



**THE SOCIAL**  
RESEARCH CENTRE

Level 1, 262 Victoria St, Nth Melbourne Vic 3051  
Phone: (03) 9326 4460 Fax: (03) 9326 4060  
Toll-free phone: 1800 023 040 ABN: 91 096 153 212  
[www.srcentre.com.au](http://www.srcentre.com.au) [info@srcentre.com.au](mailto:info@srcentre.com.au)

# SPIRIT OF GENERATION Y

---

**MARCH 2005**

## **TECHNICAL SUMMARY** **PREPARED FOR**

Spirit of Generation Y Project  
Australian Catholic University  
115 Victoria Parade  
Fitzroy Victoria 3065

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	ABOUT THIS REPORT .....	3
1.2	PROJECT OVERVIEW .....	3
<b>2.</b>	<b>SAMPLE MANAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	SAMPLE FRAME .....	5
2.2	SAMPLE GENERATION .....	5
2.3	CALL PROCEDURES .....	5
2.4	RESPONDENT SELECTION .....	6
2.5	PROCEDURES TO MAXIMISE RESPONSE .....	6
2.6	TREATMENT OF LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH .....	6
2.7	QUOTA MANAGEMENT .....	7
<b>3.</b>	<b>QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND TESTING .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT .....	8
3.2	QUESTIONNAIRE PRE-TESTING .....	8
3.2	QUESTIONNAIRE PILOT TESTING .....	8
3.3	FURTHER QUESTIONNAIRE REFINEMENTS .....	9
<b>4.</b>	<b>INTERVIEWER BRIEFING &amp; QUALITY CONTROL .....</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	INTERVIEWER BRIEFING .....	10
4.2	FIELDWORK QUALITY CONTROL PROCEDURES .....	10
4.3	CONDUCT OF OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS .....	11
<b>5.</b>	<b>RESPONSE ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	ANALYSIS OF CALL OUTCOMES .....	12
5.2	PARTICIPATION RATE .....	14
5.3	ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE .....	15
5.4	ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS ACHIEVED BY CALL ATTEMPT .....	16
5.5	ANALYSIS OF REASON FOR REFUSAL .....	17
5.6	REVIEW OF SAMPLE PERFORMANCE .....	17
<b>6.</b>	<b>DATA PROCESSING .....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1	CODING .....	18
6.2	OUTPUT EDITING AND ELECTRONIC DATA PROVISION .....	18
6.3	WEIGHTING .....	19
<b>7.</b>	<b>ISSUES ARISING FROM DE-BRIEFING .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	<b>WEIGHTING MATRIX .....</b>	<b>222</b>

---

# 1 INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 About this report

This report covers the data collection and methodological aspects of the 2005 “Spirit of Generation Y” or “Youth Spirituality” Project.

It seeks to:

- Consolidate and summarise project information and assorted reports generated throughout the survey period
- Provide analysis relating to sample characteristics and utilisation
- Consolidate issues arising from the interviewer de-briefing.

Reference information, including briefing notes and the final questionnaire, is attached as appendices.

## 1.2 Project overview

The Youth Spirituality project is a collaborative study funded by 18 academic institutions and religious organisations, with lead researchers from Monash University (Dept of Sociology), the Australian Catholic University and the Christian Research Association.

The broad aim of the project is to better understand “the spirit of Generation Y” (born 1976 – 1990) relative to previous generations – specifically Baby Boomers (born 1946 - 1960) and Generation X (born 1961 - 1975).

The quantitative CATI study, which is the subject of this report, followed a comprehensive qualitative phase involving approximately 100 in-depth, face-to-face interviews with youth from around Australia, conducted by the principal researchers and their associates.

The questionnaire for the CATI study drew on proven question blocks from previous similar studies, as well as new questions tailored specifically to meet the project objectives.

The sample for the quantitative study was structured as detailed in Table 1 opposite, over-sampling two age groups of interest (13-15 and 16-18), and including a sample of 25-59 year olds for comparative analysis.

The project was characterised by the need to gain parental permission to interview the 13-15 year old group, engage an (often difficult) respondent group, avoid presenting as a “religious” survey, and balance quantitative techniques with skills congruent with in-depth interviewing.

As can be seen, the target number of interviews was achieved for all groups, and included additional interviews with 16-18 and 19-24 year olds, obtained whilst screening for the last few 13-15 year olds (the last primary quota group to fill).

The average interview length was just over 25 minutes and fieldwork was completed over a five week period.

**Table 1 – Project overview**

---

---

	<b>Plan</b>	<b>Achieved</b>
Interviews with 13-15 year olds	400	401
Interviews with 16-18 year olds	400	408
Interviews with 19-24 year olds	400	410
Interviews with 25-59 year olds	400	400
Total interviews	1600	1619
Participation rate		80.3%
Fieldwork start date	1-Feb	1-Feb
Fieldwork finish date	7-Mar	10-Mar
Average interview length (minutes)	25	25.3

---

---

## 2. SAMPLE MANAGEMENT

---

### 2.1 Sample frame

A Random Digit Dial (RDD) sample frame was utilised in preference to other possible sample frames, such as the electronic White Pages, on the basis that an RDD approach improves the representation of single person households, single parent households, growth areas (new listings), some language groups (recent arrivals) and non home owners (transients / those in rented accommodation). All these groups, to a greater or lesser extent, are of interest for the Youth Spirituality project.

With the predominance of mobile phone usage amongst the target population, some consideration was given to attempting to access a database of mobile phone numbers. Given, however, that at least 98% of households in Australia have a landline, and that strategies were developed to access the target population on alternative numbers (see 2.3 below), this option was not pursued.

### 2.2 Sample generation

A total of 86,612 records were randomly selected from the electronic White Pages<sup>1</sup> and were used as the “seed” numbers for random number generation. This involved retaining the six-digit landline exchange prefix of the listed number (for example 039953) and randomly generating the last four digits, to create a new, randomly generated ten-digit telephone number.

The listing of randomly generated numbers was then washed against the White Pages directory to identify which randomly generated telephone numbers could be matched to the White Pages listings (the “matched” sample) and which randomly generated telephone numbers could not be matched to White Pages listings (the “unmatched” sample). “Matched” status is included in the final data file to facilitate analysis of the profile of respondent that may otherwise have been excluded, had a White Pages sample frame been used.

### 2.3 Call procedures

The call procedures included:

- Up to eight calls in total to establish contact
- Unlimited further call attempts to achieve an interview where scope status had been established
- Controlling the spread of call attempts such that, subject to other outcomes being achieved, contact attempts were spread over weekdays late afternoon to early evening (4.00 pm to 6.00 pm), weekdays mid to late evening (after 6.00 pm to 9.00

---

<sup>1</sup> Desk top Marketing Services, July 2004 release

pm) and weekends (10.00 am to 5.00 pm). No calls were attempted outside these times, except by firm appointment, and

- When volunteered by another household member (typically the parent), attempting to contact the in-scope sample member at an alternative number (typically mobile phone number or partner's number, or the number of the other parent, where shared care arrangements were in place), where this increased the chance obtaining an interview.

## **2.4 Respondent selection**

The "next birthday" method was used for respondent selection, where there was more than one in-scope person in the household.

A common sense approach was adopted in the application of the selection procedure, for example, if the selected respondent was away overseas, or did not consent to be interviewed (for example, due to study commitments), substitution within household was permitted.

Only one interview per household was conducted, given that environmental influences, cultural background, attitudes and values are likely to be similar for siblings.

## **2.5 Procedures to maximise response**

In addition to the call procedures described at 2.3 above, strategies to maximise response included:

- The operation of a 1800 number by The Social Research Centre throughout the survey period, to help establish survey bona fides, address sample members queries and encourage response
- Batched release of sample, so that calls to as few numbers as possible were initiated within the constraints of timely project delivery
- Focus on interviewer training and respondent liaison techniques, particularly for the parental consent process for 13-15 year olds, working with parents to get them "on-side" and showing sensitivity to respondent's circumstances
- Careful appointment management (to avoid repeated calls on the off chance that the target respondent would be home) and
- Adopting a "soft" approach, by offering to call-back at a more convenient time, not "pushing" for an interview, and, in isolated cases, offering to call-back with an interviewer of the same gender as the respondent.

## **2.6 Treatment of languages other than English**

No interviewing was conducted in languages other than English, since the target respondent group, generally, has adequate command of English.

Bi-lingual interviewers were used, however, to liaise with parents or other household members during the consent gaining process.

## **2.7 Quota management**

A fully interlocking quota structure, with a target number of interviews by age group (8, with 19-24 broken into 19-21 and 22-24, and 25-59 broken into 25-34, 35-44, 45-59), within gender (2) within geographic location (15), would have resulted in up to 240 cells for quota management (and many collapsed or empty cells). This was unnecessarily complex for the survey, and was beyond the survey budget.

In these circumstances, it was agreed that the four age groups of interest (13-15, 16-18, 19-24, 25-59) were the most appropriate primary quota groups. Within each primary quota group, loose location (state capital / rest of state) and gender targets were applied. This, together with monitoring the distribution of age within each primary quota group (to avoid, for example, the 25-59 year old group filling up with easier-to-interview older respondents), ensured adequate overall representation by age, gender and location.

---

## 3. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND TESTING

---

### 3.1 Questionnaire development

The Spirit of Generation Y Project Team was primarily responsible for sourcing and compiling the questions of interest, with the Social Research Centre assisting with the question order and operationalising the questionnaire.

As a starting point, it was agreed that around 25 minutes was a reasonable maximum interview length for an unsolicited call. Due to budget constraints and the risk of respondent fatigue, many of the original question items, and standard question batteries drawn from other surveys, were modified, simplified or omitted during the initial questionnaire development and pilot testing cycle.

The Spirit of Generation Y Project Team has detailed records of question sources and the rationale for inclusion, modification or omission of specific items. These are not reproduced in this report.

### 3.2 Questionnaire pre-testing

To establish an initial feel for interview length and questionnaire performance, five interviews were conducted by telephone, using a hard copy questionnaire and convenience sampling techniques. The pre-test questionnaire is included at Appendix 1.

Given that the average pre-test interview length was around 40 minutes, the questionnaire content was thoroughly reviewed by the Spirit of Generation Y Project Team prior to the programming of the questionnaire for pilot testing.

### 3.2 Questionnaire pilot testing

Prior to pilot test interviewing, standard operational testing procedures were applied to ensure that the CATI script truly reflected the agreed “hard copy” questionnaire. These included:

- reading the questionnaire directly into the CATI program
- programming the skips and sequence instructions as per the hard copy questionnaire
- rigorous checking of the questionnaire in “practice” mode” by the Social Research Centre project manager, the project quality supervisor, including checks of the on screen “presentation” of questions and response frames, and
- randomly allocating dummy data to each field in the questionnaire and examining the resultant frequency counts to check the structural integrity of the CATI script.

A pilot test of 27 interviews, using convenience sample and matched sample from the master list of selections, was conducted on 20, 24 and 27 January 2005.

Pilot testing was an iterative process, where several rounds of changes to the questionnaire were undertaken. The original pilot test questionnaire is provided at Appendix 2.

Due to the nature of changes to the questionnaire and the pilot test sample source, pilot test interviews were not included in the final dataset. Unresolved sample from the pilot test was not carried forward into the main survey.

### **3.3 Further questionnaire refinements**

Six different versions of the questionnaire (identified by version number in the final data file), were used during the conduct of the fieldwork, as incremental improvements were made to the questionnaire as a result of scrutiny of frequency counts, monitoring of interviewing by the project management team, feedback from interviewer de-briefings and review of the performance of specific questions.

The main questions that were modified during fieldwork included:

- F3a (If you were unsure of what was right or wrong in a particular situation....) – three versions in total
- E4 (Which other kinds of activities most help you find a sense of peace and happiness...) – added after 1139 interviews had been completed

The final questionnaire is provided at Appendix 3.

---

## 4. INTERVIEWER BRIEFING & QUALITY CONTROL

---

### 4.1 Interviewer briefing

All interviewers and supervisors selected on the Youth Spirituality project attended a two and a half hour briefing session delivered by the Social Research Centre project manager, which focused on:

- project background and survey procedures
- all aspects of administering the survey questionnaire, including specific data quality issues, using experiences from pilot testing
- administration of open ended questions
- coding of religion and
- overview of respondent liaison issues, including practice interviewing and role play, with a focus on issues relating to respondent selection and parental consent

A total of 46 interviewers worked on the project, however, consistent with the specialist team approach adopted by The Social Research Centre, 24 of these (predominantly female) interviewers completed 72% of the interviews.

Briefing notes are provided at Appendix 4.

### 4.2 Fieldwork quality control procedures

The in-field quality monitoring techniques applied to this project included:

- validation of 543 interviews (or approximately 33% of each interviewer's work) via remote monitoring (covering the interviewer's approach and commitment gaining skills, as well as the conduct of the interview)
- field team de-briefing after the first shift, and thereafter, whenever there was important information to impart to the field team in relation to data quality, consistency of interview administration, techniques to avoid refusals, appointment making conventions, project performance or changes to the questionnaire
- specific re-briefing sessions, focusing on probing skills for the open-ended questions (particularly reasons for no longer believing, identifying or attending)
- examination of verbatim responses to "other specify"
- monitoring of the interview to refusal ratio by interviewer, and
- an end survey de-briefing.

### **4.3 Conduct of open ended questions**

A focus of the monitoring, counselling and re-briefing effort was probing skills for the conduct of the main open ended question relating to reasons for non longer believing (H7c), reasons for no longer identifying (I5a) and reasons for no longer attending / attending less often (K17).

This involved interviewers switching between the professional, matter-of-fact, "read as written" approach that is fundamental to the consistency of questionnaire administration for quantitative surveys, and the more unstructured, "soft" and qualitative probing befitting an in-depth interview. Some interviewers proved to be better suited to this "switching" than others.

Given, however, that respondents were recruited by "cold calling", that no approach letter was provided (giving respondents time to gather their thoughts on such important life questions), no incentive was offered, respondents had no pre-determined stake in the subject matter (for example, by belonging to an interest group) and that interviewers had only 10-15 minutes to establish rapport with respondents (who were occasionally reluctant, indifferent or had difficulty expressing their opinions) before these questions were posed, outputs from the open ended questions were, overall, of an acceptable standard.

## 5. RESPONSE ANALYSIS

### 5.1 Analysis of call outcomes

A total of 124,827 call attempts were made. As can be seen in Table 2, the most frequent call outcome was no answer (43%), followed by disconnected / non-working numbers (15%) and no-one in scope in household (12%).

The high incidence of non-contact and non-working number outcomes is typical of projects that use an RDD sample frame.

**Table 2 – All call attempts**

Call result category	<i>As % all attempts</i>	
<b>Ineligible numbers</b>		
Telstra message, number disconnected	18117	14.51%
Not a residential number	4564	3.66%
<b>Scope status not determined</b>		
Engaged	7186	5.76%
Answering machine	13644	10.93%
No answer	53471	42.84%
Fax/Modem	3769	3.02%
<b>Contacts - scope status not established</b>		
Refused outright	505	0.40%
Soft refusal	159	0.13%
Refused at intro1	1777	1.42%
<b>Contacts - out of scope</b>		
No-one in household in scope	15060	12.06%
Claims to have done survey	7	0.01%
Language difficulty	309	0.25%
<b>Contacts - in scope</b>		
Completed interviews	1619	1.30%
Selected respondent temporarily unavailable to continue	1227	0.98%
Appointment made	2961	2.37%
Selected respondent away duration	54	0.04%
Wrong number / respondent not known	18	0.01%
Refused at intro2a	96	0.08%
Refused at intro2b	39	0.03%
Refused to continue at intro3	26	0.02%
Parental permission not given (Intro5)	73	0.06%
Refused to continue at QA4	120	0.10%
Genuine mid-survey terminations (A5 - close 1)	26	0.02%
<b>Total attempts</b>	124827	
Average calls per interview	77.1	
Total numbers initiated	55236	

On average, an interview was achieved every 77.1 calls, which illustrates the effort that was applied to identify and contact qualifying sample members.

The high proportion of “appointments” and “selected respondent temporarily unavailable outcomes”, relative to interviews achieved, illustrates that few interviews were conducted at the first contact, attributable to permission seeking procedures, and the acknowledged difficulties in finding the target age group at home and willing to do the interview.

The average number of calls for each number initiated was 2.2, indicating that a high proportion of sample records were resolved early in the call cycle (that is, identified as non-working numbers or as out of scope at the first call).

Table 3 presents the final call result for all numbers initiated. As can be seen, an interview was achieved at 2.9% of the 55,236 numbers to which calls were initiated.

**Table 3 – Result at last call attempt**

<b>Call result category</b>	<i>Number</i>	<i>As % numbers initiated</i>
Total numbers initiated	55236	
<b>Unusable numbers</b>		
Telstra message, number disconnected	18117	32.8%
Not a residential number	4564	8.3%
<b>Subtotal unusable numbers</b>	<b>22681</b>	<b>41.1%</b>
<b>Scope status not established</b>		
Engaged	684	1.2%
Answering machine	1456	2.6%
No answer	6708	12.1%
Fax/Modem	3769	6.8%
Refused outright	505	0.9%
Soft refusal	158	0.3%
Refused at intro1	1777	3.2%
<b>Subtotal scope status not established</b>	<b>15057</b>	<b>27.3%</b>
<b>Contacts - out of scope</b>		
No-one in household in scope	15059	27.3%
Claims to have done survey	7	0.0%
Language difficulty	309	0.6%
<b>Subtotal out of scope contacts</b>	<b>15375</b>	<b>27.8%</b>
<b>Contacts - in scope</b>		
Completed interviews	1619	2.9%
Refused at intro2a	96	0.2%
Refused at intro2b	39	0.1%
Refused to continue at intro3	26	0.0%
Parental permission not given (Intro5)	73	0.1%
Refused to continue at QA4	120	0.2%
Wrong number / respondent not known	18	0.0%
Genuine mid-survey terminations (A5 - close 1)	26	0.0%
Selected respondent temporarily unavailable to continue	29	0.1%
Appointment made	46	0.1%
Selected respondent away duration	33	0.1%
<b>Sub total in scope contacts</b>	<b>2125</b>	<b>3.8%</b>

Over forty per cent (41.1%) of numbers were unusable (fairly typical of an RDD survey), and there was no contact within the call cycle for 22.7% of numbers initiated (again, typical of an RDD survey where there are many connected numbers that continuously ring out or are engaged).

Contact was established at about one third (32.8%) of the numbers initiated, and scope status was established at 31.6% of numbers initiated (with the difference being outright household refusals where scope status was not established).

## 5.2 Participation rate

Participation rate is defined as interviews as a per cent of the sum of interviews and in-scope refusals.

To derive a participation rate, it is necessary to exclude those numbers initiated:

- that were not connected, or not residential numbers, and therefore unusable (41.1% of numbers initiated)
- where no contact could be established within the call cycle (22.7%)
- that resulted in a contact confirming that there was no one in-scope in the household (27.8%)
- that resulted in an outright refusal where scope status could not be established (4.4%)
- where an in-scope household was identified, but no contact could be made with the selected respondent within the survey period (residual appointments, selected respondent away duration, selected respondent temporarily unavailable) (<1%).

The final participation rate, as detailed in Table 4, was 80.3%.

**Table 4 – Participation rate**

<b>Completed interviews</b>	<b>1619</b>	<b>80.3%</b>
Refused to continue at QA4	120	5.9%
Refused at intro2a	96	4.8%
Parental permission not given (Intro5)	73	3.6%
Refused at intro2b	39	1.9%
Genuine mid-survey terminations (A5 - close 1)	26	1.3%
Refused to continue at intro3	26	1.3%
Wrong number / respondent not known	18	0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

This is an excellent participation rate for this kind of “cold calling” survey, where there was no approach letter to help establish bona fides and explain the purpose of the study, and there was an “additional step” in gaining interviews, due to the need for obtain parental permission to interview persons under 16 years of age.

### 5.3 Analysis of response

The profile of survey respondents was compared with that of a range of population demographic characteristics to assess the extent, if any, of response bias.

The analysis at Table 5 shows that the achieved sample broadly matched population benchmarks across gender, location and type of school attended.

**Table 5: Analysis of response**

---

---

	Achieved	ABS
<i>Gender (base= 1619, unweighted)</i>		
Male	47.3%	49.8%
Female	52.7%	50.2%
<i>Location (base=1619, unweighted)</i>		
State capital	63.9%	65.1%
Rest of state	36.1%	34.9%
<i>Type of secondary school (base=570, unweighted)</i>		
Government	61.4%	62.7%
Private	38.6%	37.3%

---

---

## 5.4 Analysis of interviews achieved by call attempt

An analysis of response was undertaken by the call number on which the interview was achieved, to enhance our understanding of whether respondents interviewed late in the call cycle were any different to those interviewed early in the call cycle.

As can be seen in Table 6, three quarters of the interviews were achieved within the first three attempts and only 3 per cent were achieved at the 7<sup>th</sup> or more call. Whilst there were no statistically significant differences (at the 95% level) between the profile of respondents interviewed late in the call cycle and those interviewed early in the call cycle, the pattern was consistent with expectation, in that, generally speaking, those looking for work were more likely to be interviewed early in the call cycle, and working sample members, and those of school age who may have needed an additional call to obtain parental consent, were marginally more likely to be interviewed later in the call cycle.

**Table 6: Analysis of interviews achieved by call attempt**

Number of calls to achieve an interview	Base	1 to 3 (1219)	4 to 6 (350)	7 or more (50)
Total sample		75.3%	21.6%	3.1%
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	765	74.5%	22.6%	2.9%
Female	854	76.0%	20.7%	3.3%
<i>Age group</i>				
13-15	401	77.6%	19.0%	3.5%
16-18	408	72.8%	23.3%	3.9%
19-24	410	75.4%	20.7%	3.9%
25-44	256	75.8%	24.2%	0.0%
45-59	144	75.0%	22.2%	2.8%
<i>Study status in 2005 (13 to 24 only)</i>				
Attending secondary school (up to and including year 12)	573	76.4%	19.4%	4.2%
Attending a tertiary institution (e.g. Uni, TAFE, etc.), or	366	74.6%	21.6%	3.8%
Not attending an educational institution	276	73.6%	23.6%	2.9%
<i>Study / Employment</i>				
Currently in secondary or tertiary education	939	75.7%	20.2%	4.0%
Employed, not studying	214	70.6%	25.7%	3.7%
<i>Main Activity</i>				
Looking for work,	56	83.9%	16.1%	0.0%
Studying,	211	74.4%	21.8%	3.8%
Doing home duties	69	75.4%	21.7%	2.9%
Other	30	73.3%	26.7%	0.0%

Given previous experience attempting to target young persons, it was anticipated that a greater proportion of interviews would be achieved later in the call cycle. However, with the timing of fieldwork (early in the year shortly after the holiday period, but before the commencement of the first university semester) and good appointment making procedures (appointing to specific, realistic times as opposed to just “trying again later”), a higher proportion of interviews were achieved earlier in the call cycle than expected.

## 5.5 Analysis of reason for refusal

As can be seen at Table 8, the majority of refusals (86.5%, refused at intro1, refused outright, soft refusal) took place before the survey could be fully introduced and scope status could be established.

Of the in-scope refusals, almost one third (31.6%) occurred at QA4 when the selected respondent had been made aware of the subject matter and the need for privacy, with another fifth (19.2%) attributable to parents not granting permission to interview, typically because of their child's study commitments.

**Table 8: Analysis of reason for refusal**

	<i>N</i>	<i>As % all refusals %</i>	<i>As % in-scope refusals</i>
Refused at intro1 (aware of subject matter)	1777	63.0%	
Refused outright (not necessarily aware of subject matter)	505	17.9%	
Soft refusal (not necessarily aware of subject matter)	158	5.6%	
Refused to continue at QA4 (potential privacy concerns)	120	4.3%	31.6%
Refused at intro2a (refused to give number of in-scope persons in household)	96	3.4%	25.3%
Parental permission not given (Intro5)	73	2.6%	19.2%
Refused at intro2b (refused next birthday selection)	39	1.4%	10.3%
Refused to continue at intro3 (refused age of selected person)	26	0.9%	6.8%
Genuine mid-survey terminations (between A5 and end of interview)	26	0.9%	6.8%
Total refusals (all types)	2820	100.0%	100.0%

There was no one question that provoked mid survey terminations, with terminations scattered widely across the questionnaire.

## 5.6 Review of sample performance

Overall, almost four in ten (39%) interviews were achieved from unmatched sample, which is in line with expectations for an RDD survey (typically 35% to 40%).

Although no full analysis of demographic, attitudinal or behavioural characteristics by sample match status has been undertaken, there is evidence to suggest, for example, that the RDD sample frame improved access to some groups, for example 19-24 year olds (43% achieved from unmatched sample).

---

## 6. DATA PROCESSING

---

### 6.1 Coding

Responses to other specify questions were reviewed and back-coded into existing categories in accordance with briefing instructions.

Otherwise, there was no further coding of other specify or open ended questions.

A file of verbatim responses, in Excel format, including the unique respondent ID, question number, text number and, where applicable, the code number to which the response was back-coded, was provided to the Spirit of Generation Y Project Team as part of the project deliverables.

In the cleaning and reviewing of verbatim responses, isolated cases of inconsistencies and mis-codes were identified and corrected in the verbatims file, however, since the final data file had already been provided, these were not corrected in the final data file.

### 6.2 Output editing and electronic data provision

Unweighted single level frequency counts of the responses to each question were produced, initially in draft format, at the completion of fieldwork. These were used to check structure and logic prior to data file preparation.

A data file was provided in SPSS format, together with a “data map” version of the questionnaire.

Whilst most variables in the data file are self-explanatory and based exclusively on questionnaire items, file users should note that:

- Throughout the data file, where a response is missing due to a questionnaire change, this is denoted by the code description “Not answered (change in questionnaire)” (eg F3A)
- “A6 Generation Category” (a6gencat) is based on definitions provided by the Spirit of Generation Y Project Team
- “A8 postcode” (a8pos) is the best postcode variable to use for analysis, as it consolidates postcode as provided / confirmed with the respondent with postcode from the sample record
- “E8 Nett not done any of E8\_1 to E8\_7” (E8\_8) identifies respondents who answer “No” to all the statements at E8.
- ‘I1 Current / lapsed religious identification” (i1) was a question with a variable question stem. To isolate current identifiers from lapsed identifiers, two new variables (i1cur and i1lap) were created, based on responses to H6, to facilitate analysis

- “M2 Respondent occupation / occupation aspires to” (m2) – similar issue to i1 – additional variables have been created to separate “occupation aspires to” for those currently studying (m2stud) from “current occupation” for workers (m2wkr).
- “Match status” (listed1 / listed2) denotes match status relative to the electronic White Pages database from which the seed numbers were drawn. It is *not* a definitive measure of current listing status of the number (commensurate with listed / unlisted number)
- “Capital city / rest of state identifier” (capros) and “location” (loc) are based on the seed number. As such they may, in isolated cases, conflict with A8 postcode due to phone number portability issues, call forwarding to holiday houses and the like, or having contacted a respondent (now resident in another location) on a mobile phone.

### 6.3 Weighting

The data file includes a weight which is based on 2001 Census age (13-15, 16-18, 19-24, 25-44 and 45-59) and gender, within location (state capital, rest of state), that is, 20 cells for weighting.

A weighting matrix is provided at Appendix 5.

---

## 7. ISSUES ARISING FROM DE-BRIEFING

---

A de-briefing was conducted on 16 March with a selection of interviewers and a representative from the Spirit of Generation Y Project Team in attendance. The main issues arising from the de-brief included:

- The detailed study description at Intro4b and Intro6b was rarely needed – respondents were usually happy to do the interview based on the initial description at Intro1 or Intro6
- B3 statement B (it is more important to act on your individual rights...) was difficult for some respondents (unsure of meaning or how to respond)
- Care should be taken in the analysis of B9 (how much of own money have you given to the Tsunami appeal), since there is no direct measure comparing the amount donated with capacity to donate (“I donated all my pocket money” / “all my spare cash” not captured)
- C1a / C1 (highest level of education attained) – there were isolated cases of individuals who had attained year 12 (at C1a), but were attending secondary school at C1 to re-do year 12 to improve their scores. Due to sequencing issues, these were generally recoded to “year 11” at C1a.
- At C3i and C3ii (subject liked best at secondary school), it was not unusual for respondents to mention two subjects in the same response category (eg Chemistry and Physics) – this should be understood as separate subjects, rather than duplication, inadvertent repetition or interviewer error.
- C4 (how far do you intend to go with your studies) – interviewers commented that, generally speaking, but especially amongst the younger age groups, there was low commitment to the answer. Short courses (for example, specific to a vocation – HGV licence, real estate licence) were coded as 3 (complete TAFE course)
- Interviewers commented that D2 (number of movies watched in an average month) is generally a much better measure of exposure to television than D1c
- E3 statement D (drinking alcohol or taking recreational drugs / finding a sense of peace and happiness) – low relevance and occasionally offensive for 13 to 15 year olds
- E5 statement B (deep inside I'm hurting...) – interviewers commented that the statement battery “works” in the context of how apparently balanced and “happy” people would “open up” at this question. However, some respondents struggled with statement D (my life has a purpose)

- E4 statement E (Social justice / how important to you is....) – concept not well understood by some (younger) respondents
- F2 (morals are relative / no definite rights and wrongs...) – concept difficult for young respondents
- H7 (ever a time when you did believe in God) – interviewers commented that they thought respondents, generally, perceived this question to relate to the Christian notion of God (“Benevolent old fellow with a white beard”, etc)
- H7d (are any of the following also reasons why you no longer believe as you did previously...) – softer wording may have helped elicit more considered responses
- H10 statement H (power of psychics and fortune tellers) – “fortune tellers” came across as a little old-fashioned
- J1 statement D (made a personal commitment to God) – poorly understood by most respondents going through this question
- K17b statement 5 (other activities more important than attending worship services..) – interviewers noted a sense of “relief” for some respondents at this point, as if this was an “acceptable” reason for no longer attending very often / as often as they did previously (as opposed to “just lost interest”).
- L7b (religious education at secondary school inclined you to take a more positive / negative view...) – “not applicable” code used for respondents claiming not to have had religious education at school

Overall, interviewers commented that respondents were quite engaged by the subject matter, that parents were generally enthusiastic about their sons / daughters taking part, and that the project was enjoyable to work on.

---

## APPENDIX      WEIGHTING MATRIX

---

Gender	Age Group	Target population	
		State Capital	Rest of State
Male	13 to 15	249408	157853
Male	16 to 18	257394	149715
Male	19 to 24	520907	240302
Male	25 to 44	1817686	931080
Male	45 to 59	1103633	661969
Female	13 to 15	236757	149603
Female	16 to 18	248988	140743
Female	19 to 24	515774	224744
Female	25 to 44	1883539	957859
Female	45 to 59	1127451	645354
<b>Total</b>		<b>7961537</b>	<b>4259222</b>