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1. Introduction

1.1. Overview

This report describes the methodological aspects of the ninth 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
- 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 National call results and response rate
- 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
- to assess changes in these attitudes over time.

1.3. Survey overview

In 2016 a National Level Survey was conducted. Data collection was by Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI).

As with the previous surveys, the in-scope population was persons aged 18 years and over who were residents of private households in Australia.

The 2016 National Survey involved 1,500 adults (aged 18 years and over), stratified by State/Territory and capital city / non-capital city. This report discusses the methodology of the National survey only.

A dual-frame sample methodology was used 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 1,500 interviews was 60.0% landline numbers and 40.0% mobile phone numbers. Overall, 256 (17%) 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)
  - interviewing in languages other than English (LOTE).

A letter could be requested by any sample member who would like more information regarding the survey in an attempt to gain participation in the survey. We had no requests for a letter.

Table 1 provides a summary of key statistics.

- The response rate for the 2016 National Survey was 50.4%, comparable to previous years although slightly under.
- There were a few revisions applied to the 2015 questionnaire for the 2016 iteration of the survey. These changes saw an increase of two minutes in interview length from 2015 to 2016 (see Section 3 and Appendix 2 for details). There was minimal difference between the average length of interviews conducted with respondents using a landline telephone (18.7 minutes) and those conducted with respondents using a mobile phone (18.6 minutes).

---

\(^1\) ACMA, December 2014.
2. Sample Design & Survey Procedures

2.1. Sample design

To accommodate the dual-frame sampling approach, the 2016 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 that 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 3 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 in the mobile sample frame; nevertheless the final distribution of the 600 interviews obtained from this frame is similar to previous years.

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 7.2 was to adjust for this disproportionate sample design.

Table 3 Survey geographic distribution of final achieved sample by sample frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic strata</th>
<th>Sample Frame</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landline</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of NSW</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Vic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Qld</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of SA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of WA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Tasmania</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of NT</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>900</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>1500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The blend of interviews from the landline and mobile phone sample frames (n=900 and n=600 respectively) was implemented with the aim of obtaining at least 200 interviews with people from “mobile phone only” households (in fact, 256 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.

- 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 2016 National 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 6,206 landline telephone records used, an up-to-date address listing was obtained for 35.3 percent (n=2,189) 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 2016 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 2016 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 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. Other exclusions that also applied included:

- persons who indicated that they were incapable of undertaking the interview due to a physical or health condition (including too old / frail)
- persons apparently under the influence of drugs or alcohol
- non-English speaking persons outside of the LOTE communities targeted for this survey (see Section 2.6)
- 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 and between 11.00 am and 5.00 pm on Saturdays and 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 Arabic.

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 31 interviews were conducted in a language other than English (10 Mandarin, 10 Vietnamese, 7 Cantonese, 3 Greek and 1 Arabic).

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. Pre-approach text messaging

For the first time, mobile phone numbers selected to take part in the National Social Cohesion study were sent a pre-approach text message informing them that they were going to be contacted for the research and offering them a way to opt out. The content of the message was:

Hi, The Social Research Centre will be calling in the next few days to ask for your opinion on some of the big issues facing Australians today, as part of an annual study conducted for Monash University. Reply: 1 if aged 18+ and can take part, Reply: 2 to optout.

Of the 5,270 mobile numbers that were sent a text message, 175 respondents replied ‘1’ to opt in and 1,210 respondents opted out. The respondents who opted out of the survey were not dialled in CATI and were excluded from response rate calculations. In future surveys, a discussion about the overall effectiveness and efficiencies gained from sending a pre-approach text message should be explored before committing to this procedure again.

2.9. 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.). In total 104 calls were made to the Social Research Centre for the National survey. The majority of calls were to make an appointment (65% National survey) or to refuse participation (16% National survey).

2.10. 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
- 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 2016 survey underwent some changes with both additions and deletions to the 2015 questionnaire with the majority of the survey items remaining the same.

The additions included questions which looked at trust towards certain multicultural, ethnic and religious groups, as well as attitudes towards the Australian Government’s policy on the Syria crisis and proposed intake of Syrian refugees. Questions about trust towards certain institutions and politics were removed. A summary of these changes can be found in Appendix 2.

3.2. Questionnaire pilot testing

The 2016 survey did not have a formal pilot but instead had a “soft launch” where a small interviewing team completed 28 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 used to ensure the CATI script accurately reflected the agreed “hard copy” questionnaire.

There was some feedback from the Operations team surrounding one of the new questions which prompted a revision to the code frame and lead in to improve the comprehension of the question as intended. This change did not fundamentally change the data collected and so the data from the soft launch was retained. The final 2016 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,
- protecting the privacy and confidentiality of respondent information,
- ensuring that mobile phone respondents are safe to take the call and have not increased their risk of accident by answering the phone while driving or in a hazardous environment.

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.

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. In total 44 interviewers were briefed to work on the 2016 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
- monitoring (listening in) by departmental supervisors.
5. Call Results & Analysis of Response

5.1. Call results

A total of 10,456 sample records (6,206 landline numbers and 4,250 mobile numbers) were initiated to achieve the final 1,500 completed surveys. A total of 38,178 calls were placed to these sample records equating to an average of 3.7 calls per record and one completed interview for every 25.6 calls.

Table 2 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 14.3 percent of the 10,456 numbers to which calls were initiated for this survey.

Of the numbers initiated, 16.4 percent were unusable; 50.7 percent were unresolved at the end of the call cycle (non-contacts or unresolved appointments); and 4.1 percent were identified as being out of scope. Refusals (all types) were encountered at 14.4 percent of the numbers to which calls were initiated.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>10,456</td>
<td>6,206</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusable numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telstra message, number disconnected</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax/Modem</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming call restrictions</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a residential number</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal unusable number</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact / unresolved in survey period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering machine</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum non-contact attempts made</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal no contact / unresolved</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims to have done survey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected respondent away for duration</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE – No language follow up</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too old / ill health / unable to do survey</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope (no-one 18 plus in hhold/on mobile)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal out of scope</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway termination</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household refusal</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent refusal</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflecting on the same trend as in previous years, the differences between landline and mobile call outcomes continue to be quite distinct. However across all of the points listed below the margin of difference between two has decreased from 2015. Of difference again this year, the landline frame had:

- A higher proportion of unusable numbers (18.0% versus 14.0% for the mobile frame), particularly non-residential phone numbers (7.9% versus 2.2% for mobiles).
- A considerably lower proportion of ‘answering machines’ (15.3% versus 22.6% of mobiles) and ‘no answer’ (8.4% versus 16.0% of mobiles), and consequently a lower proportion of ‘non-contact/unresolved’ call outcomes (46.9% versus 56.2%).

Finally, as shown in Table 3, as a proportion of all in-scope contacts, the total refusal rates were slightly higher within the landline sample frame than in the mobile sample frame (52.4% and 45.4% respectively).

**Table 3  Final call results for in-scope contacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in-scope contacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway termination</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household refusal</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent refusal</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove number from list</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named respondent not known</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused screening question</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</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 is defined as follows (AAPOR Cooperation rate 12):

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

Using this formula, the final overall response rate for the 2016 National survey was 50.0 percent; this was slightly under the 2015 survey response rates. In looking the sample frames separately, the mobile sample had a response rate of 54.4 percent and the landline sample had a response rate of 47.4 percent.

The pre-approach text message will have contributed to the mobile sample achieving a higher response rate than the landline sample. Without the pre-approach text message strong opponents of the survey would normally have refused participation upon speaking with an interviewer. Instead, they had the option to refuse via text message before calling commenced. As the mobile opt outs via text message were not included in the response rate calculations, this could be a contributing factor for that difference.

Table 4 shows the efficiency of the lettered sample compared to the non-lettered sample with 23.7 percent of households who received the letter going on to complete the interview compared to nine percent for those households who did not. Lettered sample members also appeared more likely to refuse participation compared to those who did not receive the letter (25.4% of lettered versus 11.3% of unlettered). Generally performance between the states for the landline sample was quite even with the exception of the Northern Territory with a higher unusable sample (21.1%) and non-contacts (55.7%) along with a lower uptake of the survey (8.1%) when compared to the average (15.5% unusable, 48.4% non-contact, 14.3% interviews).

Table 4 Response rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base (n)</th>
<th>Interview %</th>
<th>Refusal %</th>
<th>Unresolved contact %</th>
<th>Other contacts %</th>
<th>Non-contact %</th>
<th>Unusable %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,456</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landline</td>
<td>6,206</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landline Sample Frame Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Metro</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent letter</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No letter</td>
<td>4,017</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5.3. 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 2014 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).

As with previous years, 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 7.2).

Table 5 National sample profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Refusal</th>
<th>Unresolved contact</th>
<th>Other contacts</th>
<th>Non-contact</th>
<th>Unusable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (n) 1,500
Australian population 18 years plus 18,441,317

Age group (%)
- 18-34 years: 16.3 vs. 31.4
- 35-44 years: 12.8 vs. 17.5
- 45-54 years: 16.6 vs. 16.9
- 55-64 years: 21.0 vs. 14.8
- 65 years or more: 32.7 vs. 19.4

Gender (%)
- Male: 47.3 vs. 49.3
- Female: 52.7 vs. 50.7

Educational Attainment (%)
- University (Bachelor or Post graduate degree): 38.5 vs. 19.8
- Have not completed a university degree: 52.7 vs. 80.2

Country of birth (%)
- Born in Australia: 70.6 vs. 64.6
- Born overseas: 29.0 vs. 35.4
5.3.1. **Landline and Mobile Sample Frames**

Table 8 presents the achieved sample profile of the total sample (i.e., 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=256).

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 (31.7% were aged under 35 years compared with 6.1% of the landline sample); males (57.7% versus 40.3%); employed persons (66.2% versus 41.1%) and students (5.0% versus 2.1%); and people who did not hold Australian citizenship (11.7% versus 4.6%).
- 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 6**  
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><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34 years</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>31.7↑</td>
<td>47.3↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>15.7↑</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>11.7↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or more</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.8↓</td>
<td>7.8↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>57.7↑</td>
<td>59↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>42.3↓</td>
<td>41↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Bachelor or Post graduate degree)</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not completed a university degree</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian / Overseas born</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian born</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas born</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>66.2↑</td>
<td>70.3↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.6↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual-Frame</td>
<td>Landline Frame</td>
<td>Mobile Frame</td>
<td>Mobile Only Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home duties</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian citizen</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an Australian citizen</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result is significantly above (↑) or below (↓) the result for the landline sample frame, p<0.05.

5.4. 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” (42.1%), “no comment / just hung up” (28.1%) and “too busy” (6.5%).

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’ (9.4% versus 5.1% of those from the landline sample frame).

Table 7 Reasons for refusal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Dual-Frame</th>
<th>Landline Frame</th>
<th>Mobile Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment/just hung up</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never do surveys</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too personal/intrusive</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t believe surveys are confidential/privacy concerns</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent number</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes is too long</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get too many calls for surveys/telemarketing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t trust surveys</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like subject matter</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter put me off</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</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. Upon reviewing the modified election question at DEM22 it was decided that a code frame extension would be applied to identify votes for some minor parties.

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
- 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. 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).

---

3 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\(^4\) with the following simultaneous constraints applied during the rim weighting procedure:

- geographic location
- gender
- age by education
- 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 2016 survey.

### 6.3. Data file provision

The Social Research Centre provided two clean SPSS data files – one containing the 2016 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 \[1 - \frac{\text{(number of residents born overseas in a non-English speaking country)}}{\text{total number of residents}}\]\(^5\).

---

\(^4\) 2011 Census counts provide the most recent educational attainment and country of birth information.

\(^5\) For consistency with earlier development work on this index, the diversity scores included in the data file are based on 2011 Census counts.
### Rim weighting target matrix based on ABS 2015 Estimated Residential Population (ERP) and 2011 Census counts

<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>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>age by education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree, 18-34 years</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree, 18-34 years</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree, 35-44 years</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree, 35-44 years</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree, 45-54 years</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree, 45-54 years</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree, 55 years or more</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No university degree, 55 years or more</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/Overseas ESB*</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas NESB</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landline only</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-user</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone only</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* UK, Ireland, USA, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa
Appendix 2 2016 Questionnaire revisions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>2016 Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>How much interest did you have in the recent federal election campaign? Would you say …</td>
<td>Added in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(READ OUT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. A good deal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Not much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. None at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>There are a number of social and environmental issues facing the federal and state parliaments. Do you support or oppose legislation for…</td>
<td>Added in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*PROGRAMMER NOTE: RANDOMISE STATEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Reduced reliance on coal for electricity generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Marriage equality for same sex couples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Prescription of marijuana to treat painful medical conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Medically approved euthanasia for people suffering terminal illness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RESPONSE FRAME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Strongly support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. (Neither support nor oppose)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Oppose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Strongly oppose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2015 Questionnaire Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Trade unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The law courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Charitable organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Political parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Federal parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Doctors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(RESPONSE FRAME)

1. A lot of trust
2. Some trust
3. A little trust
4. No trust
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

### 2016 Questionnaire Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN1B</th>
<th>Next I would like to ask how you feel about different types of people coming to live in Australia as permanent or long-term residents. Do you approve or disapprove of…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TYPES OF PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Skilled workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Those who have close family living in Australia (i.e. partners or children of Australian residents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Questionnaire Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Asylum seekers who try to reach Australia by boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RESPONSE FRAME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Neither approve nor disapprove)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Somewhat disapprove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disapprove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (Don’t know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(STATEMENTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Accepting immigrants from many different countries makes Australia stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Accepting the entry of skilled workers on short-term visas is good for Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ethnic minorities in Australia SHOULD be given Australian government assistance to maintain their customs and traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RESPONSE FRAME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Neither agree or disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (None of the above/ Don’t know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Refused)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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...

(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. (Don’t know)

*Deleted in 2016*

### C4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

(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

*Deleted in 2016*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>2016 Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 (Don't know)</td>
<td>C10 Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about ethnic and cultural groups in Australia?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Refused)</td>
<td>(STATEMENTS)</td>
<td>Added in 2016 survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) We should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of different ethnic and cultural groups in this country</td>
<td>Statement ‘We should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of different ethnic and cultural groups in this country’ taken from deleted question C4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) It is best for Australia if all people forget their different ethnic and cultural backgrounds as soon as possible</td>
<td>Statement ‘People who come to Australia should change their behavior to be more like Australians’ moved from F2 to this question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) People who come to Australia should change their behavior to be more like Australians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN5</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Deleted in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>2016 Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(READ OUT ALL FOUR OPTIONS, INCLUDING THE “1”, “2”, “3” AND “4”, BEFORE ACCEPTING A RESPONSE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. They should be allowed to apply for permanent residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They should be allowed to apply for temporary residence only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. They should be kept in detention until they can be sent back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Their boats should be turned back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. They should be allowed to apply for permanent residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They should be allowed to apply for temporary residence only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. They should be kept in detention until they can be sent back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Their boats should be turned back.</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>

CN8  
Do you support or oppose the government’s plan to bring refugees from the Syrian conflict to Australia?  
(RESPONSE FRAME)  
1. Strongly support  
2. Support  
3. (Neither support nor oppose)  
4. Oppose  
5. Strongly oppose  
6. (Don’t know)  
Added in 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>2016 Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN9</td>
<td>When deciding which refugees from the Syrian conflict Australia should accept, would you prefer equal consideration be given to all religious and ethnic groups, or should priority be given to Christians?</td>
<td>Added in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RESPONSE FRAME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Preference for equal consideration to all religious and ethnic groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Preference for priority for Christians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. (Does not approve of any Syrian refugee intake)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN10</td>
<td>If some of these refugees from the Syrian conflict came to live in your community, do you think they would be welcomed, or not?</td>
<td>Added in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RESPONSE FRAME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Very welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Neither welcome nor not welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Not welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Not at all welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>2016 Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN11</td>
<td>Do you think that Australia’s current refugee intake is adequate, too few or too many?</td>
<td>Added in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RESPONSE FRAME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Much too few</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Too few</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Too many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Much too many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN12</td>
<td>Overall, do you think the Government is doing a good job, an average job or a poor job in handling the refugee issue?</td>
<td>Added in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RESPONSE FRAME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. A very good job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. A good job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. An average job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. A poor job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. A very poor job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Where have you experienced discrimination in the last year? Was it …</td>
<td>Deleted in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(STATEMENTS) (READ OUT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. On public transport?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When shopping?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. At a sporting event?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. At a social gathering?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>2016 Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 At your place of work?</td>
<td>6 On the street?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 At an educational institution?</td>
<td>8 In a government office?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RESPONSE FRAME)</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>3. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F2 Do you agree or disagree with the following statements …

(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.

(RIGHT RESPONSE FRAME)
- 1. Strongly agree
- 2. Agree
- 3. (Neither agree nor disagree)
- 4. Disagree

F2 Do you agree or disagree with the following statements …

(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 local life
- d) I am able to have a real say on issues that are important to me in my local area.

(RIGHT 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)

Statement ‘People who come to Australia should change their behavior to be more like Australians’ removed from 2016 survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>2016 Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7. (Don’t know)</td>
<td>Question wording changes to ask about the recent 2016 election and added answer option ‘Did not vote’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (There are not enough immigrants in my neighborhood to have any impact)</td>
<td>8. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (Don’t know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM22</td>
<td>DEM22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just one question about voting intentions. If there was a Federal election held today, for which party would you probably vote?</td>
<td>Just one question about voting. For which political party did you vote in the recent federal election?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Labor Party</td>
<td>1 Labour Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Liberal Party</td>
<td>2 Liberal Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 National Party</td>
<td>3 National Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Greens</td>
<td>4 Greens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Independents</td>
<td>5 Independents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Other (Specify) ________</td>
<td>6 Other (Specify) ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Don’t Know)</td>
<td>7 Did not vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Refused)</td>
<td>8 (Don’t Know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Refused)</td>
<td>9 (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM22a</td>
<td>*(IF DEM22=7 DID NOT VOTE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If you had voted, which party do you think you would have supported?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Labour Party</td>
<td>1 Labour Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Liberal Party</td>
<td>2 Liberal Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 National Party</td>
<td>3 National Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Greens</td>
<td>4 Greens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other (Specify) ________</td>
<td>5 Other (Specify) ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Don’t Know)</td>
<td>6 (Don’t Know)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Refused)</td>
<td>7 (Refused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>How much do you receive?</td>
<td>Added in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With the removal of F9, F10 will need additional text to clarify that this is in relation to payments received as part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>2016 Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>About your housing arrangements, are you (READ OUT) 1. Paying rent or board 2. Paying off this dwelling (mortgage) 3. Outright owner or full owner 4. Living rent free 5. Purchasing under a rent and buy scheme 6. Occupying your dwelling under a life tenure scheme 7. Other (specify_______) 88. (Don't know) 99. (Refused)</td>
<td>of caring responsibilities for children in OOHC. Some confusion from both respondents and interviewers about how to use this frame. Update to a frame that is more accessible in language used to define housing arrangements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3  Final 2016 Questionnaire
Questionnaire Structure

Modules

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

Call outcome codes (SMS screen) (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 STATE) (GO TO TERM2)
10. (Unable to screen – MAKE APPOINTMENT)
*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 the ethics approval number and the contact details of the researcher at Monash University.

1. Continue (GO TO S3)
2. Appointment (MAKE APPOINTMENT)
3. Respondent Refusal (GO TO RR1)
4. Wants contact details
5. QR LOTE - Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese, Turkish (language follow up) (GO TO MOBLOTE)
6. QR LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up) (COLLECT LANGUAGE & GO TO TERM3)
7. QR LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment) (MAKE APPOINTMENT)
8. Queried about how telephone number was obtained (GO TO PTEL_MOB)
9. Wants a copy of the introductory letter (ALET)

*IF MOBS2 = 4 OR S2 =4, WANTS CONTACT DETAILS
CONTACT 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. Snap back to previous

*(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
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

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.

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) (RECORD ON SMS)
6. HH LOTE – Language not identified (make appointment) (RECORD ON SMS)

You might have recently received a letter from Monash University about the study. 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. 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)

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 the ethics approval number and the contact details of the researcher at Monash University.

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. Wants contact / ethics details (GO TO CONTACT)
5. QR LOTE - Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Arabic, Lebanese, Turkish (language follow up) (GO TO LOTE)
6. QR LOTE – Other language identified (no language follow up) (COLLECT LANGUAGE & GO TO TERM3)
7. QR LOTE – Language not identified (MAKE APPOINTMENT)
8. Queried about how telephone number was obtained (DISPLAY ATELQ)
9. Wants a copy of the introductory letter (ATELQ)

*(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 will be recorded 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?

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
*(ALL)
A1 I'd like you to tell me your views on various economic and social issues. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

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

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

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

*(ALL)
A5 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)

*(ALL)
A6 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. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)

*(TIMESTAMP2)
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. Joined a boycott of a product or company
5. Attended a protest, march or demonstration
6. (None of the above)
7. (Don’t know)
8. (Refused)

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)

B12. How much interest did you have in the recent federal election campaign? Would you say …

(READ OUT)

1. A good deal
2. Some
3. Not much
4. None at all
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

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)
There are a number of social and environmental issues facing the federal and state parliaments. Do you support or oppose legislation for...

*PROGRAMMER NOTE: RANDOMISE STATEMENTS

1. Reduced reliance on coal for electricity generation
2. Marriage equality for same sex couples
3. Prescription of marijuana to treat painful medical conditions
4. Medically approved euthanasia for people suffering terminal illness

(PROBE: Is that strongly support/support or strongly oppose/oppose?)
(RESPONSE FRAME)

1. Strongly support
2. Support
3. (Neither support nor oppose)
4. Oppose
5. Strongly oppose
6. (Don't know)
7. (Refused)

*(TIMESTAMP3)
MODULE C: SOCIO-CULTURAL

*(ALL)*

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

(READ OUT)

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

*(ALL)*

C8. And to what extent do you have a sense of belonging in Australia? Would you say ...

(READ OUT)

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

*(ALL)*

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

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

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

*(ALL)*

C1. Now some questions about immigration. What do you think of the number of immigrants accepted into Australia at present? Would you say it is ...

(READ OUT)

1 Too high
2 About right, or
3 Too low
4 (No opinion/ don’t know)
5 (Refused)
Next I would like to ask how you feel about different types of people coming to live in Australia as permanent or long-term residents. Do you approve or disapprove of...

PROGRAMMER NOTE: Keep in the indicated order - do not randomise the TYPES OF PEOPLE

(PROBE: Is that strongly or somewhat approve / disapprove?)
(WHEN MOVING TO NEXT TYPE OF PEOPLE: And how do you feel about...)

TYPES OF PEOPLE
a) Skilled workers
b) Those who have close family living in Australia (i.e. partners or children of Australian residents)
c) Asylum seekers who try to reach Australia by boat
d) Refugees who have been assessed overseas and found to be victims of persecution and in need of help

(RESPONSE FRAME) (READ OUT AS REQUIRED)
1. Strongly approve
2. Somewhat approve
3. (Neither approve nor disapprove)
4. Somewhat disapprove
5. Strongly disapprove
6. (Don't know)
7. (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) Ethnic minorities in Australia SHOULD be given Australian government assistance to maintain their customs and traditions
c) Multiculturalism has been good for Australia

(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)
Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about ethnic and cultural groups in Australia?

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

(STATEMENTS)

a) We should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of different ethnic and cultural groups in this country
b) It is best for Australia if all people forget their different ethnic and cultural backgrounds as soon as possible
c) People who come to Australia should change their behavior to be more like Australians

(RESPONSE FRAME)

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

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

(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)
Next I would like to ask about your attitude to refugees. The government has announced that as part of its Humanitarian program it will resettle refugees from the Syrian conflict in Australia.

Do you support or oppose the government’s plan to bring refugees from the Syrian conflict to Australia?

(PROBE: Is that strongly support or support/ strongly oppose or oppose?)

(RESPONSE FRAME)

1. Strongly support
2. Support
3. (Neither support nor oppose)
4. Oppose
5. Strongly oppose
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)

When deciding which refugees from the Syrian conflict Australia should accept, would you prefer equal consideration be given to all religious and ethnic groups, or should priority be given to Christians?

(RESPONSE FRAME)

1. Preference for equal consideration to all religious and ethnic groups
2. No opinion
3. Preference for priority for Christians
4. (Does not approve of any Syrian refugee intake)
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

If some of these refugees from the Syrian conflict came to live in your community, do you think they would be welcomed, or not?

(PROBE: Do you think they would be made very welcome or welcome / not welcome or not at all welcome?)

(RESPONSE FRAME)

1. Very welcome
2. Welcome
3. Neither welcome nor not welcome
4. Not welcome
5. Not at all welcome
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)
*(ALL) CN11  Do you think that Australia’s current refugee intake is adequate, too few or too many?

(PROBE: Is that much too few or too few / too many or much too many?)

(RESPONSE FRAME)
1. Much too few
2. Too few
3. Adequate
4. Too many
5. Much too many
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)

*(ALL) CN12  Overall, do you think the Government is doing a good job, an average job or a poor job in handling the refugee issue?

(PROBE: Is that a very good job or good job/ poor job or very poor job?)

(RESPONSE FRAME)
1. A very good job
2. A good job
3. An average job
4. A poor job
5. A very poor job
6. (Don’t know)
7. (Refused)

*(TIMESTAMP4)
**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 in the last year
5. (Don’t know)
6. (Refused)

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

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)

*(TIEMSTAMP5)*

**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)
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)

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)
MODULE F: NEIGHBOURHOOD AND VOLUNTARY WORK

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

*(ALL)*

PROGRAMMER NOTE: ONLY SHOW CODE 6 FOR STATEMENT B

F2 Do you agree or disagree with the following statements …

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

[Interviewer Note: IF NECESSARY REMIND RESPONDENT THAT "your local area is within 15 to 20 minutes walking distance of where you live"]

(READ OUT)

(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 local life
d) 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)*

B2 How often do you participate in this sort of voluntary activity? Is it...

(READ OUT)

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

*(ALL)*

F9b intro And now turning to another issue, your sense of personal safety.

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

(READ OUT)

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

*(ALL)*

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

(READ OUT)

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

*(ALL)

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) Your spouse?
c) Your mother?
d) And finally, in which country was your father born?

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

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

*(IF DEM15a=2-33 NOT BORN IN AUSTRALIA)
DEM16 In what year did you arrive in Australia?
1. Year given (RECORD YEAR)
2. (Refused)
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)

DEM6. Are you an Australian citizen?

1 Yes
2 No
3 (Don’t know)
4 (Refused)

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)

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)
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)

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)

Do you consider yourself to be

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

Just one question about voting. For which political party did you vote in the recent federal election?

1. Labour Party
2. Liberal Party
3 National Party
4 Greens
5 Independents
6 Other (Specify) ________________________
7 Did not vote
8 (Don't Know)
9 (Refused)

*(IF DEM22=7 DID NOT VOTE)
DEM22a If you had voted, which party do you think you would have supported?

1 Labour Party
2 Liberal Party
3 National Party
4 Greens
5 Other (Specify) ________________________
6 (Don't Know)
7 (Refused)

*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)
Thank you for your help. Just in case you missed it my name is (...) and this survey was conducted on behalf of Monash University researchers.

If you have any queries or concerns about the survey, I have a number I can give you if you like.....

Questions about who is conducting the study and how your telephone number was obtained - The Social Research Centre, ph: 1800 023 040

Concerns or complaints about how the study is being conducted – Monash University Ethics Project Number: (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

Record language

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

Was this interview ...

1. Normal
2. Refusal conversion
**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>Household refusal</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one in household 18 plus</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent refusal</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntroMob=3</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Respondent under 18</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile refused safety question</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Respondent refusal</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile refused state</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile refused alternative number</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE – No follow up</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE – No follow up</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE – No follow up</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused postcode</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused postcode</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused postcode</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE – No follow up (Could not establish language)</td>
<td>Out of scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCODE</td>
<td>Final respondent postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGEGRP</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Australian/Overseas born flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Level of education (detail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education2</td>
<td>Level of education (summary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Employment status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMFLAG</td>
<td>Macromatch flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATCHID</td>
<td>Match ID (From Macromatch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Letter sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4  Primary Approach Letter
Dear Householder,

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

Details of the project may be accessed at http://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 population 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 2015 survey are available at 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组织。

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

本次问卷调查约需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。

Andrew Markus
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