

Goodna Longitudinal Study

Health, Wellbeing and Community Life Survey

Technical Report 2003



**Queensland
Government**

Office of
**Economic and
Statistical Research**
Office of the Government Statistician

61 Mary St

Brisbane

4000

Ph: 3224 5326

<http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au>

Goodna Longitudinal Study Health, Wellbeing and Community Life Survey Technical Report

1. Introduction

The Goodna Longitudinal Study 2003 Health, Wellbeing and Community Life Survey was conducted by the Office of the Government Statistician (OGS) from Monday 2nd June 2003 to Wednesday 25th June 2003.

The 2003 survey involved interviewing the following groups:

- Respondents to the 2002 survey who had agreed to a follow-up survey in 2003 and were still living in Goodna;
- Respondents to the 2002 survey who had agreed to a follow-up survey in 2003 and had moved from Goodna;
- A new (replenishment) sample designed to maintain the total sample at or above the 2002 level.

The main objectives of the survey were to:

- determine people's perceptions of community wellbeing and the quality of services available to the Goodna community;
- determine the success rate for re-interviewing respondents 12 months later;

Secondary objectives were to:

- determine respondent reaction to the survey;
- measure the time per interview;
- measure the response rate; and
- Identify factors which might impact on the future repeats of this survey.

The methodology used for the survey is described in Section 2. Operational results and interviewer feedback are reported in Sections 3 - 6, Weighting, Output and Reliability of Estimates in Sections 7 - 9 and issues to consider are described in Section 10.

2. Survey Methodology

The survey was conducted by:

- a combination of telephone and face to face interviews for those respondents still living in Goodna who were re-interviewed in 2003 (three interviewers were used for the telephone phase and one interviewer for the follow-up by face to face of non-contacts from the telephone phase);
- face to face interviewing for those respondents who were added to the sample as part of the sample replenishment (14 interviewers were used);
- telephone and mail out for those respondents who had moved from the Goodna area.

2.1 Scope of the Survey

The inscope population for the replenishment sample was all people aged 18 years or over who were usually resident in private dwellings in Goodna.

2.2 Survey Frame

The frame of addresses was obtained from the Ipswich City Council, which has a database of all land parcels located in the suburb of Goodna. From this list, 263 households were chosen to supplement the 152 respondents that had agreed to a further interview in 2003.

After screening for private dwelling households with one or more usual residents aged 18 years or over, one usual resident aged 18 years or over was asked to identify the people aged 18 years or over living in the household. One person randomly selected from these people was then asked the remaining questions on the questionnaire.

3. Operational Results – Follow-up Interviews of 2002 Respondents

3.1 Sample design and selection

A total sample of 152 respondents agreed to a follow-up interview in 2003. The sample was expected to achieve 115 completed interviews.

3.2 Status of sample units at completion of survey

All sample units were attempted and finalised by the completion of the survey. From these, 102 completed or useable partially completed interviews were achieved. The results of **all finalised** sample units in the survey appear below. A sample unit (household) was deemed to be finalised when contact with the household had been completed, or the household was found to be out of scope for the survey or the predetermined number of attempts to reach a household not answering had been reached.

Status	Number	Percentage
Completed	72	47.4%
Completed - Movers Survey	4	2.6%
Partially Completed	30	19.7%
Refused Survey - No Face to Face	7	4.6%
Unable Survey - No Face to Face	11	7.2%
Vacant House	1	0.7%
Moved House/Wrong Phone Number	27	17.8%
TOTAL	152	100%

Telstra was contacted for all sample units coded as Vacant House and Moved House/Wrong Phone Number to try and obtain a new telephone number.

At the completion of the telephone survey, 35 of the 152 units which had not been finalised were included as part of the face to face survey of the replenishment sample. This was successful on 21 occasions. It was also confirmed that a further 9 respondents no longer resided at the address on record.

3.3 Response Rate

The response rate for a survey is the number of interviews that can be used in the analysis as a percentage of all possible interviews that could have been achieved had every in scope household selected in the sample responded.

By excluding the categories of vacant house and moved house/wrong phone number, the **overall finalised inscope response rate** for the survey was 85.4% which is higher than the standard 70% but is expected as everyone agreed to participate one year ago.

3.4 Average interview time

The average total time for a completed telephone interview of the second year respondents was **16 ½ minutes**.

4. Operational Results – Replenishment sample

4.1 Sample design and selection

A total sample of 263 households were selected for the survey. The sample was designed to achieve 135 Completed or Partially Completed interviews.

4.2 Status of sample units at completion of survey - First Year Respondents

All 263 sample units were attempted and finalised by the completion of the survey. From these, 173 completed or useable partially completed interviews were achieved. The results of **all finalised** sample units in the survey appear below. A sample unit (household property allotments) was deemed to be finalised when contact with the household/person had been completed, or the household was found to be out of scope for the survey or the predetermined number of attempts to reach households not answering had been reached.

Status	Number	Percentage
Completed	86	32.7%
Partially Completed	87	33.1%
Out of Scope – Address Does not Exist	1	0.4%
Out of Scope Household – No Usual Resident 18+	1	0.4%
Out of Scope – Vacant House	18	6.8%
Refused Survey	37	14.1%
Unable Survey– Away	18	6.8%
Unable Survey– Dog Preventing Access	8	3.0%
Unable Survey - Illness	1	0.4%
Language Problems	6	2.3%
TOTAL	263	100%

Descriptions of the status' above are as follows:

Out of Scope –Address Does Not Exist – The interviewer determined that there was no location with that particular street number and address.

Out of Scope Household – No Usual Resident 18+- The person contacted indicated that the premises was a household but there were no usual residents aged 18 years or over living in the household.

Out of Scope – Vacant House – The interviewer determined that the dwelling was permanently vacant as at the time of the interview period.

Refused Survey – A usual resident aged 18 years or over indicated that the premises was a household but refused to provide the initials of the people living in the house, and therefore the survey could not be completed.

Unable Survey - Away - When no usual resident aged 18 years or over could be contacted within the call period because they were on holidays or are away from the household for an extended period of time working and would return before the completion of the survey.

Unable Survey – Dog Preventing Access – The interviewer could not gain access to the property because of a dog.

Unable Survey – Illness – When no usual resident aged 18 years or over could be interviewed within the call period because of illness.

4.3 Response Rate

The response rate for a survey is the number of interviews that can be used in the analysis as a percentage of all possible interviews that could have been achieved had every in scope household selected in the sample responded.

By excluding the categories ‘Out of Scope – Vacant House’, ‘Out of Scope - Address Does Not Exist’ and ‘Out of Scope – Household’, the **overall finalised in scope response rate** for the survey was approximately **71%**, which is similar to the 70% that was expected.

4.4 Average interview time

Due to the complexities for the interviewers to record times, actual times cannot be given. It was indicated by the interviewers that the average interview time was **30-40 minutes** for a face to face interview.

5. Operational Results - Movers Respondents

5.1 Sample design and selection

A total sample of 7 respondents were identified for the Movers Survey. This survey was designed to cater for those Goodna residents who had agreed to a follow-up survey in 2003, but were found to have left the Goodna area.

5.2 Status of sample units at completion of survey - Movers Respondents

All sample units were attempted by the completion of the survey, either by completing an interview by telephone or by mailing out a paper based questionnaire to a probable address. From these, 4 completed interviews were achieved. None of the forms mailed out were returned (completed). The results of **all finalised** sample units in the survey appear below.

Status	Number	Percentage
Completed by Telephone	4	57.1%
Non Response by Mail	3	42.9%
TOTAL	7	100%

5.3 Average interview time

Due to the complexities for the interviewers to record times, actual times cannot be given. It was indicated by the interviewers that the average interview time was about **3 minutes**.

6. Operational Results - General

6.1 Monitoring of interviewers

Due to the experienced nature of the interviewers, with four also having been used for the Goodna survey last year, the necessity to monitor on-site the face to face interviews was not required. However all interviewers were advised to ring OGS for clarification of any issue that was needed, and this was done on a few occasions. A debriefing session was held with all interviewers at the completion of the survey to obtain feedback, and query any discrepancies in the questionnaires that were found.

6.2 Non English Speaking interviews

It was necessary in one instance to conduct the survey in a language other than English (Samoan). All other interviews were conducted in English.

Six interviews could not be undertaken because interpreters were not available for the survey. Three interviews in Spanish and three interviews in Vietnamese were lost because of the lack of interpreting skills in these languages.

6.3 Interviewer Feedback - General

The interviewers were asked to provide feedback on respondent reaction to the survey at a debriefing session held at the completion of the survey. The following comments were received from the interviewers.

- It was very difficult to interview the mentally challenged people although they were very happy and enthusiastic to undertake the survey;
- Some respondents were aggressive toward the government, as they can see that a lot of effort is going into the Goodna area, but nothing is changing;
- Many respondents voiced their disapproval at the way they are treated by departments in both the State and Federal Governments such as the Department of Housing, Queensland Police Service and Centrelink. They believe they are treated like second class citizens;
- Dogs were once again a difficulty when trying to obtain an interview;
- Some community members were interviewed in the survey and they provided very positive feedback on the effectiveness of the survey and the GSIP program in general;
- The survey generated interest in the community;
- The survey has a positive flow on effect on other community work being undertaken in the Goodna area;
- Quite daunting for the interviewers going to Smith and Cross Street areas where there is a lot of drug dealing and motor vehicle theft occurring in the area;
- The GSIP pamphlet was very helpful in providing to respondents who were reluctant to participate in the survey or for those respondents who were very interested in what the government had been doing in the Goodna area;
- Calling cards would be very beneficial for future surveys, so that the interviewers can leave a card in the mail box of the respondent when they have called, so that in future visits, they are not arriving unannounced. It will also enable the respondent to call the 1800 number to provide a more suitable time to conduct the survey, so that the interviewer does not waste time returning to the unoccupied house;

- Up to 6 callbacks were made to all houses;
- The elderly had a lot of 'don't know' answers to the questions, as they very rarely leave their home;
- It is very difficult to do a survey this long on the door step - both for the interviewer and the respondent. As a result, some interviewers were asked into the houses of the respondents at times, although this was only done in the day time and if the interviewer was totally at ease with the situation;
- Many respondents like the renovations that were being carried out in Goodna by the Department of Housing.

6.4 Interviewer Feedback - Questions

- Q10 - what does the question mean when it refers to 'leaders';
- Q12 - Some respondents were offended by this question and stated that it was no worse than any other suburb in Queensland. They did not like that the question was inferring that Goodna people could not be trusted;
- Q15 - Many respondents found the mention of 'hoon' funny as they believed it was not a typical word used by the government;
- Q16 - The answer to this question on access is heavily dependent upon whether the respondent has their own motor vehicle, yet this question is not asked;
- Q23 - Q26 - these questions are difficult for the respondents to answer when they have multiple children who attend different schools;
- Q33 - Many respondents took offence that their working children were classified as 'other people'. Interviewers at the time of the interview recorded these groups as 'other specify', which were later coded correctly by OGS;
- Q68 - add a further category of 'either telephone or face to face' as many respondents did not have a preference.

6.5 Respondent Queries

A small number of queries as a result of the survey were received on the freecall number. It is assumed from this, that information provided by the interviewers was sufficient to allay any fears that the respondents may have had regarding the legitimacy of the survey. It was also decided to provide all second year respondents with a copy of the latest Goodna GSIP publication and this publication was also made available to those first year respondents who wished to have a copy. This publication helped explain some of the current projects that were being undertaken in the area to improve services.

6.6 Preapproach Letters

Preapproach letters were sent to all of the households selected for the survey.

6.7 Editing

Editing was performed by OGS throughout the duration of the survey. The following issues were found:

- Q38-52 - some Partially Completed interviews resulted from interviewers in the face to face component finding it difficult to negotiate through the transitional employment questions. This difficulty was also in evidence in the 2002 survey;
- Q67 - most Partially Completed interviews were a result of respondents refusing to provide contact details of their relatives.

7. Weighting

The frame comprised all properties located in the suburb of Goodna (excluding those that were selected for interviews last year). From this list, 263 households were chosen from which one adult was selected at random for the first phase of the longitudinal study.

The weighting was carried out in two stages. The first stage was to calculate household weights for those households where a useable interview was obtained. In order to determine the household weights, each response was classified as out of scope, inscope responding or inscope non-responding.

The second stage of the weighting involved calculating a person weight for each of the useable responses. The household weight was multiplied by the number of people aged 18 years or over in the household. This weight was then adjusted so that the estimated number of people aged 18 or over by sex and age categories agreed with projected populations (from Census 2001 estimates) of the civilian population aged 18 and over provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, adjusted for the proportion in private dwellings and interpolated to match the age boundaries in the survey question.

For a detailed description of the weighting scheme for person estimates, see Appendix 1.

For purposes of standard error calculation the sample was considered to approximate a simple random sampling of the adult population, to which post stratification by age (3 categories), sex and number of adults in the household was then applied. The third classification was included so that all units in a stratum would have the same, or close to the same, probability of selection. Population counts were obtained by summing the final person weights, and thus conformed to the benchmarks used in weighting. Some collapsing of strata was necessary so that standard errors could be estimated for each stratum. Standard formulae could then be applied to estimate overall standard errors.

8. Output

A summary report containing estimates of population percentages for each question will be provided. This report also contains significant differences (using 95% confidence intervals) of estimates that have been cross-tabulated by simple demographics.

9. Reliability of Estimate

Estimates based on a sample survey are subject to two types of error:

Sampling error. Estimates based on information obtained from a sample of households may differ from figures that would have been produced if all households had been included in the survey.

Non sampling error. Errors may also occur due to non-response to the survey, inadequacies of the sampling frame, inaccuracies in reporting by respondents and processing errors.

One measure of the sampling error is the *standard error (SE)*. It measures the extent to which an estimate may vary by chance because only a sample of households were included in the survey.

Given a large enough sample size, there are about two chances in three that an estimate will differ by less than one standard error from the figure that would have been obtained if all households had been included, and about 19 chances in 20 that the difference will be less than two standard errors.

Alternative measures of the sampling error are the *relative standard error (RSE)*, which expresses the standard error as a percentage of the estimate, and the *confidence interval (CI)*.

The RSE of an estimate is given by the following expression:

$$\text{RSE} = (\text{SE}/\text{Estimate}) \times 100$$

where SE stands for the standard error of the estimate.

The general formula for a confidence interval is:

$$\text{CI} = \text{Estimate} \pm Z \times \text{SE}$$

where Z is the appropriate value from the standard normal table. For example, for a 95% confidence interval, $Z = 1.96$ (often rounded to 2).

10. OGS Recommendations/Issues to Consider

The following issues/recommendations should be taken into consideration when undertaking the followup interview for the Longitudinal Survey in 12 months time. The issues/recommendations are based on observations by OGS operational staff, in addition to comments provided by the interviewers.

- <Currently there are none>

APPENDIX 1

Weighting Scheme

The steps involved in calculating person weights w_{2p} were as follows:

1. Initial household weights w_{1h} were calculated at the fine stratum level allowing for non-response and out of scopes. Decisions were made on how to classify the result obtained for each telephone number in the sample. There were 3 categories - out of scope, in scope responding, and in scope non-responding. The weight for each out of scope was N_s / n_s and the weight assigned to each in scope responding telephone number was

$$w_{1h} = N_s / n_s * (n_{rs} + n_{us}) / n_{rs} \text{ where}$$

n_{rs} = number inscope responding useable units in each fine level stratum

n_{us} = number inscope non responding or responding but unuseable units in each fine level stratum and

n_s = total fine level stratum sample size (telephone numbers sampled from RDD frame)

N_s = total fine level stratum population size as per RDD frame

2. For each selected person, a weight was calculated to reflect the probability of their selection

$$w_{1p} = w_{1h} \cdot q_h \text{ where}$$

q_h = total number of people aged 18+ in household h.

3. Now using these weights, the raw survey estimate of the total number of people \hat{T}_{zsa} in each of the benchmark categories zsa by Sex s by Age Group a was calculated:

$$\hat{T}_{zsa} = \sum_{\text{all responding people in zsa}} w_{1p}$$

4. An adjusted weight for each person was then calculated using:

$$w_{2p} = w_{1p} \cdot (T_{zsa} / \hat{T}_{zsa})$$

where T_{zsa} is an externally derived 'benchmark' of the civilian population in occupied private dwellings in category zsa based on Australian Bureau of Statistics Census of Population and Housing 2001.