

## 2. Results overview and LF participation and representativeness analysis

### 2.1 Overview

The remaining sections of the report present results from analysing the family/carer outcomes framework data available as at 30 June 2018. Results are organised with a separate subsection for each questionnaire version, synthesising analyses from all data sources (SF and LF, baseline and longitudinal).

In view of the large amount of data, to keep the report manageable we have chosen to focus in depth on one area judged to be of particular importance for families and carers: employment. High level summaries of results for all questions are included in separate volumes of Appendices.

The remainder of the report is organised as follows:

- Sections 2.2 and 2.3 consider LF participation rates and representativeness by key participant characteristics.
- Sections 3 and 4 contain results for families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14.
- Sections 5 and 6 contain results for families and carers of participants aged 15 to 24.
- Sections 7 and 8 contain results for families and carers of participants aged 25 and over.
- Section 9 contains results for the in-depth analysis of family/carer employment outcomes.

More detailed results contained in the Appendices include:

- Appendix A: Families and carers of participants aged 0 to 14.
- Appendix B: Families and carers of participants aged 15 to 24.
- Appendix C: Families and carers of participants aged 25 and over.

Appendices A to C contain the following information:

1. Baseline indicators – aggregate.
2. Baseline indicators – by participant characteristics.
3. Longitudinal change in indicators – aggregate.
4. Longitudinal change in indicators – by participant characteristics.
5. Perceptions of whether the NDIS has helped – aggregate and by participant characteristics.

## 2.2 LF participation rates

Unlike the SF, LF participation is voluntary. Hence the degree of representativeness of the LF sample will be affected not only by phasing, but also by differential rates of participation amongst different segments of the participant population.

Full details of participation rates by participant characteristics are contained in Section 3.2 and Appendices B.1 and B.2 of the participant outcomes report. Some of the key findings included:

- Lower response rates were observed for participants with a psychosocial disability, both at baseline and re-interview.
- Lower response rates were observed for Indigenous participants, both at baseline and re-interview.
- Lower response rates were observed for CALD participants at baseline, but not at re-interview (re-interview rates were not significantly different between CALD and non-CALD participants).
- Response rates at both baseline and review tended to decrease with increasing intensity, as measured by participant streaming type.

These results relate to response rates for participant surveys, but will affect the distribution of family/carer responses by participant characteristics since only families and carers of participants who choose to respond will have the opportunity to complete a family/carer questionnaire.

For those participants who do choose to respond, the percentage supplying a family/carer questionnaire may also differ by participant characteristics. Whilst this has not been investigated in detail, age will be a key factor, since a family member or carer will almost always be available for child participants, however adult participants may live independently of families/carers and have limited contact with them.

## 2.3 LF representativeness

Since the LF participants form a subset of participants completing the SF (and should have their answers to the SF questions collected in CRM), it is useful to compare how similar the LF sample is to the complete SF population on demographic characteristics that might affect outcomes. As discussed in Section 2.2, representativeness is affected by phasing and by differential rates of participation amongst different segments of the participant population.

Section 3.3 and Appendices B.3 and B.4 of the participant outcomes report contain details of the representativeness analysis. Some key findings are summarised below.

### Baseline

On the whole, the LF baseline was fairly representative of the SF baseline, except with respect to jurisdiction, where there are considerable differences largely driven by phasing.

For families/carers, New South Wales is considerably under-represented in the baseline for families/carers of participants under 25, but not for the 25 and over group. South Australia is over-represented across all age groups. For the young age groups this may be partly because parents of children are more likely to respond. Victoria is under-represented for the 25 and over age group, slightly under-represented for 15 to 24, but similar to benchmark for 0 to 14.

Apart from jurisdiction, there are smaller differences for families and carers by:

- Primary disability: differences are fairly slight for families/carers of participants aged 0 to 14. For the 15 to 24 age group, the LF has a slightly lower proportion with autism (35% versus 40%) and a slightly higher proportion with intellectual disability/Down syndrome (44% versus 41%). The 25 and over group has a higher proportion with intellectual disability/Down syndrome (51% versus 37%), a similar proportion with autism, and lower proportions for other disabilities.
- CALD status: there is a slightly lower proportion of CALD participants in the LF baseline, particularly for the 25 and over group (4% versus 10%).

### **Longitudinal**

For the longitudinal data, the main differences for families and carers also occurred with respect to jurisdiction: NSW is under-represented, and SA and ACT over-represented, for all age groups.