

South Australian Strategic Plan

Selected Targets Survey Results

May 2009

Prepared for Department of the
Premier and Cabinet,
Government of South Australia

Population Research and Outcome Studies Unit
Health System Information and Performance
Operations Division
SA Health

This work is copyright. It may be reproduced and the Population Research and Outcome Studies Unit (PROS) welcomes requests for permission to reproduce in the whole or in part for work, study or training purposes subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgment of the source and not commercial use or sale. PROS will only accept responsibility for data analysis conducted by PROS staff or PROS supervision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	9
Introduction.....	10
Aim	10
Methodology.....	11
Sample selection.....	11
Introductory letter.....	11
Questions.....	12
Data collection.....	12
CATI.....	12
Call backs	12
Validation	12
Response rates.....	13
Weighting.....	13
Data Processing.....	15
Data Interpretation.....	15
CHAPTER 2: SOCIOECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS 17	
Introduction.....	18
Demographic profile of participants.....	19
CHAPTER 3: SA STRATEGIC PLAN	29
Introduction.....	30
Knowledge of SA Strategic Plan	30
CHAPTER 4: CUSTOMER AND CLIENT SATISFACTION WITH GOVERNMENT SERVICES	39
Introduction.....	40
Overall satisfaction with SA government services	40
Use of SA government services.....	44
Quality, accessibility and timeliness with SA government services used in the last 12 months.....	49
Fairness, information, knowledge/competence and extra mile/courtesy with SA government services used in the last 12 months	61
Service or product received from SA government service used in the last 12 months.....	93
CHAPTER 5: INVOLVEMENT IN THE COMMUNITY	97
Introduction.....	98
Community involvement.....	98
Formal volunteering.....	102
Informal volunteering.....	106
Formal and informal volunteering.....	110
Participation in recreational, artistic, cultural or church groups.....	114

Attendance at community events	118
Involvement in physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire or administrator	122
Attendance at sporting matches or competitions	126
CHAPTER 6: MULTICULTURALISM	131
Introduction.....	132
Cultural diversity	132
CHAPTER 7: BROADBAND USAGE.....	137
Introduction.....	138
Households connected to broadband Internet	138
Households connected to dialup Internet.....	142
Households connected to the Internet	146
Households not connected to the Internet	151
Dial-up Internet.....	152
Dial-up Internet or no Internet	153
Broadband Internet.....	154
Attitude towards digital technologies	155
CHAPTER 8: ZERO WASTE	159
Introduction.....	160
Recycling and waste avoidance	160
Saving water.....	164
Saving energy.....	168
Zero waste issues ranked as most and least important.....	172
CHAPTER 9: RECREATION & SPORT	181
Introduction.....	182
Participation in Recreation and Sporting Activities.....	182
CHAPTER 10: PUBLIC TRANSPORT	209
Introduction.....	210
Frequency of travel by Public Transport	210
Mode of travel by Public Transport.....	214
Travel to start of Public Transport journey	217
Reason for travelling by Public Transport	220
Increase or decrease in the use of Public Transport.....	221
Reason for change in travel by Public Transport	224
Encourage use of Public Transport.....	225
Possession of a current driver's licence.....	227
Ownership of a motor vehicle or motor cycle	232
APPENDIX A: APPROACH LETTER.....	237

APPENDIX B: ADVISORY GROUP	239
APPENDIX C: 2009 SASP QUESTIONNAIRE.....	243

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present overall South Australian and SA government regions' estimates on specific SA Strategic Plan targets using a representative epidemiologically-sound sample of the SA population.

Some of the main findings from the survey conducted in early 2009 are presented below:

- In all, 6017 adults participated in the survey.
- One third (32.8%) of the respondents had heard of the SA Strategic Plan where 4.9% were “very familiar” with the plan.
- In general, 86.1% of respondents were satisfied with the SA government services.
- 77.6% of respondents have used at least one SA government services in the last 12 months. In terms of their most recent experience of using a SA government service:
 - 84.0% were satisfied with the overall quality of the service delivery;
 - 85.6% were satisfied with the accessibility of the service;
 - 76.1% were satisfied with the amount of time it took to get the service; and
 - 84.3% received the service or product they needed.
- 43.8% of respondents had been involved in the community.
- 43.7% had undertaken formal unpaid volunteering for not-for-profit organisations, and 57.3% had undertaken informal unpaid volunteering.
- 45.2% had participated in a recreational, artistic, cultural or church group.
- 73.8% had attended a community event that brings people together.
- 16.1% had been involved in activities as a coach, official, umpire or administrator.
- 62.8% had attended a sporting match or competition as a spectator.
- 89.4% of respondents believed that cultural diversity was a positive influence in the community.
- 71.6% of households in SA were connected to the Internet, and 61.0% had broadband Internet connection.
- 69.7% of respondents ranked saving water as the most important zero waste issue, and 36.1% of respondents ranked saving energy as the least most important zero waste issue.
- 78.0% of respondents had participated in physical activities for exercise, recreation or sport over the last 12 months.
- 60.0% used Public Transport.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In 2008, a representative, population-based, telephone household survey was conducted to obtain baseline data from the SA community, with adequate sample size for each of the twelve SA government regions, relating to several targets in the SA Strategic Plan (SASP). Four of these targets had no existing data sources with which to measure progress and there were other targets with only limited data. Progress towards achieving the targets could then be nominated and measured over time.

The 2008 survey addressed the following SASP targets:

- Customer and clients satisfaction with government services (Target 1.7);
- Cultural Engagement – Institutions (Target 4.3) and Arts activities (Target 4.4);
- Use of Public Transport (Target 3.6);
- Broadband access and usage (Target 4.8);
- Volunteering (Target 5.6); and
- Multiculturalism (Target 5.8).

It was then decided to repeat this survey in 2009 to provide follow up data for each of the targets listed above (except for Target 4.3 and 4.4) and to include information relating to the following targets.

- Recreation and sport (Target 2.3);
- Zero Waste (Target 3.8);
- Social Inclusion (Target 6.5); and
- Housing Stress (Target 6.8).

Aim

The aim of this report is to provide reliable overall SA and SA government regions' estimates related to specific SASP targets, from a sample of the SA population aged 16 years and over, using a consistent, methodologically-sound and reproducible method. In particular the report examines:

- Knowledge of SASP;
- Satisfaction with SA government services;
- Type of volunteering activities undertaken within the last twelve months;
- Views on the impact of multiculturalism on SA;
- Access to broadband and internet use within the household;
- Recreation and sport;
- Zero waste;
- Use of public transport; and
- Sociodemographic factors.

Methodology

Sample selection

All households in SA with a telephone number listed in the Electronic White Pages (EWP) were eligible for selection and stratified by the twelve SA government regions¹. The initial sample sizes for each region for the survey are reported in Table 1.1. Country regions were over-sampled to provide adequate power in the analyses of data and to produce reliable estimates. Within each household, the person who had their birthday last, aged 16 years or older, was selected for interview. There were no replacements for non-contactable persons.

Table 1.1: Sample size for each SA government region

	n
Adelaide Metropolitan area	
Eastern Adelaide	1360
Northern Adelaide	1320
Southern Adelaide	1360
Western Adelaide	1350
Greater Adelaide area	
Adelaide Hills	1350
Barossa	1210
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	1350
Country regions	
Eyre and Western	1360
Far North	1380
Limestone Coast	1350
Murray and Mallee	1360
Yorke and Mid North	1350
Total	16100

Introductory letter

A letter introducing the study was sent to the household of each selected telephone number (Appendix A). The letter informed people of the purpose of the survey and indicated that they could expect a telephone call within the time frame of the survey. Overall, 52.9% of those who participated indicated that they had received the letter.

¹ Planning SA. Government of South Australia. <http://www.planning.sa.gov.au/go/maps/-land-and-population-data/sa-government-regions/sa-government-regions>

Questions

Questions included in the survey were based on specific SASP targets. An Advisory Group consisting of key personnel from the Population Research and Outcome Studies (PROS) Unit, the SA Department of Premier and Cabinet, and other relevant government departments (Appendix B), was established to provide expertise, professional judgement, advice and accountability to the project, including development of the questionnaire. Where possible, questions that had previously been included in other surveys, and which were perceived to ascertain reliable and valid data, were used or modified.

In addition to the SASP target questions, seventeen demographic questions were asked. The full list of questions asked in this survey is contained in Appendix C.

An interview time of 15 minutes per interview was considered suitable so as not to over burden respondents. The average length of interview was 15.7 minutes.

Data collection

Data were collected by a contracted agency and interviews were conducted in English, Italian, Greek and Vietnamese.

CATI

The CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interview) system was used to conduct the interviews. This system allows immediate entry of data from the interviewer's questionnaire screen to the computer database. The main advantages of this system are the precise ordering and timing of call-backs and correct sequencing of questions as specific answers are given. The CATI system enforces a range of checks on each response with most questions having a set of pre-determined response categories. In addition, CATI automatically rotates response categories, when required, to minimise bias. When open-ended responses are required these are transcribed exactly by the interviewer.

Call backs

At least ten call-backs were made to the telephone number selected at random from the Electronic White Pages (EWP) to interview household members. Different times of the day or evening were scheduled for each call back. If a person could not be interviewed immediately they were re-scheduled for interview at a time suitable to them. Replacement interviews for persons who could not be contacted or interviewed were not permitted.

Validation

Of each interviewer's work, 10% was selected at random for validation by the supervisor. The contracted agency is a member of Interviewer Quality Control Australia (IQCA).

Response rates

The overall sample response rate was 50.2% and the participation rate was 57.9%. Initially a sample of 16100 was drawn. Sample loss of 4107 occurred due to non-connected numbers (3375), non-residential numbers (373), and fax/modem connections (196). From the eligible sample of 11993, the response rate was calculated as shown in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2: Response rate

	n	%
Initial eligible sample	11993	
Refusals	3535	29.5%
Non-contact after 10 attempts	1598	13.3%
Respondent unable to speak English, Italian, Greek or Vietnamese	208	1.7%
Incapacitated and unable to be interviewed (i.e. too ill, hearing impaired)	390	3.3%
Terminated interview	24	0.2%
Respondent unavailable	213	1.8%
Completed interviews	6017	50.2%

Weighting

The data presented in this report were weighted by age, sex and SA government region, and probability of selection in the household to the most recent Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census data. Probability of selection in the household was calculated on the number of adults aged 16 years and over in the household. Weighting is used to correct for the disproportionality of the sample with respect to the populations of interest. The weights reflect unequal sample inclusion probabilities and compensate for differential non-response. The data were weighted using the ABS 2006 Census data² so that the health estimates calculated can be representative of the adult populations of those areas.

It is important to note that an adequate and properly applied sampling method, together with careful weighting of the data, has been used in this survey and enables extrapolation of the results to the population at large. The sample selected for each region was drawn in such a way, and is large enough to provide independent estimates for each region and for the overall country region. This means that the characteristics and views of the residents who answered the questionnaire reflect those of each region's adult population. For example, if 10% of the people interviewed in the regional sample thought an issue was important, it can be said with confidence that this applies to 10% of the region's population. The proportions presented in each table in this report can therefore be used as reliable regional estimates.

² Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Population by Age and Sex, South Australia, 30 June 2006*. ABS Catalogue No. 3254.4.55.001. Canberra; ABS: 2006.

Three weighting factors were used for this survey:

1. To provide the best estimates for overall SA; and
2. To provide the best estimates for each of the 12 SA government regions.

The use of the two separate weighting variables in this report means that regional totals do not always add to the state totals (Table 1.3).

Regional and Area Weight

This weighting factor was used in all analyses where estimates were required for a region (twelve government regions). The data were weighted by age, sex and probability of selection to each of the twelve regions. Thus, each region was independently weighted by age, sex and probability of selection to reflect the age and sex structure of the region. This weight did not take into account the overall SA state age and sex structure and was used when regional estimates were required (Table 1.3).

State Weight

This weighting factor was used in all analyses where estimates were required for the state as a whole. The state weighting factor was based on the weighted factor used for the twelve regions as described above. It was adjusted by the proportion of the population in the country and metropolitan area so as to be reflective of the state. In the original sample the country regions were over sampled such that the sample consisted of 42% country respondents, 24% in the greater outer metropolitan Adelaide, and 34% in metropolitan Adelaide. Hence, the country and greater outer metropolitan Adelaide respondents were weighted down and the metropolitan Adelaide respondents were weighted up for state estimates (Table 1.3).

Household Weight

This weighting factor was used in all analyses relating to broadband usage where estimates associated with a household were more appropriate. The household weighting factor was based on the number of dwellings within each of the twelve regions. It was adjusted by the proportion of the population in the country and metropolitan area so as to be reflective of the state. In the original sample the country regions were over sampled such that the sample consisted of 42% country respondents, 24% in the greater outer metropolitan Adelaide, and 34% in metropolitan Adelaide. Hence, the country and greater outer metropolitan Adelaide respondents were weighted down and the metropolitan Adelaide respondents were weighted up for dwelling estimates (Table 1.3).

Table 1.3: Number of interviews conducted in each SA government region

	Regional weight		State weight		Household weight	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Adelaide Metropolitan area						
Eastern Adelaide	516	8.6	839	13.9	815	13.6
Northern Adelaide	487	8.1	1304	21.7	1205	20.0
Southern Adelaide	547	9.1	1293	21.5	1244	20.7
Western Adelaide	381	6.3	840	14.0	838	13.9
Greater Adelaide area						
Adelaide Hills	520	8.6	250	4.2	225	3.7
Barossa	526	8.7	233	3.9	217	3.6
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	514	8.5	170	2.8	225	3.7
Country regions						
Eyre and Western	505	8.4	205	3.4	237	3.9
Far North	448	7.4	105	1.7	117	1.9
Limestone Coast	525	8.7	239	4.0	257	4.3
Murray and Mallee	527	8.8	260	4.3	289	4.8
Yorke and Mid North	521	8.7	281	4.7	347	5.8
Total	6017	100.0	6017	100.0	6017	100.0

Data Processing

Raw data from the CATI system were imported into SPSS for Windows format. Data were then analysed using SPSS for Windows Version 15. Open-ended responses were recorded in the main SPSS database. The conventional 5% level of statistical significance was used to determine statistically significant differences.

Data Interpretation

- The weighting of the data results in occasional rounding effects for the numbers. In all instances the percentages should be the point of reference rather than the actual numbers of respondents. For example, cell sizes presented as 1, 2 and 4 could in fact be 1.3, 2.4 and 4.4 which results in a slight variation from the totals presented (e.g. 7 vs. 8). The percentages presented in this report have been processed on the figures pre-rounding.
- Caution should be exercised in the interpretation of some of the results in this report. In some of the tables presented, small cell sizes are apparent and confidence intervals around the estimates could be large.
- Differences reported with ↓ or ↑ indicate that the regional estimate is statistically significantly different from the overall state figure.
- Some of the tables have headings with: % (95% CI). This means the proportion and the 95% confidence intervals of the proportion. The confidence intervals for the proportion give a range

of values around the proportion where we expect the "true" (population) proportion is located (with a given level of certainty). For example, if the proportion is 23%, and the lower and upper limits of the confidence interval are 19% and 27% respectively, then you can conclude that there is a 95% certainty that the population proportion lies between 19% and 27%. Note that the width of the confidence interval depends on the sample size and on the variation of data values. This means the larger the sample size, the more reliable the estimate.

CHAPTER 2: SOCIOECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Introduction

This section presents all of the relevant demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. These demographic and socioeconomic factors include:

- Gender;
- Age groups;
- Number of people aged 16 years and over in the household;
- Number of people aged 15 years and under in the household;
- Country of birth including parents' country of birth;
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status;
- Family structure;
- Marital status;
- Employment status (respondent);
- Hours worked per week (respondent);
- Employment status (partner);
- Hours worked per week (partner);
- Pension or government benefits received;
- Educational attainment;
- Currently studying;
- Household weekly income;
- Money situation;
- Weekly rental/mortgage payments;
- Dwelling status;
- Length of time lived in area;
- Index of Relative Social Disadvantage; or
- Accessibility and Remoteness Index of Australia.

Demographic profile of participants

Overall, n=6017 respondents aged 16 years and over participated in the study. The demographic profile of the survey participants is shown in Table 2.1 to Table 2.7.

Table 2.1: Demographic characteristics - gender and age of respondents aged 18 years and over, number of adults (16 years and over) and children (15 years or less) in the household

Variable	Response categories	n	%
Sex	Male	2946	49.0
	Female	3071	51.0
Age	16 to 24 years	921	15.3
	25 to 34 years	941	15.6
	35 to 44 years	1069	17.8
	45 to 54 years	1063	17.7
	55 to 64 years	886	14.7
	65 to 74 years	568	9.4
	75 years and over	569	9.5
Number of adults in household aged 16 and over*	1	686	11.4
	2	3303	54.9
	3 or more	2026	33.7
Number of children in the household aged 15 and under	None	4045	67.2
	1	849	14.1
	2	800	13.3
	3 or more	323	5.4
Total		6017	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding. *Not stated category not reported.

Table 2.2: Demographic characteristics - country of birth, language spoken at home, and ATSI status

Variable	Response categories	n	%
Country of birth	Australia	4741	78.8
	United Kingdom	623	10.4
	Southern Europe	110	1.8
	Western Europe	109	1.8
	Maritime South-East Asia	75	1.2
	New Zealand	63	1.0
	South Eastern Europe (part)	57	0.9
	Eastern Europe (part)	42	0.7
	Southern Asia	35	0.6
	Southern and East Africa	35	0.6
	Chinese Asia (includes Mongolia)	32	0.5
	Mainland South-East Asia	23	0.4
	North Africa	11	0.2
	Middle East	11	0.2
	Central Asia (part)	11	0.2
	Northern America	10	0.2
	Central America	10	0.2
	South America	8	0.1
	Melanesia	5	0.1
	Polynesia (excludes Hawaii)	3	0.1
Northern Europe	2	0.1	
Central and West Africa	2	0.1	
Japan and the Koreas	-	-	
Total		6017	100.0
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) origin	Yes	64	1.3
	No	4673	98.6
	Not stated	4	0.1
Total		4741	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Table 2.3: Demographic characteristics - marital status, employment status, partners' employment status

Variable	Response categories	n	%
Family Structure*	A family with a child or children living with both biological or adoptive parents	2646	44.0
	A step or blended family	181	3.0
	A sole parent family	271	4.5
	Shared care parenting	33	0.5
	Adult living alone	594	9.9
	Adult living with partner and no children	1727	28.7
	Related adults living together	391	6.5
	Unrelated adults living together	134	2.2
	Other	39	0.6
Marital status	Married/Living with a partner	4001	66.5
	Separated/ Divorced	340	5.7
	Widowed	343	5.7
	Never married	1328	22.1
	Not stated	4	0.1
Employment status	Self employed	696	11.6
	Employed for wages, salary or payment in kind	3011	50.0
	Unemployed	171	2.8
	Engaged in home duties (with children in house)	224	3.7
	Engaged in home duties (without children in house)	48	0.8
	Caring for relative	36	0.6
	Student	422	7.0
	Retired	1256	20.9
	Unable to work (temporarily)	42	0.7
	Unable to work (permanently)	105	1.7
	Other/Refused	6	0.1
Total		6017	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding. *Not stated category not reported.

Table 2.4: Demographic characteristics - employment status, partner's employment status

Variable	Response categories	n	%
Hours worked per week	Up to 7.5 hours	74	2.0
	7.6 to 15 hours	278	7.5
	15 to 22.5 hours	294	7.9
	22.6 to 30 hours	421	11.3
	31 to 37.5 hours	377	10.2
	37.6 to 45 hours	1399	37.8
	46 hours or more	809	21.8
	Don't know	38	1.0
	Refused	17	0.5
Total		3707	100.0
Partners Employment status	Self employed	522	13.0
	Employed for wages, salary or payment in kind	2159	54.0
	Unemployed	40	1.0
	Engaged in home duties	311	7.8
	Student	49	1.2
	Retired	823	20.6
	Unable to work	83	2.1
	Other	6	0.1
	Don't know/Refused	9	0.2
Total		4001	100.0
Hours worked per week (Partner)	Up to 7.5 hours	46	1.7
	7.6 to 15 hours	146	5.5
	15 to 22.5 hours	241	9.0
	22.6 to 30 hours	296	11.0
	31 to 37.5 hours	195	7.3
	37.6 to 45 hours	1128	42.1
	46 hours or more	563	21.0
	Don't know	40	1.5
	Refused	24	0.8
Total		2680	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Table 2.5: Demographic characteristics – pension benefits, highest educational qualification obtained, study status

Variable	Response categories	n	%
Highest educational level attained	Never attended school	2	0.1
	Some primary school	34	0.6
	Completed primary school	187	3.1
	Some high school	1698	28.2
	Completed high school (Year 12, Form 6, HSC)	1148	19.1
	TAFE or trade certificate or diploma	1462	24.3
	University, CAE, other tertiary institute degree	1481	24.6
	Don't know/Refused	5	0.1
Undertaking study	Yes	1148	19.1
	No	4862	80.8
	Don't know/Refused	7	0.1
Total		6017	100.0
Receiving pension benefits*	Disability support pension	164	7.1
	Unemployment benefits	58	2.5
	Sickness benefits	8	0.3
	Aged/widows pension	852	36.9
	Service or defence/War widows/Repat. pension	87	3.7
	Supporting parents benefit	76	3.3
	Carer payment or allowance/Childcare Benefit	90	3.9
	Austudy/Student allowance	111	4.8
	Other	16	0.7
	None	859	37.2
	Don't know/Refused	12	0.5

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding. *Multiple responses.

Table 2.6: Demographic characteristics – annual household income, money situation, weekly rental/mortgage payments

Variable	Response categories	n	%
Weekly household income	\$1 - \$149 per week	48	0.8
	\$150 - \$249 per week	147	2.4
	\$250 - \$399 per week	366	6.1
	\$400 - \$599 per week	469	7.8
	\$600 - \$799 per week	317	5.3
	\$800 - \$999 per week	369	6.1
	\$1,000 - \$1,299 per week	454	7.5
	\$1,300 - \$1,599 per week	567	9.4
	\$1,600 - \$1,999 per week	575	9.6
	\$2,000 or more per week	1144	19.0
	Nil income	13	0.2
	Negative income	13	0.2
	Don't know	1140	19.0
Refused	396	6.6	
Money situation	Spending more money than receive	287	4.8
	Just enough money to get through to next pay day	1187	19.7
	Some money left over each week but spend it	345	5.7
	Save a bit every now and then	2932	48.7
	Save a lot	972	16.2
	Don't know/Refused	293	4.9
Total		6017	100.0
Weekly rental/mortgage payments	None to \$100	308	9.2
	>\$100 to \$200	686	20.5
	>\$200 to \$300	646	19.4
	>\$300 to \$400	397	11.9
	>\$400 to \$500	184	5.5
	>\$500	219	6.6
	Not stated	898	26.9
Total		3338	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Table 2.7: Demographic characteristics – dwelling status, length of time lived in area, Index of Relative Social Disadvantage (IRSD), Accessibility and Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA)

Variable	Response categories	n	%
Dwelling status	Owned outright	2679	44.5
	Owned with mortgage	2352	39.1
	Rented privately	551	9.2
	Housing trust	183	3.0
	Other	120	2.0
	Don't know	109	1.8
	Refused	22	0.4
Length of time lived in area	0 to < 6 months	179	3.0
	6 months to < 12 months	68	1.1
	1 year to 2 years	427	7.1
	3 to 4 years	246	4.1
	5 to 9 years	1029	17.1
	10 years or more	4057	67.4
	Refused	11	0.2
ARIA	Metropolitan (Highly accessible)	4981	82.8
	Rural (Accessible & Moderately accessible)	846	14.1
	Remote (Remote & Very remote)	190	3.2
Total		6017	100.0
SEIFA IRSD*	Lowest quintile (most disadvantaged)	929	15.5
	Low quintile	1242	20.7
	Middle quintile	1184	19.7
	High quintile	1304	21.7
	Highest quintile (least disadvantaged)	1339	22.3
Total		5998	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

*Some cases could not be allocated an IRSD score.

The demographic question relating to money situation was also analysed using the household weighting, in order to provide an indication of the household financial situation. Overall, 65.0% (95% CI 63.8 – 66.2) could save a bit every now and then or save a lot and 91.4% (95% CI 90.7 – 92.1) were just getting by or better (Table 2.8).

Table 2.8: Household money situation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Spending more money than receive	291	4.8	(4.3 - 5.4)
Just enough money to get through to next pay day	1280	21.3	(20.3 - 22.3)
Some money left over each week but spend it	311	5.2	(4.6 - 5.8)
Save a bit every now and then	3049	50.7	(49.4 - 51.9)
Save a lot	861	14.3	(13.4 - 15.2)
Don't know/Refused	225	3.7	(3.3 - 4.2)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who were just getting by or better in the Northern Adelaide region and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Eyre and Western region (Table 2.9). There was also a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents in the Eastern Adelaide region who were able to save some money every now and then or save a lot of money (Table 2.10).

Table 2.9: Proportion of households who are just getting by or better by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	736/815	90.3 (88.1 - 92.2)
Northern Adelaide	1121/1205	93.0 (91.4 - 94.3) ↑
Southern Adelaide	1151/1244	92.5 (90.9 - 93.8)
Western Adelaide	761/838	90.8 (88.7 - 92.6)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	208/225	92.5 (88.3 - 95.3)
Barossa	197/217	90.9 (86.3 - 94.0)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	204/225	90.5 (85.9 - 93.7)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	203/237	85.9 (80.9 - 89.8) ↓
Far North	107/117	91.5 (85.1 - 95.3)
Limestone Coast	238/257	92.6 (88.7 - 95.2)
Murray and Mallee	262/289	90.7 (86.8 - 93.5)
Yorke and Mid North	312/347	89.8 (86.2 - 92.6)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different proportion than all regions combined.

Table 2.10: Proportion of households who are saving some or a lot by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	566/815	69.4 (66.1 - 72.4) ↑
Northern Adelaide	795/1205	65.9 (63.2 - 68.5)
Southern Adelaide	803/1244	64.5 (61.8 - 67.1)
Western Adelaide	524/838	62.5 (59.1 - 65.7)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	159/225	70.6 (64.3 - 76.1)
Barossa	135/217	62.2 (55.6 - 68.4)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	145/225	64.6 (58.1 - 70.5)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	141/237	59.8 (53.4 - 65.8)
Far North	76/117	65.4 (56.4 - 73.4)
Limestone Coast	170/257	66.1 (60.1 - 71.6)
Murray and Mallee	179/289	61.9 (56.1 - 67.3)
Yorke and Mid North	217/347	62.6 (57.4 - 67.5)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different proportion than all regions combined.

CHAPTER 3: SA STRATEGIC PLAN

Introduction

This section presents the respondents' knowledge and familiarity with the South Australian Strategic Plan (SASP).

Knowledge of SA Strategic Plan

Overall, 32.8% (95% CI 31.6 – 34.0) of the respondents had heard about SASP (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1: Knowledge of SA Strategic Plan

	n	%	95% CI
Yes	1974	32.8	(31.6 - 34.0)
No	3827	63.6	(62.4 - 64.8)
Don't know	216	3.6	(3.1 - 4.1)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who said they had knowledge of the SA Strategic Plan were more likely to be male (35.4%) than female (30.3%) (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: Knowledge of SA Strategic Plan, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	1044	35.4↑	929	30.3↓
No	1821	61.8↓	2006	65.3↑
Don't know	81	2.7↓	135	4.4↑
Total	2946	100.00	3071	100.00

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Overall, respondents who had knowledge of the SASP were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia (34.4%) and statistically significantly less likely to be born in a non-English speaking country (22.3%) (Table 3.3).

Table 3.3: Knowledge of SA Strategic Plan, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	1629	34.4↑	215	30.9	130	22.3↓
No	2944	62.1↓	453	65.0	431	74.3↑
Don't know	168	3.5	28	4.1	20	3.4
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

When compared by age group, respondents who reported having knowledge of the SASP were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 45 to 64 years and statistically significantly less likely to be 16 to 24 years of age or 75 years and over (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4: Knowledge of SA Strategic Plan, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	161	17.5↓	295	31.4	376	35.2	416	39.1↑	386	43.6↑	200	35.2	140	24.6↓
No	743	80.8↑	637	67.7↑	651	60.9↓	601	56.5↓	462	52.1↓	335	59.0↓	398	69.9↑
Don't know	16	1.7↓	9	0.9↓	42	4.0	47	4.4	38	4.3	33	5.8↑	31	5.5↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who reported they had heard about the SASP in the Eastern Adelaide, Adelaide Hills, and Murray and Mallee regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Northern Adelaide, Western Adelaide, and Limestone Coast regions (Table 3.5).

Table 3.5: Knowledge of SA Strategic Plan by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	199/516	38.6 (34.5 - 42.8) ↑
Northern Adelaide	141/487	28.9 (25.1 - 33.1) ↓
Southern Adelaide	191/547	35.0 (31.1 - 39.1)
Western Adelaide	109/381	28.5 (24.2 - 33.2) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	209/520	40.3 (36.1 - 44.5) ↑
Barossa	170/526	32.3 (28.4 - 36.4)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	168/514	32.6 (28.7 - 36.8)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	166/505	32.8 (28.9 - 37.0)
Far North	130/448	28.9 (24.9 - 33.3)
Limestone Coast	136/525	25.9 (22.3 - 29.8) ↓
Murray and Mallee	201/527	38.2 (34.2 - 42.4) ↑
Yorke and Mid North	171/521	32.8 (28.9 - 37.0)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch 1, pg 14).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Of the respondents who have heard about the SASP (n=1974), 4.9% were “very familiar” with the SASP, 23.8% were “somewhat familiar”, and 71.1% were “not very familiar” (Table 3.6).

Table 3.6: Respondents’ familiarity with SA Strategic Plan

	n	%	(95% CI)
Very familiar	96	4.9	(4.0 - 5.9)
Somewhat familiar	470	23.8	(22.0 - 25.7)
Not very familiar	1404	71.1	(69.1 - 73.1)
Don't know	4	0.2	(0.1 - 0.5)
Total	1974	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There were no statistically significant differences between how familiar males and females were with SASP (Table 3.7).

Table 3.7: Respondents’ familiarity with SA Strategic Plan, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Very familiar	51	4.9	45	4.8
Somewhat familiar	247	23.6	223	24.0
Not very familiar	744	71.3	660	71.0
Total	1044	100.0	929	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Don't know category not reported (n=4).

Respondents who reported being very familiar with SASP were statistically significantly more likely to be born in a non-English speaking country (10.1%) (Table 3.8). Respondents born in Australia were statistically significantly more likely to be somewhat familiar (24.9%), and statistically significantly less likely to be not very familiar (70.2%) when compared to those born in countries other than Australia.

Table 3.8: Respondents' familiarity with SA Strategic Plan, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other- Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Very familiar	78	4.8	6	2.6	13	10.1 ↑
Somewhat familiar	406	24.9 ↑	37	17.3 ↓	26	20.4
Not very familiar	1143	70.2 ↓	172	80.1 ↑	89	68.6
Total	1629	100.0	215	100.0	130	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Note: Don't know category not reported (n=4).

There were no significant differences between age groups for respondent's familiarity with SASP (Table 3.9).

Table 3.9: Respondents' familiarity with SA Strategic Plan, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Very familiar	8	4.8	14	4.7	16	4.3	28	6.6	19	4.9	10	4.9	2	1.6
Somewhat familiar	41	25.6	64	21.6	88	23.4	105	25.3	90	23.4	45	22.3	37	26.5
Not very familiar	112	69.6	217	73.7	272	72.2	282	67.9	277	71.7	145	72.4	99	70.8
Total	161	100.0	295	100.0	376	100.0	416	100.0	386	100.0	200	100.0	140	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Don't know category not reported (n=4).

There were no statistically significant differences in the proportion of respondents who were either “very familiar” or “somewhat familiar” with the SASP between regions (Table 3.10).

Table 3.10: Participants who were “very” or “somewhat familiar” with SA Strategic Plan by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	63/199	31.6 (25.6 - 38.4)
Northern Adelaide	36/141	25.9 (19.3 - 33.7)
Southern Adelaide	68/191	35.8 (29.3 - 42.8)
Western Adelaide	32/109	29.7 (21.9 - 38.8)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	46/209	22.2 (17.1 - 28.3)
Barossa	35/170	20.9 (15.4 - 27.6)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	46/168	27.7 (21.5 - 35.0)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	33/166	19.8 (14.4 - 26.5)
Far North	32/130	24.9 (18.3 - 33.0)
Limestone Coast	33/136	24.4 (17.9 - 32.2)
Murray and Mallee	50/201	25.0 (19.5 - 31.4)
Yorke and Mid North	36/171	21.1 (15.6 - 27.8)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

CHAPTER 4: CUSTOMER AND CLIENT SATISFACTION WITH GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Introduction

This section addresses the issues around SASP Objective 1: Growing Prosperity, Target 1.7 *Performance in the public sector – customer and client satisfaction with government services*: “increase in the satisfaction of South Australians with government services by 10% by 2010, maintaining or exceeding that level of satisfaction thereafter.”

Overall satisfaction with SA government services

Respondents were asked to rank their overall satisfaction with government services in SA on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 5 means “very satisfied”).

Overall, 86.1% (95% CI 85.2 – 87.0) of respondents were satisfied³ with SA government services (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Overall satisfaction with government services in SA

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Very dissatisfied	212	3.5	(3.1 - 4.0)
2	483	8.0	(7.4 - 8.7)
3	2256	37.5	(36.3 - 38.7)
4	2271	37.7	(36.5 - 39.0)
5 Very satisfied	653	10.9	(10.1 - 11.7)
Don't know	139	2.3	(2.0 - 2.7)
Refused	3	0.1	(0.0 - 0.1)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

³ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Respondents who were not satisfied with government services were statistically significantly more likely to be male (13.5%) than female (9.6%) (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Overall satisfaction with government services in SA, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	2495	84.7↓	2685	87.4↑
Not satisfied	398	13.5↑	296	9.6↓
Don't know/Refused	52	1.8↓	89	2.9↑
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who did not know if they were satisfied with government services were statistically significantly more likely to be born in a non English speaking country (4.2%) and statistically significantly less likely to be born in Australia (2.1%) (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3: Overall satisfaction with government services in SA, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	4082	86.1	610	87.7	489	84.3
Not satisfied	558	11.8	70	10.0	67	11.5
Don't know/Refused	101	2.1↓	16	2.3	24	4.2↑
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Overall, respondents who reported satisfaction with government services were more likely to be 16 to 44 years and less likely to be 45 to 64 years of age or 75 years and over (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4: Overall satisfaction with government services in SA, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	856	93.0↑	849	90.2↑	948	88.7↑	877	82.5↓	697	78.7↓	484	85.3	469	82.4↓
Not satisfied	50	5.4↓	86	9.2↓	100	9.3↓	169	15.9↑	162	18.3↑	62	10.9	66	11.5
Don't know/Refused	15	1.6	6	0.6↓	21	2.0	17	1.6	27	3.0	22	3.8↑	35	6.1↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There were no statistically significant differences between government regions for respondents that were satisfied with SA government services (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5: Proportion of respondents that were satisfied with SA government services by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	456/516	88.4 (85.4 - 90.9)
Northern Adelaide	422/487	86.7 (83.4 - 89.4)
Southern Adelaide	470/547	86.0 (82.8 - 88.6)
Western Adelaide	316/381	82.9 (78.8 - 86.3)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	452/520	86.9 (83.7 - 89.5)
Barossa	438/526	83.2 (79.7 - 86.1)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	442/514	86.0 (82.8 - 88.8)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	439/505	86.9 (83.6 - 89.5)
Far North	386/448	86.3 (82.8 - 89.2)
Limestone Coast	449/525	85.5 (82.2 - 88.2)
Murray and Mallee	464/527	88.0 (85.0 - 90.5)
Yorke and Mid North	452/521	86.7 (83.5 - 89.3)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

Use of SA government services

Overall, 77.6% (95% CI 76.5 – 78.6) of respondents had used at least one SA government service in the last 12 months (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6: Proportion of respondents using SA government service in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	4668	77.6	(76.5 - 78.6)
No	1307	21.7	(20.7 - 22.8)
Don't know	42	0.7	(0.5 - 0.9)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Those respondents who had used at least one SA government service in the last 12 months were statistically significantly more likely to be male when compared to females (Table 4.6).

Table 4.7: Proportion of respondents using SA government service in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2325	78.9↑	2343	76.3↓
No	596	20.2↓	711	23.2↑
Don't know	25	0.8	17	0.5
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who had used a government service in the past 12 months were statistically significantly more likely to have been born in Australia (78.3%) (Table 4.3).

Table 4.8: Proportion of respondents using SA government service in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	3712	78.3↑	521	74.9	435	75.0
No	991	20.9↓	173	24.9↑	143	24.6
Don't know	38	0.8↑	1	0.2#	2	0.4#
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

When compared by age group, respondents having used a government service in the past twelve months were statistically significantly more likely to be 16 to 34 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 55 years and over (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Proportion of respondents using SA government service in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	750	81.5↑	804	85.4↑	851	79.6	832	78.2	656	74.1↓	410	72.2↓	365	64.1↓
No	161	17.4↓	131	13.9↓	208	19.5↓	226	21.3	228	25.8↑	151	26.5↑	202	35.5↑
Don't know	10	1.0	6	0.7	10	0.9	5	0.5	1	0.2#	7	1.2	2	0.4
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.
 # Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There were no statistically significant differences found between government regions for respondents who reported using a SA government service (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10: Proportion of respondents using SA government service in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	404/516	78.3 (74.6 - 81.7)
Northern Adelaide	381/487	78.2 (74.3 - 81.6)
Southern Adelaide	422/547	77.1 (73.4 - 80.4)
Western Adelaide	293/381	77.0 (72.5 - 80.9)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	400/520	76.9 (73.0 - 80.3)
Barossa	394/526	74.8 (70.9 - 78.3)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	390/514	75.9 (72.1 - 79.4)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	420/505	83.3 (79.7 - 86.3)
Far North	353/448	78.8 (74.8 - 82.4)
Limestone Coast	397/525	75.6 (71.8 - 79.1)
Murray and Mallee	413/527	78.4 (74.7 - 81.7)
Yorke and Mid North	401/521	77.0 (73.2 - 80.4)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

Respondents were asked which SA government service they had used most recently in the last 12 months. Their responses are presented in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Most recent SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%
Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure	2014	43.1
Department of Health	1648	35.3
Department of Justice	396	8.5
Department of Education and Children's Services	242	5.2
Department for Families and Communities	104	2.2
Councils (library)	103	2.2
Department of Further Education, Employment Science and Technology	41	0.9
Department of Primary Industries and Resources	35	0.7
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation	32	0.7
Corporations	12	0.2
Department of Treasury and Finance	10	0.2
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	5	0.1
Boards	4	0.1
Department of Trade and Economic Development	3	0.1
Authorities	3	0.1
Auditor General's Department	2	0.1
Commissions	1	0.1
Other	8	0.2
Don't know	7	0.1
Total	4668	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Quality, accessibility and timeliness with SA government services used in the last 12 months

Respondents who had used a SA government service in the last 12 months (n=4668), were asked a series of questions regarding the quality, accessibility, and timeliness with the service used. Table 4.12 shows the rating on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 5 means “very satisfied”) by respondents, on the overall quality of service delivery with the SA government service used most recently in the last 12 months. Overall, 84.0% (95% CI 83.0 – 85.1) were satisfied⁴ with the overall quality of service delivery.

Table 4.12: Satisfaction with quality of service delivery with SA government service in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Very dissatisfied	352	7.6	(6.8 - 8.3)
2	379	8.1	(7.4 - 8.9)
3	817	17.5	(16.4 - 18.6)
4	1593	34.1	(32.8 - 35.5)
5 Very satisfied	1512	32.4	(31.1 - 33.7)
Don't know	12	0.3	(0.1 - 0.5)
Refused	2	0.1	(0.0 - 0.3)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

⁴ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

There were no significant differences between males and females in satisfaction with quality of service delivery (Table 4.13).

Table 4.13: Satisfaction with quality of service delivery with SA government service in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	1926	82.8	1997	85.2
Not satisfied	394	16.9	338	14.4
Don't know/Refused	6	0.2	8	0.3
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who were satisfied with the quality of service delivery were more likely to be born in an English speaking country other than Australia (87.5%) (Table 4.14).

Table 4.14: Satisfaction with quality of service delivery with SA government service in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	3110	83.8	456	87.5 [↑]	399	82.0
Not satisfied	594	16.0	62	12.0 [↓]	119	17.4
Don't know/Refused	8	0.2	3	0.5	3	0.6
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

^{↑↓} Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who were satisfied with quality of service delivery were more likely to be 35 to 44 years or 65 years and over and less likely to be 45 to 64 years (Table 4.15).

Table 4.15: Satisfaction with quality of service delivery with SA government service in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	632	84.2	690	85.9	734	86.3↑	694	78.0↓	533	81.3↓	359	87.4↑	325	89.0↑
Not satisfied	117	15.7	111	13.9	116	13.7	179	21.5↑	120	18.3↑	50	12.2↓	38	10.3↓
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Note: Don't know/Refused category (n=14) not reported.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who reported being satisfied with the overall quality of the most recently used SA government service in the last 12 months in the Eyre and Western and Yorke and Mid North regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Northern, Southern, and Western Adelaide regions (Table 4.16).

Table 4.16: Satisfaction with quality of service delivery of the most recent SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	351/404	86.8 (83.2 - 89.8)
Northern Adelaide	315/381	82.6 (78.5 - 86.1) ↓
Southern Adelaide	348/422	82.6 (78.7 - 85.9) ↓
Western Adelaide	227/293	77.5 (72.4 - 81.9) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	344/400	86.1 (82.3 - 89.1)
Barossa	340/394	86.4 (82.7 - 89.5)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	342/390	87.6 (83.9 - 90.5)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	377/420	89.7 (86.4 - 92.3) ↑
Far North	314/353	89.0 (85.3 - 91.8)
Limestone Coast	343/397	86.4 (82.6 - 89.4)
Murray and Mallee	362/413	87.6 (84.1 - 90.4)
Yorke and Mid North	364/401	90.7 (87.5 - 93.2) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Table 4.17 shows the rating on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 5 means “very satisfied”) by respondents with the accessibility of the SA government service used most recently in the last 12 months. Overall, 85.6% (95% CI 84.6 – 86.6) were satisfied⁵ with the accessibility of the service.

Table 4.17: Satisfaction with accessibility of SA government service in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Very dissatisfied	324	6.9	(6.2 - 7.7)
2	310	6.6	(6.0 - 7.4)
3	726	15.6	(14.5 - 16.6)
4	1562	33.5	(32.1 - 34.8)
5 Very satisfied	1710	36.6	(35.3 - 38.0)
Don't know/Refused	36	0.8	(0.6 - 1.1)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who reported being satisfied with accessibility of government service(s) were more likely to be female (86.7%) than male (84.6%) (Table 4.18).

Table 4.18: Satisfaction with accessibility of SA government service in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	1968	84.6↓	2031	86.7↑
Not satisfied	343	14.8↑	291	12.4↓
Don't know/Refused	14	0.6	22	0.9
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

⁵ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Table 4.19 shows that respondents satisfied with accessibility of government service(s) were more likely to be born in an English speaking country other than Australia (89.6%) or a non English speaking country (91.4%) and less likely to be born in Australia (84.4%).

Table 4.19: Satisfaction with accessibility of SA government service in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	3133	84.4↓	467	89.6↑	398	91.4↑
Not satisfied	549	14.8↑	51	9.9↓	34	7.8↓
Don't know/Refused	30	0.8	3	0.5	3	0.8
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Overall, respondents who reported being satisfied with accessibility of government service(s) were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 25 to 34 years or 65 years and over and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 45 to 54 years (Table 4.20).

Table 4.20: Satisfaction with accessibility of SA government service in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	670	89.2↑	722	89.8↑	726	85.3	665	79.9↓	538	82.0↓	358	87.3↑	320	87.6↑
Not satisfied	64	8.5↓	82	10.2↓	123	14.5	163	19.6↑	117	17.8↑	49	12.0↓	36	9.9↓
Don't know/Refused	17	2.2↑	-	-	2	0.2#	4	0.4	2	0.2	3	0.7	9	2.5↑
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There were no statistically significant differences between government regions for respondents who reported being satisfied with the accessibility of the most recently used SA government service in the last 12 months (Table 4.21).

Table 4.21: Satisfaction with accessibility of the most recent SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	353/404	87.3 (83.7 - 90.2)
Northern Adelaide	321/381	84.4 (80.4 - 87.7)
Southern Adelaide	354/422	83.9 (80.1 - 87.1)
Western Adelaide	250/293	85.2 (80.7 - 88.8)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	345/400	86.4 (82.7 - 89.4)
Barossa	347/394	88.2 (84.6 - 91.0)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	324/390	82.9 (78.8 - 86.3)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	376/420	89.5 (86.2 - 92.1)
Far North	313/353	88.7 (84.9 - 91.6)
Limestone Coast	337/397	84.9 (81.1 - 88.1)
Murray and Mallee	365/413	88.4 (84.9 - 91.1)
Yorke and Mid North	356/401	88.9 (85.4 - 91.6)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

Table 4.22 shows the rating on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 5 means “very satisfied”) by respondents on the timeliness of the SA government service used most recently in the last 12 months. Overall, 76.1% (95% CI 74.9 – 77.3) were satisfied⁶ with the amount of time it took to get the SA government service.

Table 4.22: Satisfaction with timeliness of SA government service in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Very dissatisfied	589	12.6	(11.7 - 13.6)
2	449	9.6	(8.8 - 10.5)
3	874	18.7	(17.6 - 19.9)
4	1195	25.6	(24.4 - 26.9)
5 Very satisfied	1485	31.8	(30.5 - 33.2)
Don't know	72	1.5	(1.2 - 1.9)
Refused	4	0.1	(0.0 - 0.2)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was not statistically significant different between males and females in terms of satisfaction with timeliness of the service (Table 4.23).

Table 4.23: Satisfaction with timeliness of SA government service in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	1750	75.3	1804	77.0
Not satisfied	538	23.1	501	21.4
Don't know/Refused	37	1.6	39	1.7
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

⁶ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Respondents born in an English speaking country other than Australia (81.7%) and in a non English speaking country (80.9%) were statistically significantly more likely to report satisfaction with timeliness of government service(s), whereas respondents born in Australia (74.8%) were statistically significantly less likely to report satisfaction with the timeliness (Table 4.24).

Table 4.24: Satisfaction with timeliness of SA government service in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	2776	74.8↓	426	81.7↑	352	80.9↑
Not satisfied	873	23.5↑	90	17.2↓	76	17.4↓
Don't know/Refused	63	1.7	5	1.0	7	1.7
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

As presented in Table 4.25, respondents who reported satisfaction with timeliness of government service(s) were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 65 years and over and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 or 45 to 54 years.

Table 4.25 Satisfaction with timeliness of SA government service in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfied	547	72.9↓	619	77.1	661	77.7	599	72.0↓	486	74.1	335	81.7↑	306	83.8↑
Not satisfied	182	24.2	179	22.3	177	20.8	224	26.9↑	164	25.0	68	16.6↓	44	12.2↓
Don't know/Refused	21	2.8↑	5	0.7↓	13	1.5	9	1.1	6	0.9	7	1.7	15	4.0↑
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who reported being satisfied with the timeliness of the most recently used SA government service in the last 12 months in the Eyre and Western, Far North, and Yorke and Mid North regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Southern and Western Adelaide regions (Table 4.26).

Table 4.26: Satisfaction with timeliness of the most recent SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	313/404	77.4 (73.1 - 81.2)
Northern Adelaide	288/381	75.7 (71.2 - 79.8)
Southern Adelaide	308/422	73.0 (68.6 - 77.1) ↓
Western Adelaide	207/293	70.4 (65.0 - 75.4) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	307/400	76.8 (72.4 - 80.6)
Barossa	321/394	81.6 (77.5 - 85.2)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	311/390	79.8 (75.5 - 83.5)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	363/420	86.3 (82.7 - 89.2) ↑
Far North	300/353	85.0 (80.9 - 88.4) ↑
Limestone Coast	306/397	77.0 (72.6 - 80.9)
Murray and Mallee	322/413	78.0 (73.8 - 81.7)
Yorke and Mid North	339/401	84.5 (80.6 - 87.7) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Fairness, information, knowledge/competence and extra mile/courtesy with SA government services used in the last 12 months

Respondents were asked on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 means “strongly disagree” and 5 means “strongly agree”) to rate four statements regarding their interaction with staff relating to fairness, information, knowledge/competence, and going the extra mile/courtesy with the SA government service used most recently in the last 12 months.

Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed that they had been treated fairly (Table 4.27). Overall, 86.2% (95% CI 85.2 – 87.2) agreed⁷ that they had been treated fairly.

Table 4.27: Treated with fairness by staff at SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Strongly disagree	138	3.0	(2.5 - 3.5)
2	135	2.9	(2.5 - 3.4)
3	481	10.3	(9.5 - 11.2)
4	1162	24.9	(23.7 - 26.2)
5 Strongly agree	2382	51.0	(49.6 - 52.5)
Don't know	23	0.5	(0.3 - 0.7)
Refused	5	0.1	(0.0 - 0.2)
Not applicable (online service)	342	7.3	(6.6 - 8.1)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Overall, respondents who agreed that they were treated with fairness by staff at a government service were statistically significantly more likely to be female (84.6%) than male (87.9%) (Table 4.28).

Table 4.28: Treated with fairness by staff at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Agree	1966	84.6↓	2060	87.9↑
Don't agree	141	6.1	132	5.6
Don't know/Refused/NA	218	9.4↑	152	6.5↓
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

⁷ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

There were no statistically significant differences in the proportions of respondents from different countries of birth stating that they were treated with fairness.

Table 4.29: Treated with fairness by staff at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	3214	86.6	438	84.0	373	85.8
Don't agree	209	5.6	31	6.0	33	7.7
Don't know/Refused	289	7.8	52	10.0	28	6.5
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

When compared between age groups, respondents who had been treated with fairness at a government service were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years and statistically significantly less likely to be 45 to 64 years of age (Table 4.30).

Table 4.30 Treated with fairness by staff at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	699	93.1↑	690	85.9	741	87.0	676	81.2↓	542	82.5↓	359	87.4	320	87.8
Don't agree	9	1.2↓	47	5.8	49	5.8	76	9.1↑	49	7.5	21	5.2	22	6.1
Don't know/Refused	43	5.7↓	67	8.3	61	7.2	81	9.7↑	66	10.0↑	30	7.4	22	6.2
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who agreed that staff had treated them fairly in the Eyre and Western region, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents who agreed that staff had treated them fairly in the Eastern Adelaide, Western Adelaide, and Adelaide Hills regions (Table 4.31).

Table 4.31: Treated with fairness by staff at SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	338/404	83.7 (79.8 - 87.0) ↓
Northern Adelaide	332/381	87.3 (83.6 - 90.3)
Southern Adelaide	370/422	87.8 (84.4 - 90.6)
Western Adelaide	240/293	81.9 (77.0 - 85.8) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	322/400	80.5 (76.3 - 84.0) ↓
Barossa	340/394	86.5 (82.8 - 89.5)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	336/390	86.2 (82.4 - 89.3)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	386/420	91.9 (88.9 - 94.1) ↑
Far North	308/353	87.2 (83.3 - 90.3)
Limestone Coast	357/397	90.0 (86.7 - 92.6)
Murray and Mallee	368/413	89.0 (85.6 - 91.6)
Yorke and Mid North	357/401	88.9 (85.5 - 91.6)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed that they had been informed of everything they had to do to receive the service/product. Overall, 80.6% (95% CI 79.5 – 81.8) agreed⁸ with this statement (Table 4.32).

Table 4.32: Sufficiently informed by SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Strongly disagree	216	4.6	(4.1 - 5.3)
2	239	5.1	(4.5 - 5.8)
3	468	10.0	(9.2 - 10.9)
4	1282	27.5	(26.2 - 28.8)
5 Strongly agree	2015	43.2	(41.7 - 44.6)
Don't know/Refused	48	1.0	(0.8 - 1.4)
Not applicable (online service)	400	8.6	(7.8 - 9.4)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

⁸ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Overall, respondents who agreed they were sufficiently informed by a government service were more likely to be female (82.7%) than male (78.6%) (Table 4.33).

Table 4.33: Sufficiently informed by SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Agree	1827	78.6↓	1938	82.7↑
Don't agree	241	10.4	214	9.2
Don't know/Refused/NA	257	11.1↑	191	8.2↓
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents born in Australia were significant less likely to agree they were sufficiently informed by a government service and those from a non English speaking country were significantly more likely to agree (Table 4.34).

Table 4.34: Sufficiently informed by SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	2963	78.9↓	428	82.1	374	86.1↑
Don't agree	392	10.6↑	36	6.9↓	27	6.3↓
Don't know/Refused	357	9.6	57	11.0	33	7.7
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who agreed they were sufficiently informed by a government service were more likely to be aged 25 to 34 years and less likely to be aged 45 to 54 years (Table 4.35).

Table 4.35: Sufficiently informed by SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	614	81.8	688	85.6↑	692	81.3	635	76.4↓	513	78.2	334	81.5	288	78.9
Don't agree	84	11.2	44	5.4↓	91	10.7	107	12.9↑	68	10.3	31	7.5	31	8.5
Don't know/Refused	53	7.1↓	72	8.9	68	7.9	89	10.8	75	11.4	45	11.1	46	12.6↑
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who agreed they had been informed of everything they had to do to receive the service/product in the Limestone Coast and Yorke and Mid North regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Western Adelaide and Adelaide Hills regions (Table 4.36).

Table 4.36: Sufficiently informed at SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	315/404	77.9 (73.6 - 81.6)
Northern Adelaide	317/381	83.2 (79.1 - 86.6)
Southern Adelaide	343/422	81.3 (77.3 - 84.7)
Western Adelaide	222/293	75.7 (70.5 - 80.3) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	289/400	72.4 (67.8 - 76.6) ↓
Barossa	315/394	80.1 (75.9 - 83.7)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	310/390	79.5 (75.2 - 83.2)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	353/420	83.9 (80.0 - 87.1)
Far North	290/353	82.1 (77.7 - 85.7)
Limestone Coast	350/397	88.2 (84.7 - 91.0) ↑
Murray and Mallee	345/413	83.5 (79.6 - 86.7)
Yorke and Mid North	341/401	84.9 (81.1 - 88.1) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed that the staff were knowledgeable and competent. Overall, 82.0% (95% CI 80.8 – 83.0) agreed⁹ with this statement (Table 4.37).

Table 4.37: Staff were knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Strongly disagree	200	4.3	(3.7 - 4.9)
2	235	5.0	(4.4 - 5.7)
3	504	10.8	(9.9 - 11.7)
4	1273	27.3	(26.0 - 28.6)
5 Strongly agree	2049	43.9	(42.5 - 45.3)
Don't know	31	0.7	(0.5 - 0.9)
Refused	3	0.1	(0.0 - 0.2)
Not applicable (online service)	373	8.0	(7.2 - 8.8)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

⁹ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Females (84.1%) were more likely than males (79.8%) to agree that staff were knowledgeable and competent at a government service.

Table 4.38 Staff were knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Agree	1856	79.8↓	1970	84.1↑
Don't agree	229	9.8	207	8.8
Don't know/Refused	240	10.3↑	166	7.1↓
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who did not agree that staff were knowledgeable and competent were more likely to be born in Australia (9.9%) (Table 4.39).

Table 4.39: Staff were knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other– Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	3024	81.5	442	84.7	360	82.8
Don't agree	369	9.9↑	26	4.9↓	41	9.4
Don't know/Refused	318	8.6	54	10.3	34	7.8
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

As presented in Table 4.40, respondents aged 65 to 74 years or 75 years and over were more likely to agree that staff were knowledgeable and competent.

Table 4.40: Staff were knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	621	82.7	666	82.9	699	82.1	636	76.5↓	519	79.0↓	362	88.1↑	324	88.8↑
Don't agree	87	11.6↑	68	8.5	80	9.5	107	12.9↑	60	9.2	17	4.2↓	15	4.2↓
Don't know/Refused	43	5.7↓	69	8.6	72	8.4	89	10.6↑	77	11.8↑	31	7.7	26	7.0
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who agreed the staff had been knowledgeable and competent in the Eyre and Western, Limestone Coast, Murray and Mallee and Yorke and Mid North regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Western Adelaide and Adelaide Hills regions (Table 4.41).

Table 4.41: Staff were knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	332/404	82.0 (78.0 - 85.5)
Northern Adelaide	314/381	82.4 (78.2 - 85.9)
Southern Adelaide	347/422	82.3 (78.4 - 85.7)
Western Adelaide	221/293	75.4 (70.2 - 80.0) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	292/400	73.0 (68.5 - 77.1) ↓
Barossa	327/394	83.2 (79.2 - 86.6)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	322/390	82.6 (78.5 - 86.1)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	367/420	87.3 (83.7 - 90.1) ↑
Far North	298/353	84.3 (80.1 - 87.7)
Limestone Coast	353/397	88.9 (85.4 - 91.6) ↑
Murray and Mallee	365/413	88.4 (84.9 - 91.1) ↑
Yorke and Mid North	350/401	87.3 (83.7 - 90.2) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed that staff put in extra effort to make sure they got what they needed. Overall, 75.9% (95% CI 74.7 – 77.1) agreed¹⁰ with this statement (Table 4.42).

Table 4.42: Staff put in extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Strongly disagree	311	6.7	(6.0 - 7.4)
2	336	7.2	(6.5 - 8.0)
3	773	16.6	(15.5 - 17.6)
4	1089	23.3	(22.1 - 24.6)
5 Strongly agree	1682	36.0	(34.7 - 37.4)
Don't know	41	0.9	(0.7 - 1.2)
Refused	6	0.1	(0.1 - 0.3)
Not applicable (online service)	431	9.2	(8.4 - 10.1)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who agreed staff put in the extra mile/courtesy at a government service were more likely to be female (79.1%) than male (72.6%) (Table 4.43).

Table 4.43: Staff put in extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Agree	1689	72.6↓	1855	79.1↑
Don't agree	351	15.1↑	296	12.6↓
Don't know/Refused	285	12.3↑	193	8.2↓
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Overall, respondents who agreed staff put in the extra mile/courtesy at a government service were more likely to be born in a non-English speaking country (80.3%) and less likely to be born in Australia (75.0%) (Table 4.44).

¹⁰ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Table 4.44: Staff put in extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	2786	75.0↓	408	78.3	349	80.3↑
Don't agree	547	14.7↑	50	9.6↓	49	11.3
Don't know/Refused	379	10.2	63	12.1	36	8.3
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Presented in Table 4.45, respondents who agreed staff put in the extra mile/courtesy were more likely to be aged 65 years and over and less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years or 45 to 54 years.

Table 4.45: Staff put in extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Agree	549	73.1↓	603	75.1	662	77.7	586	70.5↓	495	75.4	348	84.9↑	301	82.4↑
Don't agree	144	19.2↑	121	15.1	113	13.3	145	17.4↑	78	11.9	22	5.3↓	24	6.7↓
Don't know/Refused	58	7.7↓	79	9.9	77	9.0	101	12.2↑	83	12.7↑	40	9.8	40	10.9
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who agreed the staff put in extra effort in the Eyre and Western and Limestone Coast regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Eastern and Western Adelaide and Adelaide Hills regions (Table 4.46).

Table 4.46: Staff put in extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	296/404	73.3 (68.7 - 77.3) ↓
Northern Adelaide	290/381	76.1 (71.6 - 80.1)
Southern Adelaide	319/422	75.6 (71.3 - 79.4)
Western Adelaide	211/293	72.0 (66.6 - 76.8) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	265/400	66.2 (61.4 - 70.7) ↓
Barossa	311/394	79.0 (74.7 - 82.7)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	312/390	79.9 (75.6 - 83.6)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	361/420	85.8 (82.2 - 88.8) ↑
Far North	287/353	81.4 (77.0 - 85.1)
Limestone Coast	325/397	81.7 (77.6 - 85.2) ↑
Murray and Mallee	332/413	80.4 (76.3 - 84.0)
Yorke and Mid North	324/401	80.8 (76.7 - 84.4)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Respondents were asked on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 means “not at all important” and 5 means “very important”) with four statements regarding their interaction with staff relating to fairness, information, knowledge/competence and going the extra mile/courtesy with most recent experiences with SA government service used in the last 12 months.

Respondents were asked how important it was that they had been treated fairly. Overall, 90.4% (95% CI 89.5 – 91.2) believed it was important¹¹ (Table 4.47).

Table 4.47: Importance of fairness at SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Not at all important	35	0.8	(0.5 - 1.1)
2	43	0.9	(0.7 - 1.2)
3	293	6.3	(5.6 - 7.0)
4	898	19.2	(18.1 - 20.4)
5 Very important	3029	64.9	(63.5 - 66.2)
Don't know	26	0.6	(0.4 - 0.8)
Refused	3	0.1	(0.0 - 0.2)
Not applicable (online service)	340	7.3	(6.6 - 8.1)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Overall, respondents who rated fairness as important were more likely to be female (92.2%) than male (88.6%) (Table 4.48).

Table 4.48 Importance of fairness at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Important	2061	88.6↓	2160	92.2↑
Not Important	46	2.0	32	1.4
Don't know/Refused	218	9.4↑	151	6.4↓
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

¹¹ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Respondents born in an English speaking country other than Australia were more likely to rate fairness at a government service as important (87.2%) (Table 4.49).

Table 4.49: Importance of fairness at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Important	3364	90.6	455	87.2↓	402	92.5
Not Important	60	1.6	14	2.8↑	4	0.9
Don't know/Refused	288	7.8	52	10.0	29	6.6
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

As presented in Table 4.50, respondents who reported fairness at a government service as important were more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years (87.7%), 65 to 74 years (88.2%) or 75 years and over (89.0%), and less likely to be aged 25 to 34 years (80.7%), 35 to 44 years (84.0%) or 45 to 54 years (80.7%).

Table 4.50: Importance of fairness at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Important	694	92.5↑	721	89.7	769	90.4	738	88.7	583	88.9	374	91.1	342	93.7↑
Not Important	18	2.4	19	2.3	16	1.9	16	1.9	4	0.7#	3	0.8	2	0.5
Don't know/Refused	38	5.1↓	64	8.0	66	7.7	78	9.3	69	10.4↑	33	8.1	21	5.9
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who rated fairness as important in the Limestone Coast region, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Eastern and Western Adelaide and Adelaide Hills regions (Table 4.51).

Table 4.51: Importance of fairness at SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	351/404	86.9 (83.3 - 89.9) ↓
Northern Adelaide	348/381	91.5 (88.3 - 93.9)
Southern Adelaide	392/422	92.9 (90.0 - 95.0)
Western Adelaide	256/293	87.4 (83.1 - 90.7) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	321/400	80.4 (76.2 - 84.0) ↓
Barossa	358/394	91.0 (87.8 - 93.5)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	354/390	90.6 (87.3 - 93.1)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	389/420	92.5 (89.6 - 94.7)
Far North	330/353	93.3 (90.2 - 95.5)
Limestone Coast	384/397	96.7 (94.4 - 98.0) ↑
Murray and Mallee	386/413	93.3 (90.5 - 95.4)
Yorke and Mid North	365/401	91.1 (87.9 - 93.5)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Respondents were asked how important it was that they had been informed of everything they had to do to get the service/product. Overall, 89.7% (95% CI 88.8 – 90.5) rated it as important¹² (Table 4.52).

Table 4.52: Importance of being adequately informed at SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Not at all important	19	0.4	(0.3 - 0.6)
2	39	0.8	(0.6 - 1.2)
3	339	7.3	(6.6 - 8.1)
4	900	19.3	(18.2 - 20.4)
5 Very important	2948	63.1	(61.8 - 64.5)
Don't know	26	0.6	(0.4 - 0.8)
Refused	5	0.1	(0.0 - 0.3)
Not applicable (online service)	391	8.4	(7.6 - 9.2)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

¹² A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Females (91.7%) were more likely than males (87.7%) to rate being adequately informed at a government service as important (Table 4.53).

Table 4.53: Importance of being adequately informed at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Important	2040	87.7↓	2148	91.7↑
Not Important	41	1.7↑	18	0.8↓
Don't know/Refused	245	10.5↑	178	7.6↓
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

No significant differences were found between respondents according to country of birth who rated being adequately informed as important or not important (Table 4.54).

Table 4.54: Importance of being adequately informed at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Important	3322	89.5	462	88.5	404	92.9
Not Important	52	1.4	7	1.3	-	-
Don't know/Refused	338	9.1	53	10.2	31	7.1
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Overall, respondents who rated being adequately informed as not important were more likely to be aged 35 to 44 years (Table 4.55).

Table 4.55: Importance of being adequately informed at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Important	688	91.6	724	90.1	759	89.2	746	88.7	577	87.9	373	90.8	321	88.1
Not Important	11	1.4	10	1.3	21	2.4 [↑]	7	0.9	4	0.5	2	0.6	3	0.9
Don't know/Refused	52	6.9 [↓]	70	8.7	71	8.4	78	9.4	76	11.6 [↑]	35	8.6	40	11.0
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

^{↑↓} Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who rated being informed of everything they had to do to get the service/product as important in the Limestone Coast region, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Adelaide Hills regions (Table 4.56).

Table 4.56: Importance of being adequately informed at SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	355/404	87.8 (84.3 - 90.7)
Northern Adelaide	347/381	91.0 (87.7 - 93.5)
Southern Adelaide	386/422	91.6 (88.6 - 93.9)
Western Adelaide	257/293	87.8 (83.5 - 91.0)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	322/400	80.4 (76.3 - 84.0) ↓
Barossa	353/394	89.7 (86.3 - 92.3)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	338/390	86.5 (82.8 - 89.6)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	371/420	88.2 (84.8 - 90.9)
Far North	323/353	91.4 (88.0 - 93.9)
Limestone Coast	377/397	95.0 (92.4 - 96.7) ↑
Murray and Mallee	379/413	91.8 (88.7 - 94.1)
Yorke and Mid North	363/401	90.4 (87.2 - 93.0)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Respondents were asked how important it was that the staff were knowledgeable and competent. Overall, 91.0% (95% CI 90.2 – 91.8) rated it as important¹³ (Table 4.57).

Table 4.57: Importance of staff being knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Not at all important	10	0.2	(0.1 - 0.4)
2	23	0.5	(0.3 - 0.7)
3	156	3.3	(2.9 - 3.9)
4	659	14.1	(13.1 - 15.1)
5 Very important	3435	73.6	(72.3 - 74.8)
Don't know/Refused	18	0.4	(0.2 - 0.6)
Not applicable (online service)	369	7.9	(7.2 - 8.7)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

¹³ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Respondents who rated staff being knowledgeable and competent as important were more likely to be female (92.8%) than male (89.2%) (Table 4.58).

Table 4.58: Importance of staff being knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Important	2074	89.2↓	2175	92.8↑
Not Important	18	0.8	14	0.6
Don't know/Refused	232	10.0↑	154	6.6↓
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

No significant differences were found between respondents depending on country of birth who rated staff being knowledgeable and competent as important, and those that rated it not important (Table 4.59).

Table 4.59: Importance of staff being knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Important	3383	91.1	465	89.3	401	92.1
Not Important	23	0.6	6	1.2	3	0.8
Don't know/Refused	306	8.2	50	9.5	31	7.1
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	521	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Overall, respondents who reported that staff being knowledgeable and competent was important were more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years and less likely to be aged 55 to 64 years (Table 4.60).

Table 4.60: Importance of staff being knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Important	701	93.4↑	730	90.9	775	91.0	745	89.6	582	88.7↓	381	92.8	335	91.8
Not Important	2	0.3	7	0.9	6	0.7	4	0.5	4	0.7	1	0.3	7	2.0↑
Don't know/Refused	47	6.3↓	66	8.3	70	8.2	83	10.0	69	10.6↑	28	6.8	23	6.2
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who rated knowledgeable and competent staff as important in the Limestone Coast and Murray and Mallee regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents who rated knowledgeable and competent staff as important in the Adelaide Hills region (Table 4.61).

Table 4.61: Importance of staff being knowledgeable and competent at SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	360/404	89.2 (85.8 - 91.9)
Northern Adelaide	348/381	91.5 (88.2 - 93.9)
Southern Adelaide	388/422	92.0 (89.1 - 94.3)
Western Adelaide	262/293	89.3 (85.3 - 92.4)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	329/400	82.2 (78.2 - 85.7) ↓
Barossa	359/394	91.2 (88.0 - 93.6)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	353/390	90.5 (87.2 - 93.0)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	393/420	93.4 (90.6 - 95.4)
Far North	327/353	92.6 (89.4 - 94.9)
Limestone Coast	381/397	95.9 (93.5 - 97.5) ↑
Murray and Mallee	392/413	94.8 92.3 - 96.6) ↑
Yorke and Mid North	371/401	92.6 (89.6 - 94.8)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Respondents were asked how important it was that staff put in extra effort to make sure they got what they needed. Overall, 89.4% (95% CI 88.4 – 90.2) rated it as important¹⁴ (Table 4.62).

Table 4.62: Importance of extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Not at all important	23	0.5	(0.3 - 0.7)
2	43	0.9	(0.7 - 1.2)
3	459	9.8	(9.0 - 10.7)
4	1263	27.1	(25.8 - 28.4)
5 Very important	2450	52.5	(51.0 - 53.9)
Don't know	26	0.6	(0.4 - 0.8)
Refused	11	0.2	(0.1 - 0.4)
Not applicable (online service)	394	8.4	(7.7 - 9.3)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

¹⁴ A score of 3 or more on a scale of 1 to 5

Females (91.7%) were more likely than males (87.0%) to rate that a government service going the extra mile was important (Table 4.63).

Table 4.63: Importance of extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Important	2023	87.0↓	2149	91.7↑
Not Important	45	1.9↑	21	0.9↓
Don't know/Refused	257	11.1↑	174	7.4↓
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was no significant difference according to country of birth in the proportion of respondents who rated a government service going the extra mile as important (Table 4.64).

Table 4.64 : Importance of extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other- Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Important	3322	89.5	456	87.5	394	90.6
Not Important	54	1.5	8	1.5	4	0.8
Don't know/Refused	336	9.1	58	11.1	37	8.6
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	435	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who rated a government service going the extra mile as important were more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years (Table 4.65).

Table 4.65 : Importance of extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Important	687	91.5↑	718	89.4	763	89.7	728	87.6	579	88.2	370	90.1	326	89.5
Not Important	17	2.2↑	13	1.6	12	1.4	13	1.6	3	0.4#	2	0.6↓	6	1.6↓
Don't know/Refused	47	6.3↓	72	9.0	76	8.9	90	10.9	75	11.4↑	38	9.3	32	8.9
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who rated extra effort of staff as being important in the Limestone Coast and Murray and Mallee regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Eastern Adelaide and Adelaide Hills regions (Table 4.66).

Table 4.66: Importance of extra mile/courtesy at SA government service used in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	349/404	86.3 (82.6 - 89.3) ↓
Northern Adelaide	347/381	91.1 (87.8 - 93.6)
Southern Adelaide	381/422	90.3 (87.1 - 92.8)
Western Adelaide	256/293	87.1 (82.8 - 90.5)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	317/400	79.4 (75.2 - 83.1) ↓
Barossa	353/394	89.8 (86.4 - 92.4)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	350/390	89.8 (86.4 - 92.4)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	388/420	92.4 (89.4 - 94.5)
Far North	325/353	91.9 (88.6 - 94.3)
Limestone Coast	371/397	93.3 (90.5 - 95.4) ↑
Murray and Mallee	385/413	93.1 (90.2 - 95.2) ↑
Yorke and Mid North	364/401	90.8 (87.6 - 93.3)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Service or product received from SA government service used in the last 12 months

Overall, 84.3% (95% CI 83.2 – 85.3) respondents who had used a SA government service in the last 12 months received the service or product they needed (Table 4.67).

Table 4.67: Service or product received from SA government service used in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes (received service or product)	3934	84.3	(83.2 - 85.3)
Received part of what was needed	340	7.3	(6.6 - 8.1)
No (did not receive service or product)	366	7.8	(7.1 - 8.6)
Don't know	22	0.5	(0.3 - 0.7)
Refused	5	0.1	(0.1 - 0.3)
Total	4668	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

No significant differences were found in gender of respondents regardless of what level of service or product they received (Table 4.68).

Table 4.68: Service or product received from SA government service used in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes (received service or product)	1975	85.0	1959	83.6
Part or none	336	14.5	370	15.8
Don't know/Refused	14	0.6	14	0.6
Total	2325	100.0	2343	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who received part or none of a service or product were significantly more likely to be born in Australia and those who were born in another English speaking country were significantly less likely to have received part or none of a product or service (Table 4.69).

Table 4.69: Service or product received from SA government service used in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other- English speaking		Other – Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes (received service or product)	3111	83.8	453	86.8	371	85.2
Part or none	582	15.7 [↑]	61	11.7 [↓]	64	14.6
Don't know/Refused	19	0.5	8	1.5 [↑]	1	0.2
Total	3712	100.0	521	100.0	521	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents aged 16 to 24 years were significantly more likely and those aged 45 to 54 years were significantly less likely to have received the product of service (Table 4.70).

Table 4.70: Service or product received from SA government service used in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes (received service or product)	666	88.7↑	674	83.8	719	84.5	657	79.0↓	550	83.8	354	86.3	316	86.5
Part or none	84	11.2↓	127	15.8	128	15.1	165	19.9↑	104	15.9	53	13.0	44	12.1
Don't know/Refused	1	0.1	3	0.3	4	0.5	10	1.2↑	2	0.3	3	0.8	5	1.4↑
Total	750	100.0	804	100.0	851	100.0	832	100.0	656	100.0	410	100.0	365	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There were no statistically significant differences between SA government regions for respondents who received the service or product they needed or who received part or none of what they needed (Table 4.71).

Table 4.71: Service or product received from SA government service used in the last 12 months

	Yes (received service or product)			Received part of what was needed or none		
	n	%	(95% CI)	n	%	(95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area						
Eastern Adelaide	342/404	84.6	(80.7 - 87.8)	60/404	14.8	(11.7 - 18.6)
Northern Adelaide	328/381	86.1	(82.2 - 89.2)	50/381	13.3	(10.2 - 17.0)
Southern Adelaide	354/422	84.0	(80.2 - 87.2)	66/422	15.6	(12.4 - 19.3)
Western Adelaide	231/293	78.7	(73.6 - 83.0)	62/293	21.2	(16.9 - 26.3)
Greater Adelaide area						
Adelaide Hills	342/400	85.6	(81.9 - 88.7)	53/400	13.2	(10.2 - 16.8)
Barossa	343/394	87.2	(83.5 - 90.1)	48/394	12.3	(9.4 - 15.9)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	332/390	85.0	(81.1 - 88.2)	52/390	13.3	(10.3 - 17.1)
Country regions						
Eyre and Western	364/420	86.5	(82.9 - 89.5)	53/420	12.6	(9.8 - 16.1)
Far North	302/353	85.4	(81.4 - 88.7)	48/353	13.7	(10.5 - 17.7)
Limestone Coast	336/397	84.6	(80.7 - 87.8)	60/397	15.1	(11.9 - 19.0)
Murray and Mallee	350/413	84.6	(80.8 - 87.8)	61/413	14.8	(11.7 - 18.5)
Yorke and Mid North	346/401	86.4	(82.7 - 89.4)	51/401	12.7	(9.8 - 16.3)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

CHAPTER 5: INVOLVEMENT IN THE COMMUNITY

Introduction

This section explores the connections that individual South Australians have with their various communities, indicated by the following: level of involvement in the community, formal and informal volunteering, participation in a recreational, artistic, cultural or church group, attendance at a community meeting, participation in recreation and sport (mostly presented in Chapter 9), other involvement in sport (as an umpire, coach or official) and attendance at a sporting match.

Community involvement

Within the last 12 months, 43.8% (95% CI 42.6 – 45.1) of respondents had been involved in the community such as assisting with school activities, helping with sporting events, selling raffle tickets, participating in local community discussions, or attending local/district council meetings (Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Respondents who had participated in community activities in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	2638	43.8	(42.6 - 45.1)
No	3363	55.9	(54.6 - 57.1)
Don't know	16	0.3	(0.2 - 0.4)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of females (47.3%) who participated in community activities when compared to males (40.2%) (Table 5.2).

Table 5.2: Participation in community activities, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	1186	40.2↓	1452	47.3↑
No	1757	59.6↑	1606	52.3↓
Don't know	3	0.1#	13	0.4↑
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia (45.6%) and a statistically lower proportion of respondents born in non English speaking countries who participated in community activities (Table 5.3).

Table 5.3: Participation in community activities, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other - Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	2162	45.6↑	313	44.9	163	28.2↓
No	2564	54.1↓	383	55.1	416	71.7↑
Don't know	15	0.3	-	-	1	0.1
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who had participated in community activities were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 35 to 54 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years, 55 to 64 years or 75 years and over (Table 5.4).

Table 5.4: Participation in community activities, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	319	34.6↓	403	42.8	606	56.7↑	557	52.4↑	358	40.4↓	246	43.4	149	26.2↓
No	594	64.5↑	533	56.6	463	43.3↓	506	47.6↓	526	59.4↑	321	56.6	420	73.7↑
Don't know	8	0.9↑	5	0.6↑	-	-	1	0.1	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.1
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.
 # Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who reported being involved in the community in the last twelve months in all country regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in all Adelaide metropolitan regions (Table 5.5).

Table 5.5: Respondents who had participated in community activities in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	202/516	39.2 (35.0 - 43.4) ↓
Northern Adelaide	179/487	36.7 (32.6 - 41.1) ↓
Southern Adelaide	230/547	42.0 (37.9 - 46.2) ↓
Western Adelaide	145/381	38.1 (33.4 - 43.1) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	250/520	48.2 (43.9 - 52.5)
Barossa	264/526	50.2 (45.9 - 54.4)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	270/514	52.5 (48.2 - 56.8)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	297/505	58.8 (54.5 - 63.0) ↑
Far North	246/448	54.9 (50.3 - 59.5) ↑
Limestone Coast	307/525	58.4 (54.2 - 62.6) ↑
Murray and Mallee	288/527	54.7 (50.4 - 58.9) ↑
Yorke and Mid North	337/521	64.7 (60.5 - 68.7) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Formal volunteering

Formal volunteering is defined as unpaid, voluntary help willingly given in the form of time, services, or skills for an organisation, club, or association. It excludes voluntary work done overseas and donations of money or goods. Overall, 43.7% (95% CI 42.4 – 44.9) of respondents had undertaken formal unpaid volunteering for not-for-profit organisations (Table 5.6).

Table 5.6: Respondents who had undertaken formal unpaid volunteering for not-for-profit organisations

	n	% (95% CI)
Yes	2627	43.7 (42.4 - 44.9)
No	3384	56.2 (55.0 - 57.5)
Don't know	6	0.1 (0.0 - 0.2)
Total	6017	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There were no statistically significant differences between females who reported having undertaken unpaid voluntary work when compared to males (Table 5.7).

Table 5.7: Formal volunteering, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	1274	43.2	1354	44.1
No	1671	56.7	1713	55.8
Don't know	1	0.1	5	0.1
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia (45.2%) who said they participated in formal unpaid volunteering when compared to those born in other countries, and a statistically lower proportion of respondents born in Non-English speaking countries (30.4%) doing unpaid volunteering (Table 5.8).

Table 5.8: Formal volunteering, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	2144	45.2↑	307	44.2	176	30.4↓
No	2591	54.7↓	388	55.8	404	69.6↑
Don't know	6	0.1	-	-	-	-
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who participated in unpaid formal volunteering were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 35 to 74 years, and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 34 years or 75 years and over (Table 5.9).

Table 5.9: Formal volunteering, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	275	29.8↓	363	38.5↓	543	50.8↑	531	49.9↑	418	47.2↑	286	50.4↑	211	37.1↓
No	644	69.9↑	576	61.2↑	525	49.2↓	532	50.0↓	467	52.8↓	281	49.6↓	358	62.9↑
Don't know	2	0.2	3	0.3	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who reported undertaking formal unpaid volunteering for not-for-profit organisations in the last twelve months in the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island, Eyre and Western, Limestone Coast, Murray and Mallee, and Yorke and Mid North regions. There was a statistically significantly lower proportion that reported undertaking formal unpaid volunteering in all Adelaide metropolitan regions (Table 5.10).

Table 5.10: Respondents who had undertaken formal unpaid volunteering for not-for-profit organisations by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	206/516	39.9 (35.7 - 44.1) ↓
Northern Adelaide	179/487	36.8 (32.6 - 41.2) ↓
Southern Adelaide	230/547	42.0 (37.9 - 46.2) ↓
Western Adelaide	138/381	36.3 (31.6 - 41.2) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	257/520	49.5 (45.2 - 53.8)
Barossa	250/526	47.6 (43.4 - 51.9)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	294/514	57.2 (52.9 - 61.4) ↑
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	291/505	57.7 (53.3 - 61.9) ↑
Far North	228/448	51.0 (46.4 - 55.6)
Limestone Coast	307/525	58.4 (54.1 - 62.6) ↑
Murray and Mallee	293/527	55.7 (51.4 - 59.9) ↑
Yorke and Mid North	331/521	63.6 (59.4 - 67.6) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Informal volunteering

Informal volunteering is defined as unpaid help given directly to people other than relatives; that is, using one’s own initiative rather than volunteering through a group or organisation. Examples include: shopping or taking in the mail for a neighbour, mowing someone else’s lawn, baby sitting for free, visiting or helping someone who is sick or elderly. Overall, 57.3% (95% CI 56.0 - 58.5) of respondents had undertaken informal unpaid volunteering (Table 5.11).

Table 5.11: Respondents who had undertaken informal unpaid volunteering

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	3448	57.3	(56.0 - 58.5)
No	2561	42.6	(41.3 - 43.8)
Don't know/Refused	8	0.1	(0.0 - 0.3)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of females who reported undertaking informal unpaid volunteering when compared to males (Table 5.12).

Table 5.12: Informal volunteering, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	1634	55.5↓	1814	59.1↑
No	1306	44.3↑	1255	40.9↓
Don't know	6	0.2	2	0.1
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia (58.2%) who undertook informal unpaid and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents born in Non-English speaking countries (49.2%) that did informal volunteering (Table 5.13).

Table 5.13: Informal volunteering, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	2759	58.2↑	403	57.9	285	49.2↓
No	1975	41.7↓	291	41.8	295	50.8↑
Don't know	6	0.1	2	0.2	-	-
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who participated in unpaid informal volunteering were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 45 to 54 years, and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years or 75 years and over, when compared to all the other age groups combined (Table 5.14).

Table 5.14: Informal volunteering, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	486	52.8↓	543	57.7	640	59.9	645	60.7↑	513	58.0	343	60.4	277	48.7↓
No	434	47.1↑	396	42.1	427	39.9	417	39.2↓	372	42.0	223	39.2	292	51.3↑
Don't know	1	0.1	2	0.2	2	0.2	1	0.1	-	-	2	0.4	-	-
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents in the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island, and Limestone Coast regions that reported doing unpaid volunteer work, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Eastern and Western Adelaide regions (Table 5.15).

Table 5.15: Respondents who had undertaken informal unpaid volunteering by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	269/516	52.1 (47.8 - 56.4) ↓
Northern Adelaide	274/487	56.3 (51.9 - 60.6)
Southern Adelaide	320/547	58.5 (54.3 - 62.6)
Western Adelaide	202/381	53.1 (48.0 - 58.0) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	323/520	62.2 (57.9 - 66.2)
Barossa	315/526	59.9 (55.7 - 64.0)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	329/514	64.0 (59.8 - 68.1) ↑
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	300/505	59.4 (55.1 - 63.6)
Far North	284/448	63.4 (58.8 - 67.7)
Limestone Coast	340/525	64.7 (60.5 - 68.7) ↑
Murray and Mallee	319/527	60.6 (56.3 - 64.7)
Yorke and Mid North	318/521	61.0 (56.7 - 65.0)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Formal and informal volunteering

Overall, 71.1% (CI 69.9 – 72.2) of respondents had undertaken either formal or informal volunteering and 29.9% (95% CI 28.7 – 31.1) of respondents had undertaken both formal and informal unpaid volunteering (Table 5.16).

Table 5.16: Respondents who had undertaken formal and/or informal unpaid volunteering

	n	%	(95% CI)
Formal and informal volunteering	1799	29.9	(28.7 - 31.1)
Formal but not informal volunteering	829	13.8	(12.9 - 14.7)
Informal but not formal volunteering	1649	27.4	(26.3 - 28.6)
No volunteering and/or don't know	1740	28.9	(27.8 - 30.1)
Formal and/or informal volunteering	4277	71.1	(69.9 - 72.2)
No volunteering	1740	28.9	(27.8 - 30.1)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of females (31.7%) who reported undertaking formal and informal volunteering when compared to males (28.0%) (Table 5.17).

Table 5.17: Formal and/or informal volunteering, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Formal and informal volunteering	824	28.0↓	975	31.7↑
Formal but not informal volunteering	450	15.3↑	379	12.3↓
Informal but not formal volunteering	810	27.5	839	27.3
No volunteering and/or don't know	862	29.3	879	28.6
Formal and/or informal volunteering	2084	70.7	2192	71.4
No volunteering	862	29.3	879	28.6
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia who said they undertook both formal and informal volunteering, and formal but not informal volunteering, when compared to those born in other countries and a statistically lower proportion of respondents born in Non-English speaking countries that undertook formal and informal volunteering (Table 5.18).

Table 5.18: Formal and/or informal volunteering, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Formal and informal volunteering	1464	30.9↑	224	32.1	111	19.1↓
Formal but not informal volunteering	680	14.3↑	84	12.0	65	11.3
Informal but not formal volunteering	1295	27.3	180	25.8	174	30.1
No volunteering and/or don't know	1302	27.5↓	209	30.0	230	39.6↑
Formal and/or informal volunteering	3439	72.5↑	487	70.0	351	60.4↓
No volunteering	1302	27.5↓	209	30.0	230	39.6↑
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who participated in formal and informal volunteering were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 35 to 74 years, and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 34 years or 75 years and over.

Respondents who participated in informal but not formal volunteering were statistically significantly more likely to be 16 to 34 years of age, and significantly less likely to be aged 75 years and over.

It was also found that those aged 16 to 24 years or 75 years and over were statistically significantly less likely to have undertaken any form of volunteering (Table 5.19).

Table 5.19: Informal volunteering, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Formal and informal volunteering	158	17.2↓	253	26.9↓	371	34.8↑	376	35.3↑	292	33.0↑	202	35.5↑	146	25.7↓
Formal but not informal volunteering	117	12.7	109	11.6↓	172	16.1↑	155	14.6	126	14.2	85	14.9	65	11.4
Informal but not formal volunteering	328	35.6↑	290	30.8↑	269	25.1	270	25.4	221	25.0	141	24.9	131	23.0↓
No volunteering and/or don't know	318	34.5↑	289	30.7	257	24.0↓	263	24.7↓	247	27.9	140	24.7↓	227	39.9↑
Formal and/or informal volunteering	603	65.5↑	652	69.3	812	76.0↑	800	75.3↑	639	72.1	428	75.3↑	342	60.1↓
No volunteering	318	34.5↑	289	30.7	257	24.0↓	263	24.7↓	247	27.9	140	24.7↓	227	39.9↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents in the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island, Eyre and Western, Limestone Coast, and Yorke and Mid North regions that had reported doing formal and/or informal volunteering. There was a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in all Adelaide metropolitan areas that had reported doing formal and/or informal volunteering (Table 5.20).

Table 5.20: Respondents who had undertaken formal and/or informal unpaid volunteering by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	339/516	65.6 (61.4 - 69.6) ↓
Northern Adelaide	342/487	70.2 (66.0 - 74.1) ↓
Southern Adelaide	387/547	70.8 (66.9 - 74.5) ↓
Western Adelaide	241/381	63.3 (58.4 - 68.0) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	403/520	77.5 (73.7 - 80.9)
Barossa	382/526	72.6 (68.6 - 76.2)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	404/514	78.6 (74.9 - 82.0) ↑
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	402/505	79.7 (76.0 - 83.0) ↑
Far North	342/448	76.2 (72.1 - 80.0)
Limestone Coast	425/525	80.9 (77.4 - 84.1) ↑
Murray and Mallee	406/527	77.0 (73.2 - 80.4)
Yorke and Mid North	428/521	82.1 (78.5 - 85.1) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Participation in recreational, artistic, cultural or church groups

Overall, 45.2% (95% CI 43.9 – 46.4) of respondents had participated in a recreational, artistic, cultural or church group within the last 12 months (Table 5.21).

Table 5.21: Respondents who had participated in a recreational, artistic, cultural or church group in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	2719	45.2	(43.9 - 46.4)
No	3297	54.8	(53.5 - 56.0)
Don't know	1	-	
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of females (48.3%) who reported participating in recreational, artistic, cultural or church group activities in the last twelve months, when compared to males (41.9%) (Table 5.22).

Table 5.22: Participation in recreational, artistic, cultural or church group in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	1236	41.9↓	1483	48.3↑
No	1710	58.0↑	1587	51.7↓
Don't know	1	0.1	1	0.1
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There were no statistically significant differences found between respondents in the three different country of birth categories in terms of participation in recreational, artistic, cultural or church group activities in the last twelve months (Table 5.23).

Table 5.23: Participation in recreational, artistic, cultural or church group in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	2137	45.1	312	44.9	269	46.4
No	2603	54.9	383	55.1	310	53.5
Don't know	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.1
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There were also no statistically significant differences found between respondents in the different age groups in terms of participation in recreational, artistic, cultural or church group activities in the last twelve months (Table 5.24).

Table 5.24: Participation in recreational, artistic, cultural or church group in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	386	42.0	418	44.5	485	45.3	477	44.9	404	45.6	278	49.0	270	47.5
No	534	58.0	523	55.5	584	54.7	586	55.1	482	54.4	290	51.0	298	52.4
Don't know	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who had participated in a recreational, artistic, cultural or church group in the last 12 months in the Adelaide Hills region, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Far North region (Table 5.25).

Table 5.25: Respondents who had participated in a recreational, artistic, cultural or church group in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	248/516	48.0 (43.8 - 52.3)
Northern Adelaide	216/487	44.3 (39.9 - 48.7)
Southern Adelaide	235/547	43.0 (38.9 - 47.1)
Western Adelaide	159/381	41.9 (37.0 - 46.9)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	287/520	55.2 (50.9 - 59.4) ↑
Barossa	257/526	48.9 (44.7 - 53.2)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	245/514	47.7 (43.4 - 52.0)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	240/505	47.6 (43.3 - 51.9)
Far North	174/448	38.7 (34.3 - 43.3) ↓
Limestone Coast	233/525	44.5 (40.3 - 48.7)
Murray and Mallee	243/527	46.2 (42.0 - 50.4)
Yorke and Mid North	250/521	48.0 (43.8 - 52.3)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Attendance at community events

Overall, 73.8% (95% CI 72.7 – 74.9) of respondents had attended an event that brings people together, such as fetes, shows, festivals or other community events, within the last 12 months (Table 5.26).

Table 5.26: Respondents who had attended a community event in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	4441	73.8	(72.7 - 74.9)
No	1561	25.9	(24.9 - 27.1)
Don't know	15	0.2	(0.1 - 0.4)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of females (76.1%) who reported participating in community events in the last twelve months, when compared to males (71.4%) (Table 5.27).

Table 5.27: Participation in community events in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2104	71.4↓	2337	76.1↑
No	837	28.4↑	724	23.6↓
Don't know	4	0.1	10	0.3
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia (74.9%) who said they attended community events and a statistically lower proportion of respondents born in non-English speaking countries (66.6%) that said they attended community events (Table 5.28).

Table 5.28: Participation in community events in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	3552	74.9↑	503	72.3	386	66.6↓
No	1175	24.8↓	192	27.7	194	33.4↑
Don't know	14	0.3	1	0.1	-	-
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

There was a statistically significant higher proportion of respondents aged 25 to 54 years and a statistically significant lower proportion aged 65 years and over who had participated in recreational, artistic, cultural or church group activities in the last twelve months (Table 5.29).

Table 5.29: Participation in community events in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	701	76.2	741	78.8↑	865	80.9↑	829	77.9↑	645	72.8	383	67.4↓	277	48.7↓
No	219	23.8	199	21.2↓	199	18.6↓	230	21.6↓	240	27.1	182	32.0↑	292	51.3↑
Don't know	-	-	1	0.1	5	0.5	5	0.5	1	0.1	3	0.5	-	-
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who had attended a community event in the last 12 months in the Adelaide Hills region, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Northern and Western Adelaide and Far North regions (Table 5.30).

Table 5.30: Respondents who had attended a community event in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	407/516	78.9 (75.1 - 82.2)
Northern Adelaide	324/487	66.5 (62.2 - 70.5) ↓
Southern Adelaide	408/547	74.7 (70.9 - 78.1)
Western Adelaide	264/381	69.2 (64.4 - 73.7) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	439/520	84.4 (81.1 - 87.3) ↑
Barossa	400/526	76.1 (72.2 - 79.5)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	403/514	78.4 (74.6 - 81.7)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	401/505	79.4 (75.7 - 82.7)
Far North	322/448	71.8 (67.4 - 75.7) ↓
Limestone Coast	392/525	74.7 (70.8 - 78.2)
Murray and Mallee	416/527	78.9 (75.2 - 82.2)
Yorke and Mid North	414/521	79.5 (75.8 - 82.7)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Involvement in physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire or administrator

Overall, 16.1% (95% CI 15.2 – 17.1) of respondents had been involved in any physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire or administrator within the last 12 months (Table 5.31).

Table 5.31: Respondents who had been involved as a coach, official, umpire or administrator in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	971	16.1	(15.2 - 17.1)
No	5041	83.8	(82.8 - 84.7)
Don't know	4	0.1	(0.0 - 0.2)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of males (18.6%) who reported participating in physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire or administrator in the last twelve months, when compared to females (13.8%) (Table 5.32).

Table 5.32: Involvement as a coach, official, umpire or administrator in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	547	18.6↑	425	13.8↓
No	2395	81.3↓	2646	86.2↑
Don't know	4	0.1	-	-
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia (17.6%) who reported participating in physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire, or administrator in the last twelve months, when compared to those born in another English speaking country (13.6%) or a non English speaking country (7.4%) (Table 5.28).

Table 5.33: Involvement as a coach, official, umpire or administrator in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	834	17.6↑	94	13.6↓	43	7.4↓
No	3903	82.3↓	601	86.4↑	537	92.6↑
Don't know	4	0.1	-	-	-	-
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who reported participating in physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire, or administrator in the last twelve months, were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years or 35 to 54 years, and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 25 to 34 years or 55 years and over (Table 5.34).

Table 5.34: Involvement as a coach, official, umpire or administrator in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	217	23.5↑	121	12.9↓	251	23.5↑	226	21.3↑	102	11.5↓	37	6.5↓	17	2.9↓
No	704	76.5↓	820	87.1↑	818	76.5↓	834	78.4↓	784	88.5↑	531	93.5↑	552	96.9↑
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0.3#	-	-	-	-	1	0.2
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who had been involved in physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire or administrator in the last 12 months in the Eyre and Western, Far North, and Limestone Coast regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in all Adelaide Metropolitan regions and the Barossa (Table 5.35).

Table 5.35: Respondents who had been involved in physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire or administrator in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	79/516	15.3 (12.5 - 18.7) ↓
Northern Adelaide	65/487	13.2 (10.5 - 16.6) ↓
Southern Adelaide	80/547	14.5 (11.8 - 17.8) ↓
Western Adelaide	52/381	13.7 (10.6 - 17.5) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	102/520	19.6 (16.4 - 23.2)
Barossa	81/526	15.4 (12.6 - 18.8) ↓
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	98/514	19.1 (15.9 - 22.7)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	130/505	25.8 (22.1 - 29.8) ↑
Far North	112/448	24.9 (21.1 - 29.1) ↑
Limestone Coast	133/525	25.4 (21.9 - 29.3) ↑
Murray and Mallee	98/527	18.5 (15.4 - 22.1)
Yorke and Mid North	114/521	21.9 (18.6 - 25.7)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Attendance at sporting matches or competitions

Overall, 62.8% (95% CI 61.5 – 64.0) of respondents had attended a sporting match or competition as a spectator within the last 12 months (Table 5.36).

Table 5.36: Respondents who had attended a sporting match or competition as a spectator in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	3777	62.8	(61.5 - 64.0)
No	2233	37.1	(35.9 - 38.3)
Don't know	7	0.1	(0.1 - 0.2)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of males (65.6%) who reported attending a sporting match or competition as a spectator within the last 12 months, when compared to females (60.0%) (Table 5.37).

Table 5.37: Attending a sporting match or competition as a spectator in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	1934	65.6↑	1843	60.0↓
No	1012	34.4↓	1221	39.7↑
Don't know	-	-	7	0.2
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia (67.0%) who reported attending a sporting match or competition as a spectator within the last 12 months, when compared to those born in another English speaking country (52.5%) or a non English speaking country (40.9%) (Table 5.38).

Table 5.38: Attending a sporting match or competition as a spectator in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	3175	67.0↑	365	52.5↓	237	40.9↓
No	1559	32.9↓	331	47.5↑	343	59.1↑
Don't know	7	0.2	-	-	-	-
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents, who reported attending a sporting match or competition as a spectator within the last 12 months, were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 54 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 55 years and over (Table 5.39).

Table 5.39: Attending a sporting match or competition as a spectator in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	684	74.3↑	638	67.8↑	780	72.9↑	712	66.9↑	504	56.9↓	288	50.7↓	172	30.2↓
No	231	25.1↓	302	32.1↓	289	27.0↓	351	33.1↓	382	43.1↑	280	49.3↑	398	69.8↑
Don't know	6	0.6#	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who had attended a sporting match or competition as a spectator in the last 12 months in the Eyre and Western and Limestone Coast regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island region (Table 5.40).

Table 5.40: Respondents who had attended a sporting match or competition as a spectator in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	322/516	62.5 (58.2 - 66.6)
Northern Adelaide	295/487	60.6 (56.2 - 64.8)
Southern Adelaide	341/547	62.3 (58.1 - 66.2)
Western Adelaide	234/381	61.3 (56.4 - 66.1)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	326/520	62.6 (58.4 - 66.7)
Barossa	342/526	65.0 (60.9 - 69.0)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	295/514	57.3 (53.0 - 61.5) ↓
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	362/505	71.7 (67.6 - 75.5) ↑
Far North	300/448	67.0 (62.5 - 71.2)
Limestone Coast	364/525	69.3 (65.2 - 73.1) ↑
Murray and Mallee	339/527	64.4 (60.2 - 68.4)
Yorke and Mid North	348/521	66.8 (62.7 - 70.7)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

CHAPTER 6: MULTICULTURALISM

Introduction

This section addresses the issues around SASP Objective 5: Building Communities, Target 5.8 *Multiculturalism*: “Increase the percentage of South Australians who accept cultural diversity as a positive influence in the community”.

Cultural diversity

Overall, 89.4% (95% CI 88.6 – 90.1) of respondents believed that cultural diversity was a positive influence in the community (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1: Proportion of respondents who believe that cultural diversity is a positive influence in the community

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	5378	89.4	(88.6 - 90.1)
No	308	5.1	(4.6 - 5.7)
Don't know	306	5.1	(4.6 - 5.7)
Refused	25	0.4	(0.3 - 0.6)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of females (91.1%) who believed that cultural diversity was a positive influence in the community when compared to males (87.6%) (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2: Beliefs on cultural diversity, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2579	87.6↓	2799	91.1↑
No	196	6.7↑	112	3.6↓
Don't know/Refused	170	5.7	160	5.3
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in non English speaking countries (93.9%) and a significantly lower proportion of respondents born in Australia (88.5%) who believed that cultural diversity was a positive influence in the community (Table 6.3).

Table 6.3: Beliefs on cultural diversity, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	4197	88.5↓	637	91.5	545	93.9↑
No	260	5.5↑	33	4.8	14	2.5↓
Don't know/Refused	284	6.0	26	3.7	21	3.7
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who believed that cultural diversity was a positive influence in the community were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 44 years, and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 55 years and over (Table 6.4).

Table 6.4: Beliefs on cultural diversity, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	854	92.8↑	868	92.3↑	986	92.2↑	949	89.3	773	87.3↓	489	86.1↓	458	80.5↓
No	20	2.2↓	28	2.9↓	42	3.9	68	6.4↑	57	6.5↑	41	7.2↑	51	8.9↑
Don't know/Refused	46	5.0	45	4.8	41	3.8↓	46	4.3	55	6.2	38	6.7	60	5.6↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 ↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who stated that cultural diversity was a positive influence in the community in the Eastern Adelaide, Western Adelaide and Adelaide Hills regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Far North and Murray and Mallee regions (Table 6.5).

Table 6.5: Respondents who believe that cultural diversity is a positive influence in the community by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	489/516	94.7 (92.5 - 96.4) ↑
Northern Adelaide	436/487	89.5 (86.4 - 91.9)
Southern Adelaide	489/547	89.5 (86.6 - 91.8)
Western Adelaide	347/381	91.0 (87.7 - 93.4) ↑
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	472/520	90.7 (87.9 - 92.9) ↑
Barossa	451/526	85.7 (82.5 - 88.4)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	449/514	87.3 (84.1 - 89.9)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	434/505	86.0 (82.7 - 88.7)
Far North	357/448	79.7 (75.7 - 83.1) ↓
Limestone Coast	450/525	85.7 (82.4 - 88.4)
Murray and Mallee	445/527	84.5 (81.2 - 87.4) ↓
Yorke and Mid North	443/521	84.9 (81.6 - 87.8)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

CHAPTER 7: BROADBAND USAGE

Introduction

This section addresses the issues around SASP Objective 4: Fostering Creativity and Innovation, Target 4.8, *Broadband usage*: “Broadband usage in SA to exceed the Australian national average by 2010, and be maintained thereafter”. All data are weighted by household weight for this section.

Households connected to broadband Internet

Respondents were asked if the household had a broadband Internet connection. Overall, 61.0% (95% CI 59.8 – 62.3) of all households had this type of Internet connection (Table 7.1).

Table 7.1: Households connected to broadband Internet

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	3673	61.0	(59.8 - 62.3)
No	1729	28.7	(27.6 - 29.9)
No computer	585	9.7	(9.0 - 10.5)
Don't know	28	0.5	(0.3 - 0.7)
Refused	2	0.1	(0.0 - 0.1)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of males (67.0%) who had broadband Internet connected in the household when compared to female respondents (56.3%) (Table 7.2).

Table 7.2: Households connected to broadband Internet, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	1775	67.0↑	1898	56.3↓
No	651	24.6↓	1078	32.0↑
No computer	209	7.9↓	376	11.2↑
Don't know	12	0.5	16	0.5
Refused	-	-	2	0.1
Total	2647	100.0	3369	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia (62.8%) and a significantly lower proportion of respondents born in another English speaking country (56.5%) or a non English speaking country (53.9%) who had broadband Internet connected in the household (Table 7.3).

Table 7.3: Households connected to broadband Internet, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	2871	62.8↑	478	56.5↓	324	53.9↓
No	1250	27.4↓	288	34.0↑	191	31.7
No computer	434	9.5	78	9.2	74	12.3↑
Don't know	12	0.3↓	3	0.3	13	2.2↑
Refused	2	0.1	-	-	-	-
Total	4569	100.0	846	100.0	602	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents where the household had broadband Internet connected were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 54 years, and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 65 years and over (Table 7.4).

Table 7.4: Households connected to broadband Internet, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	309	88.3↑	399	84.7↑	729	80.9↑	866	72.3↑	810	62.3	424	43.4↓	134	16.4↓
No	37	10.7↓	61	13.0↓	155	17.2↓	283	23.6↓	390	30.0	392	40.2↑	410	50.1↑
No computer	3	0.8↓	11	2.3↓	15	1.7↓	47	3.9↓	89	6.9↓	154	15.7↑	266	32.6↑
Don't know	1	0.2	-	-	2	0.3	2	0.1	9	0.7	6	0.7	8	0.9↑
Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.2#	-	-	-	-
Total	350	100.0	471	100.0	902	100.0	1199	100.0	1300	100.0	977	100.0	817	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There was a statistically significant higher proportion of respondents who reported having a broadband Internet connection in the household in the Eastern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide, and Adelaide Hills regions and a statistically significantly lower proportion in the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island and Yorke and Mid North regions (Table 7.5).

Table 7.5: Respondents who had a broadband Internet connection in the household by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	529/815	64.9 (61.6 - 68.1) ↑
Northern Adelaide	772/1205	64.1 (61.3 - 66.7) ↑
Southern Adelaide	771/1244	62.0 (59.2 - 64.6)
Western Adelaide	489/838	58.3 (54.9 - 61.6)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	161/225	71.5 (65.3 - 77.0) ↑
Barossa	125/217	57.4 (50.8 - 63.8)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	121/225	53.9 (47.4 - 60.3) ↓
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	146/237	61.8 (55.4 - 67.7)
Far North	75/117	64.5 (55.5 - 72.6)
Limestone Coast	154/257	60.0 (53.9 - 65.8)
Murray and Mallee	164/289	56.9 (51.2 - 62.5)
Yorke and Mid North	165/347	47.4 (42.2 - 52.7) ↓

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different proportion than all regions combined.

Households connected to dialup Internet

Respondents who had a computer and did not have a broadband Internet connection (n=1759), were asked if they had a dial up connection. Overall, 36.2% (95% CI 34.0 – 38.5) of these households had this type of Internet connection (Table 7.6).

Table 7.6: Households with dial up Internet connection

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	637	36.2	(34.0 - 38.5)
No	1077	61.2	(58.9 - 63.5)
Don't know	40	2.3	(1.7 - 3.1)
Refused	5	0.3	(0.1 - 0.6)
Total	1759	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

Among these respondents, there was a statistically significantly higher proportion of males (41.4%) who had dial up connected in the household when compared to females (33.1%) (Table 7.7).

Table 7.7: Households with dial up Internet connection, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	274	41.4↑	363	33.1↓
No	370	55.8↓	707	64.5↑
Don't know	19	2.8	21	2.0
Refused	-	-	5	0.4
Total	663	100.0	1096	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in an English speaking country other than Australia (42.3%) who had dial up Internet connected in the household and a significantly lower proportion of respondents born in a non English speaking country (22.4%) (Table 7.13).

Table 7.8: Households with dial up Internet connection, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	469	37.1	123	42.3↑	46	22.4↓
No	778	61.5	159	54.5↓	140	69.0↑
Don't know	16	1.3↓	9	3.2	15	7.4↑
Refused	2	0.2	-	-	2	1.2#
Total	1264	100.0	291	100.0	204	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

Respondents with dial up had Internet connected were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years or 45 to 64 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 75 years and over (Table 7.20).

Table 7.9: Households with dial up Internet connection, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	27	69.6↑	27	44.4	59	37.5	152	53.4↑	168	42.0↑	128	32.2	76	18.1↓
No	9	22.9↓	34	55.0	96	60.9	132	46.2↓	217	54.0↓	259	65.0	331	79.2↑
Don't know	3	7.5#	1	0.7	-	-	1	0.4#	14	3.4	11	2.8	11	2.6
Refused	-	-	-	-	2	1.6#	-	-	2	0.5	-	-	-	-
Total	38	100.0	61	100.0	157	100.0	285	100.0	401	100.0	399	100.0	417	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There was a statistically significant higher proportion of households who had dial-up in the Adelaide Hills region and a statistically significant lower proportion in the Eastern and Western Adelaide government regions (Table 7.15).

Table 7.10: Households with dial up Internet connection by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	62/221	27.9 (22.4 - 34.1) ↓
Northern Adelaide	131/324	40.5 (35.3 - 45.9)
Southern Adelaide	139/353	39.4 (34.4 - 44.5)
Western Adelaide	68/257	26.5 (21.5 - 32.2) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	27/49	54.9 (41.1 - 68.0) ↑
Barossa	33/71	46.8 (35.6 - 58.3)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	31/84	37.0 (27.4 - 47.7)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	22/63	35.6 (24.9 - 47.9)
Far North	7/31	23.9 (12.3 - 41.4)
Limestone Coast	30/78	38.7 (28.7 - 49.8)
Murray and Mallee	38/88	43.7 (33.8 - 54.2)
Yorke and Mid North	48/140	34.3 (26.9 - 42.5)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different proportion than all regions combined.

Households connected to the Internet

Overall, 71.6% (95% CI 70.5 - 72.8) of all households in the survey were connected to the Internet (either broadband or dial-up connection) (Table 7.11).

Table 7.11: Households with any Internet connection

	n	%	(95% CI)
Broadband	3673	61.0	(59.8 - 62.3)
Dial-up	637	10.6	(9.8 - 11.4)
No computer or Internet in household	1661	27.6	(26.5 - 28.7)
Don't know/Refused	46	0.8	(0.6 - 1.0)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of males (77.4%) who had Internet connected in the household when compared to females (67.1%) (Table 7.18).

Table 7.12: Households with any Internet connection, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2049	77.4↑	2261	67.1↓
No/No computer	578	21.8↓	1083	32.1↑
Don't know/Refused	20	0.8	26	0.8
Total	2648	100.0	3369	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents born in Australia (73.1%) who had Internet connected in the household and a significantly lower proportion of respondents born in a non English speaking country (61.5%) (Table 7.13).

Table 7.13: Households with any Internet connection, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	3339	73.1↑	601	71.0	370	61.5↓
No/No computer	1211	26.5↓	236	27.8	214	35.6↑
Don't know/Refused	19	0.4↓	10	1.2	17	2.9↑
Total	4569	100.0	846	100.0	602	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents where the household had Internet connected were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 54 years, and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 65 years and over (Table 7.20).

Table 7.14: Households with any Internet connection, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	336	95.9↑	426	90.5↑	789	87.4↑	1019	85.0↑	979	75.2↑	553	56.6↓	209	25.6↓
No	12	3.3↓	44	9.4↓	111	12.3↓	178	14.9↓	306	23.5↓	413	42.3↑	596	72.9↑
Don't know/Refused	3	0.8	1	0.1	2	0.3	2	0.1#	16	1.2↑	11	1.1	12	1.4↑
Total	350	100.0	471	100.0	902	100.0	1199	100.0	1300	100.0	977	100.0	817	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significant higher proportion of households who had either a dial-up or broadband Internet connection in the Northern Adelaide and Adelaide Hills regions, and a statistically significant lower proportion in the Western Adelaide and Yorke and Mid North government regions (Table 7.15).

Table 7.15: Households with any Internet connection by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	591/815	72.5 (69.3 - 75.4)
Northern Adelaide	903/1205	74.9 (72.4 - 77.3) ↑
Southern Adelaide	910/1244	73.1 (70.6 - 75.5)
Western Adelaide	557/838	66.4 (63.1 - 69.5) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	188/225	83.5 (78.0 - 87.7) ↑
Barossa	158/217	72.6 (66.3 - 78.1)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	152/225	67.7 (61.3 - 73.5)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	169/237	71.3 (65.2 - 76.7)
Far North	83/117	70.8 (62.0 - 78.2)
Limestone Coast	185/257	71.8 (66.0 - 77.0)
Murray and Mallee	203/289	70.2 (64.7 - 75.2)
Yorke and Mid North	213/347	61.2 (56.0 - 66.2) ↓

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different proportion than all regions combined.

Respondents from households that were connected to the Internet (broadband or dial-up) (n=4310) were asked to provide the approximate monthly cost of their Internet connection. The results are presented in Table 7.16.

Table 7.16: Approximate monthly cost of the Internet connection

	n	% (95% CI)
Less than \$20 per month	346	8.0 (7.2 - 8.9)
\$20 to \$29 per month	400	9.3 (8.5 - 10.2)
\$30 to \$39 per month	659	15.3 (14.2 - 16.4)
\$40 to \$49 per month	663	15.4 (14.3 - 16.5)
\$50 to \$59 per month	461	10.7 (9.8 - 11.7)
\$60 to \$69 per month	466	10.8 (9.9 - 11.8)
\$70 or more per month	422	9.8 (8.9 - 10.7)
Hourly rate or prepaid	105	2.4 (2.0 - 2.9)
Combined package	176	4.1 (3.5 - 4.7)
Nothing/work pays for it	42	1.0 (0.7 - 1.3)
Other	4	0.1 (0.0 - 0.2)
Don't know	554	12.9 (11.9 - 13.9)
Refused	12	0.3 (0.2 - 0.5)
Total	4310	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

Respondents in the community that were connected to either Broadband or dial-up Internet (n=4310) were asked if they were satisfied with the speed of their connection. Overall, 56.6% (95% CI 55.1 - 58.1) were satisfied with the speed of their connection. The results are presented in Table 7.17.

Table 7.17: Satisfied with speed of Internet connection in the household

	Broadband		Dial-up	
	n	% (95% CI)	n	% (95% CI)
Yes	2246	61.2 (59.6 - 62.7)	193	30.3 (26.8 - 34.0)
No	1286	35.0 (33.5 - 36.6)	417	65.4 (61.6 - 69.0)
Don't know	139	3.8 (3.2 - 4.5)	28	4.3 (3.0 - 6.2)
Refused	2	0.1 (0.0 - 0.2)	-	-
Total	3673	100.0	637	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 Note: Data are weighted by household weight.

Households not connected to the Internet

Respondents from households said they did not have a broadband or dialup connection (n=1122) were asked their reasons for not being connected to the Internet (Table 7.18).

Table 7.18: Reasons why household not connected to the Internet

	n	%
No computer	340	30.3
Don't see any value/no use for it	325	29.0
Can't afford it	151	13.5
Wouldn't have skills to use	138	12.3
Have not got around to it/cannot be bothered	134	11.9
Have access elsewhere	45	4.1
Planning on getting Internet/just got computer/recently moved	44	4.0
Intend to get broadband soon/one day	32	2.9
Don't want exposure to Internet material	25	2.2
Security concerns	20	1.8
No connection/no broadband available	20	1.8
Technical/provider issues	14	1.2
Intend to get dialup	5	0.4
Ties up the phone line	1	0.1
Other	12	1.1
Don't know	35	3.1
Refused	2	0.2

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Dial-up Internet

Respondents from households that were connected to dial-up Internet (n=637) were asked their reasons for not having a broadband Internet connection. The results are presented in Table 7.19.

Table 7.19: Reasons why household not connected to broadband Internet

	n	%
Can't afford it	208	32.7
Don't see any value	142	22.3
No broadband available here	107	16.9
Planning on getting it	46	7.3
Cheaper than broadband	44	6.8
Have not had time to organise it	33	5.1
Technical/contractual issues/existing equipment unable to cope	27	4.3
Prefer prepaid dialup	25	3.9
Don't know enough about it	22	3.4
Use at work/elsewhere	20	3.2
Waste too much time on it	8	1.3
Dial-up more secure from virus etc than broadband	4	0.7
Other	10	1.5
Don't know	16	2.5

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Dial-up Internet or no Internet

Respondents in the community who were not connected to the broadband Internet, but were either connected to dial-up Internet, or had no Internet (or responded “don’t know”) (n=2344), were asked if they used the Internet from any other location. The results are presented in Table 7.20.

Table 7.20: Internet used from any other location

	n	%
No	1650	70.4
Access from work	347	14.8
Access at friend/relative	220	9.4
Access from library/telecentre/community centre	172	7.3
Access from place of study	30	1.3
Access at cafe	29	1.2
Access on mobile phone	16	0.7
Other location	8	0.3
Don't know	2	0.1

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.
 Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Broadband Internet

Respondents in the community that were connected to a broadband Internet connection (n=3673) were asked what type of broadband connection the household currently had. The results are presented in Table 7.21.

Table 7.21: Type of broadband Internet connection in the household

	n	% (95% CI)
ADSL	2233	60.8 (59.2 - 62.4)
Wireless (NB broadband connection is not via phone line - does not include wireless network within the home)	1019	27.7 (26.3 - 29.2)
Satellite	119	3.2 (2.7 - 3.9)
Cable	66	1.8 (1.4 - 2.3)
Other	6	0.2 (0.1 - 0.4)
Don't know	223	6.1 (5.3 - 6.9)
Refused	7	0.2 (0.1 - 0.4)
Total	3673	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents in the community that were connected to a broadband Internet connection (n=3673) were asked if they knew the speed of their connection. The results are presented in Table 7.22.

Table 7.22: Speed of Broadband Internet connection in the household

	n	% (95% CI)
256 Kilobits per second	231	6.3 (5.5 - 7.1)
512 Kbps	298	8.1 (7.3 - 9.0)
1.5 Megabits per second	264	7.2 (6.4 - 8.1)
Up to 8 Mbps	125	3.4 (2.9 - 4.1)
Up to 24 Mbps	123	3.3 (2.8 - 4.0)
Don't know	2631	71.6 (70.2 - 73.1)
Total	3673	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Attitude towards digital technologies

Respondents in the community that were not connected to either dial-up or broadband Internet, or they had no computer in the household (or responded “don’t know”) (n=1707), were asked if they were generally interested in (digital) technologies such as computers, the Internet, mobile phones and digital cameras. The results are presented in Table 7.23.

Table 7.23: General interest in digital technologies

	n	% (95% CI)
Highly interested	150	8.8 (7.5 - 10.2)
Somewhat interested	548	32.1 (29.9 - 34.4)
Neutral	289	17.0 (15.3 - 18.8)
Not interested	612	35.8 (33.6 - 38.2)
Dislike them	88	5.1 (4.2 - 6.3)
Don't know	18	1.0 (0.7 - 1.6)
Refused	2	0.1 (0.0 - 0.5)
Total	1707	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents in the community that were not connected to the Internet, or they had no computer in the household (n=1707), were asked where they would expect to get information about digital technologies that they wanted to use or purchase (Table 7.24).

Table 7.24: Where expect to get information about digital technologies (households with no Internet)

	n	%
Word of mouth/friends/family	704	41.2
Retail stores	443	26.0
Library/Council/Community Centre	110	6.4
Internet	98	5.8
TV/radio/newspaper	91	5.4
Not interested/don't want information	88	5.1
Advertising	70	4.1
Internet service provider/helpdesk/computer experts	37	2.2
Training courses	30	1.8
Technology magazines	27	1.6
Choice magazine	9	0.6
Government agencies	8	0.5
Other	26	1.5
Don't know	277	16.2
Refused	5	0.3

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents from households that were not connected to dial-up or broadband Internet or they had no computer in the household (n=1707) were asked if they had any other digital technologies in their household (Table 7.25).

Table 7.25: Other digital technologies in households without dial-up or broadband Internet

	n	%
DVD/CD player/HiFi	1265	74.1
Mobile phone	1057	61.9
Video recording	849	49.7
Digital camera	599	35.1
HD or SDTV (High Definition or Standard Definition Television)	494	29.0
Digital TV (set top box or tuner card on computer for digital TV)	345	20.2
Computer (including peripherals)	290	17.0
MP3 player (includes I-Pod)	135	7.9
Game console (Playstation, Wii, Xbox, DS, Gameboy, Sony PSP)	133	7.8
Telecommunications equipment	125	7.3
GPS/Tom Tom/Navman	84	4.9
Other specify	10	0.6
No	146	8.5
Don't Know	21	1.2
Refused	6	0.3

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents in the community that were not connected to dial-up or broadband Internet, or they had no computer in the household (n=1707) were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the statement “Digital technologies are useful and allow us to do things that we would not be able to do otherwise”. The responses are in Table 7.26.

Table 7.26: Attitude towards digital technologies among respondents in households not connected to dial-up or broadband Internet

	n	% (95% CI)
Strongly agree	385	22.6 (20.6 - 24.6)
Agree	929	54.4 (52.0 - 56.7)
Neither agree or disagree	167	9.8 (8.5 - 11.3)
Disagree	120	7.0 (5.9 - 8.3)
Strongly disagree	25	1.5 (1.0 - 2.2)
Don't know	79	4.6 (3.7 - 5.7)
Refused	3	0.2 (0.1 - 0.5)
Total	1707	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

CHAPTER 8: ZERO WASTE

Introduction

This section addresses the issues around SASP Objective 3: Attaining Sustainability, Target 3.8 *Zero Waste*: “Reduce waste to landfill by 25% by 2014”.

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of zero waste issues on a scale of 1 to 10 (where 1 means “not at all important” and 10 means “extremely important”).

Recycling and waste avoidance

Overall, 92.8% (95% CI 92.1 – 93.4) of respondents rated recycling and waste avoidance as being important¹⁵ to them (Table 8.1).

Table 8.1: Importance of recycling and waste avoidance

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Not at all important	35	0.6	(0.4 - 0.8)
2	29	0.5	(0.3 - 0.7)
3	49	0.8	(0.6 - 1.1)
4	57	0.9	(0.7 - 1.2)
5	253	4.2	(3.7 - 4.7)
6	248	4.1	(3.6 - 4.7)
7	571	9.5	(8.8 - 10.3)
8	1339	22.3	(21.2 - 23.3)
9	866	14.4	(13.5 - 15.3)
10 Extremely important	2557	42.5	(41.3 - 43.8)
Don't know/Refused	13	0.2	(0.1 - 0.4)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

¹⁵ A score of 6 or more on a scale of 1 to 10

Females (94.9%) were statistically significantly more likely to rate recycling and waste avoidance as being important to them compared to males (90.5%) (Table 8.2).

Table 8.2: Importance of recycling and waste avoidance, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2666	90.5↓	2916	94.9↑
No	276	9.4↑	146	4.8↓
Don't know	3	0.1	10	0.3
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

There were no statistically significant differences for respondents according to country of birth who rated recycling and waste avoidance as being important to them (Table 8.3).

Table 8.3: Importance of recycling and waste avoidance, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking country		Other – Non English speaking country	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	4394	92.7	655	94.1	532	91.8
No	342	7.2	41	5.9	40	6.9
Don't know	5	0.1↑	-	-	8	1.4↑
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

Respondents who rated recycling and waste avoidance as being important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 35 to 64 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years (Table 8.4).

Table 8.4: Importance of recycling and waste avoidance, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	792	86.0↓	879	93.4	1019	95.3↑	1003	94.3↑	838	94.6↑	533	93.9	517	90.9
No	127	13.8↑	62	6.6	49	4.6↓	60	5.6	46	5.2↓	34	5.9	44	7.6
Don't know	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	1	0.2	9	1.5↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who rated recycling and waste avoidance as being important to them in the Eastern Adelaide and Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Far North and Murray and Mallee regions (Table 8.5).

Table 8.5: Respondents who rated recycling and waste avoidance as being important to them by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	491/516	95.2 (93.0 - 96.7) ↑
Northern Adelaide	450/487	92.5 (89.8 - 94.5)
Southern Adelaide	504/547	92.2 (89.6 - 94.2)
Western Adelaide	355/381	93.3 (90.3 - 95.4)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	487/520	93.7 (91.2 - 95.5)
Barossa	484/526	92.0 (89.4 - 94.0)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	489/514	95.1 (92.9 - 96.7) ↑
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	473/505	93.7 (91.3 - 95.5)
Far North	395/448	88.3 (85.0 - 90.9) ↓
Limestone Coast	483/525	92.0 (89.3 - 94.0)
Murray and Mallee	473/527	89.8 (87.0 - 92.1) ↓
Yorke and Mid North	472/521	90.6 (87.8 - 92.9)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Saving water

Overall, 95.9% (95% CI 95.3 – 96.3) of respondents rated saving water as being important¹⁶ to them (Table 8.6).

Table 8.6: Importance of saving water

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Not at all important	9	0.2	(0.1 - 0.3)
2	20	0.3	(0.2 - 0.5)
3	11	0.2	(0.1 - 0.3)
4	34	0.6	(0.4 - 0.8)
5	165	2.7	(2.4 - 3.2)
6	127	2.1	(1.8 - 2.5)
7	332	5.5	(5.0 - 6.1)
8	1000	16.6	(15.7 - 17.6)
9	899	14.9	(14.1 - 15.9)
10 Extremely important	3411	56.7	(55.4 - 57.9)
Don't know	9	0.2	(0.1 - 0.3)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of females (97.6%) than males (94.1%) who rated saving water as being important to them (Table 8.7).

Table 8.7: Importance of saving water, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2771	94.1↓	2997	97.6↑
No	170	5.8↑	68	2.2↓
Don't know	4	0.1	5	0.2
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

¹⁶ A score of 6 or more on a scale of 1 to 10

There were no significant differences between respondents according to country of birth in terms of those who rated saving water as being important to them (Table 8.8).

Table 8.8: Importance of saving water, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	4540	95.8	669	96.2	559	96.4
No	193	4.1	27	3.8	19	3.3
Don't know	8	0.2	-	-	2	0.3
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who rated saving water as being important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be 65 to 74 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years (Table 8.9)

Table 8.9: Importance of saving water, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	855	92.9↓	909	96.6	1027	96.1	1019	95.8	853	96.3	557	98.0↑	549	96.5
No	64	7.0↑	32	3.4	39	3.6	44	4.2	32	3.6	11	1.9↓	17	3.0
Don't know	1	0.1	-	-	3	0.3	-	-	1	0.1	1	0.1	3	0.5#
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who rated saving water as being important to them in the Eyre and Western and Yorke and Mid North regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Far North and Limestone Coast regions (Table 8.10).

Table 8.10: Respondents who rated saving water as being important to them by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	493/516	95.6 (93.4 - 97.0)
Northern Adelaide	460/487	94.5 (92.2 - 96.2)
Southern Adelaide	526/547	96.2 (94.2 - 97.5)
Western Adelaide	370/381	97.1 (94.9 - 98.4)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	499/520	96.0 (93.9 - 97.3)
Barossa	499/526	94.9 (92.7 - 96.5)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	495/514	96.3 (94.3 - 97.6)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	498/505	98.6 (97.2 - 99.3) ↑
Far North	414/448	92.5 (89.6 - 94.6) ↓
Limestone Coast	493/525	93.8 (91.4 - 95.6) ↓
Murray and Mallee	512/527	97.2 (95.4 - 98.3)
Yorke and Mid North	511/521	98.2 (96.6 - 99.0) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Saving energy

Overall, 93.1% (95% CI 92.4 – 93.7) of respondents rated saving energy as being important¹⁷ to them (Table 8.11).

Table 8.11: Importance of saving energy

	n	%	(95% CI)
1 Not at all important	21	0.4	(0.2 - 0.5)
2	22	0.4	(0.2 - 0.5)
3	28	0.5	(0.3 - 0.7)
4	54	0.9	(0.7 - 1.2)
5	274	4.6	(4.1 - 5.1)
6	252	4.2	(3.7 - 4.7)
7	568	9.4	(8.7 - 10.2)
8	1261	21.0	(20.0 – 22.0)
9	918	15.3	(14.4 - 16.2)
10 Extremely important	2601	43.2	(42.0 - 44.5)
Don't know/Refused	19	0.3	(0.2 - 0.5)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who rated saving energy as being important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be female (95.4%) than male (90.6%) (Table 8.12).

Table 8.12: Importance of saving energy, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2669	90.6↓	2930	95.4↑
No	262	8.9↑	136	4.4↓
Don't know	14	0.5↑	5	0.1↓
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

¹⁷ A score of 6 or more on a scale of 1 to 10

Respondents who rated saving energy as being important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be born in a non English speaking country (96.8%) and statistically significantly less likely to be born in Australia (92.5%) (Table 8.13).

Table 8.13: Importance of saving energy, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	4384	92.5↓	654	94.0	562	96.8↑
No	339	7.2↑	42	6.0	17	3.0↓
Don't know	18	0.4	-	-	1	0.2
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who rated saving energy as being important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 35 to 64 years or 75 years and over and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years (Table 8.14).

Table 8.14: Importance of saving energy, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	785	85.3↓	875	93.0	1010	94.4↑	1005	94.5↑	844	95.3↑	538	94.7	543	95.4↑
No	126	13.7↑	66	7.0	58	5.4	58	5.5	41	4.6↓	27	4.8	22	3.9↓
Don't know	9	1.0↑	-	-	2	0.2	-	-	1	0.1	3	0.5	4	0.8#
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There was a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents who rated saving energy as being important to them in the Adelaide Hills and Far North regions (Table 8.15).

Table 8.15: Respondents who rated saving energy as being important to them by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	482/516	93.4 (90.9 - 95.2)
Northern Adelaide	453/487	93.0 (90.4 - 95.0)
Southern Adelaide	505/547	92.2 (89.7 - 94.2)
Western Adelaide	354/381	92.9 (89.9 - 95.1)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	471/520	90.6 (87.8 - 92.8) ↓
Barossa	495/526	94.0 (91.7 - 95.8)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	489/514	95.2 (93.0 - 96.7)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	480/505	95.1 (92.9 - 96.7)
Far North	406/448	90.6 (87.5 - 92.9) ↓
Limestone Coast	486/525	92.6 (90.1 - 94.6)
Murray and Mallee	497/527	94.3 (92.0 - 96.0)
Yorke and Mid North	495/521	95.0 (92.8 - 96.6)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Zero waste issues ranked as most and least important

Respondents were asked to identify the zero waste issue they would rank as most important. Their responses are presented in Table 8.16. Overall, 69.7% (95% CI 68.5 – 70.8) of respondents rated saving water as being most important.

Table 8.16: Respondents rankings of most important zero waste issue

	n	%	(95% CI)
Saving water	4193	69.7	(68.5 - 70.8)
Saving energy	534	8.9	(8.2 - 9.6)
Recycling	524	8.7	(8.0 - 9.4)
Equally important	745	12.4	(11.6 - 13.2)
None	7	0.1	(0.1 - 0.2)
Don't know	14	0.2	(0.1 - 0.4)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who rated saving energy as being most important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be male (10.9%) when compared to females (6.9%). There were no significant differences between males and females for those who rated saving water, recycling or all zero waste issues as being equally important (Table 8.17).

Table 8.17: Respondents rankings of most important zero waste issue, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Saving water	2024	68.7	2169	70.6
Saving energy	322	10.9 [↑]	212	6.9 [↓]
Recycling	242	8.2	282	9.2
Equally important	346	11.8	399	13.0
None	5	0.2	2	0.1
Don't know	6	0.2	8	0.3
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who rated saving water as being most important to them were statistically significantly less likely to be born in a non English speaking country. Respondents who rated recycling as being most important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia. Respondents who rated zero waste issues as being equally important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be born outside of Australia (Table 8.18).

Table 8.18: Respondents rankings of most important zero waste issue, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Saving water	3320	70.0	493	70.8	381	65.6↓
Saving energy	423	8.9	48	7.0	62	10.8
Recycling	432	9.1↑	51	7.4	41	7.0
Equally important	549	11.6↓	103	14.8↑	93	16.1↑
None	7	0.1	-	-	-	-
Don't know	11	0.2	-	-	3	0.5
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who rated saving water as being most important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 65 to 74 years. Respondents who rated saving energy as being most important were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 25 to 34 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 65 years and over. Respondents who rated recycling as being most important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 55 years and over. Respondents who rated zero waste issues as being equally important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 45 years and over and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years (Table 8.19).

Table 8.19: Respondents rankings of most important zero waste issue, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Saving water	637	69.2	637	67.7	757	70.8	718	67.5	628	70.8	423	74.5↑	393	69.1
Saving energy	93	10.1	108	11.5↑	98	9.2	101	9.5	67	7.6	31	5.5↓	35	6.2↓
Recycling	146	15.8↑	92	9.7	95	8.8	84	7.9	55	6.2↓	22	3.9↓	31	5.5↓
Equally important	45	4.9↓	104	11.1	116	10.8	155	14.6↑	133	15.0↑	90	15.9↑	102	17.8↑
None	-	-	-	-	3	0.3	-	-	2	0.2	-	-	2	0.3
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	0.5↑	1	0.1	1	0.1	7	1.1↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Saving water was identified as the most important issue. There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who rated saving water as being the most important in the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island and Murray and Mallee regions and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Western Adelaide and Limestone Coast regions (Table 8.20).

Table 8.20: Respondents who rated saving water as being the most important by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	352/516	68.1 (64.0 - 72.0)
Northern Adelaide	348/487	71.5 (67.3 - 75.3)
Southern Adelaide	385/547	70.3 (66.3 - 74.0)
Western Adelaide	239/381	62.6 (57.7 - 67.3) ↓
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	373/520	71.6 (67.6 - 75.3)
Barossa	371/526	70.4 (66.4 - 74.2)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	388/514	75.5 (71.6 - 79.0) ↑
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	346/505	68.5 (64.3 - 72.4)
Far North	307/448	68.5 (64.1 - 72.6)
Limestone Coast	328/525	62.5 (58.2 - 66.5) ↓
Murray and Mallee	435/527	82.5 (79.0 - 85.5) ↑
Yorke and Mid North	386/521	74.1 (70.2 - 77.7)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Respondents were also asked to identify the zero waste issue they would rank as least important. Their responses are presented in Table 8.21. Overall, 36.1% (95% CI 34.9 – 37.3) of the respondents rated saving energy as being least important.

Table 8.21: Respondents rankings of least important zero waste issue

	n	%	(95% CI)
Saving energy	2173	36.1	(34.9 - 37.3)
Recycling	2143	35.6	(34.4 - 36.8)
Saving water	189	3.1	(2.7 - 3.6)
Equally important	1373	22.8	(21.8 - 23.9)
None	75	1.2	(1.0 - 1.6)
Don't know	64	1.1	(0.8 - 1.4)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who rated saving water as being least important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be male (4.1%) than female (2.2%). Respondents who rated zero waste issues as being equally least important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be female (24.6%) than male (21.0%). There were no significant differences between males and females for those who rated saving energy or recycling as being least important (Table 8.22).

Table 8.22: Respondents rankings of least important zero waste issue, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Saving energy	1085	36.8	1087	35.4
Recycling	1084	36.8	1059	34.5
Saving water	121	4.1↑	68	2.2↓
Equally important	618	21.0↓	755	24.6↑
None	21	0.7↓	54	1.7↑
Don't know	16	0.6↓	48	1.6↑
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who rated saving energy as being least important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia and statistically significantly less likely to be born in a non English speaking country. Respondents who rated saving water as being least important to them were more statistically significantly likely to be born in a non English speaking country and statistically significantly less likely to be born in an English speaking country other than Australia. Respondents who rated zero waste issues as being equally least important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be born in an English speaking country other than Australia and statistically significantly less likely to be born in Australia (Table 8.23).

Table 8.23: Respondents rankings of least important zero waste issue, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Saving energy	1766	37.3↑	229	33.0	177	30.5↓
Recycling	1677	35.4	245	35.2	222	38.2
Saving water	149	3.1	8	1.2↓	32	5.5↑
Equally important	1045	22.0↓	193	27.8↑	135	23.2
None	63	1.3	6	0.9	6	1.0
Don't know	41	0.9↓	14	2.0↑	9	1.5
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who rated saving energy as being least important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 34 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 45 years and over. Respondents who rated recycling as being least important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 55 to 74 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years. Respondents who rated saving water as being least important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years or 45 to 54 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 65 years and over. Respondents who rated zero waste issues as being equally least important to them were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 45 years and over and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 34 years (Table 8.24).

Table 8.24: Respondents rankings of least important zero waste issue, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Saving energy	542	58.9↑	402	42.7↑	406	38.0	294	27.6↓	247	27.8↓	145	25.5↓	137	24.1↓
Recycling	247	26.8↓	327	34.8	392	36.7	399	37.5	360	40.7↑	224	39.4↑	194	34.1
Saving water	44	4.8↑	32	3.4	26	2.4	53	5.0↑	19	2.2	6	1.0↓	10	1.7↓
Equally important	76	8.3↓	172	18.2↓	225	21.0	293	27.5↑	246	27.8↑	173	30.5↑	188	33.0↑
None	10	1.1	8	0.8	15	1.4	14	1.3	7	0.7	6	1.1	15	2.7↑
Don't know	1	0.2#	1	0.1#	5	0.5↓	11	1.0	7	0.8	14	2.5↑	25	4.4↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

Saving water was identified as the least important issue. There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who rated saving energy as being least important in the Northern and Southern Adelaide, and Adelaide Hills regions and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Eyre and Western, Far North, Limestone Coast, and Yorke and Mid North regions (Table 8.25).

Table 8.25: Respondents who rated saving energy as being least important by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	186/516	36.1 (32.1 - 40.3)
Northern Adelaide	201/487	41.2 (36.9 - 45.6) ↑
Southern Adelaide	205/547	37.5 (33.6 - 41.7) ↑
Western Adelaide	141/381	37.0 (32.3 - 41.9)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	198/520	38.1 (34.0 - 42.3) ↑
Barossa	176/526	33.4 (29.5 - 37.6)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	167/514	32.5 (28.6 - 36.7)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	140/505	27.6 (23.9 - 31.7) ↓
Far North	125/448	27.8 (23.9 - 32.1) ↓
Limestone Coast	142/525	27.0 (23.4 - 30.9) ↓
Murray and Mallee	175/527	33.1 (29.2 - 37.2)
Yorke and Mid North	134/521	25.8 (22.2 - 29.7) ↓

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

CHAPTER 9: RECREATION & SPORT

Introduction

This section addresses the issues around SASP Objective 2: Improving Wellbeing, Target 2.3 *Sport and Recreation*: “Exceed the Australian average for participation in sport and physical activity by 2014”.

Participation in Recreation and Sporting Activities

Overall, 78.0% (95% CI 76.9 – 79.0) of the respondents had participated in some type of physical activity for exercise, recreation or sport in the last twelve months (Table 9.1).

Table 9.1: Proportion of respondents who participated in any physical activities for exercise, recreation or sport in the last 12 months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	4690	78.0	(76.9 - 79.0)
No	1326	22.0	(21.0 - 23.1)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

*Don't know and Refused category not reported

Respondents who participated in any physical activity for exercise, recreation or sport in the last 12 months were statistically significantly more likely to be male (80.0%) than female (76.0%) (Table 9.2).

Table 9.2: Proportion of respondents who participated in any physical activities for exercise, recreation or sport in the last 12 months, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2358	80.0↑	2333	76.0↓
No	588	20.0↓	738	24.0↑
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who participated in any physical activity for exercise, recreation or sport in the last 12 months were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia (79.4%) and statistically significantly less likely to be born in a non English speaking country (65.1%) (Table 9.3).

Table 9.3: Proportion of respondents who participated in any physical activities for exercise, recreation or sport in the last 12 months, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	3766	79.4↑	547	78.6	378	65.1↓
No	975	20.6↓	149	21.4	202	34.9↑
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who participated in any physical activity for exercise, recreation or sport in the last 12 months were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 44 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 55 years and over (Table 9.4).

Table 9.4: Proportion of respondents who participated in any physical activities for exercise, recreation or sport in the last 12 months, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	801	87.0↑	797	84.7↑	881	82.5↑	823	77.4	666	75.2↓	408	71.9↓	313	55.0↓
No	120	13.0↓	144	15.3↓	187	17.5↓	240	22.5	220	24.8↑	160	28.1↑	256	45.0↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who participated in any physical activities for exercise, recreation or sport in the last twelve months in the Eastern Adelaide, Southern Adelaide, Adelaide Hills and Eyre and Western regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Far North, Murray and Mallee and Yorke and Mid North regions (Table 9.5).

Table 9.5: Respondents who participated in any physical activities for exercise, recreation or sport in the last 12 months by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	419/516	81.2 (77.6 - 84.3) ↑
Northern Adelaide	361/487	74.1 (70.0 - 77.8)
Southern Adelaide	463/547	84.7 (81.4 - 87.4) ↑
Western Adelaide	285/381	74.7 (70.2 - 78.8)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	433/520	83.3 (79.8 - 86.2) ↑
Barossa	403/526	76.7 (72.9 - 80.1)
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	399/514	77.7 (73.9 - 81.1)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	410/505	81.1 (77.5 - 84.3) ↑
Far North	324/448	72.4 (68.1 - 76.3) ↓
Limestone Coast	400/525	76.1 (72.3 - 79.6)
Murray and Mallee	368/527	69.8 (65.8 - 73.6) ↓
Yorke and Mid North	366/521	70.3 (66.2 - 74.0) ↓

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Table 9.6 provides a list of activities that respondents (n=4690) had participated in over the last twelve months prior to the interview.

Table 9.6: Recreation and Sporting Activities

Activity	n	%
Walking (other)	2210	47.1
Aerobics/fitness	790	16.8
Cycling	540	11.5
Weight training	495	10.6
Swimming	441	9.4
Running	380	8.1
Tennis	358	7.6
Football (outdoor)	353	7.5
Netball	323	6.9
Golf	308	6.6
Walking (bush)	248	5.3
Fishing	211	4.5
Basketball	204	4.4
Cricket (outdoor)	167	3.6
Lawn Bowls	162	3.5
Dancing	129	2.8
Yoga	116	2.5
Australian Football	107	2.3
Surf Sports	88	1.9
Aqua aerobics	76	1.6
Football (indoor)	71	1.5
Martial Arts	66	1.4
Volleyball	67	1.4
Cricket (indoor)	59	1.3
Motor Sports	57	1.2
Squash/Racquetball	52	1.1
Table Tennis	52	1.1
Water skiing/Power boating	50	1.1
Badminton	45	1.0
Sailing	45	1.0
Horse riding/Equestrian	41	0.9
Athletics/track and field	34	0.7

Table 9.6: Recreation and Sporting Activities (cont.)

Activity	n	%
Canoeing/kayaking	33	0.7
Hockey (outdoor)	32	0.7
Gymnastics	30	0.6
Shooting Sports	28	0.6
Billiards/snooker/pool	23	0.5
Ice/Snow sports	23	0.5
Rock climbing	23	0.5
Tenpin Bowling	22	0.5
Carpet Bowls	21	0.5
Boxing	19	0.4
Rugby Union	19	0.4
Touch Football	19	0.4
Scuba Diving	16	0.4
Darts	15	0.3
Roller sports	12	0.2
Softball	12	0.2
Baseball	10	0.2
Orienteering	9	0.2
Triathlons	9	0.2
Rowing	8	0.2
Hockey (indoor)	3	0.1
Rugby League	2	0.1
Other	89	1.9
None	1	0.1
Unable to participate in activity	3	0.1

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

The ten most prevalent activities that were undertaken (walking, aerobics/fitness, cycling, weight training, swimming, running, tennis, football, netball and golf), were selected and examined further in terms of activity organised by club, association or other organisation, type of club, association or other organisation that organised the activity, and time spent participating in the activity over the twelve month period prior to the interview.

Walking

Respondents who undertook the activity walking (n=2210), were asked if any of the walking activity was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.7).

Table 9.7: Proportion of respondents who participated in walking activity organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	39	1.7	(1.3 - 2.4)
Yes - some of it	27	1.2	(0.9 - 1.8)
No	2141	96.9	(96.1 - 97.5)
Don't know	3	-	
Total	2210	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in a walking activity that was organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=66), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.8).

Table 9.8: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – walking (other)

	n	%
Sport or recreation club or association	30	44.0
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	20	29.6
Charity/non-profit organisation/religious	6	9.1
School	4	5.6
Work	2	2.4
Health service	1	0.7
Other	8	12.0
Don't know	1	0.5

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who undertook the activity walking (n=2210), were asked how many times they participated in walking (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.9).

Table 9.9: Number of times participated in walking, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	195	8.8	(7.7 - 10.1)
Once a week	309	14.0	(12.6 - 15.5)
Two times a week	383	17.3	(15.8 - 19.0)
Three times a week	408	18.4	(16.9 - 20.1)
Four times a week	202	9.2	(8.0 - 10.4)
Five times a week	237	10.7	(9.5 - 12.1)
Six times a week	86	3.9	(3.2 - 4.8)
Seven times a week	339	15.4	(13.9 - 16.9)
More than seven times a week	34	1.6	(1.1 - 2.2)
Don't know/Refused	16	0.7	(0.4 - 1.2)
Total	2210	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Aerobics/fitness activity

Respondents who undertook an aerobics or fitness activity (n=790) were asked if any of that activity was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.10).

Table 9.10: Proportion of respondents who participated in aerobics/fitness activity organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	455	57.6	(54.1 - 61.0)
Yes - some of it	35	4.5	(3.2 - 6.1)
No	300	38.0	(34.6 - 41.4)
Total	790	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in an aerobics or fitness activity organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=490), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.11).

Table 9.11: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – aerobics/fitness

	n	%
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	385	78.5
Sport or recreation club or association	55	11.3
Health service (hospital, physio etc)	21	4.3
School	15	3.2
Work	4	0.9
Retirement village	3	0.5
Charity/non-profit organisation/religious	1	0.3
Other	7	1.4
Don't know	1	0.1

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who participated in an aerobics or fitness activity (n=790), were asked how many times they did so (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.12).

Table 9.12: Number of times participated in aerobics/fitness activity, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	82	10.4	(8.4 - 12.7)
Once a week	121	15.3	(13.0 – 18.0)
Two times a week	187	23.7	(20.9 - 26.8)
Three times a week	260	32.9	(29.7 - 36.2)
Four times a week	50	6.4	(4.9 - 8.3)
Five times a week	50	6.3	(4.8 - 8.2)
Six times a week	10	1.3	(0.7 - 2.3)
Seven times a week	25	3.2	(2.1 - 4.6)
More than seven times a week	4	0.5	(0.2 - 1.3)
Don't know/Refused	1	0.1	(0.0 - 0.7)
Total	790	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Cycling

Respondents who undertook the activity cycling (n=540), were asked if any of the cycling was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.13).

Table 9.13: Proportion of respondents who participated in a cycling activity organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	37	6.9	(5.1 - 9.4)
Yes - some of it	30	5.5	(3.9 - 7.8)
No	473	87.6	(84.5 - 90.1)
Total	540	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who undertook the participated a cycling activity organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=67), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.14).

Table 9.14: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – cycling

	n	%
Sport or recreation club or association	49	73.4
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	11	15.9
Charity/non-profit organisation/religious	5	7.8
Health service (hospital, physio etc.)	1	1.6
School	1	1.3
Other	1	0.6

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who participated in cycling (n=540), were asked how many times they did so (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.15).

Table 9.15: Number of times participated in cycling activity, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	193	35.7	(31.8 - 39.9)
Once a week	86	15.9	(13.1 - 19.3)
Two times a week	91	16.9	(14.0 - 20.3)
Three times a week	52	9.7	(7.5 - 12.5)
Four times a week	41	7.5	(5.6 - 10.1)
Five times a week	39	7.2	(5.3 - 9.7)
Six times a week	11	2.1	(1.2 - 3.7)
Seven times a week	14	2.6	(1.6 - 4.3)
More than seven times a week	11	2.0	(1.1 - 3.6)
Don't know/Refused	1	0.2	(0.1 - 1.1)
Total	540	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Weight Training

Respondents who did weight training (n=495), were asked if any of that activity was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.16).

Table 9.16: Proportion of respondents who participated in weight training activity organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	251	50.7	(46.3 - 55.1)
Yes - some of it	41	8.2	(6.1 - 11.0)
No	203	41.1	(36.8 - 45.4)
Total	495	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in a weight training activity that was organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=292), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.17).

Table 9.17: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – weight training

	n	%
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	285	97.7
Health service (hospital, physio etc)	4	1.5
Sport or recreation club or association	1	0.3
School	1	0.2
Work	1	0.1
Other	1	0.5

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who participated in weight training (n=495), were asked how many times they did so (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.18).

Table 9.18: Number of times participated in weight training activity, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	57	11.5	(9.0 - 14.6)
Once a week	76	15.4	(12.5 - 18.8)
Two times a week	118	23.9	(20.4 - 27.9)
Three times a week	150	30.3	(26.4 - 34.5)
Four times a week	48	9.8	(7.5 - 12.7)
Five times a week	19	3.9	(2.5 - 5.9)
Six times a week	11	2.2	(1.2 - 3.9)
Seven times a week	14	2.9	(1.7 - 4.7)
More than seven times a week	1	0.1	(0.0 - 0.9)
Don't know/Refused	1	0.1	(0.0 - 1.0)
Total	495	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Swimming

Respondents who undertook swimming (n=441), were asked if any of that activity was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.19).

Table 9.19: Proportion of respondents who participated in swimming activity organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	56	12.8	(10.0 - 16.2)
Yes - some of it	24	5.4	(3.6 - 7.9)
No	361	81.8	(77.9 - 85.1)
Total	441	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in a swimming activity that was organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=80), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.20).

Table 9.20: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – swimming

	n	%
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	34	42.4
Sport or recreation club or association	30	37.5
School	15	19.0
Work	1	0.3
Other	1	0.8

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who participated in swimming (n=441), were asked how many times they did so (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.21).

Table 9.21: Number of times participated in swimming activity, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	181	41.0	(36.5 - 45.7)
Once a week	86	19.6	(16.1 - 23.5)
Two times a week	71	16.0	(12.9 - 19.8)
Three times a week	37	8.5	(6.2 - 11.4)
Four times a week	22	5.1	(3.4 - 7.5)
Five times a week	9	2.0	(1.1 - 3.8)
Six times a week	6	1.4	(0.7 - 3.1)
Seven times a week	9	2.0	(1.0 - 3.8)
More than seven times a week	10	2.3	(1.3 - 4.2)
Don't know/Refused	9	2.0	(1.1 - 3.8)
Total	441	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Running

Respondents who did running (n=380), were asked if any of that activity was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.22).

Table 9.22: Proportion of respondents who participated in running, organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	47	12.3	(9.4 - 16.0)
Yes - some of it	21	5.5	(3.6 - 8.3)
No	312	82.2	(78.0 - 85.7)
Total	380	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in a running activity that was organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=68), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.23).

Table 9.23: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – running

	n	%
Sport or recreation club or association	39	57.8
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	14	20.5
School	10	15.2
Charity/non-profit organisation/religious	5	7.5
Other	2	2.9

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who participated in running (n=380), were asked how many times they did so (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.24).

Table 9.24: Number of times participated in running activity, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	93	24.5	(20.5 - 29.1)
Once a week	81	21.3	(17.5 - 25.7)
Two times a week	90	23.7	(19.7 - 28.3)
Three times a week	50	13.2	(10.2 - 17.0)
Four times a week	40	10.5	(7.8 - 14.0)
Five times a week	10	2.7	(1.5 - 4.9)
Six times a week	2	0.7	(0.2 - 2.1)
Seven times a week	12	3.1	(1.8 - 5.3)
Don't know/Refused	1	0.2	(0.0 - 1.4)
Total	380	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Tennis

Respondents who played tennis (n=358) were asked if any of the tennis was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.25).

Table 9.25: Proportion of respondents who participated in tennis activity organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	138	38.4	(33.6 - 43.6)
Yes - some of it	21	5.9	(3.9 - 8.8)
No	199	55.6	(50.4 - 60.6)
Total	358	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in tennis that was organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=159), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.26).

Table 9.26: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – tennis

	n	%
Sport or recreation club or association	141	88.7
School	13	8.1
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	5	3.4
Work	1	0.9

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who participated in tennis (n=358), were asked how many times they had played (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.27).

Table 9.27: Number of times participated in tennis, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	189	52.8	(47.6 - 57.9)
Once a week	76	21.3	(17.4 - 25.9)
Two times a week	66	18.3	(14.6 - 22.6)
Three times a week	26	7.2	(5.0 - 10.4)
Four times a week	1	0.1	(0.0 - 1.3)
Five times a week	1	0.2	(0.0 - 1.4)
Don't know/Refused	1	0.1	(0.0 - 1.2)
Total	358	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Football (outdoor)

Respondents who participated in outdoor football (n=353), were asked if any of the activity was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.28).

Table 9.28: Proportion of respondents who participated in football (outdoor) activity organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	241	68.4	(63.4 - 73.0)
Yes - some of it	10	2.7	(1.5 - 5.0)
No	102	28.9	(24.4 - 33.8)
Total	353	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in an outdoor football activity that was organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=251) were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.29).

Table 9.29: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – football (outdoor)

	n	%
Sport or recreation club or association	203	80.7
School	46	18.3
Work	2	0.8
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	2	0.8

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who participated in outdoor football (n=353), were asked how many times they did so (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.30).

Table 9.30: Number of times participated in football activity, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	116	32.8	(28.1 - 37.8)
Once a week	93	26.2	(21.9 - 31.1)
Two times a week	60	16.9	(13.3 - 21.1)
Three times a week	58	16.3	(12.8 - 20.5)
Four times a week	16	4.6	(2.8 - 7.3)
Six times a week	9	2.6	(1.4 - 4.8)
More than seven times a week	1	0.1	(0.0 - 1.3)
Don't know/Refused	2	0.6	(0.2 - 2.1)
Total	353	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Netball

Respondents who played netball (n=323), were asked if any of the activity was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.31).

Table 9.31: Proportion of respondents who participated in a netball activity organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	% (95% CI)	
Yes - all of it	258	80.0	(75.3 - 84.0)
Yes - some of it	17	5.3	(3.3 - 8.3)
No	48	14.8	(11.3 - 19.0)
Total	323	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in a netball activity that was organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=275), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.32).

Table 9.32: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – netball

	n	%
Sport or recreation club or association	229	83.1
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	50	18.1
School	10	3.7
Other	3	1.0
Don't know	1	0.2

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who played netball (n=323), were asked how many times they did so (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.33).

Table 9.33: Number of times participated in netball activity, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	% (95% CI)	
Less than once a week	64	19.7	(15.8 - 24.4)
Once a week	131	40.5	(35.3 - 45.9)
Two times a week	94	29.2	(24.5 - 34.4)
Three times a week	27	8.4	(5.8 - 11.9)
Four times a week	6	1.9	(0.9 - 4.1)
Five times a week	1	0.3	(0.0 - 1.7)
Total	323	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Golf

Respondents who played golf (n=308), were asked if any of that activity was organised by a club, association or other type of organisation (Table 9.34).

Table 9.34: Proportion of respondents who participated in golf organised by a club, association or other organisation

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes - all of it	156	50.6	(45.0 - 56.1)
Yes - some of it	28	9.0	(6.3 - 12.7)
No	125	40.5	(35.1 - 46.0)
Total	308	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who participated in golf that was organised by a club, association or other organisation (n=184), were asked what type of club planned the activity (Table 9.35).

Table 9.35: Type of club, association or organisation organising sporting activity – golf

	n	%
Sport or recreation club or association	174	95.0
Work	7	3.6
Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre	2	1.0
School	1	0.1
Other	1	0.4

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who participated in golf (n=308), were asked how many times they did so (per week, month, or year) during the last twelve months (Table 9.36).

Table 9.36: Number of times participated in golf, per week, over the last twelve months

	n	%	(95% CI)
Less than once a week	175	56.8	(51.2 - 62.2)
Once a week	75	24.2	(19.7 - 29.3)
Two times a week	36	11.7	(8.6 - 15.8)
Three times a week	17	5.5	(3.5 - 8.7)
Four times a week	2	0.8	(0.2 - 2.6)
Five times a week	1	0.1	(0.0 - 1.4)
Seven times a week	1	0.2	(0.0 - 1.6)
More than seven times a week	1	0.1	(0.0 - 1.4)
Don't know/Refused	2	0.6	(0.2 - 2.3)
Total	308	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

CHAPTER 10: PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Introduction

This section addresses the issues around SASP Objective 3: Attaining Sustainability, Target 3.6 *Use of Public Transport*: “Increase the use of public transport to 10% of metropolitan weekday passenger vehicle kilometres travelled by 2018”.

Frequency of travel by Public Transport

Respondents from households that were randomly selected from the Eastern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide, Southern Adelaide, Western Adelaide, Adelaide Hills, and Barossa government regions (n=4670), were asked how often they travelled by public transport. Overall, 60.0% (95% CI 58.6 - 61.4) of the respondents had used public transport (Table 10.1).

Table 10.1: Frequency of travel by public transport

	n	%	(95% CI)
Every day	303	6.5	(5.8 - 7.2)
Most days	243	5.2	(4.6 - 5.9)
Once or twice a week	467	10.0	(9.2 - 10.9)
Once or twice a month	553	11.8	(10.9 - 12.8)
Less often	1235	26.4	(25.2 - 27.7)
Never	1856	39.7	(38.3 - 41.2)
Don't know	14	0.3	(0.2 - 0.5)
Total	4670	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who travelled by public transport were statistically significantly more likely to be female (61.9%) than male (57.9%) (Table 10.2).

Table 10.2: Respondents who travel by public transport, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	1314	57.9↓	1486	61.9↑
No	951	41.9↑	905	37.7↓
Don't know/Refused	3	0.1	11	0.4
Total	2268	100.0	2401	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who travelled by public transport were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia (60.9%) and statistically significantly less likely to be born in a non-English speaking country (55.8%) (Table 10.3).

Table 10.3: Respondents who travel by public transport, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	2161	60.9↑	351	57.9	288	55.8↓
No	1372	38.7↓	255	42.1	229	44.2↑
Don't know	14	0.4↑	-	-	-	-
Total	3547	100.0	606	100.0	517	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who travelled by public transport were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years or 65 to 74 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 25 to 64 year or 75 years and over (Table 10.4).

Table 10.4: Respondents who travel by public transport, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	643	87.1↑	399	53.0↓	453	54.6↓	445	54.3↓	361	54.3↓	272	64.8↑	227	51.0↓
No	87	11.7↓	353	47.0↑	375	45.2↑	373	45.5↑	304	45.7↑	148	35.2↓	217	48.7↑
Don't know	9	1.2↑	-	-	2	0.2	2	0.2	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.3
Total	738	100.0	751	100.0	830	100.0	819	100.0	666	100.0	420	100.0	445	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who travelled by public transport in the Eastern Adelaide government region, and a statistically significantly lower proportion who travelled by public transport in the Adelaide Hills and Barossa government regions (Table 10.5).

Table 10.5: Respondents who travel by public transport by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	357/501	71.4 (67.3 - 75.2) ↑
Northern Adelaide	275/477	57.7 (53.3 - 62.1)
Southern Adelaide	323/536	60.3 (56.1 - 64.4)
Western Adelaide	223/379	58.9 (53.9 - 63.8)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	267/516	51.7 (47.4 - 56.0) ↓
Barossa	221/518	42.7 (38.5 - 47.0) ↓

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Mode of travel by Public Transport

Respondents who used public transport (n=2800) were asked what mode of transport they used the most (Table 10.6).

Table 10.6: Mode of public transport

	n	%
Bus	1949	69.6
Train	819	29.2
Tram	315	11.3
Other	7	0.2
Don't know	2	0.1

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

There were no significant differences between males and females in terms of the mode of public transport used (Table 10.7).

Table 10.7: Mode of public transport, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Bus	897	68.3	1052	70.8
Train	389	29.6	429	28.9
Tram	150	11.4	166	11.1
Other	1	0.1	6	0.4
Don't know	2	0.1	1	0.1

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who travelled by bus were statistically significantly more likely to be born in a non-English speaking country and statistically significantly less likely to be born in Australia. Respondents who travelled by train were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia and statistically significantly less likely to be born in a non-English speaking country. Respondents who travelled by tram were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia and statistically significantly less likely to be born in an English-speaking country other than Australia (Table 10.8).

Table 10.8: Mode of public transport, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Bus	1477	68.4↓	239	68.2	233	80.7↑
Train	656	30.3↑	105	30.0	58	20.0↓
Tram	258	11.9↑	22	6.2↓	36	12.4
Other	7	0.3	-	-	-	-
Don't know	2	0.1	-	-	-	-

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who travelled by bus were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 75 and over and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 35 to 44. Respondents who travelled by train were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 35 to 44 and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 75 and over. Respondents who travelled by tram were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 65 and over (Table 10.9).

Table 10.9: Mode of public transport, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Bus	451	70.1	279	69.9	297	65.5↓	298	67.0	246	68.0	185	68.0	194	85.5↑
Train	179	27.8	123	30.8	152	33.5↑	138	31.0	103	28.4	88	32.3	36	16.0↓
Tram	104	16.2↑	46	11.6	60	13.3	44	9.9	33	9.0	20	7.3↓	8	3.6↓
Other	6	0.9↑	-	-	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	-	-	1	0.3	-	-

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Travel to start of Public Transport journey

Respondents who used public transport (n=2800) were asked how they usually travelled to the start of their public transport journey (Table 10.10).

Table 10.10: Mode of travel to start of public transport journey

	n	%	(95% CI)
Walk	2036	72.7	(71.0 - 74.3)
Drive	614	21.9	(20.4 - 23.5)
Get dropped off	115	4.1	(3.4 - 4.9)
Ride a bicycle	23	0.8	(0.5 - 1.2)
Other	12	0.4	(0.2 - 0.7)
Don't know	1	0.1	(0.0 - 0.2)
Total	2800	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who walked to the start of their public transport journey were statistically significantly more likely to be male (76.2%) than female (69.6%). Respondents who drove to the start of their public transport journey were statistically significantly more likely be female than male (Table 10.11).

Table 10.11: Mode of travel to start of public transport journey, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Walk	1002	76.2↑	1034	69.6↓
Drive	231	17.6↓	382	25.7↑
Get dropped off	60	4.6	55	3.7
Ride a bicycle	19	1.4↑	4	0.2#
Other	2	0.2	9	0.6
Don't know	-	-	1	0.1
Total	1314	100.0	1486	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

There were no significant differences between respondents according to country of birth in terms of mode of travel to the start of the public transport journey (Table 10.12).

Table 10.12: Mode of travel to start of public transport journey, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Walk	1545	71.5	259	74.0	232	80.4
Drive	483	22.4	79	22.5	52	17.9
Get dropped off	100	4.6	10	2.9	5	1.7
Ride a bicycle	21	1.0	2	0.5	-	-
Other	11	0.5	1	0.2	-	-
Don't know	1	0.1	-	-	-	-
Total	2161	100.0	351	100.0	288	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different than other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who walked to the start of their public transport journey were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 25 to 34 years or 45 to 54 years. Respondents who drove to the start of their public transport journey were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 45 to 54 years. Respondents who got dropped off at the start of their public transport journey were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years (Table 10.13).

Table 10.13: Mode of travel to start of public transport journey, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Walk	522	81.2↑	273	68.5↓	328	72.3	292	65.6↓	266	73.8	188	69.0	167	73.5
Drive	84	13.0↓	91	22.9	111	24.5	127	28.5↑	82	22.6	67	24.7	52	22.7
Get dropped off	37	5.8↑	16	3.9	14	3.0	16	3.6	11	3.0	14	5.1	8	3.6
Ride a bicycle	-	-	12	3.1↑	-	-	8	1.9↑	2	0.5	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	6	1.6↑	1	0.2	1	0.2	-	-	3	1.3#	1	0.1
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.2	1	0.1	-	-	-	-
Total	643	100.0	399	100.0	453	100.0	445	100.0	361	100.0	272	100.0	227	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

Reason for travelling by Public Transport

Respondents who used public transport (n=2800) were asked why they travelled by public transport (Table 10.14).

Table 10.14: Reason for travel by public transport

	n	%
Cost of parking/parking issues or difficulties (general)	1062	37.9
Convenient/close to home or work	791	28.2
Cost of fuel/cheaper	602	21.5
Don't own a car/no access to car/car problems	399	14.3
Less stress by avoiding traffic	273	9.8
Can't drive a car/don't like driving	178	6.4
Faster than driving	138	4.9
To avoid drink/drug driving	122	4.4
Environmental benefits	108	3.9
Friends do (socialise with friends)	108	3.8
Just for fun/family outing/exercise/because I like it	87	3.1
Other	56	2.0
Don't know	23	0.8
Refused	2	0.1

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Increase or decrease in the use of Public Transport

Respondents who used public transport (n=2800) were asked if they had increased or decreased their use of public transport in the last 12 months (Table 10.15).

Table 10.15: Change in use of public transport

	n	%	(95% CI)
Increased	547	19.5	(18.1 - 21.0)
Decreased	541	19.3	(17.9 - 20.8)
Stayed the same	1703	60.8	(59.0 - 62.6)
Don't know	9	0.3	(0.2 - 0.6)
Total	2800	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who decreased their use of public transport were more likely to be female (20.8%) than male (17.7%). There were no significant differences between males and females for those who had increased their use of public transport (Table 10.16).

Table 10.16: Change in use of public transport, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Increased	242	18.4	305	20.5
Decreased	232	17.7↓	309	20.8↑
Stayed the same	837	63.7↑	866	58.3↓
Don't know	2	0.2	7	0.5
Total	1314	100.0	1486	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who decreased their use of public transport were more likely to be born in Australia (20.7%) and less likely to be born in a non English speaking country (11.6%). There were no significant differences in terms of country of birth for those who had increased their use of public transport (Table 10.17).

Table 10.17: Change in use of public transport, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Increased	428	19.8	70	20.0	48	16.8
Decreased	446	20.7↑	61	17.5	33	11.6↓
Stayed the same	1283	59.3↓	216	61.6	205	71.0↑
Don't know	4	0.2#	3	0.9	2	0.6
Total	2161	100.0	351	100.0	288	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different than other country of birth categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

Respondents who increased their use of public transport were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 35 to 54 years. Respondents who decreased their use of public transport were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 16 to 24 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 45 to 74 years (Table 10.18).

Table 10.18: Change in use of public transport, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Increased	200	31.1↑	74	18.5	66	14.5↓	58	13.1↓	58	16.1	43	15.8	48	21.2
Decreased	191	29.7↑	79	19.8	86	18.9	58	13.0↓	52	14.4↓	33	12.1↓	43	18.8
Stayed the same	252	39.2↓	246	61.7	302	66.6↑	325	73.1↑	249	68.8↑	194	71.5↑	135	59.4
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	0.8#	2	0.6	2	0.6	1	0.6
Total	643	100.0	399	100.0	453	100.0	445	100.0	361	100.0	272	100.0	227	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

Reason for change in travel by Public Transport

Respondents who had changed their use of public transport (increased or decreased, n=1088) were asked what the main reason for changing their use was (Table 10.20).

Table 10.19: Reasons for changing use of public transport

	n	%
Circumstances with respect to the need to use a car	157	14.4
Change in need/frequency of travel	118	10.9
Change in employment status	111	10.2
Change of work location	105	9.6
Availability of a car (car pooling)	102	9.4
Car parking issues	80	7.4
Disability or health status	61	5.6
Moved house	53	4.9
Cost of travel (by car)	41	3.8
Reliability of the service I use/used	33	3.1
Route of the service I use/used	29	2.7
Change in safety/security of public transport	20	1.8
Cycling (increased or decreased)	20	1.9
Cost of travel (by public transport)	17	1.6
Timetable of the service I use/used	15	1.4
Walking (increased or decreased)	11	1.0
Crowd levels on board services	5	0.5
Other	63	5.8
Don't know	46	4.2
Total	1088	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Encourage use of Public Transport

All respondents who used public transport (n=2800) were asked what would encourage them to use public transport more often (Table 10.20).

Table 10.20: Reasons to encourage use of public transport more often

	n	%
Nothing	910	32.5
Increased frequency of service	505	18.1
Lower fares	408	14.6
Improved service and reliability (running on time)	378	13.5
Providing services that go where I want to go	324	11.6
Better connections between buses, trains and trams	159	5.7
Less travel time	112	4.0
More evening and weekend services	102	3.7
If we had it (public transport) in the area	94	3.4
Better security	93	3.3
Upgraded/cleaner transport/bike friendly	87	3.1
Less crowds (not having to stand up)	79	2.8
If work location changed	31	1.1
If it was the only option	22	0.8
Driving too expensive	21	0.8
Better parking at stations/interchanges	13	0.5
Other	74	2.6
Don't know	87	3.1
Refused	1	0.1

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Respondents who said they never travelled by public transport (or didn't know, n=1869) were asked what would encourage them to use public transport (Table 10.21).

Table 10.21: Reasons to encourage use of public transport

	n	%
Nothing	811	43.4
Providing services that go where I want to go	359	19.2
Increased frequency of service	217	11.6
Improved service and reliability (running on time)	200	10.7
Better connections between buses, trains and trams	163	8.7
Lower fares	111	6.0
If it was the only option	82	4.4
Better security	70	3.7
Less travel time	44	2.3
Less crowds (not having to stand up)	39	2.1
If work location changed	31	1.6
More evening and weekend services	27	1.4
Upgraded/cleaner transport/bike friendly transport	22	1.2
Other	80	4.3
Don't know	41	2.2

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Possession of a current driver's licence

All respondents (n=6017) were asked if they had a current driver's licence (Table 10.22). Overall, 91.1% (95% CI 90.3 – 91.8) of the respondents had a current driver's licence.

Table 10.22: Proportion of respondents who had a current driver's licence

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	5480	91.1	(90.3 - 91.8)
No	536	8.9	(8.2 - 9.7)
Refused	1	0.1	(0.0 - 0.1)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who had a current driver's licence were more likely to be male (93.9%) than female (88.4%) (Table 10.23).

Table 10.23: Proportion of respondents who had a current driver's licence, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2766	93.9 [↑]	2714	88.4 [↓]
No	180	6.1 [↓]	357	11.6 [↑]
Refused	-	-	1	0.1
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

^{↑↓} Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Respondents who had a current driver’s licence were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia (91.9%) and statistically significantly less likely to be born in a non English speaking country (86.5%) (Table 10.24).

Table 10.24: Proportion of respondents who had a current driver’s licence, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	4357	91.9↑	621	89.3	502	86.5↓
No	384	8.1↓	74	10.7	78	13.4↑
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Refused (n=1) not reported

↑↓ Statistically significantly different than other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who had a current driver’s licence were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 25 to 64 years and statistically significantly less likely to be aged 16 to 24 years or 75 years and over (Table 10.25).

Table 10.25: Proportion of respondents who had a current driver's licence, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	763	82.9↓	893	94.9↑	1039	97.2↑	1027	96.6↑	843	95.2↑	516	90.8	399	70.0↓
No	158	17.1↑	48	5.1↓	30	2.8↓	36	3.4↓	42	4.8↓	52	9.1	171	30.0↑
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Refused (n=1) not reported

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who had a current driver's licence in the Barossa and Yorke and Mid North regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Eastern Adelaide and Northern Adelaide regions (Table 10.26).

Table 10.26: Proportion of respondents who had a current driver's licence by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	455/516	88.1 (85.0 - 90.6) ↓
Northern Adelaide	432/487	88.8 (85.7 - 91.3) ↓
Southern Adelaide	501/547	91.6 (89.0 - 93.7)
Western Adelaide	345/381	90.5 (87.2 - 93.1)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	492/520	94.6 (92.3 - 96.2)
Barossa	506/526	96.2 (94.2 - 97.5) ↑
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	486/514	94.6 (92.3 - 96.2)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	467/505	92.5 (89.8 - 94.5)
Far North	407/448	90.9 (87.9 - 93.2)
Limestone Coast	487/525	92.8 (90.3 - 94.7)
Murray and Mallee	490/527	93.0 (90.5 - 94.9)
Yorke and Mid North	498/521	95.7 (93.6 - 97.1) ↑

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Table 10.27 shows the proportion of respondents with or without a current driver's licence, from households that were asked how often they travelled by public transport (n=4670). Of those that had a current driver's licence, there was a statistically significantly higher proportion that did not use public transport, compared to those who did not have a current driver's licence.

Table 10.27: Proportion of respondents with or without a current driver's licence and use of public transport

	Current Driver's licence		No Driver's licence	
	n	% (95% CI)	n	% (95% CI)
Use public transport	2481	58.8 (57.3 - 60.2) ↓	319	71.4 (67.1 - 75.4) ↑
Never use public transport	1728	40.9 (39.5 - 42.4) ↑	128	28.6 (24.6 - 32.9) ↓
Don't know/Refused	14	0.3 (0.2 - 0.5)	-	-
Total	4223	100.0	446	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between those with or without a current driver's licence.

Ownership of a motor vehicle or motor cycle

Respondents (n=6017) were asked if they had a motor vehicle or motor cycle (Table 10.28). Overall, 86.4% (95% CI 85.5 – 87.2) of the respondents had a motor vehicle or motor cycle.

Table 10.28: Proportion of respondents who had a motor vehicle or motor cycle

	n	%	(95% CI)
Yes	5196	86.4	(85.5 - 87.2)
No	820	13.6	(12.8 - 14.5)
Refused	2	0.1	(0.0 - 0.1)
Total	6017	100.0	

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Respondents who owned a motor vehicle or motor cycle were statistically significantly more likely to be male (89.1%) than female (83.8%) (Table 10.29).

Table 10.29: Proportion of respondents who had a motor vehicle or motor cycle, by gender

	Male		Female	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	2623	89.1↑	2572	83.8↓
No	322	10.9↓	497	16.2↑
Refused	-	-	2	0.1
Total	2946	100.0	3071	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between males and females.

Insufficient numbers (n<5) in some categories for statistical testing.

Respondents who owned a motor vehicle or motor cycle were statistically significantly more likely to be born in Australia (87.0%) or another English speaking country (89.2%) and statistically significantly less likely to be born in a non English speaking country (78.0%) (Table 10.30).

Table 10.30: Proportion of respondents who had a motor vehicle or motor cycle, by country of birth

	Australia		Other - English speaking		Other - Non English speaking	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	4123	87.0↑	620	89.2↑	452	78.0↓
No	617	13.0↓	75	10.8↓	128	22.0↑
Refused	1	0.1	1	0.1	-	-
Total	4741	100.0	696	100.0	580	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different than other country of birth categories combined.

Respondents who owned a motor vehicle or motor cycle were statistically significantly more likely to be aged 35 to 74 years and statistically significantly less likely to be 16 to 24 years or 75 years and over (Table 10.31).

Table 10.31: Proportion of respondents who had a motor vehicle or motor cycle, by age group

	16-24 yrs		25-34 yrs		35-44 yrs		45-54 yrs		55-64 yrs		65-74 yrs		75+ yrs	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	555	60.3↓	819	87.1	1025	95.9↑	1012	95.2↑	831	93.8↑	517	91.0↑	436	76.6↓
No	365	39.7↑	122	12.9	43	4.0↓	51	4.8↓	55	6.2↓	51	8.9↓	133	23.4↑
Refused	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-
Total	921	100.0	941	100.0	1069	100.0	1063	100.0	886	100.0	568	100.0	569	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to the other age categories combined.

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of respondents who had a motor vehicle or motor cycle in the Barossa and Limestone Coast regions, and a statistically significantly lower proportion of respondents in the Eastern, Northern and Southern Adelaide regions (Table 10.32).

Table 10.32: Proportion of respondents who had a motor vehicle or motor cycle by SA government region

	n	% (95% CI)
Adelaide Metropolitan area		
Eastern Adelaide	417/516	80.9 (77.3 - 84.1) ↓
Northern Adelaide	406/487	83.3 (79.8 - 86.4) ↓
Southern Adelaide	470/547	86.0 (82.8 - 88.6) ↓
Western Adelaide	333/381	87.5 (83.8 - 90.5)
Greater Adelaide area		
Adelaide Hills	470/520	90.5 (87.6 - 92.7)
Barossa	482/526	91.6 (88.9 - 93.7) ↑
Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	468/514	91.1 (88.3 - 93.3)
Country regions		
Eyre and Western	457/505	90.5 (87.6 - 92.8)
Far North	399/448	89.1 (85.9 - 91.6)
Limestone Coast	481/525	91.6 (88.9 - 93.7) ↑
Murray and Mallee	480/527	91.2 (88.4 - 93.3)
Yorke and Mid North	475/521	91.1 (88.3 - 93.3)

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different compared to all other regions combined.

Table 10.33 shows the proportion of respondents with or without a current driver's licence, from households that were asked how often they travelled by public transport (n=4670). Of those who had a motor vehicle or motor cycle, there was a statistically significantly higher proportion that did not use public transport, compared to those who did not have a motor vehicle or motor cycle.

Table 10.33: Proportion of respondents with or without a motor vehicle or motor cycle and use of public transport

	Motor vehicle or cycle		No Motor vehicle or cycle	
	n	% (95% CI)	n	% (95% CI)
Use public transport	2263	56.9 (55.4 - 58.4) ↓	536	77.6 (74.3 - 80.5) ↑
Never use public transport	1710	43.0 (41.5 - 44.5) ↑	146	21.1 (18.2 - 24.3) ↓
Don't know/Refused	5	0.1 (0.1 - 0.3) ↓	9	1.3 (0.7 - 2.4) ↑
Total	3978	100.0	691	100.0

Note: The weighting of data can result in rounding discrepancies or totals not adding.

Note: Different weighting values have been applied to data examined by regions compared to overall data (see Ch1, pg 12).

↑↓ Statistically significantly different between those with or without a motor vehicle or cycle.

APPENDIX A: APPROACH LETTER



Government of South Australia
Department of the Premier
and Cabinet

DPC07/1158

GPO Box 2343
Adelaide SA 5001
DX 56201
Tel 08 8226 3500
Fax 08 8226 3535
www.premcab.sa.gov.au

March 2009

Dear Householder

Your household is invited to take part in a survey to help understand how South Australia is faring as a community. We will ask questions about your satisfaction with Government services. Other questions will relate to entertainment and cultural activities, volunteering practices, economic and housing pressures. Your responses to the survey will greatly assist the Government in planning and providing services for the South Australian community.

One of our interviewers will be contacting your household in the next few weeks to interview the person in the household aged 16 years and over, who had the last birthday. The interview will be conducted over the telephone and will take around 20 minutes, depending on the questions that are relevant to you. Your phone number has been selected randomly from all telephone listings in the state. **All information collected will be confidential.**

While participation is voluntary, we hope that you will choose to take part in this survey that will help us to produce accurate information to help everyone understand what is happening in our community.

If you have any concerns or questions about the survey, or do not wish to participate, please contact the free-call survey hotline at the South Australian Department of Health on (free-call) **1800 635 352**.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Sandy Pitcher'.

Sandy Pitcher
Executive Director
Office of the Executive Committee of Cabinet

APPENDIX B: ADVISORY GROUP

Matthew Winefield
Principal Policy Officer
SA Strategic Plan, Cabinet Office
Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Anne Taylor
Manager
Population Research & Outcomes Studies
Health Intelligence
Department of Health

Tiffany Gill
Senior Epidemiologist
Population Research & Outcomes Studies
Health Intelligence
Department of Health

Jan Patterson
Principal Policy Advisor
Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Nancy Rogers
Manager Research & Analysis
Families and Communities

Donna Harden
Manager, Workforce Performance
Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Andrew Hamilton
General Manager
Office for Volunteers

Roger Lean

Manager

Multicultural SA

Ralph Leonard

General Manager

Information Economy Directorate

Department for Further Education Employment, Science and Technology

Marcia Hewitt

Communications Manager

Zero Waste SA

Michelle Crisp

Research Officer

Office for Recreation and Sport

Frank Primerano

Senior Transport Analyst

Department of Transport Energy and Infrastructure

APPENDIX C: 2009 SASP QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

Interviewer note: Text that is bold is read out by the interviewer.

Good My name is I'm calling on behalf of the Government of South Australia. We are conducting a general community survey. We recently sent you a letter about the survey.

Intro 1:

Did you receive the letter?

(Single response)

Yes (go to Intro 2)

No

Don't know

Interviewer note: If respondent did not receive letter, offer to send out a copy of the letter or read out the following over the telephone:

Your household is invited to take part in a survey to help understand how South Australia is faring as a community. We will ask questions about your satisfaction with Government services. Other questions will relate to entertainment and cultural activities, volunteering practices, economic and housing pressures. Your responses to the survey will greatly assist the Government in planning and providing services for the South Australian community.

Intro 2:

Could I please speak with the person living in the household, aged 16 or over, who was the last to have a birthday?

Your phone number has been selected randomly from residential telephone numbers in the Electronic White Pages.

Whilst your input to this survey is very important to us, participation is voluntary and you can choose not to answer any question or any section, and you are free to withdraw from the survey at any time.

I can assure you that all information given will remain confidential. The answers from all people interviewed will be gathered together

and presented in a report. No individual answers will be passed on.

The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete, but may take longer depending on the number of questions that are relevant to you.

Please be aware that this phone call may be listened to by my Supervisor for quality control and training purposes.

Are you willing to participate in this survey?

1. Respondent
2. Foreign language interviewer required (Enter language)
3. Refusal (Enter reasons)

A. DEMOGRAPHICS

As some of the next questions only relate to certain groups of people only, could you please tell me...

A.1 How old are you?

(Single response. Interviewer note enter 998 Don't know, 999 refused)

1. Enter age
2. Don't know (998)
3. Not Stated/Refused (999)

Sequence guide: If A.1 < 998, go to NS

A.2 Which age group are you in? Would it be...

(Read options. Single response)

1. 16 to 24 years
2. 25 to 34 years
3. 35 to 44 years
4. 45 to 54 years
5. 55 to 64 years
6. 65 to 74 years
7. 75 years or over
8. Not stated/Refused (End interview)

A.3 Sex (ask if unsure)

(Single response)

1. Male
2. Female

A.4 Including yourself, how many people aged 16 or over live in this household?

(Single response. Enter number of people 16 years or over. Interviewer note enter 998 Don't know, 999 refused)

1. Enter number
2. Don't know (998)
3. Not stated / refused (999)

[updated SASP2008 Target T6.5]

A.5 How many children under 16 years live in this household?

(Single response. Enter number of people under 16 years. Interviewer note enter 998 Don't know, 999 refused)

1. Enter number
2. Don't know (998)
3. Not stated / refused (999)

[updated SASP2008 Target T6.5]

A.6 What is your postcode?

(Single response, enter 5999 if postcode is not known)

1. Enter postcode
2. Not stated / refused (5999)

Sequence guide: If A6 < 5999 Go to NS

If A6 = 5999 Go to A7

A.7 What is your suburb, town or community?

(Single response. Enter suburb/town/community)

1. Enter town/suburb
2. Not stated/ refused

B. SA Strategic Plan**B.1 Have you heard about South Australia's Strategic Plan?**

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

Sequence guide: If B.1 > 1 Go to NS

[SASP 2008]

B.2 How familiar are you with South Australia's Strategic Plan?

(Read options. Single response)

1. **Very familiar**
2. **Somewhat familiar**
3. **Not very familiar**
4. Don't know
5. Refused

[SASP 2008]

C. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

[Customer and client satisfaction with government services (SASP target T1.7) Dept. Premier and Cabinet]

I am now going to ask you to rate how satisfied you have been with your experiences when dealing with South Australian Government Services.

South Australian Government services include hospitals and health services, schools, police, support for families, roads and transport, and protection of the environment.

For the following question, please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied.

C.1 Overall, how satisfied are you with government services in South Australia?

(Single response)

1. (Very dissatisfied)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Very satisfied)
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[SASP 2008]

C.2 In the last 12 months, have you used any state government services?

(Single response. Interviewer note: includes online services. **PROMPT IF NECESSARY**)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: If C.2 >= 2 Go to Next Section

C.3 What was the most recent state government service you've used in the last 12 months?

(Single response. Interviewer note: includes online services, see list provided for federal and state services NOT Centrelink, aged care facilities)

1. Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (Motor Registration, Public Transport, Energy, Transport Services, Services SA)
2. Department of Education and Children's Services (schools)
3. Department of Further Education, Employment Science and Technology (TAFE SA)
4. Auditor General's Department
5. Department for Families and Communities (Housing SA, Families SA, Disability SA, Seniors Card, Domiciliary Care SA, Concessions, Home Start Finance)
6. Department of Health (IMVS, SA Ambulance Service, Ab Health, Dental Service, Breastscreen, Drug and Alcohol, Hospital Services)
7. Department of Justice (Attorney Generals, Office for Women, Forensic Science, Crown Solicitor, Public Trustee, Consumer Affairs, Residential Tenancies, Ombudsman, EEO Commission, Liquor and Gambling, Volunteers, Correctional Services, CFS, SAMFS, Legal Services, SA Fire and Emergency Services, State Electoral office, SES, SA Police)
8. Department of Primary Industries and Resources (Minerals and Energy Resources, Planning SA, SARDI, Ag SA, Fisheries etc)
9. Department of the Premier and Cabinet (Safe Work SA Office for Rec and Sport, Arts SA, State Records etc)
10. Department of Trade and Economic Development
11. Department of Treasury and Finance (SuperSA)
12. Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (water)
13. Authorities
14. Boards
15. Commissions
16. Committees
17. Corporations
18. Councils (library)
19. Other (Specify)
20. Don't know

21. Refused

C.4 The next three questions are about how you rate your experience with [name of state government agency] on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied.

How satisfied were you with the overall quality of service delivery?

(Single response)

1. (Very dissatisfied)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Very satisfied)
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[SASP 2008]

C.5 Overall, how satisfied were you with the accessibility of [name of state government agency]?

(Single response)

1. (Very dissatisfied)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Very satisfied)
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[SASP 2008]

C.6 Overall, how satisfied were you with the amount of time it took to get the service?

(Single response)

1. (Very dissatisfied)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Very satisfied)
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[SASP 2008]

I am now going to ask you to rate the next four statements in relation to your experience with [name of state government agency] where 1 means you strongly disagree and 5 means you strongly agree.

C.7 “I was treated fairly”

(Single response. Interviewer note: if accessing services ONLINE then select “Not applicable”)

1. (Strongly disagree)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Strongly agree)
6. Don't know
7. Refused
8. Not applicable (online service)

[SASP 2008]

C.8 “I was informed of everything I had to do to get the service/product”

(Single response. Interviewer note: if accessing services ONLINE then select “Not applicable”)

1. (Strongly disagree)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Strongly agree)
6. Don't know
7. Refused
8. Not applicable (online service)

[SASP 2008]

C.9 “Staff were knowledgeable and competent”

(Single response. Interviewer note: if accessing services ONLINE then select “Not applicable”)

1. (Strongly disagree)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Strongly agree)
6. Don't know
7. Refused
8. Not applicable (online service)

[SASP 2008]

C.10 “Staff went the extra effort to make sure I got what I needed”

(Single response. Interviewer note: if accessing services ONLINE then select “Not applicable”)

1. (strongly disagree)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (strongly agree)
6. Don't know
7. Refused
8. Not applicable (online service)

[SASP 2008]

I am now going to ask you to rate the next four statements in relation to how important your experience with [name of state government agency] was to you, where 1 means not at all important and 5 means very important.

C.11 “How important was it that you were treated fairly?”

(Single response. Interviewer note: if accessing services ONLINE then select “Not applicable”)

1. (Not at all important)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Very important)
6. Don't know
7. Refused
8. Not applicable (online service)

[SASP 2008]

C.12 “How important was it for you to be informed of everything you had to do to get the service or product?”

(Single response. Interviewer note: if accessing services ONLINE then select “Not applicable”)

1. (Not at all important)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Very important)
6. Don't know
7. Refused
8. Not applicable (online service)

[SASP 2008]

C.13 “How important was it for the staff to be knowledgeable and competent”

(Single response. Interviewer note: if accessing services ONLINE then select “Not applicable”)

1. (Not at all important)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Very important)
6. Don't know
7. Refused)
8. Not applicable (online service)

[SASP 2008]

C.14 “How important was it for the staff to go the extra effort to make sure you've got what you needed”

(Single response. Interviewer note: if accessing services ONLINE then select “Not applicable”)

1. (Not at all important)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. (Very important)
6. Don't know
7. Refused
8. Not applicable (online service)

[SASP 2008]

C.15 In the end, did you get what you needed?

(Read options. Single response)

1. **Yes**
2. **I got part of what I needed**
3. **No**
4. Don't know
5. Refused

[SASP 2008]

D. SOCIAL INCLUSION

[SASP Target T5.6]

There are many opportunities to become involved in the community, such as assisting with school activities, helping with sporting events, selling raffle tickets, participating in local community discussions, attending Local/District Council meetings, etc.

D.1 In the last 12 months, have you participated in any of these, or a similar, activity?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[SASP 2008]

This next question is about formal volunteering. Formal volunteering means unpaid, voluntary help willingly given in the form of time, services or skills for an organisation, club or association. It excludes voluntary work done overseas and donations of money or goods don't count as volunteering.

D.2 In the last 12 months, have you done any unpaid volunteering for any not-for-profit organisations?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[SASP 2008]

This next question is about informal volunteering. This is where you provide unpaid help directly to people OTHER THAN RELATIVES, on your own initiative and not through a group or organisation. This includes things like shopping/taking in the mail for a neighbour, mowing someone else's lawn, baby sitting for free, visiting or helping someone who is sick or elderly, etc.

D.3 In the last 12 months, have you done any informal volunteering?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[SASP 2008]

D.4 In the past 12 months, have you regularly participated in a recreational, artistic, cultural or church group?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

D.5 In the last 12 months have you attended any events that bring people together such as fetes, shows, festivals or other community events?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

E. MULTI-CULTURALISM

[SASP target T5.8]

I am now going to ask you a question about the influence of cultural diversity in South Australia.

More than 600,000 South Australians or 40 per cent of our population were either born overseas or have one or both parents born overseas. Cultural diversity is now a feature of many aspects of South Australian life: our businesses, our food, sport and arts, our workplaces and places of worship, and our range of friends and colleagues.

E.1 Do you think cultural diversity is a positive influence in the community?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[SASP 2008]

F. BROADBAND USE

[SASP target T4.8]

I would now like to ask you some questions about computers and the internet in your household.

F.1 Does this household have a broadband internet connection?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. No - Don't have a computer
4. Don't know
5. Refused

[modified SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: if F.1 = 1 go to F.4 or

If F.1 = 3 go to F.9

F.2 Does this household have a dial-up internet connection?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: if F.2 >1 go to F.8

F.3 What are the main reasons your household does not have a broadband connection?

(Multiple response)

1. Can't afford it
2. Don't see any value
3. No broadband available here
4. Prefer prepaid dial-up
5. Cheaper than broadband
6. Dial-up more secure from virus etc than broadband
7. Have not had time to organise it
8. Use at work / elsewhere
9. Technical / contractual issues / existing equipment unable to cope
10. Planning on getting it
11. Don't know enough about it
12. Waste too much time on it
13. Other (specify)
14. Don't know
15. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: Go to F.5

F.4 What type of broadband connection does your household currently have?

(Read options. Single response)

1. **ADSL (includes 1 and 2)**
2. **Wireless (NB broadband connection is not via phone line – does not include wireless network within the home)**
3. **Satellite**
4. Other (specify)
5. Don't know
6. Refused

[SASP 2008]

F.5 What is the approximate monthly cost of the Internet connection?

(Read options. Single response)

1. **Less than \$20 per month**
2. **\$20 to \$29 per month**
3. **\$30 to \$39 per month**
4. **\$40 to \$49 per month**
5. **\$50 to \$59 per month**
6. **\$60 to \$69 per month**
7. **\$70 or more per month**
8. Hourly rate or prepaid
9. Combined package (with phone etc)
10. Nothing / work pays for it
11. Other (specify)
12. Don't know
13. Refused

[SASP 2008]

F.6 Are you satisfied with the speed of connection?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: if F.2 = 1 go to F.9

F.7 Are you able to tell me what the speed of your broadband connection is?

(Read options if necessary. Single response)

1. 256 Kilobits per second
2. 512 Kilobits per second
3. 1.5 megabits per second
4. Up to 8 Mbps (megabits)
5. Up to 24 Mbps (megabits)
6. Don't know/ No
7. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: Go to NS

F.8 What are the main reasons your household is not connected to the Internet?

(Multiple response)

1. No computer
2. Intend to get broadband soon / one day
3. Intend to get dial-up
4. Can't afford it
5. Don't see any value / No use for it
6. No connection/ no broadband available
7. Ties up the phone line
8. Don't want exposure to Internet material
9. Wouldn't have skills to use it
10. Have access elsewhere
11. Planning on getting internet/just got computer/recently moved
12. Technical/provider issues
13. Security concerns
14. Have not got around to it/cannot be bothered
15. Other (specify)
16. Don't know
17. Refused

[SASP 2008]

F.9 Do you use the Internet from any other location?

(Multiple response. Prompt where internet in accessed)

1. No
2. Yes Internet access from work
3. Yes Internet access from place of study
4. Yes Internet access from library/telecentre/community centre
5. Yes Internet access at a friend or relative's house
6. Yes Internet access at café
7. Yes Internet on mobile phone
8. Yes Other location (specify)
9. Don't know
10. Refused

Sequence guide: if F.2 = 1 go NS

[SASP 2008]

F.10 Now for some questions about general technology.**How would you rate your general interest in technologies such as computers, the Internet, mobile phones, digital cameras (digital technologies)?**

(Read options. Single response)

1. **Highly interested**
2. **Somewhat interested**
3. **Neutral**
4. **Not interested**
5. **Dislike them**
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[SASP 2008]

F.11 Where would you expect to get information about digital technologies that you wanted to use or purchase?

(Multiple response)

1. Advertising
2. Technology magazines
3. Choice magazine
4. Word of mouth/friends/family
5. Training courses
6. Government agencies
7. Retail stores
8. Internet
9. Library / Council / Community Centre
10. TV / Radio / Newspaper
11. Not interested / don't want information
12. Internet service provider / helpdesk / computer experts
13. Other (specify)
14. Don't know
15. Refused

[SASP 2008]

F.12 Are there any digital technologies in your household?

(Read options if necessary. Multiple response.
Interviewer note does not include domestic appliances or whitegoods)

1. Yes computer (includes peripherals ie printers, scanner)
2. Yes - Mobile phone
3. Yes - MP3 player (includes I-Pod)
4. Yes - Video recording
5. Yes - Digital camera
6. Yes – HD or SDTV (High Definition or Standard Definition Television)
7. Digital TV (set top box, or tuner card on computer for digital TV)
8. Game console (Playstation, Wii, Xbox, DS, Gameboy, Sony PSP)
9. DVD / CD Player / Hi Fi
10. Telecommunications equipment
11. GPS / Tom Tom / Navman
12. Other (specify)
13. No digital technologies
14. Don't know
15. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Now, I would like to know if you agree or disagree with the following statement.

F.13 “Digital technologies are useful and allow us to do things that we would not be able to do otherwise”.

(Read options. Single response)

1. **Strongly agree**
2. **Agree**
3. **Neither agree or disagree**
4. **Disagree**
5. **Strongly disagree**
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[SASP 2008]

G. RECREATION AND SPORT

[SASP target T2.3]

The following questions are about sport and physical activities you have participated in during the last 12 months for exercise, recreation or sport.. Do not include any activities that were part of work or household and garden chores.

G.1 During the last 12 months did you participate in any physical activities for exercise, recreation or sport?

(Single response. Interviewer note: not as a spectator, coach, official, umpire or administrator)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[new SASP target T2.3]

Sequence guide: If G.1 >1 go to G.6

G.2 What activities did you participate in?

(Multiple response up to ten activities. Interviewer note: it is important that you code these correctly. DOES NOT INCLUDE GARDENING)

1. Aerobics/fitness
2. Aquarobics
3. Athletics/track and field
4. Australian Football
5. Badminton
6. Baseball
7. Basketball
8. Billiards/snooker/pool
9. Boxing
10. Canoeing/kayaking
11. Carpet Bowls
12. Cricket (indoor)
13. Cricket (outdoor)
14. Cycling
15. Dancing
16. Darts
17. Fishing
18. Football (indoor)
19. Football (outdoor)
20. Golf
21. Gymnastics
22. Hockey (indoor) EXTRA CATEGORY
23. Hockey (outdoor)
24. Horseriding/Equestrian
25. Ice/Snow sports
26. Lawn Bowls
27. Martial Arts
28. Motor Sports
29. Netball
30. Orienteering
31. Rock climbing
32. Rollersports
33. Rowing
34. Rugby League
35. Rugby Union
36. Running
37. Sailing]
38. Scuba Diving
39. Shooting Sports
40. Softball
41. Squash/Racquetball
42. Surf Sports
43. Swimming
44. Table Tennis
45. Tennis
46. Tenpin Bowling
47. Touch Football
48. Triathlons
49. Volleyball

50. Walking (bush)
51. Walking (other)
52. Waterpolo
53. Water skiing/Powerboating
54. Weight training
55. Yoga
56. Other (specify)
57. None
58. Unable to participate in activity
59. Refused

[new SASP target T2.3]

Repeat Questions G.3, G.4 and G.5 for each activity respondent participated in (up to ten activities).

G.3 Was any of this [enter name of activity] organised by a club, association or other type of organisation

(Single response)

1. Yes, all (organized)
2. Yes some (organized)
3. No
4. Don't know
5. Refused

[new SASP target T2.3]

Sequence guide: if G.3> 2 go to G.5

G.4 What type of club, association or organisation organised the [enter name of sport activity]? Was it a?

(Read options. Multiple response)

1. **Fitness, leisure or indoor/outdoor sports centre** (ie gym, health club, weight loss centre, YMCA or public pool)
2. **Sport or recreation club or association** (such as football, netball, lawn bowls, golf or bush walking club)
3. **School,**
4. **Work**
5. Other (specify)
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[new SASP target T2.3]

G.5 Including any practice and training, approximately how many times did you participate in [enter activity] during the last 12 months?

(Single response. Interviewer note: If too difficult to recall how many over the 12 months, enter times per week or per month)

1. **Enter times per week**
2. **Enter times per month**
3. **Enter times per year**
4. **Don't know**
5. **Refused**

[new SASP target T2.3]

G.6 I would now like you to think about any physical activities or sports that you have been involved in as either a coach, official, umpire or administrator in the last 12 months. In the last 12 months, have you been involved in any physical activities or sports as a coach, official, umpire or administrator?

(Single response. Interviewer note: question different to previously asked, as this question includes as a coach, official, umpire or administrator and not participants)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[new SASP target T5.6]

G.7 In the last 12 months, have you been to any sporting matches or competitions as a spectator?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[new SASP target T5.6]

H. ZERO WASTE

[SASP target T3.8]

I am now going to ask you to rate how important the following issues are in your life, using a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 means not at all important and 10 means extremely important.

H.1 How important is recycling and waste avoidance to you?

(Single response)

1. Not at all important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Extremely important
11. Don't know
12. Refused

[new SASP target T3.8]

H.2 How important is saving water to you [where 1 means not at all important and 10 means extremely important]?

(Single response)

1. Not at all important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Extremely important
11. Don't know
12. Refused

[new SASP target T3.8]

H.3 How important is saving energy to you [where 1 means not at all important and 10 means extremely important]?

(Single response)

1. Not at all important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Extremely important
11. Don't know
12. Refused

[new SASP target T3.8]

H.4 Which of the following would you rank as the most important?]

(Read options. Single response. CATI program rotate responses)

1. **Recycling**
2. **Saving water**
3. **Saving energy**
4. **Equally important**
5. None
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[new SASP target T3.8]

H.5 Which of the following would you rank as the least important?]

(Read options. Single response. CATI program rotate responses)

1. **Recycling**
2. **Saving water**
3. **Saving energy**
4. **Equally important**
5. None
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[new SASP target T3.8]

I. USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT

[SASP target T3.6]

SECTION ONLY ASKED FOR Eastern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide, Southern Adelaide, Western Adelaide, Adelaide Hills and Barossa regions, OTHERWISE go to SECTION Z

I.1 How often do you travel by Public Transport?

(Single response)

1. Every day
2. Most days
3. Once or twice a week
4. Once or twice a month
5. Less often
6. Never
7. Don't know
8. Refused

[new SASP target T3.6]

Sequence guide: if I.1 = 6 or 7 go to I.8

I.2 When you travel by Public Transport, what mode(s) of transport do you most often use?

(Multiple response. Read options if necessary)

1. **Train**
2. **Tram**
3. **Bus**
4. Other (specify)
5. Don't know
6. Refused

[new SASP target T3.6]

I.3 How do you usually travel to the start of your public transport journey? Do you....

(Read options. Single response)

1. **Walk**
2. **Drive** (as driver or passenger using Park and Ride facility or other car park)
3. **Get dropped off** (kiss and ride)
4. **Ride a bicycle**
5. Other (specify)
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[new SASP target T3.6]

I.4 Why do you travel by Public Transport?

(Multiple response)

1. Cost of fuel/cheaper
2. Less stress by avoiding traffic
3. Environmental benefits
4. Cost of parking/parking issues or difficulties (general)
5. Faster than driving
6. Can't drive a car/don't like driving
7. Don't own a car / no access to car/car problems
8. Convenient/close to home or work
9. Friends do (socialise with friends)
10. Other (specify)
11. Don't know
12. Refused

[new SASP target T3.6]

I.5 In the last year has your use of public transport....

(Read options. Single response)

1. **Increased,**
2. **Decreased,** or
3. **Stayed the same?**
4. Don't know
5. Refused

[new SASP target T3.6]

Sequence guide: if I.5 >2 go to I.7

I.6 What was the main reason for the change in your travel by Public Transport?

(Single response)

1. Availability of a car (car pooling)
2. Car parking issues (including cost and availability of parking)
3. Change in employment status (either commenced, reduced or stopped working)
4. Change in safety/security of using public transport
5. Change of work location
6. Circumstances with respect to the need to use a car
7. Cost of travel (by car)
8. Cost of travel (by public transport)
9. Crowd levels on board services
10. Cycling (increased or decreased)
11. Disability or health status
12. Moved house
13. Reliability of the service I use/used
14. Route of the service I use/used
15. Timetable of the service I use/used
16. Walking (increased or decreased)
17. Other (specify)
18. Don't know
19. Refused

[new SASP target T3.6]

I.7 What would encourage you to travel more often by Public Transport?

(Multiple response)

1. Improved service and reliability (*running on time*)
2. Increased frequency of service
3. Better connections between buses, trains and trams
4. Better security
5. Lower Fares
6. Less Travel time
7. More Evening and Weekend Services
8. Providing services that go where I want to go
9. Less crowds (not having to stand up)
10. Nothing
11. Other (specify)
12. Don't know
13. Refused

[new SASP target T3.6]

Go to NS

I.8 What would encourage you to travel by Public Transport?"

(Multiple response)

1. Improved service and reliability (*running on time*)
2. Increased frequency of service
3. Better connections between buses, trains and trams
4. Better security
5. Lower Fares
6. Less Travel time
7. More Evening and Weekend Services
8. Providing services that go where I want to go
9. Less crowds (not having to stand up)
10. Nothing
11. Other (specify)
12. Don't know
13. Refused

[new SASP target T3.6]

Z. DEMOGRAPHICS

Now to finish with some general questions

Z.1 How would you best describe your family structure? Please listen to the descriptions and then tell me which one is the closest to your family situation

(Read options. Single response. Interviewer note: only read out appropriate categories)

1. **A family with a child or children living with both biological of adoptive parents**
2. **A step or blended family**
3. **A sole parent family**
4. **Shared care parenting**
5. **Adult living alone**
6. **Adult living with partner and no children**
7. **Related adults living together**
8. **Unrelated adults living together**
9. Other (specify)
10. Don't know
11. Refused

[new SASP Target T6.5]

Z.2 Which of the following best describes your current marital status?

(Read options. Single response. Interviewer note: 'De facto' equals 'Living with partner')

1. **Married**
2. **Living with a partner**
3. **Widowed**
4. **Divorced**
5. **Separated**
6. **Never married**
7. Not stated/inadequately described
8. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Z.3 Which of these best describes your current employment status?

(Read options. Single response. Interviewer note: prompt home duties to ascertain if looking after children, or relatives)

1. **Self employed**
2. **Employed for wages, salary or payment in kind**
3. **Unemployed**
4. **Engaged in home duties (with children in house)**
5. **Engaged in home duties (without children in house)**
6. **Caring for relative**
7. **Student**
8. **Retired**
9. **Unable to work (temporarily)**
10. **Unable to work (permanently)**
11. Other (Specify)
12. Don't know
13. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: Z3 > 2 Go to Z.5

Z.4 How many hours do you work per week?

(Single response)

1. *Enter number of hours per week*
2. Don't know
3. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: If Z.3 <3 Go to 0

Z.5 Do you receive any of the following pension benefits?

(Read options. Multiple response)

1. **Disability Support Pension**
2. **Unemployment Benefits**
3. **Sickness Benefits**
4. **Age /widow pension/**
5. **Service or defence/ war widow's/er's pension**
6. **Supporting parents benefit**
7. **Carer Payment/Allowance or Child Care Benefit**
8. **AUSTUDY/student allowance**
9. Other (specify)
10. None
11. Don't know
12. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: if Z.1 ≠ 1, 2 or 6 go to Z.8

Z.6 Which of these best describes your partner's current employment status?

(Read options. Single response)

1. **Self employed**
2. **Employed for wages, salary or payment in kind**
3. **Unemployed**
4. **Engaged in home duties**
5. **Student**
6. **Retired**
7. **Unable to work**
8. Other (Specify)
9. Don't know
10. Refused

[new SASP Target T6.8]

Sequence guide: Z.6 >2 go to Z.8

Z.7 How many hours do they work per week?

(Single response)

1. *Enter number of hours per week*
2. Don't know
3. Refused

[new SASP Target T6.8]

Z.8 In which country were you born?

(Single response)

1. Australia
2. Austria
3. Bosnia-Herzegovina
4. Canada
5. China
6. Croatia
7. Fiji
8. France
9. Germany
10. Greece
11. Holland/Netherlands
12. Hong Kong
13. India
14. Iran
15. Italy
16. Japan
17. Malaysia
18. Malta
19. New Zealand
20. Philippines
21. Poland
22. Slovenia
23. South Africa
24. Spain
25. U.K. and Ireland
26. USA
27. Vietnam
28. Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
29. Former Yugoslav Republics of Serbia & Montenegro
30. Other country (specify)
31. Don't know
32. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Sequence guide: If Z.8 > 1, go to Z.10

Z.9 Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin?

(Single response)

1. No
2. Aboriginal
3. Torres Strait Islander
4. Both
5. Not stated

[SASP 2008]

Z.10 What is the highest level of education you have completed?

(Single response. Interviewer note:
Prompt if necessary)

1. Never attended school
2. Some primary school
3. Completed primary school
4. Some high school
5. Completed high school (i.e. Year 12, Form 6, HSC)
6. TAFE or trade certificate or diploma
7. University, CAE or some other tertiary institute degree
8. Other (specify)
9. Don't know
10. Refused

[SASP 2008]

Z.11 Are you currently undertaking any study for a trade certificate, diploma, degree or any other educational qualification?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[new SASP Target T6.5]

Z.12 Do you have a current car driver's licence?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[new SASP Target T3.6]

Z.13 Do you own a motor vehicle or motor cycle?"

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[new SASP Target T3.6]

Z.14 How long have you lived in your area?

(Single response)

1. Enter years _____
2. Enter months _____
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[new SASP 2008]

Z.15 Is this dwelling [where you live] ...

(Read options - single response. *Interviewer note: Community housing is provided to people with very high needs, usually in partnership with a specialized support provider.*)

1. **Owned outright**
2. **Owned with a mortgage**
3. **Rented privately**
4. **Rented from Housing SA or Housing Trust**
5. **Community Housing**
6. **Retirement Village**
7. **Other (specify)**
8. Don't know
9. Refused

[new SASP Target T6.8]

Z.16 Are you responsible for managing your household's budget?

(Single response)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Refused

Sequence guide: if Z.15 = 1 go to Z.18

Z.17 How much do you pay in mortgage/rent?

(Single response. *Interviewer note: dwelling that the person currently lives in (not investment). Include rent and mortgage repayments and site fees if the dwelling is a caravan or any housing located in a caravan park/home estate. Excludes water rates, council rates, repairs, maintenance and other fees. Enter amount either PER WEEK or MONTH or YEAR*)

1. Enter amount PER WEEK
[limited number field only]
2. Enter amount PER MONTH
[limited number field only]
3. Don't know
4. Refused

[new SASP Target T6.8]

Z.18 Which best describes your family's money situation?

(Read options. Single response. *Interviewer note: if respondent hesitates, please read out Don't know response option*)

1. **[I am / we are] spending more money than [I / we] get**
2. **[I / we] have just enough money to get [me / us] through to the next pay day**
3. **There's some money left over each week but [I / we] just spend it**
4. **[I / we] can save a bit every now and then**
5. **[I / we] can save a lot**
6. Don't know
7. Refused

[new SASP Target 6.8]

Z.19 I would now like to ask you about your household's income. We are interested in how income relates to lifestyle and access to services. Before tax is taken out, can you tell me your household's weekly or annual income, from all sources, over the last 12 months?

(Single response. Interviewer note: total of all wages/salaries, government benefits, pensions, allowances and other income your household usually receives. *Interviewer note: if respondent hesitates, please read out Don't know response option*)

1. \$1 - \$149 per week (\$1 - \$7,799 per year)
2. \$150 - \$249 per week (\$7,800 - \$12,999 per year)
3. \$250 - \$399 per week (\$13,000 - \$20,799 per year)
4. \$400 - \$599 per week (\$20,800 - \$31,199 per year)
5. \$600 - \$799 per week (\$31,200 - \$41,599 per year)
6. \$800 - \$999 per week (\$41,600 - \$51,999 per year)
7. \$1,000 - \$1,299 per week (\$52,000 - \$67,599 per year)
8. \$1,300 - \$1,599 per week (\$67,600 - \$83,199 per year)
9. \$1,600 - \$1,999 per week (\$83,200 - \$103,999 per year)
10. \$2,000 or more per week (\$104,000 or more per year)
11. Nil income
12. Negative income
13. Don't know
14. Refused

[new SASP Target T6.8]

Results of the 2008 household survey are available on the SA Strategic Plan website. I can give you the website address if you would like to see the results.

[Interviewer note: read out website address if respondent asks for details]

<http://www.saplan.org.au/content/view/19/51/>

That concludes the survey. On behalf of the Government of South Australia, thank you very much for taking part in this survey.

Z.20 Please record what language this interview was conducted in

(Single response)

1. English
2. Italian
3. Greek
4. Vietnamese
5. Other (specify)

By pressing enter at this screen, I certify that this is a true, accurate and complete interview, conducted in accordance with the ISO 20252 standards and the AMSRS Code of Professional Behaviour (ICC/ESOMAR). I will not disclose to any other person the content of this questionnaire or any other information relating to this project.

