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1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

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

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 a summary of the questionnaire design and testing process;
- Section 4 summarises interviewer training and quality control procedures;
- Section 5 reviews the call results, response rate and the efficacy of the call procedures; and
- Section 6 provides a brief summary of data preparation procedures.

More detailed reference information is appended.

1.2 Project background


The aims of this survey are:

- To look at the Australian community's attitudes towards various aspects of social cohesion, and
- To assess changes in these attitudes over time.

1.3 Survey overview

As with the previous surveys, the in-scope population for the Social Cohesion Survey 2015 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 2015 Social Cohesion Survey involved a National Survey of 1,501 adults (aged 18 years and over), stratified by State/Territory and capital city / non-capital city.

A dual-frame sample methodology was used in 2015 involving two separate sample frames; one drawn from randomly generated (RDD) landline telephone numbers and a second drawn from
randomly generated mobile phone numbers. Used for the first time in 2013, this approach meant the Social Cohesion Survey was able to include the views of the estimated 29%\(^1\) of adults who live in households without a landline telephone connection on which to make and receive calls (the so-called mobile phone-only population). The sample blend used for the main survey of 1,501 interviews was 60.0% landline numbers and 40.0% mobile phone numbers. Overall, 224 (14.9%) interviews were obtained with members of the mobile phone-only population – enough to draw statistically meaningful inferences about this group.

As in previous years:

- Approach letters introducing the survey were mailed to all households where randomly generated landline (fixed line) telephone numbers could be matched to a confirmed address.
- For the landline sample, where more than one eligible respondent lived in a household, the “next birthday” method of respondent selection was employed.
  
  This issue was not relevant for the mobile phone sample where interviews were conducted with the in-scope phone answerer.

- Various strategies were adopted 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).

\(^1\) ACMA, December 2014.
Table 1 provides a summary of key statistics for the National Social Cohesion Surveys.

- The response rate for the 2015 survey was 54%, maintaining the high levels of response that are typical of this survey.
- Minimal changes were made to the 2014 survey questionnaire (see Section 3 and Appendix 2 for details) which saw the administration time (16.2 minutes on average) remain consistent to that of the 2014 survey. There was minimal difference between the average length of interviews conducted with respondents using a landline telephone (16.4 minutes) and those conducted with respondents using a mobile phone (16.0 minutes).

### Table 1: Survey overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews completed</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>21st June</td>
<td>22nd June</td>
<td>1st June</td>
<td>15th Jun</td>
<td>12th Jun</td>
<td>3rd Jul</td>
<td>10th Jun</td>
<td>16th Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish date</td>
<td>1st Aug</td>
<td>31st July</td>
<td>28th June</td>
<td>18th Jul</td>
<td>21st Jul</td>
<td>4th Aug</td>
<td>16th Jul</td>
<td>14th Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average interview length (mins)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average interview length (landline)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average interview length (mobile)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Sample Design & Survey Procedures

2.1 Sample design

To accommodate the dual-frame sampling approach, the 2015 survey used a combination of geographically stratified random sampling (as in previous years) and, given the lack of geographic information available for the mobile sample, an additional mobile phone stratum which was not geographically stratified.

Final allocations to geographic strata were based on the postcode/location information provided by respondents. The final distribution of interviews across the 15 geographic strata is provided in Table 2 below.

In accordance with the sample design, the final distribution of interviews from the landline sample was proportional to the Capital City/Rest of State population in each state. This could not be controlled for the mobile sample frame; nevertheless the final distribution of the 600 interviews obtained from this frame did approximate quite well to projections based on the 2013 distribution.

The sample was designed so that interviews were distributed between states disproportionately to the actual population; this was done so that sufficiently large samples were available to support analysis at the state level for all states/territories except Tasmania, Northern Territory and the ACT. Part of the task of the data weighting procedures discussed in Section 6.2 was to adjust for this disproportionate sample design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic strata</th>
<th>Sample Frame</th>
<th>Total Interviews (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landline (n)</td>
<td>Mobile (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of NSW</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Vic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Qld</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of SA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of WA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Tasmania</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of NT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The blend of interviews from the landline and mobile phone sample frames (n=901 and n=600 respectively) was implemented with the aim of obtaining at least 200 interviews with people from “mobile phone only” households (in fact, 224 interviews with such respondents were obtained in the final sample).

2.2 Sample generation

The commercial sample provider, SamplePages, provided both the landline and mobile phone samples for this survey.

- The Random Digit Dialling (RDD) landline sample was generated via the same approach that has been used since 2010. As in previous surveys, each phone number generated was assigned a “best estimate” postcode, based on exchange district and service zone units, which was then used for a priori allocation of numbers to geographic strata.

- The sample for the mobile phone component of the survey was randomly generated from within number ranges provided by the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) that were known to contain active mobile phone numbers. No geographic or address information was provided with these numbers so primary approach letters could not be sent to any members of the mobile phone sample frame.

2.3 Primary Approach Letter

The phone number records making up the landline sample frame for the 2015 survey were matched against the current address information provided by Sensis’ Macromatch service. A primary approach letter was sent to each record for which an address could be established; of the 5,420 landline telephone records used in the 2015 National Survey, an up-to-date address listing was obtained for 37.5% (n=2,032) with a primary approach letter sent to each one.

The approach letter, on Monash University letterhead and addressed to “The Householder”, was the same version as used in previous surveys (see Appendix 5 for a copy of the 2015 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 are the most commonly spoken languages nationally.

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 requests for an approach letter were made during fieldwork for the 2015 survey.

When return-to-sender approach letters were received no action was taken to remove the telephone number associated with that address from the sample. The reason all telephone numbers associated with return-to-sender approach letters were still called is that the phone number 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 2015 National Survey was the non-institutionalised population of Australia aged 18 years or over. As such it excluded:

- Residents of institutional premises (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 LOTE communities targeted for this survey (see Section 2.6), and
- Households with no person aged 18 years or over in residence.

For the landline sample, the “next birthday” method was used to select the person 18 years or older in the household to be interviewed where more than one eligible person was resident. No substitution of individuals within households was allowed. For the mobile phone sample, the person eligible to be interviewed was the in-scope phone answerer.

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 or person, 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 suggested that the representation of groups such as males 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

Non-English language interviewing was conducted in six of the most commonly spoken community languages nationally: Vietnamese, Chinese (Cantonese and Mandarin), Italian, Greek and Lebanese.

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.

Where the preferred language could not be immediately identified, a call-back was made given the possibility 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 version of the questionnaire and recorded answers directly into the English language CATI script as normal. A total of 19 interviews were conducted in this way (4 Vietnamese, 2 Cantonese, 3 Mandarin, 5 Italian and 5 Greek).

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.

An appointment to call back was scheduled for 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 that 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).
3. **Questionnaire Design**

### 3.1 Questionnaire overview

The questionnaire for the Social Cohesion 2015 survey largely reflected the content of that used in 2014. A small number of deletions and additions were made as described in Appendix 2.

The additions included questions which looked at trust in institutions and organisations, attitudes towards visa requirements for migrants, attitudes towards multiculturalism, forms of discrimination experienced and self-reported religious beliefs; while questions about interest in politics, attitudes towards political systems and democracy and level of contact with police and the law courts were removed.

Overall, due to a fairly even number of additions and deletions, no change in the length of time taken to administer the survey was noted. The survey averaged 16.2 minutes in both 2014 and 2015.

### 3.2 Questionnaire pilot testing

The 2015 survey did not have a formal pilot but instead had a “soft launch” where a small interviewing team completed 40 interviews on the first night of the fieldwork period. This enabled an assessment to be made of the questionnaire changes in terms of their impact on flow and delivery.

During this phase, standard operational testing procedures were also used to ensure the CATI script accurately reflected the agreed “hard copy” questionnaire.

As there were no significant changes made to the questionnaire during this phase, the survey continued with the full interviewing team and the data collected during the “soft launch” was included in the final data set. The final 2015 questionnaire is provided at Appendix 3.
4. Data Collection & Quality Control

4.1 Ethical considerations

The questionnaire and survey methodology were both 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 AMSRO Privacy Principles and the AMSRS Code of Professional Behaviour.

A further very important ethical consideration with respect to conducting interviews via a mobile phone is to ensure that it is safe for the sample member to take the call. With that end in mind all members of the mobile phone sample were asked at the outset “May I just check whether or not it is safe for you to take this call at the moment? If not, I am happy to call you back when it is more convenient for you”.

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. Twenty-nine interviewers were briefed to work on the 2015 survey.

The interviewer briefing notes are provided at Appendix 4.

Additional briefing procedures specific to LOTE interviewing 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 departmental supervisors.
5. Call Results & Analysis of Response

5.1 Call results

A total of 9,187 sample records (5,420 landline numbers and 3,767 mobile numbers) were initiated to achieve the final 1,501 surveys completed for the 2015 Social Cohesion Survey. A total of 33,888 calls were placed to these sample records equating to an average of 3.7 calls per record and one completed interview for every 22.6 calls.

Table 3 shows the final call results for the survey. As can be seen, for the dual-frame sample (that is, the combined call results from the landline and mobile phone sample frames) an interview was achieved from 16.3% of the 9,187 numbers to which calls were initiated for this survey.

Of the 9,187 numbers initiated, 18.2% were unusable; 47.0% were unresolved at the end of the call cycle (non-contacts or unresolved appointments); and 4.5% were identified as being out of scope. Refusals (all types) were encountered at 14.0% of the numbers to which calls were initiated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Final call results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total numbers initiated</th>
<th>Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,187</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>5,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusable numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telstra message, number disconnected</td>
<td>767 8.3%</td>
<td>419 7.7%</td>
<td>348 9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax/Modem</td>
<td>275 3.0%</td>
<td>272 5.0%</td>
<td>3 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming call restrictions</td>
<td>21 0.2%</td>
<td>3 0.1%</td>
<td>18 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a residential number</td>
<td>611 6.7%</td>
<td>534 9.9%</td>
<td>77 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal unusable number</td>
<td>1,674 18.2%</td>
<td>1,228 22.7%</td>
<td>446 11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No contact / unresolved in survey period</th>
<th>Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>94 1.0%</td>
<td>20 0.4%</td>
<td>74 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering machine</td>
<td>1,779 19.4%</td>
<td>712 13.1%</td>
<td>1,067 28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1,196 13.0%</td>
<td>424 7.8%</td>
<td>772 20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>340 3.7%</td>
<td>219 4.0%</td>
<td>121 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum non-contact attempts made</td>
<td>909 9.9%</td>
<td>909 16.8%</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal no contact / unresolved</td>
<td>4,318 47.0%</td>
<td>2,284 42.1%</td>
<td>2,034 54.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out of scope</th>
<th>Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claims to have done survey</td>
<td>1 0.0%</td>
<td>1 0.0%</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected respondent away for duration</td>
<td>64 0.7%</td>
<td>46 0.8%</td>
<td>18 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE – No language follow up</td>
<td>82 0.9%</td>
<td>53 1.0%</td>
<td>29 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too old / ill health / unable to do survey</td>
<td>157 1.7%</td>
<td>139 2.6%</td>
<td>18 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope (no-one 18 plus in hhold/on mobile)</td>
<td>107 18.2%</td>
<td>1 7.7%</td>
<td>106 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal out of scope</td>
<td>411 4.5%</td>
<td>240 4.4%</td>
<td>171 4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacts</th>
<th>Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>1,501 16.3%</td>
<td>901 16.6%</td>
<td>600 15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway termination</td>
<td>46 0.5%</td>
<td>24 0.4%</td>
<td>22 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household refusal</td>
<td>673 7.3%</td>
<td>673 12.4%</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent refusal</td>
<td>493 5.4%</td>
<td>52 1.0%</td>
<td>441 11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove number from list</td>
<td>33 0.4%</td>
<td>11 0.2%</td>
<td>22 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named respondent not known</td>
<td>8 0.1%</td>
<td>7 0.1%</td>
<td>1 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused screening question</td>
<td>30 0.3%</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>30 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal in-scope contacts</td>
<td>2,784 30.3%</td>
<td>1,668 30.8%</td>
<td>1,116 29.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As was the case in the 2014 survey, call outcomes for the landline sample frame showed several differences from those obtained from the mobile phone sample frame. In particular, the landline frame had:

- A higher proportion of unusable numbers (22.7% versus 11.8% for the mobile frame), particularly non-residential phone numbers (9.9% versus 2.0% for mobiles);
- A considerably lower proportion of ‘answering machines’ (13.1% versus 28.3% of mobiles) and ‘no answer’ (7.8% versus 20.5% of mobiles), and consequently a lower proportion of ‘non-contact/unresolved’ call outcomes (42.1% versus 54.0%); and

Finally, as shown in Table 4, as a proportion of all in-scope contacts, the total refusal rates were more or less the same across the landline (46.0%) and mobile phone (46.2%) sample frames.

**Table 4: Final call results for in-scope contacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacts</th>
<th>Total in-scope contacts</th>
<th>Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Refusals</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household refusal</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent refusal</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway termination</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove number from list</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named respondent not known</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused screening question</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Response rate

For the purposes of this report, and to facilitate comparisons with previous Social Cohesion surveys, the response rate has been defined as follows:

\[
\text{Response Rate} = \frac{\text{number of interviews}}{\text{number of interviews} + \text{refusals}}.
\]

On this basis the final overall response rate for the 2015 National survey was 53.9%, this was slightly higher than the 2014 survey.

The response rate for the mobile phone sample frame (53.8%) was almost identical to that for the landline sample frame (54.0%).

Geographically, the highest response rates were achieved from the landline sample\(^2\) in Western Australia (63.0%), Northern Territory (60.2%) and Tasmania (56.8%), while the lowest were in NSW (48.2%) and Queensland (51.2%). The metropolitan region had a slightly higher landline sample response rate than did the non-metropolitan region (54.2% versus 53.7%) and there was also a higher response rate from that portion of the landline sample which received a primary approach letter (56.6% versus 49.6%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Response rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landline Sample Frame Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Due to the lack of geographic information attached to mobile phone sample records this analysis is only for the landline sample frame.
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 2015 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 is evident from the results presented in Table 6 which shows that 8.6% of interviews were achieved on the seventh or later interview attempt; however, the need for this was less evident within the mobile sample frame where 0.6% of interviews had not been obtained by the sixth call attempt.

Nevertheless, amongst members of the landline sample, it is evident that the extended call regime improved the representation of people aged 35-54 years (13.4% of interviews with people in this age group were obtained on the seventh or later call attempt) and 55-64 years (9.9%); and of those people in paid employment (9.6%). This pattern of response is broadly similar to that seen in previous waves of the national survey, although in comparison to last year it is evident that the extended call cycle was less valuable for the 2015 survey.

Table 6: Proportion of interviews obtained on seventh or later call attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of interviews obtained on 7th or later attempt</th>
<th>Dual-frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or more</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently employed</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Achieved sample profile

Table 7 compares the achieved sample profile (using unweighted data) with that of the adult Australian population (using Australian Bureau of Statistics June 2013 Estimated Residential Population counts for total population estimates of age and gender groupings and 2011 Census data to provide population proportions for educational attainment and country of birth).

It can be seen that the final sample exhibits a skew towards older people, females and tertiary educated respondents. Overall however, the results are consistent with those obtained in other similar surveys conducted by the Social Research Centre and all of these factors were taken into account in the weighting procedure (see Section 6.2).

Table 7: Sample profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Achieved sample profile (Unweighted)</th>
<th>Australian population 18 years plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>17,897,722 (^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34 years</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or more</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Bachelor or Post graduate degree)</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not completed a university degree</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian / Overseas born</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Australia</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born overseas</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landline and Mobile Sample Frames

Table 8 presents the achieved sample profile of the total sample (ie: the dual-frame sample) and also shows demographic information for the landline and mobile phone sample frames; major differences between these two groups are denoted by the presence of an arrow (↑ or ↓) in the “mobile frame” column. The table also presents demographic information for the “mobile phone only” respondents (n=224).

\(^2\) Excludes off-shore islands/territories as these were outside the geographic scope of the survey.
It is evident from Table 8 that, compared to members of the landline sample frame, respondents from the mobile phone sample frame had:

- A higher proportion of younger people (29.2% were aged under 35 years compared with 7.3% of the landline sample); males (53.2% versus 41.3%); employed persons (65.2% versus 48.6%) and students (6.3% versus 1.8%); and people who did not hold Australian citizenship (10.2% versus 5.1%).

- By contrast, the mobile frame sample exhibited a lower proportion of people aged 65 years or more; females; retirees; and Australian citizens.

Most of these differences are also present amongst the mobile phone only sample. That is, within this group there is a higher proportion of younger people, male, employed persons, unemployed persons, students and people who do not hold Australian citizenship.

As in previous waves, it is evident from these figures that the use of a mobile phone sample frame has improved the representativeness of the final sample in a number of areas.

Table 8: Comparative sample profile – landline and mobile sample frames (unweighted data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Only Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34 years</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>29.2↑</td>
<td>43.3↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.2↑</td>
<td>18.3↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or more</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>16.0↓</td>
<td>8.0↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>53.2↑</td>
<td>52.7↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>46.8↓</td>
<td>47.3↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Bachelor or Post graduate degree)</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not completed a university degree</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian / Overseas born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian born</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas born</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>65.2↑</td>
<td>66.1↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.6↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>18.3↓</td>
<td>10.3↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.3↑</td>
<td>8.0↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home duties</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian citizen</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>89.8↓</td>
<td>85.7↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an Australian citizen</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.2↑</td>
<td>14.3↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result is significantly above (↑) or below (↓) the result for the landline sample frame, p<0.05.
5.5 Reasons 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 from Table 9, of those cases for which a reason for refusal was recorded, the most common reasons given were; “not interested” (52.2%), “no comment / just hung up” (23.5%) and “too busy” (11.6%).

Results were similar for mobile and landline samples except that those from the mobile frame (not unexpectedly) were slightly more likely to say they were ‘too busy’ (14.7% versus 9.8% of those from the landline sample frame).

Table 9: Reasons for refusal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment / just hung up</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never do surveys</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent number</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get too many calls for surveys / telemarketing</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t believe surveys are confidential / privacy concerns</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like subject matter</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t trust surveys</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too personal / intrusive</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter put me off</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes is too long</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other reasons given</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</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.

Back coding to DEM7, DEM10, DEM11, DEM15, DEM17n, DEM18, DEM22 and RR1 was conducted by the Social Research Centre. No extension of code-frames was required for these questions.

6.2 **Weighting**

The use of dual-frame sampling required a two stage procedure for weighting the survey data. This involved calculating:

- A **design weight** to adjust for the varying chances of selection of sample members; and
- A **post-stratification weight** used to align the data with known population parameters.

**Design Weight**

The approach adopted for calculating the design weight is based on work of Jonathan Best\(^4\). In addition to typical adjustments relating to the number of in-scope persons in each household and the number of fixed-line telephone connections per household, this approach also determines a pre-weight to adjust for the overlapping chances of selection for persons who have both a mobile phone and a fixed-line telephone connection.

For members of the landline sample frame, the design weight adjusts each respondent's probability of selection according to the number of landlines and the number of resident in-scope persons for each household. For the mobile phone sample, each respondent's probability of selection was calculated based on the number of 'mobile phone' interviews in the final sample and the number of mobile phone owners in Australia.

These two design weights (that is, the separate design weights for members of the landline and mobile phone samples) were combined to create a pre-weight which was applied to each survey respondent.

**Post-stratification weighting**

As in previous surveys, a “rim weighting” procedure was used to benchmark the combined landline and mobile data against the Australian population. This second weighting stage was necessary to adjust 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 geographic distribution between states).

---

\(^4\) Jonathon Best, First-Stage Weights for Overlapping Dual Frame Telephone Surveys. Presented at AAPOR’s 65th Annual Conference, Chicago, IL May 15, 2010
Population targets were taken from Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) December 2014 Estimated Residential Population (ERP) counts and from the 2011 Census\(^5\) with the following simultaneous constraints applied during the rim weighting procedure:

- Geographic location;
- Gender;
- Age by education; and
- Country of birth.

The dual-frame approach required a further constraint being applied to the rim weighting process; each respondent's telephone status defined as “dual user” (i.e. both landline and mobile phone), landline only or mobile phone only.

The algorithm provided in the Social Research Centre’s Quantum analysis software was used to carry out the rim weighting and develop the final sample weights. 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 target population matrices used for weighting purposes in the 2015 survey.

### 6.3 Data file provision

The Social Research Centre provided two clean SPSS data files – one containing the 2015 data and a time-series file containing selected data from the seven surveys conducted since 2007. The data files included several derived variables including:

- ASGS – postcode data in concordance with the Australian Statistical Geography Standard published by the ABS;
- SEIFA – postcode data in concordance with the index of relative socio-economic disadvantage, created from ABS census data; and
- An exploratory diversity score which is the proportion of people resident in each postcode who were born either in Australia or overseas in an English speaking country; lower scores on this measure are indicative of greater cultural diversity. The formula used to calculate the diversity score for each postcode was \(1 - (\text{number of residents born overseas in a non-English speaking country} / \text{total number of residents})\)^6.

---

5 2011 Census counts provide the most recent educational attainment and country of birth information.

6 For consistency with earlier development work on this index, the diversity scores included in the data file are based on 2011 Census counts.
Appendix 1: Weighting Matrices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total aged 18 years and over</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>32.07215492%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>25.08802666%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>19.81349279%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>7.29548497%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>10.88582235%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>2.19941280%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>0.99457093%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>1.65103459%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.29811263%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.70188737%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>age by education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree, 18-34 years</td>
<td>7.23230659%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree, 18-34 years</td>
<td>24.20366340%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree, 35-44 years</td>
<td>4.70302270%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree, 35-44 years</td>
<td>13.02888073%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree, 45-54 years</td>
<td>3.52641222%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree, 45-54 years</td>
<td>13.52122126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree, 55 years or more</td>
<td>4.27665873%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree, 55 years or more</td>
<td>29.50783437%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/Overseas ESB*</td>
<td>75.11064670%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas NESB</td>
<td>24.88935330%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landline only</td>
<td>7.80000000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-user</td>
<td>63.20000000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone only</td>
<td>29.00000000%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* UK, Ireland, USA, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa
Appendix 2: 2015 Questionnaire revisions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Questions</th>
<th>2015 Questions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B8. How interested are you in politics? Would you say</strong>…</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Neither interested / disinterested)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not at all interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B9. I am now going to specify three types of political systems. For each one, would you say it is a very</strong> good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. A democracy, in which the members of parliament are chosen in an election</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Having a strong leader who does not have to bother with parliament and elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Having experts, not government, make decisions according to what they think is best for the country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B11. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: ‘Democracy may have its problems, but it is still the best form of government.’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1 I would now like to read you a list of Australian institutions and organisations. Please indicate, for each one, how much or how little trust you have in them in Australia.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Trade unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The law courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Charitable organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Political parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Federal parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Doctors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Questions</td>
<td>2015 Questions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements… b) Accepting the entry of skilled workers on short-term visas is good for Australia</td>
<td>New statement added to question in 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. When a family or individual applies to migrate to Australia, do you agree or disagree that it should be possible for them to be rejected on the basis of…</td>
<td>Added to 2015 survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(STATEMENTS) a) Their race or ethnicity? b) Their religion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? a) Multiculturalism has been good for Australia b) We should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of different ethnic and cultural groups in this country</td>
<td>Added to 2015 survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7. Where have you experienced discrimination in the last year? Was it 1 In your local area/your neighbourhood? 2 On public transport? 3 In a shopping centre? 4 At a sporting event? 5 At your place of work?</td>
<td>Update to codeframe in 2015 survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7a. Have you experienced discrimination in another place we have not mentioned? 1. Yes (SPECIFY) 2. No 3. (Don’t know) 4. (Refused)</td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7b. And is there anywhere else? 1. Yes (SPECIFY) 2. No 3. (Don’t know) 4. (Refused)</td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Questions</td>
<td>2015 Questions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7c. What form did the discrimination take? Please tell me if any of these apply?</td>
<td>1. I was made to feel like I did not belong 2. I was verbally abused 3. I was not offered a job 4. I was not promoted or treated fairly at work 5. My property was damaged 6. I was physically attacked 7. (None of these apply)^ 8. (Don’t know)^ 9. (Refused)^</td>
<td>Added to 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Do you agree or disagree with the following statements …</td>
<td>c) The mix of different national or ethnic backgrounds improves life in my local area d) People who come to Australia should change their behavior to be more like Australians</td>
<td>New statement added to question in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11. Have you had any contact with the police in your local area in the last 12 months?</td>
<td>1. Yes 2. No 3. (Don’t know) 4. (Refused)</td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12. On the basis of your experience, do you agree or disagree that police…</td>
<td>a) Treat people fairly and equally b) Perform their job professionally c) Are honest</td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14. Is it your impression that the police</td>
<td>a) Treat people fairly and equally b) Perform their job professionally c) Are honest</td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Questions</td>
<td>2015 Questions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15. How comfortable would you feel speaking with police?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Neither comfortable/not comfortable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not at all comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16. Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statements about the law courts in Australia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) I trust the law courts in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Australian law courts treat people with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM24 Do you consider yourself to be</td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to 2015 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not so religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not religious at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Final 2015 Questionnaire
Monash University
Social Cohesion Research Program

2015 NATIONAL SURVEY FINAL

Questionnaire Structure

Modules

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

Call outcome codes (SMS screen) (no change from 2010)

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
18. Remove number from list

SAMPTYP = 1 (LANDLINE SAMPLE), 2 (MOBILE SAMPLE)
**INTRODUCTION**

*MOBILE SAMPLE*

IntroMob 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 aged 18 and over to gain a better understanding of life in Australia. Would you be willing to do the survey at this time?

INTERVIEWER NOTE: PLEASE ENSURE RESPONDENT IS 18 YEARS AND OVER

1. Continue (GO TO MOB_APPT_A)
2. Appointment (GO TO MOB_APPT_A)
3. Refusal (GO TO RR1)
4. Queried about how number was obtained (GO TO PTEL_MOB)
5. Queried about why mobile was called (GO TO PINFO_MOB)
6. HH LOTE - Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese, Turkish (language follow up) (GO TO PREMOBLOTE)
7. HH LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up) (COLLECT LANGUAGE & GO TO TERM3)
8. HH LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment) (MAKE APPOINTMENT)
9. Respondent under 18 (GO TO TERM1)
10. Go to SMS

*(MOBILE LOTES)*

MOBLOTE RECORD LANGUAGE

1. Cantonese
2. Mandarin
3. Vietnamese
4. Italian
5. Greek
6. Arabic
7. Lebanese
8. Turkish

PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF LOTE MAKE APPOINTMENT

*MOBILE SAMPLE*

MOB_APPT_A Just so I know your time zone, can you tell me which state you’re in?

1. NSW
2. VIC
3. QLD
4. SA
5. WA
6. TAS
7. NT
8. ACT
9. (Refused) (GO TO TERM2)
*MOBILE SAMPLE
M2 May I just check whether or not it is safe for you to take this call at the moment. If not, I am happy to call you back when it is more convenient for you.

1. Safe to take call (GO TO PREMOB_APPT)
2. Not safe to take call (GO TO PREMOB_APPT)
3. Selected respondent refusal (GO TO RR1)

PROGRAMMER NOTE: USE STATE PROVIDED TO TIMEZONE RECORDS

PREMOB_APPT IF M2=1 (SAFE TO TAKE CALL) GO TO MOBS2. OTHERS CONTINUE.

*MOBILE SAMPLE
MOB_APPT Do you want me to call you back on this number or would you prefer I call back on another phone?

1. This number (TYPE STOP, MAKE APPOINTMENT)
2. Home phone (TYPE STOP, MAKE APPOINTMENT, RECORD HOME PHONE NUMBER)
3. Respondent Refusal (GO TO RR1)

*MOBILE SAMPLE
MOBS2 This interview should only take about 15 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.

[READ OUT CONTACT DETAILS IF REQUESTED]

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 2052, Email: muhrec@monash.edu
Questions about the purpose of the research and why it is being conducted – Dr Margaret Taft, Tel: 03 9903 5018 Email: margaret.taft@monash.edu

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 MOBLOTE)
5. QR LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up) (COLLECT LANGUAGE & GO TO TERM3)
6. QR LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment) (MAKE APPOINTMENT)
7. Queried about how telephone number was obtained (GO TO PTEL_MOB)
8. Wants a copy of the introductory letter (ALET)

*(QUERIED HOW MOBILE NUMBER WAS OBTAINED)
PTEL_MOB Your mobile number was randomly generated by computer. We’re calling on mobile phones as well as landlines so we can get a representative sample of people across Australia.

1. Snap back to previous question

*(QUERIED WHY MOBILE WAS CALLED)
One of the issues currently facing telephone survey researchers in Australia is the increasing proportion of households without a landline telephone. We are calling mobile phones as well as landlines so we can get a representative sample of people across Australia.

1. Snap back to previous question

*LANDLINE SAMPLE

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)

S1

Most households will have received a letter from Monash University researchers 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 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) (COLLECT LANGUAGE & GO TO TERM3)
6. HH LOTE – Language not identified (MAKE APPOINTMENT)
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

*(SELECTED RESPONDENT)

S2

REINTRODUCE AS NECESSARY

This interview should only take about 15 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.

[READ OUT CONTACT DETAILS IF REQUESTED]

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 2052, Email: muhrec@monash.edu

Questions about the purpose of the research and why it is being conducted – Dr Margaret Taft, Tel: 03 9903 5018 Email: margaret.taft@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) (COLLECT LANGUAGE & GO TO TERM3)
6 QR LOTE – Language not identified (MAKE APPOINTMENT)
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 – FOR BOTH LANDLINE AND MOBILE SAMPLE)*
ANSM1.Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is <…> calling on behalf of Monash University researchers from the Social Research Centre. We are telephoning 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 OR MINUS 2 HOURS

*(ANSWERING MACHINE SCRIPT)*
ANSM2.Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is <…> calling on behalf of Monash University researchers 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 OR MINUS 2 HOURS
*(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

*PROGRAMMER NOTE: PLEASE SHOW THE OUTCOME OF THIS ON SCREEN*

*(TIMESTAMP1)*

*(ALL)*
DEM18 Just before we continue, can you please tell me your postcode where you live?

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF ASKED WHY WE NEED POSTCODE – WE NEED YOUR POSTCODE TO MAKE SURE WE INTERVIEW ENOUGH PEOPLE IN EACH AREA

*PROGRAMMER NOTE: DISPLAY SAMPLE POSTCODE*

1 Postcode from sample correct
2 Collect postcode (SPECIFY) (RANGE 800 to 9729)
3 (Don’t know) (SPECIFY suburb or town______)
4 (Refused) (GO TO TERM2)
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. Crime/ law and order
5. Defense/National security/Terrorism
7. Education/ schools
8. Environment/ climate change/ water shortages (concern)
9. Environment - over-reaction to climate change/carbon tax (skeptical)
10. Government/ quality of/ politicians
11. Health/ medical/ hospitals
12. Housing shortages/ affordability/ interest rates
13. Immigration/population - too high, overcrowding /wrong people coming (negative)
14. Immigration/population - too low/ need more people (supportive)
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. 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)

How worried are you that you will lose your job in the next year or so. Would you say…

(READ OUT)

1. Very worried
2. Worried
3. (Neither worried nor not worried)
4. A little worried
5. Not worried at all
6. (Does not have a job/retired)
7. (Don’t know)
8. (Refused)
* (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)

* (ALL)

B10. Would you say the SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT we have in Australia works fine as it is, needs minor change, needs major change, or should be replaced?

1. Works fine as it is
2. Needs minor change
3. Needs major change
4. Should be replaced
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

*(TIMESTAMP3)
I would now like to read you a list of Australian institutions and organisations. Please indicate, for each one, how much or how little trust you have in them in Australia.

a. Trade unions  
b. The police  
c. The law courts  
d. Charitable organisations  
e. Political parties  
f. Federal parliament  
g. Hospitals  
h. Employers  
i. Doctors

A lot of trust  
Some trust  
A little trust  
No trust  
(Don’t know)  
(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)
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)

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) Accepting the entry of skilled workers on short-term visas is good for Australia
c) 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)

When a family or individual applies to migrate to Australia, do you agree or disagree that it should be possible for them to be rejected on the basis of...

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

(STATEMENTS)
a) Their race or ethnicity?
b) Their religion?

(RESPONSE FRAME)
1 Strongly agree
2 Agree
3 (Neither agree nor disagree)
4 Disagree
5 Strongly disagree
6 (Don’t know)
7 (Refused)
C4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

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

(STATEMENTS)

a) Multiculturalism has been good for Australia
b) We should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of different ethnic and cultural groups in this country

(RESPONSE FRAME)

1  Strongly agree
2  Agree
3  (Neither agree nor disagree)
4  Disagree
5  Strongly disagree
6  (Don’t know)
7  (Refused)

*(ALL)

Next, I would like to ask you about your attitude towards different religious groups.

CN7intro. Next, I would like to ask you about your attitude towards different religious groups.

PROGRAMMER NOTE: FOR CN7 SHOW FIRST PART OF QUESTION STEM FOR FIRST STATEMENT, THEN SECOND PART FOR REMAINING STATEMENTS

CN7. Is your personal attitude positive, negative, or neutral towards [STATEMENT]? / And what about [STATEMENT]…

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

(STATEMENTS)

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)
CN4intro Next I would like to ask how you feel about asylum seekers who try to reach Australia by boat.

*(ALL)*

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.

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
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

*(TIMESTAMP5)*
MODULE D: DISCRIMINATION

*(ALL) Intro: Now thinking about any discrimination you may have personally experienced.

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

1. Yes
2. No
3. (Refused)

*(HAS EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION, D5=1) D6. How often did you experience discrimination? Was it

1. Often – most weeks in the last year
2. About once a month in the last year
3. Three to six times in the last year
4. Just once or twice in the last year
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

*(HAS EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATIONS, D5=1) D7. Where have you experienced discrimination in the last year? Was it …

(STATEMENTS) (READ OUT)

1. On public transport?
2. When shopping?
3. At a sporting event?
4. At a social gathering?
5. At your place of work?
6. On the street?
7. At an educational institution?
8. In a government office?

(RESPONSE FRAME)

1. Yes
2. No
3. (Don’t know)
4. (Refused)

*(HAS EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATIONS, D5=1) D7c. What form did the discrimination take? Please tell me if any of these apply?

(MULTIPLE RESPONSE) (READ OUT)

1. I was made to feel like I did not belong
2. I was verbally abused
3. I was not offered a job
4. I was not promoted or treated fairly at work
5. My property was damaged
6. I was physically attacked
7. (None of these apply)^
8. (Don’t know)^
9. (Refused)^

*(TIMESTAMP6)

**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)
7  (Cannot predict / Don’t know)
8  (Refused)

*(TIMESTAMP7)*
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 AND C

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)

(STATEMENTS)

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) The mix of different national or ethnic backgrounds improves life in my local area

d) People who come to Australia should change their behavior to be more like Australians

e) 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)

*(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)

*(ALL)*
B1  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)

B2newHow 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)

*(TIMESTAMP8)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

*(ALL)
DEM1 We’re nearly finished now. Just a final few questions to make sure we’ve spoken to a good range of people.
Including you, how many people aged 18 years and over live in this household?

1. Number given (Specify) RECORD WHOLE NUMBER (ALLOWABLE RANGE 1 TO 20)
2. Don’t know (PROGRAMMER NOTE: RECORD IN DATA AS 999)
3. Refused (PROGRAMMER NOTE: RECORD IN DATA AS 888)

*(ALL)
DEM1a

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 – 29 years
3. 30 - 34 years
4. 35 – 39 years
5. 40 – 44 years
6. 45 – 49 years
7. 50 – 54 years
8. 55 – 59 years
9. 60 – 64 years
10. 65 – 69 years
11. 70 - 74 years, or
12. 75+ years
13. (Refused)

*(ALL)
DEM2. RECORD GENDER

1. Male
2. Female
*(ALL)*

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

ONLY DISPLAY CODE 32 FOR STATEMENTS B, C AND D
ONLY DISPLAY CODE 33 FOR STATEMENTS B, C AND D

(STATEMENTS)

a) Starting with yourself
b) And if applicable, 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)
35. (Same as previous)

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?

1. Year given (RECORD YEAR)
2. (Refused)
*(ALL)*
**DEM7.** What is your first language?

1. English
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)

*(ALL)*
**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 full-time
2. Employed part-time
3. Unemployed
4. Retired
5. Student
6. Home duties, or
7. Something else (Specify)
8. (Don’t know)
*(ALL)

DEM13b  Which of the following terms best describes your financial circumstances today? Would you say you are

(READ OUT)

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)

*(ALL)

DEM17N  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)

*(DEM17N=1 thru 12 OR 14, HAS RELIGION)

DEM24  Do you consider yourself to be

1. Very religious
2. Somewhat religious
3. Not so religious
4. Not religious at all
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

*PREDEM22 – IF DEM6=1 CONTINUE OTHERWISE GO TO PRESMP1

*(CITIZEN, DEM 6=1)

DEM22  Just one question about voting intentions. If there was a Federal election held today, for which party would you probably vote?

1. Labor Party
2. Liberal Party
3 National Party
4 Greens
5 Independents
6 Other (Specify) _________________
7 (Don’t Know)
8 (Refused)

*(TIMESTAMP9)

*TELEPHONE STATUS

PRESMP1 IF SAMTYP=2 (MOBILE SAMPLE) CONTINUE, ELSE GO TO PRESMP2

*(MOBILE SAMPLE) (SAMTYP=2)
SMP1 To finish up I have a question or two about your use of telephone services. Is there at least one working fixed line telephone inside your home that is used for making and receiving calls?

1. Yes
2. No (GO TO CLOSE)
3. (Don’t know) (GO TO CLOSE)
4. (Refused) (GO TO CLOSE)

PRESMP2 IF SAMTYP=1 (LANDLINE SAMPLE) OR SMP1=1 (MOBILE SAMPLE WITH LANDLINE) CONTINUE, ELSE GO TO PRESMP3

*(LANDLINE SAMPLE, MOBILE SAMPLE WITH LANDLINE) (SAMTYP=1 OR ((SAMTYP=2 AND SMP1=1))
SMP2 How many residential phone lines do you have in your household not including lines dedicated to faxes, modems or business phone numbers? Do not include mobile phones.

INTERVIEWER NOTE: If needed explain as how many individual landlines are there at your house that you can use to make and receive calls?

1. Number of lines given (Specify________) RECORD WHOLE NUMBER (ALLOWABLE RANGE 1 TO 15) *(DISPLAY “UNLIKELY RESPONSE” IF >3)
2. (Refused)
3. (Don’t know/ Not stated)

PRESMP3 IF SAMTYP=1 (LANDLINE SAMPLE) CONTINUE, ELSE GO TO CLOSE

*(LANDLINE SAMPLE) (SAMTYP=1)
SMP3 Do you also have a working mobile phone?

1. Yes
2. No
3. (Don’t know)
4. (Refused)

*(TIMESTAMP10)

*(ALL)
CLOSE 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.

*(ALL)
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: (CF07/1240), ph: 03 9905 5490, Email: muhrec@monash.edu

Questions about the purpose of the research and why it is being conducted – Dr Margaret Taft, Tel: 03 9903 5018 Email: margaret.taft@monash.edu

*(INTERVIEWER TO ENTER ONCE INTERVIEW IS COMPLETE)

INT1  Record language

1  English
2  Cantonese
3  Mandarin
4  Vietnamese
5  Italian
6  Greek
7  Arabic
8  Lebanese
9  Turkish

*(INTERVIEWER TO ENTER ONCE INTERVIEW IS COMPLETE)

INT2  Was this interview …

1  Normal
2  Refusal conversion

*(TIMESTAMP11)
**REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

USE STANDARD RR1 AND RR2

**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.

*(DID NOT PROVIDE STATE IN MOBILE SAMPLE)*
TERM2 To be able to accurately analyse the results, we need to record the state of residence of everyone who participates in the survey. Thanks anyway.

*(LOTE NOT FOLLOWUP)*
TERM3  Thank you for your time.

**ALLTERM (NEW)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed outcome</th>
<th>Summary outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1=3  Household refusal</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1=8  No one in household 18 plus</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2=3  Respondent refusal</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntroMob=3</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntroMob=9</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2=3  Mobile refused safety question</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBS2=3 Mobile Respondent refusal</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB_APPT_A=9 Mobile refused state</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB_APPT=3 Mobile refused alternative number</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1=5  LOTE – No follow up</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2=5  LOTE – No follow up</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntroMob=7</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBS2=5 LOTE – No follow up</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM18=4 Refused postcode</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTEcn=2 LOTE – No follow up (Could not establish language)</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FINCAL VARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCODE</td>
<td>Final respondent postcode</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey (DEM18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGEGRP</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Use same categories as DEM1b</td>
<td>Survey (DEM1a/DEM1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1=Male 2=Female</td>
<td>Survey (DEM2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Australian/Overseas born flag</td>
<td>1=Australian born (DEM15a=1) 2= Overseas born (DEM15a&gt;1)</td>
<td>Survey (DEM15a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Level of education (detail)</td>
<td>Categories as per questionnaire</td>
<td>Survey (DEM10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education2</td>
<td>Level of education (summary)</td>
<td>1=Year 10 or below (DEM10=1,2,3) 2=Year 12 (DEM10=4,5) 3=Trade or Technical (DEM10=6,7,8) 4=University (DEM10=9,10) 5=DK 6=REF</td>
<td>Survey (DEM10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>1= Employed (DEM11=1,2) 2=All other (DEM11=3 to 7) 3=DK 4=REF</td>
<td>Survey (DEM11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMFLAG</td>
<td>Macromatch flag</td>
<td>Categories as per sample file</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATCHID</td>
<td>Match ID (From Macromatch)</td>
<td>Categories as per sample file</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Letter sample</td>
<td>1=lettered sample 2=non-lettered sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Interviewer Briefing Notes
Social Cohesion Survey 2015
(National Level)
BRIEFING NOTES

A Research Project for:
Scanlon Foundation &
Monash University
Agenda

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

• The Scanlon Foundation started the Social Cohesion Research Program (SCRP) in 2007. The Social Cohesion Survey forms a part of this multi stage research program. Scanlon fund the survey.


• Many of the questions are retained from previous waves.

• The survey is directed by Monash University and the Australian Multicultural Foundation (AMF).
More about the stakeholders

- The immediate client for us and respondents is Monash University
- The School of International, Historical and Philosophical Studies is the faculty within Monash University conducting the research.
- Professor Andrew Markus is the lead researcher of the project at Monash University
- The reports from the research are publicly accessible on their website which is listed in the survey
• The Scanlon Foundation was established in 2001
• Their mission is to support ‘the advance of Australia as a welcoming, prosperous and cohesive nation’
• 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
Project overview

• This year we are conducting the one National survey.
  – National survey:
    o Slow start 16th June
    o Main field work period 16th June – 19th July
    o 1,500 interviews across Australia – Dual Frame
  o Targets:
    ➢ 900 Landline surveys
    ➢ 600 Mobile surveys
Survey overview

• 15 minute average interview length expected
• Covers varying topics from immigration to politics with a particular focus on multiculturalism
• Expect to hear many different, even diametrically opposed, viewpoints
• Expect that some responses may come across as offensive or alien to your point of view. Critical to remain neutral at all times.
• Gentle call control important for chatty respondents, especially when the topics are sensitive and close to the heart of the respondent
Survey overview (Contd.)

• Primary approach letter was sent to respondents for the main survey where we have an address.

• First letters were sent on Thursday 9th June and each batch is sent weekly after that.

• Numbers have been sourced from all possible available phone numbers within the area (randomly selected or RDD).
Survey overview (Contd.)

• Landlines
  – Respondent selected using the “next birthday” method
  – May need to explain that in order to achieve a representative sample we can only interview the randomly selected person in the household.

• Mobiles
  – Phone owner is the qualifying respondent (18 or over!)
  – Make sure to screen for state before making an appointment so that we have the correct time zone when calling back
Call procedures

• Calls will only be initiated between 4:30 pm and 8:30 pm weekdays and 11:00 am and 5:00 pm on Saturdays and on Sundays

• Appointments can be made for any time the call centre is operational

• Day time appointments should generally only be made if:
  – The QR requests a daytime appointment
  – Someone in the household has said daytimes are likely to be good to catch the QR
Non-English speaking respondents

- For the National survey we will be interviewing in Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese and Turkish.

- Record LOTEs using the standard SRC codes:
  - HH LOTE - Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese, Turkish (language follow up).
  - HH LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up)
  - HH LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment)

- If you are unable to establish the language spoken make an appointment for two days time (plus or minus two hours)
  - A good way to establish the language is simply to suggest a language you think they might be speaking.

- We only need to make a couple of attempts to establish the language
  - On the second unsuccessful attempt you can code away as ‘Unable to establish language’.
Survey administration

• We will be leaving answering machine messages on both landlines and mobiles
  o Up to two messages on landlines (No more!)
  o Only one message on mobiles
  – Only leave a message if we have:
    o NOT had contact with anyone in the household or on the mobile phone.
  – After leaving the message make an appointment for
    o 5 days +/- two hours for the 1\textsuperscript{st} msg
    o or 6 days +/- two hours for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} msg
    o Don’t make these during the daytime, and keep them in SRC hours, but at a different time to increase chance of contact
Survey administration ctd.

- Refusals recorded “internally” (not at SMS screen)
- Differentiate between household and respondent refusals
- Differentiate between “hard” and “soft” refusals
  - 1. Definitely do not call back
  - 2. Possible conversion
- Expected to get a minimum of 50% response rate so important to work on refusal aversion strategies (no more than one refusal for every completed interview).
- We will be conducting refusal conversion
Privacy and confidentiality

• Our contract with the Monash University 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:
  – Dr Margaret Taft
  – Tel: 03 9903 5018
  – margaret.taft@monash.edu

• Complaints
  – Human Ethics Officer
  – Tel: 03 9905 2052
  – muhrec@monash.edu
Introductions

• The first question in the survey is an unprompted “what do you think is the most important problem facing Australia today?”

• It is essential that you do not give away any information that might bias the QRs response to this question.

• Make sure that your introductions use general information only and make no mention of topics

• Use terms like “community issues” or “issues facing Australia” not specific terms like “immigration” or “population issues”.

• If someone asks you what issues the survey is about, you can let them know you can’t reveal anything more about the study due to the first question – even use this as a ‘hook’ to try to get them intrigued about the study
AN1 – Most important problem facing Australia

• This a single coded and unprompted question

• Please avoid using ‘Other’ unless absolutely necessary, as it is not a specify

• Please consult your supervisor if you come across a response you are not sure about

• The question has positive and negative dimensions for 3 topics: asylum seekers, immigration and environment
  – Asylum seekers (sympathetic comment) / Asylum seekers (negative comment)
  – Environment (concern) / Environment (sceptical)
  – Immigration/Population (negative) / Immigration/Population (supportive)

• Probe out any ambiguous answers in a neutral manner e.g. “Can you tell me a bit more about that?”
Data Quality Issues

• Take care to record all numeric responses accurately
  – Postcode, number of residential phone numbers

• Accurate probing of scale question
  – Scales must be read out as presented
  – As always, your best efforts are appreciated!
Appendix 5: Primary Approach Letter
Social Cohesion Research Project – National Survey

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://monash.edu/mapping-population/](http://monash.edu/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 15 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 2014 survey are at [http://monash.edu/mapping-population/](http://monash.edu/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).

If you would like to contact the researchers about any other aspect of this study, please contact Dr Margaret Taft

Dr Margaret Taft, School of International, Historical and Philosophical Studies, Faculty of Arts, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800
Tel: 03 9903 5018
Email: margaret.taft@monash.edu

If you have a complaint concerning the manner in which this research project (CF07/1240) is being conducted, please contact:

Human Ethics Officer, Monash Research Office, Building 3E, Room 111, Monash University, Clayton VIC 3800
Tel: 03 9905 2052
Email: muhrec@monash.edu

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信息的资料。

本次问卷调查约需15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项重要调查中的配合。

您的观点非常宝贵和重要。

Sosyal Uyum Araştırması Projesi

Adım Andrew Markus ve Monash Üniversitesi Tarihsel Araştırmalar Bölümü'nde profesör olarak görev yap口号。 Bu yazı, Monash Üniversitesi tarafından yürütülmekte olan projenin önemli bir Avustralya araştırması ile ilgili olarak sizden yardımcı talep etmek amacıyla yazılarım。 Bu çalışma, Avustralya'daki bir dizi sosyal konular üzerinde durmaktadır。

Monash Üniversitesi araştırma için gerekli olan telefon mülakatını gerçekleştirme için Social Research Centre (Sosyal Araştırmalar Merkezi) ile anlaşmıştır. Hanenizde yaşıyan kimseler, Avustralya çapında çoğul kimseler gibi şansa bağlı olarak seçilmiş bulunmaktadır。 Sağlanan bilgiler Social Research Centre tarafından tamamen gizli tutulacaktır。 Monash Üniversitesi yaptığınız anketle sizin veya hanenizdeki bireylerin kimliğini açığa vermekten herhangi bir bilgi elde etmemekteyecektir。

Bu anket yaklaşık olarak 15 dakika zamanınızı alacaktır ve katılıp katılmak tamamen isteğe bağlıdır。 Eğer katılmaya karar vermişseniz, bu kararınızı isteğiniz tamamen isimsiz kalacaktır。

Bu önemli araştırmaya görüntü 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 cho 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 chân chính cho Nghiên cứu này。Tính cổ 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。

Quý vị sẽ mất khoảng 15 phút để trả lời các câu hỏi。Việc tham gia này là hoàn toàn tự nguyện。Nguyễn cách khi quý vị đồng ý tham gia, quý vị cũng có thể xin rút bất kỳ lúc nào。Những câu trả lời của quý vị sẽ được đảm bảo tuyệt đối.

Chúng tôi xin cảm ơn quý vị đã đồng ý và quan trọng quan trọng của quý vị. Kiểu của quý vị sẽ rất giá trị và quan trọng cho dự án của chúng tôi。