



FACULTY OF
BUSINESS &
ECONOMICS

**JOURNEYS HOME
WAVE 2 TECHNICAL REPORT
October 2012**

Fieldwork, Response and Weighting

**Report prepared for the Australian Government Department of
Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs**



Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Survey Administration.....	1
2.1	Sample.....	1
2.2	Survey Mode	2
2.3	Pre-field Approach	2
2.4	Interviewers and Interviewer Support	3
2.5	Sample Updates from DEEWR.....	4
2.6	Tracking and Making Contact.....	4
2.7	Incentives	5
2.8	Managing sample movement	5
2.9	Interview Length and duration between interviews	6
3	Response and Sample Characteristics	7
3.1	Response Rates.....	7
3.2	Sample Characteristics and response bias	8
3.3	Response rate by geographical area	11
3.4	Data Linkage	11
3.5	Item non-response	12
3.6	Interviewer observations	12
4	Weighting	13
4.1	Response weight.....	13
4.2	Population Weight.....	19
5	References	19
6	Appendix	21

1 Introduction

The fieldwork for wave 2 was conducted over a 10 week-period from 1 March 2012. All wave 1 respondents (n=1,682) will be followed through all subsequent waves unless consent is subsequently withdrawn.

In wave 2 we continue to collect information on individuals' personal characteristics (and especially those that can change over time), housing and living arrangements, employment, financial situation, support services and networks, health and well-being, contact with the justice system and exposure to violence. A housing calendar that tracks individuals each episode of housing moves (up to 20 moves) was also introduced to collect information on housing mobility between wave 1 and wave 2 interviews.

Wave 2 fieldwork concluded on 17 May 2012 with an achievement rate of 91 per cent (1,525 complete interviews out of a 1,682 target sample), which is much higher than has been reported by most other longitudinal surveys that target disadvantaged groups.

This technical report documents wave 2 fieldwork administration, fieldwork outcomes, and weighting. The arrangement of the rest of the report is as follows:

- Section 2, Survey Administration: describes important fieldwork protocol, interview length and major difficulties confronted during wave 2 fieldwork, as well as reporting on interviewer feedback.
- Section 3, Response Rate and Sample Characteristics: summarises wave 2 survey outcomes including response rates and sample characteristics.
- Section 4, Weighting: presents the method used to generate response weights and population weights.

2 Survey Administration

The fieldwork for wave 2 was conducted over a 10-week period from 1 March to 17 May, 2012.

2.1 Sample

From wave 2 onwards, only the 1,682 wave 1 respondents will be approached for interviews. Descriptions of the Journeys Home population, sampling method and wave 1 responses are documented in the wave 1 technical report.

2.2 *Survey Mode*

The main method of data collection is face-to-face interviews using a questionnaire delivered by Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) tablet consoles. The location of the interview was of the sample member's choosing (but subject to concerns about interviewer safety). Telephone is used where that is the sample member's preferred mode or the person has moved to a location outside the reach of the interviewer network. As mentioned in the wave 1 technical report, the expectation was that the volume of telephone interviews would increase in subsequent waves. In wave 1, only 36 interviews (1.6% of total interviews) were conducted using telephone, which compares with 168 interviews (11%) in wave 2. Nearly half (45.8%) of the phone interviews conducted in wave 2 were with respondents who lived inside a survey region but nevertheless preferred to be interviewed by phone.

2.3 *Pre-field Approach*

Between the end of wave 1 fieldwork and the start of wave 2 fieldwork, efforts were made to keep in touch with sample members to maximise response in wave 2 fieldwork. Most notably, in the period late January to early February 2012, all sample members were sent a summary of wave 1 outcomes and details about wave 2.

Approximately two weeks prior to the beginning of fieldwork all sample members were sent a Primary Approach Letter (PAL) and brochure outlining the survey. These were mailed out in envelopes with an official Government crest and the Journeys Home logo to the listed residential and/or postal addresses. The letters were mailed out to the addresses provided by the respondent either at the end of wave 1 or when they updated their details in between waves. The PAL for wave 2 was designed to both inform the wave 1 respondents that they would be approached again and encourage them to participate. It was personalised with the individual's respondent ID, name and contact number (if provided) and provided them with the opportunity to contact Roy Morgan Research via the 1800 number or email should they have any questions or wish to provide more up-to-date contact details. The letter emphasised the scope of the survey by mentioning the approximate number of people who participated in wave 1. It was also communicated that the survey length would be shorter and background questions would not be asked again.

The brochure accompanying the PAL outlined the survey in more detail. Additional information included how they were selected to be invited to participate and details on confidentiality and voluntary participation. The brochure adhered to The Melbourne

University's Ethics Committee's Plain English Statement requirements. Interviewer and Team 1800 feedback advised that the letter / brochure contributed towards respondents' willingness to participate again, though of course not all were received.

Overall, the response to the pre-field approach was positive, with 202 (12%) respondents contacting Roy Morgan Research prior to wave 2 fieldwork. Of these respondents, 54 per cent (n=108) updated their home and / or postal address, 47 per cent updated their contact numbers, 22 per cent confirmed all of their details and the remaining 4 per cent called for other reasons, such as their availability for an interview.

2.4 Interviewers and Interviewer Support

All interviews are conducted by professional interviewers employed by Roy Morgan Research. A total of 36 interviewers were employed on wave 2. Of the 36 interviewers, 33 conducted interviews in wave 1 and three were new to the survey. The three new interviewers participated in two full days of training. The remaining 33 interviewers participated in one full day of training.

In wave 1, an additional session was conducted on Indigenous Australian Culture for interviewers working in areas with higher indigenous populations. Due to the fact that all wave 1 interviewers working in these areas returned to interview in wave 2, this training was not conducted again. Instead, a small session on indigenous interviewing was included in the full-day training session.

Interviewers and sample members are supported by a telephone support group (Team 1800), who staff project-specific free-call 1800 telephone numbers. During fieldwork these numbers were staffed 14 hours a day (8 am to 10 pm), seven days a week. The role of Team 1800 includes: handling respondent calls and emails; assisting interviewers by, for example, advising of changes in respondent details, providing technical CAPI support, advising on fieldwork protocols, advising on duty of care issues, and providing emotional support; and tracking respondents pre-field and when cases are returned to the office during fieldwork. Team 1800 members also conducted the majority of telephone interviews. A total of 15 Team 1800 staff members were trained on the Journeys Home project. Three of the Team 1800 staff members were new to survey. All Team 1800 staff members received one full day of training.

2.5 *Sample Updates from DEEWR*

DEEWR provided 5 sample updates for wave 2 which were extracted from the Centrelink data base on the following dates:

- 12 February 2012 (pre-fieldwork)
- 9 March 2012
- 30 March 2012
- 20 April 2012
- 4 May 2012

These updates were used in locating respondents, particularly if they have proven difficult to find. The information provided includes:

- the most recent contact information available and a flag indicating when each piece of contact information was changed, known as a date of effect; and
- flags for respondents who are Deceased, Overseas, or In Prison (in some cases the prison address was also provided).

2.6 *Tracking and Making Contact*

In wave 2, fieldwork interviewers drew upon the contact details provided by the sample members in wave 1 to track and make contact with sample members. The tracking protocols during fieldwork were:

- Review the previous reapproach suggestions and comments (from wave 1 interviewer / office) in planning their call strategies.
- Approach respondents who would be hard to locate early in field (e.g. those with no fixed address, or known to move around).
- Utilise all available contact information to find a respondent, keeping in mind the respondents' preferred method of contact communicated in the previous wave, or in between waves.
- If a respondent has moved from address follow up with current residents, neighbours, and their personal contacts provided in wave 1.
- If an email is available, request this be sent by Team 1800 to the respondent.
- Make enquiries with any service providers which may be of assistance, as either provided by the respondent and proved to be helpful previously.
- Utilise the DEEWR updates and Deceased, In Prison, and Overseas flags provided during fieldwork.

- If the sample member still remained untraceable, to return the sample to the office for Team 1800 to track.

Most of the above strategies proved to be useful in tracking respondents, especially the provision of updated details from DEEWR. The exception was service providers, who in some instances were helpful but were for the most part restricted in their ability to assist by confidentiality requirements.

2.7 Incentives

All sample members are offered a \$40 incentive each time they agree to be interviewed. In the case of face-to-face interviews, the incentive is provided as cash and paid immediately after the sample member agreed to participation. Cash incentives were provided in ‘thank-you’ envelopes. In the case of telephone interviews, the incentive is sent by mail, in cheque form, to the respondent after completion of the interview. All respondents are given the option to decline payment.

2.8 Managing sample movement


Monitoring and managing the movement of the sample members was handled on a daily basis throughout fieldwork. Interviewers were each provided with a list of ‘in-scope suburbs’ for their interviewing area/s and were instructed to ‘return to office’ any sample that moved outside of their area. The new address or location that the sample member moved to was then reviewed by the Journeys Home project team and either:

1. if within scope for another cluster area (or just near the boundary) the sample member was reassigned to the face-to-face interviewer in that area;
2. if outside of all cluster areas the sample member was reassigned for approach via telephone by Team 1800; or
3. in some instances, where the sample member moved just outside of the boundary of the cluster area the sample member remained assigned to the interviewer, the interviewer was instructed to still approach the respondent and gain an interview if possible.

2.9 Interview Length and duration between interviews


The average interview length of wave 2 interviews was expected to be approximately 40 minutes. The average achieved interview length was, at 34 minutes, considerably lower than this. There was, however, marked variation, with interview lengths ranging from between 13 and 98 minutes. Figure 1 shows the distribution of interview times.

In addition to length of the interview, the timing of the interview is important. Interviewers were encouraged to interview their sample approximately six months from the date of their last interview. Figure 2 shows the interval length between interviews. Sample members were interviewed anywhere from 4 to 8.5 months (16-34 weeks) later. For the majority of interviews (78%) the interval length between wave 1 and 2 interviews was 5 to 7 months (22-30 weeks). Almost one in five (19%) were re-interviewed less than 5 months from their wave 1 interview. The remaining 2 per cent were re-interviewed after 7 months or more since their wave 1 interview.



This graph is based 1,523 interviews. 2 interviews were excluded because of data issues

Figure 2: Length of interval between wave 1 and 2 interviews



3 Response and Sample Characteristics

3.1 Response Rates

In wave 2 fieldwork, the aim was to re-interview the 1,682 respondents from wave 1. A summary of the wave 2 fieldwork response outcomes is provided in Table 1. Persons who were in prison (n=16) or overseas (n=2) during the survey period or deceased (n=4) were subsequently defined as out-of-scope. This leaves a total of 1,660 in-scope sample.

Interviews were obtained from 1,529 in-scope sample members and of these 1,525 interviews were completed.

This gives a response rate of 92.1 per cent (1,529 out of the 1,660 in-scope sample) or an achievement rate of 90.7 per cent (1,525 out of the 1,682 total sample). The response rate is much higher than the 80 per cent wave 2 response rate that was projected in the proposal.

Among the 131 in-scope non-respondents were three persons who were too ill to participate, 34 refusals, 53 persons who despite being located were unable to be successfully contacted, and 42 persons who could not be located.

Journeys Home's follow-up response rate is far better than other Australian studies targeting disadvantaged populations. The Longitudinal Study of Reconnect Clients achieved a follow-

up response rate of 57.1 per cent (RPR Consulting 2003), while the Residents Outcomes Study achieved a re-interview rate of 40 per cent (Thomson Goodall Associates 2001). In fact, Journeys Home’s response rate also surpassed Australia’s general population panel survey, HILDA Survey, which achieved a follow-up response rate of 86.8 per cent (Watson and Wooden 2010, Table 2, p. 328).

Table1: Wave 2 Fieldwork Call Outcomes

<i>Sample outcome</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>% of Total sample</i>	<i>% of In-scope sample</i>
Starting sample (w1 respondents)	1682		
Less out-of-scope	22	1.3	
Total in-scope sample	1660	98.7	
Completed interviews	1525	90.7	91.9
Terminations	4	0.2	0.2
Incapable	3	0.2	0.2
Refusal	33	2.0	2.0
<i>Other non-response</i>			
Contact made	26	1.6	1.6
Non-contact & all calls made	27	1.6	1.6
Moved to unknown address	42	2.5	2.5

3.2 Sample Characteristics and response bias

To give a broad picture of the representativeness of the responding sample, Table 2 presents the characteristics of both the wave 2 and wave 1 responding samples. There do not appear to be any marked differences in the characteristics of these two samples, which should not be surprising given the low attrition rate. Nevertheless, the reported achievement rates do vary by characteristics, suggesting attrition is not totally random. The achievement rate for males, indigenous Australians and those without children were lower than their counterparts. Sample members with middle levels of education (year 12 or post school certificates) were more likely to respond than those with either higher or lower levels of educational attainment. Differences in achievement rates by income support payment type may seem sizeable, with 95 per cent of persons on Parenting Payment being interviewed compared with only 87 per cent of persons on DSP, but such differences are only weakly significant (at 10% level in a joint F test). Finally, although respondents who provided consent to data linkage in wave 1

are more likely to respond to wave 2 surveys, the difference is again not large enough to achieve statistical significance.

In addition to achievement rates, we also report the rate of telephone interview by sample characteristics. As mentioned, around 10 per cent of respondents were interviewed by phone. This is potentially of importance given the argument that survey mode may affect data quality. Respondents interviewed by phone may, for example, be more likely to provide socially desirable and/or satisficing answers simply because of the interview mode used (Jackle, Roberts & Lynn 2006). If the rate of telephone interview differs significantly by characteristics, the analysis of relationship between variables is more likely to be biased by the different interview mode.

In this study, telephone interviews are more likely to be applied to people with greater mobility given the majority of telephone interview cases involve persons who move out of a Journeys Home survey region. It is not surprising that the telephone interviewed sample tend to be younger and without dependent children. As a result, those who were on Newstart or Youth Allowances were also more likely to be interviewed through telephone. Non income support recipients also had higher rate of telephone interviews.

Such differences do not necessarily mean that data quality is severely undermined. It just means that care has to be taken when analysing the data; for example, by adding a telephone interview dummy variable as one of the control variables.

Table 2 Sample Characteristics

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Wave 1 respondents (n=1682)</i>	<i>Wave 2 respondents (n=1529)</i>	<i>Achievement rate (%)</i>	<i>Telephone Interviews (%)</i>
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	54.6	53.4	88.7	10.3
Female	45.4	46.6	93.1	9.7
<i>Age group</i>				
15-17	9.5	9.7	92.5	11.3
18-20	16.6	17.1	93.9	11.5
21-24	12.6	12.5	90.1	11.8
25-34	21.7	21.3	88.5	13.8
35-44	20.0	19.8	89.6	7.1
45-54	14.0	14.1	91.5	6.0
55+	5.6	5.6	89.5	6.3
<i>Indigenous status</i>				

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Wave 1 respondents (n=1682)</i>	<i>Wave 2 respondents (n=1529)</i>	<i>Achievement rate (%)</i>	<i>Telephone Interviews (%)</i>
Non-Indigenous	80.3	81.0	91.5	10.3
Indigenous	19.7	19.0	87.3	9.1
<i>Country of Birth</i>				
Australia	87.5	87.7	90.8	10.2
English speaking country	5.8	6.0	92.9	10.2
Non-English speaking country	6.7	6.3	86.6	8.0
<i>Marital status</i>				
Single	82.6	82.5	90.5	10.9
Partnered	17.2	17.4	91.7	9.7
Unknown	0.2	0.1	-	-
<i>Has dependent children</i>				
No	80.1	79.2	89.7	10.2
Yes	19.8	20.7	94.6	6.6
Unknown	0.1	0.1	-	-
<i>Education Level</i>				
Less than Year 10	20.3	19.7	88.3	9.1
Year 12	48.6	49.4	92.1	9.8
Apprenticeship/Trade Certificate	21.3	21.6	91.9	10.3
University	8.6	8.1	86.1	13.2
Unknown	1.2	1.1	85.0	10.5
<i>Consented to Centrelink data linkage</i>				
No	6.5	6.3	86.4	11.8
Yes	93.5	93.7	91.0	9.9
<i>Benefit type</i>				
Not on income support	9.0	9.2	92.7	13.2
Youth Allowance	33.9	33.8	90.4	11.7
New Start Allowance	19.8	20.1	91.9	11.2
Disability Support Pension	23.1	22.2	87.1	7.5
Parenting Payment	10.9	11.4	95.1	6.6
Other	3.0	3.0	90.0	6.0
Unknown	0.4	0.5	-	-

Notes: Response rates are based on wave 1 characteristics.

1) The four terminated cases in wave 2 fieldwork are included as respondents.

2) Dependent children are those under 18 years old living with the respondent all or most of the time.

3) Achievement rate and telephone interview rate are not reported for cells with less than 15 observations.

3.3 Response rate by geographical area

We also examined whether achievement rates vary by survey cluster (or location)¹. The achievement rate ranged from 79.4 per cent to 100 per cent. Two clusters attained an achievement rate of 100 per cent; both were in urban areas. Here, an urban area is defined as one of the five major capital cities (i.e. Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Perth and Adelaide), and a regional area as any other location. For clusters in regional areas, the response rate ranged from 83.9 per cent to 98.6 per cent. Only two regional area clusters (15.4% of regional area clusters) had an achievement rate lower than the overall achievement rate of 91 per cent. This compares to eight clusters in the major capital city areas (34.8% of capital city area clusters). Clearly clusters in the major capital city areas had both the worst and best performance. Despite the mixed performance of the major capital city area clusters, the mean achievement rate is similar to the regional area clusters. The mean response rate is 91.3 per cent in the major capital cities and 93.2 per cent in the regional areas; and, the difference is not statistically significant.

Those sample members whose last known location is outside the designated cluster regions were likely to have the lowest achievement rate. This is because, in a majority of cases, the only way of establishing contact would be by telephone, making contact difficult if: the telephone is disconnected; infrequently used; calls are screened by the sample member or a person known by the sample member; or they had changed their telephone number. As expected, the achievement rate for this group is relatively low – just 79.7 per cent.

3.4 Data Linkage

In wave 2, the survey sought consent from the respondents to allow researchers to link their Centrelink records to survey data if they had not already provided consent in wave 1. Of the 110 sample members who did not provide consent in wave 1, 96 were successfully re-interviewed, and 67 of them provided consent. This increased the data linkage consent rate from 93.4 per cent to 97.4 per cent of the total sample. Among the wave 2 responding sample the final data linkage consent rate is 98.1 per cent.

¹ Sample members may move location during the survey period and be re-assigned to different clusters. Here the information used to classify sample members into survey clusters is their last known geographical location.

3.5 *Item non-response*

Respondents were given the option to opt out of answering the violence and sexual violence section questions, as was the case in wave 1. However, the wave 2 instrument violence questions only asked about experiences of violence in the last six months. Among those who were re-interviewed in wave 2, more respondents opted to answer the violence section question (96% in wave 2 compared to 93.5% in wave 1). The number of respondents willing to answer the sexual violence questions also increased. Among those re-interviewed in wave 2, 88.6 per cent opted to answer the sexual violence questions in wave 1; in wave 2 the number of willing respondents increased to 94.8 per cent.

Item non-response in other sections of the wave 2 instrument is similar to or lower than wave 1 item non-response.

3.6 *Interviewer observations*

After every interview interviewers recorded their assessment of how the interview went. Interviewers provided responses on the respondent's understanding of the questions and issues that may have influenced the respondent's answers.

Of those who responded in both wave 1 and 2, the proportion rated as having an excellent or good understanding of the questions in wave 2 is 94.6 per cent, which compares with 92.8 per cent in wave 1. The proportion of respondents rated as having a poor or very poor understanding of the questions remained under one per cent.

Levels of co-operation and trust also increased among the responding sample. Less than 3 per cent were suspicious of the survey in wave 2, which compares with 5 per cent in wave 1. The rating of respondents' co-operation increased from 95.6 per cent to 97.4 per cent.

There were 183 (12%) interviews where the respondent had 'problems' that may have affected the interview. Mental illness was the most prevalent problem that may have affected the interview. Other problems included English language difficulties, being under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or just general confusion on the part of the respondent.

In some cases other people were present during interviews. Interviewers assessed whether the presence of other people influenced the answers of the respondent. For 255 interviews another person was present, and in 16 per cent (n=41) of these cases that presence was assessed as influencing the respondent's answers.

4 Weighting

Although the wave 2 attrition rate is low, as shown in the earlier section, non-random attrition does exist. We therefore generated weights that take into account the unequal probability of inclusion into the final responding sample. Three types of weight are provided in the data set.

- Design weight — adjusts for the probability of selection into wave 1 sample. The design weight remains unchanged for wave 2.
- Response weight — adjusts for the differential probability of response.
- Population weight — adjusts for design and response factors.

Details of how the response weight and population weight were created are described below.

4.1 Response weight

Response weights correct for the differential probability of response among that sample that was activated, excluding individuals who were recorded as deceased prior the last information update provided by DEEWR during wave 1 fieldwork (28 October 2011). The wave 2 response weight is defined as the wave 1 response weight multiplied by the inverse probability of wave 2 response given response in wave 1. That is,

$$W_{resp}^{wave2} = W_{resp}^{wave1} \times \frac{1}{P(Resp^{wave2} = 1 | Resp^{wave1} = 1)}$$

The probability of wave 2 response is created by estimating logistic regression models with variables from the administrative dataset (RED) extracted in June 2012 and wave 1 survey data. The predicted probability of response is capped at 0.2. That is the probability of response is set to 0.2 when the predicted probability of the observation is lower than 0.2.

The response weight is then rescaled such that the sum of the weights is equal to the size of the responding sample (i.e., 1,529).

For the purposes of weighting, a case is considered a ‘response’ if a person is interviewed or has been identified as overseas or deceased (through either DEEWR information updates or other reliable sources), and a ‘non-response’ is all other outcomes.²

A complication in estimating the wave 2 response probability is that not all wave 1 respondents provided consent to the Centrelink data linkage. For those who did not provide consent, we can only use either their wave 1 survey data or RED data but not both. To fully utilize the available information, two separate models were estimated to obtain the predicted probability of response. We first estimate a logistic model using variables derived from RED for the entire sample (n=1,682) to obtain the predicted probability for those individuals who did not provide data linkage consent.³ Next, variables from wave 1 survey response data are added to the model after restricting the sample to those individuals who provided consent (n=1,572) to obtain a predicted probability based on full information.

Explanatory variables from RED and survey administration data used in the final model include:⁴

- demographic variables;
- income support status at the start of the wave 2 survey period and the proportion of time on income support in between wave 1 and wave 2;
- personal characteristics while on income support, which include:
 - living arrangement (type of accommodation at the start of the wave 2 survey period, whether recorded as homeless at the start of the wave 2 survey period and numbers of moves in between the wave 1 and wave 2 interview periods);

² In wave 1, deceased sample members were excluded from the analysis instead of counted as response. This is because the initial sample were drawn from income support recipients. The wave 1 survey period is not far from the sampling reference period so it is unlikely that sample members moved off income support prior the time of death. Therefore, we assume all deaths were known and thus excluded from the analysis. However, in wave 2, the same assumption is unlikely to hold (there may be some sample members who passed away after they moved off income support and therefore their death may not be captured in the Centrelink data base. To allow for this uncertainty, death is counted as response in the logistic regression model.

³ We compared regression results from the survey data only model and the RED only model. The RED only model has better explanatory power and was therefore applied for the non-consent cases.

⁴ We also test many other variables that can potentially explain the response, such as education, mental health, etc. Due to the small number of non-response observations, inclusion of too many variables may run into a degree of freedom problem and yield a result where many variables have large coefficients and large standard errors. As a result the final model only includes basic demographic variables and variables that are statistically significant at 10 per cent to avoid introducing a large amount of noise in the probability estimates.

- proxies of the likelihood of contacting Centrelink between the wave 1 and wave 2 interview periods;
- whether recorded imprisonment between the wave 1 and wave 2 interview periods;
- whether the individual is assigned an interviewer who is different from their wave 1 interviewer; and
- to which geographical area at the start of the wave 2 survey period the sample member is located (three categories are included— within survey clusters in major capitals, within clusters in regional areas, or outside survey clusters).

Explanatory variables from survey response data include:

- equivalised family income;
- self-reported numbers of moves 6 months before the wave 1 interview and homeless status at wave 1 interview;
- self-reported health;
- whether mobile phone numbers are provided by the respondent at wave 1 interview;
- wave 1 interview length; and
- interviewer assessment of whether the respondent had difficulties during the wave 1 interview.

A detailed description of variables is included in Table A1 in the Appendix.

Table 5 presents results for the two logistic regressions. As noted above, one uses administrative data (RED) only while the other uses both RED and survey data. The signs of the coefficients on the demographic variables largely accord with the descriptive analysis presented in Section 3. However, gender, age and presence of dependent children become insignificant after other variables are controlled for. Indigenous Australians/Torres Strait Islanders and immigrants from non-English speaking countries are less likely to respond to the wave 2 survey. Individuals with a partner who is not on income support are also less likely to respond. However, this is only a very small group of people, so partnered persons on average still have higher response rates than single persons.

Sample members who were on income support at the start of the survey period are more likely to respond than those who were off income support. Those on student related payments

have the highest probability of response. Those who were on payment types that required frequent contact with Centrelink, such as Newstart and Youth Allowance, have a higher probability of response than others, possibly because their contact details are more up-to-date. Those who were on income support only some of the time between wave 1 and 2 interviews (most of them moved off income support recently) were also less likely to respond.

As mentioned in the previous section, the refusal rate is very low. Being unable to locate the respondent appears to be the most common reason for non-response. Thus, variables that capture the individual's mobility and currency of contact details appear important in explaining non-response. Those who changed address between interview periods have a lower probability of response, while those who had recent contact with Centrelink (indicating higher currency of address details) have a higher probability of response. Those recorded by Centrelink to be homeless at the start of wave 2 survey period are less likely to respond to the survey. Recent imprisonment also has a significant negative effect on the probability of response.

Individuals who moved outside the 36 survey clusters are much less likely to respond. A number of reasons, such as only being contactable by telephone, difficulty of locating them and a change of interviewer may have contributed to this lower probability of response. However, in other cases where the interviewer changed, no adverse effects on the response rate were found. In fact, the three survey clusters assigned the new interviewers had excellent response rates, presumably reflecting the quality of the new interviewers. The interview rate of those who move to another survey cluster is not different from those who stay in the initial cluster. These results suggest that using telephone as the sole contact mode is not a good way to reach this population.

Additional variables from wave 1 survey data mainly capture individuals' level of disadvantage. Persons who frequently move, and in particular, those who move more than 7 times within the 6 months prior to the wave 1 interview, have a lower probability of re-interview. Those who were homeless at the time of the wave 1 interview are also less likely to be re-interviewed. Surprisingly those who had poor health were more likely to respond than people with average health, while those who had excellent health were less likely to respond. This may relate to how individuals' feel about the relevance of this survey to them. Surprisingly, income does not appear to matter much.

Table 5: Logistic regression results

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Administrative data model</i>		<i>Survey and administrative data model</i>	
	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>Std. Err.</i>	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>Std. Err.</i>
Female	0.298	0.215	0.241	0.238
Indigenous	-0.460*	0.228	-0.375	0.251
<i>Country of Birth (Australia)</i>				
Main English speaking countries	0.427	0.494	0.231	0.505
Other non-main English speaking countries	-0.604#	0.326	-0.579	0.373
<i>Age (15-17)</i>				
18-20	0.462	0.458	0.632	0.481
21-24	0.088	0.539	0.085	0.570
24-35	0.082	0.516	0.267	0.554
34-44	0.407	0.531	0.500	0.571
45-54	0.469	0.556	0.615	0.606
55+	0.761	0.648	0.842	0.690
<i>Benefit type (Not on IS)</i>				
Student	3.229**	1.210	3.322**	1.255
Youth Allowance other	1.439#	0.740	1.649*	0.792
Newstart Allowance	1.335*	0.643	1.453*	0.676
Disability Support Pension	0.762	0.663	0.912	0.700
Parenting Payment	1.177	0.904	1.370	0.938
Other	-0.457	0.787	-0.204	0.849
<i>Proportion of time on IS (100%)</i>				
None of the time	-0.247	0.576	-0.082	0.648
Some of the time	-0.969*	0.381	-0.861*	0.402
Have dependent children at start of wave 2 fieldwork	0.382	0.567	0.327	0.591
<i>Partner on IS (Single)</i>				
Partner not on IS	-1.424*	0.685	-1.898*	0.781
Partner on IS	0.208	0.433	0.330	0.452
Missing	1.114#	0.638	1.240#	0.685
Ex offender	-1.486**	0.445	-1.488**	0.482
<i>Rent payment type (Private)</i>				
Government	0.375	0.795	-0.226	0.824
Lodgings	-0.361	0.258	-0.393	0.282
No rent	-0.378	0.254	0.175	0.279
Other	-0.864*	0.389	-1.012*	0.418
Missing	0.350	0.400	0.187	0.442
Vulnerability: Homeless start of field work	-1.112**	0.428	-1.067*	0.45

Number of moves between wave 1 and wave 2 midpoint

1 move	-0.443*	0.225	-0.393	0.242
2 moves or more	-0.666*	0.270	-0.642*	0.291
Contact with Centrelink	0.814**	0.301	0.568#	0.308

Assigned to different interviewer (same interviewer)

Assigned to different continuing interviewer	0.109	0.709	-0.115	0.738
Assigned to new interviewer	0.850#	0.464	0.822#	0.481

Geographical (major capital city area)

Regional area	0.038	0.206	0.053	0.223
Outside interview region	-0.950**	0.352	-0.860*	0.39

Equivalised family income (less than \$750)

\$750+			-0.224	0.398
Missing			1.319#	0.755

Self-reported number of moves 6 months before wave 1 interview

1 to 2			-0.232	0.243
3 to 6			-0.283	0.326
7+			-0.845*	0.416
Missing			0.387	1.393
Homeless			-0.412#	0.226

Health (fair/good/very good)

Poor			0.668#	0.368
Excellent			-0.513#	0.302
Provided mobile phone contact			0.494#	0.253
Had difficulties during interview			-0.301	0.219

Interview length (40 to 79 minutes)

Less than 30 minutes			-1.707**	0.642
30 to 40 minutes			0.115	0.382
80+ minutes			0.457	0.342
Constant	1.498#	0.805	1.165	0.917
Pseudo R-squared	0.136		0.170	
Sample size	1682		1572	
Log-likelihood	-431.007		-378.065	

p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01

Interview length in wave 1, on the other hand, does matter, with persons who had a relatively short interview (less than 30 minutes) in wave 1 being far less likely to participate in the

wave 2 interview. The short interview may signal a lack of enthusiasm of the respondents to the survey. Finally, as expected, people who provided a mobile phone number during the wave 1 survey were more likely to respond to the wave 2 survey. This finding is to be expected. Sample members with access to mobile telephones are more easily contacted. However, the mere fact of providing a mobile phone number may reflect a willingness to participate in the survey in the future.

4.2 Population Weight

The wave 2 population weight is the wave 1 population weight adjusted for the probability of response in wave 2. That is, the wave 1 population weight is multiplied by the inverse probability of responding in wave 2 (given response in wave 1), with group specific rescaling factors so that the sum of the weights across all cases that had acceptable outcomes in each of the homeless, at risk and vulnerable groups equal the size of population in that group. The acceptable outcomes include all respondents, persons overseas or in prison during the survey period. The population here refers to the initial Journeys Home population in clusters that were not undersize (i.e., Journeys Home survey population) excluding those who were deceased prior 28 October 2011⁵. The size of population is 22,568 for the ‘homeless’ group; 13,101 for the ‘at risk’ group; and 74,682 for the ‘vulnerable’ group.

The sum of the weights for the responding sample is 109,776 (‘homeless’ 22,467; ‘at risk’ 13,101; ‘vulnerable’ 74,208).

We also include another population variable in the data set — the population weight rescaled so the sum of the weights equals the size of the responding sample (i.e., 1,529).

5 References

Jackle A., Roberts C., and Lynn P., 2006, Telephone versus Face-to-Face Interviewing: Mode Effects on Data Quality and Likely Causes Report on Phase II of the ESS-Gallup Mixed Mode Methodology Project, ISER Working Paper 2006-41, University of Essex, Colchester.

⁵ To be eligible for inclusion in the final sample of the Journeys Home survey, a cluster in a major city had to have at least 45 flagged persons (that is, persons flagged as either ‘homeless’ or ‘at risk’) and a cluster in a regional or rural centre at least 65 flagged persons. More details on the sample design are described in the Journeys Home wave 1 technical report.

RPR Consulting 2003, Longitudinal Survey of Reconnect Clients: Statistical Report of the Longitudinal Survey of Reconnect Clients, Canberra, FaHCSIA. [Available from: <http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/our-responsibilities/housing-support/publications-articles/homelessness-youth/longitudinal-survey-of-reconnect-clients-0>]

Thomson Goodall Associates 2001, Residents Outcomes Research Study, Report prepared for the Interagency Working Party on Crisis Accommodation and funded by the Victorian Department of Human Services, Melbourne, Thomson Goodall Associates.

Watson N., and Wooden M. 2010, The HILDA Survey: Progress and Future Developments. *Australian Economic Review* 43(3), September, 326-336.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2011, *Discussion Paper: Methodological Review of Counting the Homeless, 2006* (ABS cat no. 2050.0.55.001), Canberra, ABS.

6 Appendix

Table A1 Variable Description and Summary Statistics

		All wave 1 sample (n=1682)		Sample that gave data linkage consent (n=1572)	
Variable	Categories	Frequency (n)	Proportion (%)	Frequency (n)	Proportion (%)
Gender	Male	918	54.6	852	54.2
	Female	764	45.4	720	45.8
Indigenous status	No	1350	80.3	1258	80.0
	Yes	332	19.7	314	20.0
Country of birth	Australia	1472	87.5	1374	87.4
	Main English Speaking Country	98	5.8	94	6.0
	Non-main English Speaking Country	112	6.7	104	6.6
Age category reported at wave 1 interview	15-17	109	6.5	105	6.7
	18-20	308	18.3	296	18.8
	21-24	218	13.0	207	13.2
	25-34	370	22.0	340	21.6
	35-44	335	19.9	309	19.7
	45-54	245	14.6	225	14.3
	55+	97	5.8	90	5.7
Highest education level reported at wave 1 interview	Less than year 10	341	20.3	315	20.0
	Year 10 to Year 12	818	48.6	776	49.4
	Certificate/Trade apprenticeship	359	21.3	331	21.1
	Diploma/University Degree	144	8.6	133	8.5
	Missing	20	1.2	17	1.1
Have dependent child/ren at the start of wave 2 fieldwork. Dependent children are those under 16 years old.	No	1400	83.2	1295	82.4
	Yes	282	16.8	277	17.6
Equivalised family income; this is total sample member and partner's income divided by the square root of the family size. Family members	Less than \$750	1488	88.5	1408	89.6
	\$750+	106	6.3	98	6.2

		All wave 1 sample (n=1682)		Sample that gave data linkage consent (n=1572)	
Variable	Categories	Frequency (n)	Proportion (%)	Frequency (n)	Proportion (%)
include sample member plus partner and dependent children (under 18 living with the sample member).	Missing	88	5.2	66	4.2
Number of moves 6 months before wave 1 up to wave 1 interview	None	961	57.1	887	56.4
	1 to 2 moves	453	26.9	429	27.3
	3 to 6 moves	194	11.5	186	11.8
	more than 6	65	3.9	63	4.0
	Missing	9	0.5	7	0.4
Homeless status derived from wave 1 survey data, using the Melbourne Institute definition ¹ . Anyone classified as primary, secondary or tertiary homeless under the Melbourne Institute homeless definition is in the homeless category.	Not Homeless	1286	76.5	1199	76.3
	Homeless	396	23.5	373	23.7
Health status reported at wave 1 interview	Poor	221	13.1	207	13.2
	Average (Very Good/Good/Fair)	1301	77.3	1214	77.2
	Excellent	160	9.5	151	9.6
Provided mobile number to help with follow up for wave 2 interviews	No	283	16.8	256	16.3
	Yes	1399	83.2	1316	83.7
Interviewer recorded problems that may have influenced the interview. The problems include mental illness,	No	1228	73.0	1166	74.2

		All wave 1 sample (n=1682)		Sample that gave data linkage consent (n=1572)	
Variable	Categories	Frequency (n)	Proportion (%)	Frequency (n)	Proportion (%)
language difficulties, poor co-operation, suspiciousness, health problems, intoxication and the influence of other people present during the interview	Yes	454	27.0	406	25.8
Length of wave 1 interview. The cut points were derived by taking the points that were 1 and 2 standard deviations from the mean.	less than 30 minutes	17	1.0	17	1.1
	30 to 40	159	9.5	143	9.1
	40 to 80	1309	77.8	1223	77.8
	80+	197	11.7	189	12
Benefit type at the start of wave 2 fieldwork	Not on benefit	203	12.1	188	12.0
	Student	82	4.9	78	5.0
	Youth allowance other	219	13.0	212	13.5
	Newstart allowance	519	30.9	484	30.8
	Disability support pension	413	24.6	373	23.7
	Parenting payment	200	11.9	198	12.6
	Other	46	2.7	39	2.5
Proportion of time on income support between the middle of wave 1 fieldwork to the middle of wave 2 fieldwork	None	83	4.9	74	4.7
	Some of the time	256	15.2	244	15.5
	Entire period	1343	79.8	1254	79.8
Partner on income support at the start of wave 2 fieldwork	Not Partnered	1354	80.5	1268	80.7
	Partner not on income support	22	1.3	20	1.3
	Partner on income support	121	7.2	114	7.3
	Missing	185	11.0	170	10.8
Ex offender in between middle of wave 1	No	1645	97.8	1537	97.8

		All wave 1 sample (n=1682)		Sample that gave data linkage consent (n=1572)	
Variable	Categories	Frequency (n)	Proportion (%)	Frequency (n)	Proportion (%)
fieldwork and wave 2 fieldwork	Yes	37	2.2	35	2.2
Rent payment type at the start of wave 2 fieldwork	Private	613	36.4	574	36.5
	No rent	406	24.1	381	24.2
	Lodgings	369	21.9	347	22.1
	Government	36	2.1	33	2.1
	Other (includes: Mooring fees, site fees, Other housing organisation, net rent being assessed and other)	76	4.5	72	4.6
	Not in rent table	182	10.8	165	10.5
Recorded vulnerability of being homeless at the start of wave 2 fieldwork	No	1635	97.2	1525	97
	Yes	47	2.8	47	3.0
Number of moves from the middle of wave 1 fieldwork to the middle of wave 2 fieldwork	No moves	1086	64.6	1004	63.9
	1 move	397	23.6	376	23.9
	2 or more moves	199	11.8	192	12.2
Had contact with Centrelink between the middle of wave 1 and the middle of wave 2 fieldwork	No	1306	77.6	1162	73.9
	Yes	376	22.4	410	26.1
Assigned to a different interviewer for wave 2 fieldwork. A change in the interviewer excludes those re-assigned to Team 1800.	Kept the same interviewer at the start of wave 2	1473	87.6	1370	87.2
	Re-assigned to different continuing interviewer	27	1.6	27	1.7
	Re-assigned to new interviewer	182	10.8	175	11.1
Location of respondent using last known location at the start of wave 2 fieldwork	Major capital city area	817	48.6	751	47.8
	Regional area	788	46.8	749	47.6
	Outside interview region	77	4.6	72	4.6

1) Scutella R., Johnson G., Moschion J., Tseng Y. and Wooden M., 2012, Wave 1 findings, Journeys Home Research Report No.1