



# Extra information for community questions

## Engagement with people from Paekākāriki

We don't know how many people we engaged with are from Paekākāriki.

We used five different design research activities. Each was chosen and tailored to achieve the purpose of different phases of work, to ensure we heard from a wide mix of people, and to provide the robust and well-rounded understanding in a cost-effective way.

One of the activities involved recruitment of people to fit specific requirements — the recruited, long semi-structured interviews. [See below for more info on selection criteria for this activity.] We know none of those people were from Paekākāriki.

Three of the five activities — street intercept interviews, market pop-ups, online survey — did not involve prior recruitment of people. They also did not require people to say where they are from.

Street intercept interviews were not held in Paekākāriki. People were not required to say where they live. Some did, some did not. At least three people engaged through street intercepts were from Paekākāriki.

Market pop-ups were not held in Paekākāriki. People were asked whether they live in Kāpiti, but not where within the district. Some offered the information, most did not. At least [Andrea to provide figure] engaged through market pop-ups were from Paekākāriki.

The online survey did not require people to say where they live. Three people said they were part of the Paekākāriki community. Some people spoke directly about the Paekākāriki community in their responses, and about this community's impact through current representation arrangements.

One community workshop was held in Paekākāriki. Three people attended.

Because all individual responses are held in confidence, we will not provide further detail.

Council officers also presented to meetings of the four community boards, and at a session open to all community board members. Council officers presented updates to Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti (twice, at two stages of the project), the Accessibility Advisory Group, Older Persons Council and Youth Council. Any comments from those presentations fed into the analysis process. People attending those sessions might have been from Paekākāriki.

To be clear, voices from Paekākāriki were only difficult to capture in the long semi-structured interviews. That activity involved recruitment of people to fit specific requirements, particularly targeting people unlikely to engage in the process otherwise. [See below for notes on qualifying criteria.] Despite phoning many households in Paekākāriki, we did not find people who fit the criteria.

That does not concern us. This activity was part of our set to capture people who would otherwise be unlikely to engage in the process of determining representation arrangements. If people from one suburb did not meet the qualifying criteria, it means people from that suburb are not unlikely to engage in other ways. As noted above, people from Paekākāriki have indeed already engaged through other activities.

We also note the above is not the whole of council's community engagement. The proposed representation arrangements are now open for public consultation.

### **Criteria for selecting people to engage with**

We used five different design research activities. Each was chosen and tailored to achieve the purpose of different phases of work, to ensure we heard from a wide mix of people, and to provide the robust and well-rounded understanding in a cost-effective way.

In the design research, we only sought and analysed input from people who are eligible to vote in Kāpiti Council elections. We analysed input from people who live in Kāpiti, and people who own property in Kāpiti but live elsewhere.

Three of the five activities — street intercept interviews, market pop-ups, online survey — did not involve prior recruitment of people. If people are eligible to vote in Kāpiti Council elections, we sought their contribution.

From time to time, people younger than voting age contributed, with permission from their guardian. For example, whole families would chat to us at the market pop-ups. We set that information aside for analysis.

People in specific geographic catchments were invited to come to each community workshop. People were invited by way of an unaddressed paper invitation placed in letterboxes. No other criteria was imposed.

We recruited and scheduled people for the long semi-structured interviews. We specifically targeted people unlikely to engage in the process otherwise. As a base screening, we asked whether people had put their view forward to council over the last six months. We asked this in a few different plain-English ways, and asked the nature of the input and frequency of prior input. As such, we started with a quantitative screening, then added a qualitative screening to ensure we were targeting people unlikely to engage in the process otherwise.

In addition to meeting that base qualifying criteria, we aimed for a mix of other demographics in our semi-structured interviews — suburbs of residence, age, sex, income level, and employment type. We asked additional questions to allow us to get a mix of those criteria.

The people we spoke with from Paekākāriki did not meet our base qualifying criteria. Even when we dropped the threshold to three months (ie they had not put their view forward to council in the last three months), only a few people passed that screening question. They were then removed from consideration on further questioning, based on their likelihood of engaging with the process in other ways.

We used targeted direct channels to invite people. We started with a small database of people who are known to our research recruitment specialist. That did not prove fruitful, as people who were interested in taking part did not meet our qualifying criteria. As a next step, we used telephone directories and cold-called people. We also engaged two people who had responded to us approaching and recruiting them on the street, who met the qualifying criteria.

We did not fact-check people's credentials for any of the design research activities. It is possible a person did not accurately respond to questions about living or owning property in Kāpiti, or prior engagement with council. But asking the questions clearly, our method of initial engagement — letterbox drop, cold-calling through white pages, advertisements in council channels, etc — and the responses provided give us confidence that participants meet our criteria.

## **Tabulated results**

Tabulated results are held in confidence by the core project team. People we engaged with were promised that individual responses would not be shared. Even if name and contact details are removed, responses are very contextualised to each person's life, and is largely deemed to be 'person-identifying information'.

It is Empathy's policy to not share field notes or individual summaries of conversations except when strict protocol is agreed and established at the beginning of projects. This is a very rare occurrence. Putting those protocols in place for this project would have significantly impacted the quality, quantity and specificity of information received from people. That approach was not appropriate for this project.