

WELFARE DIVISION WORKING PAPER

Number 11

AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF HEALTH
& WELFARE LIBRARY

Client profiles for aged care services in Australia

Anne Jenkins

June 1996

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare
Canberra

COPY No. ³⁹⁴³⁸⁸.....
MASTER No. ¹⁸¹⁸³.....



AIHW/ARCH
HV 1451.A8
C536

© Commonwealth of Australia 1996

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced without written permission from the Australian Government Publishing Service. Requests and enquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be directed to the Manager, Commonwealth Information Services, Australian Government Publishing Service, GPO Box 84, Canberra ACT 2601.

A complete list of the Institute's publications is available from the Publications Unit, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, GPO Box 570, Canberra ACT 2601.

Suggested citation

Jenkins A 1996. Client profiles for aged care services in Australia. Canberra: AIHW. (Welfare Division working paper no. 11).

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Board Chair
Professor Janice Reid

Director
Dr Richard Madden

Any enquiries about or comments on this publication should be directed to:

Anne Jenkins
Australian Institute of Health and Welfare
GPO Box 570
Canberra ACT 2601

Phone: (06) 244 1173

Published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Contents

Abstract.....	1
1. Introduction	1
2. The data	2
3. Age and sex profiles.....	3
4. Pension and benefit recipients	5
5. Cohabitants and Carers	13
Carers	13
Living arrangements.....	15
6. Usual residence.....	21
7. Marital status.....	25
8. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders	30
9. Non-English Speaking Background.....	40
10. Summary	55
References.....	57

CLIENT PROFILES FOR AGED CARE SERVICES IN AUSTRALIA

Abstract

The client profiles of two home based care services (Home and Community Care and community options projects) and two residential care services (nursing homes and hostels) are examined. Variables examined include age, sex, marital status, living arrangements and pension status. Older women made up the largest group of clients in all services; a group which had the highest proportion of individuals who had lived alone or did not have a carer, and for whom the highest proportions had been widowed. Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders made use of aged care services differently to non-indigenous Australians. They used services at younger ages than non-indigenous Australians, and indigenous Australians receiving home care services showed a lower availability of carers than non-indigenous Australians. Clients of aged care services from non-English speaking backgrounds had similar characteristics to clients of English speaking backgrounds, although a somewhat higher proportion of non-English speaking background clients were younger, a slightly higher proportion were male, and a higher proportion were living with others or had carer available.

1. Introduction

Underlying the changing balance of aged care services in Australia over the last decade has been a concern with making the most appropriate use of available resources. An appropriate allocative strategy was deemed to be one which reserved high intensity services such as those provided in nursing homes, for a high need group, with less intensive services, such as hostels and community care, providing an adequate and more appropriate level of care for people with lower levels of dependency or for people at higher levels of dependency who were already receiving significant levels of support from informal carers, thereby enabling them to remain in the community. This type of targeting is required under circumstances of growing demand and fiscal constraint, but it has also been widely argued that older people prefer to remain in the community rather than move into residential care (HHCS, 1991).

This paper is concerned with the consequences of the policy changes which have occurred under the Aged Care Reform Strategy, in terms of the kinds of people now using aged care services in Australia. It profiles clients of aged care services according to such characteristics as age, sex, marital status, living arrangements and pension status and compares these profiles across services of varying intensity, from home and community care and community options projects, to hostels and nursing homes. It also examines service use by people of Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and non-English speaking backgrounds.

2. The data

The data analysed here were obtained from four of the national data collections undertaken within the aged care service network.

Home and Community Care (HACC) organisations provide a range of services to frail older people and younger people with a disability and their carers who are living in the community. The HACC Service User Characteristics Survey records the characteristics of a sample of HACC service users over a four week period in all States (DHHCS, 1992). The specified four week period varied from State to State and fell between August 1993 and May 1994. HACC agencies completed and returned 41,653 service users survey forms in the 1993-94 survey period.

Community options projects share the HACC objective to provide assistance to those in need within the community in order to prevent premature or inappropriate admission to long-term institutional care. The projects provide packages of services to clients based on their assessed care needs. The community options projects Client Characteristics Survey is a census of clients taken over a two week period across all states and territories. The census reported here was undertaken in 1993 and collected information on 6,726 clients.

Hostels not only provide serviced accommodation to individuals but also provide institution based care for individuals who require some form of personal assistance with such tasks as dressing, mobility, transfers, and supervision of medication. Records established at the time of admission to the hostel collect data on all residents. The data reported here was taken from these records for all residents present in hostels at 30 June 1994; these numbered 52,535.

Nursing homes accommodate individuals who require more intensive levels of care, and have the capacity to offer on-going care to some residents who may otherwise require hospitalisation. Records established at the time of admission to the nursing home collect data on all residents. The data reported here was taken from these records for all residents present in nursing homes at 30 June 1994; these numbered 73,552.

3. Age and sex profiles

Home and Community Care

Of the 41,653 Home and Community Care service users sampled, aged persons were in the majority; 40% of users were aged 80 and over and 73% of users were aged 70 and over (Table 1). Only 15% of HACC service users were below the age of 60. More than two thirds of these were female (69%). Women predominate at all age groups, although the effect increases with age. At age 80 and above there were more than two and a half times more female HACC clients than male HACC clients.

Table 1: HACC service users by age and sex for the four week survey period, 1993-94.

Age	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of total sample	Number	% of total sample	Number	% of total sample
0-49	2,424	5.8	1,702	4.1	4,126	9.9
50-54	555	1.3	320	0.8	875	2.1
55-59	672	1.6	379	0.9	1,051	2.5
60-64	1,179	2.8	714	1.7	1,893	4.5
65-69	2,282	5.5	1,201	2.9	3,483	8.4
70-74	4,045	9.7	1,822	4.4	5,867	14.1
75-79	5,457	13.1	2,196	5.3	7,653	18.4
80-84	6,307	15.1	2,499	6.0	8,806	21.1
85-89	3,889	9.3	1,498	3.6	5,387	12.9
90+	1,844	4.4	668	1.6	2,512	6.0
All ages	28,654	68.8	12,999	31.2	41,653	100.0

Note: Number of cases with missing data = 0
Data collected for one month between August 1993 and May 1994

Table 2: Community options clients by age and sex for the two week survey period, 1993.

Age	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of total sample	Number	% of total sample	Number	% of total sample
0-49	489	7.8	501	8.0	990	15.9
50-54	100	1.6	68	1.1	168	2.7
55-59	110	1.8	60	1.0	170	2.7
60-64	179	2.9	89	1.4	268	4.3
65-69	270	4.3	201	3.2	471	7.5
70-74	521	8.3	248	4.0	769	12.3
75-79	708	11.3	326	5.2	1,034	16.6
80-84	782	12.5	383	6.1	1,165	18.7
85-89	591	9.5	206	3.3	797	12.8
90+	313	5.0	95	1.5	408	6.5
All ages	4,063	65.1	2,177	34.9	6,240	100.0

Note: Proportions calculated excluding cases with missing data.
Number of cases with missing data = 486 (7.2%)

Community Options Projects

Table 2 shows the age and sex profile of the 6,726 community options projects clients surveyed in 1993. Like the HACC clientele, a large proportion of

community options projects clients were very old; 38% were over the age of 80 years and 66% of all clients were over the age of 70. Twenty two percent of clients were below the age of 60. Two thirds of clients were female (65%). Again, older women over the age of 70 comprised a substantial 46% of the total clientele. There were almost two and a half times as many women over the age of 80 (27%) using community options services as men of the same age (11%).

Hostels

Table 3 shows that of the 52, 535 residents present in hostels at 30 June 1994, almost three quarters (74%) were aged 80 and over, 93% were aged 70 and over, and less than 2% of hostel residents were under the age of 60. Approximately three quarters (74%) of hostel residents were female. Most of these women were aged 70 and over, such that, of the total hostel population, 71% were women aged 70 and above. Among hostel residents aged 80 and above, there were three and a half times as many women as men (58% of the total sample compared to 16% of the total sample, respectively).

Table 3: *Hostel residents by age and sex at 30 June 1994.*

Age	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of total sample	Number	% of total sample	Number	% of total sample
0-49	115	0.3	131	1.0	246	0.5
50-54	88	0.2	124	0.9	212	0.4
55-59	180	0.5	220	1.6	400	0.8
60-64	384	1.0	398	3.0	782	1.5
65-69	948	2.4	862	6.4	1,810	3.5
70-74	2,237	5.7	1,388	10.4	3,625	6.9
75-79	4,819	12.4	1,949	14.5	6,768	12.9
80-84	10,022	25.7	3,072	22.9	13,094	25.0
85-89	11,333	29.0	3,113	23.2	14,446	27.6
90+	8,897	22.8	2,153	16.1	11,050	21.1
All ages	39,023	100.0	13,410	100.0	52,433	100.0

Note: Number of cases with missing data = 102 (0.2%)

Nursing Homes

The age and sex profile for the 73, 552 nursing home residents present at 30 June 1994 is shown in Table 4. Almost two thirds (63%) were aged 80 years and over, 89% were aged 70 and over, and 6% of nursing home residents were below the age of 60. Women comprised close to three quarters (71%) of nursing home residents and most of these were aged 90 or over. One half (50%) of nursing home residents were women over the age of 80 and 66% were women over the age of 70. There were three and a half times as many women as men in nursing homes in the 80 and over age group and approximately two and one half times as many women as men aged over 70.

Table 4: *Nursing home residents by age and sex at 30 June 1994.*

Age	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of total sample	Number	% of total sample	Number	% of total sample
0-49	515	0.7	594	0.8	1,109	1.5
50-54	286	0.4	250	0.3	536	0.7
55-59	441	0.6	450	0.6	891	1.2
60-64	806	1.1	772	1.1	1,578	2.2
65-69	1,877	2.6	1,849	2.5	3,726	5.1
70-74	4,182	5.7	3,082	4.2	7,264	9.9
75-79	7,532	10.3	4,015	5.5	11,547	15.8
80-84	12,516	17.1	4,628	6.3	17,144	23.4
85-89	12,856	17.6	3,474	4.7	16,330	22.3
90+	11,166	15.3	1,892	2.6	13,058	17.9
All ages	52,177	71.4	21,006	28.6	73,183	100.0

Note: Number of cases with missing data = 369 (0.5%)

All services

The majority of clients in all four services were older women. Comparison of home based services (HACC and community options projects) with residential care services (hostels and nursing homes), shows higher proportions of female clients in residential services than home based services. For instance, of users HACC services who were over the age of 80, there were two and half times as many women as men, but in hostels there were as many as three and a half times as many women as men over the age of 80. Similarly, in nursing homes, there were three and a half times as many women as men over the age of 80.

In absolute numbers, there were 8,342 more women than men in hostels over the age of 80 as at 30 June 1994. In nursing homes there were as many as 26,554 more women than men over the age of 80 as at 30 June 1994.

Although nursing homes and hostels are targeted to older people, as many as 6% of nursing home residents were below the age of 60 years and 2% of hostel residents were below the age of 60 years. In contrast, Home and Community Care and the Community Options Projects, which are intended for use by individuals of all ages, delivered services to a clientele of which 15% and 22% respectively were below the age of 60.

4. Pension and benefit recipients

Home and Community Care

Information of the type of pension received by clients of Home and Community Care is not collected. The HACC Service Users Characteristics survey only collects information on whether the client receives a pension of any kind and whether the client holds a pension health benefit card. Information is also obtained regarding whether the client receives a benefit from the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Table 5 displays pension status and veteran's benefit status for HACC service users over the designated four week period. The majority of

HACC service users were recipients of a pension (93%). Similar proportions of male and female HACC service users received a pension (92% and 93% respectively). Below the age of 55 years, a higher proportion of males compared to females were recipients of a pension (82% of male HACC clients received a pension compared to 76% of female HACC clients). Over the age of 60 slightly higher proportions of females received a pension than males. Ten percent of HACC clients received the veteran's benefit. A higher proportion of males were recipients of the veteran's benefit than females (16% and 8% respectively); there was a large proportion of males over the age of 70 receiving veteran's benefit.

Table 5. Pension and benefit status by age and sex for HACC service users surveyed over a four week period, 1993-94.

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
Pension recipient						
0-54	1,946	75.9	1,435	82.0	3,381	78.3
55-64	1,498	92.3	889	91.2	2,387	91.9
65-69	1,931	94.2	997	93.3	2,928	93.9
70-79	8,171	95.8	3,373	93.9	11,544	95.2
80+	10,208	95.5	3,857	93.7	14,065	95.0
All ages	23,754	93.3	10,551	91.7	34,305	92.8
Veteran's benefits recipient						
0-54	79	3.4	59	3.7	138	3.5
55-64	58	4.2	29	3.5	87	4.0
65-69	140	8.0	131	14.8	271	10.3
70-79	784	10.9	808	26.9	1,592	15.6
80+	625	7.0	516	15.6	1,141	9.3
All ages	1,686	7.8	1,543	16.1	3,229	10.3

Note: Proportions calculated excluding missing data
 Missing data for pension recipient = 4,693 (11.3%)
 Missing data for veteran's benefit recipient = 10,427 (25.0%)
 Data collected for one month between August 1993 and May 1994

A large proportion of missing data for the items related to pension health benefit status (42%) preclude drawing firm conclusions regarding the representativeness of these statistics. Hence the age by sex profile for this group is not presented here. However, of the sample for whom these questions were completed, 79% held a pension health benefit card. Similar proportions of male and female HACC service users were eligible for the pension health benefits (78% and 80% respectively).

Community Options Projects

Table 6 details pension and pension health benefit status for community options projects clients in the sample periods. Most community options projects clients were pension recipients (92%). Equivalent proportions of males and females were recipients of the pension (both 92%). As Table 6 shows, higher proportions of older clients than younger clients held a pension. Recipients of the pension

health benefit are also listed in this table. A similar proportion of females and males were in receipt of this benefit (91% and 89% respectively).

Table 6: Pension and health benefit status by age and sex for COP clients surveyed over a two week period, 1993.

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
Pension recipient						
0-54	467	82.2	462	85.1	929	83.6
55-64	240	88.2	123	89.8	363	88.8
64-69	244	93.8	184	93.9	1,666	93.9
70-79	1,137	95.1	529	94.5	2,162	94.9
80+	1,543	94.3	619	93.8	2,162	94.1
All ages	3,631	92.3	1,917	91.5	7,282	92.0
Pension Health Benefit recipient						
0-54	400	84.7	372	82.5	772	83.6
55-64	201	87.0	109	89.3	310	87.8
64-69	212	91.4	151	90.4	363	91.0
70-79	976	93.1	445	93.1	1,421	93.1
80+	1,316	91.8	509	90.1	1,825	91.3
All ages	3,105	90.9	1,586	89.0	4,691	90.2

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data for Pension = 698 (10.4%)

Number of cases with missing data for Pension Health Benefit = 1457 (21.7%)

The age and sex profiles for community options projects clients holding individual pension types are shown in Table 7. The age pension was the most commonly held pension (70% of all community options projects clients held this pension). The disability support pension¹ was the next most commonly held by community options projects clients (21%). Sex differences are evident with regard to the type of pension held by community options projects clients. Nineteen percent more female community options projects clients than male clients held an age pension. Fourteen percent more male clients than female clients held an disability support pension. Similarly, a higher proportion of males than females were recipients of a repatriation pension: 8% of males held a repatriation pension compared to 4% of females with this same type of pension.

Hostels

Table 8 displays information regarding the type of pension received by hostel residents. It should be noted, that there was a substantial proportion of missing data (37%). Overall however, most hostel residents in receipt of a pension were receiving the age pension (84% of the total sample of pension recipients).

¹ The disability support pension replaced the invalid pension from 12 November 1991 as part of the Disability Reform Program. The aim of this program was to assist people with disabilities to move into employment rather than being dependent on long-term income support (DSS, 1992). Although the criteria for eligibility are somewhat different for the invalid pension and the disability support pension, some aged care collections have continued to collect information regarding disability support pension under the label of invalid pension.

Table 7: Type of pension held by community options clients by age and sex for the two week survey period, 1993.

Type of pension	Age																
	0-54			55-64			65-69			70-79			80+			All Ages	
	Number	%		Number	%		Number	%		Number	%		Number	%	Number	%	
Age	0	0.0		100	41.7	Female	199	81.6	1,032	90.9	1,448	93.8	2,779	76.6			
Disability support	416	89.1		116	48.3		24	9.8	23	2.0	17	1.1	596	16.4			
Repatriation	0	0.0		5	2.1		14	5.7	53	4.7	57	3.7	129	3.6			
Other	51	10.9		19	7.9		7	2.9	27	2.4	21	1.4	125	3.4			
Total	467	100.0		240	100.0		244	100.0	1,135	100.0	1,543	100.0	3,629	100.0			
Age	0	0.0		0	0.0	Male	136	73.9	432	81.7	539	87.2	1,107	57.8			
Disability support	420	90.9		114	92.7		25	13.6	14	2.6	9	1.5	582	30.4			
Repatriation	5	1.1		2	1.6		19	10.3	70	13.2	55	8.9	151	7.9			
Other	37	8.0		7	5.7		4	2.2	13	2.5	15	2.4	76	4.0			
Total	462	100.0		123	100.0		184	100.0	529	100.0	618	100.0	1,916	100.0			
Age	0	0.0		100	27.5	Persons	335	78.3	1,464	88.0	1,987	91.9	3,886	70.1			
Disability support	836	90.0		230	63.4		49	11.4	37	2.2	26	1.2	1,178	21.2			
Repatriation	5	0.5		7	1.9		33	7.7	123	7.4	112	5.2	280	5.0			
Other	88	9.5		26	7.2		11	2.6	40	2.4	36	1.7	201	3.6			
Total	929	100.0		363	100.0		428	100.0	1,664	100.0	2,161	100.0	5,545	100.0			

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations

Number of missing cases for all residents = 1,181 (17.6%)

Table 8: Type of pension held by hostel residents according to age and sex at 30 June 1994

Type of pension	Age											
	0-54		55-64		65-69		70-79		80+		All Ages	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Age	0	0.0	104	34.1	468	82.7	4,150	87.3	17,003	91.3	21,725	89.2
Disability support	101	87.8	157	51.5	34	6.0	22	0.5	29	0.2	343	1.4
Repatriation	0	0.0	12	3.9	45	8.0	443	9.3	1,032	5.5	1,532	6.3
Other	14	12.2	32	10.5	19	3.4	137	2.9	554	3.0	756	3.1
Total	115	100.0	305	100.0	566	100.0	4,752	100.0	18,618	100.0	24,356	100.0
Age	0	0.0	0	0.0	292	56.1	1,311	60.2	4,259	79.4	5,862	68.6
Disability support	132	88.6	303	89.9	148	28.4	45	2.1	18	0.3	646	7.6
Repatriation	3	2.0	9	2.7	53	10.2	743	34.1	897	16.7	1,705	20.0
Other	14	9.4	25	7.4	28	5.4	79	3.6	189	3.5	335	3.9
Total	149	100.0	337	100.0	521	100.0	2,178	100.0	5,363	100.0	8,548	100.0
Age	0	0.0	104	16.2	760	69.9	5,461	78.8	21,268	88.7	27,587	83.8
Disability support	233	88.3	460	71.7	182	16.7	67	1.0	47	0.2	989	3.0
Repatriation	3	1.1	21	3.3	98	9.0	1,186	17.1	1,929	8.0	3,237	9.8
Other	28	10.6	57	8.9	47	4.3	216	3.1	743	3.1	1,091	3.3
Total	264	100.0	642	100.0	1,087	100.0	6,930	100.0	23,987	100.0	32,904	100.0

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations

Number of missing cases for all residents = 19,631 (37.4%)

Female hostel residents aged 65 and over were most likely to be recipients of the age pension. Male hostel residents who were aged 65 and over were also most commonly recipients of the age pension. However, in comparison to females there were higher rates of disability support and repatriation pensioners. At age 65 to 69, 56% of men received the age pension, with the largest portion of the balance (28%) receiving the disability support pension. At age 70-79 a cohort effect is evident for men involved in the second World War: 60% of men received the age pension, with the largest portion of the balance being accounted for by the repatriation pension (34%). This effect is also evident among male hostel residents aged 80 and over: 79% received the age pension, with 17% receiving the repatriation pension.

Residents in hostels who were below the age of 65 and who were pension recipients, were most likely to be receiving the disability support pension. Of hostel residents below the age of 55 who were pension recipients, 88% received the disability support pension; of residents between the ages of 55 and 65, 72% were in receipt of the disability support pension. Gender differences were evident with respect to the disability support pension. Below the age of 55, relatively equal proportions of male and female pension recipients were receiving an disability support pension (89% and 88% for males and females respectively). For males between the ages of 55 and 65, the proportion receiving the disability support pension remained high at 90%, but fell to 52% for females. Between the ages of 65 and 69, the proportion of pension recipients receiving the disability support pension fell for both sexes but still accounted for more than a quarter of pensions received by males (28%) while only accounting for 6% of pensions received by females.

Other pensions accounted for only 3% of pensions received by hostel residents. The majority of these were received by hostel residents below the age of 65 and were received by males and females in relatively equal proportions.

Nursing Homes

Table 9 provides an age and sex profile of pension holders and non-pension holders for nursing home residents. According to these figures, 94% of nursing home residents were in receipt of a pension (although missing data for 21% of all nursing home residents necessitates that this figure be taken only as an estimate of the true proportion of pension holders).

Table 10 shows that the majority of nursing home residents were recipients of the age pension (82% of residents). The second most commonly received pension was the repatriation pension (9%). Again, while these trends were true for both males and females, a higher proportion of women were in receipt of the age pension relative to men (87% of females compared to 68% of males), and a higher proportion of men were in receipt of an repatriation pension relative to women (17% of males compared to 6% of females). For residents between the ages of 70 and 79, the repatriation pension was the second most common pension received, with 15% of residents in this age group having received this pension, 65% of whom were males. By the age of 80 and above, the proportion of residents in receipt of an repatriation pension had halved to just 7%, with

males showing the most notable decline in the number of repatriation pension recipients between the ages of 70 to 79 and 80 and above.

Table 9: *Number and proportion of nursing home residents receiving a pension or domiciliary nursing care benefit by age and sex at 30 June 1994.*

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
Pension recipient						
0-54	421	87.7	464	89.7	885	88.8
55-64	745	88.7	744	90.1	1,489	89.4
65-69	1,226	93.0	1,290	93.0	2,516	93.0
70-79	8,747	94.6	5,254	95.0	14,001	94.7
80+	27,963	94.8	7,406	93.9	35,369	94.6
All ages	39,102	94.5	15,158	93.8	54,260	94.3
Domiciliary nursing care benefit						
0-55	56	10.2	45	7.7	101	8.9
55-65	99	10.3	68	7.2	167	8.8
65-70	121	8.1	117	7.6	238	7.8
70-80	670	6.7	567	9.2	1,237	7.7
80+	1,594	5.1	593	6.8	2,187	5.5
All ages	2,540	5.8	1,390	7.7	3,930	6.3

Note: Proportions calculated excluding missing data

Missing data for pension recipient = 16,011 (21.8%)

Missing data for Domiciliary nursing care benefit = 11,615 (15.8%)

The disability support pension was the pension most commonly received by nursing home residents under the age of 65. Most of these pension recipients were men. Between the ages of 55 and 65 years 66% of nursing home residents received the disability support pension; 64% of disability support pension recipients in this age group were male. Below 55 years of age, 84% of nursing home residents received this pension, made up of approximately equal proportions of men and women (51% of pension recipients in this category were men). This proportion reduced sharply at older ages.

The Domiciliary Nursing Care Benefit (DNCB) is a benefit paid to carers who provide intensive care to a person who would otherwise require nursing home care. Table 9 shows that 6% of residents had a carer receiving this benefit at the time of their entry to the nursing home. For both males and females, those least likely to have had a carer receiving the DNCB were residents aged 80 and over. Older women over the age of 70 were somewhat less likely to have a carer who received this benefit than men over the age of 70. A higher proportion of women under the age of 65 had a carer receiving this benefit than men under the age of 65.

All services

The majority of clients of these aged care services examined pension recipients of some kind. Within each service type, client pension status follows predictable trends: most older persons held an age pension, older men aged 65 and above were those most likely to hold a repatriation or veteran's benefit. Those under

Table 10: Type of pension held by nursing home residents by age and sex at 30 June 1994.

Type of pension	Age											
	0-54		55-64		65-69		70-79		80+		All Ages	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Age	0	0.0	278	37.3	938	76.5	7,524	86.0	25,198	90.1	33,938	86.8
Disability support	362	86.0	355	47.7	115	9.4	76	0.9	97	0.3	1,005	2.6
Repatriation	1	0.2	27	3.6	88	7.2	757	8.7	1,559	5.6	2,432	6.2
Other	58	13.8	85	11.4	85	6.9	390	4.5	1,109	4.0	1,727	4.4
Total	421	100.0	745	100.0	1,226	100.0	8,747	100.0	27,963	100.0	39,102	100.0
Age	0	0.0	0	0.0	765	59.3	3,489	66.4	6,054	81.7	10,308	68.0
Disability support	382	82.3	622	83.6	311	24.1	118	2.2	34	0.5	1,467	9.7
Repatriation	2	0.4	20	2.7	126	9.8	1,395	26.6	981	13.2	2,524	16.7
Other	80	17.2	102	13.7	88	6.8	252	4.8	337	4.6	859	5.7
Total	464	100.0	744	100.0	1,290	100.0	5,254	100.0	7,406	100.0	15,158	100.0
Age	0	0.0	278	18.7	1,703	67.7	11,013	78.7	31,252	88.4	44,246	81.5
Disability support	744	84.1	977	65.6	426	16.9	194	1.4	131	0.4	2,472	4.6
Repatriation	3	0.3	47	3.2	214	8.5	2,152	15.4	2,540	7.2	4,956	9.1
Other	138	15.6	187	12.6	173	6.9	642	4.6	1,446	4.1	2,586	4.8
Total	885	100.0	1,489	100.0	2,516	100.0	14,001	100.0	35,369	100.0	54,260	100.0

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations

Number of missing cases for all residents = 19,292 (26.2%)

the age of 65 received the highest proportion of disability support pensions and a slightly higher proportion of males than females in these younger age groups received this pension. The large proportion of missing data for the residents of nursing homes and hostels precludes a comparison of the proportions of pension recipients across service types.

5. Cohabitants and Carers

Carers

Home and Community Care

According to the HACC service users characteristics survey, a carer was defined as a friend or relative who was providing informal assistance with tasks of daily living, or who was monitoring the person's well-being on a reliable and sustained basis. Fifty eight percent of HACC clients had a person who fulfilled this role. A higher proportion of male HACC service users were reported as having a person in this role than were female service users. Over the total sample, 66% of males had a carer compared to 55% of females. Table 11 shows variations of carer availability according to age and sex. While there was a general trend towards lower rates of carer availability among older service users, higher proportions of males of all age groups had a carer available than females. The only group of women where carer availability approached that for males overall (66%) were women under 55 (65%). However, males in this particular age group (that is, under 55) reported carers in 78% of cases.

HACC service users who had a carer were also asked if this carer was co-resident with the service user or, alternatively, if they visited the service user. Of all HACC service users, 38% were living with a carer at the time. The likelihood of HACC service users having had a co-resident carer decreased substantially as age increased. More than half of HACC service users below the age of 55 had a co-resident carer (59%), but less than a third of HACC service users over the age of 80 had a resident carer (32%). Table 12 shows that across all age groups, higher proportions of males than females had a resident carer. Those least likely to have the benefit of a co-resident carer were women over the age of 80 years (27%).

Table 11: *Carer availability by age and sex for HACC service users surveyed over a four week period, 1993-94.*

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
0-54	1,780	64.7	1,480	77.9	3,260	70.1
55-64	904	54.9	641	62.7	1,545	57.9
55-69	1,094	54.2	694	63.0	1,788	57.3
70-79	4,323	51.2	2,308	62.8	6,631	54.7
80+	5,952	55.3	2,730	64.5	8,682	57.9
All ages	14,053	54.8	7,853	65.8	21,906	58.3

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations

Number of missing cases = 4,095 (9.8%)

Data collected for one month between August 1993 and May 1994

Table 12: Resident carer availability by age and sex for HACC service users surveyed over a four week period, 1993-94.

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
0-54	1,404	53.2	1,207	66.6	2,611	58.6
55-64	635	40.0	484	49.1	1,119	43.5
55-69	722	36.8	516	49.3	1,238	41.2
70-79	2,348	28.7	1,646	47.2	3,994	34.2
80+	2,815	27.0	1,777	44.4	4,592	31.8
All ages	7,924	31.9	5,630	49.7	13,554	37.5

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations

Number of missing cases = 5,494 (13.2%)

Data collected for one month between August 1993 and May 1994

Community Options Projects

Sex and age differences were also evident with respect to carer availability for community options projects clients. Table 13 shows that carers became less available as age increased and that fewer women had carers than did men (69% of females and 76% of males).

Table 14 shows the number of community options projects clients with a resident carer, and the number of clients with a carer as a proportion of all community options projects clients. The availability of a co-resident carer decreased in older age groups, an effect which is particularly marked among women. Below the age of 55 years more than three quarters of all male community options projects clients had a resident carer (76% of males compared to only 65% of females). For community options clients over the age of 80 years only a half (51%) of males had a co-resident carer, while for females as few as a third (33%) had a co-resident carer.

Table 13: Carer availability by age and sex for COP clients surveyed over a two week period, 1993.

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
0-54	446	76.6	481	85.0	927	80.7
55-64	180	62.9	99	67.8	279	64.6
65-69	174	65.2	142	71.0	316	67.7
70-79	819	67.0	421	73.6	1,240	69.1
80+	1,162	69.4	511	75.1	1,673	71.0
All ages	2,781	69.0	1,654	76.4	4,435	71.6

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data = 529 (6.7%)

Table 14: Resident carer availability by age and sex for COP clients surveyed over a two week period, 1993.

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
0-54	380	65.3	432	76.3	812	70.7
55-64	138	48.3	84	57.5	222	51.4
65-69	129	48.3	120	60.0	249	53.3
70-79	488	39.9	329	57.5	817	45.5
80+	553	33.0	348	51.2	901	38.3
All ages	1,688	41.9	1,313	60.7	3,001	48.4

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.
Number of cases with missing data = 529 (6.7%)

Data on the pre-admission presence of carers for hostel and nursing home residents is not available. The numbers of nursing home residents whose carers were recipients of the DNCB (6%) provides only an indication of the proportion of carers present to residents who, prior to admission, had a carer who had applied for and met the eligibility criteria for, the benefit. Data are, however, available on the living arrangements of residents prior to entry into hostels and nursing homes. Indeed, these data are available for all four sectors of care, although in the case of HACC and community options projects, the level of detail is limited. It is important to bear in mind that cohabitation does not always imply the availability of a carer.

Living arrangements

Table 15: Number and proportion living alone by age and sex for HACC service users surveyed over a four week period, 1993-94.

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
0-54	687	24.5	433	22.8	1,120	23.8
55-64	732	42.5	396	38.8	1,128	41.1
55-69	1,067	49.3	446	39.2	1,513	45.8
70-79	5,378	59.9	1,593	41.8	6,971	54.5
80+	7,516	65.7	2,021	46.0	9,537	60.3
All ages	15,380	56.7	4,889	39.9	20,269	51.5

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations
Number of missing cases = 2,275 (10.1%)
Data collected for one month between August 1993 and May 1994

Home and Community Care

Just over one half of HACC clients had lived alone (52%), a smaller proportion of men had lived alone than women (40% of males compared to 57% of females). For both males and females as the age of the client increased the proportion who had lived alone increased: just under a quarter below the age of 55 lived alone (24%) but well over a half (60%) of clients over 80 years lived alone. Females over the age of 80 were the client group most likely to have

lived alone: two thirds (66%) of women in this age category had lived alone (Table 15).

Community Options Projects

Among community options projects clients 42% had lived alone (Table 16). Approximately one half of all female clients had lived alone (49%) and just under one third (30%) of male clients had lived alone. As the age of the clients increased, so too did the proportion who had lived alone: again, a trend more pronounced for women. Twenty percent of women below the age of 55 years had lived alone, a proportion which increased to 60% for women over the age of 80 years. For males, 15% below the age of 55 years had lived alone, a proportion which increased to 39% for males over the age of 80 years.

Table 16: *Number and proportion living alone by age and sex for community options clients for the two week survey period, 1993.*

Age group	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group	Number	% of age group
0-54	117	20.1	85	15.0	202	17.6
55-64	110	38.5	47	32.2	157	36.3
55-69	125	46.3	60	30.0	185	39.4
70-79	617	50.4	200	35.0	817	31.1
80+	1,003	59.9	265	38.9	1,268	53.8
All ages	1,972	48.8	657	30.3	2,629	42.4

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations

Number of missing cases = 523 (7.8%)

Hostels

Table 17 shows that a majority of hostel residents lived alone prior to admission to the hostel. Well over half (56%) of all residents fell into this category. Approximately a third of residents had lived with their spouse only, with their child and child's family, or with a person other than family or spouse, such as a friend or boarder (12%, 10% and 13% respectively). Two percent of residents had lived with their brother or sister, 3% with their child only, and a further 3% with family other than spouse, child or sibling.

A higher proportion of women (60%) had lived alone than men (45%). One in five men had lived with their spouse (21%), more than twice as many proportionally than women (9%). Similarly, proportionally more males than females had lived with a person other than those specified in other categories (17% of males compared to 11% of females). This category of living arrangement captures such co-residents as friends, boarders and relationships not formally recognised as marriages. A higher proportion of women compared to men had lived with their own child and their child's family (12% of women had shared with their child and their child's family compared to 8% of men).

The proportion of both men and women who had lived alone prior to admission increased with age. Of hostel residents over the age of 80, 59% had lived alone, whereas 22% of hostel residents below the age of 55 had lived alone.

Table 17: Usual cohabitant for hostel residents by age and sex at 30 June 1994.

Usual cohabitant	0-54		55-64		65-69		70-79		80+		All Ages	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Lived alone	22	17.7	120	34.6	298	49.1	2,819	55.8	12,379	62.2	15,639	60.1
Spouse only	7	5.7	42	12.1	67	11.0	605	12.0	1,573	7.9	2,294	8.8
Spouse and other	3	2.4	8	2.3	5	0.8	36	0.7	84	0.4	136	0.5
Sibling	5	4.0	18	5.2	26	4.3	120	2.4	355	1.8	524	2.0
Child	4	3.2	12	3.5	23	3.8	138	2.7	648	3.3	825	3.2
Child and child's family	3	2.4	21	6.1	54	8.9	535	10.6	2,294	11.5	2,907	11.2
Other family	32	25.8	27	7.8	13	2.1	96	1.9	434	2.2	602	2.3
Other	48	38.7	99	28.5	121	19.9	700	13.9	2,147	10.8	3,115	12.0
Total	124	100.0	347	100.0	607	100.0	5,049	100.0	19,914	100.0	26,042	100.0
						Female						
Lived alone	42	25.3	150	38.5	235	41.5	1,047	45.3	2,719	46.8	4,193	45.4
Spouse only	5	3.0	21	5.4	52	9.2	417	18.0	1,436	24.7	1,931	20.9
Spouse and other	8	4.8	9	2.3	12	2.1	37	1.6	81	1.4	147	1.6
Sibling	9	5.4	25	6.4	27	4.8	72	3.1	108	1.9	241	2.6
Child	1	0.6	2	0.5	8	1.4	29	1.3	124	2.1	164	1.8
Child and child's family	3	1.8	12	3.1	18	3.2	170	7.4	552	9.5	755	8.2
Other family	25	15.1	30	7.7	25	4.4	54	2.3	132	2.3	266	2.9
Other	73	44.0	141	36.2	189	33.4	485	21.0	653	11.3	1,541	16.7
Total	166	100.0	390	100.0	566	100.0	2,311	100.0	5,805	100.0	9,238	100.0
						Male						
Lived alone	64	22.1	270	36.6	533	45.4	3,866	52.5	15,098	58.7	19,851	56.1
Spouse only	12	4.1	63	8.6	119	10.1	1,022	13.9	3,009	11.7	4,231	12.0
Spouse and other	11	3.8	17	2.3	17	1.5	73	1.0	165	0.6	286	0.8
Sibling	14	4.8	43	5.8	53	4.5	192	2.6	463	1.8	773	2.2
Child	5	1.7	14	1.9	31	2.6	167	2.3	772	3.0	991	2.8
Child and child's family	6	2.1	33	4.5	72	6.1	705	9.6	2,846	11.1	3,663	10.4
Other family	57	19.7	57	7.7	38	3.2	150	2.0	566	2.2	876	2.5
Other	121	41.7	240	32.6	310	26.4	1,185	16.1	2,800	10.9	4,703	13.3
Total	290	100.0	737	100.0	1,173	100.0	7,360	100.0	25,719	100.0	35,374	100.0

Note: Proportions calculated excluding missing cases
 Number of missing cases = 17,256 (32.8%)

As the age of male hostel residents increased, the proportions who had lived with their spouse only also increased, from 3% for those below the age of 55 to 25% for those aged 80 and above. For women, the proportion who lived with their spouse alone remained fairly constant at around 12% after the age of 55 but dropped sharply to 8% for female residents aged 80 and over. Residents who had lived previously with their spouse and another person or persons were most common below the age of 55 (4% compared to less than 1% of those 80 years and over). Residents who had shared their previous dwelling with sibling were most common between the ages of 55 and 64 (6%) and this proportion decreased as the age of the residents increased such that among residents of age 80 and above, only 2% had shared with a sibling.

While a fairly constant proportion of women (3%) had lived together with their child only across all age groups, men were less likely to fall into this category. On average, only one percent of men below the age of 80 had shared with a child only but this proportion rose to 2% for male residents aged 80 and above. Two percent of male and female hostel residents below the age of 55 had been sharing with their child and child's family and this proportion increased to 10% and 12% for male and female hostel residents over the age of 80 respectively. The highest proportion of residents who had previously shared their dwelling with family members other than their child, child's family, spouse or sibling was found among residents aged below 55 years. The prevalence of this arrangement was markedly lower among older residents. At age 70 and over only 2% lived with an extended family compared to 20% below the age of 55. The proportion of residents who had lived with a person other than those previously specified decreased among older residents from as high as 43% for those below the age of 55 to as low as 11% for those aged 80 and above.

Nursing Homes

The living arrangements of nursing home residents prior to admission were similar to those of hostel residents. Most commonly, nursing home residents had lived alone prior to admission, although the proportion in this situation was somewhat lower than for hostel residents (33%). Twenty percent of nursing home residents had lived with their spouse only prior to entry into the nursing home and twenty eight percent of nursing home residents had lived with a person other than those previously specified such as a de facto partner or friends. Eight percent of nursing home residents had shared a residence with their own child and their child's family and four percent of nursing home residents had lived together with their child only prior to admission. Three percent of nursing home residents had lived with their spouse and another person or persons. Similar to hostel residents, 2% of nursing home residents had lived with a brother or sister prior to entry into the home. One percent of nursing home residents had previously lived with their parent or parents.

A higher proportion of women had lived alone than men (36% of women, 26% of men). In contrast, one third (35%) of male residents had lived with their spouse only and this was more than twice as many proportionally than female residents (14%). A greater proportion of women than men had lived with a person other than those previously specified, such as a de facto partner or

Table 18: Usual cohabitant for nursing home residents by age and sex at 30 June 1994.

Usual cohabitant	1-54		55-64		65-69		70-79		80+		All Ages	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
	Female											
Lived alone	47	11.3	133	17.2	325	26.5	2,985	33.9	10,385	38.3	13,875	36.2
Spouse only	44	10.6	224	29.0	359	29.3	2,035	23.1	2,509	9.2	5,171	13.5
Spouse and other	61	14.7	52	6.7	57	4.7	197	2.2	243	0.9	610	1.6
Sibling	18	4.3	41	5.3	29	2.4	157	1.8	523	1.9	768	2.0
Child	12	2.9	23	3.0	58	4.7	361	4.1	1,520	5.6	1,974	5.1
Child and child's family	9	2.2	33	4.3	78	6.4	728	8.3	2,659	9.8	3,507	9.1
Parents	62	14.9	28	3.6	8	0.7	38	0.4	206	0.8	342	0.9
Other family	13	3.1	15	1.9	11	0.9	117	1.3	475	1.8	631	1.6
Other	150	36.1	223	28.9	300	24.5	2,188	24.8	8,611	31.7	11,472	29.9
Total	416	100.0	772	100.0	1,225	100.0	8,806	100.0	27,131	100.0	38,350	100.0
	Male											
Lived alone	82	17.7	195	25.5	334	25.6	1,267	23.6	2,147	27.6	4,025	25.7
Spouse only	21	4.5	161	21.1	382	29.3	2,205	41.0	2,674	34.4	5,443	34.7
Spouse and other	52	11.2	79	10.3	101	7.8	260	4.8	272	3.5	764	4.9
Sibling	21	4.5	28	3.7	43	3.3	89	1.7	97	1.2	278	1.8
Child	1	0.2	6	0.8	12	0.9	68	1.3	222	2.9	309	2.0
Child and child's family	2	0.4	10	1.3	33	2.5	190	3.5	515	6.6	750	4.8
Parents	75	16.2	28	3.7	9	0.7	17	0.3	22	0.3	151	1.0
Other family	16	3.5	10	1.3	16	1.2	58	1.1	103	1.3	203	1.3
Other	193	41.7	247	32.3	373	28.6	1,225	22.8	1,722	22.2	3,760	24.0
Total	463	100.0	764	100.0	1,303	100.0	5,379	100.0	7,774	100.0	15,683	100.0
	Persons											
Lived alone	129	14.7	328	21.4	659	26.1	4,252	30.0	12,532	35.9	17,900	33.1
Spouse only	65	7.4	385	25.1	741	29.3	4,240	29.9	5,183	14.8	10,614	19.6
Spouse and other	113	12.9	131	8.5	158	6.3	457	3.2	515	1.5	1,374	2.5
Sibling	39	4.4	69	4.5	72	2.8	246	1.7	620	1.8	1,046	1.9
Child	13	1.5	29	1.9	70	2.8	429	3.0	1,742	5.0	2,283	4.2
Child and child's family	11	1.3	43	2.8	111	4.4	918	6.5	3,174	9.1	4,257	7.9
Parents	137	15.6	56	3.6	17	0.7	55	0.4	228	0.7	493	0.9
Other family	29	3.3	25	1.6	27	1.1	175	1.2	578	1.7	834	1.5
Other	343	39.0	470	30.6	673	26.6	3,413	24.1	10,333	29.6	15,232	28.2
Total	879	100.0	1,536	100.0	2,528	100.0	14,185	100.0	34,905	100.0	54,033	100.0

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations
 Number of missing cases = 19,519 (26.2%)

friends (30% of women, 24% of men). Higher proportions of women had shared a residence with their own child and their child's family than men (9% of women and 5% of men lived in this way) and a higher proportion of women had lived together with their child only prior to admission than men (5% of women, compared to 2% of men). As for hostel residents, a higher proportion of men had lived with their spouse and another person or persons prior to admission (5% and 2% respectively). Sex differences were not evident in relation to the proportion of residents who had lived with a brother or sister, with parents, or with family members other than those already mentioned.

The proportion of residents who had lived alone at admission was higher among older residents, and as for hostels, this trend was more pronounced among women than men. For males, the proportion living alone was higher by 10% from the ages of less than 55 years (18%) compared to more than 80 years (28%). For women, the proportion living alone was more than triple across the same ages groups with 11% having lived alone below the age of 55, to 38% having lived alone in the 80 and over age group. Higher proportions of residents had lived with their spouse only as the age of residents increased, although the proportion dropped again among the oldest residents by which time well over half of all residents had lived alone. For men, living with a spouse only was most common in the 70 to 79 age group; for women this arrangement was most common in the 65 to 69 age group.

Compared to those in younger age groups, higher proportions of men and women in the 80 and over age group had lived with their child only (6% and 3% respectively) however, the shift towards this arrangement was much greater for men than for women. Higher proportions of women than men had shared a residence with their child across the age groups but this arrangement was quite uncommon among male residents with the exception of the very old. For both men and women, the proportion who had shared a residence with their own child and their child's family increased with the age of the resident. Less than one percent of male nursing home residents and 2% of female nursing home residents below the age of 55 had been sharing with their child and child's family and this proportion increased to 7% for male hostel residents over the age of 80 and 10% for female hostel residents over the age of 80. Residents who had lived with their spouse and another person or persons prior to nursing home admission were most commonly below the age of 55 (13%). A higher proportion of residents below the age of 65 had lived with a brother or sister prior to entry into the home than older residents. The highest proportions of residents to have previously lived with their parent or parents or with family other than those already mentioned were among those aged below 55 years (16% and 3% respectively).

As for hostel residents, nursing home residents below the age of 55 were most likely to have lived with a person other than those previously specified such as a de facto partner or friend. The most frequent occurrence of this living arrangement was in this age group (39%) and the least frequent occurrence was for those aged between 70 and 79 (24%). Unlike hostels, for residents aged 80 and above there was a slightly larger proportion likely to live with a person not covered by the previous categories (30%). This was accounted for by the high

proportion of female residents over the age of 80 who had such a co-resident; a trend which was not present for males.

All services

Australian Bureau of Statistics census counts have shown that the number of lone-person households aged 65 and over has been increasing through the 1980s and into the 1990s (AIHW, 1995). This has come about because of the ageing of the population and the tendency of women to live longer than men and hence for wives to out-live their husbands (Cornish, 1993; McDonald, 1995). The living arrangements of clients of aged care services reflect these larger trends. Across the four service areas covered in this report, residents of hostels were those most likely to have lived alone prior to admission; more than half of hostel clientele had lived in this way. A similar proportion of lone dwellers were present among HACC clients. Nursing homes had the lowest proportion of clients who had lived alone prior to admission: only one third had lived under these circumstances. Clients of community options projects fell in the mid range. Across both residential and home based services, higher proportions of males compared to females had lived with someone else. The data for home based services showed that compared to females, higher proportions of males had a carer and that carers of males were more likely to be co-resident. Across all service types examined, the likelihood of clients having lived alone increased with age. Thus, older females, particularly those over the age of 80, were most likely to have lived alone. For clients of home based services, carer availability also decreased with age as did the likelihood of this carer being a co-resident. Thus, for home based services, older females were the group least likely to have had a carer and least likely to have had a co-resident carer.

6. Usual residence

Data on the type of accommodation in which the client or resident lived prior to admission was available (and relevant) only for nursing home and hostel residents.

Hostel residents

Reflecting the accommodation circumstances of the general population, most hostel residents had lived in a house or flat prior to admission. Seventy four percent of the total residents had lived in such accommodation, with similar proportions of men and women in these circumstances (74% of women and 72% of men). Higher proportions of older residents had come to the hostel from a house or a flat than younger residents. About one half (53%) of all residents below the age of 55 had moved to the hostel from a house or a flat compared to three quarters (75%) of all residents aged 80 and above.

Self-care units such as those found in retirement villages or aged care complexes (also referred to as independent units), were the second most common form of accommodation. Eleven percent of hostel residents had lived in such a unit, with proportionally more women than men in this accommodation (12% of female hostel residents and 8% of male residents). The proportion of residents

Table 19: Usual residence of hostel residents by age and sex at 30 June 1994.

Usual residence	0-54		55-64		65-69		70-79		80+		All Ages	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
	Female											
House or flat	76	60.8	230	66.7	439	71.7	3,804	74.8	14,919	74.3	19,468	74.2
Independent unit	3	2.4	16	4.6	39	6.4	492	9.7	2,689	13.4	3,239	12.3
Hostel	29	23.2	54	15.7	81	13.2	401	7.9	1,508	7.5	2,073	7.9
Nursing home	5	4.0	9	2.6	16	2.6	132	2.6	318	1.6	480	1.8
Psychiatric hospital	0	0.0	3	0.9	1	0.2	5	0.1	6	0.0	15	0.1
Other	12	9.6	33	9.6	36	5.9	253	5.0	635	3.2	969	3.7
Total	125	100.0	345	100.0	612	100.0	5,087	100.0	20,075	100.0	26,244	100.0
	Male											
House or flat	80	47.1	202	52.3	320	56.1	1,602	68.8	4,485	76.9	6,725	71.8
Independent unit	3	1.8	10	2.6	23	4.0	119	5.1	547	9.4	705	7.5
Hostel	42	24.7	81	21.0	100	17.5	277	11.9	439	7.5	960	10.3
Nursing home	14	8.2	22	5.7	25	4.4	90	3.9	102	1.7	259	2.8
Psychiatric hospital	1	0.6	5	1.3	3	0.5	6	0.3	1	0.0	17	0.2
Other	30	17.6	66	17.1	99	17.4	233	10.0	262	4.5	700	7.5
Total	170	100.0	386	100.0	570	100.0	2,327	100.0	5,836	100.0	9,366	100.0
	Persons											
House or flat	156	52.9	432	59.1	759	64.2	5,406	72.9	19,404	74.9	26,157	73.5
Independent unit	6	2.0	26	3.6	62	5.3	611	8.2	3,236	12.5	3,941	11.1
Hostel	71	24.1	135	18.5	181	15.3	678	9.2	1,947	7.5	3,062	8.6
Nursing home	19	6.4	31	4.2	41	3.5	222	3.0	420	1.6	733	2.1
Psychiatric hospital	1	0.3	8	1.1	4	0.3	11	0.2	7	0.0	31	0.1
Other	42	14.2	99	13.5	135	11.4	486	6.6	897	3.5	1,659	4.7
Total	295	100.0	731	100.0	1,182	100.0	7,414	100.0	25,911	100.0	35,583	100.0

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations
 Number of missing cases = 17,002 (32.4%)

who had lived in this type of accommodation increased as the age of the resident increased, with women having consistently higher proportions than men in each age group.

Nine percent of hostel residents had come to the hostel from another hostel. Eight percent of women and 10% of men were in this category. Residents below the age of 55 were most likely to have come from this type of accommodation (24%), with proportions decreasing in each of the incremental age groupings to a proportion of only 8% for those aged 80 and over. For residents between the ages of 55 and 79, slightly larger proportions of men came from hostel accommodation than had women, with equivalent proportions for each sex in the other age groups.

Two percent of hostel residents had come to the hostel from a nursing home. Two percent of women and 3% of men were in this category. Residents below the age of 55 were most likely to have come from this type of accommodation (7%), with proportions decreasing in each of the incremental age groupings to a proportion of only 2% for those aged 80 and over. For residents below the age of 80, larger proportions of men had come from nursing home accommodation than had women.

Less than 1% of hostel residents came from psychiatric hospitals. Similar proportions of women and men had come from such a facility. The age group which contained the highest proportion of residents from these hospitals was residents 55-64 years of age.

Five percent of residents came to the hostel from a type of accommodation other than those already covered. A higher proportion of younger residents than older residents had come from these unclassified accommodation types (15% below the age of 55 dropping in proportions to 4% by age 80 and over) as did a slightly higher proportion of men than women (8% of males and 4% of females).

Nursing home residents

Like hostel residents, nursing home residents were most likely to have lived in a house or flat prior to admission. Sixty one percent of the total nursing home residents had lived in such accommodation, with 58% of women and 67% of men in these circumstances. Higher proportions of older residents compared to younger residents had come to the home from this type of accommodation, although for those in the oldest age groups the proportion again declined. The age at which the highest proportion of men had lived in a house or flat was from 70 to 79 years (69%) with a slight decrease in the proportion for those aged 80 years and above (67%). The age at which the highest proportion of women had lived in a house or flat was 65-69 years of age (71%) with the proportion decreasing as the age of the female residents increased, such that, of female residents aged 80 and over, only 55% had lived in a house or flat prior to admission.

Hostel accommodation was the second most common form of residence for nursing home residents prior to admission. Twenty nine percent of nursing home residents had come from a hostel to the nursing home. Higher

Table 20: Usual residence of nursing home residents by age and sex at 30 June 1994.

Usual residence	1-54		55-64		65-69		70-79		80+		All Ages	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
	Female											
House or flat	276	65.4	526	67.9	869	70.9	5,869	66.3	15,058	54.9	22,598	58.4
Independent unit	4	0.9	11	1.4	32	2.6	405	4.6	1,415	5.2	1,867	4.8
Hostel	53	12.6	141	18.2	198	16.2	2,035	23.0	9,784	35.7	12,211	31.6
Psychiatric hospital	20	4.7	25	3.2	53	4.3	112	1.3	145	0.5	355	0.9
Other	69	16.4	72	9.3	74	6.0	427	4.8	1,002	3.7	1,644	4.3
Total	422	100.0	775	100.0	1,226	100.0	8,848	100.0	27,404	100.0	38,675	100.0
	Male											
House or flat	270	58.1	488	63.5	841	64.5	3,739	69.3	5,189	66.5	10,527	66.9
Independent unit	5	1.1	10	1.3	28	2.1	189	3.5	416	5.3	648	4.1
Hostel	70	15.1	135	17.6	253	19.4	986	18.3	1,838	23.5	3,282	20.9
Psychiatric hospital	23	4.9	36	4.7	45	3.5	111	2.1	74	0.9	289	1.8
Other	97	20.9	100	13.0	137	10.5	369	6.8	290	3.7	993	6.3
Total	465	100.0	769	100.0	1,304	100.0	5,394	100.0	7,807	100.0	15,739	100.0
	Persons											
House or flat	546	61.6	1,014	65.7	1,710	67.6	9,608	67.5	20,247	57.5	33,125	60.9
Independent unit	9	1.0	21	1.4	60	2.4	594	4.2	1,831	5.2	2,515	4.6
Hostel	123	13.9	276	17.9	451	17.8	3,021	21.2	11,622	33.0	15,493	28.5
Psychiatric hospital	43	4.8	61	4.0	98	3.9	223	1.6	219	0.6	644	1.2
Other	166	18.7	172	11.1	211	8.3	796	5.6	1,292	3.7	2,637	4.8
Total	887	100.0	1,544	100.0	2,530	100.0	14,242	100.0	35,211	100.0	54,414	100.0

Note: Cases with missing values excluded from calculations

Number of missing cases = 19,138 (26.0%)

proportions of women than men had made this transition (32% of women compared to 21% of men). A higher proportion of older residents had come from such accommodation than younger residents; one third (33%) of residents over the age of 80 were in this category compared to 14% of residents below the age of 55. The age trends for this category of prior residence were similar for males and females although there were somewhat higher proportions of women over the age of 70 in this category than men over the age of 70.

Five percent of nursing home residents had come from independent units. Men and women were equally likely to have come from this type of accommodation (4% of men and 5% of women). The proportions of residents who had lived in this type of accommodation increased similarly for males and females as the age of the resident increased.

As for hostels, approximately 1% of nursing home residents had previously been residing in a psychiatric hospital. Equivalent proportions of women and men had come from such a facility (1% of women and 2% of men). The age group with the highest proportion of residents from these hospitals was residents aged below 55 years (5%).

Five percent of residents came to the nursing home from a type of accommodation other than those already covered. A higher proportion of younger residents than older residents had come from these unclassified accommodation types (19% below the age of 55, reducing in proportion to 4% by age 80 and over) and a higher proportion of men than women had lived in these places (6% of males and 4% of females).

Residential services

The usual residence of nursing home and hostel clients to some degree reflects the accommodation options of individuals whose dependency is increasing with age. While the most common residential arrangement for residents of nursing homes and hostels was to have lived in a house or flat prior to admission, a higher proportion of hostel residents had this arrangement than nursing home residents. A higher proportion of hostel residents than nursing home residents had lived in independent units before admission; more than one resident in ten had come from such accommodation. In contrast, more than a quarter of nursing home residents had come to the home after having previously lived in a hostel and as few as one in twenty nursing home residents had previously lived in an independent unit.

7. Marital status

Information on the marital status of aged care service users was available for nursing home and hostel residents but not for clients of HACC and community options projects.

Hostel residents

Table 21 shows that two thirds (67%) of hostel residents were widowed at the time of admission to the hostel. The second largest group of hostel residents were married at the time of admission (16%) and a further 12% of hostel residents had never been married. The remaining five percent comprised those who were separated (2%), divorced (3%) or had a de facto relationship prior to admission to the hostel (less than 1%).

A considerably higher proportion of women were widowed compared to men (75% of women, 42% of men). Compared to women, a higher proportion of male hostel residents had been married (28% compared to 11% respectively), never been married (18% of males, 11% of females), separated (5% of males, 1% of females) and a higher proportion of males were divorced than women (6% of men compared to 2% of women).

A higher proportion of older residents had entered the hostel widowed than younger residents, with 2% of residents below the age of 55 widowed and three quarters of residents (73%) over the age of 80 widowed.

Over the total sample of hostel residents, those aged 70 to 79 years were most likely to have been married (18%). There are differences, however, between males and females with respect to the distribution of married people with age. Below the age of 70 the proportions of residents who were married at the time of admission was similar for both men and women, and increased by small proportions from 10% of men and women below the age of 55, to 15 and 14% for men and women respectively between the ages of 65 and 69. For women this pattern of increase in proportion continued in the 70 to 79 age group, but then fell away for those over the age of 80 (10%). For men, the proportion who were married at the time of admission rose to 25% for the 70 to 79 years age group. Another increase in the proportion married was evident for men aged 80 years and over, of whom one in three (33%) were married, or more than three times the proportion of women in the same age group.

The highest proportion of separated residents were those below the age of 55 (11%), although differences are evident between males and females with regard to the prevalence of this status with age. Male residents between the ages of 55 and 64 were most likely to have been separated at the time of their admission (12%) but among females residents, those most likely to have been separated were below the age of 55 (13%). Between the ages of 55 and 64 females were less than half as likely as females below the age of 55 to have been separated (5% of females between 55 and 64 years of age were separated).

Residents below the age of 55 were most likely to have never been married, with approximately six in ten residents (62%) below the age of 55 who had never been married and approximately one in ten residents (9%) over the age of 80 who had never been married. For both males and females, younger residents below the age of 65 years were most likely to have had a de facto relationship or to have been divorced.

Table 22: Marital status of nursing home residents by age and sex at 30 June 1994.

Marital Status	1-54		55-64		65-69		70-79		80+		All Ages	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Female												
Widowed	18	3.0	173	17.3	497	31.5	5,383	51.8	23,132	71.4	29,203	63.5
Never married	246	41.0	233	23.3	207	13.1	849	8.2	2,926	9.0	4,461	9.7
Separated	34	5.7	39	3.9	41	2.6	134	1.3	134	0.4	382	0.8
Divorced	68	11.3	87	8.7	97	6.2	316	3.0	301	0.9	869	1.9
De facto	4	0.7	11	1.1	13	0.8	47	0.5	35	0.1	110	0.2
Married	172	28.7	407	40.7	646	41.0	3,397	32.7	5,078	15.7	9,700	21.1
Other	58	9.7	50	5.0	76	4.8	257	2.5	792	2.4	1,233	2.7
Total	600	100.0	1,000	100.0	1,577	100.0	10,383	100.0	32,398	100.0	45,958	100.0
Male												
Widowed	6	0.9	48	4.9	184	11.7	1,296	20.5	3,358	37.3	4,892	26.4
Never married	331	52.3	344	34.9	413	26.2	876	13.9	804	8.9	2,768	14.9
Separated	35	5.5	39	4.0	77	4.9	142	2.2	121	1.3	414	2.2
Divorced	66	10.4	126	12.8	131	8.2	353	5.6	182	2.0	858	4.6
De facto	14	2.2	10	1.0	6	0.4	30	0.5	22	0.2	82	0.4
Married	128	20.2	368	37.4	704	44.6	3,455	54.7	4,346	48.2	9,001	48.6
Other	53	8.4	50	5.1	64	4.1	170	2.7	178	2.0	515	2.8
Total	633	100.0	985	100.0	1,579	100.0	6,322	100.0	9,011	100.0	18,530	100.0
Persons												
Widowed	24	1.9	221	11.1	681	21.6	6,679	40.0	26,490	64.0	34,095	52.9
Never married	577	46.8	577	29.1	620	19.6	1,725	10.3	3,730	9.0	7,229	11.2
Separated	69	5.6	78	3.9	118	3.7	276	1.7	255	0.6	796	1.2
Divorced	134	10.9	213	10.7	228	7.2	669	4.0	483	1.2	1,727	2.7
De facto	18	1.5	21	1.1	19	0.6	77	0.5	57	0.1	192	0.3
Married	300	24.3	775	39.0	1,350	42.8	6,852	41.0	9,424	22.8	18,701	29.0
Other	111	9.0	100	5.0	140	4.4	427	2.6	970	2.3	1,748	2.7
Total	1,233	100.0	1,985	100.0	3,156	100.0	16,705	100.0	41,409	100.0	64,488	100.0

Note Cases with missing values excluded from calculations

Number of missing cases = 9,064 (12.3%)

Nursing home residents

Nursing home residents had a similar marital status profile to that of hostel residents, with a few notable exceptions. Like hostel residents, nursing home residents were most likely to have been widowed at the time of admission to the home, however the proportion who were widowed (53%) was lower than that for hostels. As in hostels, the second most common marital status for nursing home residents was to have been married at the time of admission although the proportion for nursing homes (29%) was almost twice that for hostel residents. Similar to hostel residents, 11% of nursing home residents had never been married. The remaining 5% of nursing home residents were either separated (1%), divorced (3%), or in a de facto relationship prior to admission to the home (less than one percent).

More than twice as many women in nursing homes were widowed at admission compared to men (64% of women and 26% of men). More than two times the proportion of men were married at the time of admission as women (49% of men compared to 21% of women). A higher proportion of males had never been married compared to females (15% and 10% respectively) and a somewhat larger proportion of men were divorced (5% of men and 2% of women). Similar proportions of men and women had been separated (2 and 1% respectively) or had a de facto relationship at the time of admission (less than 1%).

As for hostels, a higher proportion of older residents were admitted to the nursing home widowed than younger residents, with 2% of residents below the age of 55 years having been widowed and two out of three residents (64%) over the age of 80 having been widowed. The highest proportions of residents who had never been married, were separated, or were divorced, occurred among younger residents below the age of 65 years. Over the total sample of nursing residents, those aged 65 to 79 years were most likely to have been married. In the two age groups 65 to 69 and 70 to 79, two in five (43% and 41% respectively) were married at the time of admission to the hostel. This was more than twice as many as for hostel residents in the same age groups.

Differences between males and females in nursing homes with respect to age and marital status are similar to patterns observed for hostel residents. The proportion of male residents who were married was highest in the 70 to 79 age group and for women the proportion was highest between the ages of 65 and 69 (41%). For men the largest proportion of divorcees was among residents aged 55 to 64 (13%) and for women the largest proportion was among residents below the age of 55 (11%). For females the most common occurrence of de facto relationships was for residents between the ages of 55 and 64 (1% of females between the ages of 55 and 59 were in a de facto relationship) and for males the most common occurrence was for those below the age of 55 (2% of males below the age of 55 were in a de facto relationship). Below the age of 80 higher proportions of men had never been married than women but at 80 years and over the proportions became similar.

Residential services

For the most part, clients of residential care services were widowed at the time of admission: approximately two thirds of hostel residents and half of all nursing home residents. Being widowed was more common among older residents and much more common among women in both homes and hostels. Married residents were the second most common group in nursing homes and hostels, however almost twice as many nursing home residents were married compared to hostel residents, and a higher proportion of male residents had been married than female residents. Those who were never married made up the other substantial group of clients of residential services. Approximately one in ten hostel and nursing home residents had never been married, and a somewhat higher proportion of men were in this category than females.

8. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

One important objective of the Aged Care Reform Strategy was to facilitate access to aged care services by people of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent. In acknowledgment of the lower life expectancy and higher incidence of illness and debilitation currently evident among indigenous Australians, the age cut off used for planning for the provision of aged care facilities for these people is 50 years: twenty years younger than for non-indigenous Australians (DHHCS, 1991).

Examination of service use data confirms that indigenous Australians make use of aged care services at considerably younger ages than their non-indigenous counterparts. In addition to their particular physical and medical requirements, indigenous Australians show important differences in social and cultural characteristics which predispose them to patterns of service use atypical of those of the non-indigenous population. For instance, the report of the Aged Care Reform Strategy Mid-Term Review made note of the difficulty of developing culturally appropriate residential care services for indigenous people, and described the preference among indigenous Australians for home and community care projects (DHHCS, 1991). The data presented here provide a profile of some of the characteristics of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander aged care service users across the four areas of service provision described in this report.

Home and Community Care

From the survey of 41,653 HACC service users, information on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status was not available for a total of 4,331 (10%) service users. Excluding these missing cases from further analyses, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders comprised 3% of HACC service users. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service users differed from non-indigenous Australians with respect to the ratio of males to females, but most particularly by their age and living arrangements.

Just over one-third of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander HACC service users were males (37%). The proportion of males was slightly higher among

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander users of HACC services compared to non-indigenous users (31% of non-indigenous users were males).

Examination of the age distribution of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander users of HACC services revealed a markedly different pattern compared to that obtained for all HACC service users. The modal age group for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander HACC service users is less than 50 years; for non-indigenous Australians the modal age category is 80 to 84 years. Among indigenous Australians aged 50 years and over, the most common age group was 65 to 69 years, fifteen years younger than the mode for non-indigenous Australians. This service use pattern is consistent with mortality and morbidity trends for indigenous Australians and non-indigenous Australians (Abraham, d'Espaignet, & Stevenson, 1995). Table 23 shows that indigenous Australians make greater use of HACC services at younger ages compared to non-indigenous Australians.

Similar proportions of indigenous and non-indigenous HACC service users received the pension (95% of indigenous Australians were pension recipients and 93% of the total sample were recipients). A high incidence of missing data precludes the presentation of frequencies regarding recipients of the pension health benefit and the veteran's benefit.

Table 23: Age profile for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Home and Community Care service users, 1993-94.

Age group	Aboriginal		Non-Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
0-49	213	20.8	3,487	9.6
50-54	65	6.3	703	1.9
55-59	81	7.9	854	2.4
60-64	109	10.6	1,599	4.4
65-69	154	15.0	2,977	8.2
70-74	132	12.9	5,120	14.1
75-79	113	11.0	6,788	18.7
80-84	89	8.7	7,786	21.5
85-89	49	4.8	4,769	13.1
90 +	20	2.0	2,214	6.1
Total	1,025	100.0	36,297	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data: 4,331 (10.4%)

Data collected for one month between August 1993 and May 1994

A higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander HACC service users lived with someone else compared to non-indigenous users. Just under three quarters (73%) of indigenous Australian HACC service users lived with someone else compared to just under one-half (49%) of non-indigenous HACC service users. In comparison, the proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander HACC service users with a carer available was equivalent to the proportion noted among non-indigenous users (60% and 58%, respectively).

Community Options Projects

Of community options clients sampled nationally in 1993, 7% were of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent. Thirty eight percent of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community options clients were males, 4% higher than the proportion of males in the non-indigenous population.

A sizeable proportion of non-indigenous community options clients were below the age of 50 (15%) but for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service users as many as one in four (24%) were below the age of 50 (Table 24). For older community options projects clients (those over 50 years), the peak of community options clients occurs at a considerably younger age for indigenous Australians than for non-indigenous Australians. For indigenous Australians aged 50 years and over, the largest proportion of clients was between the ages of 70 and 74 years (14%); for older non-indigenous Australians, the highest proportion of clients was noted between the ages of 80 and 84 years (20%). Seventy per cent of non-indigenous community options clients were aged 70 years and above. In contrast, 67% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community options clients were below the age of 70. There was a greater use of community options projects by younger indigenous Australians, with a small increase in the proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service users with increasing age. The percentage of indigenous Australians in the 70 to 74 years age group was only 4% larger than that in the 50 to 54 years age group. In contrast, a ten fold increase was noted in the proportion of non-indigenous Australians using community options projects, from the ages of 50 to 54 years (2%) to 80 to 84 years (20%).

Table 24: Age profile for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community options project clients, 1993

Age group	Aboriginal		Non-Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
0-49	90	24.1	879	14.9
50-54	35	9.4	129	2.2
55-59	41	11.0	160	2.7
60-64	39	10.5	198	3.4
65-69	45	12.1	403	6.8
70-74	50	13.4	679	11.5
75-79	34	9.1	882	14.9
80-84	23	6.2	1,197	20.3
85-89	13	3.5	853	14.4
90 +	3	0.8	528	8.9
Total	373	100.0	5,908	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data: 445 (6.7%)

A somewhat higher proportions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community options projects clients compared to non-indigenous community options projects clients were recipients of the pension (95% of indigenous Australians compared to 92% of non-indigenous Australians). Again, missing data counts preclude a comparison of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander to non-indigenous pension health benefit recipient rates.

Just under three quarters of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community options clients lived with someone else (73%). This proportion was substantially larger than that for non-indigenous community options clients for whom 57% lived with someone else. Clearly, however, not all co-residents were able or willing to be carers: only 43% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients had a co-resident carer, 20% had a visiting carer, leaving 37% without a carer. In comparison, 48% of non-indigenous clients had a co-resident carer, 22% had a visiting carer, leaving just 28% without a carer.

Hostels

Records established at the time of admission to the hostel collect data on all residents, but the item indicating whether residents are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent is not a mandatory field. Consequently, of the 52,535 hostel residents present at 30 June 1994, information concerning indigenous origin was not available for 30,269 (58%) residents. For hostel residents for whom this data was available, 2% were of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent. Almost half of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents were males (48%) which proportionately was almost twice as many males as among non-indigenous hostel residents (26%).

Table 25 illustrates the age breakdown of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-indigenous residents in hostels which reveals that the modal age group for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents was the same as for non-indigenous hostel residents: 80 to 84 years (10% of indigenous Australians and 15% of non-indigenous Australians fell into this age category). However, between the ages of 50 and 75 there was almost double the proportion of indigenous Australians compared to non-indigenous Australians (29% of indigenous Australians fell in this age category as compared to 15% of non-indigenous Australians).

Table 25: *Age profile for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents at 30 June 1994*

Age group	Aboriginal		Non-Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
0-49	35	10.2	77	14.9
50-54	15	4.4	84	2.2
55-59	20	5.8	152	2.7
60-64	30	8.8	315	3.4
65-69	33	9.6	711	6.8
70-74	42	12.2	1,576	11.5
75-79	41	12.0	3,172	14.9
80-84	59	17.2	6,080	20.3
85-89	43	12.5	6,012	14.4
90 +	25	7.3	3,678	8.9
Total	343	100.0	21,857	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data: 30,335 (57.7%)

Similar proportions of Aboriginal and non-indigenous hostel residents were pension recipients (93% and 91% for indigenous Australians and non-indigenous Australians respectively).

A higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander residents lived with someone else prior to entry into a hostel than non-indigenous Australians (68% compared to 43%). Information on the availability of a carer prior to entry into the hostel is not collected, however, information is available on the relationship of the cohabitant to the hostel resident. Table 26 presents this information for indigenous Australians and non-indigenous Australians. Where the hostel resident had been living with another person or persons, for indigenous Australians this was most likely to have been a person other than family (22%), followed by their child and their child's family (14%), and then by a family member other than immediate siblings, children or spouse (12%); for non-indigenous Australians this was most likely to have been a person other than family (13%), followed by their spouse only (12%).

Table 26: Usual cohabitant for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents at 30 June 1994.

Cohabitant	Aboriginal		Non Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
Lives alone	112	32.2	12,398	57.2
Spouse only	23	6.6	2,667	12.3
Spouse and other	18	5.2	157	0.7
Sibling	20	5.8	476	2.2
Child	7	2.0	618	2.9
Child and child's family	49	14.1	2,143	9.9
Other family	43	12.4	474	2.2
Other	76	21.8	2,739	12.6
Total	348	100	21,672	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data: 30,515 (58.1%)

Table 27 shows that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents were less likely than non-indigenous hostel residents to have lived in a house or flat before coming to the hostel (60% or indigenous Australians lived in a house or flat prior to the hostel, compared to 75% or non-indigenous Australians). A higher proportion of non-indigenous hostel residents compared to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents had moved from an independent unit as in a retirement village (11% of non-indigenous Australians lived in such a unit, compared to 3% or indigenous Australians). Higher proportions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents than non-indigenous residents had lived in a nursing home (4 and 2% respectively) or hostel (18 and 8%, respectively) prior to their current hostel admission. Fourteen percent of Aborigines came from unspecified accommodation arrangements, this represents, more than three times the proportion for non-indigenous residents.

Table 27: Usual residence for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents at 30 June 1994.

Type of residence	Aboriginal		Non Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
House or flat	212	60.4	16,294	75.1
Independent retirement village unit	12	3.4	2,324	10.7
Hostel	63	18.0	1,750	8.1
Nursing home	15	4.3	432	2.0
Psychiatric hospital	0	0.0	23	0.1
Other	49	14.0	887	4.1
Total	351	100.0	21,710	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.
Number of cases with missing data: 30,474 (58.0%)

Table 28 shows that the majority of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents were widowed (52%) but this proportion was lower than that noted among non-indigenous residents, two-thirds of whom (67%) were widowed. A higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents compared to non-indigenous residents had never been married (22% compared to 12%), were separated (9% compared to 2%), or had lived in a de facto relationship (3% compared to 0.1%).

Table 28: Marital status of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents at 30 June 1994

Marital status	Aboriginal		Non Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
Widowed	180	51.6	14,496	66.6
Never married	75	21.5	2,686	12.3
Separated	30	8.6	417	1.9
Divorced	9	2.6	720	3.3
De facto	10	2.9	31	0.1
Married	45	12.9	3,408	15.7
Total	349	100.0	21,758	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data
Number of cases with missing data: 30,515 (58.1%)

Nursing Homes

Records established at the time of admission to a nursing home collect data on all residents, although, as is the case for hostels, the item indicating whether residents are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent is not a mandatory field. Consequently, of the 73,552 nursing home residents present at 30 June 1994, information concerning indigenous origin was not available for 17,668 (24%) residents. For nursing home residents for whom this data was available, 1% were of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent. One-third (33%) of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents were males; again this proportion was somewhat higher than that noted for non-indigenous Australians (29%).

The number and proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander residents in nine age categories is shown in Table 29. The modal age group was the same for both groups: 80 to 84 years (19% of indigenous Australians and 24% of non-indigenous Australians fell into this category). There is however, evidence of heavier use of nursing homes by younger indigenous Australians compared to non-indigenous Australians. Just over one third (36%) of non-indigenous hostel residents were aged under 80 years, whereas half (50%) of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents were aged under 80 years. Likewise, the proportion of indigenous Australians below the age of 50 (7%) was approximately seven times that of the proportion of non-indigenous Australians (1%).

Although the percentage of missing data was high (36%) regarding pension status for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents, available data suggests that a higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents were pension recipients than non-indigenous Australians. All indigenous Australians for whom this question was completed received some form of pension; in contrast, 94% of non-indigenous Australians received some form of pension.

Table 29: Age profile for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents at 30 June 1994

Age group	Aboriginal		Non-Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
0-49	43	6.9	669	1.2
50-54	9	1.4	338	0.6
55-59	27	4.3	597	1.1
60-64	19	3.0	1,092	2.0
65-69	44	7.0	2,676	4.9
70-74	74	11.8	5,387	9.8
75-79	100	15.9	8,870	16.1
80-84	119	19.0	13,071	23.8
85-89	110	17.5	12,455	22.7
90 +	82	13.1	9,833	17.9
Total	627	100.0	54,988	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data: 17,937 (24.4%)

Table 30 lists the cohabitants of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-indigenous residents prior to admission. Approximately two-thirds (68%) of non-indigenous residents lived with someone else prior to entry into the nursing home, but among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander residents this proportion was slightly higher (72%). Where an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander resident had been living with another person or persons, this was most likely to have been a person other than family (30%) such as a de facto partner, a friend or boarder. This proportion was similar to that for non-indigenous nursing home residents, for whom 28% had been living with a person other than family.

Table 30: Usual cohabitant for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents at 30 June 1994.

Cohabitant	Aboriginal		Non Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
Lives alone	165	28.0	14,641	32.4
Spouse only	67	11.4	9,149	20.2
Spouse and other	26	4.4	1,159	2.6
Sibling	15	2.5	886	2.0
Child	15	2.5	1,976	4.4
Child and child's family	57	9.7	3,623	8.0
Parents	15	2.5	433	1.0
Other family	51	8.7	662	1.5
Other	178	30.2	12,707	28.1
Total	589	100.0	45,236	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data: 27,727 (37.7%)

The second most common cohabitant for both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-indigenous nursing home residents was a spouse. Eleven per cent of indigenous Australians lived alone with their spouse prior to admission, almost half the proportion for non-indigenous residents (20%). The resident's child and their child's family was the third most common co-resident for both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-indigenous nursing home residents (10% and 8% respectively). A similar proportion of indigenous Australians were co-residing with family members other than parents and children (9%), but non-indigenous Australians were far less likely to have lived in this extended family arrangement (2%). Similar proportions of non-indigenous and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander residents had lived with a spouse and another person or persons prior to admission (3% for non-indigenous Australians and 4% for indigenous Australians), alone with their child (4% for non-indigenous Australians and 3% for indigenous Australians), with a sibling (2% for both groups) and with parents (1% for non-indigenous Australians and 3% for indigenous Australians).

As Table 31 shows, most Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents had lived in a house or flat prior to admission. The proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander residents who had lived in such accommodation (58%) was only slightly below that of non-indigenous residents (61%). One in four (24%) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents had come to the nursing home from a hostel; three percent less than the proportion of non-indigenous residents from the same type of previous residence (28%). Approximately equal proportions of indigenous Australians and non-indigenous Australians had lived in an independent retirement village unit or similar accommodation (4 and 5%, respectively). Equal proportions of both indigenous and non-indigenous Australians had come to the nursing home from a psychiatric hospital (1% for both groups). Indigenous Australians were almost three times more likely than non-indigenous Australians to have come to the nursing home from other accommodation not included in the previous categories (13% and 5% respectively).

Table 31: Usual residence for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents at 30 June 1994.

Type of residence	Aboriginal		Non Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
House or flat	345	57.8	27,833	61.1
Independent retirement village unit	24	4.0	2,107	4.6
Hostel	145	24.3	12,823	28.2
Psychiatric hospital	6	1.0	567	1.2
Other	77	12.9	2,219	4.9
Total	597	100.0	45,549	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data: 27,406 (37.3%)

Similar proportions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-indigenous nursing home residents had been widowed. As Table 32 shows, just over half of both groups of residents had been widowed (54% of indigenous Australians and 52% of non-indigenous Australians). Fourteen per cent of indigenous Australians had never been married at the time of admission, a proportion only slightly higher than that for non-indigenous Australians (14% of indigenous Australians compared to 11% of non-indigenous Australians). A somewhat higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents compared to non-indigenous Australians were separated (4 and 1% respectively), divorced (4 and 3% respectively) or de facto (2 and 0.3% respectively) at the time of admission to the home. One in five (20%) indigenous Australians were married at the time of admission to the nursing home, 10% less than the proportion of non-indigenous residents who had been married. Two to three per cent of both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-indigenous nursing home residents had marital arrangements other than those specified above at the time of admission.

Table 32: Marital status of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents at 30 June 1994

Marital status	Aboriginal		Non Aboriginal	
	Number	%	Number	%
Widowed	344	54.1	28,581	52.1
Never married	90	14.2	6,142	11.2
Separated	23	3.6	653	1.2
Divorced	25	3.9	1,397	2.5
De facto	11	1.7	159	0.3
Married	127	20.0	16,643	30.4
Other	16	2.5	1,254	2.3
Total	636	100.0	54,829	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data: 18,087 (24.6%)

All services

Indigenous Australians comprise 3% of Home and Community Care clients, 7% of community options clients, 2% of hostel residents, 1% of nursing home residents, and an estimated 1.6% of the population of Australia (ABS, 1995b). Bearing in mind the limitations of the data presented here, it appears that indigenous Australians make greater use of non-residential aged care services than residential services. An important reason for this apparent under-representation of indigenous Australians in residential aged care services is detailed in the report of the Tjilpi Pampa Tjutaku Project, titled "*They Might Have To Drag Me Like A Bullock*" (Woenne-Green, 1995). This report documents the strong desire of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to remain on the land in their old age, including the time in which they approach death.

Given that life expectancy and health outcomes are so much poorer for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population, it follows that indigenous Australians would make use of aged care services at an earlier age. This is indeed the case for Home and Community Care and community options projects, whose Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clientele is predominantly under the age of 70 years, but whose non-indigenous clientele is predominantly over the age of 70 years. This trend is also evident in residential aged care services, although to a lesser degree. Sizeable proportions of indigenous Australians in nursing homes and hostels are among the very old, aged 80 years and over, well beyond the average life-expectancy for indigenous Australians.

In the non-indigenous Australian population, approximately one third of individuals in each of the four service types were male. For indigenous Australians the proportion of males was consistently higher than that for non-indigenous Australians, although this difference was small for users of HACC, community options clients and nursing homes. For hostel residents the proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander males was almost twice that of non-indigenous males. It is important to note, however, that this large difference may be an artefact of the high number of missing cases in the hostel data, producing unreliable client population estimates. The observation that larger proportions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander males make use of services than non-indigenous males has been observed in relation to other health care facilities. For instance, hospital admission rates in 1991-92 were 71% higher for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander males than for non-indigenous males, but admission rates were 57% higher for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander females compared to non-indigenous females (AIHW, 1994).

A higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander users of aged care services compared to non-indigenous users of aged care services had shared their dwelling with others. However, the presence of co-residents cannot be assumed to imply the presence of a carer. Among home care services, there were fewer indigenous Australians with a carer than there were indigenous Australians with co-residents. Although a smaller proportion of indigenous Australians lived alone relative to non-indigenous Australians, co-residents of Indigenous Australians were less likely to be able or willing to undertake a

carer's role. Similar proportions of indigenous Australians and non-indigenous Australians were without a carer (in the case of community options projects, a higher proportion of indigenous Australians compared to non-indigenous Australians were without a carer).

The majority of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents had lived in a house or flat prior to admission. A higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander residents than non-indigenous residents had previously lived in a nursing home or other hostel or in some other unspecified form of accommodation. A lower proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents compared to non-indigenous residents had lived in an independent unit or in a house or flat. Although the trends for nursing home residents are somewhat different, showing less difference between people of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent and non-indigenous descent, a higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander nursing home residents had come to the home from an unspecified form of accommodation than non-indigenous residents.

Information on marital status, available only for hostel and nursing home residents, shows that, like non-indigenous residents, the largest proportion of indigenous Australians in hostels and nursing homes were widowed. It also appears that a higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander residents had marital arrangements which may have left them without a partner to care for them - that is, a higher proportion of indigenous Australians were separated. Indigenous Australians were also more likely to have never been married and to have lived in a defacto relationship prior to entry into residential care.

Comparisons of aged care service use by indigenous Australians across residential and non-residential care are made difficult by the high proportion of missing data regarding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status. This problem is most evident for hostel residents. This avoidable source of data loss seriously compromises the validity of any analyses concerning Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander use of aged care services carried out with our national collections.

9 Non-English Speaking Background

Australian immigration policies have been the major determinant of the demographic structure of the non-English speaking background population. Progressing into the next century, the population is becoming increasingly culturally diverse: older overseas born Australians are coming from a greater variety of countries and are more likely to come from non-English speaking backgrounds (AIMA, 1983). In addition, Rowland (1991) estimates that the number of non-English speaking background aged 75 years and over will essentially double for many of the major non-English speaking background groups between 1988 and 2001. According to the 1991 census, people born in countries in which the main language spoken was not English comprised 13% of

the Australian population and 4% of these were over the age of 75 years (ABS, 1992).

The Aged Care Reform Strategy included the objective of improving equity of access to aged care services for people of non-English speaking background. Initiatives to achieve this objective have included the development of ethno-specific services in both residential and community care service areas. Attempts have been made to enhance access to mainstream services, including the provision of multilingual information and assistance and support for the involvement of family and community in caring for non-English speaking background aged have been some of the initiatives in this latter category.

The data presented here describes the characteristics of people of non-English speaking background who are currently making use of residential and community care services. Earlier data on the use of mainstream services by non-English speaking background aged can be found in Rowland (1991). Service users who identified themselves as being of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent were not included in the comparisons of clients of English and non-English speaking backgrounds.

Home and Community Care

Two indicators of ethnicity were available for the HACC data: the client's country of birth and a language indicator. The language indicator recorded whether a language other than English was spoken at home and a four point scale was used to measure how well the client spoke English. From the survey of 41,653 HACC service users, information on non-English speaking background as measured by country of birth was not available for a total of 2,421 (6%). Information on non-English speaking background as measured by language spoken at home was not available for a total of 3,239 (8%) service users.

People who were born in a country in which the main language spoken was not English made up 12% of the HACC service users sampled over the four week period under study in 1993. People for whom a language other than English was spoken at home comprised 11%. Among this group, 39% either spoke no English at all or did not speak English well.

Just over one third of HACC clients from a non-English speaking background were male. Using either country of birth or language as an indicator of non-English speaking background, 36% of non-English speaking background clients were males. This proportion is marginally larger than that for clients who were not of non-English speaking background origin, for whom 30% were males.

An age breakdown of non-English speaking background users of HACC services in comparison to that of English speaking background users is presented in Table 33. As for English speaking background HACC service users, the modal age group for non-English speaking background service users was 80 to 84 years. Like English speaking background HACC service users, the majority of non-English speaking background users of HACC services are aged 70 and over. However the proportion of service users below the age of 70 was larger for non-

English speaking background service users than for English speaking background service users.

Table 33: Age and sex profile of non-English speaking background HACC service users as surveyed over a two week period in 1993.

Age group	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
0-49	248	5.8	3,110	10.3
50-54	102	2.4	567	1.9
55-59	129	3.0	664	2.2
60-64	276	6.4	1,254	4.1
65-69	551	12.8	2,284	7.5
70-74	827	19.2	4,062	13.4
75-79	743	17.2	5,695	18.8
80-84	841	19.5	6,591	21.7
85-89	428	9.9	4,145	13.7
90+	166	3.9	1,936	6.4
Total	4,311	100.0	30,308	100.0
Language spoken at home				
0-49	338	8.6	3,018	9.6
50-54	82	2.1	601	1.9
55-59	110	2.8	718	2.3
60-64	221	5.6	1,338	4.3
65-69	449	11.4	2,465	7.9
70-74	662	16.9	4,317	13.8
75-79	708	18.0	5,870	18.7
80-84	802	20.4	6,777	21.6
85-89	395	10.1	4,258	13.6
90+	160	4.1	2,003	6.4
Total	3,927	100.0	31,365	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.
 Number of cases with missing data for country of birth = 1,678 (4.6%),
 language spoken at home = 1,005 (2.8%)
 Data collected for one month between August 1993 and May 1994

Approximately 92% of people from non-English speaking backgrounds held a pension card. This proportion is equivalent to that for the English speaking background population for whom 93% held such a card.

A higher proportion of users of HACC services from a non-English speaking background had someone living with them than English speaking background service users. Among service users who were born in a non-English speaking country, 58% lived with someone else, compared to 47% of those born in a country in which English was the main language. Among those for whom the main language spoken at home was not English, 60% lived with someone else, compared to 47% of those who spoke English at home.

A higher proportion of users of HACC services from a non-English speaking background had a carer available than those from an English speaking background. Among service users who were born in a non-English speaking country, 63% had a carer compared to 57% of those born in a country in which English was the main language. Among those for whom the main language

spoken at home was not English, 66% had a carer available, compared to 56% of those who spoke English at home.

Community Options Projects

Of the 6,726 community options project clients sampled nationally in 1993, information on non-English speaking background, as measured by country of birth, was not available for only 0.4% of service users; information on non-English speaking background as measured by language spoken at home was not available for 0.8% service users. When Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander groups were excluded, 20% of community options project clients were born in a country in which the main language spoken was not English. Nineteen percent of community options project clients spoke a language other than English at home. Among community options project clients for whom English is not the only language spoken at home, the majority of clients either do not speak English at all or do not speak English well (56%).

Table 34: *Age profile of non-English speaking background COP clients as surveyed over a two week period in 1993.*

Age group	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
0-49	63	5.2	824	17.8
50-54	20	1.7	117	2.5
55-59	23	1.9	108	2.3
60-64	63	5.2	163	3.5
65-69	125	10.4	305	6.6
70-74	227	18.8	486	10.5
75-79	237	19.7	756	16.4
80-84	244	20.2	885	19.1
85-89	142	11.8	637	13.8
90+	62	5.1	342.0	7.4
Total	1,206	100.0	4,623	100.0
Language spoken at home				
0-49	85	7.7	788	16.7
50-54	15	1.4	121	2.6
55-59	24	2.2	107	2.3
60-64	52	4.7	174	3.7
65-69	106	9.6	323	6.9
70-74	197	17.9	512	10.9
75-79	222	20.2	774	16.4
80-84	230	20.9	899	19.1
85-89	119	10.8	659	14.0
90+	51	4.6	352	7.5
Total	1,101	100.0	4,709	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases with missing data for country of birth = 400 (6.4%),

language spoken at home = 419 (6.7%)

More than a third of community options clients born in countries in which the main language spoken was not English were males (36%). This proportion represents a slightly higher use of community options projects services by non-English speaking background males compared to non-English speaking

background females than by English speaking background males compared to English speaking background females.

The age profile of non-English speaking background and English speaking background clients presented in Table 34 shows that the largest proportion of both non-English speaking background and English speaking background community options project clients were between the ages of 80 and 84. As a proportion of their group, there were fewer non-English speaking background clients aged 80 years and over than English speaking background clients aged 80 and over (17% of non-English speaking background clients were in this age category compared to 21% of non-English speaking background clients, using country of birth to determine non-English speaking background). In addition however, a substantial proportion of clients from an English speaking background were below the age of 50 years. Using the country of birth indicator, the proportion of English speaking background clients in this age group was 18% compared to only 5% of non-English speaking background clients in this age group.

A slightly larger proportion of non-English speaking background clients held a pension card compared to English speaking background community options projects clients. For those born in a non-English speaking country, 94% received a pension, whereas, 91% of those clients born in an English speaking country received the pension. Similar proportions were obtained using language spoken at home as the indicator.

Just over one third of non-English speaking background clients lived alone (36%). This was substantially less than the proportion for clients from English speaking backgrounds, 44% of whom lived alone. Additionally, more than three quarters of non-English speaking background clients had a carer available. A higher proportion of non-English speaking background clients had a carer available than clients from English speaking backgrounds (78% of non-English speaking background clients had a carer available compared to 69% of English speaking background clients).

Hostels

Information regarding non-English speaking background is not a mandatory item in the records established at the time of admission to the hostel. As a result, of the 52,535 hostel residents present at 30 June 1994, information on country of birth was not collected for 31% of residents and information regarding language spoken at home was not collected for 30% of residents. Among those hostel residents for whom this information was collected, 2,760 residents (8%) were born in a country in which the main language spoken was not English, and 1,568 residents (4%) spoke a language other than English at home.

Almost a third of non-English speaking background hostel residents were males, whereas males made up approximately one quarter of all English speaking background hostel residents. Males comprised 32% of hostel residents who were born in a non-English speaking country and 30% of hostel residents who spoke a

language other than English at home. In comparison, 26% of hostel residents born in an English speaking country were males and the same percentage of hostel residents who spoke English at home were males.

The average age of non-English speaking background hostel residents differed very little from that of English speaking background hostel residents. The average age for residents born in a non-English speaking country was 81 years and for residents born in an English speaking country, 83 years. The same average age was obtained for both groups when non-English speaking background was determined by language spoken at home. Table 35 shows the age distribution among hostel residents of non-English speaking background and English speaking background. Although the difference is small, larger proportions of hostel residents from non-English speaking backgrounds were between the age of 65 years and 84 years than hostel residents from English speaking backgrounds. In contrast, English speaking background hostel residents were present in greater proportions than non-English speaking background hostel residents in the 85 years and over age group.

Table 35: *Age profile of non-English speaking background hostel residents at 30 June 1994.*

Age group	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
0-49	9	0.3	112	0.3
50-54	7	0.3	113	0.3
55-59	28	1.0	207	0.6
60-64	47	1.7	428	1.3
65-69	139	5.1	1,027	3.1
70-74	268	9.7	2,246	6.8
75-79	430	15.6	4,452	13.5
80-84	753	27.4	8,764	26.6
85-89	695	25.3	9,348	28.3
90+	375	13.6	6,283	19.1
Total	2,751	100.0	32,980	100.0
Language spoken at home				
0-49	7	0.5	119	0.3
50-54	8	0.5	115	0.3
55-59	15	1.0	219	0.6
60-64	23	1.5	457	1.3
65-69	72	4.6	1,104	3.2
70-74	139	8.9	2,412	7.0
75-79	243	15.6	4,680	13.5
80-84	438	28.0	9,183	26.6
85-89	399	25.5	9,764	28.3
90+	219	14.0	6,503	18.8
Total	1,563	100.0	34,556	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.
 Number of cases excluded for country of birth 16,667 (31.9%),
 language spoken at home 16,416 (31.2%)

A somewhat larger proportion of non-English speaking background residents were recipients of the age pension than were English speaking background

residents (89% and 84% respectively according to country of birth as shown in Table 36). A marginally higher proportion of residents from non-English speaking backgrounds received a disability support pension compared to English speaking background residents (4% compared to 3% for English speaking background residents), and a higher proportion of non-English speaking background residents received some other form of pension compared to English speaking background residents (5% compared to 3% for English speaking background residents). A substantially smaller proportion of non-English speaking background residents had received a repatriation pension (1% of non-English speaking background residents compared to 11% of English speaking background residents received this pension). Similar results were obtained when non-English speaking background was determined by the language spoken at home data item.

Table 36: Type of pension held by non-English speaking background and English speaking background hostel residents at 30 June 1994

Pension type	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
Age	2,206	89.2	24,503	83.6
Invalid	97	3.9	786	2.7
Repatriation	35	1.4	3,123	10.7
Other	134	5.4	916	3.1
Total	2,472	100.0	29,328	100.0
Language spoken at home				
Age	1,546	88.4	25,738	68.9
Invalid	67	3.8	837	7.5
Repatriation	42	2.4	3,164	3.9
Other	94	5.4	977	19.7
Total	1,749	100.0	30,716	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases excluded for country of birth 20,374 (39.7%)

Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 19,709 (37.8%)

Table 37 lists the cohabitants of non-English speaking background and English speaking background hostel residents prior to admission. A higher proportion of non-English speaking background residents lived with family or extended family groups. A larger proportion of non-English speaking background residents had lived with someone else prior to admission to the hostel. When non-English speaking background was determined by country of birth, 47% of non-English speaking background residents had lived alone compared to 57% of English speaking background residents). Residents from non-English speaking backgrounds who had not lived alone prior to admission most frequently lived with their child and their child's family (17%), some other non-family member (15%) or with their spouse alone (12%). In contrast, English speaking background residents who had lived with someone else had most frequently lived with a non-family member (13%); to have lived with spouse alone was the second most common cohabitant (12%) and a child and child's family was third

most common (10%). Similar results were obtained when non-English speaking background was determined by language spoken at home.

Table 37: Usual cohabitant for non-English speaking background hostel residents at 30 June 1994

Cohabitant	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
Lived alone	1,230	46.7	17,985	57.2
Spouse only	315	12.0	3,781	12.0
Spouse and other	40	1.5	220	0.7
Sibling	34	1.3	702	2.2
Child	108	4.1	856	2.7
Child and child's family	447	17.0	3,061	9.7
Other family	77	2.9	733	2.3
Other	385	14.6	4,104	13.1
Total	2,636	100.0	31,442	100.0
Language spoken at home				
Lived alone	860	46.4	18,746	56.9
Spouse only	204	11.0	3,978	12.1
Spouse and other	27	1.5	239	0.7
Sibling	30	1.6	718	2.2
Child	88	4.7	891	2.7
Child and child's family	343	18.5	3,245	9.9
Other family	70	3.8	758	2.3
Other	233	12.6	4,372	13.3
Total	1,855	100.0	32,947	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases excluded for country of birth 18,096 (34.7%)

Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 17,382 (33.3%)

Table 38 shows that the majority of non-English speaking background residents had lived in a house or flat prior to admission into the hostel. When non-English speaking background was determined by country of birth, the proportion in this category was 77%. This proportion was only slightly higher than that for residents from English speaking backgrounds for whom 74% had lived in a house or flat. The next most common living arrangement for residents of non-English speaking background was to have transferred from another hostel (11%); this proportion is also slightly higher than that for English speaking background residents for whom 8% had transferred from another hostel. Non-English speaking background residents were less likely to have moved to the hostel from an independent unit such as those in a retirement village; in proportional terms, half as many non-English speaking background residents as English speaking background residents had come from such accommodation (6% and 12%, respectively). Similar results were obtained when non-English speaking background was determined by language spoken at home.

Table 39 shows that two thirds of hostel residents born in countries in which the main language spoken is not English were widowed (66%). This proportion is similar to that for hostel residents born in English speaking countries (67%). In addition, similar proportions in the two groups were married at the time of admission (16% for both). A slightly smaller proportion of residents born in

non-English speaking countries had never been married (9% compared to 13% for English speaking background residents), fewer residents born in non-English speaking countries had been separated than residents born in English speaking

Table 38: Usual residence for non-English speaking background hostel residents at 30 June 1994.

Type of residence	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
House or flat	2,057	77.0	23,246	73.5
Independent retirement village unit	158	5.9	3655	11.6
Hostel	282	10.6	2609	8.3
Nursing home	59	2.2	647	2.0
Psychiatric hospital	5	0.2	27	0.1
Other	109	4.1	1460	4.6
Total	2,670	100.0	31,644	100.0
Language spoken at home				
House or flat	1,472	77.8	24,325	73.4
Independent retirement village unit	115	6.1	3,799	11.5
Hostel	202	10.7	2,757	8.3
Nursing home	40	2.1	684	2.1
Psychiatric hospital	3	0.2	29	0.1
Other	61	3.2	1,560	4.7
Total	1,893	100.0	33,154	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.
 Number of cases excluded for country of birth 17,861 (34.2%)
 Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 17,127 (32.8%)

Table 39: Marital status of non-English speaking background hostel residents at 30 June 1994.

Marital status	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
Widowed	1,763	66.4	21,085	66.5
Never married	234	8.8	4,060	12.8
Separated	82	3.1	553	1.7
Divorced	146	5.5	1,023	3.2
De facto	5	0.2	41	0.1
Married	427	16.1	4,943	15.6
Total	2,657	100.0	31,705	100.0
Language spoken at home				
Widowed	1,292	68.5	22,046	66.4
Never married	167	8.9	4,205	12.7
Separated	51	2.7	603	1.8
Divorced	83	4.4	1,114	3.4
De facto	3	0.2	43	0.1
Married	289	15.3	5,188	15.6
Total	1,885	100.0	33,199	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.
 Number of cases excluded for country of birth 17,812 (34.1%)
 Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 17,070 (32.7%)

countries (3% compared to 2% for English speaking background residents), and fewer residents born in non-English speaking countries had been divorced (6% compared to 3% for English speaking background residents). Similar proportions of less than 1% for both groups had lived in a de facto relationship prior to admission. Similar results were obtained when non-English speaking background was determined by language spoken at home.

Nursing Homes

As for hostel residents, it has not been mandatory for nursing homes to collect information regarding non-English speaking background from their residents. Consequently, of the 73,552 nursing home residents present at 30 June 1994, information on country of birth was not available for 29% of residents and information on language spoken at home was not available for 27% of residents. Where such information was available it was found that those who were born in a country in which the main language spoken was not English comprised 6,959 (14%) of nursing home residents. Residents who spoke a language other than English at home comprised 3,989 (8%) of nursing home residents.

Table 40: *Age profile of non-English speaking background nursing home residents at 30 June 1994.*

Age group	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
0-49	57	0.8	494	1.1
50-54	33	0.5	252	0.6
55-59	96	1.4	449	1.0
60-64	182	2.6	883	2.0
65-69	436	6.3	1,917	4.3
70-74	866	12.4	4,153	9.3
75-79	1150	16.5	7,226	16.2
80-84	1682	24.2	10,891	24.4
85-89	1,495	21.5	10,424	23.4
90+	962	13.8	7,938	17.8
Total	6,959	100.0	44,627	100.0
Language spoken at home				
0-49	31	0.8	522	1.1
50-54	13	0.3	282	0.6
55-59	52	1.3	508	1.0
60-64	106	2.7	982	2.0
65-69	227	5.7	2,189	4.5
70-74	457	11.5	4,679	9.6
75-79	691	17.3	7,871	16.1
80-84	1,024	25.7	11,870	24.3
85-89	878	22.0	11,361	23.2
90+	508	12.7	8,621	17.6
Total	3,987	100.0	48,885	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases excluded for country of birth 21,996 (29.9%)

Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 20,680 (28.1%)

When either country of birth or language spoken at home are used as indicators of non-English speaking background, there was a higher proportion of males among residents from non-English speaking backgrounds compared to English speaking backgrounds. Among nursing home residents born in a non-English speaking country, 35% were men. Among nursing home residents born in an English speaking country, 28% were men. Thirty two percent of nursing home residents who spoke a language other than English at home were males compared to nursing home residents who spoke English at home for whom 29% were males.

The average age of non-English speaking background nursing home residents was similar to that of English speaking background nursing home residents: the average age for residents born in a non-English speaking country was 81 years and for residents born in an English speaking country, 82 years. The same average ages were obtained for both groups when non-English speaking background was determined by language spoken at home. Table 40 shows the age distribution among nursing home residents of non-English speaking background and English speaking background. The most notable difference between the distributions for the two groups is the proportion among the very old. In the 90 years and over age group there were five percent fewer residents of non-English speaking background than there were residents of English speaking background. Residents from non-English speaking backgrounds were present in somewhat higher proportions in ages which ranged between 65 years and 75 years.

Table 41: Type of pension held by non-English speaking background and English speaking background nursing home residents at 30 June 1994.

Pension type	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
Age	5,495	83.4	32,693	77.5
Invalid	238	3.6	1,524	3.6
Repatriation	145	2.2	3,991	9.5
Other	302	4.6	1,277	3.0
None	406	6.2	2,693	6.4
Total	6,586	100.0	42,178	100.0
Language spoken at home				
Age	3,246	85.5	35,873	77.8
Invalid	115	3.0	1,686	3.7
Repatriation	43	1.1	4,177	9.1
Other	172	4.5	1,445	3.1
None	221	5.8	2,945	6.4
Total	3,797	100.0	46,126	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases excluded for country of birth 24,788 (33.7%)

Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 23,629 (32.1%)

The type of pension received by nursing home residents of non-English speaking background and English speaking backgrounds is listed in Table 41. A larger proportion of non-English speaking background residents were recipients of the age pension than were English speaking background residents (83% and 78% respectively using country of birth to determine non-English speaking background). Residents of non-English speaking backgrounds were substantially less likely to have been in receipt of a repatriation pension (2% of non-English speaking background residents compared to 10% of English speaking background residents received this pension). Similar proportions of non-English speaking background and English speaking background residents had been receiving an disability support pension (4% for both groups), or some other form of pension (5% compared to 3% for English speaking background residents) and similar proportions received no pension at all (6% for both groups). The same results were found when language spoken at home was used to determine non-English speaking background.

Table 42: Usual cohabitant for non-English speaking background nursing home residents at 30 June 1994.

Cohabitant	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
Lived alone	1,846	26.9	14,922	34.1
Spouse only	1,482	21.6	8,527	19.5
Spouse and other	305	4.4	950	2.2
Sibling	67	1.0	903	2.1
Child	317	4.6	1,844	4.2
Child and child's family	1,072	15.6	2,841	6.5
Parents	49	0.7	401	0.9
Other family	158	2.3	588	1.3
Other	1,565	22.8	12,781	29.2
Total	6,861	100.0	43,757	100.0
Language spoken at home				
Lived alone	932	23.7	16,301	34.0
Spouse only	826	21.0	9,427	19.7
Spouse and other	229	5.8	1,052	2.2
Sibling	39	1.0	956	2.0
Child	202	5.1	1,997	4.2
Child and child's family	807	20.5	3,175	6.6
Parents	27	0.7	433	0.9
Other family	101	2.6	654	1.4
Other	772	19.6	13,928	29.1
Total	3,935	100.0	47,923	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases excluded for country of birth 22,934 (31.2%)

Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 21,694 (29.5%)

Data on the usual cohabitant for non-English speaking background nursing home residents shows similar trends to that for hostel residents of the same background: there was a higher likelihood of such people living with family or

extended family groups. As Table 42 shows, residents born in a non-English speaking country were less likely to have lived alone than those born in an English speaking country (27% compared to 34%, respectively). Like residents born in an English speaking country, non-English speaking background residents were most likely to have lived with a person other than family (23% and 29% for non-English speaking background and English speaking background residents respectively) or a spouse (22% and 20% for non-English speaking background and English speaking background residents respectively). They were more than twice as likely as English speaking background residents to have lived previously with a child and their child's family (16% compared to 7%, respectively) and twice as likely as English speaking background residents to have lived together with a spouse and another person (4% compared to 2%, respectively). When language spoken at home is used to determine non-English speaking background, similar results were obtained.

Table 43: Usual residence for non-English speaking background nursing home residents at 30 June 1994.

Type of residence	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
House or flat	4,814	69.9	26,148	59.3
Independent retirement village unit	208	3.0	2,145	4.9
Hostel	1,485	21.6	13,112	29.7
Psychiatric hospital	108	1.6	507	1.2
Other	269	3.9	2,173	4.9
Total	6,884	100.0	44,085	100.0
Language spoken at home				
House or flat	2,937	74.4	28,759	59.6
Independent retirement village unit	65	1.6	2,361	4.9
Hostel	729	18.5	14,243	29.5
Psychiatric hospital	66	1.7	562	1.2
Other	151	3.8	2,355	4.9
Total	3,948	100.0	48,280	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases excluded for country of birth 22,583 (30.7%)

Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 21,324 (29.0%)

Table 43 details the type of accommodation in which non-English speaking background residents had lived prior to admission. A higher proportion of non-English speaking background residents lived in a house or flat prior to admission than English speaking background residents (70% compared to 59%, respectively when country of birth was used to determine non-English speaking background). The next most common living arrangement for residents of non-English speaking background was to have transferred from a hostel (22%); this proportion is considerably lower than that for English speaking background residents for whom 30% had transferred from a hostel. Only slightly fewer non-English speaking background residents had come to the nursing home from an independent unit such as those in a retirement village (3% for non-English

speaking background residents compared to 5% for those of English speaking background) and similar proportions of non-English speaking background and English speaking background residents had come from a psychiatric hospital or some other form of accommodation. The same results were obtained when language spoken at home was used to indicate non-English speaking background.

The majority of non-English speaking background residents were either widowed or married at the time of admission to a nursing home. Table 44 shows that equivalent proportions of nursing home residents from non-English speaking background and English speaking background were widowed at the time of admission (56% and 57%, respectively when country of birth was used as the indicator of non-English speaking background). A somewhat higher proportion of non-English speaking background residents were married at the time of admission than English speaking background residents (32% and 26% respectively). Fewer non-English speaking background residents had never been married prior to admission (7% compared to 12% for English speaking background residents). Similar proportions of non-English speaking background and English speaking background residents had been divorced, were separated, de facto or some other arrangement. Using language spoken at home as the indicator of non-English speaking background provided consistent results.

Table 44: Marital status of non-English speaking background nursing home residents at 30 June 1994.

Marital status	Non-English speaking background		English speaking background	
	Number	%	Number	%
Country of birth				
Widowed	3,815	55.5	25,412	57.3
Never married	483	7.0	5,315	12.0
Separated	125	1.8	618	1.4
Divorced	233	3.4	1,367	3.1
De facto	28	0.4	143	0.3
Married	2,177	31.7	11,393	25.7
Other	15	0.2	78	0.2
Total	6,876	100.0	44,326	100.0
Language spoken at home				
Widowed	2,231	56.7	27,673	57.1
Never married	208	5.3	5,746	11.8
Separated	54	1.4	704	1.5
Divorced	102	2.6	1,552	3.2
De facto	12	0.3	163	0.3
Married	1,321	33.5	12,562	25.9
Other	10	0.3	91	0.2
Total	3,938	100.0	48,491	100.0

Note: All figures calculated excluding cases with missing data.

Number of cases excluded for country of birth 22,350 (30.4%)

Number of cases excluded for language spoken at home 21,123 (28.7%)

All services

People born in a non-English speaking country comprise 12% of Home and Community Care clients, 20% of community options clients, 8% of hostel

residents, 14% of nursing home residents, and an estimated 13% of the population of Australia (ABS, 1992). People for whom English was not the main language spoken at home comprise 11% of Home and Community Care clients, 19% of community options clients, 4% of hostel residents, and 8% of nursing home residents. Bearing in mind that incomplete resident records for nursing home and hostel data preclude firm conclusions regarding the actual proportions of non-English speaking background residents present, and that samples for the home based services were collected differently to that of the residential services, it appears that the proportions of non-English speaking background clients using Home and Community Care and nursing homes is roughly equivalent to the proportion of non-English speaking background people in the population. It also appears that people of non-English speaking backgrounds make greater use of nursing homes than hostels and greater use of community options projects than Home and Community Care services.

Approximately a third of non-English speaking background service users in all four of the service types covered in this study were males, a proportion consistently larger than that for males from English speaking backgrounds. There is little difference between the age structure of non-English speaking background clients across the four service types, with the exception of a slight trend for non-English speaking background clients to be somewhat younger on average than English speaking background clients.

A higher proportion of clients of aged care services from non-English speaking backgrounds were in receipt of a pension than clients from English speaking backgrounds. Data from residential services collections showed that this slight difference between the two groups was largely due to the larger proportion of non-English speaking background clients receiving the age pension.

A smaller proportion of non-English speaking background clients than English speaking background clients had lived alone either before they were admitted to a residential service or during the time of receiving home based care. Residents of nursing homes from non-English speaking backgrounds had the smallest proportion of individuals who had lived alone prior to admission. Carer availability was also more common for home based service clients from non-English speaking backgrounds than for those from English speaking backgrounds.

A somewhat higher proportion of non-English speaking background residents of homes and hostels had lived in a house or flat prior to admission than English speaking background residents. The marital status of non-English speaking background clients of residential services did not differ greatly from that of non-English speaking background clients: the majority of residents of both nursing homes and hostels were widowed. Compared to English speaking background residents, smaller proportions of non-English speaking background residents of nursing homes and hostels had never been married.

10. Summary

At the last census, there was an estimated 2.1 million persons aged 65 years and over in Australia, accounting for 12% of the Australian population (ABS, 1995a). The use of aged care services is, however, more a function of the extent to which older people are affected by illness and disability, than it is of age alone. In 1993 there was an estimated 352,800 persons aged 65 years and over with a profound or severe handicap of a kind which would indicate a need for assistance with either self-care, mobility or verbal communication (ABS, 1993; AIHW, 1995). At the 30th of June 1994, nursing homes provided residential care to 73,552 people and hostels to 52,535. Statistical collections of equivalent coverage are not available for home based services, however, it has been estimated that in an average month, Home and Community Care organisations provide assistance to over 215,000 persons (HSH, 1995).

Residential care services and home based care services were used primarily by older persons. In both hostels and homes fewer than 6% of residents were under the age of 65. Among the home based services of Home and Community Care and community options projects, services were delivered to a clientele of which 19% and 26% respectively were below the age of 65. The majority of clients in all four services were older women although this trend is most pronounced in residential services. For instance, of users of HACC services who were over the age of 80, there were two and half times as many women as men, but in hostels there were three and a half times as many women as men over the age of 80. Similarly, in nursing homes, there were three and a half times as many women as men over the age of 80.

Where data was available, more than 90% of clients were pension recipients. Similar trends were observed across all service types. Older clients (over the age of 65) were most likely to have been recipients of the age pension. The repatriation pension or veteran's benefit was most commonly received by older men aged 65 and above. Invalid pensions were most frequently received by those under the age of 65 and only a slightly larger proportion of males in these younger age groups received this pension than females.

The living arrangements of clients of aged care services is the result of a complex mix of lifestyle factors and care needs. Data on this variable reflects this complexity, providing some insight into the structure of community support networks and the role these networks play in determining the type of assistance required. Of the four service types examined, nursing homes had the lowest proportion of clients who had lived alone prior to admission (33%), and hostels had the highest proportion (56%). Like hostel residents, a large proportion of Home and Community Care clients lived alone (52%).

Consistent patterns of sex differences were also evident across the service types: higher proportions of women using home based services were living alone than men, and higher proportions women in residential care had lived alone prior to admission than men. The likelihood of clients having lived alone also increased with age in all service types. The group with the largest proportion of members who had lived alone were older females, particularly those over the

age of 80. Carer availability showed similar trends across age and sex for all four service types. The data for home based services showed that a lower proportion of females had a carer than males and that a smaller proportion of carers of female were co-resident than carers of males. The group with the smallest proportion of members with a carer and the smallest proportion of members with a co-resident carer were the older female clients of home based services.

The most common residential arrangement for residents of nursing homes and hostels was to have lived in a house or flat prior to admission. However, the usual residence of nursing home and hostel clients to some degree reflects the accommodation options of individuals increasing in dependency with age. A larger proportion of hostel residents had lived in a house or flat prior to admission (74%) than nursing home residents (61%). In addition, a larger proportion of hostel residents had lived in independent units before admission, whereas, more than a quarter of nursing home residents had come to the home after having previously lived in a hostel.

The most common marital status for residents of nursing homes and hostels was to have been widowed. Approximately two thirds of residents had been separated from their marital partner by death; a phenomenon which increased in likelihood with the age of the resident and which was much more common among female residents. A substantial proportion of home and hostel residents were still married at the time of admission: among nursing home residents, more than one in four were married, but the proportion of married residents in hostels was almost half this. A higher proportion of male residents in both nursing homes and hostels had a living spouse at the time of admission than females. The other major group in the marital status category was those who had never married. Approximately one in ten residents were in this category; a slightly higher proportion of males held this status than females.

The characteristics of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders making use of aged care services varies according to the type of service being used. Woenne-Green's (1995) study of the rights and needs of indigenous Australians in remote settings showed that indigenous Australians had a strong preference for non-residential services; services which did not require them to be separated from their family and community. Three percent of Home and Community Care clients and 7% of community options projects clients were indigenous Australians, proportions which were higher than that for indigenous Australians resident in nursing homes (1%) and indigenous Australians resident in hostels (2%), and higher still than the proportion of indigenous Australians in the total population (1.6%).

The characteristics of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients of home-based services reflect the circumstances of indigenous Australians in rural and remote settings: they make use of care services at younger ages than the non-indigenous population. Although a higher proportion of indigenous Australians lived with others compared to non-indigenous Australians, they were not more likely to have had a carer available. Differences in the characteristics of indigenous Australians and non-indigenous Australians in residential services was not as evident. However, while the majority of

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander hostel residents had lived in a house or flat prior to admission, a higher proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander residents compared to non-indigenous residents had previously lived in unspecified forms of accommodation. For residents of hostels, a higher proportion of indigenous Australians compared to non-indigenous Australians had to come to the hostel after having lived in another residential service which provided care, such as a nursing home or hostel. These difference between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians were not evident among nursing home residents.

The provision of aged care services to the ethnic aged is another important area of concern in the Aged Care Reform Strategy, particularly with regard to equity of access. The statistics presented in this paper shows that the proportions of clients from non-English speaking backgrounds who had used home based and residential services are roughly equivalent to the proportion of non-English speaking background people in the population. Community options projects have been particularly successful in providing services to people of non-English speaking backgrounds since as many as one in five clients were in this category.

Statistics for non-English speaking background peoples presented in this paper are aggregated over all non-English speaking backgrounds; in the case of home based service data collections, more detailed data is not available. At this aggregated level of data the differences between non-English speaking background and English speaking background clients are small and are fairly consistent across all the service types examined. The proportion of males from a non-English speaking background was consistently larger in all four of the service types than that for males from English speaking backgrounds. Age trends showed a slight tendency for non-English speaking background clients to be somewhat younger on average than English speaking background clients. A slightly higher proportion of clients of aged care services from non-English speaking backgrounds were in receipt of a pension than clients from English speaking backgrounds. Slightly higher proportions of non-English speaking background residents of homes and hostels compared to English speaking background residents had lived in a house or flat prior to admission.

The living arrangements of clients of non-English speaking backgrounds and the associated issue of carer availability was also an important area of difference with clients of English speaking backgrounds. Lower proportions of non-English speaking background clients compared to English speaking background clients had lived alone either before they were admitted to a residential service or during the time of receiving home based care. Carer availability was also more common for home based service clients from non-English speaking backgrounds than for those from English speaking backgrounds.

References

Abraham B, d'Espaignet E, and Stevenson C (1995). Australian Health Trends 1995. Canberra: AIHW.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1992). June 1990 and preliminary June 1991, estimated resident population by country of birth, age and sex, Australia. Cat No. 3221.0. Canberra: AGPS.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1993). Disability, ageing and carers user guide: Australia 1993. Cat. No. 4431.0. Canberra: AGPS.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1995a). June 1993 and preliminary June 1994, estimated resident population by sex and age, States and Territories of Australia. Cat No. 3201.0. Canberra: AGPS.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1995b). Experimental Estimates of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population, June 1986 to June 1991, Cat No. 3230.0. Canberra: AGPS.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) (1994). Australia's Health 1994. Canberra: AGPS.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) (1995). Australia's Welfare 1995. Canberra: AGPS.

Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA) (1983). Papers on the Ethnic Aged. Melbourne: AIMA.

Cornish, J (1993). Population changes and housing demand, Australian economic indicators, 1993 feature articles, ABS Cat. No. 1350.0. Canberra: ABS.

Department of Health, Housing and Community Services (HHCS) (1991). Aged Care Reform Strategy, Mid Term Review 1990-91. Canberra: AGPS.

Department of Health, Housing and Community Services (HHCS) (1992). HACC User Characteristics Survey 1990. Canberra: AGPS.

Department of Human Services and Health (HHS) (1995). The efficiency and effectiveness review of the Home and Community Care program: Final report. Canberra: AGPS.

Department of Social Security (DSS) (1992). Annual Report 1991-92. Canberra: AGPS.

McDonald, P (1995). Families in Australia: A socio-demographic perspective. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Rowland, DT (1991). Care of the Ethnic Aged. In Commonwealth Department of Health Housing and Community Services, 'Aged Care Reform Strategy Mid Term Review 1990-91, Discussion Papers'. Canberra: AGPS.

Woenne-Green S (1995). They Might Have to Drag Me Like A Bullock: the Tjilpi Pampa Tjutaka Project. Alice Springs: Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Women's Council Aboriginal Corporation.