s, but a substantial improvement in the 10 years to 2005–2007 (a gain of 3.8 years for both sexes). This exceeded the improvement for non-Māori over the same period (3.6 years for males and 2.4 years for females). However, the overall gain in Māori life expectancy from 1985–1987 to 2005–2007 (5.5 years for males, 4.6 years for females) was less than that for non-Māori.
Socio-economic differences

There is an association between life expectancy and the level of deprivation in the area where people live. In 2005–2007, males in the least deprived 10th of small areas in New Zealand could expect to live 8.8 years longer than males in the most deprived 10th of small areas (82.1 versus 73.3 years). For females, the difference was smaller, but still substantial, at 5.9 years (84.6 versus 78.7 years). These differences illustrate the links between socio-economic status and health.

International comparison

In 2005–2007, New Zealanders’ life expectancy at birth was 82.2 years for females and 78.1 years for males. This was slightly below the OECD median of 82.3 years for females and slightly above the OECD median of 77.1 years for males. Out of 30 OECD countries, New Zealand was ranked 17th for females, and seventh equal for males. In 1960–1961, New Zealand’s ranking was ninth for females and seventh equal for males. Through the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, longevity improved faster in many other OECD countries than it did in New Zealand. Since the 1980s, faster-than-average gains in life expectancy in New Zealand, particularly for males, have improved New Zealand’s relative position. In 2006, life expectancy at birth was highest for females in Japan (85.8 years) and highest for males in Iceland (79.4 years). Compared to New Zealand, female life expectancy was higher in Australia (83.5 years) and Canada (82.7 years in 2005), but lower in the United Kingdom (81.1 years in 2005) and the United States (80.4 years in 2005). Male life expectancy was higher in Australia (78.7 years), similar in Canada (78.0 years in 2005), and lower in the United Kingdom (77.1 years in 2005) and the United States (75.2 years in 2005).22
Suicide

DEFINITION
The number of suicide deaths per 100,000 population, for the population aged 5 years and over.

RELEVANCE
Suicide is an indicator of the mental health of society and a major cause of injury-related death in the population.

CURRENT LEVEL AND TRENDS
In 2006, 524 people died by suicide, an increase from the 511 people who died in 2005.23 The age-standardised suicide death rate was 12.2 per 100,000 population in 2006, the same rate as in 2005. Over the 1980s and 1990s there was an upward trend in the suicide death rate, which peaked at 15.1 per 100,000 in 1998. The rate has generally declined since then and in 2006 it was similar to the rate in 1986 (12.3 per 100,000).

Figure H3.1
Age-standardised suicide death rate, by sex, 1986–2006

Source: Ministry of Health
Notes: (1) 2006 figures are provisional (2) Age-standardised to WHO standard population

AGE DIFFERENCES
People aged 15–24 years had the highest suicide death rate in 2006 (19.7 per 100,000 population, with 119 deaths), followed by people aged 25–34 years (18.6 per 100,000, with 102 deaths).

Figure H3.2
Suicide death rate, by age, 1986–2006

Source: Ministry of Health
Note: 2006 figures are provisional

The youth (15–24 year olds) suicide death rate increased steeply in the late-1980s, peaking at 28.7 per 100,000 people aged 15–24 years in 1995. It has fallen by 32 per cent since then, but is still higher than the 1986 rate of 15.6 per 100,000. The pattern is similar for 25–34 year olds. Suicide death rates have fallen over the past two decades for people aged 45 years and over. These age patterns may reflect, in part, cohort effects.
SEX DIFFERENCES  Males have a significantly higher rate of death by suicide than females, with an age-standardised rate of 18.5 deaths per 100,000 males in 2006, compared with 6.3 deaths per 100,000 females. The male suicide death rate increased sharply in the late-1980s, peaked at 23.9 deaths per 100,000 males in 1995, then declined after 1998. In the years 2002 to 2006, the male rate was similar to the 1986 rate of 18.3 deaths per 100,000 males. In comparison, the female rate has been relatively stable over the last 20 years. Because of the small numbers involved, it is more reliable to consider the trend over several years.

While the suicide death rate is higher for males, more females than males are hospitalised for intentional self-harm. In 2006, the female–male rate ratio for intentional self-harm in New Zealand was 1.8 female hospitalisations to every male hospitalisation per 100,000 population. Females more commonly choose methods that are less likely to be fatal.

ETHNIC DIFFERENCES  In 2006, there were 107 Māori deaths by suicide, accounting for 20 per cent of all suicide deaths in that year. The age-standardised rate of suicide deaths in 2006 was 17.8 per 100,000 population for Māori, compared to 11.0 per 100,000 for non-Māori. The suicide death rate for Māori youth (15–24 year olds) in 2006 was 31.8 per 100,000, compared with the non-Māori rate of 16.8 per 100,000. Since 1996, suicide death rates have declined for non-Māori but there is no obvious trend for Māori, although the small numbers of Māori suicide deaths make it hard to ascertain trends.

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON  A comparison of the latest age-standardised suicide death rates in 13 OECD countries between 2004 and 2006 shows New Zealand’s (2006) rate was the fifth highest for males (18.2 per 100,000 males) and the eighth highest for females (6.2 per 100,000 females). Finland had the highest male suicide death rate (31.1 per 100,000 in 2006), while Japan had the highest female rate (12.7 per 100,000 in 2004). Australia (16.4 in 2005) had a lower rate of male suicide deaths than New Zealand, as did the United States (18.0 in 2005) and Canada (17.7 in 2004). The United Kingdom had the lowest male suicide death rate (11.1 in 2005). Canada (4.5), the United States (4.4), Australia (4.3) and the United Kingdom (3.8) all reported lower female suicide death rates than New Zealand.

New Zealand had the second highest male youth (15–24 years) suicide death rate (after Finland), and the second highest female youth suicide death rate (after Japan). New Zealand is one of a small number of countries which have higher suicide death rates at younger ages than at older ages.
Cigarette smoking

DEFINITION
The proportion of the population who currently smoke cigarettes. Up to 2005, the survey population was people aged 15 years and over (ACNielsen survey). From 2006, the survey population is people aged 15–64 years (New Zealand Tobacco Use Survey, New Zealand Health Survey).

RELEVANCE
Tobacco smoking is a well-recognised risk factor for many cancers and for respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. In addition, exposure to environmental tobacco smoke (particularly maternal smoking) is a major risk factor for Sudden Infant Death Syndrome and respiratory problems in children. Smoking has been identified as the major cause of preventable death in OECD countries.29

CURRENT LEVEL AND TRENDS
In 2008, 23 per cent of people aged 15–64 years were current cigarette smokers, according to the New Zealand Tobacco Use Survey. This was just below the smoking prevalence rate derived from the New Zealand Tobacco Use Survey conducted in the first quarter of 2006 (24 per cent).

Long-term trends are available only for the population aged 15 years and over. The Ministry of Health’s estimate of smoking prevalence for this population in 2008 is 21.0 per cent. This is similar to the 2006/2007 New Zealand Health Survey estimate of 19.9 per cent and the 2006 Census figure of 20.7 per cent, but below the 24 per cent derived from the ACNielsen survey for 2005. Among the population aged 15 years and over, smoking has declined from 30 per cent in 1986, with most of the decline occurring between 1987 and 1991.

It is important to note there are methodological differences between these three surveys and some caution should be used when comparing figures. Ongoing monitoring in the social report will be based on the New Zealand Tobacco Use Survey. As this survey is carried out in two out of every three years, it allows the most frequent updates.

Figure H4.1

Prevalence of cigarette smoking, population aged 15 years and over, 1986–2008

Source: Ministry of Health

AGE AND SEX DIFFERENCES
Smoking rates for females and males have generally been similar since the mid-1980s. However, after adjusting for age, the male rate was higher than the female rate in 2008 (26 per cent and 22 per cent respectively).

In 2008, smoking was most prevalent among people aged 25–34 years (28 per cent), followed by those aged 15–24 years (26 per cent). People aged 55–64 years had a significantly lower smoking prevalence than younger age groups (17 per cent). Since the mid-1980s, people aged 55 years and over have experienced the greatest decline in smoking prevalence.30
Daily smoking rates for 14–15 year olds have declined considerably since 1999. Between 1999 and 2007, the prevalence of daily smoking declined by 56 per cent for males in this age group (from 14 per cent to 6 per cent) and by 51 per cent for females (from 17 per cent to 8 per cent).

**ETHNIC DIFFERENCES**

After adjusting for age, smoking prevalence is significantly higher among Māori and Pacific peoples (at around 46 per cent and 31 per cent respectively in 2008), than among the total population aged 15–64 years. It is significantly lower among Asian ethnic groups (13 per cent in 2008). Among Māori, smoking prevalence is significantly higher for women than for men. The opposite is the case for other ethnic groups, particularly Asians: Asian men have a significantly higher smoking prevalence rate than Asian women.

**Table H4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage in each ethnic group who smoke cigarettes</th>
<th>European/Other</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Pacific peoples</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Health (2009b)

Notes: (1) Rates are age-standardised using the WHO world standard population (2) People who reported more than one ethnic group are counted once in each group reported

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIFFERENCES**

In 2008, the smoking prevalence rate in the most deprived areas (NZDep2006 deciles 9 and 10) was 2.7 times the rate in the least deprived areas (deciles 1 and 2).31

**INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON**

In an OECD comparison of daily smoking rates for adults aged 15 years and over, New Zealand had a rate of 18 per cent in 2007, compared with an OECD median of 23 per cent.32 New Zealand ranked fourth lowest out of 30 OECD countries. Smoking prevalence was highest in Greece (40 per cent in 2008) and lowest in Sweden (just under 15 per cent in 2006). New Zealand’s daily smoking rate was lower than the United Kingdom’s (21 per cent in 2007), similar to Australia’s (17 per cent in 2007) and Canada’s (18 per cent in 2007), and higher than the rate in the United States (15 per cent in 2007). Compared to other OECD countries, New Zealand’s smoking levels are relatively low for both sexes, ranking fourth lowest for males and 13th lowest for females.33

**TOBACCO CONSUMPTION**

In 2008, tobacco available for consumption was 1,011 cigarette equivalents per person aged 15 years and over, similar to 1,002 in 2007. Since 1991, tobacco consumption has decreased by 42 per cent. Over this period, the drop in tobacco consumption has been more rapid than the drop in smoking prevalence.

**Figure H4.2**

Tobacco consumption, cigarette equivalents per person aged 15 years and over, 1991–2008

Source: Statistics New Zealand
 Obesity

DEFINITION

The proportion of the population aged 15 years and over who are obese, and the proportion of children aged 5–14 years who are obese.

For adults aged 18 years and over, obesity is defined as having a body mass index (BMI) greater than or equal to 30 kg/m² (for all ethnic groups). For those aged under 18 years, internationally defined sex and age specific BMI cut-off points have been used.

RELEVANCE

Obesity is associated with a long list of adult health conditions, including heart disease, high blood pressure and strokes, type 2 diabetes, various types of cancer, and psychological and social problems. Obese children are likely to be obese into adulthood.

CURRENT LEVEL AND TRENDS

In 2006/2007, the age-standardised obesity prevalence rate for the population aged 15 years and over was 25 per cent. This was similar to the 2002/2003 rate of 24 per cent but a significant increase from the 1997 rate of 19 per cent.

In 2006/2007, 8 per cent of children aged 5–14 years were obese, a prevalence rate similar to that of 2002 (9 per cent).

The major drivers of the increase in obesity rates have been changing dietary and physical activity patterns, reflecting an environment that promotes the over-consumption of energy-dense foods and drinks and limits the opportunities for physical activity.

AGE AND SEX DIFFERENCES

Age-standardised prevalence rates for 2006/2007 showed no significant sex difference in the proportion of the population aged 15 years and over who were obese (males, 25 per cent; females, 26 per cent). This was also the case in 2002/2003. In 1997, the age-standardised rate for females was significantly higher than the rate for males.

Among children aged 5–14 years, there was no significant difference by sex or age in the prevalence of obesity, either in 2002 or in 2006/2007.

Among those aged 15 years and over in 2006/2007, the prevalence of obesity was highest in the 55–64 years age group (36 per cent), followed by the 65–74 years age group.

Table H5.1 Prevalence (%) of obesity, by age group and sex, 2006/2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5–14</th>
<th>15–24</th>
<th>25–34</th>
<th>35–44</th>
<th>45–54</th>
<th>55–64</th>
<th>65–74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Health
ETHNIC DIFFERENCES

There are large differences in the prevalence of obesity by ethnicity. Among the population aged 15 years and over in 2006/2007, Pacific peoples (65 per cent) and Māori (43 per cent) had significantly higher age-standardised obesity rates than the total population in this age group, while Asians (12 per cent) had a significantly lower rate. The obesity rate of European/Other was (23 per cent). For Māori, there was no significant change from 1997 to 2006/2007 in the prevalence of obesity, adjusted for age, either for men or for women. Between 2002/2003 and 2006/2007, only Asians had a statistically significant increase in obesity.

Among children aged 5–14 years in 2006/2007, the pattern of ethnic differences in the prevalence of obesity was similar to that of the population aged 15 years and over. Pacific children had the highest rate (26 per cent), followed by Māori children (13 per cent), Asian children (6 per cent) and children of European/Other ethnic groups (5 per cent).

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

The prevalence of obesity is higher in relatively deprived neighbourhoods. In 2006/2007, 38 per cent of the population aged 15 years and over living in NZDep2006 quintile 5 (the most disadvantaged fifth of neighbourhoods) were obese, compared with 26 per cent of those living in quintile 4, 23 per cent of those living in quintile 3 and 21 per cent of those living in quintiles 1 and 2.

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

New Zealand has a relatively high prevalence of obesity compared with other OECD countries. In 2006/2007, New Zealand’s unadjusted rate was 26.5 per cent, compared to an OECD median of 14.9 per cent. New Zealand had the third highest rate out of 30 OECD countries reporting obesity prevalence from 1999–2007. However, most countries use the self-reporting method to measure obesity whereas New Zealand and seven other countries use actual measurements recorded by an interviewer. Out of the eight countries that use actual measurements, New Zealand had the second highest obesity rate after the United States (34.3 per cent in 2006), and a similar rate to the United Kingdom (24.0 per cent in 2007) and Australia (21.7 per cent in 1999). Out of all OECD countries, Japan (3.4 per cent in 2006) and Korea (3.5 per cent in 2005) had the lowest prevalence of obesity.40
**Potentially hazardous drinking**

**DEFINITION**

The proportion of the population aged 15 years and over who drink alcohol, who scored eight or more on the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT), as measured in the New Zealand Health Surveys conducted by the Ministry of Health in 1996/1997, 2002/2003 and 2006/2007. The AUDIT is a 10-item questionnaire covering alcohol consumption, alcohol-related problems and abnormal drinking behaviour.

**RELEVANCE**

Potentially hazardous drinking, defined by an AUDIT score of eight or more, is an established pattern of alcohol consumption that carries a high risk of future damage to physical or mental health, but may not yet have resulted in significant adverse effects. Alcohol also contributes to death and injury due to traffic accidents, drowning, suicide, assaults and domestic violence.

**CURRENT LEVEL AND TRENDS**

In 2006/2007, 22.9 per cent of adult drinkers had a potentially hazardous drinking pattern, as indicated by an AUDIT score of eight or more. This was similar to the proportions recorded in the 1996/1997 and 2002/2003 surveys (22.3 per cent and 22.5 per cent, respectively).

**AGE AND SEX DIFFERENCES**

For both males and females, the proportion of adult drinkers with a potentially hazardous drinking pattern is highest among those aged 15–24 years and declines at older ages.

In 2006/2007, male drinkers (29.2 per cent) were significantly more likely than female drinkers (13.0 per cent) to have a potentially hazardous drinking pattern. This was the case for all age groups and in each survey year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>15–24</th>
<th>25–34</th>
<th>35–44</th>
<th>45–54</th>
<th>55–64</th>
<th>65–74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996/1997</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Health, Public Health Intelligence

ETHNIC DIFFERENCES

Māori and Pacific drinkers are significantly more likely than drinkers in the total population to have a potentially hazardous drinking pattern. Asian drinkers are significantly less likely to have such a pattern. These ethnic differences are evident for both sexes.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th>25–34</th>
<th>35–44</th>
<th>45–54</th>
<th>55–64</th>
<th>65–74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996/1997</td>
<td>European/Other</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Health, Public Health Intelligence

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

The proportion of adult drinkers with a potentially hazardous drinking pattern in 2006/2007 was significantly higher (at 30.8 per cent) in the most deprived small areas (NZDep2006 quintile 5) than in all other areas (quintiles 1–4), where proportions ranged from 19–24 per cent.

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

Because of the paucity of international data using the AUDIT method of identifying potentially hazardous drinking, this section uses information on annual per capita alcohol consumption compiled by the OECD. New Zealand had the 13th lowest level of alcohol consumption out of 30 OECD countries in 2003–2007, with a per capita consumption of 9.2 litres in 2007. New Zealand’s alcohol consumption in 2007 was higher than that of the United States (8.6 litres in 2006) and Canada (8.1 litres in 2006), but lower than that of Australia (9.9 litres in 2006) and the United Kingdom (11.2 litres in 2007). The OECD median in 2003–2007 was 9.9 litres of alcohol per capita.44