

# **The HILDA Survey and Research on Families**

Ruth Weston

*Australian Institute of Family Studies*

and

Mark Wooden

*Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research,  
University of Melbourne*

Paper presented at the Eighth Australian Institute of Family Studies  
Conference – “Step Forward for Families: Research, Practice and Policy”.  
Melbourne Exhibition Centre, 12-14 February.

## **Acknowledgements**

The HILDA Survey was initiated, and is funded, by the Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services. It is managed by a group based at the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne. Apart from the Melbourne Institute, the other partners are the Australian Council for Educational Research and the Australian Institute of Family Studies.

A version of this paper was published in *Family Matters*, Issue no. 63, Spring / Summer 2002, pp. 66-73.

In 2001 the first wave of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (or HILDA) Survey, a major new household panel study, was conducted. While the coverage of the HILDA Survey is broad-ranging, one of its three principal areas of interest is household formation, and especially the changing role of families in Australian society. This article examines the potential for this new survey to contribute to research on families in Australia. It begins by summarising the case for yet another survey. It then moves on to provide brief summaries of the survey design and sample selection process, the type of information being collected, and the outcomes from wave 1. The paper then concludes with a discussion of the sorts of family issues that could be explored with these data.

### **The need for household panel data**

The obvious question that many may ask is do we really need yet another survey. The HILDA Survey, however, is distinctly different from most other surveys conducted in Australia in that it is a panel, or longitudinal, survey. That is, it involves re-surveying the same persons over time, whereas most surveys are simple cross-sections and hence provide a snapshot at a single point in time. This distinction is critical for understanding any type of economic or social change. It is, for example, ideal for analysing the effects of marital separation. With cross-section data the only way this question can be broached is through identifying sample members who have separated recently and then collecting information about their past retrospectively. This, however, is problematic, both because of recall problems and because of the likely contamination of response as a result of the separation. Objective analyses of the impact of marital separation require data collected pre- and post-separation, which in turn require longitudinal methods.

Second, the HILDA Survey involves conducting interviews with all members of the household (aged 15 years or over). This again marks the HILDA Survey as relatively distinctive. The Family Characteristics Survey run by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) in 1997, for example, was conducted on an “any responsible adult” basis, meaning that one household member responded on behalf of all others. This method obviously precludes asking subjective questions. It also raises concerns about the accuracy of some of the data collected. For example, while it can be expected that one household member will know the employment status of all other household members, is it reasonable to expect them to know more specific details of the employment arrangement (such as hours of work)?

### **Survey design and sample selection**

The broad objective of the HILDA Survey is to select a nation-wide sample of private households and then attempt to trace all of the individual members of these households, including children, over time. Individuals would only drop out of the sample in the event of death, emigration from Australia, the acquisition of some disability that prevented further participation (such as the onset of dementia), and incarceration.

However, the HILDA Survey involves more than just re-interviewing persons interviewed in the previous wave. In line with the designs used in most of the household panel studies conducted overseas (such as the British Household Panel Survey [BHPS] and the German Socio-Economic Panel [GSOEP]), the sample is automatically extended over time by “following rules”. That is, any new children or members of the selected

households (including both biological and adopted children) as well as any new household members resulting from changes in the composition of the original households are added to the sample. This is a deliberate and important feature of the HILDA Survey design, and is expected to greatly enhance the power of research into questions concerning the influences on, and impact of, changing household structure. Furthermore, with time this indefinite life panel approach is clearly superior in terms of addressing questions concerning the socio-economic links between generations.

The data collection unit is the household, with the initial sample of households selected using a multi-stage approach. First, a sample of 488 Census Collection Districts (CDs) were selected from across Australia (each of which consists of approximately 200 to 250 households). Second, within each of these CDs, a sample of 22 to 34 dwellings were selected, depending on the expected response and occupancy rates of the area. This resulted in a total of 12,252 dwellings being selected. Selections were made after all dwellings within each of the CDs were fully listed. Finally, within each dwelling, up to three households were selected to be part of the sample. Note that the intent was only to select occupied private dwellings, and hence dwellings that were subsequently discovered to be vacant or businesses were excluded from the sample.

The intent is to conduct survey waves annually, though funding beyond wave 3 has yet to be secured.

### **Instrument content**

As defined by the principal client, the Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services, the primary objective of the HILDA Survey is to support research questions falling within three broad and inter-related areas. These are: (i) income dynamics; (ii) labour market dynamics; and (iii) family dynamics. Thus we would expect to include in each wave of the survey a set of like (if not identical) questions covering each of these three broad areas.

The income component in wave 1 has been designed to provide a measure of previous financial year income of all individual household members. Household income, therefore, has to be calculated by summing across individual household members. Further, our approach, which is based closely on that used in the ABS Survey of Income and Housing Costs, involves deducing total individual income from the sum of different components. The HILDA data will thus provide measures of each of the different components of income – wages and salaries, pensions and benefits, business income, and so on. Measures of current income, but only for wages and salaries and for government pensions and benefits, are also sought.

Questions about employment and job search activity are primarily concerned with job characteristics for those employed at the time of interview, and with work intentions and job search activity for those not in employment. In addition, one of the novel features of the HILDA Survey is the inclusion of a calendar covering the period between 1 July in the preceding year and the time of interview. This calendar will be used to collect data on the length and timing of different spells of employment and unemployment and periods spent in study.

The family oriented components of the survey are dealt with in more detail below, but include a section on childcare arrangements, asked of one member in the household, a section on family formation, with a particular emphasis on child-parent contact in families that are no longer intact, and a section on partnering. In addition, additional questions about parenting and other aspects of family life are included in a self-completion questionnaire.

The range of topics covered by the HILDA Survey extends well beyond these three broad areas to include such diverse issues as housing, health, and quality of life. In addition, during wave 1 an extensive array of personal characteristics was also collected. This array extends well beyond the standard demographic variables to include, for example, parental and family background, marital history and labour market history variables.

A particularly novel feature of the HILDA Survey, at least relative to its international counterparts, is the amount of subjective data that is being collected. While a very limited range of attitudinal questions are included in both the BHPS and GSOEP, the addition of a leave-behind self-completion instrument as part of the suite of HILDA Survey instruments has facilitated the collection of far more information of this kind.

In future waves, while much of the content will remain stable, it is expected that there will be scope for up to 10 minutes of interview time to be devoted to special topics. The topic for wave 2 is household assets and debts, with the broad objective being to measure net household wealth. In wave 3 we are planning separate modules on retirement and the use of information technology to facilitate learning and training.

## **Wave 1 outcomes**

### *Data collection*

The data collection task, at least for the first three waves, has been sub-contracted to ACNielsen, a private market research company. The majority of wave 1 data were collected through face-to-face interviews, which mostly took place between 24 August 2001 and 21 December 2001, with the workload spread across a total of 139 interviewers.

After establishing contact with a member of the household, an interview lasting, on average, around 10 minutes, was conducted with at least one member of the household. Further interviews were then pursued with each household member aged 15 years and over, and averaged 34 minutes in length. Once an individual completed this interview they were then provided with a Self-Completion Questionnaire (SCQ) to complete in private. The interviewer returned to the household at a later date to pick up the SCQ. If the SCQ was still not complete or could not be collected in person, instructions were left with the respondent to return it by mail.

In most cases, selected households were sent a primary approach letter and a brochure approximately one week prior to when the interviewer was scheduled to make contact with the household. To encourage response, a \$50 cash incentive was offered to households where all eligible household members completed the Person Questionnaire. If this did not occur, a \$20 payment was made if at least one interview was obtained.

### *Response rates*

A summary of wave 1 response rates is provided in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 reveals that from the 11,693 households identified as in scope, interviews were completed with all eligible members of 6872 households and with at least one eligible member of a further 810 households. The household response rate was, therefore, 66 per cent.

The person-level outcomes are provided in Table 2. Within the 7682 households at which interviews were conducted, there were 19,917 people, resulting in an average of 2.6 persons per household. Of these people, 4790 were under 15 years of age on the preceding 30 June and hence ineligible for an interview in wave 1. This provided a sample of 15,127 eligible persons, 13,969 of who completed the Person Questionnaire (PQ) interview.

### *Sample characteristics*

Table 3 provides a summary of selected characteristics of the sample of individual respondents. Moreover, to assist in the assessment of how representative this sample is, we also provide comparative population data from the Monthly Population Survey conducted by the ABS.

This table demonstrates that the HILDA sample is noticeably different from the broader population in a number of ways. First, Sydney residents are under-represented in the HILDA sample. The first column in Table 3 indicates that according to the ABS Monthly Population Survey for October 2001, persons living in Sydney comprised 21.5 per cent of the Australian population aged 15 years and over. In contrast, Sydney residents make up only 16.9 per cent of the sample of persons completing a PQ. This difference, we believe, reflects both greater difficulties making contact with the occupants of selected dwellings in Sydney (e.g., as a result of a relatively high incidence of dwellings with locked gates, gatekeepers and other devices intended to screen access) and a greater reluctance to participate because of time commitments.

Second, the HILDA sample has an under-representation of men and an over-representation of women, which is not uncommon in voluntary surveys.

Third, married persons are over-represented (and unmarried persons under-represented). In part, this was to be expected given the population for HILDA excludes persons living in institutions. It was also expected that it would be more difficult to make contact with persons living alone. Nevertheless, the size of the differential is much larger than expected.

Fourth, immigrants from a non-English-speaking background comprise only 14.7 per cent of the HILDA sample, which compares with a population estimate of 17.5 per cent. We suspect this difference reflects, at least in part, the greater difficulties communicating with persons for whom English was not their first language.

Of the other characteristics considered, the differences are small and often insignificant. The age composition of the HILDA individual sample, for example, is quite close to the MPS, even though the HILDA sample excludes persons living in institutions, which will tend to mean a lesser representation of older people. That said, it is true that people in their early 20s are under-represented. The breakdown by labour force status is also similar, though persons working part-time are over-represented while persons outside the

labour force status are under-represented. We suggest that these differences might be explained by both the over-representation of married women and by the exclusion of persons living in institutions. Finally, when comparing our sample of employed persons with that reported in the August 2001 MPS, we again found only small differences. Specifically, there does appear to be an under-representation of own account workers (that is, the self-employed) in the HILDA sample.

### **Potential contribution to research on families**

Overall, there can be little doubt that the HILDA Survey has the potential to provide extremely rich data on families, including couple and sole parent families, old and young families, the advantaged and disadvantaged, and those in rural and urban settings. We now turn to a discussion of some of the more important issues that could be examined with these data.

#### *Paid work and non-parental childcare arrangements*

The HILDA survey derives very detailed information on work-related non-parental childcare arrangements, with wave 2 extending the focus by tapping arrangements set in place to meet parents' non-work needs. Work-related issues cover thoughts about using different forms of childcare, difficulties surrounding childcare use (e.g., finding good quality childcare, juggling multiple childcare arrangements, finding child care during school holidays), and childcare arrangements that are in place for pre-schoolers and for school age children during school term and during school holidays. For each child, the types of care used are ascertained (including self-care for school-age children and care by siblings for all children), along with the hours per week the child usually spends in each type of care and its associated cost.

It will thus be possible to identify the circumstances of families linked with exclusive use of certain types of care, use of multiple forms of care per child or across children, and placement of children in non-parental care for short or long periods, along with exclusive reliance on parental care.

Such information has important policy implications. For instance, previous research suggests that most mothers want to care for their infants full-time and to increase their hours of work as their child grows older (McDonald 2000), and that most people believe that mothers ought to remain at home to care for infants (Evans & Kelley 2002). Under what circumstances do parents place their very young children in long hours of non-parental care? How many parents do so despite feeling that this is not in the best interests of their child, and what factors appear to be implicated in their decisions? Under what circumstances do parents rely on multiple forms of care for children, sibling care for very young children, or self-care for children in their early primary school years?

The survey also gathers information about numerous issues that may shed light on links between childcare and paid work decisions, and between these arrangements and parental well-being. For example, HILDA not only derives details about financial and labour market circumstances of families, but also parents' perceptions of their financial well-being and of various aspects of their paid work (e.g., their job security, autonomy, access to family-friendly benefits), along with benefits and difficulties they experience in

combining paid work and family life. Information is also obtained about parents' satisfaction with their relationship with their children and each other (if living together or if this was their most recent partnership), the stress they feel in relation to their parenting responsibilities, perceived fairness of their domestic and childcare responsibilities, their sense of time pressure, physical and emotional health, perceptions of social support, and health-related lifestyle patterns (physical exercise, alcohol consumption, and cigarette smoking).

Much further down the track, as the children mature, the significance of early childcare and family life experiences for children's developmental outcomes can be examined. All such research issues have important policy implications for helping parents balance work and family life, enjoy their parenting, and maximise their children's chances of developing into well-adjusted and productive members of society.

#### *Marital status and well-being*

A number of studies have suggested that married people tend to be happier and healthier than those in other marital status categories (particularly those who are separated or divorced), but the mechanisms linking marital status and well-being remain uncertain (see Coombs, 1991; de Vaus 2002; Stock & Eshleman 1998). Wave 1 of HILDA will shed some light on the importance of various objective and subjective factors linked with each partner in explaining these patterns.

However, a better understanding of the mechanisms linking marital status with personal well-being will be achieved over time as the survey waves accumulate. We will then be able to assess that extent to which differences in the well-being of people in different marital status groups result from "social selection" as opposed to "social causation". Here, social selection applies if people who are happy and healthy are particularly likely to get married and stay married, while social causation applies if marriage is more likely than other marital statuses to promote health and happiness.

By controlling for social selection factors, we will derive greater insight into the strength and nature of social causation – that is, the benefits that marriage tends to confer on partners. For instance, Stock and Eshleman (1998) argue that personal well-being is promoted by the economic protection provided by marriage and by the emotional support and encouragement of healthy lifestyles provided by spouses.

Very differently, some authors argue that marriage is more beneficial to men than women, although recent research by de Vaus (2002) suggests that mental health disorders of married men and women vary in form (dysfunctional mood versus behaviour) but not in overall incidence. Even so, should separation take place, both partners are more likely to see the decision as unilateral rather than joint and to attribute the separation decision to the wife rather than to the husband (McDonald 1986; Wolcott & Hughes 1999). The array of objective and subjective measures in HILDA survey will shed light on some of the mechanisms that help explain such patterns.

#### *Financial hardship and relationship breakdown*

Consistent with Stock & Eshleman's (1998) contention that the financial protection that is typically provided by marriage promotes personal well-being, a great deal of evidence has amassed suggesting the financial hardship increases the risks of relationship

breakdown (White & Rogers 2000; Clarke & Berrington 1999; Kiernan & Mueller 1999). The detailed information provided by HILDA will throw light on the mechanisms underlying this link.

Ambert (1998) maintains that poverty threatens marital relationships indirectly, by generating depression, marital conflict, tension and in some cases, violence. However, she also refers to research suggesting that male unemployment is particularly problematic for couples. Why would this be so? According to Ambert, men are prone to feeling “diminished” by their unemployment and unsuccessful search for jobs and may react negatively towards their wives, while wives may resent the associated financial difficulties or their need to shoulder the entire breadwinning responsibility. Other processes damaging to relationships may also be involved. For instance, Jorm (1997) and de Vaus (2002) conclude that men are more likely than women to express their distress through problematic behaviours, such as heavy drinking. Such behaviours may be especially damaging to relationships.

The HILDA data will provide important insights into processes through which objective financial hardship created by different circumstances may threaten relationship stability, including the role of physical and emotional problems in each partner, drinking patterns, interpretation of financial circumstances, and satisfaction with family relationships.

Another example of how relevant the HILDA Survey is for policy-driven research on families is its ability to throw light on the nature of links between financial hardship and family breakdown. Parental separation often creates an economic crisis since the money that supported an intact family is often insufficient to meet the costs of the two newly formed households, one of which includes the children. But as the HILDA Survey waves accumulate and increasing numbers of couples in the sample separate, we will gain a much better understanding of the extent to which post-separation financial difficulties can be explained by pre-existing financial hardship that may have contributed to relationship breakdown. This information is clearly important for the establishing timely prevention and intervention strategies.

In exploring these issues through HILDA, researchers will be able to take into account many other factors known to threaten marital stability, such as early age at marriage, low education, non-traditional family values, emotional problems, and parental divorce during respondents’ childhood (see Wolcott & Hughes 1999). The ability to take into account characteristics of each partner, and thus characteristics of the couple relationship, will enhance our understanding of the nature and relative contribution of factors that promote or threaten relationship well-being. The interconnections between factors linked with divorce appear to be very complex. For instance, in the UK, McAllister (1999) reports that, while divorce is more closely associated with age at marriage than with “social class”, those in low social classes are more likely to marry as teenagers and thus experience both financial difficulties and divorce.

#### *The stability of marriages preceded by cohabitation*

Premarital cohabitation is another factor that has commonly been linked with marital instability, despite the opportunities cohabitation should provide for screening out unsuitable matches. Previous research suggests a number of social selection factors that contribute to this link. That is, couples that follow the different pathways to marriage

vary systematically in ways that appear to affect the quality of their relationship (see ABS 1998; Clarke & Berrington 1999; Glezer, Edgar & Prolisko 1992).

However, since premarital cohabitation has increased dramatically and is now adopted by the majority of couples – 72% of those who married in 2001 (ABS 2002) – the link between mode of entry into marriage and marital stability may be weakening for more recent birth cohorts. On the other hand, those who marry at the outset may be more likely than the majority who initially cohabit to possess characteristics that promote the well-being or at least stability of marriage.

There remains, of course, the possibility that social selection factors do not fully account for the relationship between cohabitation and marital stability. For instance, some cohabiting couples may decide to marry in the hope of saving their troubled relationship, or the experience of cohabitation itself may change couples' attitudes or behaviour in ways that threaten marital stability (see Andrews Report 1998; Axin & Thornton, 1992; Thomson & Colella 1992). While wave 1 of HILDA will enable researchers to examine social selection factors that might influence the stability of relationships, it will be possible to examine the relevance of cohabiting experiences on marital stability after several years of data collection.

#### *Views about having children*

With the decline in the total fertility rate and consequent ageing of the population, there is a strong need to understand factors contributing to childlessness and small family sizes. Waves 1 and 2 of the HILDA Survey tap preferences and expectations about having a first or additional child and family size intentions, while in wave 2, the timing of any intended birth is ascertained. In wave 1, it will be possible to examine the relative strength of links between fertility preferences and expectations and various objective circumstances (e.g., relationship status, age of each partner, income, career path, access to family friendly work benefits), and psychological factors (e.g., job satisfaction and sense of job security, relationship satisfaction, values about parenthood and children's needs). With later waves, it will be possible to explore ways in which preferences change, the circumstances underlying such changes, and outcomes when couples disagree about having children.

#### *Post-separation child support and contact*

The HILDA Survey also collects information about the non-resident parents' financial support for, and contact with, their children. As Smyth (2002) points out, we currently know very little about the different the patterns of child contact that take place, factors contributing to the different patterns, and their links with child support and children's and parents' well-being. Over time, it will be possible to examine relationships between child support and contact dynamics and life course trajectories of the children.

#### *Intergenerational transmission*

By providing data on family of origin as well as relationship history, wave 1 will enable researchers to examine the strength of so-called "intergenerational transmission" effects such as the experience of parental unemployment in childhood and labour force participation in adulthood, and the experience of parental divorce during childhood and relationship stability in adulthood. More importantly, the wealth of information

provided by the HILDA Survey will provide insight into mechanisms that help explain any intergenerational transmission effects observed and factors that help protect individuals from such effects.

### *Young people*

It also needs to be remembered that the HILDA survey includes interviews with young people aged 15 years or more. In wave 1, it will be possible to identify those who appear to get along well or poorly with other family members and to explore reasons for these trends. In the future, it will be possible to examine life course trajectories for these different groups of young people, and for other groups, such as those who grow up in wealthy or poor families or in families whose economic fortunes change markedly, and those who have experienced multiple transitions in family life. Indeed, HILDA will enable researchers to explore patterns of leaving home – the characteristics and circumstances of those who leave home early, later experiences that influence their remaining away from home or returning, and the impact that such arrangements have on parents and the young people themselves.

### *The elderly*

The ageing of the population has led to calls for employers and workers to reverse the trend towards early retirement. But how will this affect their children and grandchildren? Currently, most older people who are in their 60s and early 70s appear to be in good health and to provide more financial and practical support to their families than they receive (McDonald & Kippen 1999; Millward 1998). The support of the older generation to their families may be curtailed by their continuing work responsibilities.

According to McDonald and Kippen (1999), those aged 75 or more years tend to receive more support than they provide, with family members (especially female members) being by far the most significant sources of support (Wolcott 1997). While spouses are the most common sources of support for the frail elderly (AIHW 2000), many Australians are entering old age without a spouse because they have divorced. Furthermore, divorced parents, along with those who have remarried, are less likely than other parents to receive any kind of support from their children – a trend that is particularly likely for fathers (Millward 1998). How do these people cope when living in private dwellings? What are the characteristics of elderly people living in private dwellings who believe they lack the social support they need? Are elderly people who are generally healthy and happy more likely to receive support – and if so, what is the causal direction (if any) between these variables? How do elderly parents fare when their adult children live with them for adverse reasons such as unemployment or divorce? What factors discriminate between elderly couples who appear to be enjoying their lives and those who are distressed? Where one partner is ill, what circumstances help the other to cope well in his or her caring role? Clearly, HILDA is going to be extremely valuable in throwing light on these issues, thereby suggesting important ways of supporting the growing number and proportion of elderly people in Australia.

### **Conclusion**

The HILDA Survey has two key features that suggest it is likely to enhance enormously the power of research on family-related matters in Australia in the years ahead.

First is its longitudinal dimension. While it is often difficult to establish the existence, let alone direction, of causal connections in cross-sectional studies, the temporal order of many events and circumstances will be revealed as the different waves of the HILDA Survey accumulate. HILDA will thus enable us to distinguish between outcomes for families, couples, and individual family members and their causes – issues that are extremely important in the development of effective, well targeted and timely policy strategies.

Second, the HILDA Survey provides detailed information pertaining to the living standards and functioning of households, families, and individual family members. In contrast, most family-related research is based on surveys of individuals only – not couples or parents and children. Any information collected about other family members thus tends to be quite limited and to be based on the perspective of a single informant. This can be quite misleading. The HILDA Survey overcomes these difficulties and will improve our understanding of the inter-connections between dynamics relating to financial resources, labour market activities, and families.

Of course, it does need to be recognised that ongoing funding for the HILDA Survey has yet to be secured. It is thus entirely possible that the HILDA Survey will end after three waves, robbing researchers of much (if not all) of the power of the longitudinal design.

## References

Ambert, A.M. (1998), *The Web of poverty: Psychosocial Perspectives*, Haworth Press, New York.

Andrews Report (1998), Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, *To Have and to Hold: Strategies to Strengthen Marriage and Relationships*, A report of the Inquiry into Aspects of Family Services, House of Representative Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, CanPrint Communications Pty Ltd, Canberra.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2002), *Marriages and Divorces 2001*, Catalogue No. 3310.0, Canberra.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2000), *Disability and Ageing: Australian Population Patterns and Implications*, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Canberra.

Axin, W.G. & Thornton, A. (1992), “The relationship between cohabitation and divorce: Selectivity or causal influence?” *Demography*, vo.29, no.3, pp.357-374.

Clarke, L. & Berrington, A. (1999), “Socio-demographic predictors of divorce”, in J. Simons (ed.), *High Divorce Rates: The State of the Evidence on Reasons and Remedies* (volume 1), One plus One Marriage and Partnership Research, Lord Chancellor’s Department, Research Secretariat, London.

Coombs, R.H. (1991), "Marital status and personal well-being: A literature review", *Family Relations*, vol.40, pp.97-102.

de Vaus, D. (2002), "Marriage and mental health", *Family Matters*, no.62, pp.26-32.

Evans, M.D.R. & Kelley, J. (2002), "Changes in public attitudes to maternal employment: Australia, 1984 to 2001", *People and Place*, vol.10, no.1, pp.42-56.

Glezer, H., Edgar, D., & Prolisko, A. (1992), "The importance of family background and early experiences on premarital cohabitation and marital dissolution". Paper presented at the International Conference on Family Formation and Dissolution: Perspectives from East and West, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China, 21-23 May.

Harrison, M. "Legal process", in P. McDonald (ed.), *Settling Up: Property and Income Distribution on Divorce in Australia*, Prentice-Hall of Australia, Sydney.

Jorm, A.F. (1996), *The "Men and Mental Health Report"*, Proceedings from the National Men's Health Conference, 10-11 August 1995, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Kiernan, K. & McMueller, G. (1999), "Who divorces?", in S. McRae (ed.), *Changing Britain: Families and Households in the 1990s*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

McAllister, F. (1999), "Effects of changing material circumstances on the incidence of marital breakdown", in J. Simons (ed.), *High Divorce Rates: The State of the Evidence on Reasons and Remedies* (volume 1), One plus One Marriage and Partnership Research, Lord Chancellor's Department, Research Secretariat, London.

McDonald, P. (2000), "Low fertility in Australia: evidence, causes and policy responses", *People and Place*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 6-21.

McDonald, P. & Kippen, R. (1999), "Ageing: The social and demographic dimensions", in Productivity Commission and Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, *Policy Implications of the Ageing of Australia's Population: Conference Proceedings*, AusInfo, Canberra.

Millward, C. (1998), "Family relationships and intergenerational exchange in later life", Working Paper No.15, Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.

Smyth, B. (2002), "Research into parent-child contact after parental separation", *Family Matters*, no.62, pp.33-37.

Stack, S. & Eshleman, J.R. (1998), "Marital status and happiness: A 17-nation study", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol.60, pp.527-536.

Teachman, J.D. (2002), "Stability across cohorts in divorce risk factors", *Demography*, vol.39, no.2, pp.331-351.

Thomson, E. & Colella, U. (1992), "Cohabitation and marital stability: Quality or commitment?", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol.54, pp.259-267.

White, L. & Rogers, S.J. (2000), "Economic circumstances and family outcomes: A review of the 1990s", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol.62, pp.1035-1051.

Wolcott, I. (1997), "The influence of family relationships on later life", *Family Matters*, no.48, pp.20-26.

Wolcott, I. & Hughes, J. (1999), "Towards understanding the reasons for divorce", Working Paper No. 20, Australian Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.

**Table 1 Wave 1 Household Outcomes**

<i>Sample outcome</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Addresses issued	12252	
less out-of-scope (vacant, non-residential, foreign)	- 804	
plus multi-households additional to sample	+ 245	
<i>Total in-scope households</i>	<i>= 11693</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Refusals to interviewer	2670	22.8
Refusals to fieldwork company (via 1800 number or email)	431	3.7
Non-response with contact	469	4.0
Non-contact	441	3.8
Fully responding households	6872	58.8
Partially responding households	810	6.9

**Table 2 Wave 1 Person Outcomes**

<i>Sample outcome</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Enumerated persons	19917	
less ineligible children (under 15)	- 4790	
<b>Eligible adults</b>	<b>= 15127</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Refusals to interviewer	597	3.9
Refusals to fieldwork company (via 1800 number or email)	31	0.2
Non-response with contact	218	1.4
Non-contact	312	2.1
Responding individuals	13969	92.3

**Table 3 Wave 1 Individual Sample Characteristics  
(persons aged 15 years or over)**

	<i>MPS<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>HILDA PQ respondents<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>HILDA: All household members<sup>b</sup></i>
<b>Area of usual residence</b>			
Sydney	21.5	16.9**	18.0**
Rest of NSW	12.2	14.5**	14.1**
Melbourne	18.4	17.3*	17.5
Rest of Victoria	6.7	7.5	7.3
Brisbane	8.6	8.8	8.8
Rest of Queensland	10.0	11.5*	11.4
Adelaide	5.8	6.1	5.8
Rest of South Australia	2.0	2.4*	2.3
Perth	7.3	7.5	7.4
Rest of Western Australia	2.5	2.8	2.7
Tasmania	2.4	2.8	2.7
Northern Territory	0.9	0.5**	0.5**
ACT	1.6	1.6	1.6
<b>Sex</b>			
Male	49.3	47.4**	48.6*
Female	50.7	52.6**	51.4*
<b>Age (years) at 30 Sept. 2001</b>			
15-19	8.8	8.7	9.4*
20-24	8.9	7.4**	7.8**
25-34	18.7	18.7	18.7
35-44	19.0	21.7**	21.4**
45-54	17.1	17.1	17.1
55-64	11.8	12.0	11.7
65 or over	15.6	14.4*	13.9**
<b>Marital status</b>			
Married (including de facto)	58.7	63.4**	62.7**
Not married	41.3	36.6**	37.3**
<b>Indigenous status</b>			
Indigenous	1.7	1.8	
Non-indigenous	98.3	98.2	
<b>Birthplace</b>			
Born in Australia	72.4	74.4**	
Born outside Australia			
Main English-speaking country	10.2	10.9	
Other country	17.5	14.7**	

**Table 3 (cont'd)**

	<i>MPS<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>HILDA: PQ respondents<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>HILDA: All household members<sup>b</sup></i>
Employment status in main job (employed persons only)			
Employee	86.0	87.0	
Employer	3.6	43.9	
Own account worker	10.0	8.4**	
Contributing family worker	0.4	0.8**	
Labour force status			
Employed			
Full-time	42.1	41.7	
Part-time	17.4	19.5**	
Unemployed	4.3	4.4	
Not in the labour force	36.3	34.5**	

Notes: \*\* and \* denotes significantly different from the MPS estimate at the 99% and 95% confidence levels respectively. Standard errors have been adjusted to take account of both the stratified and clustered nature of the design employed in the HILDA Survey.

- a With the exception of indigenous status and employment status, the MPS estimates come from the October 2001 survey. In the case of the two exceptions, data for August 2001 are used. With the exception of country of birth, the population that these estimates apply to is all civilians aged 15 years and over. The figures for country of birth exclude persons living in an institution.
- b The HILDA estimates are also for people aged 15 years and over, but include defence force personnel and exclude people living in remote areas of Australia and those living in special dwellings. The HILDA estimates have also been adjusted to account for variability in the probability of selection across CDs.
- c We vary from the usual ABS definition in defining full-time work solely on the basis of usual hours worked (rather than on a combination of usual hours and actual hours worked).

Source: ABS data are from *The Labour Force, Australia* (cat. no. 6203.0), August 2001 and October 2001 issues.