

## Appendix 3: Using the statistical linkage key

This appendix provides a description of the linkage processes, including the validation of the linkage key, the results of linkage and an overview of the rules used to allocate responses that are inconsistent between linked records.

### Record linkage

The linkage of service user records was carried out on the basis that two or more records with fully valid linkage keys that completely matched were regarded as referring to the same service user. Therefore, in the final linked data set for service users there is only one record for each unique linkage key, which is taken to be one service user.

The data for Victoria had a large number of invalid statistical linkage keys owing to service users not giving the letters of names component, and as for the previous two collections (2002–03 and 2003–04) a ‘pseudo’ linkage key was used where necessary, comprising date of birth, sex and postcode. By matching to other records within the data set, this key was then used to assign valid linkage keys wherever possible.

This process increased the proportion of records in the unlinked Victoria data with valid linkage keys from 74% to 80%. A further 10% remained with pseudo linkage keys. Through the matching process, the number of missed matches between records with these keys and other records in the national data has been reduced to a minimum. However, the use of the pseudo key means that some records would have been wrongly matched and other records not matched when they should have been.

There were 5,908 records (1.9%) for which sex was unknown. These records were tested for matches within the same geographical state or territory using the linkage key without sex, with all other records in 2004–05, as well as all records in the 2003–04 and 2002–03 6-monthly data set and the snapshot day data sets for 1999 to 2002. This resulted in the allocation of sex to 128 of these records.

For a small number of records (94) that were missing one component other than sex (e.g. date of birth, last or first name characters), it was possible to assign the full linkage key by similar comparison methods. Of the other records (8,045) that were missing one or more parts of the linkage key other than sex, a group of 40 (0.5%) had been identified by other means by the jurisdiction as having one or more matches. The remaining 8,005 were not matched and were given a unique key for all future analyses.

For 2,920 records (1.1%), the date of birth was recorded as being an estimate and for a further 4,566 records it appeared from examination of the frequency of dates for particular agencies that the date was an estimate, even though it was not flagged as such. Generally this meant that the day and month were recorded as 1 January. A matching analysis was carried out to determine whether any service users may have had both estimated and actual dates of birth recorded in the data set. As a result, estimated dates of birth were reassigned in 439 cases with the corresponding linkage keys changed accordingly.

The letter part of the linkage key was examined to check whether any unlikely or possibly false sequences (such as ‘ABCDE’) or repetitions (such as ‘AAAA’) appeared at a higher frequency than might be expected. There were no such apparently invalid linkage keys in the 2004–05 collection.

## Date of birth frequencies

For those records for which the date of birth was not treated as being an estimate, the frequency distribution of days and months was examined for any unexpected patterns. The date of 1 January was still more common than expected, with 1,380 dates recorded compared with an expected number of 685. Presumably 1 January was sometimes recorded when the year of birth was known but the day and month were not, without this being indicated by either the date estimate flag or a high frequency of this date for the relevant agency. This does appear to have occurred, as the average number of records per service user is lower for these cases than for the remaining non-estimated cases. However, if the true ratio of the cases with these 1 January birthdates was the same as for other non-estimated cases, then the number of service users would be overestimated by only 108.

For the other 11 months of the year, the number of birth dates on the first of the month was only slightly higher than expected, with 7,985 (3.2%) such dates recorded compared with an expected number of 7,515 (3.0%). This may indicate that for a small number of these dates the day of the month was in fact unknown. The average number of service records per service user for this group was slightly lower than for the remaining non-estimated cases. A similar calculation can be made as that made above for 1 January birthdates, and this suggests that the number of service users would be overestimated by 141 owing to dates for which the day of the month was unknown, but which were not flagged as estimated.

## Results of linkage

There were 263,610 service user records relating to service users who accessed services between 1 July 2004 and 30 June 2005. After linkage, the estimated total number of service users was 200,493. Almost all linkage occurred within the one jurisdiction (state, territory or Australian Government) or between state/territory and Australian government services located within the same state or territory. However, there were 494 matches of the linkage key between states and territories, meaning that these service users were assumed to be using services from two different states or territories (or in three cases, three different states) during the 12-month period. Of these, 114 were between matching records having the same postcode. It is assumed that the remaining 380 service users (0.2% of the total number of service users) either moved from one state or territory to another during the period, or somehow otherwise relocated and/or accessed services from more than one state or territory.

Table A3.1 shows the number of records per linkage key. Around 57% (149,704) of all records had a unique, valid linkage key – that is, a valid linkage key that did not match with any other record. A further 3.1% (8,005) of records had an invalid linkage key and thus could not be matched. The proportion of invalid linkage keys was under 1% for all jurisdictions except Victoria (9.7%) (Table A3.2).

Overall, about 60% (157,709) of all records were unmatched, meaning there were 157,709 service users for whom there was only one record (79% of all service users) (Table A3.1). The other 40% (105,901) of records did have at least one match and were shared between 42,784 service users. For example, there were 57,894 records (28,947 multiplied by 2) for the 28,947 service users who had two matching records. The number of records with the same linkage key ranged from one to ten. Over two-thirds (68%) of all matches found were between two records only (28,947 of 42,784).

Note that the number of service user records in the database does not necessarily correspond with the number of service type outlets that service users have accessed. This is because it is

possible for service user data to be recorded once by an agency even if the service user has accessed more than one service type outlet within the agency.

Records with invalid linkage keys cannot, of course, be matched with any other records, so result in an overestimate of the number of service users. From the results of linkage among records with valid linkage keys, it is estimated that 3,317 of the records with invalid keys would be expected to show a match if they had a valid key, and as a result the total for service users would decrease by 1,977. To this can be added the estimated extra 249 counted owing to estimated dates of birth that could not be recognised as such. This would mean that the total number of service users is overestimated by 2,226 or 1.1%. However, the statistical linkage key by its nature does not result in perfect matching and can result in both false matches and missed matches. Previous testing of the linkage key indicated a false match rate of 1% or less (AIHW: Ryan et al. 1999).

**Table A3.1: Number of service user records that match using the statistical linkage key and resulting number of service users, 2004–05**

Effect of linkage key	Records		Service users	
	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Unmatched records</b>				
Valid linkage key	149,704	56.8	149,704	74.7
Invalid linkage key <sup>(a)</sup>	8,005	3.0	8,005	4.0
<i>Total</i>	<i>157,709</i>	<i>59.8</i>	<i>157,709</i>	<i>78.7</i>
<b>Linked records</b>				
2 records	57,894	22.0	28,947	14.4
3 records	27,819	10.6	9,273	4.6
4 records	12,716	4.8	3,179	1.6
5 records	4,945	1.9	989	0.5
6 records	1,668	0.6	278	0.1
7 records	658	0.2	94	0.0
8 or more records <sup>(b)</sup>	207	0.1	24	0.0
<i>Total</i>	<i>105,901</i>	<i>40.2</i>	<i>42,784</i>	<i>21.3</i>
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>263,610</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>200,493</b>	<b>100.0</b>

(a) Pseudo linkage keys used for some Victorian cases are included with valid linkage keys. See 'record linkage' for further information. A further 40 records were matched by other means by the jurisdiction and are included as cases with 2 to 6 records as appropriate.

(b) There were 136 service users who had 8 records, 45 with 9 records, and 26 had 10 records.

**Table A3.2: Validity of the statistical linkage key in the CSTDA NMDS, by jurisdiction, 2004–05**

	NSW	Vic <sup>(a)</sup>	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aus Gov	Total
Number of service user records (unlinked)	33,812	78,878	21,141	31,182	20,354	5,504	3,509	1,664	67,566	263,610
Number with invalid linkage keys	2	7,638	140	68	191	3	2	0	1	8,045
<b>% invalid linkage keys<sup>(b)</sup></b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.1</b>

(a) For Victoria, 'psuedo' linkage keys are included as valid.

(b) Statistical linkage keys missing sex only are counted as valid.

## **Methods for resolving discrepancies between linked records**

When records are matched by linkage key, they are assumed to then relate to the same service user. In the majority of cases, all the information on matching records will be the same. However, in some cases the other information on two or more matching records is not entirely consistent; that is, for some items the values recorded will differ between records. For example, of two records with the same linkage key, one may record the service user as 'living with others' and having 'other effective non-spoken communication', with the other recording the service user as 'living with family' and having 'little or no effective communication'. Depending on the item in question, this may be due to differences in opinion, judgment or quality of information, or possibly because of miscoding on one record.

In order to produce any tabulations or analysis of items by service user, it is necessary to reconcile such discrepancies by some method that is consistent for each item. Standard agreed processes have been designed to select the data from the most reliable source. Depending on the nature of the item, these may involve selection on the basis of one or more of (a) the frequency of each value recorded, (b) an order of preference by the actual value of the item (this is also used to resolve any inconsistencies within a single record), (c) an order of precedence by service type of the outlets that recorded the data, or (d) some form of summation of all values for the item. A further general principle used in all cases is that valid values for an item take precedence over missing ('not stated') or 'not known' values. This is on the basis that valid values imply the relevant information was known and could be given, whereas missing/not known values imply that the information was either unknown or would not be disclosed. Thus, where there are only two records and one has a particular item missing or not known, the value on the other record will be the one assigned to the service user.

## Appendix 4: Service type classification (definitions)

The following definitions are taken from the 2004–05 CSTDA NMDS Data Guide (AIHW 2004b).

### Accommodation support

#### 1.01 *Large residential/institutions (>20 places)*

Large residential/institutions are usually located on large parcels of land and provide 24-hour residential support in a congregate setting of more than 20 beds. In some cases a range of residential and vocational/day services, and/or respite services are provided on the one site. (Where this is the case, each additional service type should be funded and/or reported against under the CSTDA NMDS as a separate service type outlet.)

#### 1.02 *Small residential/institutions (7–20 places)*

Small residential/institutions are usually located on large parcels of land and provide 24-hour residential support in a congregate or cluster setting of 7 to 20 beds. In some cases a range of residential and vocational/day services, and/or respite services are provided on the one site. (Where this is the case, each additional service type should be funded and/or reported against under the CSTDA NMDS as a separate service type outlet.)

#### 1.03 *Hostels*

Hostels provide residential support in a congregate setting of usually less than 20 beds, and may or may not provide 24-hour residential support. Many are situated in an institutional setting and also have respite beds included on the premises. In contrast to residential/institutions (1.01 and 1.02), hostels usually do not provide segregated specialist services. (Where this is the case, each additional service type should be funded and/or reported against under the CSTDA NMDS as a separate service type outlet.)

#### 1.04 *Group homes (<7 places)*

Group homes provide **combined** accommodation and community-based residential support to people in a residential setting. Usually no more than 6 service users are located in any one house, although this can vary. Group homes are generally staffed 24 hours a day. The agency being funded to provide the service must have control of the residence, i.e. own, lease, hold in trust, or in other ways be responsible for the residence, not just the support to enable the residents to remain in the residence. If the only service being provided is support to enable residents to remain in their existing accommodation, then see category 1.05 'attendant care/personal care' or 1.06 'in-home accommodation support'.

#### 1.05 *Attendant care/personal care*

An attendant care program provides for an attendant(s) to assist people with daily activities that they are unable to complete for themselves because of physical, intellectual or any other disability. The service is provided to people to assist them to live in the community, and to live on their own.

#### 1.06 *In-home accommodation support*

Support involves individual in-home living support and/or developmental programming services for people with a disability, **supplied independently of accommodation**. The accommodation may be owned, rented, or otherwise provided, but should be independent of the agency providing the in-home support service, otherwise see code 1.04 'group homes'. Where an in-home accommodation support services also provides some other limited assistance, for example help with banking once a week, then in-home accommodation should be recorded, as it is the primary focus of the support provided.

#### 1.07 *Alternative family placement*

Placements of a person with a disability with an alternative family who will provide care and support. Includes shared-care arrangements and host family placements.

#### 1.08 *Other accommodation support*

Accommodation support services that provide short-term, one-off instances of accommodation such as:

- accommodation provided so that individuals or families can access specialist services, or further education;
- emergency or crisis accommodation support (e.g. following the death of a parent or carer);
- houses or flats for holiday accommodation.

If the accommodation support is primarily for respite (i.e. involves the separation of the service user from their usual support arrangements or the addition of extra support in their current environment) please refer to the relevant service type 4.01–4.05.

### **Community support**

#### 2.01 *Therapy support for individuals*

Specialised, therapeutic care services including occupational therapy, physiotherapy, speech pathology. These services are intended to improve, maintain or slow deterioration of a person's functional performance, and/or assist in the assessment and recommendation of equipment to enable people to perform as independently as possible in their environment.

#### 2.02 *Early childhood intervention*

Support services to assist children up to (but not including) 6 years of age with a developmental delay to integrate with peers into pre-schools and the wider community. This will include the full range of services that the child receives.

#### 2.03 *Behaviour/specialist intervention*

These include the range of services relating to the management of challenging behaviours, including dangerous antisocial behaviour. Services include intensive intervention support, training and education in behaviour management, and consultancy services for other professionals. Behaviour/specialist intervention is often provided as a by-product of other services.

#### 2.04 *Counselling (individual/family/group)*

Services that provide counselling to individuals, families or groups.

#### 2.05 *Regional resource and support teams*

Regional resource and support teams are generally inter-disciplinary teams that provide a combination of services in the categories 2.01, 2.02 and 2.03, that cannot be broken down into the component parts. Regional resource and support teams may also assist service users to access mainstream services and/or support mainstream-funded agencies. Except for early childhood intervention teams, these teams usually have an individual, rather than a family, focus.

#### 2.06 *Case management, local coordination and development*

This is a broad service type category, including elements of individual or family-focused case management and brokerage as well as coordination and development activity within a specified geographical area. Services assist people with disabilities to maximise their independence and participation in the community through working with the individual, family and/or carers in care planning and/or facilitating access to appropriate services.

Case management services are targeted to individuals who require assistance, for a period of time, to access necessary supports, including help with service coordination and with assisting services to respond to their service needs. Brokerage is one method of purchasing appropriate supports for an individual and should be included in this category.

Other forms of local coordination and development generally involve working with the individual, family and/or carers and at the community level to facilitate positive changes that assist people with a disability to live and participate in the community and assist families in their continued provision of care. Local coordination does not generally involve management of individuals' funds and does not generally involve ongoing case management. However, discretionary funds are sometimes available for one-off purchases (e.g. respite, therapy) to enable a quick response until longer term supports can be put in place.

#### 2.07 *Other community support*

### **Community access**

#### 3.01 *Learning and life skills development*

These programs provide ongoing day-to-day support for service users to gain greater access and participate in community-based activities. Programs may focus on continuing education to develop skills and independence in a variety of life areas (e.g. self-help, social skills and literacy and numeracy) or enjoyment, leisure and social interaction. They are often called Day Programs.

#### 3.02 *Recreation/holiday programs*

Recreation services and holiday programs aim to facilitate the integration and participation of people with disabilities in recreation and leisure activities available in the general community. These services may also enhance the capacity and responsiveness of mainstream sport and recreation agencies and community organisations to provide for people with disabilities.

#### 3.03 *Other community access*

### **Respite**

#### 4.01 *Own home respite*

Respite care provided in the individual's own home location.

#### 4.02 *Centre-based respite/respite homes*

Respite care provided in community setting similar to a 'group home' structure and respite care provided in other centre-based settings. This service type includes respite care provided in any of the accommodation settings 1.01–1.04.

#### 4.03 *Host family respite/peer support respite*

Host family respite provides a network of 'host families' matched to the age, interests and background of the individual and their carer. Peer support is generally targeted at children or young adults up to 25 years of age, and matches the individual with a peer of similar age and interests, usually for group activities. Usually provided on a voluntary basis.

#### 4.04 *Flexible respite*

Respite services that offer any combination of own home, host family or peer support respite. Includes respite where day outings and camping trips are taken (this service type is distinguished from service type 3.02 'Recreation/holiday programs' because the primary purpose is respite). Flexible respite to meet an individual's needs may include brokerage for respite, only when the funding dollars come from respite resources.

#### 4.05 *Other respite*

Respite services other than those outlined above, including:

- crisis respite
- holidays for the person with the disability where the primary intention of the service is to provide respite support (rather than primarily a holiday experience) and the service user is generally separated from their usual support arrangements, e.g. family.

### **Employment**

#### 5.01 *Open employment*

Services that provide employment assistance to people with a disability in obtaining and/or retaining paid employment in **another** organisation.

#### 5.02 *Supported employment*

Services that support or employ people with a disability within the same organisation.

#### 5.03 *Open and supported employment<sup>7</sup>*

Services that provide both open and supported employment assistance.

### **Advocacy, information and print disability**

#### 6.01 *Advocacy*

Services designed to enable people with a disability to increase the control they have over their lives through the representation of their interests and views in the community. Examples include:

- self advocacy/individual advocacy
- citizen advocacy
- group advocacy
- system/systematic advocacy

---

<sup>7</sup> This service type ceased to be operational from 1 December 2004.



6.02 *Information/referral*

Information services provide accessible information to people with disabilities, their carers, families and related professionals. This service type provides specific information about disability-specific and generic services, equipment, and promotes the development of community awareness. Information includes contact by phone, print or email that recommends a person to another service.

6.03 *Combined information/advocacy*

Services that offer both information and advocacy services to individuals where these two components cannot reasonably be separated.

6.04 *Mutual support/self-help groups*

Focus, or special interest groups to provide support and assistance for people with disabilities, their families and carers. These groups promote self advocacy through the provision of information, support and assistance.

6.05 *Alternative formats of communication*

Includes alternative formats of communication for people who by reason of their disabilities are unable to access information provided in the standard format. May include interpreter services, radio and alternative formats of print medium, e.g. TTY, braille etc.

**Other support**

7.01 *Research and evaluation*

Research and evaluation with respect to the provision of services funded under the CSTDA for people with disabilities. This includes the investigation of the need for new services or enhancement of existing services and the measurement of outcomes for people with disabilities using these services. Responsibility for this service type is shared between the Commonwealth and state/territory governments.

7.02 *Training and development*

Training and development services may be funded for example, to train disability-funded agencies to deliver higher quality or more appropriate services to people with disabilities or to develop materials or methods that promote service system improvements.

7.03 *Peak bodies*

Peak bodies are generally funded to support non-government disability-funded agencies in achieving positive outcomes for people with disabilities.

7.04 *Other support services*

Services that are completely outside any of the defined service types above (that is, outside service types, 1.01–1.08, 2.01–2.07, 3.01–3.03, 4.01–4.05, 5.01–5.03, 6.01–6.05 and 7.01–7.03). This service type also includes the provision of one-off funding for a defined event (e.g. for promotional activities) or for the purchase of aids and equipment for a community facility (not for an individual).

## Appendix 5: English proficiency groupings

An 'English proficiency index', a standard tool developed by the Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research, was used to construct each of the English Proficiency (EP) Groups (see AIHW: Benham et al. 2000). Those countries with immigrants who scored 98% or higher on this index and had an immigrant population of 10,000 or more were rated as EP Group 1. This group includes those countries referred to in previous CSDA MDS reports as 'Other English-speaking countries' (Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom and United States of America).

The remaining EP Groups were determined by their EP index score as follows:

- those countries with a 'high' level of English proficiency (80–98%, or above 98% but with an immigrant population of less than 10,000) were placed in EP Group 2
- those countries with a 'moderate' level of English proficiency (a rating of more than 50% but less than 80%) fell into EP Group 3
- the remaining countries (i.e. those with a rating on the EP index of less than 50%) were labelled as having a 'low' level of English proficiency and placed in EP Group 4.

### English Proficiency Group 1

Canada  
Ireland  
New Zealand  
South Africa  
United Kingdom  
United States of America

### English Proficiency Group 2

Africa (excl. North Africa) nfd	Brunei	Estonia
Algeria	Bulgaria	Faeroe Islands
Andorra	Burundi	Falkland Islands
Anguilla	Cameroon	Fiji
Antigua and Barbuda	Cayman Islands	Finland
At sea	Central African Republic	Former Czechoslovakia nfd
Australian ext. territories nfd	Central America nfd	France
Austria	Central and West Africa nfd	French Guiana
Bahamas	Chad	French Polynesia
Bahrain	Comoros (excl. Mayotte)	Gabon
Bangladesh	Congo	Gambia
Barbados	Cook Islands	Germany, Federal Republic of
Belgium	Cote D'Ivoire	Ghana
Belize	Czech Republic	Gibraltar
Benin	Denmark	Greenland
Bermuda	Dominica	Grenada
Bhutan	Dominican Republic	Guadeloupe
Botswana	Eastern Europe nfd	Guatemala
Brazil	Equatorial Guinea	Guinea

(continued)

**English Proficiency Group 2 (continued)**

Guinea-Bissau	Nepal	Southern and East Africa nfd
Guyana	Netherlands	Southern Asia nfd
Haiti	Netherlands Antilles	Southern Europe nfd
Holy See	New Caledonia	Spain
Iceland	Niger	Sri Lanka
India	Nigeria	St Helena
Israel	Niue	St Kitts-Nevis
Jamaica	Norfolk Island	St Lucia
Jordan	North Africa nfd	St Vincent and the Grenadines
Kenya	Northern America nfd	Sth/Ctrl America & Caribbean nfd
Kiribati	Northern Europe nfd	Suriname
Kuwait	Northern Mariana Islands	Swaziland
Lesotho	Norway	Sweden
Liberia	Oceania and Antarctica nfd	Switzerland
Libya	Oman	Tadjikistan
Liechtenstein	Other Australian ext. territories	Tanzania
Luxembourg	Other Polynesia (excl. Hawaii)	The Caribbean nfd
Madagascar	Pakistan	Togo
Malawi	Palau	Tonga
Malaysia	Papua New Guinea	Trinidad and Tobago
Maldives	Philippines	Turks and Caicos Islands
Mali	Qatar	Tuvalu
Malta	Reunion	Uganda
Marshall Islands	Rwanda	United Arab Emirates
Martinique	Samoa, American	Vanuatu
Mauritania	Samoa, Western	Venezuela
Mauritius	San Marino	Virgin Islands, British
Mexico	Sao Tome and Principe	Virgin Islands, United States
Micronesia nfd	Seychelles	Wallis and Futuna
Monaco	Sierra Leone	Western Europe nfd
Montserrat	Singapore	Yemen
Morocco	Slovak Republic	Zaire
Mozambique	Slovenia	Zambia
Namibia	Solomon Islands	Zimbabwe
Nauru	Southeast Asia nfd	Zimbabwe

**English Proficiency Group 3**

Afghanistan	Belarus	Costa Rica
Albania	Bolivia	Croatia
Angola	Bosnia-Herzegovina	Cuba
Antarctica nfd	Burkina Faso	Cyprus
Argentina	Burma (Myanmar)	Djibouti
Armenia	Cape Verde	Ecuador
Aruba	Chile	Egypt
Azerbaijan	Colombia	El Salvador

---

(continued)

**English Proficiency Group 3 (continued)**

Eritrea	Kazakhstan	Romania
Ethiopia	Korea, Republic of	Russian Federation
Europe and the Former USSR nfd	Kyrgyzstan	Saudi Arabia
Fmr Yslav Rep Macedonia (FYROM)	Latvia	Senegal
Fmr Yslav Rep Serbia/Montenegro	Lebanon	Somalia
Former USSR & Baltic States nfd	Lithuania	South America nfd
Former Yugoslavia nfd	Macau	Sudan
Georgia	Middle East & North Africa nfd	Syria
Greece	Middle East nfd	Taiwan (Province of China)
Guam	Moldova	Thailand
Honduras	Mongolia	Tokelau
Hong Kong	Nicaragua	Tunisia
Hungary	Panama	Turkmenistan
Indonesia	Paraguay	Ukraine
Iran	Peru	Uruguay
Iraq	Poland	Uzbekistan
Italy	Portugal	West Bank/Gaza Strip
Japan	Puerto Rico	

**English Proficiency Group 4**

Cambodia
Chilean Antarctic Territory
China (excl. Taiwan Province)
Korea, Democratic People's Republic of
Laos
Turkey
Viet Nam

---

*Note:* nfd—no further definition.

*Source:* DIMA 1999.

# References

- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) 1999. Standards for statistics on cultural and language diversity. Cat. no. 1289.0. Canberra: AGPS.
- ABS 2004a. Australian demographic statistics. Cat. no. 3101.0. Canberra: AGPS.
- ABS 2004b. Disability, ageing and carers: summary of findings. Cat. no. 4430.0. Canberra: AGPS.
- ABS 2004c. Labour force Australia, June 2004. Cat. no. 6203.0. Canberra: AGPS.
- ABS 2004d. Experimental projections of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population 30 June 2001 to 30 June 2009. Cat. no. 3238.0. Canberra: AGPS.
- AIHW (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare) 2003. Australia's national disability services data collection: redeveloping the Commonwealth-State/Territory Disability Agreement National Minimum Data Set. AIHW cat. no. DIS 30. Disability Series. Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW 2004a. Disability support services 2002–03: the first six months of data from the CSTDA NMDS. AIHW cat. no. DIS 35. Disability Series. Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW 2004b. Data guide: data items and definitions 2004–05. Commonwealth State/Territory Disability Agreement National Minimum Data Set collection. Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW 2005a. Disability support services 2003–04: national data on services provided under the Commonwealth State/Territory Disability Agreement. AIHW cat. no. DIS 40. Disability Series. Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW 2005b. CSTDA NMDS tables prepared for the CSTDA annual public report 2003–04. AIHW cat. no. DIS 42. Welfare Working Paper Series no. 51. Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW 2006. Disability rates among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people – updating the Indigenous factor in disability services performance indicator denominators. AIHW cat. no. DIS 45. Welfare Working Paper Series no. 50. Canberra: AIHW.
- AIHW: Benham C, Gibson D, Holmes B & Rowland D 2000. Independence in ageing: the social and financial circumstances of older overseas-born Australians. AIHW cat. no. AGE 15. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs & AIHW.
- AIHW: Ryan T, Holmes B & Gibson D 1999. A national minimum data set for home and community care. AIHW cat. no. AGE 13. Canberra: AIHW.
- DIMA (Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs) 1999. 1996 classification of countries into English Proficiency Groups. Statistical focus C96.1A revised. Canberra: DIMA.
- NDA (National Disability Administrators) 2005. Commonwealth State/Territory Disability Agreement annual public report 2003–04 (prepared by Australian Healthcare Associates). Canberra: Australian Government Department of Family and Community Services.
- SCRCSSP (Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision) 2006. Report on government services 2006. Vol. 2 Health, community services, housing. Canberra: AusInfo.