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Outline of presentation

1. Users of data about and for Indigenous Australians
2. Major sources of data and their characteristics
3. Data gaps
   • Longitudinal data
   • Linked administrative data
4. Examples of research/evaluation that would be possible/improved by linked administrative longitudinal data
5. Data sovereignty and Indigenous controlled surveys
Users of data about Indigenous Australians

- Indigenous communities and organisations for informing decisions, advocacy and accountability
- Governments to allocate resources, identify needs, monitoring, evaluation, planning and accountability
- Academics and researchers for explaining and understanding
- Wider Australian community for accountability and to provide more information about the circumstances of Indigenous Australians
## Major sources of data about Indigenous Australians and their characteristics AS OF 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics/uses</th>
<th>Cross-sectional data</th>
<th>Longitudinal data</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Admin data</th>
<th>Community controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>AEDI</td>
<td>NATSISS</td>
<td>AATSIHS</td>
<td>LSAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Indigenous sample</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally representative sample</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indigenous comparison</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information across life course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous-specific measures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: X = data set has characteristic; 0 = data set has characteristic to some extent

There have been big advances in data about and for Indigenous Australians since inclusion in the Census for the first time in 1971.

Much of the data is limited by being:
- Cross-sectional
- Small Indigenous samples or in selected areas only
- Limited range of information available

Of only limited value for the evaluation of government policies and the evaluation of services provided by government, community sector, Indigenous organisations and the private sector.
• Policy development and evaluation desperately needs high quality longitudinal data on the Indigenous population and how compare to other population groups.

• Very challenging and expensive to achieve for Indigenous population using conventional national longitudinal survey methods

• Costs of data collection
• Burden on respondents given relatively small population

• Data linkage and matching provides the opportunity to create such a data asset about and for Indigenous Australians
New Income Management in the NT (NIM)

- Income Management (IM) restricts how people can spend a portion of their income support payments
- 50% of income support payment (some 70%)
- Mainly through BasicsCard
  - No alcohol
  - No tobacco
  - No gambling
  - No pornography
  - No cash
Key data sources

• Longitudinal survey of participants and control population
• Survey of Centrelink staff
• Case-file analysis
• Extensive structured interviews & consultations
• Centrelink administrative data
• BasicsCard transactions
• Stores data
• Secondary administrative & ABS data
Length of time on Income Management – Centrelink administrative data (Centrelink admin data)
Limited by not being able to link administrative data sources

- Centrelink data (identifies those on Income Management)
- child protection, school attendance, prisons data, AEDI, NAPLAN, hospital admissions, alcohol related crime (do not identify those on Income Management)
- Inability to link Centrelink with other admin and survey data limited ability to answer evaluation questions
- E.g., impact on children limited to survey responses from adults and analysis of aggregated data which did not compare outcomes before and after income management.
- Data linkage would have improved quality of evaluation of an important policy and possibly have reduced cost of evaluation
Ratio of Indigenous to non-Indigenous high/very high psychological distress rates, adult population, age standardised, New Zealand & Australia, 2004–14 (Gray and Hunter 2017)
Data sovereignty and Indigenous controlled surveys

• Emerging and growing issue
• Vital to have Indigenous controlled surveys

• Examples
  – Mayi Kuwayu: the National Study of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Wellbeing
  – Family and Community Safety (FaCTS) for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Study