



# Community Wellbeing Indicators: Measures for Local Government



# Community Wellbeing Indicators Measures for local government

May 2013

## About the author

This report was prepared by Alan Morton and Lorell Edwards from Morton Consulting Services Pty Ltd. The authors have extensive experience consulting to local government in Queensland and elsewhere in Australia. Their areas of expertise include policy research and analysis, finance and rating, organisation structures, planning and regional development.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all those who assisted with this project including councils that provided feedback to the draft questionnaire. They would also like to thank Geoff Woolcock (Adjunct Associate Professor, School of Human Services and Social Work, Griffith University), and the staff of the Local Government Association of Queensland and the Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government whose support, comments and suggestions were greatly appreciated.

Cover images were provided by Penrith City Council.

## Citation

Morton, A. & Edwards, L. 2012, *Community Wellbeing Indicators, Survey Template for Local Government*, Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government, University of Technology, Sydney.

ISSN 1838-2525

## Preface

One of the most important objectives of the Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government (ACELG) is to support informed debate on key policy issues. We recognise that many councils and other local government organisations are not always able to undertake sufficient background research to underpin and develop sound, evidence-based policy. ACELG's *Research Paper Series* seeks to address this deficit. These research papers address a number of key areas of policy consideration and take a variety of forms, depending on their purpose.<sup>1</sup>

This report, *Community Wellbeing Indicators: Measures for Local Government*, builds on earlier research on frameworks for measuring liveability, including research undertaken by Penrith City Council (NSW) with ACELG support in 2012 (Olesson et al. 2012).

The Local Government Association of Queensland (LGAQ) initiated this project to develop better ways to understand and measure local community wellbeing, build a robust and consistent statistics base, improve community planning, and strengthen citizen involvement. LGAQ is of the view that all three levels of Government impact local communities and that measuring performance is critical to enhancing governance and general service delivery. This project builds on the Community Wellbeing Indicators Project commenced in March 2011 as part of a broader Community Indicators Queensland (CIQ) initiative.

The wellbeing of individuals and communities is fundamental to the work of local government and many councils prepare plans based on community needs and aspirations, either voluntarily or under legislative mandate. ACELG was keen to partner with LGAQ to undertake this work because of the sector's strong interest in developing a consistent approach to collecting information from local communities on their perception of wellbeing.

LGAQ and ACELG welcome feedback on this paper and encourage local governments across the country to consider using the survey template contained in this report as a key tool to source data for their long term planning.

For more information, please contact Stefanie Pillora, ACELG Program Manager, Research: [stefanie.pillora@acelg.org.au](mailto:stefanie.pillora@acelg.org.au).

### **Roberta Ryan**

Associate Professor and Director  
Australian Centre for Excellence in Local Government

### **Greg Hoffman**

General Manager, Advocacy  
Local Government Association of Queensland

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information see <<http://www.acelg.org.au/program-details.php?pid=1>>.

## Contents

Preface .....	2
1. Background .....	5
2. Framework .....	6
3. Draft Community Questionnaire .....	9
4. Benchmarking Results .....	11
5. Revised Questionnaire .....	13
6. Benchmarks from the 2013 Survey .....	17
7. The Next Steps .....	20
References .....	21
Attachment A .....	22
Attachment B .....	26
Attachment D .....	32
Attachment E .....	51

## 1. Background

LGAQ launched the **Community Wellbeing Indicators Project** in March 2011.

The Project was aimed at supporting councils in developing ways to better:

- understand and measure local community wellbeing
- build a consistent statistics base
- improve community planning
- strengthen citizen involvement in planning.

LGAQ undertook a community wellbeing indicator pilot survey in 2011 to trial a limited set of wellbeing indicators based on community perceptions, and to demonstrate the value of such an approach to local government.

The five pilot councils were Sunshine Coast, Gladstone, Isaac and Longreach, where a telephone survey was conducted, plus Wujal Wujal, an indigenous community where a small group of community members responded to the questionnaire in a forum group. **Attachment D** provides the research report from the pilot survey.

This current research project, jointly sponsored by LGAQ and ACELG, builds on national work undertaken in developing community wellbeing indicators and contributes to the enhanced capacity of Queensland councils to plan for, measure and report on the wellbeing of their communities.

In particular, this research aims to further develop the community wellbeing indicators survey approach used in the pilot project to provide a resource for councils to measure, analyse and assess the level of community wellbeing in a local government area.

A key objective of this research is to formulate a valid set of indicators which:

- provide a general indication of community wellbeing in a particular local government area
- can be benchmarked against results in other council areas.

The project does not seek to identify every possible measure of community wellbeing. Instead, the project aims to develop a practical community survey tool that can be used to assess and monitor community wellbeing within the framework of local community objectives and the context of local government roles and responsibilities.

## 2. Framework

The majority of Queensland councils have developed a long term community plan that embodies respective community views, visions and values, and outlines how the community aspires to reach its full potential.

The amended *Local Government Act 2012 (Qld)* removed the legislative requirement to adopt long term community plans. However, where community plans are in place across Queensland, there is reasonable community expectation that councils implement initiatives based on these plans. There is also widespread evidence across local governments in Queensland of an interest in using effective indicators for community planning before and after these legislative amendments.

The inter-relationship between community wellbeing, economic development, ecological sustainability, the built environment, social equity and justice have long been recognised as integral to the role of local government. This is reflected in a resurgent global interest in these inter-relationships, most evident in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Global Project for Measuring the Progress of Societies<sup>2</sup> and nationally with the Australian Bureau of Statistics' (ABS) Measures of Australia's Progress (MAP; ABS 2012) and Australian National Development Index (ANDI).<sup>3</sup>

The concept of community wellbeing has been the focus of research for many years but has been revitalised by a renewed interest in how it might be measured.

The 2001 LGAQ *Guideline for Integrating Community Wellbeing in Planning Schemes* specifically focuses on statutory planning impacts and community wellbeing relationships (LGAQ 2001).

The 2003/04 LGAQ *Local Government and Social Capital Action Research Project*<sup>4</sup> also furthered the interest in community wellbeing by focussing on relevant, practical steps for local government to enhance social capital, including the importance of collecting baseline community wellbeing data.

Furthermore, the June 2004 *Queensland Planner Journal* was devoted to articles focused on community wellbeing frameworks and engagement processes, thus attesting to the relevance of the concept (Cuthill 2004).

Previous research and analysis thus continues to inform ongoing research in the field of community wellbeing.

The primary objective of this project is to enhance local government's ability to measure the value of their investment in their communities across social, cultural, economic, environmental and democratic activities. The use of a standardised community survey is intended to assess these values and establish comparative benchmarks.

The concept aims at providing councils with a tool which will allow them to:

- measure community wellbeing using a number of standard indicators
- track changes over time in community wellbeing
- benchmark performance against results from comparative surveys in councils across the State
- identify policy measures that can improve community outcomes.

<sup>2</sup> See <<http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/>>.

<sup>3</sup> See <<http://www.andi.org.au>>.

<sup>4</sup> See <<http://www.lgaq.asn.au/web/guest/social-capital-action-research-project>>.

The project focuses on five themes developed by Community Indicators Queensland (CIQ)<sup>5</sup> as Table 2.1 shows.

**Table 2.1. Indicator Themes**

**CIQ framework domains**

1. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities
2. Culturally rich and vibrant communities
3. Dynamic resilient local economies
4. Sustainable built and natural environments
5. Democratic and engaged communities.

The project has also been assisted by community indicator research undertaken in other jurisdictions. In particular, the Community Indicators Victoria (CIV) survey undertaken for each local government area in Victoria has been of significant value (Social Research Centre n.d.).

The LGAQ wellbeing indicators project rolled out simultaneously with the Community Resilience project conducted jointly by the Queensland Council of Social Service and Griffith University using the same five domain CIQ framework informed by CIV.<sup>6</sup> The resilience measures project further confirmed the need for establishing baseline community wellbeing measures at the local government level.

Research on a local government framework for measuring liveability, undertaken by Penrith City Council and ACELG was also of value in assisting in the development of the draft questionnaire (Olesson et al. 2012).

Other international research and indicator frameworks have also been reviewed as part of the research conducted for this project.

In summation, key background research used in the development of the proposed Queensland local government community wellbeing survey included: CIQ 2011; Malcom 2012; Michaelson et al. 2009;<sup>7</sup> Olesson et al. 2012; Olesson, Albert & Coroneos 2012; and CIV 2013.<sup>8</sup> In addition, the *Australian Unity Wellbeing Index*<sup>9</sup> and the *World Values Survey*<sup>10</sup> were also of value in identifying the scope of questions to be included in the survey.

Measuring community wellbeing has been a focus of recent international research. The OECD *Better Life Initiative* is intended to provide an understanding of what drives the sense of wellbeing of people and nations, and what needs to be done to achieve greater progress for all.

The OECD report on this initiative notes that "... GDP has been the main factor by which [the OECD] has measured and understood economic and social progress. But it has failed to capture many of the factors that influence people's lives, such as security, leisure, income distribution and a clean environment" (*Executive Summary* n.d., p. 1).

<sup>5</sup> Community Indicators Queensland is an ongoing multi-agency project which focuses on the development of a framework, database and web interface, to support the creation and use of local community wellbeing indicators.

<sup>6</sup> See <<http://www.communityindicatorsqld.org.au/>>.

<sup>7</sup> See <<http://www.nationalaccountsofwellbeing.org/engage/survey.html>>.

<sup>8</sup> See <<http://www.communityindicators.net.au/>>.

<sup>9</sup> See <[www.australianunitycorporate.com.au/community/auwi/](http://www.australianunitycorporate.com.au/community/auwi/)>.

<sup>10</sup> See <<http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/>>.

The model developed through the New Economics Foundation's National Accounts of Wellbeing<sup>11</sup> relies on subjective ratings which capture personal wellbeing and social wellbeing assessments (Michaelson et al. 2009, p. 4). **Personal wellbeing** measures people's experiences of their positive and negative emotions, satisfaction, vitality, resilience, self-esteem and sense of positive functioning in the world. **Social wellbeing** measures people's experiences of supportive relationships and sense of trust and belonging with others.

A key issue for this project is the development of a valid set of questions. A further consideration has been how to minimise the number of questions required while still being able to provide an indication of relative community wellbeing.

The National Accounts of Wellbeing project reports two headline figures for personal and social wellbeing, noting that "... presenting separate data on 40 or so different questions would make it hard to see the patterns for the numbers and has the lack of reliability associated with using a single measure to capture any particular aspect of wellbeing" (ibid., p. 25).

These observations from international research were all relevant to the way in which this project has formulated a relatively simple set of questions covering the indicator themes noted in Table 2.1.

This research tool was designed to be relevant to the majority of local governments which typically do not have the research resources of the larger councils.

---

<sup>11</sup> See <<http://www.nationalaccountsofwellbeing.org/>>.



### 3. Draft Community Questionnaire

**Attachment A** includes the draft survey questionnaire based on work undertaken in the pilot study, feedback obtained from that survey, as well as from review of community wellbeing surveys being conducted in other jurisdictions.

Table 3.1 summarises the key indicator frameworks that contributed to the selection of each question in the draft survey instrument. The frameworks drawn on have been coded using the abbreviations noted in Section 2 above for each source.

In some cases, the wording of the question has been modified from that used in the specific framework noted in Table 3.1 to suit the approach developed for this survey instrument, including benchmarking on the mean scores for each question.

**Table 3.1. Proposed Indicators and Frameworks Contributing to Question**

Item	CIQ	CIV	PCC	ESS
1. Public transport adequacy	X	X	X	
2. Health service adequacy				
3. Education service adequacy				
4. Sport and recreation	X		X	
5. Arts and culture	X	X	X	
6. Park upkeep	X	X		
7. Park accessibility	X			
8. Bikeways	X	X		
9. Walking paths	X	X		
10. Protection of natural environment				
11. Liveable built environment				
12. Suitability for young children				
13. Suitability for teenagers				
14. Suitability for seniors				
15. Level of support from friends	X			
16. Level of support from family	X			
17. Level of support from neighbours	X			
18. Access for disabled			X	
19. Racial harmony	X	X	X	
20. Community involvement	X		X	
21. Safety when alone	X	X	X	
22. Life Satisfaction	X	X	X	X
23. Work not demanding or stressful		X		X
24. Work not interfering with family life	X	X		X
25. Job security		X		X
26. Impact of cost of living				
27. Impact of housing cost	X	X	X	
28. Opportunities for engagement		X	X	
29. Appropriate range and quality of council services			X	
30. Ability to access internet	X	X	X	
31. Ability to access private or public transport	X			

While the draft questionnaire was intended to cover the various themes shown in Table 2.1, it has not been set out in groups of questions by theme. A key reason for this approach is that some questions may appear to the respondent as more confronting in terms of their personal circumstances. The approach has been to start with the questions which are less personal, allowing the respondent time to adjust to the nature of the survey.

It is a practical fact that household surveys need to be kept to a manageable size in terms of the time to administer the instrument. The thrust of this project was to develop an efficient and effective tool which can be used consistently by councils, while also providing the capacity to identify any differences for each community from typical (average) responses.

Ten councils in Queensland representing a cross-section of council types and economic and demographic circumstances were invited to review the draft questionnaire. This move sought to ascertain the relevance of the survey to their local context and seek feedback on how well these questions met their needs for a valid set of key indicators to measure and monitor community wellbeing.

Reviewers were also asked to identify the relative importance of each question to their context and community, as well as to identify possibilities for rewording and/or additional questions to better meet their needs.

Of the ten councils invited to review the questionnaire, the following six responded:

- Central Highlands
- Gympie
- Isaac
- Mackay
- Townsville
- Western Downs.

One other council responded verbally that they felt the survey instrument was useful to them but no written comments were received. Three councils completed the feedback form which included the opportunity to rate the perceived priority of each question relative to their community.

The participation and support of those councils that participated is appreciated.

**Attachment B** summarises the feedback and the collective priority of each question based on those responses.

As noted, the draft questionnaire sought to present a valid survey instrument containing a limited number of questions addressing the various themes associated with community wellbeing.

This basic set of questions covering community wellbeing can readily be supplemented with additional questions of particular relevance to each community, along with feedback requirements of each council.

**Attachment B** reports the suggestions on additional questions or variations made by the participating councils.

## 4. Benchmarking Results

The majority of the draft survey questions have been formulated using a five point scale. This allows the results to be measured in a number of ways. For example, the percentage giving satisfied or very satisfied ratings provides a measure of wellbeing. The higher the result, the better the wellbeing status of the community on that measure.

It is also possible to develop a mean score out of a possible maximum of 5 based on the spread of the results from “very unsatisfied” to “very satisfied”. An average score across all indicators can then be produced to provide a simple measure of overall community wellbeing. This is considered as a better measure than simply using the percentage with high ratings (4 or 5) as this can be affected by differences in the response rate and spread of “poor” ratings.

To illustrate the benchmarking approach, the overall results from the pilot surveys are presented in Table 4.1. This provides an initial calibration of the indicators which can be further developed as the results from surveys in other communities are produced and collated. Section 6 of this report provides details of the survey conducted in March 2013 to further calibrate the questions developed in the final questionnaire.

**Table 4.1. Proposed Indicators and Pilot Survey Scores**

Item	Pilot Survey Score (Total Sample)
1. Public transport adequacy	3.9
2. Health service adequacy	3.2
3. Education service adequacy	3.9
4. Sport and recreation	3.8
5. Arts and culture	3.4
6. Park upkeep	3.6
7. Park accessibility	3.6
8. Bikeways	3.2
9. Walking paths	3.3
10. Protection of natural environment	3.5
11. Liveable built environment	Not piloted
12. Suitability for young children	3.8
13. Suitability for teenagers	3.4
14. Suitability for seniors	3.7
15. Level of support from friends	4.1
16. Level of support from family	4.1
17. Level of support from neighbours	3.9
18. Access for disabled	3.4
19. Racial harmony	4.0
20. Community involvement	Not piloted as rating
21. Safety when alone	4.0
22. Life Satisfaction	4.2
23. Work not demanding or stressful	3.2
24. Work not interfering with family life	3.3
25. Job security	3.8
26. Impact of cost of living	2.6
27. Impact of housing cost	Not piloted

Item	Pilot Survey Score (Total Sample)
28. Opportunities for engagement	3.0
29. Appropriate range and quality of council services	Not piloted
30. Ability to access internet	Not piloted
31. Ability to access private or public transport	Not piloted
<b>Average of above</b>	<b>3.6</b>

The questions and rating scales have all been framed so that higher scores are given for higher levels of satisfaction, wellbeing or less adverse impact to an individual's lifestyle. This ensures that there is a consistency in the measures being reported.

Clearly, a limited set of questions cannot measure in absolute terms overall community wellbeing. However, provided the questions cover a range of relevant and tested topics then an indication of community wellbeing can be obtained. Importantly, results can be benchmarked against other community surveys using the standard set of indicator questions.

It is also possible to produce benchmarks for each theme by grouping questions into the indicator themes noted earlier. This is discussed in Section 5 of this report.

## 5. Revised Questionnaire

Following feedback from the participating councils, the draft questionnaire was revised. The questions developed for the final questionnaire are summarised below. **Attachment C** contains the revised formatted questionnaire.

### Summary of Revised Questions

1. How would you rate the adequacy of the following services in your local community in terms of your needs and wellbeing?
  - a) public transport
  - b) health services
  - c) education
2. How adequate are the opportunities in your local community for you to effectively engage in:
  - a) sport and recreation
  - b) art and cultural activities
3. How would you rate the opportunity for social interaction within your local community's public spaces?
4. How do you rate the parks, reserves and open spaces in your local community for:
  - a) upkeep
  - b) accessibility
  - c) facilities
5. How do you rate the availability in your local community of:
  - a) bikeways
  - b) walking paths
6. How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your local community:
  - a) to protect and conserve the natural environment
  - b) to provide a socially inclusive environment
  - c) to provide a liveable built environment
7. How would you rate the suitability of your local community for:
  - a) young children
  - b) teenagers
  - c) seniors
8. How would you rate the level of support available to you from:
  - a) friends
  - b) family
  - c) neighbours
9. How would you rate access to buildings and services in your local community for people with a physical disability?
10. How strongly do you agree or disagree that your local community is welcoming of people from different cultures?
11. How would you rate your level of involvement in your local community as a volunteer or member of a community organisation?
12. How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place in your local community?
13. Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?
14. What is your current work status?
15. If 'working' then: do you agree or disagree with the following statements
  - a) my work is not too demanding and stressful
  - b) my work and family life do not interfere with each other

- c) I have good job security
16. How would you rate the impact on your household from the increasing costs of living?
  17. How would you rate the impact on your household's finances of your current rental or mortgage payments?
  18. How satisfactory is the way your local council provides opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?
  19. How would you rate the overall performance of your local council in delivering an appropriate range and quality of services relevant to your household's needs?
  20. How satisfactory is your ability to access the internet whenever you need to?
  21. How satisfactory is your ability to access private or public transport to meet your daily mobility requirements?

As noted previously, an important outcome from the use of a standardised set of questions is the ability to benchmark responses in a particular council area with averages derived from surveys in other localities. Obviously, this needs some organisation to collate data and disseminate the results.

LGAQ does undertake a biennial Community Satisfaction Tracking Study which reports on the results at a state-wide level. LGAQ has disseminated the study results as a benchmarking exercise and encouraged councils to undertake similar surveys to obtain specific results on community satisfaction for their area.<sup>12</sup>

LGAQ has indicated that they will consider a biennial state-wide survey using the questionnaire developed in this project. The first such survey was conducted in March 2013 to provide benchmarks for all the questions in this final survey instrument.

It is not known how many councils across the state use the questions included in the LGAQ Community Satisfaction Tracking Study, and there is no centralised process to collate such data.

In contrast, the CIV process is undertaken centrally and consequently data can be collated to provide benchmarking across council segments.

As noted earlier, the questions have been framed around the five themes used by CIQ, namely:

1. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities
2. Culturally rich and vibrant communities
3. Dynamic resilient local economies
4. Sustainable built and natural environments
5. Democratic and engaged communities.

Table 5.1 groups these questions by theme.

It should be noted that some questions are relevant to other themes, but the grouping allocates each question to one theme only. Scores achieved in the pilot survey for similar questions are shown along with an average score for each theme.

---

<sup>12</sup> Tracking studies available on the LGAQ website. See <<http://www.lgaq.asn.au/web/guest/library>>.

**Table 5.1: Questions grouped by Theme**

Theme	Score
<b>1.0 Healthy, safe and inclusive communities</b>	
How would you rate the opportunity for social interaction within your local community's public spaces?	N/A
How would you rate the suitability of your local community for:	
young children	3.8
teenagers	3.4
seniors	3.7
How would you rate the level of support available to you from:	
friends	4.1
family	4.1
neighbours	3.9
How would you rate access to buildings and services in your local community for people with a physical disability?	3.4
How would you rate your level of involvement in your local community as a volunteer or member of a community organisation?	N/A
How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place in your local community?	4.0
How satisfactory is your ability to access the internet whenever you need to?	N/A
<b>Average for Theme "Healthy, safe and inclusive communities"</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>2.0 Culturally rich and vibrant communities</b>	
How adequate are the opportunities in your local community for you to effectively engage in:	
sport and recreation	3.8
art and cultural activities	3.4
How strongly do you agree or disagree that your local community is welcoming of people from different cultures?	N/A
Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?	4.2
<b>Average for Theme "Culturally rich and vibrant communities"</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>3.0 Dynamic resilient local economies</b>	
If 'working' then: do you agree or disagree with the following statements:	
my work is not too demanding and stressful	3.2
my work and family life do not interfere with each other	3.3
I have good job security	3.8
How would you rate the impact on your household from the increasing costs of living?	2.6
How would you rate the impact on your household's finances of your current rental or mortgage payments?	N/A
<b>Average for Theme "Dynamic resilient local economies"</b>	<b>3.2</b>
<b>4.0 Sustainable built and natural environments</b>	
How do you rate the parks, reserves and open spaces in your local community for:	
upkeep	3.6
accessibility	3.6
facilities	N/A
How do you rate the availability in your local community of :	
bikeways	3.2
walking paths	3.3
How would you rate the adequacy of the following services in your local community in terms of your needs and wellbeing:	
public transport	3.9
health services	3.2
education	3.9
How satisfactory is your ability to access private or public transport to meet your daily mobility requirements?	N/A
How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your local community:	
to protect and conserve the natural environment	3.5
to provide a socially inclusive environment	N/A
to provide a liveable built environment	N/A
<b>Average for Theme "Sustainable built and natural environments"</b>	<b>3.6</b>

Theme	Score
<b>5.0 Democratic and engaged communities</b>	
How satisfactory is the way your local council provides opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?	3.0
How would you rate the overall performance of your local council in delivering an appropriate range and quality of services relevant to your household's needs?	N/A
<b>Average for Theme "Democratic and engaged communities"</b>	<b>3.0</b>
<b>Average for all questions</b>	<b>3.6</b>

The lowest theme scores were for "democratic and engaged communities" (although only one question had been scored) and for "dynamic resilient local economies". Neither of these results is surprising. A number of other surveys have shown low scores for questions on community engagement which are relevant to the "democratic and engaged communities" theme. Similarly, given the current economic climate, a lower score in the "dynamic resilient local economies" theme is not surprising.

Again, it is important to reiterate that the benchmark scores shown are from a limited cross-section of councils and situations.

For this reason, it was considered appropriate to undertake a state-wide survey as part of this project using the final questionnaire. This provides a sound cross-section of situations within the State, as well as providing benchmarks for questions that were not used in the pilot.



## 6. Benchmarks from the 2013 Survey

As noted earlier, a state-wide survey was undertaken in March 2013 to further develop the benchmark scoring system for each question.

**Attachment E** provides the full results from this survey along with detailed tables for each question. The questionnaire used is **Attachment C**.

In this survey, 500 people were interviewed in the following areas:-

- Southeast Queensland (SEQ) (n= 250)
- Regional cities (n= 150)
- Rural balance (n=100).

These groupings were used as they generally corresponded with LGAQ's council segments. The LGAQ council segments are:

- SEQ
- Coastal (the regional cities sample covers these councils)
- Resource
- Rural (the rural sample covers both the rural and resource segments)
- Indigenous (the Indigenous councils were not included in this telephone sample).

This sample frame also allowed any differences in ratings by geographic location to be identified.

Table 6.2 shows the results obtained from this survey. At the aggregate level, there is very little difference for the ratings given by each geographic sector, or those given in the 2011 pilot. For most questions there was little significant difference in the responses by gender or by age group.

At the aggregate level, the total score of 3.43 (68.6%) was only marginally below the 2011 pilot survey (72%) result. For most of the questions, the mean scores were similar in the 2011 and 2013 surveys.

However, there were three questions where the results were significantly different. These are shown in Table 6.1.

For 'Public transport adequacy', part of the difference could be explained by the re-wording of this question. For 'Job security', the ongoing economic downturn could well explain the more pessimistic view in 2013.

**Table 6.1. Significant Variations between 2011 and 2013 Results**

Item	2011 Pilot Survey	2013 Survey
Public transport adequacy	3.9	2.75
Suitability of community for teenagers	3.4	2.97
Job security	3.8	3.08

Given the relatively small sample of the State included in the 2011 pilot survey along with changes to the questions, it is considered appropriate to adopt the 2013 state-wide results as the initial benchmark for community wellbeing monitoring.

**Table 6.2. 2013 Community Wellbeing Survey Scores**

Item	2011 Pilot Survey	2013 Survey	SEQ 2013	Provincial Cities 2013	Rural 2013
1. Public transport adequacy	3.9	<b>2.75</b>	3.00	2.66	2.23
2. Health service adequacy	3.2	<b>3.48</b>	3.58	3.44	3.28
3. Education service adequacy	3.9	<b>3.71</b>	3.79	3.61	3.65
4. Sport and recreation	3.8	<b>3.74</b>	3.73	3.73	3.78
5. Arts and culture	3.4	<b>3.35</b>	3.34	3.26	3.53
6. Social interaction in public spaces	Not piloted	<b>3.58</b>	3.48	3.78	3.51
7. Park/reserves upkeep	3.6	<b>3.77</b>	3.97	3.47	3.71
8. Park/reserves accessibility	3.6	<b>3.84</b>	4.00	3.58	3.84
9. Park/reserves facilities	Not piloted	<b>3.58</b>	3.68	3.47	3.48
10. Bikeways	3.2	<b>2.96</b>	3.06	2.81	2.94
11. Walking paths	3.3	<b>3.16</b>	3.34	2.92	3.09
12. Protection of natural environment	3.5	<b>3.49</b>	3.58	3.38	3.46
13. Socially inclusive environment	Not piloted	<b>3.40</b>	3.45	3.39	3.30
14. Liveable built environment	Not piloted	<b>3.50</b>	3.56	3.34	3.54
15. Suitability for young children	3.8	<b>3.52</b>	3.49	3.49	3.63
16. Suitability for teenagers	3.4	<b>2.97</b>	2.90	3.13	2.90
17. Suitability for seniors	3.7	<b>3.58</b>	3.58	3.61	3.52
18. Level of support from Friends	4.1	<b>4.30</b>	4.21	4.44	4.30
19. Level of support from family	4.1	<b>4.32</b>	4.32	4.37	4.23
20. Level of support from neighbours	3.9	<b>3.93</b>	3.91	3.89	4.05
21. Access for disabled	3.4	<b>3.37</b>	3.31	3.44	3.39
22. Welcoming of people from different cultures	Not piloted	<b>3.57</b>	3.42	3.74	3.65
23. Volunteer/organisation involvement	Not piloted	<b>2.26</b>	2.40	1.93	2.41
24. Safety when alone	4.0	<b>3.72</b>	3.83	3.48	3.82
25. Life satisfaction	4.2	<b>4.30</b>	4.27	4.42	4.18
26. Work not demanding or stressful	3.2	<b>3.01</b>	3.13	2.79	3.07
27. Work not interfering with family life	3.3	<b>3.16</b>	3.24	2.79	3.49
28. Job security	3.8	<b>3.08</b>	3.18	2.63	3.51
29. Impact of cost of living	2.6	<b>2.37</b>	2.38	2.25	2.51
30. Impact of housing cost	Not piloted	<b>3.29</b>	3.48	2.77	3.60
31. Opportunities for engagement	3.0	<b>3.02</b>	3.02	3.07	2.96
32. Range and quality of council services	Not piloted	<b>3.18</b>	3.25	3.05	3.18
33. Ability to access internet	Not piloted	<b>3.96</b>	3.98	4.01	3.82
34. Ability to access private or public transport	Not piloted	<b>3.55</b>	3.66	3.16	3.85
<b>Average of above</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.43</b>

As previously discussed in Section 5, it is also useful to aggregate the scores by each of the five themes. Table 6.3 summarises the results by theme for both the 2013 survey and the 2011 pilot. Table 6.4 shows the scores for each question included under each theme. As noted earlier, all questions were not used in the 2011 survey, but it is still useful to compare the two data sets.

**Table 6.3. Themed Scores in the 2013 Survey and 2011 Pilot**

Theme	Score 2013	Pilot 2011
1. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	3.69	3.8
2. Culturally rich and vibrant communities	3.74	3.8
3. Dynamic resilient local economies	2.98	3.2
4. Sustainable built and natural environments	3.46	3.6
5. Democratic and engaged communities	3.10	3.0

**Table 6.4. Questions Grouped by Theme and 2013 Scores**

Theme and questions	Score
<b>1. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities</b>	
How would you rate opportunity for social interaction within your local community's public spaces?	3.58
How would you rate the suitability of your local community for:	
Young children	3.52
Teenagers	2.97
Seniors	3.58
How would you rate the level of support available to you from:	
Friends	4.30
Family	4.32
Neighbours	3.93
How would you rate access to buildings & services in local community for people with physical disability?	3.37
How would you rate your level of involvement in your local community as a volunteer or member of a community organisation.	2.26
How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place in your local community?	3.72
How satisfactory is your ability to access the internet whenever you need to?	3.96
<b>Average for theme "healthy, safe and inclusive communities"</b>	<b>3.69</b>
<b>2. Culturally rich and vibrant communities</b>	
How adequate are the opportunities in your local community for you to effectively engage in:	
Sport and recreation	3.74
Art & cultural activities	3.35
How strongly do you agree or disagree that your local community is welcoming of people from different cultures?	3.57
Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?	4.30
<b>Average for theme "culturally rich and vibrant communities"</b>	<b>3.74</b>
<b>3. Dynamic resilient local economies</b>	
If 'working' then: do you agree or disagree with the following statements:	
My work is not too demanding and stressful	3.01
My work and family life do not interfere with each other	3.16
I have good job security	3.08
How would you rate the impact on your household from the increasing costs of living?	2.37
How would you rate the impact on your household's finances of your current rental or mortgage payments?	3.29
<b>Average for theme "dynamic resilient local economies"</b>	<b>2.98</b>
<b>4. Sustainable built and natural environments</b>	
How do you rate the parks, reserves and open spaces in your local community for:	
Upkeep	3.77
Accessibility	3.84
Facilities	3.58
How do you rate the availability in your local community of :	
Bikeways	2.96
Walking paths	3.16
How would you rate the adequacy of the following services in your local community in terms of your needs and wellbeing:	
Public transport	2.75
Health services	3.48
Education	3.71
How satisfactory is your ability to access private or public transport to meet your daily mobility requirements?	3.55
How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your local community:	
To protect and conserve the natural environment	3.49
To provide a socially inclusive environment	3.40
To provide a liveable built environment	3.50
<b>Average for theme "sustainable built and natural environments"</b>	<b>3.46</b>
<b>5. Democratic and engaged communities</b>	
How satisfactory is the way your local council provides opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?	3.02
How would you rate the overall performance of your local council in delivering an appropriate range and quality of services relevant to your households needs?	3.18
<b>Average for theme "democratic and engaged communities"</b>	<b>3.1</b>
<b>Average for all questions</b>	<b>3.43</b>

## 7. The Next Steps

The project has provided a community wellbeing survey instrument with benchmark scores for each question and theme. The overall benchmark score for wellbeing is 68.6%, about halfway between the “fair” to “satisfactory” ratings typically used in the survey questions.

Data from the *Australian Unity Wellbeing Index* survey in April 2011 (Cummins et al. 2011) provides an indication of how well this survey corresponds with other surveys aimed at measuring wellbeing. In this Australian Unity survey, two indexes generally cover the themes used for this study. For ‘personal wellbeing’ the score was 75.9%, while for ‘national wellbeing’ the score was 62.7%. Combining these two indexes gives a score of 69.3%, very similar to the aggregate score above.

The intent of this project was to provide a survey template and benchmarks that could be used by other councils, in Queensland or elsewhere. LGAQ will place the results of this project, including the questionnaire and benchmarks, on-line. LGAQ also intends to promote the use of the questionnaire by Queensland councils and expects to replace its biennial Community Attitudes Survey with this survey tool.

Where a council uses the specific questions and survey framework, it would be valuable if individual council results were collated and also made available through the LGAQ website. This would provide more specific benchmarks for different types of councils.

Consideration could also be given to developing a web-based questionnaire. While such surveys do not have the rigour of a random sample, they do provide an opportunity to collect and analyse a large volume of data.

Such web-based personal wellbeing surveys are available on the Australian Unity website, through the World Values Survey, and the National Accounts of Wellbeing discussed earlier in this report.

ACELG will distribute the report widely through its national local government networks and will support the LGAQ in promoting the use of the survey in other jurisdictions.

## References

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2012, *Measures of Australia's Progress - aspirations for our nation: a conversation with Australians about progress*, 1370.0.00.002, ABS, Australian Capital Territory.

Community Indicators Queensland (CIQ) 2011, *Draft Community Indicators Framework*, Community Indicators Queensland, South Brisbane, Queensland.

Community Indicators Victoria (CIV) 2013, *Community Indicators Victoria*, The University of Melbourne, viewed 30 April 2013, <<http://www.communityindicators.net.au/>>.

Cummins, R.A., Woerner, J., Hartley-Clark, L., Perera, C., Gibson-Prosser, A., Collard, J. & Horfiniak, K. 2011, *The Wellbeing of Australians – Relationships and the Internet*, Australian Unity Wellbeing Index Survey 25.0, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria.

Cuthill, M. 2004, 'Focus – Community Wellbeing', *Queensland Planner*, vol. 44, no. 2, p. 8.

*Executive Summary* n.d., OECD, viewed 30 April 2013, <<http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/wpsystem/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/EXECUTIVE-SUMMARY1.pdf>>.

Local Government Association Of Queensland (LGAQ) 2001, *A Guideline For Integrating Community Wellbeing In Planning*, LGAQ, Queensland.

Malcom, F. 2012, *Resilience Profiles Project*, Final Report, Community Indicators Queensland, South Brisbane, Queensland.

Michaelson, J., Abdallah, S., Steuer, N., Thompson, S. & Marks, N. 2009, *National Accounts of Well-being: bringing real wealth onto the balance sheet*, New Economics Foundation, London.

Olesson, E., Albert, E., Coroneos, R., Leeson, R., and Wyatt, R. 2012, *Options for a local government framework for measuring liveability*, Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government, University of Technology, Sydney.

Olesson, E., Albert & E., Coroneos 2012, *Measuring Liveability Community Wellbeing Framework and Indicators Stage 2 – Final Draft for Consultation*, Unpublished.

Social Policy and Implementation Branch of the Chief Minister's Department (CMD) 2007, *Community Well-being Indicators*, Discussion Paper, Australian Capital Territory (ACT) Community Inclusion Board, ACT.

The Social Research Centre n.d., *Victorian Community Survey Main Study Core Questionnaire v1.1*, The Social Research Centre, North Melbourne, Victoria.

## Attachment A

### Draft local government community wellbeing questionnaire 2012

#### Introduction

We are conducting a survey about community wellbeing. The data compiled from this survey will be used to assist local government with its planning and delivery of community services and in their advocacy role to State and Federal Governments.

We are talking about various issues to find out how important they are to you, on a scale of 1 to 5

**[Note: Introduction details will change depending on how survey is administered]**

1. How would you rate the adequacy of the following services in your community in terms of your needs and wellbeing? Use a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 being very unsatisfactory and 5 being excellent.

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Public transport	1	2	3	4	5	6
Health services	1	2	3	4	5	6
Education	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. How adequate are the opportunities in your community for you to engage in:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Sport and recreation	1	2	3	4	5	6
Art and cultural activities	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. Again using a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 being very unsatisfactory and 5 being very satisfactory, how do you rate the parks in your community for:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Upkeep	1	2	3	4	5	6
Accessibility	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Still using the 1 to 5 scale, how do you rate the availability in your community of:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Bikeways	1	2	3	4	5	6
Walking paths	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your community:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
To protect and conserve the natural environment	1	2	3	4	5	6
To provide a liveable built environment	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. How would you rate the suitability of your community for:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Young children	1	2	3	4	5	6
Teenagers	1	2	3	4	5	6
Seniors	1	2	3	4	5	6

**7. How would you rate the level of support available to you from:**

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
<b>Friends</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Family</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Neighbours</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6

**8. How would you rate access to buildings and services in your community for people with a disability?**

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**9. How would you rate the racial harmony in your community?**

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**10. How would you rate your level of involvement in your community as a volunteer or member of a community organisation. Use a scale from 1 for no involvement at all to 5 for very actively involved:**

Not involved at all	Very limited involvement	Some involvement	Actively involved	Very actively involved	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**11. How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place in your community?**

Very unsafe	Unsafe	Fair only	Safe	Very safe	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**12. Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?**

Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Fair only	Satisfied	Very satisfied	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**13. What is your current work status? Are you**

Working full-time?	1	Home duties?	4
Working part-time?	2	Retired?	5
Unemployed?	3	Incapacitated?	6

**14. If 'working' (1 or 2) then: On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree, do you agree or disagree with the following statements**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
<b>My work is not too demanding and stressful</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<b>My work and family life do not interfere with each other</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<b>I have good job security</b>	1	2	3	4	5

**15. How would you rate the impact on your household from the increasing costs of living? Use a scale of 1 (very badly affected) to 5 (not affected at all).**

Very badly affected	Affected	Only a little	Does not affect much	Does not affect at all	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

16. How would you rate the impact on your household's finances of your current rental or mortgage payments? Use a scale of 1 (very badly affected) to 5 (not affected at all).

Very badly affected	Affected	Only a little	Does not affect much	Does not affect at all	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

17. How satisfactory is the way your local council provides opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

18. How would you rate the overall performance of your local council in delivering an appropriate range and quality of services relevant to your households needs?

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

19. How satisfactory is your ability to access the internet whenever you need to?

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

20. How satisfactory is your ability to access private or public transport to meet your daily mobility requirements?

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

## Demographics

Record gender: Male 1 Female 2

Thank you for that. Now just to make sure we are speaking to a good cross-section of people could I have your:

Age group..... 18-24 1 35-44 3 55-64 5  
25-34 2 45-54 4 65+ 6

In which country were you born?

Australia 01  
Great Britain 02  
New Zealand 03  
Italy 04  
Vietnam 05  
India 06  
USA 07  
China 08  
Other (specify) \* \_\_\_\_\_



And what is the present occupation of the main income-earner of your household? (**PROBE, WRITE ON THE LINE AND THEN CODE BELOW**)

- .....
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Manager/Administrator/Professional                       | 1 |
| Para-professional/Trades person                          | 2 |
| Clerical worker/ Sales or Personal Service worker        | 3 |
| Plant or machine operator/ Driver/ Labourer/ Farm worker | 4 |
| Main income-earner not working / No breadwinner          | 5 |

**What group would the total annual household income be...**

- Less than say \$25K 1  
\$25 to \$50K? 2  
Over \$50K 3

**What is your household situation? Are you...**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Living alone                           | 1 |
| A single person, sharing accommodation | 2 |
| Living as a couple                     | 3 |
| Living as a family (2 parent)          | 4 |
| Living as a family (1 parent)          | 5 |

**What is your current postcode?** \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment B

### Draft local government community wellbeing questionnaire 2012 Feedback Form

#### Priority of Questions based on respondent ratings

Question	Low priority	Medium priority	High priority
1. Adequacy of the following services in your community in terms of your needs and wellbeing? Public transport Health services Education		2 2 2	
2. Adequacy of the opportunities in your community for you to engage in: Sport and recreation Art and cultural activities			2.7 2.7
3. How do you rate the parks in your community for: Upkeep Accessibility			2.7 2.7
4. How do you rate the availability in your community of : Bikeways Walking paths			2.7 2.7
5. How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your community: To protect and conserve the natural environment To provide a liveable built environment		2	2.7
6. How would you rate the suitability of your community for: Young children Teenagers Seniors		2.3	3 2.7
7. How would you rate the level of support available to you from: Friends Family Neighbours		2.3 2.3	2.7
8. How would you rate access to buildings and services in your community for people with a disability?		2.3	
9. How would you rate the racial harmony in your community?		1.8	
10. How would you rate your level of involvement in your community as a volunteer or member of a community organisation.		2.3	
11. How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place in your community?			2.7
12. Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?		1.8	
13. If 'working' then: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements: My work is not too demanding and stressful My work and family life do not interfere with each other I have good job security		1.8 1.8 1.8	
14. How would you rate the impact on your household from the increasing costs of living?			2.7
15. How would you rate the impact on your household's finances of your current rental or mortgage payments?		2.3	
16. How satisfactory is the way your local council provides opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?			3
17. How would you rate the overall performance of your local council in delivering an appropriate range and quality of services relevant to your households needs?			2.7

Question	Low priority	Medium priority	High priority
18. How satisfactory is your ability to access the internet whenever you need to?		2.3	
19. How satisfactory is your ability to access private or public transport to meet your daily mobility requirements?			2.7

**Suggested Additional Questions:**

1. The opportunity for social interaction within your community's public places
2. Efforts made to provide a socially inclusive and connected environment
3. The ease of access to your local council
4. The ability to make an easy choice about living an environmentally sustainable lifestyle
5. Efforts made to promote a connection to natural and cultural heritage
6. The ability to access fresh and healthy food at affordable prices
7. The opportunity to showcase the community's creativity
8. The opportunity to celebrate the community's multiculturalism.

**Other Feedback**

*I believe the questions listed on your survey are excellent to gain community perceptions on these important issues. The list is simple, short and easy to manage.*

*This is an exciting project and would be very interested in Council using it both as a local survey but also as part of a wider community attitude survey on council services.*

*Some additional questions specifically relating to indigenous and multicultural communities would be useful.*

*The survey responses would be useful in measuring perceptions aligned against Community Plan goals (this would be complementary to a measure of progress relating to actions)*

*I consider the survey adequately covers the range of issues at a basic level.*

*Q3. Add "Facilities"*

*Wording of Question 3 - maybe add " parks, reserves and open spaces"*

*There is only one question on health service. Could we also ask about mental and physical wellbeing. or public health awareness?*

*In regards to safety can we split the question into two scenarios? One when they are alone and one when in a crowded place.... security and feeling safe is just as much an issue in a crowd as it can be walking alone along the street.*

*In regard to "sustainable built environments" we need to cover more than parks and bikeways - we need to also ask about the connectivity of the community through road and transport networks. Maybe also a traffic congestion question.*

*Question 18 seems more like a customer satisfaction survey question not a community wellbeing or engagement question.*

*The income spectrum seems to be too limited.*

*In terms of 'personal / demographic' info adding a category to household situation eg living as a family (other) that might include indigenous families with many relatives living under the one roof.*

## Attachment C

### REVISED SURVEY INSTRUMENT

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMUNITY WELLBEING QUESTIONNAIRE

#### Introduction

We are conducting a survey about community wellbeing. The data compiled from this survey will be used to assist local government with its planning and delivery of community services and in their advocacy role to State and Federal Governments.

We are talking about various issues to find out how important they are to you, on a scale of 1 for a low rating to 5 for a top score.

**[Note: Introduction details will change depending on how survey is administered]**

1. How would you rate the adequacy of the following services in your local community in terms of your needs and wellbeing? Use a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 being very unsatisfactory and 5 being very satisfactory.

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Public transport	1	2	3	4	5	6
Health services	1	2	3	4	5	6
Education	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. How adequate are the opportunities in your local community for you to effectively engage in:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Sport and recreation	1	2	3	4	5	6
Art and cultural activities	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. How would you rate the opportunity for social interaction within your local community's public spaces?

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	D/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Again using a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 being very unsatisfactory and 5 being very satisfactory, how do you rate the parks, reserves and open spaces in your local community for:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Upkeep	1	2	3	4	5	6
Accessibility	1	2	3	4	5	6
Facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. Still using the 1 to 5 scale, how do you rate the availability in your local community of :

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Bikeways	1	2	3	4	5	6
Walking paths	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your local community:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
To protect and conserve the natural environment	1	2	3	4	5	6
To provide a socially inclusive environment	1	2	3	4	5	6
To provide a liveable built environment	1	2	3	4	5	6

7. How would you rate the suitability of your local community for:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Young children	1	2	3	4	5	6
Teenagers	1	2	3	4	5	6
Seniors	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. How would you rate the level of support available to you from:

	Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
Friends	1	2	3	4	5	6
Family	1	2	3	4	5	6
Neighbours	1	2	3	4	5	6

9. How would you rate access to buildings and services in your local community for people with a physical disability?

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

10. How strongly do you agree or disagree that your local community is welcoming of people from different cultures? Use a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

11. How would you rate your level of involvement in your local community as a volunteer or member of a community organisation? Use a scale from 1 for no involvement at all to 5 for very actively involved:

Not involved at all	Very limited involvement	Some involvement	Actively involved	Very actively involved	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

12. How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place in your local community?

Very unsafe	Unsafe	fair only	Safe	Very safe	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

13. Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?

Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Fair only	Satisfied	Very satisfied	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

14. What is your current work status? Are you:

Working full-time?	1	Home duties?	4
Working part-time?	2	Retired?	5
Unemployed?	3	Incapacitated?	6

15. If 'working' (1or 2) then: On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
My work is not too demanding and stressful	1	2	3	4	5
My work and family life do not interfere with each other	1	2	3	4	5
I have good job security	1	2	3	4	5

**16. How would you rate the impact from the increasing costs of living on your household? Use a scale of 1 (very badly affected) to 5 (not affected at all).**

Very badly affected	Affected	Only a little	Does not affect much	Does not affect at all	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**17. How would you rate the impact of your current rental or mortgage payments on your household's finances? Use a scale of 1 (very badly affected) to 5 (not affected at all).**

Very badly affected	Affected	Only a little	Does not affect much	Does not affect at all	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**18. How satisfactory is the way your local council provides opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?**

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**19. How would you rate the overall performance of your local council in delivering an appropriate range and quality of services relevant to your household needs?**

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	d/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**20. How satisfactory is your ability to access the internet whenever you need to use it?**

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	D/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

**21. How satisfactory is your ability to access private or public transport to meet your daily mobility requirements?**

Very unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Fair only	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	D/k
1	2	3	4	5	6

### Demographics

**Record Gender:** Male 1 Female 2

**Thank you for that. Now just to make sure we are speaking to a good cross-section of people could I have your:**

Age group..... 18-24 1 35-44 3 55-64 5  
25-34 2 45-54 4 65+ 6

In which country were you born?

Australia 01  
Great Britain 02  
New Zealand 03  
Italy 04  
Vietnam 05  
India 06  
USA 07  
China 08  
Other (specify) \* \_\_\_\_\_

And what is the present occupation of the main income-earner of your household? (**PROBE, WRITE ON THE LINE AND THEN CODE BELOW**)

- .....
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Manager/Administrator/Professional                    | 1 |
| Para-professional/Trades person                       | 2 |
| Clerical worker/Sales or Personal Service worker      | 3 |
| Plant or machine operator/Driver/Labourer/Farm worker | 4 |
| Main income-earner not working/No breadwinner         | 5 |

**What group would the total annual household income be...**

- |                      |   |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|
| Less than \$30,000   | 1 | \$55,000 to \$85,000 | 3 |
| \$30,000 to \$55,000 | 2 | Over \$85,000        | 4 |

**What is your household situation? Are you...**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Living alone                           | 1 |
| A single person, sharing accommodation | 2 |
| Living as a couple                     | 3 |
| Living as a family (2 parent)          | 4 |
| Living as a family (1 parent)          | 5 |
| Other                                  | 6 |

**What is your current postcode?** \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you very much for your assistance with this research.**

## Attachment D

### 2011 COMMUNITY WELLBEING INDICATORS PILOT

---

MORTON CONSULTING SERVICES PTY LTD  
and MARKET FACTS QLD

SEPTEMBER 2011

#### 1. Background

This report provides the results of a pilot survey of community wellbeing conducted for the Local Government Association of Queensland (LGAQ). A copy of the questionnaire used for this pilot survey is included at Attachment A of this report. The survey was undertaken by Market Facts in August and September 2011

A telephone survey of a sample of 1100 people was completed in the following local government areas:-

Sunshine Coast (n= 300),  
Gladstone(n= 300),  
Longreach (n=250), and  
Isaac (n=250).

In addition, a pilot was conducted by LGAQ in the indigenous community of Wujal Wujal. A sample of some 14 community members completed the survey. The results from this component of the study are also included in this report. Because this is a small number of respondents, the sample is unlikely to be statistically valid. However, the purpose of the pilot in Wujal Wujal was to ascertain the suitability of such a questionnaire for an indigenous community. The results for Wujal Wujal are therefore reported as aggregate means so that they can be readily compared with the results from each of the other pilot communities.

For most questions, a rating scale of 1 to 5 was used, with 1 representing very low satisfaction or performance and 5 indicating very high satisfaction or performance

In the tables presented in this report and attachments significance tests have been applied to the differences between the sub-samples and the total sample. These appear in the tables as:

+++	significantly greater than the sample result at the 99% level of confidence
++	significantly greater than the sample result at the 95% level of confidence
+	significantly greater than the sample result at the 90% level of confidence
---	significantly lower than the sample result at the 99% level of confidence
--	significantly lower than the sample result at the 95% level of confidence
-	significantly lower than the sample result at the 90% level of confidence

Attachment B includes additional tables by demographic group while Attachment C provides verbatim responses where reasons for a response were included in the question.



## 2. Survey Results

### 2.1 Parks

The first question asked “How do you rate the parks in your community for upkeep, accessibility and community usage?”

The following tables provide the results by each local government area.

More than 15% of Longreach respondents could not provide a rating for any of these questions.

#### Upkeep of Parks

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsatisfactory %	2.3	1.3	0.7	7.2	0.4
			--	+++	--
Unsatisfactory %	7.9	11.3	5	7.6	7.6
		++	--		
Fair only %	29.2	37.7	28	24.8	24.8
		+++		-	-
Satisfactory %	44.5	44	46.7	34.4	52.4
				---	+++
Very satisfactory %	10.9	5.7	18	10.8	8.8
		---	+++		
D/K %	5.3	-	1.7	15.2	6
			---	+++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.7</b>

Some 55.4% of the sample rated the upkeep of parks as ‘satisfactory’ or ‘very satisfactory’. In Gladstone some 64.7% gave these ‘satisfactory’ ratings.

The overall mean was 3.6 (72%). The mean score was highest in Gladstone (76%) and Isaac (74%) and lowest in Longreach and the Sunshine Coast (68%). In Wujal, the mean score was 72%, the same as for the survey sample.

#### Accessibility of Parks

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsatisfactory %	1.5	1	0.3	5.2	-
			--	+++	
Unsatisfactory %	6.5	11.7	4.7	3.6	5.6
		+++		--	
Fair only %	31	38.3	27.3	20.8	36.8
		+++		---	++
Satisfactory %	43.5	43.3	44.3	41.2	44.8

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Very satisfactory %	12	5.7	21.3	13.6	6.8
		---	+++		---
D/K %	5.5	-	2	15.6	6
			---	+++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>

Some 55.5% of the sample rated the accessibility of parks as 'satisfactory' or 'very satisfactory'. Again, in Gladstone a high 65.6% gave these 'satisfactory' ratings.

The overall mean score was 3.6 (72%). The mean score was again highest in Gladstone (76%) and lowest on the Sunshine Coast (68%). In Wujal, the mean score was 66%.

### Usage by Community

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsatisfactory %	1.8	1	0.7	6	-
			-	+++	
Unsatisfactory %	8.5	12	9	6.4	6
		++			
Fair only %	32	36.7	29.7	25.2	36
		++		---	
Satisfactory %	40.7	44.3	38.3	33.6	46.4
				---	++
Very satisfactory %	10.3	6	18	11.2	5.2
		---	+++		---
D/K %	6.6	-	4.3	17.6	6.4
			-	+++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>

Overall, 51% rated the usage by the community as 'satisfactory' or 'very satisfactory'. There was little significant difference in the 'satisfactory' ratings between councils.

The overall mean score was 3.5 (70%). The mean score was highest in Gladstone (74%) and lowest on the Sunshine Coast (68%). In Wujal, the mean score was 68%.

For these three questions on parks, across the sample, the ratings are just over half way between 'fair only' and 'satisfactory', with an average score of 3.6 (72%) which is considered to be a sound outcome. This rating is similar to that given in the 2011 State-wide Community Satisfaction Study for parks, playgrounds and public amenities of 3.6. The aggregate score for Wujal was 3.4.

## 2.2 Bikeways and Walking Paths

The next question asked "how do you rate the availability in your community of bikeways and walking paths?"

The following tables provide the results by council area. Again, a high proportion of Longreach respondents (around 30%) could not provide a response to these questions.

### Bikeways

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very poor %	6	8.7	3.7	7.2	4.4
		++	--		
Poor %	13.7	16	12.3	6	20.4
				---	+++
Fair only %	28.4	27	37.7	16.8	30.4
			+++	---	
Good %	30.5	41.7	28	27.2	23.2
		+++			---
Very good %	6.5	6.7	8	10.4	0.8
				+++	---
D/K %	14.9	-	10.3	32.4	20.8
			---	+++	+++
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.9</b>

Overall, only 37% rated the availability of bikeways as 'good' or 'very good'. However, on the Sunshine Coast 48.4% gave these 'good' ratings.

The overall mean score was 3.2 (64%). This was highest in Longreach (68%) and lowest in Isaac (58%). (Note: the mean score excludes those who responded "don't know"). In Wujal, a low score of 24% was given.

### Walking Paths

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very poor %	4.9	8.7	2.7	7.6	0.4
		+++	--	++	---
Poor %	11	15.3	11	9.2	7.6
		+++			-
Fair only %	31.8	28	33.3	18.8	47.6
		-		---	+++
Good %	35	41.3	36.7	24.4	36
		+++		---	
Very good %	7.8	6.7	11.7	10.8	1.6
			+++	++	---
D/K %	9.5	-	4.7	29.2	6.8
			---	+++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>

Overall, only 42.8% gave 'good' or 'very good' ratings for availability of walking paths. Both the Sunshine Coast and Gladstone had higher 'good' ratings at 48%. A high 24% gave 'poor' or 'very poor' responses on the Sunshine Coast.

The overall mean score was 3.3 (66%). This was highest in Gladstone (70%) and lowest on the Sunshine Coast (64%). In Wujal, the score was a low 34%.

### 2.3 Protection of Natural Environment

The next question asked “How satisfied are you with efforts being made to protect and conserve the natural environment in your area?”

#### Protection and Conservation of Natural Environment

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsatisfactory %	5.5	2.3	11	8	-
		---	+++	++	
Unsatisfactory %	5.8	5	8	8.8	1.2
			+	++	---
Fair only %	32.3	20.7	38.3	18.4	52.8
		---	+++	---	+++
Satisfactory %	45.5	63.3	31	42.8	44.4
		+++	---		
Very satisfactory %	8.1	8	8.3	14.8	1.2
				+++	---
D/K %	2.8	0.7	3.3	7.2	0.4
		---		+++	---
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>

Overall, some 53.6% said efforts on the natural environment were ‘satisfactory’ or ‘very satisfactory’. This was highest on the Sunshine Coast where 71.3% gave this ‘satisfactory’ response.

With a mean score of 3.5 (70%) satisfaction was half way between ‘fair only’ and ‘satisfactory’. Satisfaction was highest on the Sunshine Coast (74%) and lowest in Gladstone (64%). The aggregate score in Wujal was 62%.

### 2.4 Government Engagement

The next question asked “How well do you feel governments, including the council, provide opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?”

#### Satisfaction with Government Engagement

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsatisfactory %	10.1	6.3	11.3	23.2	0
		--		+++	
Unsatisfactory %	13.7	23	10.7	14.8	5.2
		+++	-		---
Fair only %	45.7	52.3	46	37.2	46
		+++		---	

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Satisfactory %	25.9	17	23.3	20	45.6
		---		--	+++
Very satisfactory %	2.4	0	4.3	2.4	2.8
			+++		
D/K %	2.2	1.3	4.3	2.4	0.4
			+++		--
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>

Only 28.3% responded 'satisfactory' or 'very satisfactory' on the opportunity given by governments for their voice to be heard. This was highest in Isaac with 48.4% giving 'satisfactory' responses.

Overall, the mean score was 3.0 (60%). This was highest in Isaac (70%) and lowest in Longreach (52%). In Wujal, the aggregate score was 62%, similar to the score for the total sample.

When asked what could be done to improve engagement, comments covered more consultation, increased information and communication and the need to listen to the people. Attachment C provides a complete list of responses.

## 2.5 Sport, Recreation and Culture

The next question asked "How adequate are the opportunities in your area for you to engage in sport and recreation as well as art and cultural activities?"

### Sport and Recreation

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsatisfactory %	1	0	0	4.4	0
				+++	
Unsatisfactory %	2.7	2.3	1	6.8	1.2
			--	+++	-
Fair only %	26.1	38.7	14.3	24	27.2
		+++	---		
Satisfactory %	55.5	56	59.3	38.4	67.6
				---	+++
Very satisfactory %	11.6	2.7	22.7	20	0.8
		---	+++	+++	---
D/K %	3	0.3	2.7	6.4	3.2
		---		+++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>

Overall, some 67.1% gave 'satisfactory' or 'very satisfactory' responses on sport and recreation opportunities. A high 82% gave 'satisfactory' responses in Gladstone.

The overall mean score was 3.8 (76%). This was highest in Gladstone (82%) and lowest on the Sunshine Coast (72%). The aggregate score in Wujal was also 76%.

### Art and Cultural Activities

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsatisfactory %	2.3	0.3	1.3	5.6	2.4
		---		+++	
Unsatisfactory %	10.3	4.3	3.7	7.2	28.4
		---	---	-	+++
Fair only %	35.9	34.7	31.3	20.8	58
			-	---	+++
Satisfactory %	38.5	57.7	42.7	40	9.2
		+++	+		---
Very satisfactory %	10	3	17.3	18.8	0.8
		---	+++	+++	---
D/K %	3	-	3.7	7.6	1.2
				+++	-
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.8</b>

Overall, some 48.5% said “satisfactory’ or ‘very satisfactory’ on art and cultural activities. This was lowest in Isaac where only 10% gave ‘satisfactory’ responses.

The mean score across the sample was 3.4 (68%). This was highest in Gladstone (74%) and lowest in Isaac (56%). In Wujal, the score was a high 80%.

## 2.6 Access to Services

The next question asked “How much does access to any of the following (public transport, health services, education) affect your wellbeing?”

A high 78.8% of Isaac respondents did not provide an opinion.

### Public Transport

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Does not affect at all %	31.5	21.7	41	52.8	10.4
		---	+++	+++	---
Does not affect much %	21.4	42.3	25.3	8.4	4.4
		+++	++	---	---
Just a little %	13.5	30.7	10.7	4.8	4.8
		+++	-	---	---
Affected %	4	4	4.7	5.6	1.6
					--
Very affected %	6.6	1	1.7	26	-
		---	---	+++	
D/K %	23.1	0.3	16.7	2.4	78.8
		---	---	---	+++

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.9</b>

Only 10.6% regarded their wellbeing as 'affected' or 'very affected' by access to public transport. This was highest in Longreach where 31.6% saw their wellbeing 'affected'.

Overall, the mean score was 2.1 (42%) close to the 'does not affect much' rating. This was highest in Longreach at 2.4 (48%), but still not regarded as affecting wellbeing to any extent. In Wujal, the score was 3.2 (64%), slightly above the 'just a little' affect rating.

### Health Services

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Does not affect at all %	15.5	19	19.3	17.2	5.2
		+	++		---
Does not affect much %	28.5	42.7	25.3	12.4	31.6
		+++		---	
Just a little %	29.5	33.3	26	18	40.4
		+		---	+++
Affected %	13.2	3.7	14.7	17.6	18.4
		---		++	+++
Very affected %	12.1	1	13.7	34.4	1.2
		---		+++	---
D/K %	1.2	0.3	1	0.4	3.2
					+++
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.8</b>

Overall, only 13.3% felt that availability of health services 'affected' or 'very affected' their wellbeing. Again this was highest in Longreach at 52%.

The overall mean score was 2.8 (56%), close to a 'just a little' affect rating. The rating was highest in Longreach at 68% and lowest on the Sunshine Coast (44%). In Wujal the score was 66% again above the 'just a little' affect rating.

### Education

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Does not affect at all %	38.5	50.3	43.3	37.2	20
		+++	++		---
Does not affect much %	29.4	31.3	27.3	14.4	44.4
				---	+++
Just a little %	16.2	16.3	8.7	15.2	26
			---		+++
Affected %	6.8	1	7.7	14.8	4.8

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
		---		+++	
Very affected %	6.1	0.7	7.3	17.2	0
		---		+++	
D/K %	3	0.3	5.7	1.2	4.8
		---	+++	-	+
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.2</b>

Again, very few saw access to education as impacting on their wellbeing with only 12.9% saying 'affected' or 'very affected'. Again, those in Longreach felt affected the most (32% 'affected').

The overall mean score was 2.1 (42%). In Longreach it was 52% while on the Sunshine Coast a low 34%. In Wujal the score was 68%, again above the 'just a little' affect rating.

Based on these results, access to public transport, health services and education is not regarded as having much impact on wellbeing. Only in Longreach is the concern on access to services relatively higher, and primarily in relation to access to health services. The highest concern ratings were in Wujal.

## 2.7 Community Involvement

The next question asked "With regard to your involvement in the community, are you involved as a member of a community organisation and/or a volunteer?"

### Community Involvement

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
not a volunteer or member of any organisation %	67.7	72	72.3	45.6	79.2
		+	++	---	+++
Both %	12.2	16	8.3	22.4	2
		++	--	+++	---
volunteer %	11.5	9	12	20	5.6
				+++	---
member of a community organisation %	8.5	3	7.3	12	13.2
		---		++	+++

Some 67.7% of respondents were not involved as a volunteer or a member of a community organisation. Those in Isaac were less likely to be involved (79.2%) while those in Longreach had the greatest involvement (only 45.6% not involved). All respondents in Wujal were a volunteer or member of a community organisation, with 64% saying "both".

## 2.8 Racial Harmony

The next question asked "How would you rate the racial harmony in your community?"



### Racial Harmony

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
very unsatisfactory %	0.4	0	0.7	0.8	0
Unsatisfactory %	1.2	0	2	2.8	0
				+++	
fair only %	11.4	6.7	14.7	8	16.4
		---	++	-	+++
Satisfactory %	68.8	73.7	65	55.6	80.8
		++	-	---	+++
very satisfactory %	16.6	19	14.3	30.4	2.8
				+++	---
D/K %	1.6	0.7	3.3	2.4	-
			+++		
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>

Overall, 85.4% rated racial harmony as 'satisfactory' or 'very satisfactory'. This was highest on the Sunshine Coast where 92.7% gave 'satisfactory' responses. A high 30.4% in Longreach gave the 'very satisfactory' rating.

Overall, a relatively high mean score of 4.0 (80%) was given. The rating was very similar across all communities. In Wujal the score was 76%.

## 2.9 Support from Friends, Family and Neighbours

The next question asked "How would you rate the level of support available to you from friends, family and neighbours?"

### Support from Friends

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsupportive %	0.6	0	0.7	2	0
				+++	
Unsupportive %	0.9	0	1	2.8	0
				+++	
Fair only %	13.1	9.7	7	9.2	28.4
		--	---	--	+++
Supportive %	57.9	65.3	55.3	39.6	70.4
		+++		---	+++
Very supportive %	27.1	24.7	35.7	46	0.8
			+++	+++	---
D/K %	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.7</b>

Overall, some 85% rated support from friends as ‘supportive’ or ‘very supportive’. This was lowest in Isaac at 71.2%.

The overall mean score was 4.1 (82%). This was highest in Longreach (86%) and lowest in Isaac (74%). In Wujal, the score was 88%.

### Support from Family

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsupportive %	1.5	0.3	2.7	2.4	0.4
		-	++		
Unsupportive %	1.3	0	0.3	2.8	2.4
			-	++	+
Fair only %	15.1	15.3	9	4.8	32.4
			---	---	+++
Supportive %	47.5	56.3	42	27.2	63.6
		+++	--	---	+++
Very supportive %	34	27.7	44.3	62.4	0.8
		---	+++	+++	---
D/K %	0.7	0.3	1.7	0.4	0.4
			++		
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.6</b>

Support from family also received a high overall rating with 81.5% saying ‘supportive’ or ‘very supportive’. This was highest in Longreach (89.6%) and lowest in Isaac (64.4%).

The overall mean was 4.1 (82%). This was highest in Longreach (88%) and lowest in Isaac (72%). In Wujal, the score was 88%.

### Support from Neighbours

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsupportive %	1.5	0	3.7	2	0
			+++		
Unsupportive %	4.2	2	4.7	6	4.4
		--			
Fair only %	21.8	15.3	18.3	9.6	46
		---	-	---	+++
Supportive %	48.6	57.3	47	40.4	48.4
		+++		---	
Very supportive %	22.7	25	25.7	38.8	0.4
				+++	---
D/K %	1.2	0.3	0.7	3.2	0.8
				+++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>

Support from neighbours had a slightly lower rating with 71.3% saying 'supportive' or 'very supportive'. This was highest in the Sunshine Coast (82.8%) and lowest in Isaac 48.8%.

The overall score was 3.9 (78%). This was highest in the Sunshine Coast and Longreach (82%) and lowest in Isaac (70%). In Wujal, the score was 84%.

These questions on support from friends, family and neighbours all reveal relatively high levels of support with an average score of 80%. As might be expected, Isaac, with significant mining communities was much lower in terms of support than the other three areas, with an average score of 72%. This is still relatively high. In Wujal, the average support score was 86%.

## 2.10 Suitability of Community for Children, Teenagers and Seniors

The next question asked "How would you rate the suitability of your community for young children, teenagers and seniors?"

### Suitability for Young Children

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsuitable %	1.1	0	1	3.6	0
				+++	
Unsuitable %	3.5	0.3	3.7	6.4	4
		---		+++	
Fair only %	19.4	12.7	20.3	22.4	23.2
		---			+
Suitable %	61	76.7	56.7	38.8	69.6
		+++	-	---	+++
Very suitable %	11.8	10	11.7	24.8	1.2
				+++	---
D/K %	3.3	0.3	6.7	4	2
		---	+++		
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>

Overall, 72.8% rated their community as 'suitable' or 'very suitable' for young children. This was highest on the Sunshine Coast (86.7%) and lowest in Longreach (63.6%).

The overall mean was 3.8 (76%). This was highest on the Sunshine Coast (80%) and lowest in Isaac (74%). In Wujal, the score was 74%.

### Suitability for Teenagers

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsuitable %	2	0	2	5.6	0.8
				+++	
Unsuitable %	13	0.3	13.7	20.8	19.6
		---		+++	+++
Fair only %	30.3	12.7	30.7	30	51.2
		---			+++

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Suitable %	43.9	76	41.3	26.8	25.6
		+++		---	---
Very suitable %	7.4	10.7	6	12.4	0
		++		+++	
D/K %	3.5	0.3	6.3	4.4	2.8
		---	+++		
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.0</b>

There was a slightly lower rating for suitability for teenagers with 51.3% overall giving 'suitable' or 'very suitable' ratings. This was highest on the Sunshine Coast (86.7%) and lowest in Isaac (25.6%).

The overall mean score was 3.4 (68%). The Sunshine Coast was significantly different from the average with a high mean score of 80% while Isaac received only a 60% score. The aggregate score in Wujal was 62%.

#### Suitability for Seniors

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsuitable %	2.3	0	1.3	2.8	5.6
					+++
Unsuitable %	9.3	0	7	2.8	29.6
				---	+++
Fair only %	21.1	13	15.3	19.2	39.6
		---	---		+++
Suitable %	47.8	75.7	47.7	48.8	13.6
		+++			---
Very suitable %	15.5	11	20	22.4	8.4
		--	++	+++	---
D/K %	4.1	0.3	8.7	4	3.2
		---	+++		
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>

Overall, some 63.3% rated their community as suitable for seniors. This was highest in the Sunshine Coast (86.7%) and lowest in Isaac (22.0%).

The overall mean score was 3.7 (74%). This was highest in the Sunshine Coast (80%) and lowest in Isaac (58%). Again the difference in the Isaac council area is significant relative to the other communities. In Wujal, the score was 78%.

#### 2.11 Service Access for Disabled

The next question asked "How would you rate access to buildings and services in your community for people with a disability?"

### Access to Buildings/Services for Disabled

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very inaccessible %	1.7	1	2	3.6	0.4
				+++	-
Inaccessible %	15.2	4.3	23.7	2.4	30.8
		---	+++	---	+++
Fair only %	29.1	34	25.7	14	42.4
		++		---	+++
Accessible %	40	52	33.3	50.8	22.8
		+++	---	+++	---
Very accessible %	9.3	3.7	10	22.4	2
		---		+++	---
D/K	4.7	5	5.3	6.8	1.6
				+	---
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>

Overall, some 49.3% rated buildings and services as 'accessible' or 'very accessible' for people with a disability. The rating was highest in Longreach where 73.2% gave 'accessible' ratings.

The overall mean score was 3.4 (68%). This was highest in Longreach (78%) and lowest in Isaac (60%). In Wujal, the score was 76%.

### 2.12 Safety when Alone

The next question asked "How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place?"

#### Safety when Alone

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsafe %	0.5	0	1	1.2	0
Unsafe %	2.5	4.7	3.3	1.2	0.4
		+++			--
Fair only %	19.5	36.3	16.7	5.6	16.4
		+++		---	
Safe %	48.3	37	57.7	22.4	76.4
		---	+++	---	+++
Very safe %	28.7	21.7	21	68.4	6.8
		---	---	+++	---
D/K %	0.5	0.3	0.3	1.2	-
				++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>3.9</b>

Overall, some 77% gave 'safe' or 'very safe' responses. This was highest in Longreach (90.8%) and lowest in the Sunshine Coast (58.7%).

The overall mean score was 4.0 (80%). This ranged from a very high 92% in Longreach to 76% in the Sunshine Coast. In Wujal, the score was 88%.

### 2.13 Satisfaction with Life as a Whole

The next question asked "Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole? "

#### Satisfaction with Life

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Very unsatisfied	0.4	0	0.3	1.2	0
				++	
Unsatisfied	0.6	0	1	1.2	0.4
fair only	8.4	4	10.3	8.4	11.2
		---			+
Satisfied	56.1	58.3	59	35.6	70.4
				---	+++
Very satisfied	34.3	37.3	29	53.6	17.6
			--	+++	---
D/K	0.3	0.3	0.3	-	0.4
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>

There was little significant difference between communities in satisfaction with life as a whole. Overall, 90.4% gave 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' ratings. This was highest in the Sunshine Coast (95.6%), with very similar aggregate 'satisfied' ratings in the other three communities.

The overall score was 4.2 (84%). This ranged from 88% in Longreach to 82% in Isaac. In Wujal, the score was 92%.

Asked if there was one area of their life they were most dissatisfied with, only 14.1% said "yes". This was highest in Longreach (28.8%) and lowest in Isaac (0.4%).

#### Is there one area of life you are most dissatisfied with?

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
No %	85.9	94	78.7	71.2	99.6
		+++	---	---	+++
Yes %	14.1	6	21.3	28.8	0.4
		---	+++	+++	---

For those responding 'yes', the areas of life showing most dissatisfaction concentrated on finances and health. A full list of responses is included at Attachment C.

## 2.14 Demands of Work

Those working (full or part time) were asked “do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

*My work is too demanding and stressful,  
My work and family life often interfere with each other,  
I have good job security”*

Some 55.3% indicated they were working. In Wujal, all respondents were working.

### Too Demanding and Stressful

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	609	114	185	140	170
Strongly disagree %	10.7	0	13.5	15.7	10.6
				++	
Disagree %	39.2	0.9	31.9	31.4	79.4
		---	--	--	+++
Neither %	19.7	43.9	13	22.9	8.2
		+++	---		---
Agree %	24.3	54.4	34.1	14.3	1.8
		+++	+++	---	---
Strongly agree %	6.1	0.9	7.6	15.7	0
		--		+++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.0</b>

Overall, only 30.4% agreed with the statement that work is too demanding and stressful. Agreement was highest on the Sunshine Coast (55.3%) and lowest in Isaac (1.8%).

The overall mean score was 2.8 (56%) indicating marginal disagreement with the proposition. The score was highest on the Sunshine Coast (72%), a rating just below ‘agree’. It was lowest in Isaac at 40%, equivalent to ‘disagree’. In Wujal, the rating was 64%, just above the ‘neither agree or disagree’ rating.

### Interference with Family Life

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	609	114	185	140	170
Strongly disagree %	14.6	0	18.4	27.1	10
			+	+++	--
Disagree %	35.3	1.8	29.7	21.4	75.3
		---	-	---	+++
Neither %	20.7	36.8	14.1	25	13.5
		+++	---		---
Agree %	24.3	60.5	31.9	12.9	1.2
		+++	+++	---	---
Strongly agree %	5.1	0.9	5.9	13.6	0
		--		+++	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.1</b>

Overall, only 29.4% agreed with the proposition that work and family life often interfere with each other. Agreement was strongest in the Sunshine Coast (61.4%) and lowest in Isaac (1.2%).

The overall score was 2.7 (54%) indicating marginal disagreement with the proposition. Agreement was highest in the Sunshine Coast with a score of 72%, a rating just below 'agree'. Again it was lowest in Isaac (42%), equivalent to 'disagree'. In Wujal, the score was 64%, again just above the 'neither agree or disagree' rating.

### Job Security

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	609	114	185	140	170
Strongly disagree %	1	0	1.1	2.9	0
				++	
Disagree %	3.8	10.5	3.2	2.9	0.6
		+++			--
Neither %	31.9	65.8	26.5	10	32.9
		+++	-	---	
Agree %	41.2	23.7	41.6	28.6	62.9
		---		---	+++
Strongly agree %	22.2	0	27.6	55.7	3.5
			++	+++	---
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.7</b>

Overall, some 63.4% responded that they 'agree' or 'strongly agree' that they have good job security. This was highest in Longreach (84.3%) and lowest in the Sunshine Coast (23.7%). The strong agreement in Longreach is significantly different from the view elsewhere.

The overall mean score was 3.8 (76%). This was highest in Longreach (78%) and lowest in the Sunshine Coast (62%). In Wujal, the score was 84%, a relatively high level of job security.

## 2.15 Impact of Cost of Living Increases

The next question asked "How would you rate the impact on your household from the increasing costs of living?"

### Cost of Living

	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
Sample	1100	300	300	250	250
Does not affect at all %	1.7	0	3.7	3.2	0
			+++	++	
Does not affect much %	14.8	27.3	18.3	8.8	1.6
		+++	++	---	---
just a little %	38.9	59	33.7	29.2	30.8
		+++	--	---	---
Affected %	34.8	10.7	33	40.4	60.4
		---		++	+++
Very badly affected %	9.5	3	10.7	18	7.2



	Total	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac
		---		+++	
D/K %	0.3	0	0.7	0.4	0
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>

Overall, some 44.3% said they were 'affected' or 'very badly affected' by cost of living increases. This was highest in Isaac (67.6%) and lowest in the Sunshine Coast (3%).

The overall mean score was 3.4 (68%) almost half way between 'just a little affected' and 'affected'. On the Sunshine Coast the score was 2.9 (58%) close to the 'just a little affected' rating. In Isaac the score was 3.7 (74%) close to the 'affected' rating. In Wujal, the score was 78%.

The greater concern on cost of living increases in Isaac is interesting as they reported the highest household incomes with 79.2% over \$50,000 compared with 61.2% for the total sample and only 42.8% in Longreach.

When asked what their reason for the response was, most highlighted increases in costs across the board while others highlighted increases for groceries, fuel and rents in particular. Attachment C provides a full list of responses.

## 2. Overview of Ratings

The following table summarises the results for those questions where a satisfaction rating was provided on a scale from low (1) to high (5). For those questions where a number of questions were asked about the same matter (eg parks), the mean scores have been averaged.

The highlighted scores represent the highest mean score for the item for each community. An average score across all the items is also shown. At the aggregate level, there is very little difference for the ratings given by each community.

In terms of the highest average ratings, respondents in Longreach are the most satisfied while those in Isaac are marginally less satisfied.

Respondents from Wujal gave a higher rating for life satisfaction than any of the four communities involved in the sample survey. Again it must be noted that the group used to pilot the survey in Wujal may not represent the average Wujal resident, so care should be taken when comparing scores for Wujal against the other four pilot communities.

Item	Total Survey Sample	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac	Wujal Wujal
Parks	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.4
Bikeways/Walking Paths	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.1	1.5
Protection of Natural Env.	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.1
Government Engagement	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.6	3.5	3.1
Sport, Recreation & Culture	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.9
Racial Harmony	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.8
Level of Support	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.3	3.6	4.3
Overall Living Suitability	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.2	3.6
Access for Disabled	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.9	3.0	3.8
Safety when alone	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.6	3.9	4.4

Item	Total Survey Sample	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac	Wujal Wujal
Life Satisfaction	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.6
Job Security	3.8	3.1	3.9	4.3	3.7	4.2
<b>Average of above</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>

The next table summarises those questions where a low score indicates less adverse impact on wellbeing. The lowest score for each item is also highlighted. An average score across all the items is also shown. At the aggregate level, there is very little difference for the ratings given by each community.

Item	Total Survey Sample	Sunshine Coast	Gladstone	Longreach	Isaac	Wujal Wujal
Public Transport Availability	2.1	2.2	1.8	2.4	1.9	3.2
Health Service Availability	2.8	2.2	2.8	3.4	2.8	3.3
Education Availability	2.1	1.7	2.0	2.6	2.2	3.4
Stressful Work	2.8	3.6	2.9	2.8	2.0	3.2
Work interference	2.7	3.6	2.8	2.6	2.1	3.2
Cost of Living	3.4	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.9
<b>Average of above</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>

Based on the above, living in Isaac or Gladstone has less factors (based on overall score) impacting adversely on wellbeing.

Nevertheless, there are more elements with lower scores on the Sunshine Coast, so wellbeing there may not be as adversely impacted because of the range of available services.

## Attachment E

### Community wellbeing indicators project 2013 state-wide benchmarking survey

MORTON CONSULTING SERVICES PTY LTD  
and MARKET FACTS QLD

March 2013

#### 1. Background

This report provides the results of a State-wide survey of community wellbeing conducted for the Local Government Association of Queensland (LGAQ) using the final questionnaire developed by this project. The purpose of the survey was to provide benchmark ratings for each question to assist individual councils conducting their own community wellbeing surveys using the survey instrument developed by LGAQ. A detailed report on the project research is available from LGAQ, including the survey questionnaire.

A telephone survey of a sample of 500 people was completed in the following areas:-

SEQ (n= 250),  
Regional Centres(n= 150),  
Rural Balance (n=100)

These groupings were used as they generally correspond with LGAQ's council segments. It also allows any differences in ratings by geographic location to be identified.

This 2013 survey follows a pilot survey conducted in 2011 in five communities as part of the initial development of the survey instrument.

For all questions, a rating scale of 1 to 5 was used, with 1 representing very low satisfaction or performance and 5 indicating very high satisfaction or performance. This enabled mean scores to be calculated for each question, providing a valid but simple way in which to interpret the ratings.

Annex A (p. 65) includes additional tables by demographic group. In these tables, significance tests have been applied to the differences between the sub-samples and the total sample. These appear in the tables as:

- +++ significantly greater than the sample result at the 99% level of confidence
- ++ significantly greater than the sample result at the 95% level of confidence
- + significantly greater than the sample result at the 90% level of confidence
- significantly lower than the sample result at the 99% level of confidence
- significantly lower than the sample result at the 95% level of confidence
- significantly lower than the sample result at the 90% level of confidence

#### 2. Service Adequacy

The first question asked *"How would you rate the adequacy of the following services (public transport, health services, education) in your local community in terms of your needs and wellbeing?"*

For **public transport**, 35.8% of the sample rated this as "very unsatisfactory" or "unsatisfactory". This was highest in rural communities with 51% giving unsatisfactory ratings. The overall mean score was a low 2.75 (55%), with rural communities giving the lowest score of 2.23 (44.6%).

### Public Transport

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	22.0%	20.8%	14.0%	37.0%
Unsatisfactory	13.8%	12.0%	16.7%	14.0%
Fair only	21.8%	20.4%	30.7%	12.0%
Satisfactory	18.4%	22.0%	14.0%	16.0%
Very satisfactory	9.2%	15.6%	2.0%	4.0%
Don't Know/No response	14.8%	9.2%	22.7%	17.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>2.23</b>

For **health services**, 17.8% of the sample gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. Rural communities were the least satisfied with 24% giving “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was half way between “fair only” and “satisfactory” at 3.48 (69.6%). The mean for rural communities was 3.28 (65.6%).

### Health Services

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	6.6%	5.2%	8.0%	8.0%
Unsatisfactory	11.2%	11.2%	8.0%	16.0%
Fair only	25.6%	24.8%	24.0%	30.0%
Satisfactory	39.4%	37.6%	48.7%	30.0%
Very satisfactory	16.2%	20.8%	9.3%	15.0%
Don't Know/No response	1.0%	0.4%	2.0%	1.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.28</b>

For **education services** only a low 5.8% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.71 (74.2%) with little significant difference by location.

### Education

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	1.2%	1.6%	0.0%	2.0%
Unsatisfactory	4.6%	4.8%	4.0%	5.0%
Fair only	25.0%	24.0%	28.0%	23.0%
Satisfactory	41.0%	37.6%	43.3%	46.0%
Very satisfactory	13.0%	19.6%	4.7%	9.0%
Don't Know/No response	15.2%	12.4%	20.0%	15.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.65</b>

## 3. Sport, Recreation, Culture and Public Spaces

The next question asked “How adequate are the opportunities in your local community for you to effectively engage in:

*sport and recreation  
art and cultural activities?”*

For sport and recreation only 10% gave “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.74 (74.8%) with little difference by location.

### Sport and Recreation

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	3.0%	2.8%	3.3%	3.0%
Unsatisfactory	7.0%	7.6%	4.7%	9.0%
Fair only	19.0%	18.0%	22.0%	17.0%

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Satisfactory	44.2%	44.0%	48.0%	39.0%
Very satisfactory	18.4%	17.6%	16.0%	24.0%
Don't Know/No response	8.4%	10.0%	6.0%	8.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>3.78</b>

For **art and cultural activities** some 16.2% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.35 (67%) with a marginally higher score given by rural communities at 3.53 (70.6%).

#### Art and Cultural Activities

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	4.4%	4.4%	4.0%	5.0%
Unsatisfactory	11.8%	12.0%	12.0%	11.0%
Fair only	31.6%	33.2%	34.7%	23.0%
Satisfactory	33.6%	34.0%	32.0%	35.0%
Very satisfactory	9.6%	9.2%	5.3%	17.0%
Don't Know/No response	9.0%	7.2%	12.0%	9.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>3.53</b>

The next question asked “How would you rate the opportunity for social interaction within your local community’s public spaces?”

#### Opportunity for Social Interaction in Public Spaces

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	2.6%	3.6%	0.7%	3.0%
Unsatisfactory	6.8%	8.0%	3.4%	9.0%
Fair only	29.7%	32.4%	25.5%	29.0%
Satisfactory	41.1%	35.6%	53.0%	37.0%
Very satisfactory	12.4%	12.0%	13.4%	12.0%
Don't Know/No response	7.4%	8.4%	4.0%	10.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>3.51</b>

Only 9.4% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings with regional cities having a very low level of dissatisfaction with only 4.1% giving the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.58 (71.6%) with regional cities recording the highest rating at 3.78 (75.6%).

The next question asked “How do you rate the parks, reserves and open spaces in your local community for upkeep, accessibility and facilities?”

For **upkeep**, a low 7.8% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.77 (75.4%) with SEQ recoding the highest at 3.97 (79.4%) and regional cities the lowest at 3.47 (69.4%).

#### Upkeep - Parks & Reserves

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	2.2%	2.8%	1.3%	2.0%
Unsatisfactory	5.6%	3.2%	6.0%	11.0%
Fair only	25.0%	19.2%	39.3%	18.0%
Satisfactory	44.6%	43.2%	46.0%	46.0%
Very satisfactory	20.4%	31.2%	4.0%	18.0%

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Don't Know/No response	2.2%	0.4%	3.3%	5.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>3.71</b>

For **accessibility**, a low 6.8% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.84 (76.8%) with the highest rating in SEQ at 4.00 (80%) and the lowest in regional cities at 3.58 (71.6%).

#### Accessibility - Parks & Reserves

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	1.4%	2.0%	0.7%	1.0%
Unsatisfactory	5.4%	3.6%	5.3%	10.0%
Fair only	21.8%	18.4%	32.7%	14.0%
Satisfactory	47.8%	44.0%	52.0%	51.0%
Very satisfactory	21.4%	31.2%	5.3%	21.0%
Don't Know/No response	2.2%	0.8%	4.0%	3.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.84</b>

For **facilities**, 11.6% gave the “unsatisfactory ratings. The mean score was 3.58 (71.6%) with little significant difference by location.

#### Facilities - Parks & Reserves

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	1.6%	1.6%	1.3%	2.0%
Unsatisfactory	10.0%	10.4%	6.7%	14.0%
Fair only	30.4%	28.4%	37.3%	25.0%
Satisfactory	41.0%	36.0%	47.3%	44.0%
Very satisfactory	14.2%	22.4%	3.3%	10.0%
Don't Know/No response	2.8%	1.2%	4.0%	5.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>3.48</b>

The next question asked “How do you rate the availability in your local community of bikeways and walking paths?”

For **bikeways**, a high 31.2% gave unsatisfactory ratings. The mean was a low 2.96 (59.2%) with similar ratings across all locations. A higher proportion (9%) could not respond to this question.

#### Bikeways

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	16.0%	16.0%	12.7%	21.0%
Unsatisfactory	15.2%	14.0%	20.0%	11.0%
Fair only	25.0%	22.4%	32.7%	20.0%
Satisfactory	25.6%	28.0%	25.3%	20.0%
Very satisfactory	9.2%	12.0%	1.3%	14.0%
Don't Know/No response	9.0%	7.6%	8.0%	14.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>2.94</b>

For **walking paths**, a high 27.2% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.16 (63.2%) with the highest score in SEQ at 3.34 (66.8%) and the lowest in regional cities at 2.92 (58.4%).

#### Walking Paths

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	13.6%	11.6%	14.0%	18.0%
Unsatisfactory	13.6%	10.4%	19.3%	13.0%
Fair only	25.6%	24.8%	29.3%	22.0%
Satisfactory	32.6%	35.2%	30.0%	30.0%
Very satisfactory	12.0%	15.6%	4.7%	14.0%
Don't Know/No response	2.6%	2.4%	2.7%	3.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>3.09</b>

## 4. Natural and Built Environment

The next question asked *“How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your local community to:  
protect and conserve the natural environment in your area  
provide a socially inclusive environment  
provide a liveable built environment?”*

For **conservation of the natural environment**, some 11.8% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. This was highest in rural communities where 17% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.49 (69.8%) with the highest score of 3.58 (71.6%) in SEQ and the lowest in regional cities at 3.38 (67.6%).

#### Protection and Conservation of Natural Environment

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	2.4%	1.6%	2.0%	5.0%
Unsatisfactory	9.4%	9.2%	8.0%	12.0%
Fair only	33.8%	32.0%	40.7%	28.0%
Satisfactory	39.8%	40.4%	39.3%	39.0%
Very satisfactory	11.0%	14.0%	4.0%	14.0%
Don't Know/No response	3.6%	2.8%	6.0%	2.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.46</b>

For a **socially inclusive environment**, 11.4% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. A relatively high 12.2% did not respond. The mean score was 3.4 (68%) with little significant difference by location.

#### Providing a socially inclusive environment

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	1.2%	1.2%	0.7%	2.0%
Unsatisfactory	10.2%	11.2%	8.0%	11.0%
Fair only	33.2%	29.2%	35.3%	40.0%
Satisfactory	38.8%	40.0%	39.3%	35.0%
Very satisfactory	4.4%	6.4%	1.3%	4.0%
Don't Know/No response	12.2%	12.0%	15.3%	8.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.30</b>

For a **liveable built environment**, 7.8% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings while a high 20.2% (36.7% in regional cities) did not respond. The mean score was 3.50 (70%) with the lowest in the regional centres at 3.34 (66.8%).

### Providing a liveable built environment

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	0.6%	0.4%	0.7%	1.0%
Unsatisfactory	7.2%	8.0%	5.3%	8.0%
Fair only	29.2%	26.8%	31.3%	32.0%
Satisfactory	37.2%	42.0%	24.0%	45.0%
Very satisfactory	5.6%	6.8%	2.0%	8.0%
Don't Know/No response	20.2%	16.0%	36.7%	6.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.54</b>

## 5. Community Suitability and Support

The next question asked “How would you rate the suitability of your local community for young children, teenagers and seniors?”

For **young children**, some 12.4% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was 3.52 (70.4%) with little difference by location.

### Suitability for Young Children

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	2.8%	3.6%	2.0%	2.0%
Unsatisfactory	9.6%	9.6%	9.3%	10.0%
Fair only	28.4%	30.4%	29.3%	22.0%
Satisfactory	41.8%	40.0%	42.0%	46.0%
Very satisfactory	11.0%	12.0%	8.0%	13.0%
Don't Know/No response	6.4%	4.4%	9.3%	7.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>3.63</b>

For **teenagers**, a high 27.4% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings, with both SEQ and rural communities having at least 30% giving the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean was a low 2.97 (59.4%) with regional cities having the highest score at 3.13 (62.6%).

### Suitability for Teenagers

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	9.2%	9.6%	7.3%	11.0%
Unsatisfactory	18.2%	21.2%	13.3%	18.0%
Fair only	36.6%	38.0%	33.3%	38.0%
Satisfactory	25.4%	23.2%	34.0%	18.0%
Very satisfactory	4.2%	4.0%	2.7%	7.0%
Don't Know/No response	6.4%	4.0%	9.3%	8.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.90</b>

For **seniors**, 12.2% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings (18% in rural communities). The mean score was 3.58 (71.6%) with rural communities having the lowest score at 3.52 (70.4%).

### Suitability for Seniors

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	2.8%	2.8%	2.0%	4.0%
Unsatisfactory	9.4%	7.2%	10.0%	14.0%



Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Fair only	29.8%	32.8%	26.7%	27.0%
Satisfactory	40.4%	39.2%	46.0%	35.0%
Very satisfactory	15.6%	15.2%	14.0%	19.0%
Don't Know/No response	2.0%	2.8%	1.3%	1.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.52</b>

The next question asked “How would you rate the level of support available to you from friends, family and neighbours?”

For **support from friends**, a very low 4% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was a high 4.30 (86%) with little significant difference by location.

#### Support from Friends

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	1.2%	2.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Unsatisfactory	2.8%	4.0%	2.0%	1.0%
Fair only	9.2%	10.0%	7.3%	10.0%
Satisfactory	37.8%	37.6%	32.0%	47.0%
Very satisfactory	48.0%	45.2%	56.7%	42.0%
Don't Know/No response	1.0%	1.2%	1.3%	0.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>4.44</b>	<b>4.30</b>

For **support from family**, only 6.4% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was a high 4.32 (86.4%) with no significant difference by location.

#### Support from Family

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	3.4%	4.8%	0.7%	4.0%
Unsatisfactory	3.0%	2.4%	4.7%	2.0%
Fair only	7.6%	5.6%	8.0%	12.0%
Satisfactory	29.0%	29.2%	28.7%	29.0%
Very satisfactory	55.0%	56.4%	55.3%	51.0%
Don't Know/No response	2.0%	1.6%	2.7%	2.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>4.23</b>

For **support from neighbours**, 9.8% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. This was highest in SEQ (11.2%) and lowest in rural communities (6%). The mean score was 3.93 (78.6%) with rural communities having the highest score at 4.05 (81%).

#### Support from Neighbours

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	5.6%	6.0%	6.7%	3.0%
Unsatisfactory	4.2%	5.2%	3.3%	3.0%
Fair only	19.0%	18.0%	21.3%	18.0%
Satisfactory	33.8%	33.2%	32.0%	38.0%
Very satisfactory	37.0%	37.2%	36.7%	37.0%
Don't Know/No response	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	1.0%

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>4.05</b>

The next question asked *“How would you rate access to buildings and services in your local community for people with a physical disability?”*

Some 14.8% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings (19% in rural communities). The mean score was 3.37 (67.4%) with no significant difference by location.

#### Access for Physically Disabled

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	5.2%	4.8%	5.3%	6.0%
Unsatisfactory	9.6%	8.0%	10.0%	13.0%
Fair only	33.4%	40.8%	24.7%	28.0%
Satisfactory	38.0%	31.6%	48.7%	38.0%
Very satisfactory	8.2%	7.2%	7.3%	12.0%
Don't Know/No response	5.6%	7.6%	4.0%	3.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.39</b>

The next question asked *“How strongly would you agree that your local community is welcoming of people from different cultures?”*

Some 12.8% gave the negative (not welcoming) response to this question. This was lowest in regional cities at 7.4%. The mean score was 3.57 (71.4%) indicating agreement with the statement that their local community is welcoming of people from different cultures. Regional cities had the highest score at 3.74 (74.8%).

#### Community Welcomes People from Different Cultures

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Strongly Disagree	2.8%	4.4%	0.7%	2.0%
Disagree	10.0%	10.8%	6.7%	13.0%
Neither Agree/Disagree	27.2%	34.4%	19.3%	21.0%
Agree	41.8%	28.4%	62.7%	44.0%
Strongly Agree	13.8%	15.2%	9.3%	17.0%
Don't Know/No response	4.4%	6.8%	1.3%	3.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.65</b>

The next question asked *“How would you rate your level of involvement in your local community as a volunteer or member of a community organisation?”*

#### Involvement as Volunteer or Organisation Member

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Not involved	40.6%	35.2%	56.7%	30.0%
Very limited involvement	18.8%	19.2%	16.0%	22.0%
Some involvement	20.0%	23.6%	10.7%	25.0%
Actively involved	13.6%	13.2%	10.7%	19.0%
Very actively involved	6.8%	8.4%	6.0%	4.0%
Don't Know/No response	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>2.41</b>

Some 59.4% had limited or no involvement as a volunteer or member of a community organisation. In regional cities involvement was lowest with 72.7% providing these responses. The mean score was a very low 2.26 (45.2%) indicating very limited involvement on average. The lowest score was for regional cities at 1.93 (38.6%).

The next question asked *“How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place in your local community?”*

Some 12% gave the “unsafe or “very unsafe” responses with 18.6% in regional cities giving this response. The mean score was 3.72 (74.4%), close to a “safe” rating of 4, with the lowest in regional cities at 3.48 (69.6%).

#### Safety when Alone

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsafe	4.8%	4.0%	7.3%	3.0%
Unsafe	7.2%	4.8%	11.3%	7.0%
Fair only	23.4%	23.2%	24.7%	22.0%
Safe	38.0%	38.8%	38.0%	36.0%
Very safe	25.0%	28.0%	18.0%	28.0%
Don't Know/No response	1.6%	1.2%	0.7%	4.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.82</b>

## 6. Satisfaction with Life as a Whole

The next question asked *“Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?”*

Only 3.2% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings. The mean score was a high 4.30 (86%) with little significant difference by location.

#### Satisfaction with Life

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.0%
Unsatisfactory	2.6%	3.6%	0.7%	3.0%
Fair only	9.8%	12.0%	6.7%	9.0%
Satisfactory	40.6%	35.2%	40.0%	55.0%
Very satisfactory	46.2%	48.4%	52.0%	32.0%
Don't Know/No response	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>4.18</b>

## 7. Work Life Balance

Of the 500 respondents, some 259 (51.7%) were working full or part time. This was lowest in SEQ (47.6%) and highest in rural communities (59.6%).

#### Work Status

	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Working full-time	35.3%	31.6%	44.0%	31.3%
Working part-time	16.4%	16.0%	9.3%	28.3%
Retired	27.9%	33.2%	29.3%	12.1%

	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Home duties	13.8%	11.2%	14.0%	20.2%
Unemployed	3.6%	4.0%	2.0%	5.1%
Incapacitated	3.0%	4.0%	1.3%	3.0%

Those working (full or part time) were asked “do you agree or disagree with the following statements:  
*My work is not too demanding and stressful,*  
*My work and family life do not interfere with each other,*  
*I have good job security”*

On whether **work was not demanding or stressful**, 35.7% gave the “disagree” ratings. The mean score was 3.01 close to the middle 3 rating (neither agree or disagree), with those in SEQ regarding work as marginally less demanding and stressful with a score of 3.13.

#### Work not demanding or stressful

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Strongly Disagree	10.5%	6.7%	17.5%	8.5%
Disagree	25.2%	22.7%	28.8%	25.4%
Neither Agree/Disagree	25.6%	31.1%	13.8%	30.5%
Agree	30.6%	30.3%	37.5%	22.0%
Strongly Agree	8.1%	9.2%	2.5%	13.6%
Don't Know/No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>3.07</b>

#### Work and family life not interfering

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Strongly Disagree	8.5%	5.9%	17.5%	1.7%
Disagree	22.1%	19.3%	26.3%	22.0%
Neither Agree/Disagree	23.3%	28.6%	16.3%	22.0%
Agree	37.2%	37.0%	40.0%	33.9%
Strongly Agree	8.9%	9.2%	0.0%	20.3%
Don't Know/No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>3.49</b>

On whether **work and family life did not interfere with each other**, 30.6% of those working disagreed, indicating there was conflict, with regional cities having 43.8% disagreeing. The mean score of 3.16 was just above the neither agree or disagree 3 rating with those in regional cities being the most negative (2.79) and those in rural communities the most positive (3.49).

On **whether they had good job security**, some 32.7% of those working indicated they did not, and this was highest in regional cities (51.9%). The mean score of 3.08 was just above the neither agree or disagree score of 3. The lowest score (2.63) was for regional cities while the highest was in rural communities (3.51).

#### Have good job security

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Strongly Disagree	9.7%	4.2%	21.0%	5.1%
Disagree	23.2%	25.2%	30.9%	8.5%
Neither Agree/Disagree	27.0%	29.4%	18.5%	33.9%
Agree	29.7%	31.1%	23.5%	35.6%
Strongly Agree	10.4%	10.1%	6.2%	16.9%

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Don't Know/No response	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>3.51</b>

## 8. Cost of Living

The next question asked “How would you rate the impact from the increasing costs of living on your household?”

A high 59.8% indicated they were “very badly affected” or “affected). This was highest in regional cities (60.7%). The mean score was 2.37 (47.4%) indicating that the increasing cost of living was regarded as having an adverse impact.

### Cost of Living Impact

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very badly affected	21.8%	21.2%	28.0%	14.0%
Affected	38.0%	39.2%	32.7%	43.0%
Only a little	25.4%	23.2%	28.7%	26.0%
Does not affect much	10.2%	12.8%	7.3%	8.0%
Does not affect at all	4.4%	3.6%	3.3%	8.0%
Don't Know/No response	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>2.51</b>

The next question asked “How would you rate the impact of your current rental or mortgage payments on your household’s finances?”

Rental or mortgage payments had a lower proportion “affected” (31.6%) than for the previous question on cost of living. Again this was highest in regional cities (42.7%). A relatively high 28.4% said it did not affect at all compared with only 4.4% giving this rating for the previous question on cost of living impacts. The mean score of 3.29 (65.8%) was just above the “little affected” rating, but dragged down by the more negative regional cities view with a 2.77 rating (55.4%).

### Impact of rental or mortgage payments on finances

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very badly affected	12.2%	9.2%	22.7%	4.0%
Affected	19.4%	20.4%	20.7%	15.0%
Only a little	23.0%	20.4%	26.0%	25.0%
Does not affect much	16.0%	11.6%	18.7%	23.0%
Does not affect at all	28.4%	37.6%	12.0%	30.0%
Don't Know/No response	1.0%	0.8%	0.0%	3.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>3.60</b>

## 9. Council Engagement & Service Delivery

The next question asked “How satisfactory is the way your local council provides opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?”

A high 25% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings and this was highest in rural communities (29%) and lowest in regional cities (19.3%). The mean score was 3.02 (60.4%), with no significant difference by location.

### Satisfaction with Community Engagement

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	10.2%	11.2%	8.0%	11.0%
Unsatisfactory	14.8%	15.6%	11.3%	18.0%
Fair only	36.6%	35.6%	40.0%	34.0%
Satisfactory	25.0%	24.8%	26.7%	23.0%
Very satisfactory	5.8%	7.6%	3.3%	5.0%
Don't Know/No response	7.6%	5.2%	10.7%	9.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>2.96</b>

The next question asked “How would you rate the overall performance of your local council in delivering an appropriate range and quality of services relevant to your households needs?”

Some 19.2% gave the “unsatisfactory” ratings on this question. The mean score was 3.18 (63.6%) with no significant difference by location. A similar question was asked in the LGAQ 2011 Community Satisfaction Survey, with the mean score in that survey a similar 64.0%.

### Overall performance of council on service range and quality

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	6.2%	6.8%	5.3%	6.0%
Unsatisfactory	13.0%	10.4%	16.7%	14.0%
Fair only	42.2%	40.0%	46.7%	41.0%
Satisfactory	31.2%	34.0%	26.0%	32.0%
Very satisfactory	5.8%	7.2%	3.3%	6.0%
Don't Know/No response	1.6%	1.6%	2.0%	1.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.18</b>

## 10. Internet Access

The next question asked “How satisfactory is your ability to access the internet whenever you need to use it?”

Only 10.2% gave the “unsatisfactory” responses. The mean score was a high 3.96 (79.2%) with no significant difference by location. Some 17.6% could not respond to this question.

### Ability to access internet

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	4.0%	3.6%	3.3%	6.1%
Unsatisfactory	6.2%	8.0%	3.3%	6.1%
Fair only	11.0%	8.8%	16.0%	9.1%
Satisfactory	29.3%	29.2%	28.0%	31.3%
Very satisfactory	31.9%	33.6%	33.3%	25.3%
Don't Know/No response	17.6%	16.8%	16.0%	22.2%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>3.82</b>

## 11. Transport Mobility

The next question asked “How satisfactory is your ability to access private or public transport to meet your daily mobility requirements?”

### Ability to access private/public transport

Rating	Total	SEQ	Regional cities	Rural
Very unsatisfactory	7.4%	6.8%	9.3%	6.0%
Unsatisfactory	7.2%	6.8%	6.0%	10.0%
Fair only	28.8%	26.8%	46.0%	8.0%
Satisfactory	31.6%	30.4%	28.0%	40.0%
Very satisfactory	21.4%	27.6%	6.0%	29.0%
Don't Know/No response	3.6%	1.6%	4.7%	7.0%
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>3.85</b>

Some 14.6% gave the “unsatisfactory” responses. The mean score was 3.55 (71%) and this was highest in rural communities at 3.85 (77%) and lowest in regional cities at 3.16 (63.2%).

## 12. Overview of Ratings

The following table summarises the results for all questions. The table also includes the ratings given for the total sample in the LGAQ 2011 pilot community wellbeing survey for those questions included in the final questionnaire used in this 2013 survey.

An average score across all the items is also shown. At the aggregate level, there is very little difference for the ratings given by each community.

### 2013 Community Wellbeing Survey Scores

Item	2011 Pilot Survey	2013 Survey	SEQ	Provincial Cities	Rural
1. Public Transport adequacy	3.9	<b>2.75</b>	3.00	2.66	2.23
2. Health Service adequacy	3.2	<b>3.48</b>	3.58	3.44	3.28
3. Education Service adequacy	3.9	<b>3.71</b>	3.79	3.61	3.65
4. Sport, Recreation	3.8	<b>3.74</b>	3.73	3.73	3.78
5. Arts & Culture	3.4	<b>3.35</b>	3.34	3.26	3.53
6. Social interaction in public spaces	Not piloted	<b>3.58</b>	3.48	3.78	3.51
7. Park/Reserves Upkeep	3.6	<b>3.77</b>	3.97	3.47	3.71
8. Park/Reserves Accessibility	3.6	<b>3.84</b>	4.00	3.58	3.84
9. Park/Reserves Facilities	Not piloted	<b>3.58</b>	3.68	3.47	3.48
10. Bikeways	3.2	<b>2.96</b>	3.06	2.81	2.94
11. Walking paths	3.3	<b>3.16</b>	3.34	2.92	3.09
12. Protection of natural environment	3.5	<b>3.49</b>	3.58	3.38	3.46
13. Socially inclusive environment	Not piloted	<b>3.40</b>	3.45	3.39	3.30
14. Liveable built environment	Not piloted	<b>3.50</b>	3.56	3.34	3.54
15. Suitability for young children	3.8	<b>3.52</b>	3.49	3.49	3.63
16. Suitability for teenagers	3.4	<b>2.97</b>	2.90	3.13	2.90
17. Suitability for seniors	3.7	<b>3.58</b>	3.58	3.61	3.52
18. Level of Support from Friends	4.1	<b>4.30</b>	4.21	4.44	4.30
19. Level of Support from Family	4.1	<b>4.32</b>	4.32	4.37	4.23
20. Level of Support from Neighbours	3.9	<b>3.93</b>	3.91	3.89	4.05
21. Access for Disabled	3.4	<b>3.37</b>	3.31	3.44	3.39
22. Welcoming of people from different cultures	Not piloted	<b>3.57</b>	3.42	3.74	3.65
23. Volunteer/Organisation involvement	Not piloted	<b>2.26</b>	2.40	1.93	2.41
24. Safety when alone	4.0	<b>3.72</b>	3.83	3.48	3.82
25. Life Satisfaction	4.2	<b>4.30</b>	4.27	4.42	4.18
26. Work not demanding or stressful	3.2	<b>3.01</b>	3.13	2.79	3.07
27. Work not interfering with family life	3.3	<b>3.16</b>	3.24	2.79	3.49
28. Job Security	3.8	<b>3.08</b>	3.18	2.63	3.51
29. Impact of cost of living	2.6	<b>2.37</b>	2.38	2.25	2.51
30. Impact of housing cost	Not piloted	<b>3.29</b>	3.48	2.77	3.60
31. Opportunities for engagement	3.0	<b>3.02</b>	3.02	3.07	2.96

Item	2011 Pilot Survey	2013 Survey	SEQ	Provincial Cities	Rural
32. Range & quality of council services	Not piloted	<b>3.18</b>	3.25	3.05	3.18
33. Ability to access internet	Not piloted	<b>3.96</b>	3.98	4.01	3.82
34. Ability to access private or public transport	Not piloted	<b>3.55</b>	3.66	3.16	3.85
<b>Average of above</b>		<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.43</b>

At the aggregate level, the total score of 3.43 (68.6%) was only marginally below that in the 2011 pilot survey (72%). For most of the questions, the mean scores were similar in the 2011 and 2013 surveys.

However, there were three questions where the results are significantly different. These are shown below.

Item	2011 Pilot Survey	2013 Survey
Public Transport adequacy	3.9	2.75
Suitability of community for teenagers	3.4	2.97
Job Security	3.8	3.08



ANNEX A

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES BY GENDER AND AGE

Table 1.1b: 1. How would you rate the adequacy of the following services in your local community in terms of your needs and wellbeing?

	Public transport								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	22.0	18.5 -	25.7 +	-	17.5	12.6 --	24.8	31.5 +++	20.0
Unsatisfactory	13.8	17.4 ++	10.0 --	14.3	10.0	20.7 ++	22.2 +++	8.7 -	7.0 --
Fair only	21.8	22.8	20.7	28.6	15.0	20.7	21.4	22.0	24.3
Satisfactory	18.4	18.1	18.7	35.7	22.5	20.7	12.8 -	17.3	20.0
Very satisfactory	9.2	8.9	9.5	7.1	17.5 +	12.6	7.7	3.9 --	11.3
D/K N/A	14.8	14.3	15.4	14.3	17.5	12.6	11.1	16.5	17.4

Table 1.2b: 1. How would you rate the adequacy of the following services in your local community in terms of your needs and wellbeing?

	Health services								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	6.6	6.6	6.6	7.1	2.5	5.7	10.3 +	4.7	7.0
Unsatisfactory	11.2	9.7	12.9	-	15.0	5.7 -	12.8	18.9 +++	5.2 --
Fair only	25.6	25.5	25.7	21.4	12.5 --	29.9	23.9	27.6	27.0
Satisfactory	39.4	41.7	36.9	64.3	42.5	39.1	37.6	32.3 -	45.2
Very satisfactory	16.2	16.2	16.2	7.1	25.0	18.4	14.5	15.0	15.7
D/K N/A	1.0	0.4	1.7	-	2.5	1.1	0.9	1.6	-

Table 1.3b: 1. How would you rate the adequacy of the following services in your local community in terms of your needs and wellbeing?

	Education								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	1.2	1.2	1.2	-	2.5	2.3	1.7	0.8	-
Unsatisfactory	4.6	3.5	5.8	-	7.5	9.2 ++	1.7 -	7.1	0.9 --
Fair only	25.0	22.4	27.8	14.3	15.0	21.8	35.0 +++	24.4	22.6
Satisfactory	41.0	44.0	37.8	64.3	45.0	44.8	36.8	40.9	38.3
Very satisfactory	13.0	13.1	12.9	21.4	20.0	12.6	15.4	7.1 --	13.9
D/K N/A	15.2	15.8	14.5	-	10.0	9.2 -	9.4 --	19.7	24.3 +++

Table 2.1b: 2. How adequate are the opportunities in your area for you to effectively engage in...

	Sport and recreation								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	3.0	2.3	3.7	-	12.5 +++	2.3	2.6	0.8 -	3.5
Unsatisfactory	7.0	8.1	5.8	7.1	7.5	4.6	10.3	6.3	6.1
Fair only	19.0	18.9	19.1	21.4	17.5	23.0	18.8	20.5	14.8
Satisfactory	44.2	45.9	42.3	42.9	32.5	46.0	42.7	48.0	44.3
Very satisfactory	18.4	16.2	20.7	21.4	27.5	18.4	19.7	17.3	14.8
D/K N/A	8.4	8.5	8.3	7.1	2.5	5.7	6.0	7.1	16.5 +++

Table 2.2b: 2. How adequate are the opportunities in your area for you to effectively engage in...

	Art and cultural activities								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	4.4	4.2	4.6	7.1	2.5	4.6	6.0	3.1	4.3
Unsatisfactory	11.8	13.9	9.5	21.4	20.0 +	12.6	12.8	10.2	7.8
Fair only	31.6	32.8	30.3	35.7	27.5	35.6	30.8	36.2	25.2 -
Satisfactory	33.6	32.8	34.4	21.4	40.0	28.7	32.5	32.3	39.1
Very satisfactory	9.6	7.3 -	12.0 +	14.3	7.5	6.9	8.5	10.2	12.2
D/K N/A	9.0	8.9	9.1	-	2.5	11.5	9.4	7.9	11.3

Table 3b: 3. How would you rate the opportunity for social interaction within your local community's public spaces?

	Opportunity for social interaction within your local community's public spaces?								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	
Unweighted Base	499 100.0	259 51.9 100.0	240 48.1 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.5 100.0	114 22.8 100.0
Satisfactory	41.1	44.0	37.9	50.0	32.5	47.1	34.2 -	40.9	45.6
Fair only	29.7	29.3	30.0	28.6	32.5	29.9	38.5 ++	27.6	21.9 --
Very satisfactory	12.4	13.1	11.7	14.3	10.0	13.8	12.0	13.4	11.4
D/K	7.4	5.4 -	9.6 +	-	10.0	4.6	8.5	6.3	9.6
Unsatisfactory	6.8	6.6	7.1	7.1	12.5	2.3 -	5.1	10.2 +	6.1
Very unsatisfactory	2.6	1.5	3.8	-	2.5	2.3	1.7	1.6	5.3 ++

Table 4.1b: 4. How do you rate the parks, reserves and open spaces in your local community for....

	Upkeep								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	2.2	1.2 -	3.3 +	-	5.0	1.1	1.7	2.4	2.6
Unsatisfactory	5.6	5.0	6.2	7.1	2.5	3.4	9.4 ++	6.3	3.5
Fair only	25.0	25.1	24.9	50.0	20.0	28.7	30.8 +	18.9 -	21.7
Satisfactory	44.6	49.4 ++	39.4 --	28.6	40.0	37.9	37.6 -	51.2 +	53.0 ++
Very satisfactory	20.4	17.4 -	23.7 +	14.3	32.5 ++	26.4	18.8	18.1	16.5
D/K N/A	2.2	1.9	2.5	-	-	2.3	1.7	3.1	2.6

Table 4.2b: 4. How do you rate the parks, reserves and open spaces in your local community for....

	Accessibility								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	1.4	0.4 --	2.5 ++	-	-	-	2.6	0.8	2.6
Unsatisfactory	5.4	5.4	5.4	7.1	7.5	4.6	4.3	7.1	4.3
Fair only	21.8	21.6	22.0	14.3	17.5	23.0	24.8	18.1	24.3
Satisfactory	47.8	50.6	44.8	57.1	50.0	48.3	41.9	51.2	47.8
Very satisfactory	21.4	20.1	22.8	21.4	25.0	21.8	23.9	20.5	18.3
D/K N/A	2.2	1.9	2.5	-	-	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.6

Table 4.3b: 4. How do you rate the parks, reserves and open spaces in your local community for....

	Facilities								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	1.6	1.2	2.1	7.1	-	1.1	0.9	1.6	2.6
Unsatisfactory	10.0	8.5	11.6	7.1	7.5	8.0	12.0	12.6	7.8
Fair only	30.4	29.7	31.1	42.9	25.0	33.3	34.2	30.7	24.3
Satisfactory	41.0	44.4	37.3	28.6	47.5	39.1	38.5	39.4	46.1
Very satisfactory	14.2	13.9	14.5	14.3	17.5	16.1	12.0	12.6	15.7
D/K N/A	2.8	2.3	3.3	-	2.5	2.3	2.6	3.1	3.5

Table 5.1b: 5. How do you rate the availability in your community of....

	Bikeways								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	16.0	16.6	15.4	7.1	20.0	11.5	23.9 +++	15.7	11.3
Unsatisfactory	15.2	13.9	16.6	28.6	12.5	17.2	14.5	16.5	12.2
Fair only	25.0	24.7	25.3	28.6	25.0	26.4	23.9	26.8	22.6
Satisfactory	25.6	26.3	24.9	28.6	22.5	25.3	18.8 -	26.0	33.0 ++
Very satisfactory	9.2	9.7	8.7	-	12.5	13.8	11.1	5.5 -	7.8
D/K N/A	9.0	8.9	9.1	7.1	7.5	5.7	7.7	9.4	13.0 +

Table 5.2b: 5. How do you rate the availability in your community of...

	Walking paths								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	13.6	13.1	14.1	7.1	12.5	13.8	18.8 +	15.7	7.0 --
Unsatisfactory	13.6	12.7	14.5	28.6	15.0	16.1	12.8	13.4	10.4
Fair only	25.6	27.0	24.1	21.4	27.5	27.6	27.4	24.4	23.5
Satisfactory	32.6	32.4	32.8	28.6	27.5	27.6	26.5	35.4	41.7 ++
Very satisfactory	12.0	12.7	11.2	14.3	15.0	11.5	12.0	10.2	13.0
D/K N/A	2.6	1.9	3.3	-	2.5	3.4	2.6	0.8	4.3

Table 6.1b: 6. How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your local community;

	to protect and conserve the natural environment								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	2.4	2.3	2.5	-	5.0	2.3	1.7	3.9	0.9
Unsatisfactory	9.4	10.8	7.9	21.4	7.5	5.7	11.1	9.4	9.6
Fair only	33.8	35.5	32.0	35.7	32.5	35.6	39.3	33.9	27.0 -
Satisfactory	39.8	38.6	41.1	28.6	42.5	42.5	33.3	37.0	47.8 ++
Very satisfactory	11.0	9.3	12.9	7.1	12.5	12.6	12.0	9.4	10.4
D/K N/A	3.6	3.5	3.7	7.1	-	1.1	2.6	6.3 +	4.3

Table 6.2b: 6. How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your local community;

	<b>to provide a socially inclusive environment</b>								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	1.2	0.8	1.7	-	2.5	-	0.9	0.8	2.6
Unsatisfactory	10.2	10.0	10.4	7.1	10.0	4.6 -	12.0	16.5 +++	6.1 -
Fair only	33.2	34.7	31.5	42.9	20.0 -	36.8	40.2 +	31.5	28.7
Satisfactory	38.8	36.7	41.1	35.7	45.0	40.2	33.3	33.9	47.0 ++
Very satisfactory	4.4	5.0	3.7	7.1	5.0	6.9	4.3	3.1	3.5
D/K N/A	12.2	12.7	11.6	7.1	17.5	11.5	9.4	14.2	12.2

Table 6.3b: 6. How satisfied are you with efforts being made in your local community;

	<b>to provide a liveable built environment</b>								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	0.6	0.4	0.8	-	2.5	-	0.9	-	0.9
Unsatisfactory	7.2	8.1	6.2	-	7.5	4.6	10.3	8.7	5.2
Fair only	29.2	28.2	30.3	14.3	25.0	31.0	36.8 ++	29.1	23.5
Satisfactory	37.2	36.7	37.8	64.3	45.0	37.9	31.6	37.0	36.5
Very satisfactory	5.6	5.0	6.2	-	5.0	8.0	5.1	5.5	5.2
D/K N/A	20.2	21.6	18.7	21.4	15.0	18.4	15.4	19.7	28.7 +++

Table 7.1b: 7. How would you rate the suitability of your community for ...

	Young children								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	2.8	1.5 -	4.1 +	-	5.0	2.3	1.7	3.1	3.5
Unsatisfactory	9.6	9.3	10.0	7.1	10.0	9.2	10.3	8.7	10.4
Fair only	28.4	31.3	25.3	14.3	22.5	28.7	32.5	27.6	28.7
Satisfactory	41.8	42.1	41.5	57.1	45.0	39.1	43.6	40.2	40.9
Very satisfactory	11.0	9.7	12.4	21.4	15.0	18.4 ++	8.5	11.0	5.2 --
D/K N/A	6.4	6.2	6.6	-	2.5	2.3 -	3.4	9.4	11.3 ++

Table 7.2b: 7. How would you rate the suitability of your community for ...

	Teenagers								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	9.2	6.9 -	11.6 +	7.1	17.5 +	5.7	11.1	7.9	8.7
Unsatisfactory	18.2	17.4	19.1	-	12.5	20.7	18.8	20.5	17.4
Fair only	36.6	40.2 +	32.8 -	28.6	32.5	33.3	41.0	40.2	33.0
Satisfactory	25.4	26.3	24.5	50.0	30.0	28.7	20.5	18.1 --	31.3 +
Very satisfactory	4.2	4.6	3.7	14.3	7.5	8.0 ++	2.6	3.9	0.9 --
D/K N/A	6.4	4.6 -	8.3 +	-	-	3.4	6.0	9.4	8.7



Table 7.3b: 7. How would you rate the suitability of your community for ...

	Seniors								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	2.8	3.1	2.5	-	-	3.4	3.4	2.4	3.5
Unsatisfactory	9.4	10.4	8.3	14.3	12.5	10.3	9.4	10.2	6.1
Fair only	29.8	27.4	32.4	-	42.5 +	36.8	30.8	26.0	27.0
Satisfactory	40.4	40.9	39.8	64.3	30.0	33.3	43.6	39.4	44.3
Very satisfactory	15.6	15.4	15.8	21.4	15.0	12.6	9.4 --	19.7	19.1
D/K N/A	2.0	2.7	1.2	-	-	3.4	3.4	2.4	-

Table 8.1b: 8. How would you rate the level of support available to you from

	Friends								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	1.2	0.4 -	2.1 +	-	5.0 ++	-	0.9	-	2.6
Unsatisfactory	2.8	3.5	2.1	-	2.5	4.6	4.3	2.4	0.9
Fair only	9.2	9.7	8.7	-	10.0	6.9	13.7 +	8.7	7.8
Satisfactory	37.8	38.6	36.9	42.9	47.5	33.3	27.4 ---	45.7 ++	39.1
Very satisfactory	48.0	46.7	49.4	57.1	35.0 -	54.0	51.3	42.5	49.6
D/K N/A	1.0	1.2	0.8	-	-	1.1	2.6 +	0.8	-

Table 8.2b: 8. How would you rate the level of support available to you from

	Family								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	3.4	4.2	2.5	7.1	7.5	1.1	5.1	2.4	2.6
Unsatisfactory	3.0	2.7	3.3	-	2.5	2.3	2.6	3.1	4.3
Fair only	7.6	8.1	7.1	-	2.5	6.9	9.4	9.4	7.0
Satisfactory	29.0	33.6 ++	24.1 --	14.3	30.0	23.0	31.6	33.9	27.0
Very satisfactory	55.0	49.4 ---	61.0 +++	78.6	55.0	64.4 +	48.7	48.8	58.3
D/K N/A	2.0	1.9	2.1	-	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.4	0.9

Table 8.3b: 8. How would you rate the level of support available to you from

	Neighbours								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very unsatisfactory	5.6	4.6	6.6	7.1	7.5	2.3	8.5	3.9	6.1
Unsatisfactory	4.2	3.5	5.0	14.3	5.0	6.9	4.3	3.1	1.7
Fair only	19.0	21.2	16.6	35.7	15.0	18.4	18.8	23.6	13.9
Satisfactory	33.8	35.5	32.0	14.3	45.0	37.9	32.5	37.0	27.0 -
Very satisfactory	37.0	34.4	39.8	28.6	27.5	33.3	35.9	32.3	50.4 +++
D/K N/A	0.4	0.8	-	-	-	1.1	-	-	0.9

Table 9b: 9. How would you rate access to buildings and services in your community for people with physical disability?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Satisfactory	38.0	38.2	37.8	57.1	35.0	31.0	35.0	40.2	42.6
Fair only	33.4	31.3	35.7	21.4	35.0	40.2	35.0	30.7	30.4
Unsatisfactory	9.6	9.7	9.5	7.1	7.5	9.2	12.8	8.7	8.7
Very satisfactory	8.2	9.3	7.1	14.3	12.5	8.0	8.5	7.1	7.0
D/K	5.6	6.2	5.0	-	5.0	5.7	4.3	7.1	6.1
Very unsatisfactory	5.2	5.4	5.0	-	5.0	5.7	4.3	6.3	5.2

Table 10b: 10 How strongly do you agree or disagree that your local community is welcoming of people from different cultures?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Agree	41.8	40.2	43.6	42.9	47.5	33.3	41.0	46.5	41.7
Neither agree or disagree	27.2	27.8	26.6	28.6	12.5 --	36.8 ++	28.2	24.4	27.0
Strongly agree	13.8	12.4	15.4	21.4	30.0 +++	12.6	14.5	11.8	9.6
Disagree	10.0	12.0	7.9	-	2.5 -	9.2	11.1	10.2	13.0
D/K	4.4	3.9	5.0	-	2.5	5.7	3.4	5.5	4.3

Table 11b: 11. How would you rate your level of involvement in your local community as a volunteer or member of a community organisation?

	Gender			Age group					
	Total	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Not involved at all	40.6	42.9	38.2	50.0	52.5	37.9	39.3	33.1 --	47.0
Some involvement	20.0	18.9	21.2	21.4	12.5	23.0	20.5	26.0 +	13.0 --
Very limited involvement	18.8	18.9	18.7	21.4	7.5 -	19.5	17.1	23.6	18.3
Actively involved	13.6	12.4	14.9	7.1	20.0	14.9	15.4	9.4	13.9
Very actively involved	6.8	6.9	6.6	-	7.5	4.6	6.8	7.9	7.8
D/K	0.2	-	0.4	-	-	-	0.9 +	-	-

Table 12b: 12. How safe do you feel when you are outside and alone in a public place?

	Gender			Age group					
	Total	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Safe	38.0	36.7	39.4	42.9	42.5	35.6	38.5	37.0	38.3
Very safe	25.0	30.5 +++	19.1 ---	21.4	35.0	29.9	20.5	29.1	18.3 -
Fair only	23.4	23.9	22.8	14.3	12.5 -	24.1	23.9	19.7	31.3 ++
Unsafe	7.2	4.6 --	10.0 ++	-	5.0	5.7	10.3	9.4	4.3
Very unsafe	4.8	2.7 --	7.1 ++	21.4	5.0	3.4	4.3	2.4	7.0
D/K	1.6	1.5	1.7	-	-	1.1	2.6	2.4	0.9

Table 13b: 13. Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Very satisfied	46.2	44.4	48.1	50.0	45.0	52.9	39.3 -	44.1	50.4
Satisfied	40.6	39.8	41.5	42.9	50.0	33.3	43.6	45.7	33.9 -
fair only	9.8	11.2	8.3	7.1	5.0	8.0	13.7	8.7	10.4
Unsatisfied	2.6	3.5	1.7	-	-	3.4	2.6	1.6	4.3
Very unsatisfied	0.6	0.8	0.4	-	-	1.1	0.9	-	0.9
D/K	0.2	0.4	-	-	-	1.1 ++	-	-	-

Table 14b: 14. What is your current work status?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	499 100.0	258 51.7 100.0	241 48.3 100.0	13 2.6 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.5 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Working full-time	35.3	46.5 +++	23.2 ---	38.5	42.5	54.0 +++	52.1 +++	35.4	0.9 ---
Retired	27.9	29.5	26.1	-	-	-	6.0 ---	18.9 ---	93.9 +++
Working part-time	16.4	13.2 --	19.9 ++	53.8	22.5	23.0 +	17.1	20.5	-
Home duties	13.8	1.9 ---	26.6 +++	-	30.0 +++	17.2	15.4	16.5	2.6 ---
Unemployed	3.6	4.7	2.5	7.7	5.0	3.4	4.3	5.5	-
Incapacitated	3.0	4.3 +	1.7 -	-	-	2.3	5.1	3.1	2.6

Table 15.1b: 15. (If Working) Do you agree or disagree with the following .....

	<b>My work is too demanding and stressful</b>								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	258 100.0	154 59.7 100.0	104 40.3 100.0	12 4.7 100.0	26 10.1 100.0	67 26.0 100.0	81 31.4 100.0	71 27.5 100.0	1 0.4 100.0
Strongly Disagree	10.5	13.6 ++	5.8 --	8.3	11.5	13.4	7.4	11.3	-
Disagree	25.2	24.0	26.9	41.7	19.2	25.4	33.3 ++	14.1 --	100.0
Neither agree nor disagree	25.6	26.6	24.0	16.7	26.9	23.9	24.7	29.6	-
Agree	30.6	29.2	32.7	16.7	34.6	26.9	29.6	36.6	-
Strongly agree	8.1	6.5	10.6	16.7	7.7	10.4	4.9	8.5	-

Table 15.2b: 15. (If Working) Do you agree or disagree with the following .....

	<b>My work and family life often interfere with each other</b>								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	258 100.0	154 59.7 100.0	104 40.3 100.0	12 4.7 100.0	26 10.1 100.0	67 26.0 100.0	81 31.4 100.0	71 27.5 100.0	1 0.4 100.0
Strongly Disagree	8.5	9.7	6.7	8.3	11.5	7.5	11.1	5.6	-
Disagree	22.1	21.4	23.1	41.7	15.4	26.9	23.5	15.5	-
Neither agree nor disagree	23.3	25.3	20.2	8.3	30.8	25.4	19.8	25.4	-
Agree	37.2	35.1	40.4	25.0	34.6	29.9	37.0	46.5 +	100.0
Strongly agree	8.9	8.4	9.6	16.7	7.7	10.4	8.6	7.0	-

Table 15.3b: 15. (If Working) Do you agree or disagree with the following .....

	<b>I have good job security</b>								
	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	259 100.0	154 59.5 100.0	105 40.5 100.0	12 4.6 100.0	26 10.0 100.0	67 25.9 100.0	81 31.3 100.0	72 27.8 100.0	1 0.4 100.0
Strongly Disagree	9.7	11.7	6.7	8.3	3.8	14.9 +	9.9	6.9	-
Disagree	23.2	18.8 --	29.5 ++	50.0	19.2	23.9	25.9	16.7	-
Neither agree nor disagree	27.0	31.8 ++	20.0 --	8.3	23.1	31.3	25.9	29.2	-
Agree	29.7	29.2	30.5	16.7	42.3	20.9 -	29.6	34.7	100.0
Strongly agree	10.4	8.4	13.3	16.7	11.5	9.0	8.6	12.5	-

Table 16b: 16. How would you rate the impact on your household from the increasing cost of living?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Affected	38.0	39.0	36.9	21.4	35.0	39.1	40.2	39.4	36.5
Only a little	25.4	25.5	25.3	42.9	20.0	19.5	24.8	27.6	27.8
Very badly affected	21.8	20.5	23.2	14.3	25.0	28.7 +	23.9	14.2 --	22.6
Does not affect much	10.2	10.4	10.0	21.4	17.5	11.5	6.8	12.6	6.1 -
Does not affect at all	4.4	4.2	4.6	-	2.5	-	4.3	6.3	7.0
D/K	0.2	0.4	-	-	-	1.1 ++	-	-	-

Table 17b: 17. How would you rate the impact of your current rental or mortgage payments in your household's finances?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Does not affect at all	28.4	26.6	30.3	28.6	12.5 --	17.2 --	23.9	29.9	45.2 +++
Only a little	23.0	21.6	24.5	21.4	15.0	23.0	29.1 +	24.4	18.3
Affected	19.4	20.8	17.8	14.3	27.5	24.1	24.8 +	18.1	9.6 ---
Does not affect much	16.0	18.1	13.7	14.3	25.0	14.9	11.1 -	20.5	13.9
Very badly affected	12.2	11.6	12.9	14.3	20.0	19.5 ++	10.3	6.3 --	12.2
D/K	1.0	1.2	0.8	7.1	-	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.9

Table 18b: 18 How satisfied are you in the way your local council provides for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Fair only	36.6	34.7	38.6	42.9	30.0	42.5	34.2	36.2	36.5
Satisfactory	25.0	25.9	24.1	35.7	32.5	19.5	24.8	23.6	27.0
Unsatisfactory	14.8	15.8	13.7	14.3	12.5	16.1	19.7 +	17.3	7.0 ---
Very unsatisfactory	10.2	10.0	10.4	7.1	12.5	6.9	10.3	11.0	11.3
D/K	7.6	7.7	7.5	-	7.5	9.2	6.0	5.5	11.3 +
Very satisfactory	5.8	5.8	5.8	-	5.0	5.7	5.1	6.3	7.0



Table 19b: 19. How would you rate the overall performance of your local council in delivering an appropriate range and quality of services relevant to you household needs?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Unweighted Base	500 100.0	259 51.8 100.0	241 48.2 100.0	14 2.8 100.0	40 8.0 100.0	87 17.4 100.0	117 23.4 100.0	127 25.4 100.0	115 23.0 100.0
Fair only	42.2	41.3	43.2	57.1	32.5	43.7	37.6	41.7	47.8
Satisfactory	31.2	33.2	29.0	35.7	37.5	33.3	28.2	29.1	32.2
Unsatisfactory	13.0	13.1	12.9	7.1	15.0	16.1	19.7 ++	13.4	3.5 ---
Very unsatisfactory	6.2	6.2	6.2	-	7.5	1.1 --	10.3 ++	7.1	5.2
Very satisfactory	5.8	5.0	6.6	-	5.0	3.4	4.3	7.1	8.7
D/K	1.6	1.2	2.1	-	2.5	2.3	-	1.6	2.6

Table 20b: 20. How satisfactory is your ability to access the internet whenever you need to use it?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Very satisfactory	31.9	32.9	30.7	78.6	50.0 ++	41.9 ++	29.9	29.1	17.4 ---
Satisfactory	29.3	27.9	30.7	7.1	30.0	27.9	31.6	33.9	25.2
D/K	17.6	17.4	17.8	14.3	7.5 -	8.1 --	12.0 -	10.2 --	42.6 +++
Fair only	11.0	9.7	12.4	-	5.0	9.3	15.4 +	12.6	9.6
Unsatisfactory	6.2	6.6	5.8	-	7.5	11.6 ++	6.0	7.9	0.9 ---
Very unsatisfactory	4.0	5.4 +	2.5 -	-	-	1.2	5.1	6.3	4.3

Table 21b: How satisfactory is your ability to access private or public transport to meet your daily mobility requirements?

	Total	Gender		Age group					
		Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Satisfactory	31.6	34.0	29.0	35.7	27.5	28.7	29.9	33.9	33.9
Fair only	28.8	29.0	28.6	28.6	37.5	32.2	30.8	22.0	28.7
Very satisfactory	21.4	19.7	23.2	21.4	25.0	20.7	20.5	22.8	20.0
Very unsatisfactory	7.4	6.9	7.9	7.1	2.5	5.7	8.5	7.1	9.6
Unsatisfactory	7.2	7.3	7.1	-	7.5	11.5	6.8	8.7	3.5
D/K	3.6	3.1	4.1	7.1	-	1.1	3.4	5.5	4.3

## Australian Centre for Excellence for Local Government (ACELG)

ACELG is a unique consortium of universities and professional bodies that have a strong commitment to the advancement of local government. The consortium is based at the University of Technology, Sydney and includes the UTS Centre for Local Government, the University of Canberra, the Australia and New Zealand School of Government, Local Government Managers Australia and the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia. In addition, the Centre works with program partners to provide support in specialist areas and extend the Centre's national reach. These include Charles Darwin University and Edith Cowan University.

ACELG's activities are grouped into six program areas:

- Research and Policy Foresight
- Innovation and Best Practice
- Governance and Strategic Leadership
- Organisation Capacity Building
- Rural-Remote and Indigenous Local Government
- Workforce Development

### Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government

PO BOX 123 Broadway NSW 2007

T: +61 2 9514 3855 F: +61 9514 4705

E: [acelg@acelg.org.au](mailto:acelg@acelg.org.au) W: [www.acelg.org.au](http://www.acelg.org.au)



## Local Government Association of Queensland (LGAQ)

The LGAQ is the peak body for local government in Queensland. It has been advising, supporting and representing local councils since 1896, allowing them to improve their operations and strengthen relationships with their communities.

### Local Government Association of Queensland

PO Box 2230 Fortitude Valley BC Queensland 4006

T: +61 7 3000 2222 F: +61 7 3252 4473.

E: [ask@lgaq.asn.au](mailto:ask@lgaq.asn.au) W: <http://www.lgaq.asn.au>



An Australian Government Initiative