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1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

This report summarises the methodological aspects of the fifth Australian Social Cohesion Survey funded by the Scanlon Foundation and undertaken by a consortium involving the Scanlon Foundation, Monash University and the Social Research Centre.

For the Local Survey\(^1\) component, this report provides:

- details of the survey procedures; and
- a consolidated record of assorted technical information for the project.

The report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides details of the sampling process and call procedures;
- Section 3 provides an overview of the questionnaire design and testing process;
- Section 4 details interviewer training and quality control procedures;
- Section 5 reviews the call results, response rate and the efficacy of the call procedures; and
- Section 6 details data preparation procedures.

Detailed reports, source documents and reference information are appended.

1.2 Project background

The Social Cohesion Survey forms part of the Scanlon Foundation Social Cohesion Research Program (SCRP) which commenced in 2007 under the direction of the Monash Institute for the Study of Global Movements (MISGM) and the Australian Multicultural Foundation (AMF). A key element of the SCRP is the Australian Social Cohesion Surveys which have been conducted in 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011 and now 2012 with the current iteration including local surveys for the first time since 2009.

These surveys aim to:

- Look at the Australian community’s attitudes towards social cohesion, and
- Assess changes in these attitudes over time.

\(^1\) Methodological details of the 2012 National Survey are provided in a separate document (Part I).
1.3 Survey overview

As with the previous local and national surveys, the in-scope population for the Social Cohesion Survey 2012 was persons aged 18 years and over who were residents of private households in Australia. Data collection was by Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI).

The 2012 Social Cohesion Survey consisted of five elements:

- A National Survey of 2,000 adults (aged 18 years and over), stratified by State/Territory and capital city / non-capital city; and
- Four local surveys (n=500 interviews in each survey), methodological details of which are provided in this document. These local surveys were conducted in suburbs selected from within the Local Government Areas (LGAs) of:
  - Hume (Victoria)
  - Bankstown (New South Wales)
  - Fairfield (New South Wales), and
  - Greater Dandenong (Victoria).

The following target suburbs were selected as the focus of interviewing within each of these LGAs:

- Hume: Broadmeadows, Campbellfield, Coolaroo, Dallas, Meadow Heights and Roxburgh Park;
- Bankstown: Bankstown, Condell Park, Greenacre, Mount Lewis, Punchbowl and Yagoona;
- Fairfield: Cabramatta, Cabramatta West, Canley Heights, Canley Vale;
- Greater Dandenong: Keysborough, Noble Park, Springvale and Springvale South.

The initial random telephone number sample frame was provided by SampleWorx. Records from this sample frame were then matched against the latest version (2011) of the telephone number listing product Australia on Disc so that a suburb address could be attached where possible. Because the SampleWorx product does not provide the level of geographic precision (that is, suburb level) required for the local survey sampling, this “matched” sample was used as the final sample frame for the local surveys.

Approach letters introducing the survey were mailed to all households where an address match was obtained.

Quotas were used to control the number of overseas born, Australian born and long-time Australians included in the final sample. Where more than one eligible respondent lived in a household, the “next birthday” method of selection was employed. A range of strategies was used to maximise the survey response rate including repeated call backs to establish contact, the use of the Social Research Centre’s helpdesk (1800 023 040), and interviewing in languages other than English (LOTE).

---

3 Methodological details for the National survey are provided in a separate document (Social Cohesion Survey 2012, Part I: National Survey; August 2012).
3 While not a primary target suburb it proved necessary to obtain additional interviews (n=12) from Fairfield East.
4 Australian born people both of whose parents were also born in Australia.
Table 1 provides a summary of key statistics for the local surveys.

The overall *adjusted* response rate for the 2012 local surveys was 56%, the highest response rate achieved for this survey by a significant margin.

The questionnaire was the same as that used for the national survey apart from screening questions to confirm suburb of residence and country of birth information. This questionnaire included a number of changes from that used in the last local survey in 2009 (see Appendix 2 for details) and these were reflected in an increased administration time from 16.0 minutes on average in 2009 to an average of 18.2 minutes in 2012.

**Table 1: Local survey overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews completed</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>2,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>28th June</td>
<td>22nd June</td>
<td>20th June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish date</td>
<td>18th August</td>
<td>31st July</td>
<td>31st July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average interview length (mins)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Sample Design & Survey Procedures

2.1 Sample design

As in previous years, the 2012 local surveys used geographically targeted sampling with interviews conducted amongst the residents of selected suburbs within the LGAs of Hume, Bankstown, Fairfield and Greater Dandenong.

Quotas were implemented for country of birth (Australia-born versus overseas-born) with additional monitoring within the Australian-born quota so that approximately 50% of interviews undertaken in this category were with long-time Australian-born respondents (ie: people with both parents also born in Australia).

A minimum of 500 interviews\(^5\) was undertaken in each target area (2,006 interviews in total) with these interviews split between approximately 300 overseas-born and 200 Australian-born respondents (of whom about 100 were long-time Australians) in each location. This approach ensured that the final sample composition provided a sufficiently large sample of overseas-born, Australian-born and long-time Australian respondents to support analysis within each of these subgroups.

The final sample achieved is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Overseas Born n</th>
<th>Australian Born</th>
<th>Total Interviews n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas Born</td>
<td>Long-time</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Australian(^6)</td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Dandenong</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) Slight oversampling occurred in Fairfield (n=504) and Greater Dandenong (n=502)

\(^6\) Respondent and both parents born in Australia.
2.2 Sample generation

Due to the need for accurate sampling at the individual suburb level, the local survey sampling approach differed from that used for the national survey where discrimination beyond the level of State/Territory and metropolitan/regional areas was not required.

For the local surveys, a sample pool for each of the target localities was generated by SampleWorx (a commercial sample provider endorsed by the Association of Market and Social Research Organisations). However, SampleWorx can only append a “best estimate” postcode to the telephone numbers they generate (based on telephone exchange district) and it became apparent early in the fieldwork period that this approach lacked the precision needed for the very tight geographic targeting required for this survey.

Thus, following the release of this first batch of numbers to interviewers, a second stage of geographic matching was undertaken for all subsequent batches in order to meet the tight suburb-level targeting required. The records obtained from SampleWorx were subsequently matched against the latest version (2011) of the telephone number listing product *Australia on Disc* so that a suburb address could be attached to them. For subsequent batches, only those records for which a match was achieved (and hence a suburb could be appended to the record) were included in the final sample.

2.3 Primary Approach Letter

Primary approach letters were sent to each record for which a current address could be established; of the 11,873 telephone records used in the 2012 local surveys, primary approach letters were sent to 78% (n=9,254). The presence of records for which an address match was not available was a consequence of using unmatched SampleWorx records in the early stages of the local survey fieldwork as well as the need to top-up sample records later in the fieldwork period.

For the records that were not sent a primary approach letter in advance, letters were available on request (and additional information was available via the Social Research Centre’s web-site and 1800 number).

The approach letter, on Monash University letterhead and addressed to “The Householder”, was the same version as that used in previous surveys (see Appendix 5 for a copy of the 2012 letter). The main body of the letter was in English, with translated summaries on the reverse side in Arabic, Turkish, simplified Chinese and Vietnamese. These languages were chosen as they represented the key target groups for the local surveys and because space limitation precluded the use of more than four different languages.

The approach letter introduced the survey, encouraged participation and provided sample members with telephone numbers, email addresses and website details to assist with the resolution of any queries they might have.

As part of the data collection procedures, arrangements were put in place to send (additional) approach letters to sample members upon request. In such cases a letter was dispatched to the household the next day and an appointment made to call back to the household 5 days later.
No action was taken for return-to-sender approach letters on the basis that the telephone number associated with that address may still be active and should be called regardless of whether or not the approach letter reached the intended household.

2.4 Scope status and respondent selection

The in-scope population for the 2012 local surveys was the non-institutionalised population of Australia aged 18 years or over resident in selected suburbs within the LGAs of Hume, Bankstown, Fairfield and Greater Dandenong. As such it excluded:

- Residents of institutional quarters (prisons, nursing homes, etc) and military bases;
- Persons incapable of undertaking the interview due to a physical or mental health condition (including too old / frail);
- Persons under the influence of drugs or alcohol,
- Non-English speaking persons outside of the six LOTE communities targeted for this survey (see Section 2.6);
- Households with no person aged 18 years or over in residence; and
- People resident outside the selected geographic areas.

The “next birthday” method was used to select the respondent where more than one eligible person was resident. No substitution of individuals within households was allowed.

For the local surveys, additional screening criteria were put in place to ensure respondents were residents of the selected survey areas and to confirm birthplace (Australia / overseas).

In addition a dynamic screening process was setup within the CATI script to enable the survey introduction to be tailored depending upon which quota groups were still open. For example, if the Australian-born quota was full the following screening script was displayed:

- “Today we are particularly interested in speaking with people born overseas. Is there anyone in this household who was born overseas?”

Likewise, when the overseas-born quota was full the following screening script was displayed:

- “For this study, we’ve been speaking with both Australian born and overseas born people. Since our quota of overseas born people is now full, could I please ask is there anyone in this household aged 18 years or over who is AUSTRALIAN BORN?”
2.5 Call procedures

A 15-call protocol was used for the study, whereby up to six attempts were made to establish contact with the selected household, and on making contact, up to nine more attempts were made to achieve an interview with the selected respondent.

This call regime was adopted to improve the representativeness of the achieved sample. Previous experience has suggested that the representation of groups such as young persons and working persons is improved by using an extended call cycle of this type.

Initial contact attempts were made between 4.30 pm and 8.30 pm on weekdays, between 10.00 am and 4.00 pm on Saturdays and between 11.00 am and 4.00 pm on Sundays. Appointments were made for any suitable time within the hours of operation of the call centre.

2.6 Procedures for interviewing in Languages other than English (LOTE)

Non-English language interviewing was conducted in the six language groups used most widely in the local survey target areas: Vietnamese, Chinese (Cantonese and Mandarin), Italian, Greek, Arabic (inc. Lebanese) and Turkish.

Where the preferred language of interview of the selected sample member was identified as one of the above, these records were initially stockpiled until a reasonable workload for a bi-lingual interviewer was reached. Every effort was made to minimise the time between initial and follow-up contact within the limits imposed by interviewer availability and the maintenance of operational efficiency. Overall, 52% of those identified as potential LOTE interviews had been re-contacted by a bi-lingual interviewer within 48 hours of their initial contact; 16% were recontacted on the same day. Where the preferred language could not be immediately identified a call-back was made in the hope that another household member might be available to assist with the request for interview. Where the preferred language was not one of the six target languages, the record was assigned the code “language difficulty, no follow up” and no further call attempts were made.

Bi-lingual interviewers annotated their own hard copy questionnaires (one for each target language) with key words and concepts translated. These interviewers then read the questions from their hard copy questionnaires and recorded answers directly into the English language CATI script as normal. A total of 387 interviews were conducted in these six languages; that is 19.3% of all interviews undertaken in the local surveys.

Distribution of LOTE interviews by location

As shown in Table 3, the proportion of interviews conducted in a language other than English ranged from a high of 30.6% in Fairfield to a low of 12.2% in Greater Dandenong. It can also be seen that the proportion of LOTE interviews conducted in each location is in line with the proportion of each target population who use a language other than English at home. For example, 84.5% of Fairfield residents use a language other than English at home, a figure which is reflected in the highest proportion of LOTE interviews (30.6% of all Fairfield interviews) being conducted in this location.
Table 3: Distribution of LOTE interviews by interview location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of interviews in each location conducted in ...</th>
<th>Hume %</th>
<th>Bankstown %</th>
<th>Fairfield %</th>
<th>Greater Dandenong %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of target population who speak at home* ...</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of the specific languages in which LOTE interviews were conducted are shown in Table 4. It is evident that LOTE interviews were conducted most often in Vietnamese with 10.8% of all local survey interviews (and 24.4% of all Fairfield interviews) undertaken in this language.

Table 4: Languages in which LOTE interviews were conducted by interview location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of interviews in each location conducted in ...</th>
<th>Hume %</th>
<th>Bankstown %</th>
<th>Fairfield %</th>
<th>Greater Dandenong %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic/Lebanese</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese/Mandarin</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of the resident population in each target location who use each of these languages at home is shown in Table 5. In keeping with the high proportion of Fairfield interviews conducted in Vietnamese (24.4%), there is also a relatively high proportion (36.3%) of people who speak Vietnamese at home. Similarly, the relatively high proportion of Vietnamese speakers in Greater Dandenong (16.7%) is reflected in the relatively high proportion of Vietnamese-language interviews (7.6%) conducted in this location.

Nevertheless, despite the comparatively high proportion of Arabic speakers in Bankstown, only 3.0% of the interviews in this location were conducted in Arabic or Lebanese. Differential LOTE interviewing rates for the various language groups seem to be at least partly a consequence of differential competence in spoken English – for example, in NSW 84% of those who speak Arabic at home claim to speak English “very well” or “well” compared with only 66% of those who use Vietnamese at home.7

---

7 Australian Bureau of Statistics Census 2011 – Basic Community Profile data.
8 Ibid.
Table 5: Languages used at home\(^9\) by interview location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Hume %</th>
<th>Bankstown %</th>
<th>Fairfield %</th>
<th>Greater Dandenong %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese/Mandarin</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Leaving messages on answering machines

A pre-scripted message was left on answering machines if there had been no previous ‘personal’ contact made with a household. Refer questionnaire at Appendix 3 for the full message script.

The CATI system automatically scheduled a call back six days later the first time such a message was left and for five days hence on the second such occasion. Messages were not left on answering machines in any other circumstances.

2.8 1800 number operation

Monash University provided a telephone number that respondents could call to verify the survey and find out additional information about why it was being conducted. The Social Research Centre operated a 1800 number throughout the study period to handle any questions about participation in the survey (setting an appointment time, requesting an interpreter, refusing to participate etc.).

2.9 Sundry response maximisation procedures

In addition to providing a 1800 number, offering to send an introductory letter and arranging for interviews in the agreed languages, other response maximisation procedures applied to the project included:

- Referring sample members to the Monash University number on an “as required” basis; and
- Ensuring appropriately trained interviewers worked on the survey (see also Section 4.2).

---

\(^9\) Australian Bureau of Statistics Census 2011 – Basic Community Profile data.
3. Questionnaire Design

3.1 Questionnaire overview
The questionnaire for the Social Cohesion 2012 local surveys repeated a significant portion of the content of the 2009 instrument although a number of deletions and additions have occurred since that time. These changes are summarised in Appendix 2.

3.2 Questionnaire pilot testing
There was no formal pilot for the 2012 local surveys although the first night involved a “soft launch” of 20 interviews to confirm the screening procedures that were the main difference between the local and national surveys.

No changes were made to the local survey questionnaire during this phase, so data collection continued with the full interviewing team; the data collected during the “soft launch” phase has been included in the final data set. The final 2012 questionnaire is provided at Appendix 3.
4. **Data Collection & Quality Control**

4.1 **Ethical consideration**

The questionnaire and survey methodology were approved by the Monash University ethics board. Other ethical considerations for the Social Cohesion Survey included:

- Ensuring informed consent;
- Ensuring the voluntary nature of participation was clearly understood; and
- Protecting the privacy and confidentiality of respondent information.

Safeguards regarding the above were covered by the Social Research Centre’s contract with Monash University and by the appropriate privacy laws. In addition, the Social Research Centre is bound to adhere to ASMRO Privacy Principles and the AMSRS Code of Professional Behaviour.

4.2 **Field team briefing**

All interviewers selected to work on the Social Cohesion Survey attended a comprehensive briefing session covering the project background, objectives and procedures; all aspects of administering the survey questionnaire, including specific data quality issues; an overview of respondent liaison issues, including refusal avoidance techniques; and practice interviewing.

The briefing sessions were delivered by the Social Research Centre project manager and supervisory staff. Fifty-nine interviewers were briefed to work on the 2012 local survey while, in keeping with the Social Research Centre’s “specialist team” policy, 39 of these interviewers completed 95% of the total interviewing task.

The interviewer briefing notes are provided at Appendix 4.

Additional briefing procedures for LOTE interviewing also covered:

- Establishing scope status;
- Tone and delivery;
- Reviewing the questionnaire for instances where word-for-word translations may lose their exact meaning or context.

4.3 **Fieldwork quality control procedures**

The in-field quality monitoring techniques applied to this project included:

- Validation of interviews in accordance with ISO Standard 20252;
- Maintenance of an “interviewer handout” document addressing respondent liaison issues and tips for refusal avoidance;
- Examination of verbatim responses to “other specify” questions; and
- Monitoring (listening in) by the Social Research Centre project managers and departmental supervisors.
5. Call Results & Analysis of Response

5.1 Call results

A total of 51,888 calls were placed to achieve 2,006 completed interviews. This equates to an interview every 25.9 calls and an average of 4.4 calls per sample record.

The most commonly occurring call outcome was no answer (35.8%); there was also a high number of ‘appointment’ (24.0%) and ‘answering machine’ (17.2%) outcomes.

Table 6: All call attempts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Calls</td>
<td>51,888</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>18,580</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>12,445</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering machine</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telstra message, number disconnected</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax/Modem</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming call restrictions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a residential number</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims to have done survey</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected respondent away for duration</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too old / ill health / unable to do survey</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE – No language follow up</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope (no-one 18+, etc)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope (outside area/quota full)</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household level refusal</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent level refusal</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused, type not identified</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total calls made</td>
<td>51,888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average calls per interview</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average calls per sample record</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 shows the final call results for the survey. As can be seen, an interview was achieved at 16.9% of the 11,873 phone numbers to which at least one call was made for the local surveys. Of these 11,873 numbers, 15.3% were unusable; 24.3% were unresolved at the end of the call cycle (non-contacts or unresolved appointments); and 24.1% were identified as being out of scope. Refusals (all types) were encountered at slightly less than a fifth (19.4%) of the numbers to which calls were initiated.

In keeping with the matching process undertaken as part of developing the final sample, there was a lower proportion of unusable numbers than in the national survey (15.3% versus 25.6%) and a higher proportion of out of scopes (24.1% versus 5.9%).

**Table 7: Final call results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total numbers initiated</th>
<th>11,873</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unusable numbers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telstra message, number disconnected</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax/Modem</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming call restrictions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a residential number</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal unusable number</strong></td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No contact / unresolved in survey period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering machine</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal no contact / unresolved</strong></td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of scope</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims to have done survey</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected respondent away for duration</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too old / ill health / unable to do survey</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE – No language follow up</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope (no-one 18+, etc)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope (lives outside target area or not born in target country)</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal out of scope</strong></td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In scope contacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household level refusal</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent level refusal</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused, type not identified</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal in-scope contacts</strong></td>
<td>4,303</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Response rate

Calculation of response rates for the 2012 local surveys followed the same approach as used in 2009. This was slightly different from the national survey response rate calculation because of the need to allow for sample contacts who were out of scope because they lived outside the target suburbs or because they failed to fulfil other quota requirements\(^{10}\), factors which were not considerations in the national survey.

The reasoning behind the method used to deal with these factors was as follows. Within the household refusal category it is not known if potential respondents would have been eligible to participate in the survey, as the screening process to determine eligibility did not take place. Since a proportion of these household refusals would have proven to be out of scope (rather than “lost” interviews), an adjustment to the response rate is required to take this into account.

The \textit{adjusted} response rate was calculated by dividing the number of “interviews” by the number of “interviews” plus the number of “eligible refusals” (ie: respondent refusals or refusals of unknown type) plus a proportion of refusals of “unknown eligibility” (ie: household refusals). The proportion of refusals of “unknown eligibility” included in the denominator was calculated by dividing the number “interviews” plus “eligible refusals” by the number of “interviews” plus the number of “eligible refusals” plus the number of records known to be out of scope due to living outside the target suburbs or failing to meet country of birth quota requirements. Details of the calculation method are shown below in Table 8.

\textbf{Table 8: Adjusted response rates for local level surveys}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Interviews (l)</th>
<th>Eligible refusals (ER)*</th>
<th>Ineligible numbers (IN)^</th>
<th>Refusals of unknown eligibility (RUK)#</th>
<th>p (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Level surveys</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Dandenong</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion (p) of refusals of unknown eligibility is calculated as follows: \[
\frac{I+ER}{I+ER+IN}
\]

Adjusted response rate is calculated as follows: \[
\frac{I}{I+ER+p(RUK)}
\]

* Eligible refusals = respondent refusals + refusals, type unknown
\(^{10}\) Specifically Australian / overseas born.

\(^{10}\) Ineligible numbers = Out of scope (lives outside target area or no one born in target country)

\(^{#}\) Refusals of unknown eligibility = Household refusals
The overall adjusted response rate for the local surveys was 56.3% in 2012, well above the rates achieved in 2007 (42%) and 2009 (43%). The improved response rate is attributable to telephone survey researchers now having access to more up-to-date telephone number directories for local level matching purposes and, as such, the ability to send out more primary approach letters. As reported above (Section 2.3) for the current survey 78% of records were able to be sent a primary approach letter compared with just 12% in 2009 when the only telephone directory available for matching purposes was the 2004 Desktop Marketing Systems telephone directory. Primary approach letters are known to have a very positive impact on response rates.

Some variation was evident between the four localities with the highest response rate achieved in Greater Dandenong (62.0%) and the lowest in Fairfield (52.4%).

5.3 Review of call cycle

As was the case in previous surveys, an extended call cycle (i.e. 15 calls) was used for the 2012 Social Cohesion Survey to ensure the achieved sample was as representative as possible of the Australian adult population.

The value of this extended call cycle (a six call cycle being more typical) is evident from the results presented in Table 9 which shows that 10.2% of interviews were achieved on the seventh or later interview attempt. Importantly, the extended call cycle improved the representation of younger people aged under 45 years – 18 to 24 year olds (18.6% of interviews with people in this age group were obtained on the seventh or later call attempt); 25 to 34 year olds (14.8%); 35 to 44 year olds (14.7%) - and of those people in employment (14.1%). This pattern of response is broadly similar to that seen in the national survey and in previous local surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Analysis of response by call attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call attempt on which interview was achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to give age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Dandenong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Achieved sample profile

Table 10 compares the profile of the achieved sample (using unweighted data) in each location with that of the general population (based mainly on 2011 Census data) from these areas. The achieved sample shows a skew towards older people, females and tertiary educated respondents.

These results are generally consistent with those obtained in other similar surveys conducted by the Social Research Centre. All of these factors were taken into account in the weighting procedure (refer to Section 6.2).

Table 10: Sample profile (unweighted data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hume Achieved</th>
<th>Hume Popn</th>
<th>Bankstown Achieved</th>
<th>Bankstown Popn</th>
<th>Fairfield Achieved</th>
<th>Fairfield Popn</th>
<th>Greater Dandenong Achieved</th>
<th>Greater Dandenong Popn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>41,476</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>71,818</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>35,319</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>62,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or more</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 Reason for refusal

Reasons for refusal were captured, where possible, from either the phone answerer (household refusal) or the selected sample member (respondent refusal).

As can be seen at Table 11, of those cases for which a reason for refusal was recorded, the main reasons given were; “not interested” (45.7%), “no comment / just hung up” (29.0%) and “too busy” (11.6%).

Table 11: Reasons for refusal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for refusal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>2,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment / just hung up</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never do surveys</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get too many calls for surveys / telemarketing</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like subject matter</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t believe surveys are confidential / privacy concerns</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent number</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too personal / intrusive</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 minutes is too long</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter put me off</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other reasons given</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Data Outputs & Reporting

6.1 Treatment of responses to open ended / other specify questions

To maintain comparability over time, considerable effort was made to keep coding rules and code-frames consistent with those used in earlier surveys for the limited number of questions where this was required. However consideration was given to code-frame extensions for two new questions with an “other specify” response option; that is questions D5a (how respondent has been affected by discrimination) and DN9a (reasons for why the level of racial prejudice in Australia is thought to have increased). Code-frame extensions were approved for both of these questions and included in the final data file.

6.2 Weighting

As in previous surveys, a “rim weighting” approach was used to adjust the data for differential survey response rates across age, gender, educational attainment and country of birth and, where necessary, to also adjust for disproportionate aspects of the sample design (i.e. disproportionate distribution by suburb and country of birth). Where possible, target proportions were taken from 2011 Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census counts – this applied to the population estimates of age by gender by geographic location and country of birth.

“Rim weighting” was used to create weights which adjusted the data in-line with the ABS counts on these variables. The weights were created using a statistical regression approach which seeks to achieve the “best fit” possible with the population proportions specified by the weighting variables while disturbing the overall data as little as possible.

The algorithm provided in the Social Research Centre’s Quantum analysis software was used to develop sample weights incorporating the variables suburb of residence, age, gender, country of birth and educational attainment. These weights were applied to all data prior to reporting and have been included in the electronic data files provided as outputs from the survey.

Appendix 1 provides the population matrices used for weighting purposes in the 2012 local surveys.

6.3 Data file provision

The Social Research Centre provided two clean SPSS data files – one containing the 2012 local survey data and a time-series file containing selected data from the 2009 and 2012 surveys. The data files included several derived variables including:

- ASGS – postcode data in concordance with the Australian Statistical Geography Standard published by the ABS; and
- SEIFA – postcode data in concordance with the index of relative socio-economic disadvantage, created from ABS census data.
Appendix 1: Weighting Matrices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hume¹</th>
<th>Bankstown²</th>
<th>Fairfield³</th>
<th>Greater Dandenong⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 18 years and over</td>
<td>41,476</td>
<td>71,818</td>
<td>35,319</td>
<td>62,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/Overseas ESB*</td>
<td>21,069</td>
<td>35,719</td>
<td>13,004</td>
<td>26,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas NESB</td>
<td>20,407</td>
<td>36,099</td>
<td>22,315</td>
<td>36,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University education</td>
<td>4,399</td>
<td>8,503</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>6,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not university education</td>
<td>37,077</td>
<td>63,315</td>
<td>32,502</td>
<td>56,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/sex categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males 18-34</td>
<td>7,566</td>
<td>12,206</td>
<td>5,197</td>
<td>11,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males 35-44</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>6,349</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>5,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males 45-54</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>5,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males 55+</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>4,811</td>
<td>9,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females 18-34</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>12,869</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>10,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females 35-44</td>
<td>4,504</td>
<td>6,807</td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>5,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females 45-54</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>4,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females 55+</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>10,783</td>
<td>5,554</td>
<td>10,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Based on total population proportions
* English Speaking Background: UK, Ireland, USA, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa

Suburbs
¹ Broadmeadows, Cambellfield, Coolaroo, Dallas, Meadow Heights, Roxburgh Park
² Bankstown, Greenacre, Condell Park, Mt Lewis, Yagoona, Punchbowl
³ Cabramatta, Cabramatta West, Canley Heights, Canley Vale
⁴ Keysborough, Noble Park, Springvale, Springvale South
Appendix 2: 2011 Questionnaire revisions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Question</th>
<th>2012 Question</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN1. To start with, what do you think is the most important problem facing Australia today?</td>
<td>New Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1a. Australia has an excellent government school system.</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1new. The next questions are about unpaid voluntary work. By this I mean any unpaid help you give to the community in which you live, or to an organization or group to which you belong. It could be to a school, a sporting club, the elderly, a religious group or people who have recently arrived to settle in Australia. Have you done any unpaid voluntary work of this kind in the last 12 months?</td>
<td>Moved to follow F3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2new. How often do you participate in this sort of voluntary activity?</td>
<td>Moved to follow F3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Please tell me which if any, of the following, you have done over the last three years or so. * Attended a political meeting * Participated in strike action * Some other form of political action</td>
<td>Questions deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn2 Would you say your feelings are positive, negative or neutral towards immigrants from [RANDOM SELECTION OF 5 COUNTRIES – ONE FROM EACH SET] * England, New Zealand, USA * Italy, Greece, Germany * China, Vietnam, India * Lebanon, Egypt, Iraq * Congo, Sudan, Ethiopia</td>
<td>New Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN3</td>
<td>Next I would like to ask how you feel about different types of people coming to live in Australia as permanent or long-term residents. Do you feel positive, negative or neutral about.... * Skilled workers (e.g. Doctors or Nurses, plumbers etc) * Those who have close family living in Australia (i.e. parents or children) * Refugees who have been assessed overseas and found to be victims of persecution and in need of help * Young people who want to study in Australia</td>
<td>New Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN4</td>
<td>What do you think is the main reason that asylum seekers try to reach Australia by boat?</td>
<td>New Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN5</td>
<td>Which of the following four statements comes closest to your view about the best policy for dealing with asylum seekers, who try to reach Australia by boat? 1. They should be allowed to apply for permanent residence 2. They should be allowed to apply for temporary residence only 3. They should be kept in detention until they can be sent back 4. Their boats should be turned back.</td>
<td>New Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN6</td>
<td>What do you think of how the government is handling the asylum seeker issue? Overall do you think they are doing a good job, an average job or a poor job?</td>
<td>New Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN7</td>
<td>Is your personal attitude positive, negative or neutral towards ... a) Christians b) Buddhists c) Muslims</td>
<td>New Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10. Do you think the balance or mix of immigrants from different countries is about right?</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11. From which countries, if any, should there be more immigrants?</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12. From which countries, if any, should there be less immigrants?</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Have you ever experienced discrimination in Australia because of your national or ethnic background or your religion?</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. Where did the discrimination occur?</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN9. Do you think the level of racial prejudice in Australia now is more, less or about the same as it was 5 years ago?</td>
<td>New Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN9a. Why do you think that there is more racial prejudice?</td>
<td>New Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. Compared with your life, do you think that the lives of today’s children will be …</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. Why do you say that?</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1. What proportion of all the people in your local area are of the same national or ethnic group as you?</td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2c. Do you agree or disagree - I am able to have a real say on issues that are important to me in my local area.</td>
<td>New Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5. To the best of your knowledge, in the last 12 months would you say the level of immigration into Australia has increased, decreased or is unchanged?</td>
<td>Moved to follow C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F6.</strong> Which of the following is closest to your view? It's is better for a country if different racial or ethnic groups maintain their distinct customs and traditions OR it is better if these groups adapt and blend into the larger society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F7.</strong> Do you agree or disagree that you can influence local council decisions affecting your local area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F7N.</strong> Would you say that living in your local area is becoming better or worse, or is it unchanged?</td>
<td>New Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F8.</strong> How often do you think the local council can be trusted to do what is right for the people in your area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F9A.</strong> How safe do you feel walking alone in your local area during the day?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEM4.</strong> How many children, if any, do you have?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEM13A.</strong> To what extent do you use the skills and knowledge gained from your qualifications in your current job?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEM15X.</strong> Are you renting, paying off a mortgage, do you own your home outright or do you have some other arrangement?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question deleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Final Questionnaire
Monash University
Social Cohesion Research Program
2012 Local Survey (PR0903B)

Questionnaire Structure
Modules

Screening and Introduction
A: Economic
B: Political
C: Socio-Cultural
D: Discrimination
E: Reflective
F: Neighbourhood and Voluntary Work

Demographics

Call outcome codes (SMS screen)

1. No answer
2. Answering machine (no message left)
3. Answering machine (left message 1)
4. Answering machine (left message 2)
5. Fax machine / modem
6. Engaged
7. Appointment
8. Stopped interview
9. LOTE – No follow up
10. Named person not known
11. Telstra message / Disconnected
12. Not a residential number
13. Too old / deaf / disabled/health/family reasons
14. Claims to have done survey
15. Away for duration
16. (SUPERVISOR USE ONLY) Refused prior (eg. phoned 1800 number to refuse participation after receiving letter)
17. Remove number from list
INTRODUCTION

*(ALL)
Intro

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is (...) and I am calling on behalf of Monash University from the Social Research Centre.

We’re conducting an important study on the attitudes of Australians to gain a better understanding of life in Australia.

1 Continue
2 HH LOTE - Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese, Turkish (language follow up) (GO TO LOTE)
3 HH LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up) (RECORD ON SMS)
4 HH LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment) (RECORD ON SMS)

S4 Before we begin, we are interested in speaking with people who live in specific suburbs, so can I please check the suburb in which you live? (EXPLAIN IF NECESSARY: It is important that we collect this information so we can analyse the results at a local level)

1. Record suburb
2. Refused to give suburb GO TO TERM5
3. Household refusal GO TO RR1

* IF BOTH AUSTRALIAN BORN AND OVERSEAS BORN QUOTAS ARE OPEN
S1 Most households will have received a letter from Monash University about the study. As the letter says to help with this important study we’d like to arrange a short interview with the person aged 18 or over who is going to have the next birthday.

May I speak to that person please?

1 Start survey (GO TO S2)
2 Stop interview, make appointment (RECORD NAME AND ARRANGE CALL BACK)
3 Household refusal (ATTEMPT CONVERSION / RECORD REASONS) (GO TO RR1)
4 HH LOTE - Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese, Turkish (language follow up) (GO TO LOTE)
5 HH LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up) (RECORD ON SMS)
6 HH LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment) (RECORD ON SMS)
7 Queried about how telephone number was obtained (DISPLAY ATELQ)
8 No one in household over 18 (TERM1)
9 Wants a copy of the letter (ALET)
10 Return to SMS

*IF AUSTRALIAN BORN QUOTA FULL / OVERSEAS BORN QUOTA OPEN ASK S1B-S1D
S1b Today we are particularly interested in speaking with people born overseas. Is there anyone in this household who was born overseas?

1. Yes
2. No (GO TO TERM2)
3. (Refused) (GO TO TERM2)
S1c  Most households will have received a letter from Monash University about the study. As the letter says, we need to speak to one person in each household and it is very important that we randomly select that person.

So firstly, how many people aged 18 years or over that usually live in your household were born overseas?

1. One  (GO TO S1d INTRO A)
2. Number given (specify) (RANGE 2 TO 20)  (GO TO S1d INTRO B)
3. None  (GO TO TERM2)
4. (Refused)  (GO TO TERM2)

S1d  INTRO A: May I speak with that person please?
INTRO B: Of the (insert number from S1c – code 2) people in your household who were born overseas, we’d like to arrange to interview the person aged 18 or over who is going to have the next birthday. May I speak with that person please?

1. Start survey (GO TO S2)
2. Stop interview, make appointment (RECORD NAME AND ARRANGE CALL BACK)
3. Household refusal (ATTEMPT CONVERSION / RECORD REASON) (GO TO RR1)
4. Queried about how telephone number was obtained (DISPLAY ATELQ)
5. Wants a copy of the letter (ALET)

*SIF AUSTRALIAN BORN QUOTA OPEN / OVERSEAS BORN QUOTA FULL ASK S1E-S1G*

S1e  For this study, we’ve been speaking to both Australian born and overseas born people. Since our quota of overseas born people is now full, could I please ask, is there anyone in this household aged 18 years or over who is AUSTRALIAN BORN?

1. Yes
2. No  (GO TO TERM3)
3. (Refused)  (GO TO TERM3)

S1f  Most households will have received a letter from Monash University about the study. As the letter says, we need to speak to one person in each household and it is very important that we randomly select that person.

So firstly, how many people aged 18 years or over that usually live in your household are Australian born?

1. One  (GO TO S1g INTRO A)
2. Number given (specify) (RANGE 2 TO 20)  (GO TO S1g INTRO B)
3. None  (GO TO TERM3)
4. (Refused)  (GO TO TERM3)

S1g  INTRO A: May I speak with that person please?
INTRO B: Of the (…) people in your household who were born in Australia, we’d like to arrange to interview the person aged 18 or over who is going to have the next birthday. May I speak with that person please?

1. Start survey (GO TO S2)
2. Stop interview, make appointment (RECORD NAME AND ARRANGE CALL BACK)
3. Household refusal (ATTEMPT CONVERSION / RECORD REASON) (GO TO RR1)
4. HH LOTE - Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese, Turkish (language follow up) (GO TO LOTE)
5. HH LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up) (RECORD ON SMS)
6. HH LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment) (RECORD ON SMS)
7. Queried about how telephone number was obtained (DISPLAY ATELQ)
8. Wants a copy of the letter (ALET)
For this study, we are speaking with people born in Australia, and people born overseas. To make sure I ask the right questions, could I just confirm whether you were born in Australia or overseas?

1. Born in Australian
2. Born overseas (GO TO SDUM)
3. Don’t Know / Refused (GO TO TERM6)

Were either of your parents born overseas?

1. Yes
2. No
3. (Don’t Know / Refused) (GO TO TERM7)

This interview should only take about 17 minutes and all information you give us will be strictly confidential. Participation in this study is voluntary and you can stop the interview at any time. If you have any concerns I can give you contact names and numbers.

Questions about who is conducting the study and how your telephone number was obtained - The Social Research Centre, ph: 1800 023 040
Concerns or complaints about how the study is being conducted – Monash University Ethics Project Number: (CF07/1240), ph: 03 9905 5490, Email: muhrec@monash.edu

Questions about the purpose of the research and why it is being conducted – Professor Andrew Markus, Tel: 03 9903 5009, Email: andrew.markus@monash.edu

Is it convenient to talk now or would you like to make an appointment?

1. Continue (GO TO S3)
2. Appointment (MAKE APPOINTMENT)
3. Respondent Refusal (GO TO RR1)
4. QR LOTE - Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese, Turkish (language follow up) (GO TO LOTE)
5. QR LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up) (RECORD ON SMS)
6. QR LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment) (RECORD ON SMS)
7. Queried about how telephone number was obtained (DISPLAY ATELQ)
8. Wants a copy of the introductory letter (ALET)

*(LOTES)
LOTE RECORD LANGUAGE

1. Cantonese
2. Mandarin
3. Vietnamese
4. Italian
5. Greek
6. Arabic
7. Lebanese
8. Turkish
*(ANSWERING MACHINE SCRIPT)*

ANSM1. Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is <SAY NAME> calling on behalf of Monash University from the Social Research Centre.  
We are telephoning households across Australia to conduct an important study about life in Australia.  
If you would like to participate in this study, please call our hotline number: 1800 023 040 and we will call you back at a time that is convenient to you. Thank you."  
*PROGRAMMER NOTE: SET AS APPOINTMENT FOR TIME OF CALL PLUS 5 DAYS PLUS 1 HOUR*

*(ANSWERING MACHINE SCRIPT)*

ANSM2. Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is <SAY NAME> calling on behalf of Monash University from the Social Research Centre.  
We left a message recently on your answering machine regarding an important study about life in Australia.  
If you would like to participate in this study, please call our hotline number: 1800 023 040 and we will call you back at a time that is convenient to you. Thank you."  
*PROGRAMMER NOTE: SET AS APPOINTMENT FOR TIME OF CALL PLUS 6 DAYS PLUS 1 HOUR*

*(QUERIED HOW TELEPHONE NUMBER WAS OBTAINED)*

ATELQ Your telephone number has been chosen at random from all possible telephone numbers in your area. We find that this is the best way to obtain a representative sample of all Australians for our study.

*(WANTS TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE LETTER)*

ALET RECORD ADDRESS DETAILS TO SEND COPY OF LETTER

(RECORD NAME AND VERIFY ADDRESS DETAILS FROM SAMPLE / COLLECT ADDRESS DETAILS)

*PROGRAMMER NOTE RE ALET: WILL NEED TO BE ABLE TO TRACK INTERVIEWS RESULTING FROM SENDING A COPY OF THE LETTER]*

*(ALL)*

S3 This call may be monitored for training and quality purposes. Is that OK?  

1 Monitor  
2 Do not monitor
To start with, what do you think is the most important problem facing Australia today?

(DO NOT READ OUT; MAXIMUM OF ONE RESPONSE ONLY)

1. Aboriginal / Indigenous issues (health, poverty, treatment, etc)
2. Asylum Seekers - poor treatment /refugees / boat people /illegal immigrants (sympathetic comment)
3. Asylum Seekers - too many /refugees / boat people /illegal immigrants (negative comment)
4. Immigration/population - too high, overcrowding /wrong people coming (negative)
5. Immigration/population - too low/ need more people (supportive)
6. Crime/ law and order
7. Defense/National security/Terrorism
8. Economic issues - Economy/Unemployment/ jobs/ Deficit/poverty
9. Education/ schools
10. Environment/ climate change/ water shortages (concern)
11. Environment - over-reaction to climate change/carbon tax (skeptical)
12. Government/ quality of/ politicians
13. Health/ medical/ hospitals
14. Housing shortages/ affordability/ interest rates
15. Industrial relations/Trade unions
16. Racism
17. Social Issues - drug use, family breakdown, internet overuse, childcare
18. Women’s issues (e.g.: equal pay/opportunity, violence, etc)
19. Other
20. Nothing
21. Don’t know
22. Refused
I'd like you to tell me your views on various economic and social issues. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

(PROBE: Is that agree or strongly agree / disagree or strongly disagree?)

(STATEMENTS)
  a. People living on low incomes in Australia receive enough financial support from the government
  b. In Australia today, the gap between those with high incomes and those with low incomes is too large.
  c. Australia is a land of economic opportunity where in the long run, hard work brings a better life.

(RESPONSE FRAME)
  1. Strongly agree
  2. Agree
  3. (Neither agree nor disagree)
  4. Disagree
  5. Strongly disagree
  6. (None of the above/ Don’t know)
  7. (Refused)

Now a question about your own financial circumstances. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your present financial situation?

(PROBE: Is that satisfied or very satisfied / dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?)

  1. Very satisfied
  2. Satisfied
  3. (Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied)
  4. Dissatisfied
  5. Very dissatisfied
  6. (Don’t know)
  7. (Refused)
**MODULE B: POLITICAL**

*(ALL)*

B4. Now some questions about different forms of political action people can take. Please tell me which, if any, of the following you have done over the last three years or so?

(READ OUT) (ACCEPT MULTIPLES)

1. Voted in an election
2. Signed a petition
3. Written or spoken to a Federal or State Member of Parliament
4. (deleted)
5. Joined a boycott of a product or company
6. Attended a protest, march or demonstration
7. (deleted)
8. (deleted)
9. (None of the above) ^s
10. (Don't know) ^s
11. (Refused) ^s

*(ALL)*

B6a. How often do you think the government in Canberra can be trusted to do the right thing for the Australian people? Would you say …

(READ OUT)

1. Almost always
2. Most of the time
3. Only some of the time, or
4. Almost never
5. (Don't know)
6. (Refused)
MODULE C: SOCIO-CULTURAL

*(ALL)*  
C7. To what extent do you take pride in the Australian way of life and culture? Would you say …

(READ OUT)

1. To a great extent
2. To a moderate extent
3. Only slightly, or
4. Not at all
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

*(ALL)*  
C8. And to what extent do you have a sense of belonging in Australia? Would you say …

(READ OUT)

1. To a great extent
2. To a moderate extent
3. Only slightly, or
4. Not at all
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

*(ALL)*  
C9. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? “In the modern world, maintaining the Australian way of life and culture is important”.

(PROBE: Is that agree or strongly agree / disagree or strongly disagree?)

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. (Neither agree nor disagree )
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)
*(ALL) C1. Now some questions about immigration. What do you think of the number of immigrants accepted into Australia at present? Would you say it is …

(READ OUT)
1. Too high
2. About right, or
3. Too low
4. (No opinion/ don't know)
5. (Refused)

*(ALL) F5 And to the best of your knowledge, in the last 12 months would you say the level of immigration into Australia has increased, decreased or is unchanged?

1. Increased
2. Decreased
3. Unchanged
4. (Don't know)
5. (Refused)

*(ALL) C2. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements…

(PROBE: Is that agree or strongly agree / disagree or strongly disagree?)

(STATEMENTS)
   a) Accepting immigrants from many different countries makes Australia stronger
   b) Ethnic minorities in Australia SHOULD be given Australian government assistance to maintain their customs and traditions

(RESPONSE FRAME)
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. (Neither agree or disagree)
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. (None of the above/ Don't know)
7. (Refused)
PROGRAMMER NOTE: SELECT RANDOMLY ONE COUNTRY FROM EACH OF a), b), c), d) and e) ALSO ROTATE SET A, B, C, D, E – THAT IS FIVE COUNTRIES PER Respondent. EACH COUNTRY SHOULD BE ASKED OF AN APPROXIMATELY EQUAL NUMBER OF RespondENTS (~667)

*(ALL)*

CN2introt: I’m now going to ask about your feelings towards immigrants from five different countries. To begin with …

CN2 Would you say your feelings are positive, negative or neutral towards immigrants from [COUNTRY]?

(PROBE: Is that very or somewhat positive/negative?)

(STATEMENTS)

SET A
1. ENGLAND
2. NEW ZEALAND
3. USA (AMERICA)

SET B
4. ITALY
5. GREECE
6. GERMANY

SET C
7. CHINA
8. VIETNAM
9. INDIA

SET D
10. LEBANON
11. EGYPT
12. IRAQ

SET E
13. CONGO
14. SUDAN
15. ETHIOPIA

(RESPONSE FRAME)
1. Very positive
2. Somewhat positive
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat negative
5. Very negative
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)
*(ALL)*

CN3intro

Next I would like to ask how you feel about different types of people coming to live in Australia as permanent or long-term residents.

CN3 [1st: Do you feel positive, negative or neutral about [STATEMENT] / [2nd-4th: And what about [STATEMENT] coming to live in Australia as permanent or long-term residents?

PROGRAMMER NOTE: DO NOT ROTATE STATEMENTS. USE 1ST SENTENCE FOR FIRST ITERATION AND 2-4TH SENTENCE FOR ALL OTHER ITERATIONS

(PROBE: Is that very or somewhat positive/negative?)

(STATMENTS)

a) Skilled workers (e.g Doctors or Nurses, plumbers etc)
b) Those who have close family living in Australia (i.e. parents or children)
c) Refugees who have been assessed overseas and found to be victims of persecution and in need of help
d) Young people who want to study in Australia

(RESPONSE FRAME)

1. Very positive
2. Somewhat positive
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat negative
5. Very negative
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)

CN4intro

Next I would like to ask how you feel about asylum seekers who try to reach Australia by boat.

*(ALL)*

CN4 What do you think is the main reason that asylum seekers try to reach Australia by boat?

(PROBE: What else? Anything else?)

(DO NOT READ OUT) (ACCEPT MULTIPLES)

1. Are in fear of their lives
2. Are facing persecution
3. Are living in poverty
4. Are queue jumpers
5. Are wealthy and can afford
6. For a better life
7. Desperation/Desperate
8. Other (please specify)
9. (Don’t know)
10. (Refused)
CN5 Which of the following four statements comes closest to your view about the best policy for dealing with asylum seekers who try to reach Australia by boat?

(READ OUT ALL FOUR OPTIONS, INCLUDING THE “1”, “2”, “3” AND “4”, BEFORE ACCEPTING A RESPONSE)

1. They should be allowed to apply for permanent residence
2. They should be allowed to apply for temporary residence only
3. They should be kept in detention until they can be sent back
4. Their boats should be turned back.

CN6 How is the government handling the asylum seeker issue? Overall do you think they are doing a good job, an average job or a poor job?

(PROBE: Is that very good or good/ poor or very poor)

1. Very good
2. Good
3. Average job
4. Poor
5. Very poor
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)
Next I would like to ask you about your attitude towards different religious groups.

[1st Is your personal attitude positive, negative or neutral towards] / [And what about] [STATEMENT]?

(PROBE: is that very or somewhat positive/negative?)

(STATMENTS)

a) Christians
b) Buddhists
c) Muslims

(RESPONSE FRAME)
1. Very positive
2. Somewhat positive
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat negative
5. Very negative
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)
MODULE D: DISCRIMINATION

Intro: Now thinking about any discrimination you may have personally experienced.

D5  Have you experienced discrimination because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion over the last 12 months?

1. Yes
2. No  (GO TO DN9)
3. (Refused)  (GO TO DN9)

* (HAS EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION)  (IF D5=1)

D5a. How did that discrimination affect you?

(DO NOT READ OUT) [PROGRAMMER: RECORD FIRST MENTIONED RESPONSE]

PROBE: What else?  Anything else?)

(DO NOT READ OUT)  (ACCEPT MULTIPLES)

PROGRAMMER NOTE: PLEASE SET THE CODE “OTHER (97)” UP IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO CHANGE IT TO “OTHER (SPECIFY) IF NEEDED.

IMPACT ON OUTLOOK
1. Made me feel unsafe in public places (eg felt unsafe on the street at night, unsafe alone).
2. Did not want to participate in sports (eg felt unsafe playing sports)
3. Made me feel bad (e.g. negatively affected my mental health)
4. Lost trust in Australia/ life in Australia (e.g. it made me feel like leaving Australia)

PHYSICAL/ CONCRETE IMPACT/ IMPACT ON BEHAVIOUR
1. Physically injured / attacked
2. Property was stolen / damaged
3. Unfairly treated by police
4. Unfairly treated by other authorities (e.g. legal system, public authorities)
5. Stopped going out at night
6. Impact on employment (e.g. did not get an interview for a job, did not get/lost a job)
7. Impact on accommodation (e.g. I did not get / lost accommodation)
97. Other (Specify)
98. Don’t know
99. Refused

*(ALL)

DN9  Do you think the level of racial prejudice in Australia now is more, less or about the same as it was 5 years ago?

(PROBE: Is that much more or more/ much less or less)

1. Much more now
2. More now
3. About the same
4. Less
5. Much less
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)
8. (Not in Australia for 5 years)
*NEW (MORE PREJUDICE) (IF DN9 = 1 OR 2)

DN9a. Why do you think that there is more racial prejudice

(DO NOT READ OUT) (RECORD FIRST RESPONSE ONLY)

1. Too much immigration (general)
2. Too many Muslims in Australia
3. Too many refugees ('boat people', asylum seekers)
4. 
5. Too much diversity in Australia society (general) (e.g. too many people from certain racial/religious/ethnic groups)
6. Action/behaviour of Aboriginal groups
7. Action/behaviour of certain immigrant groups
8. Action/behaviour of Muslims
10. Economic reasons (e.g. unemployment/not enough jobs, too much competition)
11. Government favours minorities/ racial/ religious/immigrant/ Aboriginal groups; (e.g. provide too much assistance)
12. Negative statements by public figures about immigration/ racial/religious groups
13. Negative statements by public figures about refugees, asylum seekers, ‘boat people’
14. Negative statements by public figures about Aborigines
15. Media negative coverage of Aboriginal groups
16. Media negative coverage of immigration/ racial/religious groups
17. Media negative coverage of refugees, asylum seekers, ‘boat people’
18. Government treats asylum seekers harshly and encourages prejudice
19. Other (Specify)
20. Don’t know
21. Refused
**MODULE E: REFLECTIVE**

*(ALL)*

Intro: Next I’d like to ask your opinion on some more general issues.

**E1.** Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?

(PROBE IF NECESSARY: Is that can be trusted / can’t be too careful?)

1. Can be trusted
2. Can’t be too careful
3. (Can’t choose/Don’t know)
4. (Refused)

*(ALL)*

**E2.** Taking ALL things into consideration, would you say that over the last year YOU have been …

(READ OUT)

1. Very happy
2. Happy
3. (Neither happy nor unhappy)
4. Unhappy, or
5. Very unhappy
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)

*(ALL)*

**E3.** In three or four years, do you think that your life in Australia will be …

(READ OUT)

1. Much improved
2. A little improved
3. The same as now
4. A little worse, or
5. Much worse
6. (Don’t think will be living in Australia) (GO TO F1)
7. (Cannot predict / Don’t know)
8. (Refused)
MODULE F: NEIGHBOURHOOD AND VOLUNTARY WORK

Intro: And now thinking about your local area that is within 15 to 20 minutes walking distance of where you live

*(ALL)*

PROGRAMMER NOTE: ONLY SHOW CODE 6 FOR STATEMENT B

F2 Do you agree or disagree with the following statements …

(PROBE: Is that agree or strongly agree / disagree or strongly disagree?)

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF NECESSARY REMIND RESPONDENT THAT “your local area is within 15 to 20 minutes walking distance of where you live”]

(READ OUT)

(STATMENTS)
a) People in my local area are willing to help their neighbours?
b) My local area is a place where people from different national or ethnic backgrounds get on well together
c) I am able to have a real say on issues that are important to me in my local area.

(RESPONSE FRAME)
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. (Neither agree nor disagree )
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. (There are not enough immigrants in my neighborhood to have any impact)
7. (Don’t know)
8. (Refused)

** NEW (ALL)**

F7. Would you say that living in your local area is becoming better or worse, or is it unchanged?

(PROBE: Is that better or much better / worse or much worse?)

1. Much better
2. Better
3. Unchanged
4. Worse
5. Much worse
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)
In general, what has been the impact of immigration on daily life in your local area? Would you say it has been…?

(READ OUT)

1. Very positive
2. Somewhat positive
3. Neither positive nor negative
4. Somewhat negative, or
5. Very negative
6. (There are not enough immigrants in my neighbourhood to have any impact)
7. (Don't know)
8. (Refused)

The next two questions are about unpaid voluntary work. By this I mean any unpaid help you give to the community in which you live, or to an organisation or group to which you belong.

It could be to a school, a sporting club, the elderly, a religious group or people who have recently arrived to settle in Australia.

Have you done any unpaid voluntary work of this kind in the last 12 months?

1. Yes
2. No
3. (Don't know)
4. (Refused)
*(UNDERTAKES VOLUNTEER WORK) (B1=1)

B2new

How often do you participate in this sort of voluntary activity? Is it…

(READ OUT)

1. At least once a week
2. At least once a month
3. Three to four times a year
4. At least once a year
5. Less often than once a year
6. (Don't know)
7. (Refused)

*(ALL)

F9b intro

And now turning to another issue, your sense of personal safety.

F9b How safe do you feel walking alone at night in your local area? Would you say you feel …

(READ OUT)

1. Very safe
2. Fairly safe
3. A bit unsafe: or
4. Very unsafe
5. (Neither safe nor unsafe)
6. (Never walk alone at night)
7. (Don't know)
8. (Refused)

*(ALL)

F10 Thinking about all types of crime in general, how worried are you about becoming a victim of crime in your local area? Would you say you are…

(READ OUT)

1. Very worried
2. Fairly worried
3. Not very worried
4. Not at all worried
5. (Don't know)
6. (Refused)
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

*(ALL)
DEM1a
We’re nearly finished now. Just a final few questions to make sure we’ve spoken to a good range of people.

Can I ask, how old were you last birthday?

1. Age given (RECORD AGE IN YEARS (RANGE 18 TO 99) (GO TO DEM2)
2. (Refused)

*(REFUSED AGE DEM1a=2)
DEM1b
Could you please tell me which of the following age groups are you in? (READ OUT)

1. 18 - 24 years
2. 25 - 34 years
3. 35 - 44 years
4. 45 – 54 years
5. 55 – 64 years
6. 65 – 74 years, or
7. 75 + years
8. (Refused)

*(ALL)
DEM2. RECORD GENDER

1. Male
2. Female

*(ALL)
DEM3. Which of the following best describes your current marital status? Are you…

(READ OUT)

1. Married
2. Living with a partner
3. Widowed
4. Divorced
5. Separated, or
6. Never married
7. (Don’t know)
8. (Refused)

PROGRAMMER NOTE: ONLY SHOW STATEMENT B IF DEM 3=CODE 1 OR 2 (MARRIED OR LIVING WITH PARTNER)

ONLY DISPLAY CODE 32 FOR STATEMENTS C AND D

ONLY DISPLAY CODE 33 FOR STATEMENTS B, C AND D
*(ALL)*

**DEM15** In which countries were you and your family members born?

(STATEMENTS)

a) Starting with yourself
b) Your spouse?
c) Your mother?
d) And finally, in which country was your father born?

(RESPONSE FRAME)

1. Australia
2. Canada
3. China (excluding Taiwan)
4. Croatia
5. Egypt
6. Fiji
7. Germany
8. Greece
9. Hong Kong
10. Hungary
11. India
12. Indonesia
13. Ireland
14. Italy
15. Lebanon
16. Macedonia
17. Malaysia
18. Malta
19. Netherlands (Holland)
20. New Zealand
21. Philippines
22. Poland
23. Serbia / Montenegro
24. Singapore
25. South Africa
26. Sri Lanka
27. Sudan
28. United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales, Nth Ireland)
29. USA
30. Vietnam
31. Other (please specify)
32. (Not applicable)
33. (Don’t know)
34. (Refused)

PREDEM16 IF DEM15a=CODE 1 OR 34 (BORN IN AUSTRALIA OR REFUSED) GO TO DEM7, OTHERS CONTINUE.

*(IF DEM15a=2-33 NOT BORN IN AUSTRALIA)*

**DEM16** In what year did you arrive in Australia?

INTERVIEWERS NOTE: PEOPLE WHO HAVE A LONG-STAY VISA (FOR EXAMPLE, 457 VISA OR STUDENT VISA). IF THEY DO NOT HOLD A LONG-STAY VISA, CODE AS “4”

1. Response given (SPECIFY _____) (ALLOWABLE RANGE 2011 LESS AGE OF RESPONDENT)
2. (Don’t know)
3. (Refused)
4. (Do not have permanent / long-stay visa)
*(ALL)*

DEM7. What is your first language?

1. English (GO TO DEM6)
2. Arabic
3. Lebanese
4. Australian Indigenous Languages
5. Cantonese
6. Mandarin
7. Croatian
8. Greek
9. Hindi
10. Italian
11. Macedonian
12. Spanish
13. Turkish
14. Vietnamese
15. Other (Specify)
16. (Don’t know)
17. (Refused)

*(IF DEM7=2–17 ENGLISH IS A SECOND LANGUAGE)*

DEM8. (Please bear with me as we ask this question of everyone), how well, would you say you SPEAK English?

1. Very well
2. Well
3. Not well, or
4. Not at all
5. (Can’t say)
6. (Refused)

*(IF DEM 16=1-3 OR DEM15A=1)*

DEM6. Are you an Australian citizen?

1. Yes
2. No
3. (Don’t know)
4. (Refused)
*(ALL)
DEM10  What is the highest level of education you have completed?

1. Primary school
2. Year 7 to Year 9
3. Year 10
4. Year 11
5. Year 12
6. Trade/apprenticeship
7. Other TAFE/Technical Certificate
8. Diploma
9. Bachelor Degree
10. Post-Graduate Degree
11. Other (Specify)
12. (Refused)

*(ALL)
DEM11  Which one of these BEST describes your employment situation? Are you …

(READ OUT)
1. Employed
2. Unemployed
3. Retired
4. Student
5. Home duties, or
6. Something else (Specify)
7. (Don’t know)
8. (Refused)

PREDEM13 IF DEM11=CODE 1 (EMPLOYED) CONTINUE. OTHERS GO TO PREDEM13b

*(EMPLOYED IF DEM11=1)
DEM13  What is your current occupation?

(PROBE: Main duties and job title)
1. Manager
2. Professional
3. Technician or trades worker
4. Community or personal service worker
5. Clerical or administrative worker
6. Sales worker
7. Machinery operator or driver
8. Labourer
9. Other (specify) (Probe for job title and main duties)
10. (Don’t know)
11. (Refused)
Which of the following terms best describes your financial circumstances today? Would you say you are

1. Prosperous
2. Living very comfortably
3. Living reasonably comfortably
4. Just getting along
5. Struggling to pay bills
6. Poor
7. (Don't Know)
8. (Refused)

What is your religion, even if you are not currently practicing?

1. Catholic
2. Anglican (Church of England)
3. Uniting Church
4. Presbyterian
5. Greek Orthodox
6. Baptist
7. Lutheran
8. Islam
9. Buddhist
10. Judaism
11. Hinduism
12. Christian (no further information)
13. No religion
14. Other (SPECIFY)
15. (Don't know)
16. (Refused)

Is that (or most closely) (READ OUT)

1. Catholic
2. Anglican (Church of England)
3. Uniting Church
4. Presbyterian
5. Greek Orthodox
6. Baptist
7. Lutheran, or
8. Something else (SPECIFY)
9. (Don't know)
10. (Refused)
PREDEM20 IF DEM17new – 1 to 12 or 14 CONTINUE OTHERWISE GO TO PREDEM22)

*(SPECIFIED A RELIGION) (DEM17new= 1 TO 12 or 14)
DEM20 How important is religion in your life today? Is it…

(READ OUT)
1. Very important
2. Somewhat important
3. Neither important not unimportant
4. Not very important
5. Not at all important
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)

*(SPECIFIED A RELIGION) (DEM17new= 1 TO 12 or 14)

DEM21 In the past 12 months, how often did you participate in religious activities or attend religious services or meetings – with other people – other than for events such as weddings and funerals? Was it ..

(READ OUT)
1. At least once a week?
2. At least once a month?
3. At least 3 times a year?
4. Once or twice a year?
5. Not at all?
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)

*PREDEM22 – IF DEM6=1 CONTINUE OTHERWISE GO TO PREDEM18)

*(CITIZEN) (DEM 6=1)
DEM22 And to finish up just one question about voting intentions. If there was a Federal election held today, for which party would you probably vote?

1. Labour Party
2. Liberal Party
3. National Party
4. Greens
5. Independents
6. Other (Specify ___)
7. (Don’t Know)
8. (Refused)
Thank you for your help. Just in case you missed it my name is (...) and this survey was conducted on behalf of Monash University researchers.

If you have any queries or concerns about the survey, I have a number I can give you if you like…..
Questions about who is conducting the study and how your telephone number was obtained - The Social Research Centre, ph: 1800 023 040
Concerns or complaints about how the study is being conducted – Monash University Ethics Project Number: (2007/0319), ph: 03 9905 5490, Email: muhrec@monash.edu
Questions about the purpose of the research and why it is being conducted – Professor Andrew Markus, Tel: 03 9903 5009, Email: andrew.markus@monash.edu

Record language
- English
- Cantonese
- Mandarin
- Vietnamese
- Italian
- Greek
- Arabic
- Lebanese
- Turkish

Was this interview …
- Normal
- Refusal conversion

OK, that’s fine, no problem, but could you just tell me the main reason you do not want to participate, because that’s important information for us?
- No comment / just hung up
- Too busy
- Not interested
- Too personal / intrusive
- Don’t like subject matter
- Letter put me off
- Don’t believe surveys are confidential / privacy concerns
- Silent number
- Don’t trust surveys / government
- Never do surveys
- 17 minutes is too long
- Get too many calls for surveys / telemarketing
- Too old / frail / deaf / unable to do survey
- Not a residential number (business, etc)
- Language difficulty
- Going away / moving house
- No one 18 plus in household
- Other (SPECIFY ________)
*(REFUSED)
RR2 RECORD RE-CONTACT TYPE

1 Definitely don’t call back
2 Possible conversion

Termination scripts

*(NO ONE IN HOUSEHOLD OVER 18)
TERM1 Thanks anyway, but for this survey we need to speak to people aged 18 or more. Thanks for being prepared to help.

*(NO ONE IN HOUSEHOLD BORN OVERSEAS)
TERM2 Thanks anyway, but for this survey we need to speak to people aged 18 or over who are born overseas. Thanks for being prepared to help.

*(NO ONE IN HOUSEHOLD BORN IN AUSTRALIA)
TERM3 Thanks anyway, but for this survey we have finished our quota of overseas born people, and now need to speak to people aged 18 or over who are Australian born.

*(LIVES OUTSIDE LOCATION OF INTEREST)
TERM4 Thanks anyway, but for this survey we need to speak to people living in specific suburbs. Thanks for being prepared to help.

*(REFUSED TO SAY LOCATION)
TERM5 To be able to accurately analyse the results, we need to able to identify what location we are interviewing in. Thanks anyway.

*(REFUSED TO SAY IF BORN OVERSEAS/AUSTRALIA)
TERM6 Thanks anyway, but to be able to accurately analyse the results, we need to able to identify if you have born overseas or in Australia

*(REFUSED TO SAY IF PARENTS BORN OVERSEAS/AUSTRALIA)
TERM7 Thanks anyway, but to be able to accurately analyse the results, we need to able to identify if either of your parents have born overseas
Appendix 4: Interviewer Briefing Notes
Social Cohesion 2012
BRIEFING NOTES

A Research Project for:

Agenda

- Project background
- Detailed questionnaire run-through
- Practice interviewing
- Interviewing
- End of shift review

Project background

- The Social Cohesion Survey forms part of the Scanlon Foundation Social Cohesion Research Program (SCRP) which began in 2007 with six projects funded by the Scanlon Foundation and directed by the Monash Institute for the Study of Global Movements (MISGM) and the Australian Multicultural Foundation (AMF).
- Current study is part of a multi stage research program
- This survey has been conducted by SRC since 2007 (2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011)
- Most of the questions are retained from previous waves. However, in 2012 there are two new questions which need to be monitored carefully. Also, some questions have been deleted in order to decrease the interview length.

About Scanlon Foundation

- The Scanlon Foundation was established in 2001
- Their mission is: “to support the creation of a larger Cohesive Australian society”
- Primarily interested in cultural diversity and social cohesion
- Provides substantial funding grants for further research into these two areas
- Driven by the principle that maintaining social cohesion is fundamental to the future prosperity of Australia
Survey overview

- In 2011 we only conducted a National survey. In 2012, we are conducting two surveys: National and Local survey. Both surveys have been set up separately, however the questionnaire is the same (some screener questions on the Local questionnaire)
- 20 pilot test interviews (conducted 12th – 14th June)
  - Primarily to check quota, sample management and interview length
  - Feedback on new questions
- Main surveys - Number of Interviews required:
  - National survey: 2000 interviews across Australia
  - Local survey: 2000 interviews from four local areas containing relatively high proportions of people born overseas, particularly those from an Asian or Middle Eastern background.

Survey overview (Contd.)

- 17 minute average interview length (slightly shorter than 2011 – 20 min)
- Qualifying respondent for the National survey is the person with next birthday who is 18+
- For the Local survey we are targeting:
  - 4 local areas
  - Overseas born
  - Australian born:
    - With both parents born in Australia; and
    - With any of both parents born overseas
- Fieldwork:
  - National Survey (Jun 18 to Jul 22)
  - Local Survey (Jun 20 – Jul 23)

Approach Letter

- Matched – letter will be sent
  - the RDD number has been matched to the EWP (Electronic White Pages)
- Unmatched – no letters will be sent
  - the RDD number could not be matched to the EWP which will include some non-working numbers and unlisted numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Targeted Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Targeted Sub-quota Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Study – 15 locations</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local survey – 4 local areas (60% Overseas born / 40% Australia born)</td>
<td>Hurst (MelPlan) (VIC), Dandenong (VIC), Bankstown (NSW), Fairfield (NSW)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey procedures

- Sample sourced using RDD (Random Digit Dial)
- 15 call protocol
- LOTE interviewing is essential (same countries as per last wave)
- Please leave up to 2 answering machine messages

Survey procedures (Contd.)

- Primary approach letter sent to respondents who are currently listed on the white pages – about 50% of respondents are being sent a letter
- Qualifying population is anyone aged 18 years and over in Australia who reside in a private dwelling
- Code to “out of scope”
  - Residents of institutional quarters (prisons, nursing homes, etc)
  - Residents of military bases
  - Persons incapable of undertaking the interview due to a physical health condition (including too old / frail)
  - Persons incapable of undertaking the interview due to a mental health condition (dementia, intellectual disability)
  - Persons under the effect of drugs or alcohol (interviewer judgement call)
  - Households where no adults 18 plus are available to take the survey

Survey procedures (Contd.)

- Respondent selected using the “next birthday” method
- May need to explain (to some respondents) that in order to achieve a representative sample we can only interview the randomly selected person in the household.
- No one other than the “next birthday person” in the household can be interviewed.

Call procedures

- Calls will only be initiated between 4:30 pm and 6:30 pm weekdays and 10:00 am and 4:00 pm on Saturdays and 11:00 am and 4:00 pm on Sundays
- Appointments can be made for any time the call centre is operational
- Up to 9 calls to each household to establish contact and determine that it is a live residential number. In order to make initial contact – the system will automatically spread these call attempts over different days and time of day
- Once contact has been made and the respondent has been selected, 9 further calls will be attempted to interview the selected respondent
Non-English speaking respondents

- Coding of call results for LOTEs
- LOTE follow-up (Arabic, Lebanese, Cantonese, Mandarin, Greek, Italian, Vietnamese, Turkish)
- LOTE other language – no follow up (specify language)
- LOTE (language unknown) - unsure of the language spoken - make an appointment. If still can’t identify language at call-back, code to “LOTE other language - no follow up”

Recording of reason for refusal

- Refusals recorded “internally” (not at SMS screen)
- Differentiate between “hard” and “soft” refusals
- Record “definitely don’t call back” or “possible conversion”
- National Survey:
  - Household refusal – Occurs when we are going through the next birthday selection process. Attempt conversion
  - Respondent refusal – Directly from the selected respondent. Attempt conversion

Recording of reason for refusal (Contd.)

- Local Survey:
  - Household refusal:
    - Refused to confirm suburb
    - Refused on next birthday selection
    - Refused to say if anyone born Australia / overseas
    - Refused to say number of Australia / overseas born people in household
    - Refused to pass on to Australia / overseas born selected person
  - Respondent Refusal:
    - Refused to confirm if Australia / overseas born
    - Refused to confirm if either parent born in overseas
    - Refused to complete survey

Response rate

- Response rates are crucial to the success of this project. It is therefore critical that call outcomes are meticulously and correctly recorded
- High response rates are largely dependent on:
  - Confident explanations of the importance of the survey
  - Simple refusal conversion techniques
  - Persistence in making contact with selected residents
Response rate (Contd.)

- Use item level refusal option - “if there are any questions you don’t want to answer…”
- Stress voluntary nature of survey
- Don’t dwell on item level refusals - move on to the next question – “That’s ok” and continue with next question
- Reiterate confidentiality provisions whenever necessary (even if not scripted)
- Explain that we are bound by the provisions of the Commonwealth Privacy Act

Privacy and confidentiality

- Our contract with the Scanlon Foundation explicitly prohibits us from passing on information to a third party
- Details kept strictly confidential and used for research purposes only
- Data analyzed at an aggregated (not individual) level
- Bound by the provisions of the Commonwealth Privacy Act and Australian Market and Social Research Society’s Code of Professional Behavior

Respondent queries

- All initial queries directed to the SRC helpdesk – 1800 023 040
- Monash University - Information on why the study is being conducted:
  - Professor Andrew Markus
  - Tel: 03 9903 5009
  - andrew.markus@monash.edu
- Complaints
  - Human Ethics Officer
  - Tel: 03 9905 5490
  - muhrec@monash.edu

Data quality (General)

- Read the question exactly as scripted in order to maintain continuity and comparability with previous waves
- Remember to probe all questions with unfolding agree / disagree scales
- Some questions capture the “order of mention” – important to record response in order
- Ensure you code to code frame before putting the response in Other - If you need to put the response in Other – ensure that you are giving the coder enough context to code the information
- Intro - Use Monash University as a selling point and “Community attitudes in Australia”
Data quality (Specific)

- Question AN1: has positive and negative dimensions for three responses: asylum seekers, immigration and environment
- Question AN1, and new questions D5a and D9a will need "on the go" coding – practice these questions well – See "Interviewer handout"
- Please give us as much feedback as you can for the new questions – we need to determine if they have worked well for their inclusion in future waves

Overview of questionnaire

- Screening and Introduction
- A: Economic
- B: Political
- C: Socio-Cultural
- D: Discrimination
- E: Reflective (Reflection of current life in Australia)
- F: Neighborhood and Voluntary Work
- Demographics
Appendix 5: Primary Approach Letter
Dear Householder

My name is Andrew Markus and I am a professor in the Faculty of Arts at Monash University. I am writing to ask for your help with an important Australian study being undertaken by researchers at Monash University. This project aims to obtain people’s views on Australian society and its future, with a focus on social cohesion and population issues.

Details of the project may be accessed at [http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/mapping-population/](http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/mapping-population/)

**Why were you chosen to participate?**
Monash University has contracted the Social Research Centre to conduct the telephone interviews required for this study. Your household has been selected on a random basis to take part, along with many others across Australia. Any information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence by The Social Research Centre. Monash University will not receive any information from the survey that could identify you or your household.

**Possible benefits**
This project will provide government and the Australian public with information on social cohesion and immigration issues in Australian society. In doing so the project will make an important contribution to public discussion and planning.

**What does the research involve?**
The study involves your response over the telephone to a set of questions.

**How much time will the research take?**
The questionnaire will take approximately 17 minutes of your time.

**Inconvenience/discomfort**
The survey will not intrude into your privacy: you may decide not to answer some of the questions.

**Payment**
There is no payment for participation.

**Can I withdraw from the research?**
Participation is entirely voluntary. If you do agree to participate, you may withdraw at any time.

**Confidentiality**
Your responses to the survey questions will be entirely anonymous.

**Storage of data**
Storage of the data will be undertaken under University regulations. The anonymous responses will be kept on secure computers on University premises for a minimum of five years.

**Use of data for other purposes**
Data resulting from the survey will be reported nationally and will be accessible to researchers.

**Results**
Once the project is completed the key findings will be accessible for a minimum of five years on the project website. The results of the 2011 survey are at [http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/mapping-population/](http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/mapping-population/)

**Further questions**
If you have any questions about your participation in the survey or would like to make a time for an interviewer to call you, please call The Social Research Centre on 1800 023 040 (a free call).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you would like to contact the researchers about any other aspect of this study, please contact the Chief Investigator:</th>
<th>If you have a complaint concerning the manner in which this research project (CF07/1240) is being conducted, please contact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor Andrew Markus, School of International, Historical and Philosophical Studies, Faculty of Arts, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tel: 03 9903 5009&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:andrew.markus@monash.edu">andrew.markus@monash.edu</a></td>
<td><strong>Human Ethics Officer, Monash Research Office, Building 3E, Room 111, Monash University, Clayton VIC 3800</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tel: 03 9905 5490&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:muhrec@monash.edu">muhrec@monash.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you in anticipation of your voluntary co-operation in this important survey. Your views are valuable and important in helping us understand Australian society and its future development.

Professor Andrew Markus
社会凝聚力研究项目

我叫Andrew Markus，是蒙纳士大学历史研究系的教授。给您写信，目的是请求您配合蒙纳士大学开展澳大利亚的一项重要研究项目。本次研究内容涉及澳大利亚的各类社会事务。

蒙纳士大学委托社会研究中心开展本次研究所需的电话采访工作。我们随机抽选了您的家庭和澳大利亚境内众多家庭一同参加。您所提供的全部资料都将得到社会研究中心最严格的保密。蒙纳士大学不会得到本次调查中任何可能泄露您或您家庭身份的信息。

本次问卷调查约需17分钟，是否参加完全自愿；若同意参加，您也可以随时退出。您的回答将完全匿名。

在此预先感谢您在这件事上调查中的配合。您的观点非常宝贵和重要。

Andrew Markus　

蒙纳士大学历史研究系

Sosyal Uyum Araştırma Projesi


Bu anket yaklaşık olarak 17 dakika zamanınızı alacaktır ve katılmamak tamamen isteğe bağlıdır. Eğer katılmamaya karar vermişseniz, bu kararınızı istediğini z zaman geri çekebilirsiniz. Verdiğiniz cevaplar tamamen isimsiz kalacaktır.

Bu önemli araştırma gönülü olarak katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederim. Görüşleriniz bizim için değerli ve önemlidir.

Dự án Nghiên cứu về Gắn bó Xã hội

Tên tôi là Andrew Markus. Tôi là giáo sư giảng dạy tại Khoa Sử học, Trường Đại học Monash. Tôi viết thư này mong được sự giúp đỡ của quý vị để một chương trình nghiên cứu quan trọng của Trường Đại học Monash, Công trình nghiên cứu này sẽ xem xét nhiều vấn đề xã hội ở Úc.

Trường Đại học Monash đã ký hợp đồng giao cho Viện Nghiên cứu Xã hội tiến hành các cuộc phỏng vấn qua điện thoại cần thiết cho Dự án này. Tình cờ gia đình của quý vị đã được chọn tham gia Dự án, cũng như nhiều gia đình khác trên khắp nước Úc. Mọi thông tin thu thập sẽ được Viện Nghiên cứu Xã hội bảo mật tuyệt đối. Trường Đại học Monash sẽ không nhận được bất kỳ thông tin nào từ cuộc khảo sát này, mà qua đó có thể xác định được danh tính hay gia đình của quý vị.


Chúng tôi xin cảm ơn nếu quý vị vui lòng tự nguyện hợp tác với chúng tôi trong cuộc khảo sát quan trọng này. Y kiến của quý vị sẽ rất giá trị và quan trọng cho dự án của chúng tôi.