Social Media Minimum Age Evaluation

Technical Report | three-month follow-up

July 2026

Social Research Centre

Life in Australia™

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the Wurundjeri People who are the Traditional Custodians of the lands on which our company is located, and the Traditional Custodians of country throughout Australia, where we conduct our business. We pay our respects to Elders, past, present and emerging. The Social Research Centre is committed to honouring First Nations peoples' unique cultural and spiritual relationships to the land, waters and seas and their rich contribution to society.

Project sponsor:

The project is funded by the eSafety Commissioner (eSafety)

Contact:

For more information on the conduct and results of the study, the team can be contacted:

The Social Research Centre
Level 5, 350 Queen Street
Melbourne, Victoria 3000
Telephone: (613) 9236 8500
info@srcentre.com.au
srcentre.com.au

Version: 2

Contents

List of tables

1. Introduction

This three-month follow-up successfully establishes the first post-implementation check-in for the Social Media Minimum Age Evaluation. The wave achieved 1,021 completed parent–child dyads, slightly exceeding the target of 1,000, and retained the study's core dyadic design by including only cases where both parent and child surveys were completed. The mixed-panel design continues to combine the methodological strength of Life in Australia™ as the probability-based reference sample with additional non-probability-based sample (Octopus) to support scale. Passive metering data continued to be collected alongside the survey data, strengthening the dataset available for future analysis.

1.1. Project overview

This technical report refers to the three-month follow-up survey conducted in March and April 2026, the first check-in point for participants following the baseline survey. For more information regarding the project background and baseline survey, please refer to the baseline technical report, the Social Media Minimum Age Evaluation Methodology report and the Study Protocol.

The baseline survey was conducted across November and December 2025, capturing data from participants before the commencement of the *Online Safety Amendment (Social Media Minimum Age) Act 2024* legislation, which took effect on 10 December 2025. A total of *n* = 4,121 parent / child dyads (*n* = 8,242 individual respondents) responded to the baseline survey, forming the foundation of the longitudinal cohort, who will be contacted throughout the remainder of the study to participate in future survey waves.

The three-month follow-up survey was intended to be an early check-in, conducted with a small cohort of respondents from the baseline survey, including all Life in Australia™ participants who completed the baseline survey, and a sub-set of participating Octopus respondents.

Smartphone tracking of active participants continued throughout the survey fieldwork period, however no additional recruitment for passive metering, or data linkage was conducted for this survey. Similarly, the additional AIC module that formed part of the baseline survey was not included in the three-month follow-up. As at the baseline, eSafety engaged the Social Research Centre to deliver programming and fieldwork services for the longitudinal study. The Social Research Centre provided expert advice on the design of the online survey.

1.2. Ethics and quality assurance

This study has been reviewed and approved by the AIFS Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) (approval number: 2025/06). eSafety led the HREC submission process.

eSafety was responsible for obtaining human research ethics review and approval for the three-month follow-up survey. For more information refer to the Social Media Minimum Age Evaluation Methodology report and the Study Protocol.

All aspects of this research were undertaken in accordance with ISO 20252:2019 Market, Opinion and Social Research Standard, The Research Society (formerly AMSRS) Code of Professional Behaviour, the Australian Privacy Principles and the *Privacy (Market and Social Research) Code 2021*.

The Social Research Centre is an accredited Company Partner of The Research Society with all senior staff as full members and several senior staff QPR (Qualified Practicing Researcher) accredited. The Social Research Centre is also a member of the Australian Data and Insights Association (ADIA, formerly known as AMSRO) and bound by the *Privacy (Market and Social Research) Code 2021*.

2. Methodology

2.1. Three-month follow-up survey

The primary in-scope population for the three-month follow-up survey was all Life in Australia™ members who participated in the baseline survey, and a random selection of Octopus participants who participated in the baseline survey, as required to reach a total of *n* = 1,000 completes for this wave of the survey.

The age group of children included in the study increased to 17, to account for 16-year-olds who participated in the baseline survey aging up in the meantime.

The Social Research Centre's Life in Australia™ panel as described below, formed the probability 'spine' around which the Octopus participants data was calibrated. This statistical blending process helps moderate or reduce the bias inherent in using non-probability samples[1].

The Octopus participant data collection was undertaken in parallel with Life in Australia™ fieldwork.

The survey was designed to run for a total of 20 minutes, with 10 minutes allocated to completion of each of the parent and child components. To ensure comparability, the measures for the three-month follow-up survey were largely drawn from the baseline survey, with numbering retained where applicable for ease of analysis.

All survey materials are available on the Open Science Framework, and other study materials (e.g., consent forms) can be made available upon request to eSafety.

Inclusions in the data required the completion of both parent and child surveys, so no standalone parent surveys were included in the final dataset.

Incentives

Members of Life in Australia™ received an incentive of $20 for parent and child for participation in the three-month follow-up survey. Incentives are accumulated as points ($1 = 1 point) redeemable as a wide variety of gift cards via our e-gift card provider (options are curated to omit those that might be problematic, such as alcohol retailers). Panellists also have the option to donate the incentive to one of five pre-selected charities that are changed annually (Rural Aid, StreetSmart Australia, The Man Cave, Djirra, and Love your Sister).

2.2. Questionnaire design and programming

The questionnaires were developed by eSafety, with input from the Lead Academic Partner, Stanford University's Social Media Lab, and Academic Advisory Group, and then refined in response to feedback from the Social Research Centre.

The Social Research Centre project team then programmed the finalised and approved questionnaire ready for data collection. The Social Research Centre used Forsta to program the surveys, which is hosted at Amazon Web Services (AWS) Sydney.

Standard operational procedures were used to ensure the data collection scripts reflected the agreed questionnaire. These include:

- programming the skips and sequence instructions as per the word-processed questionnaire
    - subjecting the programming to a rigorous checking procedure undertaken by our project management team, eSafety staff and operational staff, including:
    - checking the questionnaire in 'practice mode' to fully test the skip pattern and the appearance of the questionnaire without testing the questionnaire on 'live' respondents
    - reviewing 'dummy data' to further check the structural integrity of the script.

[1] Elliott, M.R. and R. Valliant (2017) Inference for nonprobability samples. Statistical Science 32(2), 249-264. DOI: 10.1214/16-STS598. Valliant, R. (2020). Comparing alternatives to estimation from nonprobability samples. Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology 8(2), 231–263. DOI: 10.1093/jssam/smz003.

2.3. Data Collection via research panels

2.3.1 Life in Australia™

In 2016, the Social Research Centre established Australia's first national probability-based online panel: Life in Australia™ (Kaczmirek et al., 2019). The panel is the most methodologically rigorous online panel in Australia and is one of only a small number worldwide. Members of the panel are recruited via random selection methods, including digit dialling (RDD), address-based sampling (A-BS), or knock-to-nudge and agreed to provide their contact details to take part in surveys on a regular basis. What separates Life in Australia™ from other online panels is the use of sampling frames for which units have known probability of selection and the fact that people cannot enrol unless invited to participate. For further details on Life in Australia™ methodology, see https://srcentre.com.au/methodology/.

While Life in Australia™ provides excellent data quality (Lavrakas et al., 2022; Pennay et al., 2024), and high respondent participation and retention (key for longitudinal research), the numbers required for the project necessitated the use of non-probability research panels to augment the sample.

2.3.2 Non-probability panel - Octopus

The non-probability panel included to boost numbers for the three-month follow-up survey was Octopus. Given Octopus formed the bulk of the sample for the baseline survey, the sample was more substantial to draw on for this three-month follow-up survey, without compromising the potential for the six-month follow-up in a substantial way.

Octopus was originally selected for the overall longitudinal study based on accessible sample size, data quality, and adherence to industry standards and guidelines as below:

- Accredited to ISO 20252.
- Adheres to the ESOMAR guidelines on conducting market and opinion research using the internet.
- Australian Data and Insights Association (ADIA) member.
- Adheres to ADIA privacy principles and fully conforms to the Australian Privacy Principles as detailed in the Privacy Amendment Act (2000).
- Adheres to the Research Society Code of Professional Behaviour and guidelines on the confidential handling and delivery of respondent information.
- ADIA Quality Standards for Online Research (Access panels).
- Adheres to the Australian anti-spam laws.

2.4. Sample design and size

Sampling

All Life in Australia™ respondents who participated in the baseline survey were recontacted for the three-month follow-up survey.

Octopus was provided with a full list of participants who completed the baseline survey, and a random selection from this sample was contacted to complete the three-month follow-up. This ensured that all Octopus respondents who participated in the baseline survey had an equal chance of being selected and participating in the three-month follow-up survey.

Key survey dates

Fieldwork for the three-month follow-up survey on Life in Australia™ was undertaken over two weeks, outlined in

Table 1.

Table 1 Life in Australia™ key survey dates

Event	Date
Survey soft launch	17th March 2026
Day 1 data checks	18th March 2026
Survey full launch (email and SMS)	18th March 2026
Email reminder #1	20th March 2026
Email reminder #2	24th March 2026
SMS reminder #1	24th March 2026
Email reminder #3	27th March 2026
Email reminder #4	29th March 2026
Reminder calls	25th – 27th March 2026
Close survey	30th March 2026

Octopus fieldwork was staggered from Life in Australia™, to ensure a smooth launch process for both panels. The fieldwork dates for Octopus are shown in Table 2, with reminders sent consistently to panellists throughout the fieldwork period.

Table 2 Key Octopus survey dates

Event	Date
Octopus soft launch	20th March 2026
Octopus full launch	23rd March 2026
Octopus final close	9th April 2026

2.5. Other response maximisation procedures

Other procedures to maximise response for the survey included:

- Operation of an 1800 number throughout the survey period, to help establish survey bona fides, address sample members' queries, and encourage response.
- Provision of comprehensive Participant Information Sheets ahead of the survey.
- Focus on interviewer training and respondent liaison techniques during interviewer briefing and throughout fieldwork for the CATI reminder element of Life in Australia™ fieldwork.

Predicted Retention rates

Annual adult re-interview rates on Life in Australia™ average 90%, compared to 30% for non-probability online panels (estimated based on previous performance for recontact studies). Estimated retention rates are shown in Table 3. Actual retention rates were not examined this wave of the study, as a sub-set of the overall sample was invited to participate.

Table 3 Estimated retention rates

Wave	Life in Australia™ re-interview rates %	Non-probability panel re-interview rates %
1: Baseline 1-month pre-regulation	100.0	100.0
2: 3-months post-regulation	**96.0**	**67.0**
3: 6-months post-regulation	93.0	50.0
4: 12-months post-regulation	88.0	27.0

Wave	Life in Australia™ re-interview rates %	Non-probability panel re-interview rates %
5: 24-months post-regulation	78.0	8.0

3. Response outcomes

The total sample size achieved for the three-month follow-up survey was *n* = 1,021 parent / child dyads (*n* = 2,042 individual respondents). Completes were defined as a parent / child dyad who completed both the parent and child versions of the three-month follow-up survey, answering at least to the end of question W2C_9.2. Completes per panel are outlined in Table 4.

Table 4 Completes by panel

Panel Name	Completed dyad surveys
Octopus	546
Life in Australia™	475
Total	**1,021**

The median survey completion time for parents and children is outlined in Table 5:

Table 5 Parent and child median survey completion time

Survey completion median	Minutes
Parents	15.4
Children	10.8

3.1. Respondent profile

The demographic profile of the final three-month follow-up respondents is outlined in Table 6. Demographics were primarily reported by parents in the baseline survey and included in the three-month follow-up data set for analysis purposes.

Table 6 Unweighted respondent demographics – parent and child

Demographics	*n*	% of final sample
State (parent report)		
NSW	314	30.8
VIC	280	27.4
QLD	208	20.4
SA	69	6.8
WA	98	9.6
TAS	28	2.7
NT	8	0.8
ACT	15	1.5
Remoteness (parent report)		
Major cities	796	78.0
Inner regional	162	15.9
Outer regional	60	5.9
Remote	1	0.1
Very remote	1	0.1

Demographics	*n*	% of final sample
SEIFA (parent report)		
Quintile 1 – Most disadvantage	145	14.2
Quintile 2	165	16.2
Quintile 3	257	25.2
Quintile 4	231	22.6
Quintile 5 – Least disadvantage	222	21.7
Age (parent)		
18-24 years	2	0.2
25-34 years	76	7.4
35-44 years	495	48.5
45-54 years	384	37.6
55-64 years	59	5.8
65-74 years	4	0.4
75+ years	1	0.1
Gender (parent)		
Man or male	355	34.8
Woman or female	663	64.9
Non-binary	2	0.2
Language diversity		
Parent uses languages other than English at home	223	21.8
Parent does not use languages other than English at home	798	78.2
Other parents use languages other than English at home	222	21.7
Other parents do not use languages other than English	800	78.4
Education (parent)		
Year 9 and below	19	1.9
Certificate I/II	1	0.1
Years 10 and 11	42	4.1
Year 12	65	6.4
Certificate III and/or IV Level	211	20.7
Advanced Diploma and/or Diploma Level	123	12.0
Bachelor Degree Level	300	29.4
Graduate Diploma and/or Graduate Certificate Level	68	6.7
Postgraduate Degree Level	191	18.7
Age (child)		
10 years	94	9.2
11 years	130	12.7
12 years	112	11.0
13 years	116	11.4
14 years	152	14.9

Demographics	*n*	% of final sample
15 years	199	19.5
16 years	186	18.2
17 years	32	3.1
Gender (child)		
A boy (he/him)	566	55.4
A girl (she/her)	433	42.4
Non-binary	6	0.6
A trans boy	1	0.1
A trans girl	6	0.6
A sistergirl	0	0.0
A brotherboy	1	0.1
I use a different term	3	0.3
I'm still working on it	5	0.5
I don't want to say	1	0.1
Aboriginal and / or Torress Strait Islander identity (child)		
No	967	94.7
Yes, child is Aboriginal	52	5.1
Yes, child is Torres Strait Islander	0	0
Yes, child is both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander	2	0.2

4. Data processing and outputs

4.1. Coding and verbatim cleaning

eSafety is responsible for coding, allowing for fully customised and actionable codeframes. The Social Research Coding team therefore focused on basic cleaning, and de-identification of verbatims.

4.2. Data quality checks for online completes

Data quality checks for online completes consisted of checks for:

- speeding (using an approach developed by TrueSample, speeders were defined as those who speeded on 40 percent or more of web survey pages[2])
- straight lining during grid questions (participants can legitimately straight-line many scales, so checks review the total proportion of grid questions where straight lining occurred.)
- number of non-substantive response options selected (over 20% of 'Not sure' or over 30% 'Prefer not to say' options selected)
- responses to open-ended questions, including nonsense responses (e.g. strings of letters 'ajusybf' instead of response)
- duplication of respondents across different panels (checks for identical responses across different panellists).

We consider all these indicators when determining whether a respondent is removed for poor data quality. Data quality indicators other than verbatim responses are used to identify potentially problematic cases. Free-text responses that indicated thoughtful engagement with the survey encouraged retention of the respondent where another data quality flag was recorded (for example, respondents flagged for straight lining may be kept if their verbatim responses indicated engagement with the survey).

Data quality is tracked for panel members over time and those with repeated issues are retired from the Life in Australia™. Panels are also advised of poor-quality respondents for their own management purposes.

Following data quality checks, no respondents were flagged for removal.

4.3. Electronic data provision

A final version of the data file (with weights) was provided in SPSS. Supporting documentation, including a data dictionary, was also provided.

An updated unit record excel data file, with passive metering activity from February 1st 2026, to 30th April 2026 was provided alongside the survey data.

[2] cfpb_nfwbs-puf-user-guide.pdf

5. Approach to weighting

5.1. Establishment weights for parent respondents

The study consisted of two components that were combined for weighting purposes:

1. A random (probability) sample of parents with 10- to 17-year-old children from Life in Australia™.
2. Convenience (non-probability) samples of parents and children aged 10- to 17-year-old to support extended reporting and analysis.

The usual approach to weighting random (probability) samples is a two-step process that aims to reduce biases caused by non-coverage and non-response and to align weighted sample estimates with external data about the target population (Kalton and Flores-Cervantes, 2003). First, base weights are calculated to account for each respondent's initial chance of selection and for the survey's response rate. Next, the base weights are adjusted to align respondents with the population on key socio-demographic characteristics. Refer to Särndal et al. (1992) for detailed information about model-assisted survey sampling and estimation, and to Valliant et al. (2018) for a contemporary treatment of weighting and estimation for sample surveys.

The convenience (non-probability) samples used non-random mechanisms to recruit participants to the survey, which means that the design-based approach just described does not apply. Refer to Elliott and Valliant (2017) for a discussion and further references about the challenges of making inferences from non-random samples. There are several methods for weighting such samples and making estimates from them, however (refer to Valliant, 2020). One of these methods, used here, is "quasi-randomisation" which requires a reference sample chosen at random from the target population. The reference sample is used to estimate pseudo-selection probabilities for the convenience samples, to adjust for selection bias. For this survey, the reference sample consisted of the probability cases from Life in Australia™.

A machine learning model (Stekhoven & Bühlmann, 2012) was used to estimate base weights for the non-probability sample, conditional upon the reference weights for Life in Australia™ respondents and the demographic, lifestyle, and outcome variables common between the two samples. Following this process, the combined sample had base weights for the two groups – a probability-based one for Life in Australia™ cases and a modelled one for convenience cases.

The base weights were then adjusted to align the combined sample with the population on key characteristics. The choice of alignment characteristics was guided by three factors:

- Which characteristics are most different between the probability and convenience samples?
- Which characteristics are most associated with the survey's key questionnaire items?
- Which characteristics are most different between the combined sample and the population?

With these factors in mind, the characteristics used to adjust the weights are those shown in Table 7. This table also includes the population counts and percentages, obtained from an ABS data request for the 2021 Census (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2026). All population counts refer to the population of parents aged 18 and over with at least one child aged 10 to 16 years in the household.

The method used to adjust the base weights was regression calibration (Deville et al., 1993), implemented in R (R Core Team, 2023) using the survey package (Lumley, 2020). For more information on weighting of sample surveys, refer to Valliant et al. (2018).

5.2. Establishment weights for child respondents

A second weight was calculated for respondents who completed the child section of the questionnaire. This weight reflects the child in the context of the population of Australian 10–16-year-old children. Like the non-probability sample, the design-based approach to weighting does not apply to child respondents, as there is

a non-random mechanism of recruitment. Unlike the parent weighting, however, there is no probability-based reference sample with which the quasi-randomisation approach can be applied. Instead, a super-population (modelling) approach is taken, in which all respondents are assigned the same base weight and regression calibration is used to adjust these base weights. More information on this approach can be found in Elliott and Valliant (2017).

The set of characteristics used to adjust the child weights are those shown in Table 8. This table also includes the population counts and percentages, obtained from a Census 2021 data request (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2026). All population counts refer to the Australian 10-16-year-old population.

5.3. Establishment weights for parent-child pairs (dyads)

A third weight was also calculated, designed to reflect the parent-child dyad in the context of the population of Australian parents and 10–16-year-old child dyads. As the with child weights, the design-based approach to weighting does not apply to the dyads, since there is a non-random mechanism of selection. A super-population approach is taken, in which all dyads are assigned the same base weight of 1, and regression calibration is used to adjust base weights to match the population of parent-child pairs.

The set of characteristics used to adjust the dyad weights reflects the three attributes of parent-child pairs – child characteristics, parent characteristics and shared characteristics. Characteristics and population counts are shown in Table 9. Counts were estimated from the Census 2021 confidentialised unit record file (5% sample) (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2026). All population counts refer to the population of Australian parent and 10–16-year-old child dyads.

5.4. Longitudinal Weights

To facilitate analysis of the individual level changes across surveys, longitudinal weights were calculated for respondents to both the baseline and the three-month follow-up survey. A separate longitudinal weight was calculated for each of the corresponding weights calculated during the baseline wave. The process of longitudinal weight calculation is described in the following steps:

1. Assign base weights as the final weights from the baseline wave.
2. Adjust the base weight based on estimated response propensity to the follow-up survey from a propensity model.
3. Calibrate the propensity-adjusted weights using external benchmarks.

The propensity model in the second step estimates the longitudinal response propensity given a respondent was a member of the baseline wave, conditional upon demographic and outcome characteristics from the baseline data. The variables used in each response propensity model were based on the target for each question. The model for the parent longitudinal weight included only items asked of the parents, the model for the child longitudinal weight included only items asked of the child respondents, and the model used for the dyad weight included both parent and child items. Regularised logistic regression was chosen for modelling propensity. Propensities resulting from each model estimate the probability of being in the longitudinal sample. The propensities were grouped into 10 classes (after Cochran, 1968) and the inverse of the average probability within each class was used as the probability-based design weight for the online sample (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1984). The calibration adjustment of the longitudinal weights included the same demographic characteristics and benchmark values as were used in adjusting weights in the baseline wave. These are shown in Tables 7, 8, and 9.

5.5. Weighting variables

Three weighting variables have been added to the dataset: *weight_parent*, *weight_child*, and *weight_dyad*. Each set of weights is calibrated to sum to the total number of dyads in the dataset; however, each is intended for a different analytical purpose:

- *weight_parent* should be used when making estimates and inferences for the population of parents.
- *weight_child* should be used when making estimates and inferences for the population of children aged 10-17 years.
- *weight_dyad* should be used when making estimates and inferences about the joint attitudes and behaviours of parent-child pairs.

Table 7 Characteristics used for adjusting parent base weights, with population distribution and data sources.

Category	Benchmark Target (#)	Benchmark Target (%)	Source
State or territory of residence			(A)
New South Wales	766,915	31.9	
Victoria	612,718	25.48	
Queensland	497,640	20.7	
South Australia	160,364	6.67	
Western Australia	254,090	10.57	
Tasmania	48,602	2.02	
Northern Territory	20,698	0.86	
Australian Capital Territory	43,390	1.8	
Part of State			(A)
Capital city	1,653,168	68.76	
Rest of state	751,249	31.24	
Age group by Highest education			(A)
18-34 years x Bachelor or above	15,915	0.66	
18-34 years x Below Bachelor	120,400	5.01	
35-44 years x Bachelor or above	367,867	15.3	
35-44 years x Below Bachelor	630,177	26.21	
45-54 years x Bachelor or above	466,739	19.41	
45-54 years x Below Bachelor	636,729	26.48	
55+ years x Bachelor or above	59,472	2.47	
55+ years x Below Bachelor	107,118	4.46	
Language other than English spoken at home			(A)
Yes	661,689	27.52	
No	1,742,728	72.48	
Gender			(A)
Man or male	1,077,205	44.8	
Woman or female	1,327,212	55.2	
Labour Force Status			(A)
Employed	1,962,489	81.62	
Other	441,928	18.38	

Sources: ABS Census 2021 (ABS 2026)

Table 8 Characteristics used for adjusting child base weights, with population distribution and data sources.

Category	Benchmark Target (#)	Benchmark Target (%)	Source
State or territory of residence			(A)
New South Wales	631,795	30.87	
Victoria	499,624	27.13	
Queensland	427,458	19.29	
South Australia	133,547	7.23	
Western Australia	213,727	10.22	
Tasmania	41,896	2.94	
Northern Territory	17,617	0.68	
Australian Capital Territory	34,849	1.65	
Age group			(A)
10-13 years	1,171,461	54.11	
14-16 years	829,053	45.89	
Language other than English spoken at home			(A)
Yes	375,156	15.43	
No	1,625,358	84.57	
Gender			(A)
Boy or male	1,029,811	54.09	
Girl or female	970,703	45.91	

Sources: ABS Census 2021 (ABS 2026)

Table 9 Characteristics used for adjusting dyad weights, with population distribution and data sources.

Category	Benchmark Target (#)	Benchmark Target (%)	Source
Age group – Child			(B)
10-13 years	95,038	59.17	
14-16 years	65,582	40.83	
Language other than English spoken at home – Child			(B)
Yes	29,277	18.23	
No	131,343	81.77	
Gender – Child			(B)
Boy or male	82,216	51.19	
Girl or female	78,404	48.81	
State or territory of residence – Shared			(B)
New South Wales	51,067	31.79	
Victoria	40,761	25.38	
Queensland	33,766	21.02	
South Australia	10,801	6.72	

Category	Benchmark Target (#)	Benchmark Target (%)	Source
Western Australia	16,766	10.44	
Tasmania	3,421	2.13	
Northern Territory	1,320	0.82	
Australian Capital Territory	2,718	1.69	
Age group by Highest education – Parent			(B)
18-34 years x Bachelor or above	893	0.56	
18-34 years x Below Bachelor	7,093	4.42	
35-44 years x Bachelor or above	24,155	15.04	
35-44 years x Below Bachelor	42,920	26.72	
45-54 years x Bachelor or above	33,033	20.57	
45-54 years x Below Bachelor	42,344	26.36	
55+ years x Bachelor or above	3,637	2.26	
55+ years x Below Bachelor	6,545	4.07	
Language other than English spoken at home – Parent			(B)
Yes	39,304	24.47	
No	121,316	75.53	
Gender – Parent			(B)
Man or male	72,754	45.3	
Woman or female	87,866	54.7	
Labour Force Status – Parent			(B)
Employed	133,220	82.94	
Other	27,400	17.06	

Sources: Census 2021 CURF (ABS 2026)

6. References

American Association for Public Opinion Research. (2023). *Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys* (10th ed). https://aapor.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Standards-Definitions-10th-edition.pdf

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2026). *2021 Census of Population and Housing: Customised data request* [Unpublished microdata]. ABS.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2026). *2021 Census of Population and Housing: Confidentialised Unit Record File (CURF)* [Unpublished microdata]. ABS.

Cochran, W. G. (1968). The Effectiveness of Adjustment by Subclassification in Removing Bias in Observational Studies. Biometrics, 24(2), 295. https://doi.org/10.2307/2528036

Deville, J.-C. C.-E. Särndal and O. Sautory (1993). Generalized raking procedures in survey sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 88(423), 1013-1020. DOI: 10.1080/01621459.1993.10476369.

Elliott, M.R. and R. Valliant (2017) Inference for nonprobability samples. Statistical Science 32(2), 249-264. DOI: 10.1214/16-STS598.

eSafety Commissioner. (2025, February 11). Social media age restrictions. https://www.esafety.gov.au/about-us/industry-regulation/social-media-age-restrictions

Kaczmirek, L., Phillips, B., Pennay, D., & Neiger, D. (2019). Building a probability-based online panel: Life in Australia™. CSRM & SRC Methods Paper No. 2/2019. Canberra: ANU Centre for Social Research & Methods, Research School of Social Sciences, College of Arts & Social Sciences, the Australian National University. https://srcentre.com.au/our-research/methods-research/Building%20a%20probability-based%20online%20panel-Life%20in%20Australia%20-%202.0.pdf

Kalton, G. and I. Flores-Cervantes (2003). Weighting methods. *Journal of Official Statistics* 19(2), 81-97.

Lavrakas, P. J., Pennay, D., Neiger, D., & Phillips, B. (2022). Comparing probability-based surveys and nonprobability online panel surveys in Australia: A total survey error perspective. Survey Research Methods, 16(2), 241–266. https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2022.v16i2.7907

Lumley, T. (2020) survey: analysis of complex survey samples. R package version 4.0. https://cran.r-project.org/package=survey.

Pennay, D., Phillips, B., Neiger, D., Ward, A., & Slamowicz, S. (2024). Results from the 2022 Australian Comparative Study of Survey Methods (CSRM & SRC Methods Paper No. 1/2024). ANU Centre for Social Research and Methods. https://polis.cass.anu.edu.au/files/docs/2025/6/ACSSM_Analytical_Report_21Jan2024_DP.pdf

R Core Team (2023). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/.

Rosenbaum, P. R., & Rubin, D. B. (1984). Reducing Bias in Observational Studies Using Subclassification on the Propensity Score. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 79(387), 516–524. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1984.10478078

Särndal, C.-E., B. Swensson and J. Wretman (1992). *Model Assisted Survey Sampling*. Springer-Verlag Publishing. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4612-4378-6.

Stekhoven D. J. and P. Buehlmann, P. (2012). MissForest - non-parametric missing value imputation for mixed-type data. *Bioinformatics*, 28(1), 112-118. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btr597.

Valliant, R. (2020). Comparing alternatives to estimation from nonprobability samples. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 8(2), 231–263. DOI: 10.1093/jssam/smz003.

Valliant, R., J. Dever and F. Kreuter (2018). *Practical Tools for Designing and Weighting Survey Samples*. (2nd ed.) Springer. Statistics for Social and Behavioral Sciences. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-93632-1.

The Social Research Centre Pty Ltd
Level 5, 350 Queen Street, Melbourne VIC 3000
PO Box 13328, Law Courts VIC 8010

03 9236 8500 | info@srcentre.com.au

srcentre.com.au

Social
Research
Centre