

Appendix 6: Using the statistical linkage key

This appendix provides details of linkage processes, including validation of the linkage key, results of linkage and the rules used to allocated responses that are discrepant between linked records. It relates to material presented in Sections 2.5 and 2.6.

Methods for the linkage of records

The process for linking records is simple:

- Two, three or more records that had fully valid linkage keys that completely matched were regarded as referring to the same consumer.
- Records that were missing sex were tested for matches with all other records using the linkage key without sex. This resulted in 19 matches (17 pairs and 1 triple), and for each match the records were from the same State. These matching records were also regarded as referring to the same consumer. For each match at least one case had sex validly recorded for the consumer.
- Records that were missing any part of the linkage key other than sex were not matched and given a unique key for all future analyses.

There were two exceptions to the general process for 1999:

- Western Australia did not use the standard linkage key and records were pre-matched within the State, and so could not be matched to the Commonwealth or any other States.
- Victoria identified 10 records that were not regarded as matches, on the basis of other information at the State level, even though the linkage key matched with another case(s). These records were tested against data from other jurisdictions and no other matches were found. They were then assigned unique linkage keys so as not to match in any further analysis.

Validity of linkage key

The validity of the linkage key was tested firstly by comparison with names in the National Death Index (NDI), and secondly by looking at the frequencies of letter combinations and birthdates. The NDI is a fully name-identified database for Australia of all people who have died. The linkage key was divided into its component letters and date parts to examine the frequency distribution of each part.

The frequencies of letters in the five letter positions were compared with Institute analyses of names in the NDI (Table A6.1). The frequency distributions of the most common letters were very similar for last name, and fairly similar for first name (the main difference being that for the second letter 'A' was more common and 'O' less common in the MDS than in the NDI). This difference is not surprising, as names are likely to vary with time and fashion, particularly first names. For example, the first name 'Myrtle' may occur more commonly in the NDI than among CSDA recipients.

Table A6.1: Distribution of letters with a frequency of 5 per cent or more in name part of linkage key in the 1999 CSDA MDS collection compared to the National Death Index

First name, second letter			First name, third letter			Last name, second letter			Last name, third letter			Last name, fifth letter		
Lette			Lette			Lette			Lette			Lette		
r	MDS	NDI	r	MDS	NDI	r	MDS	NDI	r	MDS	NDI	r	MDS	NDI
A	28.1	21.5	R	14.3	15.5	A	22.7	22.5	R	12.6	12.6	E	17.0	17.4
E	16.1	16.9	N	11.2	10.2	O	16.8	17.1	L	10.9	11.2	None	12.4	11.2
O	13.0	18.3	A	9.1	8.7	E	12.0	12.2	N	8.9	9.0	I	8.0	8.3
I	10.4	9.5	E	7.2	5.7	I	10.6	10.5	A	8.6	8.2	A	7.0	6.9
R	7.2	7.7	T	7.2	5.9	R	7.7	7.8	I	6.5	6.4	S	7.0	7.1
H	5.4	4.6	L	6.6	9.4	U	6.9	7.4	O	6.4	6.5	N	6.7	6.7
			C	5.4	3.3				E	6.4	6.3	R	5.2	5.3
			I	5.0	5.7							H	5.1	5.2
												L	5.0	5.0
Total	80.2	78.5		66.0	64.4		76.7	77.5		60.3	60.2		73.4	73.1

Note: Analysis includes people born between 1913 and 1987 (inclusive) who died between 1980 and January 2000.

The most common name sequences in the MDS were then examined to determine whether any unlikely or possibly false sequences (such as 'ABCDE') appeared at high frequency. The only such apparent sequence was 'AAAA-', which was obviously false as it occurred 22 times for only one service provider. For these records the linkage key was treated as invalid.

For the date part of the key the frequency distribution of days and months were examined for any unexpected patterns. It was apparent that 1st January was more common as a birth date than was expected, presumably because it was sometimes being entered when the year of birth was known but the day and month were not (in this case the Data Guide instructions are to enter 99 for the day and month). This date occurred 436 times compared to an expected frequency of 147 if all dates occurred at random. (The birth date of some Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people may be legitimately recorded as 1st January when their precise birth date is not known. However, this would only explain a small component of these dates as only 4.3% were for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people.)

Results of linkage

Table A6.2 shows the results of linking data for each State and Territory, and for Australia combined. The mean number of services received per consumer on the snapshot day is represented by the ratio of unlinked to linked cases.³⁰ For State and Territory services, this ratio ranges from 1.094 for the Australian Capital Territory to 1.208 for Queensland. For Commonwealth services alone the ratio is much less (1.007 overall) because, as would be expected, very few people were using more than one employment service. The final columns of Table A6.2 show the results of linking for State and Commonwealth services combined. For all services combined the ratio of unlinked to linked cases varies from 1.142 (Northern Territory) to 1.229 (Queensland).

³⁰ The ratio between the number of unlinked records representing episodes of service or 'service recipients', and the number of consumers within the jurisdiction, each with one or more linked records. A higher ratio indicates a greater use of more than one service on the snapshot day.

Table A6.2: Numbers of cases with and without use of the statistical linkage key, by State/Territory for State and Commonwealth services and for all services combined

State/Territory	State services			Commonwealth services			State and Commonwealth combined			State/ Cwlth ratio
	Unlinked	Linked	Ratio	Unlinked	Linked	Ratio	Unlinked	Linked	Ratio	
New South Wales	13,172	11,323	1.163	5,922	5,879	1.007	19,094	16,350	1.168	1.052
Victoria	21,367	17,887	1.195	3,895	3,860	1.009	25,262	21,157	1.194	1.028
Queensland	7,022	5,811	1.208	2,827	2,806	1.007	9,849	8,012	1.229	1.076
Western Australia	8,355	6,933	1.205	2,186	2,176	1.005	10,541	9,109	1.157	n.a.
South Australia	4,158	3,788	1.098	2,086	2,075	1.004	6,244	5,392	1.158	1.087
Tasmania	1,438	1,211	1.187	564	562	1.004	2,002	1,698	1.179	1.044
ACT	591	540	1.094	247	246	1.004	838	719	1.166	1.093
Northern Territory	255	222	1.147	131	131	1.000	386	338	1.142	1.044
<i>Total</i>	<i>56,358</i>	<i>47,715</i>	<i>1.181</i>	<i>17,858</i>	<i>17,735</i>	<i>1.007</i>	<i>74,216</i>	<i>62,775</i>	<i>1.182</i>	<i>1.043</i>
Australia	56,358	47,704	1.181	17,858	17,734	1.007	74,216	62,752	1.183	1.043
Without WA	48,003	40,782	1.177	15,672	15,559	1.007	63,675	53,644	1.187	1.050

Notes

1. State/Commonwealth ratio is the ratio due to linkage between State and Commonwealth data after linkage within State services and within Commonwealth services.
2. A non-standard linkage key was used in Western Australia, so State and Commonwealth data could not be linked for this State.
3. The difference between the Total and Australia rows is due to linkage of records between States and Territories.

The ratio for linkage *between* State and Commonwealth services (as opposed to linkage *within* State services and *within* Commonwealth services in each State/Territory) is also shown (in the last column of Table A6.2). This is a measure of the number of consumers who use both State and Commonwealth services. (It is calculated as the number of consumers (linked count) of State services plus the number of consumers of Commonwealth services, divided by the total number of consumers, for example for New South Wales this is $(11,323+5,879)/16,350 = 1.052$.) This ranges from 1.028 for Victoria to 1.093 for the Australian Capital Territory.

Overall, ignoring matches between States and Territories (see notes to Table A6.2), the estimated number of consumers is 62,775. However, there are also 23 matches of the linkage key between States and Territories for all records combined (which is the difference between the rows for 'Total' and 'Australia' in Table A6.2). All except one of these matches are between Commonwealth or State services in New South Wales, and those in another geographically-adjacent State or Territory (including 14 between Albury and Wodonga and 3 between NSW and ACT), and so generally appear to be genuine matches. Allowing for matches between States, the estimated total number of consumers becomes 62,752 (62,775 minus 23). The mean number of services received per consumer is 1.183 (74,216 unlinked records divided by 62,752 consumers).

However, there is no linkage possible between Commonwealth and State services for Western Australia because of the use of a non-standard linkage key. Leaving out State and Commonwealth services for Western Australia, the linkage ratio for all other jurisdictions combined is 1.187, and 1.050 for linkage between State/Territory and Commonwealth services (Table A6.2). Applying this latter figure to Western Australia would give an estimated reduction of 432 consumers due to matching between State and Commonwealth services, which would result in a total estimate for Australia of 62,320 consumers.

Table A6.3 shows the number of records per linkage key. About 68% (50,616) of all records had a valid linkage key that did not match with any other record. A further 3% (2,068) of records had an invalid linkage key and thus could not be matched. Thus, altogether, 71% (52,684) of all records were unmatched, and as a result there were 52,684 consumers for whom there was only one record. The other 29% (21,532) of records did have at least one match and were shared between 10,078 consumers. For example, there were 17,814 records (8,907 multiplied by 2) for the 8,907 consumers who had two matching records.

To accurately examine the results of linkage it is again more appropriate to omit Western Australian Commonwealth and State services as is done in the middle of Table A6.3. However, the proportion of records that have at least one match only rises slightly from 29% to 30% (19,111 of 63,675). For all jurisdictions other than Western Australia, the number of records with the same linkage key ranged from one to five. Almost all the matches found were between two records only (for all States/Territories other than Western Australia, 90% of matches (8,203 of 9,079) were between two records).

Table A6.3: Number of records that match using the statistical linkage key and resulting number of consumers

Effect of linkage key	Without WA Commonwealth and State services											
	All				Without WA Commonwealth and State services				Without WA State services			
	Records		Consumers		Records		Consumers		Records		Consumers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No match												
Invalid linkage key	2,068	2.8	2,068	3.3	2,068	3.2	2,068	3.9	2,068	3.1	2,068	3.7
Valid linkage key	50,616	68.2	50,616	80.6	42,497	66.7	42,497	79.2	44,661	67.8	44,661	80.0
Total	52,684	71.0	52,684	83.9	44,565	70.0	44,565	83.1	46,729	71.0	46,729	83.7
Match												
Two records	17,814	24.0	8,907	14.2	16,406	25.8	8,203	15.3	16,428	24.9	8,214	14.7
Three records	3,048	4.1	1,016	1.6	2,415	3.8	805	1.5	2,415	3.7	805	1.4
Four records	464	0.6	116	0.2	264	0.4	66	0.1	264	0.4	66	0.1
Five records	75	0.1	25	<0.05	25	<0.05	5	<0.05	25	<0.05	5	<0.05
Six plus records	131	0.2	14	<0.05	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—
Total	21,532	29.0	10,078	16.1	19,111	30.0	9,079	16.9	19,132	29.0	9,090	16.3
Grand total	74,216	100.0	62,762	100.0	63,675	100.0	53,643	100.0	65,861	100.0	55,819	100.0

The final columns in Table A6.3 omit only Western Australian State services (and not Commonwealth services). This includes all the records for which the standard linkage key was used. Of these, 9,090 records had at least one match and it is this subset that is used in the discrepancy analyses that follow.

There were no invalid linkage keys for State or Commonwealth services in Western Australia. The effect of invalid linkage keys can be estimated for the other jurisdictions. For the latter, 3.2% of linkage keys were invalid. In addition, a further estimated 270 records (0.5%) had an invalid linkage key due to the day and month of the birth-date being recorded as 01/01 when they should have been missing (see above). Records with invalid linkage keys cannot of course be matched with any other records, so result in an overestimate of the number of consumers. From the results of linkage among records with valid linkage keys, a further 630 of the records with invalid keys would be expected to show a match if they had a valid key, and the total for consumers would decrease by this number. Together with the lack of linkage between Commonwealth and State services for

Western Australia, this means that the total number of consumers is overestimated by between 1% and 2%.

Discrepancies between linked records

Occurrence of discrepancies

When records are matched by linkage key they are assumed to then relate to the same consumer. In the majority of cases the information on matching records will be the same. However, in some cases the information on two or more matching records is not entirely consistent, that is, for some items the values recorded will differ between records. For example, of two records with the same linkage key, one may record the consumer as Aboriginal and with primary disability intellectual, the other as being neither Aboriginal nor Torres Strait Islander and having primary disability physical. Depending upon the item in question, this may be due to differences in opinion, judgment or quality of information, or possibly because of miscoding on one record.

The discrepancy rate for an item is the proportion of consumers with two or more matching records, who have two or more differing valid values for that item recorded. Table A6.4 shows the discrepancy rates for six demographic items. The discrepancy rate tends to be higher where the item is at least partly a matter of judgment (for example, method of communication) and/or there is more than one common value for the item (for example, living arrangements).

Table A6.4: Discrepancy rate for demographic data items

Data item	Frequency of most common value (% of all unlinked records)	Discrepancy rate (% of linked record sets with discrepancies)
Country of birth	89.2	1.5
Indigenous status	89.0	0.7
Method of communication	61.8	12.1
Main language spoken at home	92.2	1.6
Main source of income	73.2	2.4
Living arrangements	44.2	12.5

The discrepancy rates for particular disability groups range from 0.7% to 14.8% (Table A6.5). This variation in discrepancy rates cannot be completely explained by differences in the frequency of occurrence of each disability. The disability groups with the highest rates of discrepancies are speech, psychiatric and neurological. Overall, about one-third (34%) of matches have at least one discrepancy (Table A6.5).

Disability groups differ from other items in that any number from 1 (primary disability only) to 11 can be recorded. Ignoring simple errors, discrepancies in disability groups for a consumer may conceptually occur in two different ways:

- The one disability may be classified differently so that disability groups will be swapped between records but the number of disabilities will be the same (for example, if a disability is classified on one form as intellectual and on another as autism, then one record will have intellectual present, autism absent and the other intellectual absent, autism present).

- A disability may be judged to be present for the person by one service and absent by another. In this case the number of disabilities recorded will differ between records (for example, one record may have intellectual, physical and speech present, another just intellectual and speech).

Table A6.5: Frequencies and discrepancy rates for disability groups

Disability group	% all present	% all absent	Discrepancy rate (%)
Developmental delay	1.0	98.2	0.9
Intellectual	86.0	9.0	5.0
Special learning/ADD	1.7	97.1	1.3
Autism	6.5	90.8	2.7
Physical	25.5	65.9	8.6
Acquired brain injury	2.4	96.0	1.6
Deafblind	0.7	98.6	0.7
Vision	9.7	84.3	5.9
Hearing	5.5	90.9	3.5
Speech	21.4	63.8	14.8
Psychiatric	5.1	83.9	11.0
Neurological	14.2	75.8	10.0
<i>Primary disability</i>			7.9
Mean			6.6

Both these possibilities occur in the 1999 data. For the one consumer, they may both occur at the same time and for more than one disability group so that the resulting number of discrepancy combinations is quite large. However, the first situation in which matching records have a different number of disabilities is the most frequent (Table A6.6).

The discrepancy rate for primary disability was 7.9%. There are two reasons for primary disability differing between records.

- From all the disability groups of consumer, there is disagreement as to which one is the primary disability.
- There is disagreement on the classification of disability groups as discussed above, resulting in different possibilities for primary disability.

Table A6.6: Number of consumers with matched records, with different types of discrepancies for disability groups

Type of discrepancy	Number of records				All	
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Number	%
None	5,495	456	38	2	5,991	65.9%
Difference in number of groups	2,094	243	17	0	2,354	25.9
'Swapping' of disability groups	369	27	1	0	397	4.4
Both types of discrepancy	256	79	10	3	348	2.8
<i>Total discrepancies</i>	2,719	349	28	3	3,099	34.1%
Total consumers	8,214	805	66	5	9,090	100.0

The frequency of need for support or assistance in the ten areas is largely a matter of judgment. It is then not surprising that the discrepancy rate for these items is generally high, 26% on average (Table A6.7). However, over three-quarters of the discrepancies are between adjacent values in the scale, that is, between none/occasional, occasional/frequent or frequent/continual. Thus much of the discrepancy may be due to the precise application of the scale, rather than to large underlying differences of judgment. The mean discrepancy rate for non-adjacent categories is 6.1% of which most is due to the occasional/continual combination (Table A6.7). The combination none/continual ranges from 1% to 3% of all discrepancies.

Table A6.7: Discrepancy rates for areas of need for support or assistance

Area of need for support or assistance	Total discrepancy rate (%)	Non-adjacent discrepancies (%)	
		All non-adjacent	Occasional/continual
Self-care	26.0	5.7	2.9
Mobility	30.1	9.8	3.6
Communication	28.1	6.5	3.1
Home living	20.1	4.1	2.6
Social skills	27.8	6.4	4.3
Self-direction	25.3	5.5	4.3
Managing emotions	27.1	7.3	5.4
Learning	24.9	4.6	3.7
Working	21.3	5.8	4.1
Other day activity	24.7	5.7	3.8
Mean	25.5	6.1	3.8

Methods for resolving discrepancies

In order to produce any tabulations or analysis of items by consumer, it is necessary to reconcile such discrepancies by some method that is consistent for each item. The processes used for each item and the rationale for them is described in the following sections.

Missing and 'Not known' values

A general principle used in all cases is that valid values for an item should take precedence over missing or 'not known' values. This is on the basis that valid values imply the relevant information was known and could be given, whereas missing/not known values imply that the information was either unknown or would not be disclosed. Thus, where there are only two records and one is missing or unknown for a particular item, the value on the other record will be the one assigned to the consumer.

Age and sex

Age and sex have no discrepancies because they are both part of the linkage key, so if the linkage key matches then so must these two variables. The only exception is where records with missing sex have been linked to records with non-missing sex (see under 'Methods for the linkage of records' on page 129). In these cases the non-missing sex value is used.

Country of birth

- Order of precedence: non-English-speaking country, other English-speaking country, Australia.

Rationale

Australia may be used as the default response.

Indigenous status

- Order of precedence: Torres Strait Islander, Aboriginal, not Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.

Rationale

Anyone who is identified at some time as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander is likely to be so. Torres Strait Islanders are more likely to be recorded as Aboriginal than vice versa.

Method of communication

- Responses recoded to take age into account (all consumers less than 5 years coded as such).
- Order of precedence: Little or no effective communication, Sign language, Spoken language.

Rationale

If the person is regarded as having 'Little or no effective communication', then it is assumed that this is the case in some contexts even if it is not apparent in others, and so that this is a more accurate overall assessment of the difficulties of communication for the person. The same assumption applies to a lesser degree to the use of sign language or other non-spoken communication rather than spoken language.

Main language spoken at home

- Order of precedence: Other specified, 'Other language', English.
- Where two or more non-English languages are specified, precedence given to responses in order of service type order 1 (Box A6.1).
- For any remaining cases precedence given in order of frequency of occurrence in the MDS (two cases in 1999).

Rationale

English may be used as default response. Where two or more other languages recorded (rare) then services with greater contact with the consumer can more reasonably be expected to have more accurate and complete information about the consumer.

Main source of income – child (under 16 years)

- Precedence given to Yes.

Rationale

No may be used as default response.

Main source of income – adult (16 years and over)

- Precedence given to responses in order of service type order 2 (Box A6.2).
- For any remaining cases, precedence given in order of frequency of occurrence in the MDS. There were 19 such cases in 1999, and for all of these this resulted in selecting DSP ahead of another response.

Rationale

Employment services expected to have more accurate and complete information on income, followed by services with greater contact with the consumer.

Living arrangements/accommodation type

- Precedence given to responses in order of service type order 1.
- For any remaining cases precedence given in order of frequency of occurrence in the MDS (17 cases in 1999).

Rationale

Services with greater contact with the consumer can more reasonably be expected to have more accurate and complete information about the consumer.

Disability groups (all disabilities including primary disability)

- Count all disabilities recorded.
- If one or more records include deafblind and other records include vision and/or hearing then only deafblind is included. For these cases, if primary disability is vision or hearing it is also changed to deafblind. (Note that it is possible to record both vision and hearing but not deafblind as the latter specifically refers to 'dual sensory impairments causing severe restrictions in communication, and in the ability to participate in community life'.)

Rationale

Services commonly indicate only those disabilities that relate to their target group and not others. The majority of discrepancies are due to differences in the numbers of disability groups recorded, rather than one disability group being recorded instead of another.

Primary disability group

- If age is greater than five, then precedence is given to any other disability before developmental delay.
- For three or more records, where possible take majority value.
- For two records or where there is no majority, take the value that is most often recorded for the consumer, whether as primary or other disability.
- For remaining cases, precedence given to responses in order of service type order 1.
- For any remaining cases, precedence given in order of frequency of occurrence in the MDS. (There were 27 such cases in 1999, which were resolved to intellectual (20), physical (6) and autism (1).)

Rationale

Primary disability will often depend upon which of a number of disability groups is chosen as being the most important. This is largely a matter of judgment. For unresolved cases, services with greater contact with the consumer can more reasonably be expected to have more accurate and complete information about the consumer.

Other significant disability – which present

- Includes all disability groups other than that selected for primary disability.

Rationale

Follows from above.

Other significant disability – whether present

- If, based on the above, more than one disability group is present set to Yes.
- If only one disability group is present, then take in order of precedence Yes, No, Not known, Not stated. If set to Yes (3 cases in 1999), this means that the other disability groups present are unknown (as for consumers with no matching records).

Areas of need for support or assistance

- For working, precedence given to responses in order of service type order 2.
- For all other areas, precedence given to responses in order of service type order 1.
- For remaining cases, the higher median value is taken. (In 1999, ranged from 38 cases for working to 229 cases for mobility.)

Rationale

Services with greater contact with the consumer can more reasonably be expected to have more accurate and complete information about the consumer, except for the area of Working for which employment services can be expected to have the most accurate information.

Box A6.1: CSDA MDS service type order 1 for resolution of discrepancies after statistical linkage

Order	MDS code	Service type
Accommodation		
1	1.01	<i>Institutional accommodation/large residential</i>
2	1.02	<i>Hostels</i>
3	1.03	<i>Group homes</i>
4	1.04	<i>Attendant care</i>
5	1.05	<i>Outreach support/other 'in-home' living support</i>
6	1.06	<i>Alternative family placement</i>
7	1.07	<i>Other accommodation support services</i>
Case management		
8	2.08	<i>Behaviour intervention/specialist intervention services</i>
9	2.07	<i>Family/individual case practice/management services</i>
10	2.10	<i>Brokerage/direct funding/individual support packages</i>
Community access and employment		
11	3.02	<i>Day programs (post-school options/social and community support</i>
12	3.03	<i>Other community access and day programs</i>
13	3.01	<i>Continuing education/independent living training/adult training centre</i>
14	5.02	<i>Supported employment</i>
15	5.03	<i>Open and supported employment</i>
16	5.01	<i>Open employment</i>
17	5.04	<i>Other employment</i>
Counselling, intervention and therapy		
18	2.09	<i>Counselling: individual/family/group</i>
19	2.13	<i>Resource teams/regional teams</i>
20	2.06	<i>Therapy services</i>
21	2.04	<i>Early childhood intervention</i>
Respite		
22	4.02	<i>Centre-based respite/respite homes</i>
23	4.01	<i>Own home respite</i>
24	4.03	<i>Host family/peer support respite</i>
25	4.04	<i>Other respite/combination/flexible</i>
Other community support		
26	2.05	<i>Recreation/holiday programs</i>
27	2.11	<i>Mutual support/self-help groups</i>
28	2.14	<i>Other community support services</i>

Box A6.2: CSDA MDS service type order 2 for resolution of discrepancies after statistical linkage

Order	MDS code	Service type
Employment		
1	5.02	<i>Supported employment</i>
2	5.03	<i>Open and supported employment</i>
3	5.01	<i>Open employment</i>
4	5.04	<i>Other employment</i>
Accommodation		
5	1.01	<i>Institutional accommodation/large residential</i>
6	1.02	<i>Hostels</i>
7	1.03	<i>Group homes</i>
8	1.04	<i>Attendant care</i>
9	1.05	<i>Outreach support/other 'in-home' living support</i>
10	1.06	<i>Alternative family placement</i>
11	1.07	<i>Other accommodation support services</i>
Case management		
12	2.08	<i>Behaviour intervention/specialist intervention services</i>
13	2.07	<i>Family/individual case practice/management services</i>
14	2.10	<i>Brokerage/direct funding/individual support packages</i>
Community access		
15	3.02	<i>Day programs (post-school options/social and community support)</i>
16	3.03	<i>Other community access and day programs</i>
17	3.01	<i>Continuing education/independent living training/adult training centre</i>
Counselling, intervention and therapy		
18	2.09	<i>Counselling: individual/family/group</i>
19	2.13	<i>Resource teams/regional teams</i>
20	2.06	<i>Therapy services</i>
21	2.04	<i>Early childhood intervention</i>
Respite		
22	4.02	<i>Centre-based respite/respite homes</i>
23	4.01	<i>Own home respite</i>
24	4.03	<i>Host family/peer support respite</i>
25	4.04	<i>Other respite/combination/flexible</i>
Other community support		
26	2.05	<i>Recreation/holiday programs</i>
27	2.11	<i>Mutual support/self-help groups</i>
28	2.14	<i>Other community support services</i>