Life in the UK Index

Technical Report
October 2024

Karl Ashworth, Dr Emily Gray, Stuart Stevenson, Ipsos

collective wellbeing Carnegie UK

Ipsos

24-030653-01 | Version 1 | Public | This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for Market Research, ISO 20252. © Ipsos 2024

Contents

1 Research overview 4
2 Survey design 5
Recruitment to the panel 5
Conducting the survey 5
3 Index content 7
4 Data processing 10
4.1 Data preparation and cleaning 10
5 Analysis 12
5.1 Data analysis procedure 12
5.2 Replicating the factor analysis 13
5.3 Computing domain scores 13
5.3.1 Rescaling of ordinal responses 13
5.3.2 Calculation of domain scores 14
5.4 Computing Collective Wellbeing 14
6 Regression – UK Report 15
6.1 Overview 15
6.2 Collective wellbeing 15
6.3 Social wellbeing 17
6.4 Economic wellbeing 19
6.5 Environmental wellbeing 21
6.6 Democratic wellbeing 23
Appendix A – Profile of weights 26
Appendix B – Questionnaire 30
Appendix C – Nation-level regression write-up 35
Regression analysis of the 2024 Life in the UK Index - England 35
Regression analysis of the 2024 Life in the UK Index - Scotland 45
Regression analysis of the 2024 Life in the UK Index - Wales 51
Regression analysis of the 2024 Life in the UK Index – Northern Ireland 57

1 Research overview

In 2023, Carnegie UK and Ipsos worked together to create the Life in the UK index, a measure of the wellbeing of UK residents by considering key factors across social, economic, environmental, and democratic domains. A measure of each of these four domains was calculated separately from a short survey of questions, building an evidence-based understanding of wellbeing. Furthermore, a measure of overall collective wellbeing was created by averaging the individual level scores of the four domains.

This multi-dimensional approach provided a nuanced understanding of societal progress beyond traditional economic indicators. The survey underpinning the index was repeated in May 2024. The intention is for this to be an annual index, which will enable Carnegie UK to assess change and stability across the four domains of wellbeing and overall collective wellbeing.

The Life in the UK index of 26 questions was generated from a range of pre-existing surveys to identify questions that would capture different aspects of the four wellbeing domains. The question set was finalised following consultation with an expert Advisory Group and focus group testing ahead of the first wave of the survey in 2023. Advisory Group members bridged expertise in statistics, wellbeing and the Northern Irish, Scottish, Welsh and UK contexts.

For the 2024 implementation of the index, 6,774 respondents completed the survey from Ipsos' Knowledge Panel, a random probability survey panel with selection based on a random sample of UK households.

In the 2023 survey[1], exploratory factor analyses were conducted for each of the four domains. This helped to establish the subset of questions that represented each wellbeing domain. The factor analysis for each domain was replicated in 2024 with similar levels of cohesion and consistency as with the previous year. A bootstrapping factor analysis had also been performed the previous year to measure the stability of each model.

In both 2023 and 2024, the scores for each wellbeing domain were computed by averaging the raw scores of the questions included in each domain, as determined by the factor analysis and consultation with the Advisory Group. The overall collective wellbeing score was obtained by averaging the scores of the four domain wellbeing scores. This process ensured that the wellbeing measures captured a comprehensive understanding of wellbeing across the four domains.

[1] https://carnegieuktrust.org.uk/publications/liuk2023methodology/

2 Survey design

The survey was conducted through Ipsos' KnowledgePanel, which is a random probability survey panel with selection based on a random sample of UK households. Fieldwork was carried out between 9th and 15th May 2023, with a total of 6,774 interviews achieved from UK residents aged 16 and over.

Recruitment to the panel

Panellists are recruited via a random probability unclustered address-based sampling method. This means that every household in the UK has a known chance of being selected to join the panel. Letters are sent to selected addresses in the UK (using the Postcode Address File) inviting them to become members of the panel. Invited members are able to sign up to the panel by completing a short online questionnaire or by returning a paper form. Members of the public who are digitally excluded are able to register to the KnowledgePanel either by post or by telephone, and are given a tablet, an email address, and basic internet access which allows them to complete surveys online.

Conducting the survey

The survey was designed using a 'mobile-first' approach, which took into consideration the look, feel and usability of a questionnaire on a mobile device. This included: a thorough review of the questionnaire length to ensure it would not overburden respondents from focusing on a small screen for a lengthy period, avoiding the use of grid style questions (instead using question loops which are more mobile friendly), and making questions 'finger-friendly' so they are easy to respond to. The questionnaire was also compatible with screen reader software to help those requiring further accessibility.

Sample

The KnowledgePanel is a random probability survey panel. Therefore, the KnowledgePanel does not use a quota approach when conducting surveys. Instead invited samples are stratified when conducting waves to account for any profile skews within the panel.

The sample was stratified to get a reasonable representation of respondents by nation, age, education, ethnicity, and community background (in Northern Ireland, based on religion and religion brought up in). In particular, the number of minority ethnic individuals was boosted to be able to break down analysis by ethnicity.

A total of 12,763 panellists in the United Kingdom (16+) were selected and invited to take part in the survey. Of these, 6,774 respondents completed the survey – a response rate of 53%.

Weighting

In order to ensure the survey results are as representative of the target population as possible, a weighting specification was applied to the data in line with the target population profile.

Three members per household are allowed to register on the KnowledgePanel. To account for this and varying household sizes, a data design was employed to correct for unequal probabilities of selection of household members.

Calibration weights have also been applied using the latest population statistics relevant to the surveyed population to correct for imbalances in the achieved sample. England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland were each weighted separately, while an additional weight has been created for the United Kingdom overall.

The calibration weights were applied in two stages:

- The first set of variables were (*using ONS 2019 mid-year population estimates as the weighting targets*): An interlocked variable of gender by age, and region.
- The second set were (*using ONS 2019 mid-year population estimates and the ONS Annual Population Survey as the weighting targets*): Education, Ethnicity, Index of Multiple Deprivation (quintiles), number of adults in the household and Community Background (Northern Ireland).

The weighting profile targets for England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland are provided in Appendix A.

3 Index content

The finalised questionnaire used in 2023 balanced the need for “content validity” with “statistical validity” when constructing the scales. This meant that the question set in 2023 for each domain was both statistically cohesive in that it measures the same fundamental theme, e.g. social wellbeing, while also sufficiently broad to cover a range of different aspects of each domain, e.g. physical and mental health, access to amenities, a sense of community and safety, and experiences of discrimination all in the case of social wellbeing.

The 2023 index survey included 36 question items, of which 26 were used in the calculation of the index scores. In 2024, the same set of 26 question items was used for the index for consistency. 34 of the 36 question items were included in the index questionnaire, dropping one question on a sense of belonging in the respondent’s immediate neighbourhood and another question on the respondent’s perceptions of the condition of their home. Two question items related to access to services, namely access to public transport and GP appointments, were retained in order to keep overall question wording consistent, despite not being included in the wellbeing scores. Likewise, question items measuring trust in MPs, social media and big tech companies, as well as trust in the devolved administrations and parliamentarians for respondents in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland respectively, were also retained as valuable context to the results, despite not being included in the index construction.

The full set of question items included in the index and organised into the four wellbeing domains is provided below in Table 3.1, together with details on the original surveys from which they were sourced. A copy of the full questionnaire has been provided in Appendix B.

Table 3.1: Questions included in each domain

Domain	Questions, scales and sources
Social wellbeing	• *General health:* How is your health in general? (5-point Likert scale; commonly asked on UK-wide surveys such as OECD's Better Life Index) • *Mental health:* And how would you describe your mental health in general? (5-point Likert scale; Ipsos Levelling Up Index) • *Neighbourhood safety:* How safe do you feel walking alone in your local neighbourhood after dark? (5-point Likert scale; Crime Survey for England and Wales) • *Rely on neighbours:* How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement? If I was alone and needed help, I could rely on someone in this neighbourhood to help me (5-point Likert scale; The Impact of COVID-19 on Wellbeing in Scotland survey) • *Access to supermarket:* Thinking of physical access, distance, opening hours and the like, how easy or difficult is it for you to access a grocery shop or supermarket in person? (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Discrimination:* Sometimes people are treated unfairly because of their characteristics or because they belong to a particular group. How much, if at all, have you personally been unfairly treated or discriminated against in the last 12 months? (4-point Likert scale; OECD's Better Life Index)
Economic wellbeing	• *Job opportunities:* Leaving aside whether you personally are looking for a job, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with job opportunities for people in your local area? (5-point Likert scale; Ipsos Levelling Up Index) • *Afford warm house:* My household can afford to keep our home adequately warm (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Afford holiday:* My household can afford to pay for a week's annual holiday away from home (not staying with relatives) (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Afford unexpected expense:* My household can afford to pay an unexpected, but necessary, expense of £850 (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Afford enough food:* My household can afford to buy enough food for everyone in the household (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Afford socialising:* My household can afford to socialise with friends or family outside of the home once a month if we want to (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Satisfaction with skills:* How satisfied are you with your education and skills? (5-point Likert scale)

Environmental wellbeing	• *Noise pollution:* Please think about your local neighbourhood. Do you have major, moderate, minor or no problems with the following? Noise (4-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Air pollution:* Please think about your local neighbourhood. Do you have major, moderate, minor or no problems with the following? Air quality (4-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Litter:* Please think about your local neighbourhood. Do you have major, moderate, minor or no problems with the following? Litter or rubbish (4-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Satisfaction with open spaces:* Please think about the public, green or open space in your local area that is nearest to your home, for example a park, countryside, wood, play area, canal path, riverside or beach. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the quality of the space? This might include how well it meets your needs, whether it is safe, attractive, free of litter or other mess, and the quality of the facilities if there are any (5-point Likert scale; Scottish Household Survey) • *UK's environmental efforts:* How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with efforts to preserve the environment in the UK? (5-point Likert scale; Gallup)
Democratic wellbeing	• *Trust in UK government:* On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how much do you trust each of the following? UK Government (10-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Trust in UK local council:* On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how much do you trust each of the following? Local council (10-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Trust in the legal system:* On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how much do you trust each of the following? Legal system and courts (10-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Trust in the media:* On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how much do you trust each of the following? News media (10-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Trust in the police:* On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how much do you trust each of the following? Police (10-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Trust in banks:* On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how much do you trust each of the following? Banks (10-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • *Influence in UK decision-making:* How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? I can influence decisions affecting the UK as a whole (5-point Likert scale; Scottish Government Wellbeing surveys) • *Influence in local area decision-making:* How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? I can influence decisions affecting my local area (5-point Likert scale; Scottish Government Wellbeing surveys)

4 Data processing

4.1 Data preparation and cleaning

Once the data was collected the research team at Ipsos cleaned and prepared the data by:

- Ensuring that all questions had been recorded appropriately, with the minimum and maximum values as per the questionnaire.
- Recoding “Don’t know” and “Prefer not to say” answers as missing values.
- Rescaling of all raw variables. Questions varied in their response categories between 4-point, 5-point and 10-point response scales. It was necessary to adjust the raw responses such that a maximum score of 4 on one item was not treated as a score of 4 on a 1-10 scale but became equivalent to a score of 10. For this reason, all raw response outputs were refactored to a continuous 0-1 scale.
- Additionally, for the questions related to noise pollution, air quality and litter, as well as discrimination, the first response was the most negative, requiring that the order of the response categories was reversed before being rescaled. Rescaled values were multiplied by 100 so that the wellbeing scores’ range would extend from 0 to 100.

The percentage of missing values[2] was monitored throughout the analysis process (See Table 4.1). Missing data raises various challenges. Any item with high levels of missing values suggests that it may not be well suited for inclusion into a scale because it cannot be answered appropriately by all, though this is not a rule applied stringently. Whilst low levels of missingness may be of little concern for individual questions, the number of cases with missing values can accumulate across questions included in a scale. Missing data may also give rise to systematic differences in characteristics between people who have provided a response and those who have not, and our approach to explore this is discussed further below.

The level of missing data was generally low across individual questions (an average of 1.9%, Table 4.1) except for the question on satisfaction with the availability of job opportunities, where a response was missing in 11.4% of cases, which related to respondents answering, “Don’t know”. Although the percentage of missing cases in this variable was relatively high, it was not particularly associated with a broader pattern of missingness and its impact on the final economic wellbeing domain was limited.

A listwise deletion procedure was applied when combining data from more than one variable. This involves removing entire rows of data for the purposes of analysis where a single missing value is present. However, given the relatively low rate of missingness in the sample, the effect of this strategy was negligible.

[2] Here missing values refers to cases where we expect a response to be given and excludes any logically missing responses through filtering.

Table 4.1: Mean, standard deviation and percentage of missing cases per variable

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Missing Percent
Social Wellbeing				
General health	6751	69.70	21.15	0.3
Mental health	6742	68.29	23.11	0.5
Rely on neighbours	6680	67.01	27.51	1.4
Access to supermarket	6739	84.79	21.56	0.5
Neighbourhood safety	6698	62.66	28.03	1.1
Discrimination	6596	80.81	24.73	2.6
Economic Wellbeing				
Job opportunities	6001	50.51	24.79	11.4
Afford warm house	6733	75.23	27.64	0.6
Afford holidays	6690	68.52	33.84	1.2
Afford unexpected expense	6676	62.83	36.17	1.4
Afford enough food	6740	85.08	21.88	0.5
Afford socialising	6703	78.11	26.61	1
Satisfied with skills	6737	76.06	21.82	0.5
Environmental Wellbeing				
Noise pollution	6735	69.88	28.64	0.6
Air pollution	6530	72.85	29.29	3.6
Litter	6729	55.62	29.23	0.7
Satisfaction with open spaces	6701	69.45	25.63	1.1
UK's environmental efforts	6596	42.6	26.33	2.6
Democratic Wellbeing				
Trust in UK government	6646	27.82	24.74	1.9
Trust in local council	6565	41.92	24.39	3.1
Trust in the legal system	6544	51.72	24.71	3.4
Trust in the media	6670	37.59	23.96	1.5
Trust in the police	6664	52.45	24.77	1.6
Trust in banks	6653	52.61	25.58	1.8
Influence in the UK	6612	23.91	23.71	2.4
Influence in local area	6610	34.79	25.28	2.4

5 Analysis

5.1 Data analysis procedure

For the 2023 index, factor analysis was used to create the subsets of questions used to generate the domain specific wellbeing scores. Factor analysis is a statistical technique used to show whether the respondent data is measuring a single theme or “factor”.

For the 2024 index, the factor analysis was repeated with the same input variables as 2023. This was to test whether the question choice for each domain was still statistically sound for the new set of data. The factor loading and Cronbach’s alpha were substantially similar to the previous year’s exploratory factor analysis, which indicates that the models are a good fit for the index. Figures and further analysis are presented below.

The bootstrapping analysis of the 2023 data had shown that the models were stable, an indication that it was likely that the model would hold up to repeat analysis in subsequent years. The bootstrapping was not repeated for the 2024 index, but the consistent factor loading is a good indication that the model is consistently stable.

After confirming that the pattern of responses was looking similar to the previous year, a process of rescaling, weighting and averaging was used to generate the summary domain scores as well as the collective wellbeing scores for 2024.

5.2 Replicating the factor analysis

For the 2024 index, the factor analysis, first conducted in 2023, was replicated to ensure that the index model was still suitable for the 2024 dataset. Re-running the factor analysis provided a check that the relationships between the variables identified in 2023 remained similar enough in 2024 to justify continuing with the 2023 scale construction.

The factor analysis revealed that the patterns of correlation observed in the previous year were almost identical to the 2024 wave of the index. Respectable Cronbach's alpha scores, as shown in Table 5.1 below, are indicative of the model's stability which had previously been evidenced through bootstrapping analysis.

The democratic domain showed two separate, though correlated, dimensions in 2023, i.e. trust and influence. The 2024 data confirmed the structure revealed in 2023 and the two factors were again positively correlated ($R^2 = 0.31$) indicating that the trust and influence factors increase in line with each other, without necessarily moving in lockstep.

Table 5.1: Cronbach's Alpha by domain

Domain	Cronbach's Alpha
Social wellbeing	**0.67**
Economic wellbeing	**0.86**
Environment wellbeing	**0.68**
Democratic wellbeing	**0.83**

5.3 Computing domain scores

5.3.1 Rescaling of ordinal responses

The 26 questions in the index questionnaire (See Appendix B) are in the form of ordinal scale single-choice questions. As an example, question GENHEALTH asks respondents "How is your health in general?" with a single-choice four-point scale of "Very good", "Good", "Fair" and "Bad". For the purposes of rescaling and generating the index, the most positive response ("Very good") is initially given a score of 4, the next most positive ("Good") is given a score of 3, and so on. The below formula is applied to the original GENHEALTH scores (x_{GH}) to generate a new GENHEALTH value (x'_{GH}).[3]

$$x'_{GH} = \frac{x_{GH}-1}{n-1}$$

This new value for GENHEALTH spans a range of 0-1 and has been normalised for comparison with all other questions in the survey that may use different scales. All questions were either 4-point, 5-point or 10-point single-choice ordinal scale.

[3] *n in this case refers to the number of response categories. For GENHEALTH this is 4.*

For some questions, the first option listed is the most positive, i.e. '1'. In these cases, the scale was reverse ordered prior to rescaling, i.e. '1' was always the most negative option on the scale prior to rescaling to ensure a consistent ordering from negative (low) to positive (high) across all items.

5.3.2 Calculation of domain scores

Once values had been rescaled, an individual domain wellbeing score was calculated for each respondent. Where respondents had skipped over a question or responded "Don't know" or "Refused" for any questions belonging to a domain, no such domain score was calculated. This method of handling missing data is known as "listwise deletion". It can be potentially problematic where missing values are correlated with expected responses and can introduce bias. However, analysis performed for the 2023 index showed that the effect was minimal given the relatively low level of missing data. As in the 2023 survey, there was a high proportion of "Don't know" responses for the job availability question (See Table 4.1). Other than this, the levels of missing data were consistently low (between 0.3% and 3.6%), as in 2023 and so the listwise deletion method was continued.

Weighted averages of each domain score were calculated to generate the final domain scores (See Table 5.2). These values were also multiplied by 100 to give a potential range of 0-100.

5.4 Computing Collective Wellbeing

Domain scores for each respondent were averaged, again using listwise deletion, to produce respondent level collective wellbeing scores. These scores were subsequently averaged with weights to ensure that the results were representative (See Appendix A for weighting profile) and using listwise deletion to create the overall collective wellbeing score (See Table 5.2 below).

Table 5.2: Descriptive statistics of domain scores

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Social wellbeing score	**6763**	**.00**	**100.00**	**72.13**	**15.21**
Economic wellbeing score	**6757**	**.00**	**100.00**	**71.32**	**20.94**
Environmental wellbeing score	**6754**	**.00**	**100.00**	**62.08**	**18.60**
Democratic wellbeing score	**6744**	**.00**	**100.00**	**40.36**	**16.77**
Collective wellbeing score	**6765**	**.00**	**100.00**	**61.48**	**13.16**

6 Regression – UK Report

This section presents the regression results for the UK overall. Individual regression reports for the four jurisdictions – England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland – were also created for the 2024 index and can be found in Appendix C.

6.1 Overview

Regression analysis is a statistical method used to examine the relationship between a dependent variable (in this case, wellbeing scores) and one or more independent variables. It allows for the investigation of how differences in demographic characteristics, such as age, ethnicity, or gender, are associated with different outcomes of the dependent variable. By using regression, we can isolate the effects of specific demographic factors while controlling for other variables that may also be influential.

A key advantage of regression is that it explains the relationship between each demographic characteristic and collective wellbeing over and above the relationship between other demographic characteristics and wellbeing. Consequently, we can, for example, say that age has an effect of increasing or decreasing collective wellbeing by a value of *x* irrespective of any other demographic characteristic describing a person. It is important to note that regression models cannot establish causation. Rather, they provide valuable insights into the associations between variables.

Through interpretation of the regression estimates and the significance of the explanatory variables, we can develop a deeper understanding of how different socio-demographic factors contribute to collective wellbeing.

The estimates represent the expected change in the collective wellbeing score for each unit of change in an explanatory variable (i.e. demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, etc.). These estimates reveal the direction and size of the relationship between the characteristics and the collective wellbeing scores.

Furthermore, statistical measures such as p-values help determine whether the relationship observed between the demographic characteristics and the outcome variable is statistically significant. A p-value below our chosen threshold ($p < 0.05$) suggests that is likely that there are wider, population differences in wellbeing, that are dependent on a demographic characteristic. A p-value greater than the chosen threshold ($p > 0.05$) means that it is not possible, based on this dataset, to say with confidence that there are differences in the wellbeing of the population dependent on this characteristic.

Regression analysis results for collective wellbeing and for each of the four wellbeing domains – social, economic, environmental, and democratic – are provided below.

6.2 Collective wellbeing

Collective wellbeing varied substantially according to a range of socio-demographic characteristics. These accounted for around a third of the variation in collective wellbeing between respondents ($R^2 = 0.34$).

- **Income** was a particularly strong predictor of collective wellbeing with a difference of 9.01, or 16%, between those earning more than £100,000 and those earning under £26,000. The next highest income band (£52,000 to £99,999) also showed an increased collective wellbeing score of 6.35, or 11%, but this is not as stark as the previous estimate. The second lowest income band of £26,000 to £51,999 also showed a significant increase when compared with the reference group, of 3.89, or 7%.
- Other demographic factors which were strong predictors of collective wellbeing were **housing tenure**, **disability** and **area deprivation** quintile (IMD):
    - Those living in social housing had lower collective wellbeing of -5.76 (10%) when compared with owner occupiers. Private renters had a score between the two, scoring -2.81 or 5% less than homeowners.
    - People with a disability scored -5.74 (10%) fewer points than those without a disability. Disability is a strong predictor of a significantly lower score both for collective wellbeing and across the four wellbeing domains.
    - Area deprivation had a consistent impact on collective wellbeing; as the level of local deprivation decreased, wellbeing increased. Living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) added nearly five and a half points (5.44, or 9%) to a person's wellbeing score on average compared to living in the most deprived areas. Those living in IMD4 areas had 4.76 more points (8%) while those living in IMD3 had an additional 2.95 points (5%) when compared to the reference group. Those living in the second quintile of area deprivation scored 2.08 (4%) more points on average when compared to the most deprived areas.
- There was also variation in collective wellbeing by **age**. Older respondents (aged 55 and over) had a higher collective wellbeing score (5.09 or 9%) than those aged 16 to 34. There was no significant difference between young people aged 16-34 (the reference group) and those aged 35 to 54.
- Those living in **urban areas** had a lower overall wellbeing than those in rural areas by just under 3 points (-2.94, or 5%).
- **Ethnic minorities** (including white minorities) had a lower average collective wellbeing score by almost one and a half (-1.43, or 2%) points. **Men** scored almost a whole point higher than women (0.94).
- The presence of **children in the household** made a significant difference to average collective wellbeing. Those with one child (-1.89 points) or with three or more children (-2.64 points) reporting lower wellbeing scores than those without children. Those with exactly two children also score lower than those without children (-1.41) but this difference is not statistically significant.
- There was no significant difference in collective wellbeing between the reference jurisdiction (England) and Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland.

Table 6.1: Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	57.60	1.03	0.00
Men	***0.94***	***0.41***	***0.02***
Aged 35-54	0.03	0.65	0.96
Aged 55+	***5.09***	***0.69***	***0.00***
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	***3.89***	***0.58***	***0.00***
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	***6.35***	***0.63***	***0.00***
Income of £100,000+	***9.01***	***0.79***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	***-1.43***	***0.63***	***0.02***
Having a disability	***-5.74***	***0.52***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-2.81***	***0.75***	***0.00***
Social housing tenant	***-5.76***	***0.84***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	***-1.89***	***0.74***	***0.01***
Having 2 children	-1.41	0.72	0.05
Having 3 or more children	***-2.64***	***1.26***	***0.04***
IMD2	***2.08***	***0.71***	***0.00***
IMD3	***2.95***	***0.70***	***0.00***
IMD4	***4.76***	***0.73***	***0.00***
IMD5	***5.44***	***0.68***	***0.00***
Urban area	***-2.94***	***0.46***	***0.00***
Scotland	0.70	0.52	0.18
Wales	-0.20	0.64	0.75
Northern Ireland	-0.64	0.73	0.38

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

6.3 Social wellbeing

The demographic variables explained just over a third of the variation (adjusted R^2 = 0.33) between people's social wellbeing. This means that their influence is important but around two-thirds of the variation is explained by other factors than those we have included in the model.

- **Disability** was a notably strong predictor of a low social wellbeing score, with an average drop of -10.25 points, or 15%, for those with a disability compared with those without a disability.
- **Age, income, housing tenure** and **area deprivation** were also significantly associated with differences in social wellbeing:
  - Those aged 55 and over scored an additional 5.38 points or 8% higher than the reference group of those aged 16-34. Those aged 35 to 54 also had a higher social wellbeing score: 1.61 points higher (2%) than the reference group.
  - Income level showed a pattern of the higher the income level, the greater the increase to average social wellbeing score. Those earning between £26,000 and £51,999 scored 3.44 or 5% higher than the reference group of those earning less than £26,000. Those earning between £52,000 and £99,999 scored 4.61 points or 7% higher than the reference group. The highest earners (£100,000 or more) scored highest, 5.99 or 9% higher in social wellbeing.

  - Those living in social housing scored lower on social wellbeing than owner-occupiers (-5.91 or 9% lower) while private renters scored in between (-2.68 points or 4% lower).
  - Area deprivation level was associated with differences in social wellbeing in a similar way to income. Compared to the reference group (IMD1 or those living in the most deprived areas), those in IMD2 or IMD3 scored around 2 points higher (2.13 or 3% for those living in IMD2 areas and 2.17 or 3% for those living in IMD3 areas) on social wellbeing. Again, compared to the reference set, those in IMD4 and 5 (those living in the least deprived areas) scored around 4 points higher on social wellbeing (4.50 or 6% for those in IMD4 areas and 4.05 or 6% for those living in IMD5 areas).

- **Ethnic minorities** scored significantly lower (-2.94 or 4%) than the reference group of white British respondents. Those living in **urban** areas similarly reported lower social wellbeing (-2.89 or 4%) than those living in rural areas. **Men** scored 2.30 or 3% higher than women in social wellbeing.
- **Scotland** was the only nation to have a significantly higher average social wellbeing score (1.65 points or 2% higher than the reference group of England).
- The presence or number of children was not a significant factor associated with a difference in social wellbeing.

Table 6.2: Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	69.28	1.18	0.00
Men	***2.30***	***0.47***	***0.00***
Aged 35-54	***1.61***	***0.74***	***0.03***
Aged 55+	***5.38***	***0.78***	***0.00***
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	***3.44***	***0.69***	***0.00***
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	***4.61***	***0.75***	***0.00***
Income of £100,000+	***5.99***	***0.92***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	***-2.94***	***0.78***	***0.00***
Having a disability	***-10.25***	***0.62***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-2.68***	***0.89***	***0.00***
Social housing tenant	***-5.91***	***1.00***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	-0.15	0.78	0.84
Having 2 children	-0.31	0.90	0.73
Having 3 or more children	-0.94	1.36	0.49
IMD2	***2.13***	***0.80***	***0.01***
IMD3	***2.17***	***0.86***	***0.01***
IMD4	***4.50***	***0.83***	***0.00***
IMD5	***4.05***	***0.78***	***0.00***
Urban area	***-2.89***	***0.53***	***0.00***
Scotland	***1.65***	***0.61***	***0.01***
Wales	1.37	0.72	0.06
Northern Ireland	1.22	0.82	0.14

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

6.4 Economic wellbeing

The demographic variables explained almost two-fifths of the variation between people's responses for the economic wellbeing scores (adjusted $R^2 = 0.39$). This is a slight increase compared with 2023 when the adjusted R^2 was 0.34.

- **Income** was a notably influential factor in determining economic wellbeing. Those in the highest income bracket (earning £100,000 or more) scored 22.65 points or 36% more than those in the lowest income bracket (earning £26,000 or less). Those earning between £52,000 and £99,999 also scored significantly higher, with an additional 17.05 points or 27%. Even those earning between £26,000 and £51,999 scored 9.84 or 16% higher than the reference set. The data showed an even more pronounced dependence of economic wellbeing on income band, than was seen in 2023.

- **Housing tenure** was also highly correlated with average economic wellbeing. When compared with owner-occupiers, those living in social housing scored -13.08 points or 21% lower on economic wellbeing. Private renters also scored lower than homeowners with -8.43 points or 13% lower for economic wellbeing.

- **Having children** was also a strong predictor of low economic wellbeing. Both those with a single child and with two children scored -6.25 or -6.24 respectively (10%) down on those with no children. Furthermore, those with three or more children scored -10.89 points or 17% down on economic wellbeing when compared to those without children. The pattern of similarly low economic wellbeing amongst those with one and two children was also observed in the 2023 survey.

- **Disability, age** and **area deprivation** had, in comparison to the previous three factors, a moderate effect on economic wellbeing:
  - Disabled respondents scored -5.91 or 9% lower than the reference group (people without a disability).
  - Age was also a significant factor correlated with economic wellbeing. Those in the middle age band (aged 35–54), scored lowest (-2.80 or 4% lower than the reference group). This was followed by the reference group (aged 34 and younger) and then the oldest group (aged 55 and over), whose scores were highest (5.70 or 9% more than the reference group). This pattern is similar to that observed for the 2023 survey.
  - Those living in the least deprived areas (IMD4 and 5) scored around 4 points higher than the reference group (IMD1, those living in the most deprived areas) (4.29 or 7% higher for those living in IMD4 areas and 4.09 or 6% higher for those in IMD5 areas). People living in IMD3 areas scored 2.74 points or 4% higher. Those living in IMD2 areas were not significantly different in terms of economic wellbeing when compared with those in IMD1 areas.

- **Northern Ireland** was the only jurisdiction to show any difference in economic wellbeing compared with the reference group, scoring -2.65 or 4% lower.

- **Men** had a marginally higher economic wellbeing score than women with an additional 1.31 points on average.

- Ethnic minorities and those living in urban settings showed no significant difference in economic wellbeing compared to the reference groups (white British and rural dwellers).

Table 6.3: Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	62.98	1.63	0.00
Men	***1.31***	***0.63***	***0.04***
Aged 35-54	***-2.80***	***0.99***	***0.00***
Aged 55+	***5.70***	***1.06***	***0.00***
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	***9.84***	***0.93***	***0.00***
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	***17.05***	***0.99***	***0.00***
Income of £100,000+	***22.65***	***1.16***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-1.00	0.97	0.30
Having a disability	***-5.91***	***0.85***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-8.43***	***1.16***	***0.00***
Social housing tenant	***-13.08***	***1.39***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	***-6.25***	***1.10***	***0.00***
Having 2 children	***-6.24***	***1.10***	***0.00***
Having 3 or more children	***-10.89***	***1.84***	***0.00***
IMD2	1.81	1.16	0.12
IMD3	***2.74***	***1.07***	***0.01***
IMD4	***4.29***	***1.15***	***0.00***
IMD5	***4.09***	***1.09***	***0.00***
Urban area	-0.34	0.74	0.64
Scotland	-0.05	0.81	0.95
Wales	-0.93	1.13	0.41
Northern Ireland	***-2.65***	***1.30***	***0.04***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

6.5 Environmental wellbeing

Demographic variables explained 19% of the variation between people's environmental wellbeing scores (adjusted $R^2 = 0.19$).

- **Area deprivation** showed the clearest distinction between levels of environmental wellbeing among variables included in the model. There was a clear, ordinal pattern where those living in the least deprived areas (IMD5) had the highest wellbeing score on average (10.42 or 18% higher than the reference group, IMD1). Those living in IMD4 areas had an additional 7.88 points or 14%, those living in IMD3 areas had an additional 5.56 points or 10% and those living in IMD2 areas had an additional 3.47 points or 6% higher than the reference group. This result is consistent with the 2023 survey.

- **Urbanity** and **age** also showed a significant correlation with environmental wellbeing:
  - Respondents living in urban areas had an environmental wellbeing score -7.24 points or 12% lower than those in rural areas.
  - Environmental wellbeing scores increased with age, with those aged 35-54 scoring 2.29 additional points or 4% higher than the youngest group (aged 16-34). Scores among those aged 55 and over were even higher (6.97 points or 12% more than the reference group).

- **Northern Ireland** and **Scotland** both scored significantly higher in terms of environmental wellbeing when compared with England (the reference group), both by around 3.8 points or 7%. There was no significant difference in environmental wellbeing between Wales and England.

- Looking at **income** brackets, only the richest groups (£100,000 or more in annual household income) showed a significant increase in environmental wellbeing score (3.77 or 6% more when compared with those earning £26,000 per year or less).

- People with a **disability** had a lower average environmental wellbeing score than those without a disability (-3.68 or 6% less).

- **Ethnic minorities**, including white minorities, scored significantly lower in terms of environmental wellbeing than white British groups by -2.79 points or 5%.

- There were no significant differences in environmental wellbeing based on gender, housing tenure or the presence of children in the household.

Table 6.4: Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	58.37	1.65	0.00
Men	0.13	0.62	0.84
Aged 35-54	***2.29***	***0.99***	***0.02***
Aged 55+	***6.97***	***1.06***	***0.00***
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	1.62	0.90	0.07
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	1.97	1.04	0.06
Income of £100,000+	***3.77***	***1.28***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	***-2.79***	***0.97***	***0.00***
Having a disability	***-3.68***	***0.76***	***0.00***
Private tenant	0.36	1.17	0.76
Social housing tenant	-1.77	1.14	0.12
Having 1 child	-1.35	1.12	0.23
Having 2 children	1.23	1.08	0.25
Having 3 or more children	1.48	1.97	0.45
IMD2	***3.47***	***1.05***	***0.00***
IMD3	***5.56***	***1.09***	***0.00***
IMD4	***7.88***	***1.12***	***0.00***
IMD5	***10.42***	***1.06***	***0.00***
Urban area	***-7.24***	***0.70***	***0.00***
Scotland	***3.81***	***0.81***	***0.00***
Wales	1.04	1.01	0.30
Northern Ireland	***3.75***	***1.07***	***0.00***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

6.6 Democratic wellbeing

As was also the case in the 2023 Index, demographic characteristics appeared to be less relevant to democratic wellbeing than to other aspects of wellbeing. The demographic variables explained less than 11% of the variation (adjusted $R^2 = 0.11$) between people's responses to the democratic wellbeing scale. This finding reflects the fact that democratic wellbeing is a complex domain and that other factors beyond core demographic characteristics will be more influential (e.g. general trust levels, political climate, etc.).

- Democratic wellbeing varied notably between the different **jurisdictions** of the UK. Those living in Northern Ireland scored -4.75, or 12%, lower on democratic wellbeing than the reference group (England). Scotland and Wales also scored lower than the reference group (-2.48 and -2.23 respectively, or 6% lower for both jurisdictions).

- Those with the highest household **income** (more than £100,000 per year) had higher democratic wellbeing scores (3.60, or 9% more) than the reference group (earning less than £26,000 per year). There was no significant difference between the reference group and the other income bands.

- **Disabled people** had a democratic wellbeing score -3.31 points lower, or 8%, less than those without a disability.

- **Those living in the least deprived areas** (IMD4 and 5) had higher democratic wellbeing than those living in the most deprived areas (IMD1, the reference group). Those living in IMD4 areas had an additional 2.47 points, or 6%, and those living in IMD5 areas had an additional 3.30 points, or 8%. While those living in IMD2 and IMD3 areas also had slightly higher democratic wellbeing than the reference group, this difference was not statistically significant.

- **Those living in social housing** had lower democratic wellbeing scores than homeowners (-2.86 points lower, or 7%).

- Democratic wellbeing also varied between certain **age** groups, with those aged 55+ reporting higher democratic wellbeing scores (2.28, or 6% higher) than the youngest age group (aged 16 – 34).

- There were no significant differences in democratic wellbeing according to gender, ethnicity, presence of children in the household or urbanity.

Table 6.5: Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	39.87	1.48	0.00
Men	-0.07	0.59	0.91
Aged 35-54	-1.09	0.92	0.24
Aged 55+	***2.28***	***1.00***	***0.02***
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	0.50	0.84	0.55
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	1.73	0.98	0.08
Income of £100,000+	***3.60***	***1.16***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	1.08	0.86	0.21
Having a disability	***-3.31***	***0.74***	***0.00***
Private tenant	-0.48	1.04	0.65
Social housing tenant	***-2.86***	***1.14***	***0.01***
Having 1 child	-0.15	1.02	0.88
Having 2 children	-0.25	1.02	0.81
Having 3 or more children	-0.08	1.70	0.96
IMD2	1.10	0.96	0.25
IMD3	1.49	0.97	0.12
IMD4	***2.47***	***1.04***	***0.02***
IMD5	***3.30***	***0.96***	***0.00***
Urban area	-1.29	0.70	0.07
Scotland	***-2.48***	***0.75***	***0.00***
Wales	***-2.23***	***0.97***	***0.02***
Northern Ireland	***-4.75***	***1.09***	***0.00***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

Appendix A – Profile of weights

The below table presents the weighting profile targets for England:

Age & Gender				
	Male	Female	In another way	PNTS
16-24	6.67%	6.30%	0.19%	0.07%
25-34	8.35%	8.23%	0.14%	0.12%
35-44	7.73%	7.84%	0.03%	0.00%
45-54	8.21%	8.41%	0.08%	0.11%
55-64	7.27%	7.51%	0.03%	0.00%
65-74	5.85%	6.30%	0.06%	0.07%
75+	4.47%	5.94%	0.00%	0.02%

Region (NUTs2)	
England	
North East	4.8%
North West	13.1%
Yorkshire And The Humber	9.8%
East Midlands	8.7%
West Midlands	10.5%
East Of England	11.0%
London	15.7%
South East	16.3%
South West	10.2%

IMD Quintiles	
1 – Most deprived	20.0%
2	20.0%
3	20.0%
4	20.0%
5 – Least deprived	20.0%

Education	
Degree level or above	30.2%
Below degree level	68.6%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	1.2%

Ethnicity	
White	85.3%
Mixed	1.3%
Asian	5.5%
Black / African / Caribbean	3.3%
Arab / Other	3.5%
Prefer not to say/Not Stated	1.3%

Number of adults in the household	
One adult	18.2%
Two or more adults	81.9%

The below table presents the weighting profile targets for Wales:

Age & Gender	Male	Female	In another way	Prefer not to say
16-34	14.63%	13.86%	0.00%	0.32%
35-44	6.72%	6.89%	0.00%	0.00%
45-54	7.84%	8.26%	0.21%	0.00%
55-64	7.67%	8.08%	0.00%	0.00%
65-74	6.72%	7.15%	0.00%	0.11%
75+	5.00%	6.55%	0.00%	0.00%

Education	
Degree level or above	26.0%
Below degree level	73.0%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	1.1%

Ethnicity	
White	95.1%
Non-white	4.2%
Prefer not to say/ Not stated	0.5%

IMD quintiles	
1	20.0%
2	20.0%
3	20.0%
4	20.0%
5	20.0%

Number of adults in the household	
One adult	18.8%
Two or more adults	81.2%

The below table presents the weighting profile targets for Scotland:

Age & Gender	Male	Female	In another way	Prefer not to say
16-24	14.55%	14.43%	0.39%	0.17%
25-34	7.20%	7.49%	0.00%	0.00%
35-44	8.06%	8.61%	0.00%	0.05%
45-54	7.82%	8.31%	0.00%	0.00%
55-64	6.05%	6.59%	0.10%	0.00%
65-74	4.21%	5.97%	0.00%	0.00%
75+	14.55%	14.43%	0.39%	0.17%

Region (NUTs2)	
Scotland	
Central Scotland	12.1%
Glasgow	13.1%
Highlands and Islands	8.3%
Lothian	14.6%
Mid Scotland and Fife	12.3%
North East Scotland	14.1%
South Scotland	12.6%
West Scotland	12.9%

Ethnicity	
White	94.4%
Non-White	4.7%
Prefer not to say/ Not stated	0.9%

IMD quintiles	
1	20.0%
2	20.0%
3	20.0%
4	20.0%
5	20.0%

Number of adults in the household	
One adult	21.7%
Two or more adults	78.3%

Education	
Degree level or above	27.8%
Below degree level	71.5%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	0.7%

The below table presents the weighting profile targets for Northern Ireland:

Age & Gender	Male	Female	In another way	Prefer not to say
16-34	15.30%	14.85%	0.23%	0.08%
35-44	7.77%	8.23%	0.00%	0.23%
45-54	8.36%	8.76%	0.00%	0.00%
55-64	7.53%	7.77%	0.00%	0.00%
65-74	5.51%	5.87%	0.00%	0.00%
75+	4.00%	5.53%	0.00%	0.00%

Region (NUTs2)	
Northern Ireland	
Belfast	15.5%
East	24.5%
North	15.7%
Outer Belfast	21.8%
West and South	22.5%

IMD quintiles	
1	20.0%
2	20.0%
3	19.9%
4	20.0%
5	20.1%

Education	
Degree level or above	23.2%
Below degree level	75.7%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	1.1%

Number of adults in the household	
One adult	16.9%
Two or more adults	83.1%

Ethnicity	
White	97.7%
Non-White	1.8%
Prefer not to say/ Not stated	0.5%

Community Background	
Protestant	44.4%
Catholic	41.5%
Neither	10.6%
Don’t know/ PNTS	3.5%

Appendix B – Questionnaire

MODULE INTRO TEXT
Now for some questions about your life nowadays.

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE
GENHEALTH
How is your health in general?
Please select one option only
REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Very good
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Bad
5. Very bad
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE
MHEALTH
And how would you describe your mental health in general?
Please select one option only
REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Very good
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Bad
5. Very bad
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE
SAFETY
How safe do you feel walking alone in your local neighbourhood after dark?
Please select one option only
REVERSE SCALE 1-4 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Very safe
2. Fairly safe
3. A bit unsafe
4. Very unsafe
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE
RELY
To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
If I was alone and needed help, I could rely on someone in this neighbourhood to help me.
Please select one option only
REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Strongly agree
2. Tend to agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Tend to disagree
5. Strongly disagree
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE
SKILLS

How satisfied are you with your education and skills?

Please select one option only

REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. Fairly dissatisfied
5. Very dissatisfied
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX] [

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE
JOBAVAIL

Leaving aside whether you personally are looking for a job, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the availability of job opportunities for people in your local area?

Please select one option only

REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS

1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. Fairly dissatisfied
5. Very dissatisfied
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT S1-S5
AFFORD
There are some things that many people cannot afford, even if they would like them.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?
Please select one option only
RANDOMISE STATEMENTS S1-S5
S1. My household can afford to keep our home adequately warm (including in the winter months)
S2. My household can afford to pay for a week's annual holiday away from home (not staying with relatives)
S3. My household can afford to pay an unexpected, but necessary, expense of £850
S4. My household can afford to buy enough food for everyone in the household
S5. My household can afford to socialise with friends or family outside of the home once a month if we want to
REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Strongly agree
2. Tend to agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Tend to disagree
5. Strongly disagree
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT S1-S3
SERVICES
Thinking of physical access, distance, opening hours and the like, how easy or difficult is it for you to...
Please select one option only
RANDOMISE STATEMENTS S1-S3
S1. Access public transport (bus, metro, tram, train etc.) that can get you to where you want to go
S2. Access a grocery shop or supermarket in person
S3. Get a GP appointment at a time when you need one

REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Very easy
2. Fairly easy
3. Neither easy nor difficult
4. Fairly difficult
5. Very difficult
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT S1-S3
ENVQUAL
Please think about your local neighbourhood. Do you have major, moderate, minor or no problems with the following?
Please select one option only
RANDOMISE STATEMENTS S1-S3
S1. Noise
S2. Air quality
S3. Litter or rubbish on the street
REVERSE SCALE 1-4 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Major problems
2. Moderate problems
3. Minor problems
4. No problems
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE
ENVSPACE
Please think about the public, green or open space in your local area that is nearest to your home, for example a park, countryside, wood, play area, canal path, riverside or beach.
How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the quality of the space? This might include how well it meets your needs, whether it is safe, attractive, free of litter or other mess, and the quality of the facilities if there are any.
Please select one option only
REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. Fairly dissatisfied
5. Very dissatisfied
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE
ENVEFFORTS
How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with efforts to preserve the environment in the UK?
Please select one option only
REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4. Fairly dissatisfied
5. Very dissatisfied
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT S1- S11
TRUST
On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how much do you trust each of the following?
Please select one option only
RANDOMISE STATEMENTS S1-S11
S1. MPs
S2. UK Government
S3. [ASK ALL WALES, SCOTLAND, NORTHERN IRELAND] [m_country_cat = 3] **Scottish Government**; [m_country_cat = 4] **Welsh Government**; [m_country_cat = 2] **Northern Ireland Executive;**
S4. [ASK ALL WALES, SCOTLAND, NORTHERN IRELAND] [m_country_cat = 3] **Scottish Parliament members**; [m_country_cat = 4] **Welsh Parliament members**; [m_country_cat = 2] **Northern Ireland Assembly members**
S5. The local council for your area
S6. The legal system and courts
S7. The news media (eg, TV, radio, newspapers)
S8. Social media (eg. Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube, TikTok)
S9. The police
S10. Banks
S11. Big tech companies (e.g. Google, Apple)
REVERSE SCALE FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. 1- No trust at all
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10- Trust completely
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

ASK ALL

SINGLE CODE
DISCRIM
Sometimes people are treated unfairly because of their characteristics or because they belong to a particular group. How much, if at all, have you personally been unfairly treated or discriminated against in the last 12 months?
Please select one option only
REVERSE SCALE 1-4 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. A great deal
2. A fair amount
3. Not very much
4. Not at all
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX] [

ASK ALL
SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT S1-S3
INFLU
To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
Please select one option only
RANDOMISE STATEMENTS S1-S3
S1. I can influence decisions affecting the UK as a whole
S2. I can influence decisions affecting my local area
S3. [ASK ALL WALES, SCOTLAND, NORTHERN IRELAND] **I can influence decisions affecting** [m_country_cat = 3] **Scotland**; [m_country_cat = 4] **Wales**; [m_country_cat = 2] **Northern Ireland**

REVERSE SCALE 1-5 FOR HALF OF RESPONDENTS
1. Strongly agree
2. Tend to agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Tend to disagree
5. Strongly disagree
998. Don't know [FIX]
999. Prefer not to say [FIX]

Appendix C – Nation-level regression write-up

Regression analysis of the 2024 Life in the UK Index - England

Overview

Regression analysis is a statistical method used to examine the relationship between a dependent variable (in this case, wellbeing scores) and one or more independent variables. It allows for the investigation of how differences in demographic characteristics, such as age, race, or gender, are associated with different outcomes of the dependent variable. By using regression, we can isolate the effects of specific demographic factors while controlling for other variables that may also be influential.

A key advantage of regression is that it explains the relationship between each demographic characteristic and collective wellbeing over and above the relationship between other demographic characteristics and wellbeing. Consequently, we can, for example, say that age has an effect of increasing or decreasing collective wellbeing by a value of *x* irrespective of any other demographic characteristic describing a person. It is important to note that regression models cannot establish causation. Rather, they provide valuable insights into the associations between variables.

Through interpretation of the regression estimates and the significance of the explanatory variables, we can develop a deeper understanding of how different socio-demographic factors contribute to collective wellbeing.
The estimates represent the expected change in the collective wellbeing score for each unit of change in an explanatory variable (i.e. demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, etc.). These estimates reveal the direction and size of the relationship between the characteristics and the collective wellbeing scores.

Furthermore, statistical measures such as p-values help determine whether the relationship observed between the demographic characteristics and the outcome variable is statistically significant. A p-value below our chosen threshold ($p < 0.05$) suggests that is likely that there are wider, population differences in wellbeing, that are dependent on a demographic characteristic. A p-value greater than the chosen threshold ($p > 0.05$) means that it is not possible, based on this dataset, to say with confidence that there are differences in the wellbeing of the population dependent on this characteristic.

Regression analysis results for collective wellbeing and for each of the four wellbeing domains – social, economic, environmental, and democratic – are provided below.

Collective wellbeing

Around a third (adjusted $R^2 = 0.34$) of the variation observed in collective wellbeing in England could be apportioned to the demographic differences present in the sample.

- **Household income** was a particularly strong predictor of collective wellbeing score in England; as income band increased, so did overall score. Those with household income between £26,000 and £51,999 scored 3.69, or 6% higher than the reference group earning less than £26,000. Those earning between £52,000 and £99,999 scored 6.31, or 11% higher than the reference group and the highest earners (with household income of £100,000 or more) scored an additional 9.36, or 16%.

- **People with a disability** scored significantly lower (-5.57, or 10%) than those without a disability in collective wellbeing.

- **Area deprivation level** was also correlated with collective wellbeing. Those living in the least deprived areas (IMD5) scored 5.56, or 10% more than the reference group of those living in the most deprived areas (IMD1). Those living in IMD4 areas was similarly higher than the reference group with an additional 5.08, or 9%. Both of those living in IMD2 and IMD3 areas were also significantly greater than the reference group with an addition 2.08 (4%) and 3.02 (5%) respectively.

- **Housing tenure** was significantly associated with collective wellbeing. Those living in social housing scored -5.52 points, or 10% less than the reference group; owner occupiers. Private renters also scored lower (-2.64, or 5%) than homeowners on collective wellbeing.

- Collective wellbeing was shown to vary between certain **age** groups. Those in the oldest age bracket (aged 55 and over) scored significantly higher (4.73, or 8%) compared to the youngest group (aged 34 and younger). There was no significant difference between the youngest group and those aged 35 to 54.

- Compared to the above demographic groups the remaining demographic groups: **urbanity, gender, region of England, number of children** and **ethnicity** had a smaller observed effect on the average collective wellbeing score. However, all demographic groups measured did show some degree of significant difference in the data:
    - Those living in urban areas scored -2.65 points, or 5% lower than those living in a rural setting.
    - Men had a marginally higher collective wellbeing score than women (1.19, or 2% higher).
    - Respondents living in South West England scored significantly higher than the reference region, North East England, by 2.61 points, or 5%.
    - Those with a single child had a lower collective wellbeing (-2.02, or 4%) than those without children. Parents with two or three plus children also had a lower collective wellbeing than those without children, but this was not statistically significant.
    - Ethnic minority (including white minority) respondents scored marginally lower on average (-1.45, or 3%) compared to the reference group of white British respondents.

Table 1. Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores in England

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	57.14	1.58	0.00
Men	***1.19***	***0.47***	***0.01***
Aged 35-54	-0.10	0.74	0.89
Aged 55+	***4.73***	***0.79***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***3.69***	***0.67***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***6.31***	***0.72***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***9.36***	***0.92***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	***-1.45***	***0.71***	***0.04***
Having a disability	***-5.57***	***0.61***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-2.64***	***0.82***	***0.00***
Social housing tenant	***-5.52***	***0.98***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	***-2.02***	***0.84***	***0.02***
Having 2 children	-1.48	0.80	0.06
Having 3 or more children	-2.55	1.41	0.07
IMD2	***2.08***	***0.82***	***0.01***
IMD3	***3.02***	***0.80***	***0.00***
IMD4	***5.08***	***0.84***	***0.00***
IMD5	***5.56***	***0.79***	***0.00***
Urban area	***-2.65***	***0.57***	***0.00***
English regions – North West	0.58	1.29	0.65
English regions – Yorkshire and The Humber	1.19	1.32	0.37
English regions – East Midlands	-0.61	1.38	0.66
English regions – West Midlands	-0.96	1.31	0.46
English regions – East of England	0.02	1.27	0.99
English regions – South East	-0.02	1.25	0.99
English regions – South West	***2.61***	***1.28***	***0.04***
English regions - London	-0.97	1.36	0.48

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Social wellbeing

The demographic variables explained a third of the variation (adjusted $R^2 = 0.33$) between people's social wellbeing. This means that their influence is important but around two-thirds of the variation is explained by other factors than those included in the model.

- **Disability** was a notably strong predictor of average social wellbeing. People with a disability scored -10.34, or 15% lower than those without a disability.

- As observed in the collective wellbeing regression for England, there was a strong relationship between social wellbeing and **household income band**. Those in the highest household income band (earning £100,000 per year or more) scored an additional 6.32 or 9% when compared to the reference group, with a household income of less than £26,000. Those in the next income bracket down (household income of £52,000 to £99,999) also scored 4.61, or 7% higher than the reference group, while those in the second lowest income category scored 3.31 or 5% higher

than the lowest earners.

- **Housing tenure** was also a significant predictor of social wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of homeowners, private renters scored -2.47 or 4% lower and those living in social housing scored even lower: -5.36 points down, or 8%.

- Social wellbeing showed statistically significant improvement with **age**. The oldest age group, 55 and over, scored 5.15, or 8% higher than the youngest group, aged 34 and younger. The median bracket, ages 35 to 54, scored 1.74, or 3% more than the youngest group.

- **Area deprivation** was another significant predictor of social wellbeing. Those living in the least deprived areas (IMD4 and IMD5) showed higher social wellbeing scores when compared to those in the most deprived areas (IMD1). Those in IMD4 scored 4.75 more points, or 7% higher than the reference group, while those in the least deprived areas, IMD5, scored 3.98 more, or 6%. Those living in IMD2 and IMD3 also had higher rates of social wellbeing than the reference group, but not as high as those in the least deprived areas. Those in IMD2 scored an additional 2.28, while those living in IMD3 scored an additional 2.05 (both 3% higher).

- Certain **regions of England**, outperformed others with respect to social wellbeing. South West England scored the highest, with 4.18 points, or 6% more than the reference group of North East England. North West England was the only other region to score significantly higher than the reference group on social wellbeing, scoring 2.98 more, or 4%.

- **Urbanity, gender, and ethnicity** were also significant, although less so than the demographic factors above:
    - Respondents in urban areas had a social wellbeing score -3.08 points lower, or 5% less than those living in rural areas.
    - Men scored an additional 2.51, or 4% on their average social wellbeing score compared to women.
    - Ethnic minority respondents, including white minorities, scored -2.70 lower, or 4% than the reference group of white British respondents.

- There were no significant differences in social wellbeing scores distinguished by the presence of children in the household.

Table 2. Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores in England

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	67.96	1.78	0.00
Men	***2.51***	***0.54***	***0.00***
Aged 35-54	***1.74***	***0.84***	***0.04***
Aged 55+	***5.15***	***0.90***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***3.31***	***0.80***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***4.61***	***0.86***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***6.32***	***1.08***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	***-2.70***	***0.87***	***0.00***
Having a disability	***-10.34***	***0.72***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-2.47***	***0.97***	***0.01***
Social housing tenant	***-5.36***	***1.17***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	-0.13	0.89	0.89
Having 2 children	-0.41	0.99	0.68
Having 3 or more children	-1.12	1.51	0.46
IMD2	***2.28***	***0.93***	***0.01***
IMD3	***2.05***	***0.99***	***0.04***
IMD4	***4.75***	***0.97***	***0.00***
IMD5	***3.98***	***0.90***	***0.00***
Urban area	***-3.08***	***0.64***	***0.00***
English regions – North West	***2.98***	***1.42***	***0.04***
English regions – Yorkshire and The Humber	2.24	1.47	0.13
English regions – East Midlands	-0.18	1.47	0.90
English regions – West Midlands	0.23	1.53	0.88
English regions – East of England	-0.05	1.44	0.97
English regions – South East	1.61	1.43	0.26
English regions – South West	***4.18***	***1.46***	***0.00***
English regions - London	-0.28	1.57	0.86

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Economic wellbeing

The demographic variables explained almost two-fifths of the variation between people's responses for the economic wellbeing scores (adjusted $R^2 = 0.39$). This means that economic wellbeing can be predicted with some degree of confidence from the independent variables in the model.

- **Household income** was a very influential predictor of economic wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of those earning £26,000 per year or less, the highest earning group, with household income of £100,000 per year or more scored an additional 23.06 points, or 38% higher. The next highest earners, with between £52,000 and £99,999, scored an additional 16.92 points, or 28% more than the reference group. And those with between £26,000 and £51,999 in annual household income, scored 9.35, or 15% more than the lowest earners.

- **Housing tenure** was also a significant factor influencing average economic wellbeing. Those living in social housing scored -12.45, or 20% less on economic wellbeing, when compared to

homeowners. Private renters additionally scored lower than the reference group, with -8.28 lower, or 14%.

- Having more **children** was associated with significantly lower economic wellbeing. Compared to those without children, parents with both one or two children scored -6.42, or 10% lower. Respondents three of more children scored even lower, -11.22 points down, or 18%.

- A number of other characteristics were associated with significant differences in economic wellbeing, although less notably so than those above.
    - **Age** bands were correlated with differences in economic wellbeing such that the median age band, aged 35 to 54, had a lower economic wellbeing score (-2.66, or 4%) than the youngest group, aged 16 to 34. Yet, the oldest band, aged 55 and over, scored significantly more than the younger reference group, 5.57 points, or 9% more.
    - People with a **disability** showed a significantly lower economic wellbeing score than those without a disability. -5.57 points lower, or 9%.
    - **Area deprivation** was also associated with differences in economic wellbeing. Those living in the bottom two quintiles (IMD1; the reference group and IMD2) were not significantly different but the top three all had higher scores than people in IMD1. Those living in IMD3 areas scored 2.73, or 4% more than the reference group. Those living in IMD4 scored 4.61, or 8% more while those living in the least deprived areas (IMD5) scored 3.92 additional points, or 6% more.
    - **Men** also scored 1.51, or 2% more than women, on average.

- There were not significant differences in economic wellbeing in terms of urbanity, English region, or ethnicity.

Table 3. Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores in England

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	61.17	2.44	0.00
Men	***1.51***	***0.73***	***0.04***
Aged 35-54	***-2.66***	***1.13***	***0.02***
Aged 55+	***5.57***	***1.23***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***9.35***	***1.07***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***16.92***	***1.14***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***23.06***	***1.34***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-1.51	1.13	0.18
Having a disability	***-5.57***	***1.00***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-8.28***	***1.27***	***0.00***
Social housing tenant	***-12.45***	***1.63***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	***-6.42***	***1.25***	***0.00***
Having 2 children	***-6.42***	***1.21***	***0.00***
Having 3 or more children	***-11.22***	***2.01***	***0.00***
IMD2	1.55	1.36	0.25
IMD3	***2.73***	***1.25***	***0.03***
IMD4	***4.61***	***1.31***	***0.00***
IMD5	***3.92***	***1.26***	***0.00***
Urban area	-0.36	0.89	0.69
English regions – North West	3.13	1.98	0.11
English regions – Yorkshire and The Humber	2.73	1.99	0.17
English regions – East Midlands	1.67	1.98	0.40
English regions – West Midlands	0.50	1.99	0.80
English regions – East of England	1.90	1.93	0.32
English regions – South East	0.96	1.89	0.61
English regions – South West	3.34	1.96	0.09
English regions - London	2.04	2.11	0.33

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Environmental wellbeing

Demographic variables explained about a fifth of the variation between people's environmental wellbeing scores (adjusted $R^2 = 0.20$).

- **Area deprivation** was the most notable characteristic when distinguishing average environmental wellbeing scores. There is a strong trend where those living in less deprived areas had a higher score. Compared to the reference group of those in most deprived areas (IMD1), those living in IMD2 scored 3.82 points, or 7% higher. Those living in in IMD3 areas scored an additional 6.03, or 10% higher. This in the second least deprived areas (IMD4) scored 8.25, or 14% more than the reference group while those living in the least deprived areas scored highest of all, 10.66, or 19% more than those living in the most deprived areas.

- **Older** respondents (aged 55 and over) scored 6.45 points, or 11%, more than the youngest group (aged 34 and under) on average. There was no significant difference between the

youngest group and the median age band (aged 35-54).

- Those living in the London **region of England** scored an average of -5.82 points, or 10% less than the reference group of North East England. No other English regions were significantly different than the reference region.

- Those living in **urban** regions scored -5.78, or 10% less than those living in rural areas.

- Higher earners (with a **household income** of more than £100,000 per year) scored an additional 4.81, or 8% more in terms of environmental wellbeing than the lowest earners (£26,000 or less per year in annual household income). Other income bands were not significantly different to the lowest earners.

- **People with disabilities** scored -3.53 points less, or 6% lower than those without disabilities.

- There was no statistically significant difference in environmental wellbeing for those than differed by gender, ethnicity, housing tenure or number of children in the household.

Table 4. Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores in England

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	57.76	2.48	0.00
Men	0.33	0.72	0.64
Aged 35-54	1.60	1.13	0.16
Aged 55+	***6.45***	***1.22***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	1.80	1.03	0.08
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	2.31	1.20	0.05
HH income of £100,000+	***4.81***	***1.46***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-1.56	1.08	0.15
Having a disability	***-3.53***	***0.87***	***0.00***
Private tenant	0.63	1.28	0.62
Social housing tenant	-1.51	1.32	0.26
Having 1 child	-1.61	1.30	0.22
Having 2 children	1.13	1.19	0.34
Having 3 or more children	1.56	2.14	0.47
IMD2	***3.82***	***1.22***	***0.00***
IMD3	***6.03***	***1.24***	***0.00***
IMD4	***8.25***	***1.28***	***0.00***
IMD5	***10.86***	***1.22***	***0.00***
Urban area	***-5.78***	***0.85***	***0.00***
English regions – North West	-0.79	1.91	0.68
English regions – Yorkshire and The Humber	0.25	2.07	0.90
English regions – East Midlands	-2.28	2.15	0.29
English regions – West Midlands	-0.85	1.98	0.69
English regions – East of England	-0.04	1.95	0.98
English regions – South East	-1.27	1.90	0.50
English regions – South West	3.39	1.89	0.07
English regions - London	***-5.82***	***2.07***	***0.00***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Democratic wellbeing

Demographic characteristics appeared to be less relevant to democratic wellbeing than to other aspects of wellbeing. The demographic variables explained only around a tenth of the variation (adjusted R^2 = 0.11) between people's responses to the democratic wellbeing scale.

- Those living in the **least deprived areas** showed the greatest difference in their democratic wellbeing scores, when compared with those living in the most deprived areas. Those in IMD4 scored 2.81 or 7% more than those in the most deprived areas (IMD1). Those in the lowest quintile of area deprivation (IMD5) scored 3.58 points more, or 9%.

- Those living in **North West England** scored 3.53 points, or 8% more on democratic wellbeing than those living in North East England.

- The highest earners (with a total **household income** of more than £100,000 annually) scored significantly higher than the lowest earners (less than £26,000 per year) with an additional 3.14 points, or 7%.

- **Disabled** respondents in England scored -3.04 points less, or 7% than those without a disability.

- There was no significant difference in democratic wellbeing in England, between the demographic groups based on gender, age, ethnicity, housing tenure, urbanity or number of children in the household.

Table 5. Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores in England

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	41.99	2.27	0.00
Men	0.28	0.67	0.67
Aged 35-54	-1.22	1.06	0.25
Aged 55+	1.70	1.16	0.14
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	0.12	0.98	0.90
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	1.32	1.14	0.25
HH income of £100,000+	***3.14***	***1.33***	***0.02***
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-0.01	0.96	0.99
Having a disability	***-3.04***	***0.86***	***0.00***
Private tenant	-0.46	1.17	0.69
Social housing tenant	-3.49	1.32	0.01
Having 1 child	-0.34	1.15	0.77
Having 2 children	-0.15	1.15	0.90
Having 3 or more children	0.76	1.91	0.69
IMD2	0.89	1.11	0.42
IMD3	1.43	1.12	0.20
IMD4	***2.81***	***1.17***	***0.02***
IMD5	***3.58***	***1.13***	***0.00***
Urban area	-1.39	0.86	0.11
English regions – North West	***-3.53***	***1.78***	***0.05***
English regions – Yorkshire and The Humber	-0.48	1.87	0.80
English regions – East Midlands	-1.86	1.98	0.35
English regions – West Midlands	-3.71	1.92	0.05
English regions – East of England	-1.74	1.78	0.33
English regions – South East	-1.51	1.78	0.40
English regions – South West	-0.57	1.83	0.76
English regions - London	0.13	1.84	0.95

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Regression analysis of the 2024 Life in the UK Index - Scotland

Overview

Regression is a statistical tool used to understand the relationship between one or more explanatory variables and an outcome variable. For the Life in the UK research, regression models is used to identify those demographic characteristics which is associated with collective wellbeing and the four wellbeing domains that comprise it (social, economic, environmental and democratic wellbeing).

A key advantage of regression is that it explains the relationship between each demographic characteristic and collective wellbeing over and above the relationship between other demographic characteristics and wellbeing. Consequently, we can, for example, say that age has an effect of increasing or decreasing collective wellbeing by a value of *x* irrespective of any other demographic characteristic describing a person. It is important to note that regression models cannot establish causation. Rather, they provide valuable insights into the associations between variables.

Through interpretation of the regression estimates and the significance of the explanatory variables, we can develop a deeper understanding of how different socio-demographic factors contribute to collective wellbeing.
The estimates represent the expected change in the collective wellbeing score for each unit of change in an explanatory variable (i.e. demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, etc.). These estimates reveal the direction and size of the relationship between the characteristics and the collective wellbeing scores.

Furthermore, statistical measures such as p-values help determine whether the relationship observed between the demographic characteristics and the outcome variable is statistically significant. A p-value below a specific threshold (i.e. $P < 0.05$) indicates that the relationship is statistically significant, suggesting that the characteristic has a meaningful impact on the wellbeing score.

Regression analysis results for collective wellbeing and for each of the four wellbeing domains – social, economic, environmental, and democratic – are provided below.

Collective wellbeing

Several demographic variables explained the differences in people's collective wellbeing, which reflects the multifaceted nature of this metric. Of the many variables which influenced wellbeing, those which were included in the model explained around two-fifths of the overall variation (adjusted $R^2 = 0.39$). This means that more than half of the variation in people's collective wellbeing was accounted for by factors outside the scope of this model. Table 1 displays the full results.

- **Household income** was the variable most notably associated with collective wellbeing. Earning £100,000 or more was linked with a collective wellbeing score 9.25 points higher than those earning less than £26,000. This equated to a 17% difference. The association between income and collective wellbeing was statistically significant for every income band above the reference group (which was those earning less than £26,000).

- **Disability status** also showed a notable association with collective wellbeing. Disabled people had, on average, a -6.78-point reduction (or -12%) in their collective wellbeing score compared to those without disabilities.

- **Age** was another influential correlate with collective wellbeing. People aged 55+ showed a collective wellbeing score 6.75 points (12%) higher than those aged 16-34. However, no significant association was found between age and collective wellbeing for 35-54s, in comparison to 16-34s.

- As the level of **local deprivation** decreased, wellbeing increased. Living in an area in the least deprived quintile was associated with a collective wellbeing score 6.24 points (11%) higher than living in the most deprived quintile. The largest incremental difference was found between those

living in IMD1 and IMD2 (3.23 or 6%), which indicates that the impact of local deprivation was pronounced for those who were living in the most deprived areas.

- Living in **social housing**, in comparison to being a homeowner, was associated with a lower collective wellbeing score (-4.10 or -7%). This occurred over and above a person's household income or the level of deprivation in their locality. On the other hand, being a private tenant was not significantly linked with collective wellbeing.

- Living in an **urban area** was linked with a small, but significant, reduction in collective wellbeing (-2.40 or -4%).

Neither gender, ethnicity, nor number of children were significantly associated with collective wellbeing scores.

Table 1. Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	55.55	2.09	0.00
Men	-0.42	0.83	0.62
Aged 35-54	0.44	1.42	0.76
Aged 55+	***6.75***	***1.36***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***5.71***	***1.18***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***7.84***	***1.30***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***9.25***	***1.79***	***0.00***
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	3.28	1.94	0.09
Having a disability	***-6.78***	***1.06***	***0.00***
Private tenant	-2.48	1.84	0.18
Social housing tenant	***-4.10***	***1.52***	***0.01***
Having one child	-0.96	1.73	0.58
Having two children	-0.90	2.02	0.66
Having three or more children	-7.29	4.19	0.08
IMD2	***3.23***	***1.47***	***0.03***
IMD3	***4.28***	***1.53***	***0.01***
IMD4	***4.67***	***1.59***	***0.00***
IMD5	***6.24***	***1.51***	***0.00***
Urban area	***-2.40***	***0.96***	***0.01***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Social wellbeing

The demographic variables explained a little over one third of the variation in people's social wellbeing (adjusted $R^2 = 0.37$). Table 2 displays the full results.

- **Disability status** showed disabled people had an average social wellbeing score -9.87 points (-15%) lower than people without disabilities.

- **Household income** was the next most influential factor associated with social wellbeing and a clear trend emerged. The higher the income level, the greater the social wellbeing score. For those earning £100,000 or more, the difference in social wellbeing compared with the reference group was 8.80 points (13%), while smaller differences were found for those earning £52,000 to £99,999 (6.52 or 10%), and £26,000 to £51,999 (5.86 or 9%).

- **Local area deprivation** also showed an influential association with social wellbeing. Living in the least deprived quintile was linked with a social wellbeing score 6.31 points (9%) higher than

residing in the most deprived quintile of areas. Between these extremes, the trend showed that an increase in social wellbeing occurred as level of deprivation improved.

- Living in **social housing** was associated with worse social wellbeing, by a difference of -5.69 points (-8%) compared with homeowners.
- On the other hand, being **older** was associated with increased social wellbeing, above and beyond any effects of homeownership or household income. While there was no difference for 35-54s compared to the 16-34 age group, being aged 55+ was associated with a 5.17-point (8%) increase in social wellbeing score compared with the reference group of 16-34s.

Ethnicity, urbanity, gender and having children were not associated with any significant differences in social wellbeing.

Table 2. Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	67.81	2.62	0.00
Men	0.74	1.01	0.46
Aged 35-54	-0.43	1.74	0.81
Aged 55+	***5.17***	***1.68***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***5.86***	***1.39***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***6.52***	***1.52***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***8.80***	***2.15***	***0.00***
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	1.21	2.40	0.61
Having a disability	***-9.87***	***1.32***	***0.00***
Private tenant	-1.12	2.17	0.60
Social housing tenant	***-5.69***	***1.97***	***0.00***
Having one child	-0.08	1.81	0.97
Having two children	-0.48	2.31	0.84
Having three or more children	-3.98	6.00	0.51
IMD2	***3.64***	***1.80***	***0.04***
IMD3	***4.83***	***1.94***	***0.01***
IMD4	***5.71***	***1.83***	***0.00***
IMD5	***6.31***	***1.85***	***0.00***
Urban area	-1.60	1.21	0.19

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Economic wellbeing

The demographic variables explained more than two-fifths of the variation in people's economic wellbeing (adjusted R^2 = 0.43). Table 3 displays the full results.

- **Household income** held the strongest association with economic wellbeing. In comparison to the reference group, this ranged from a 12.12-point increase (21%) for those in a household earning between £26,000 to £51,999, which rose to a 22.07-point increase (38%) for those with earnings of £100,000 or more.
- **Tenure** was also strongly associated with economic wellbeing: social housing was associated with economic wellbeing scores -13.10 points lower (-23%) than homeownership, while private tenancy was associated with economic wellbeing scores -7.52 points lower (-13%).
- **Local area deprivation** and **disability** were each associated with economic wellbeing. Living in the highest quintile of area deprivation and being disabled were each associated with a lower economic wellbeing score, by -7.12 points and -7.05 points respectively (-12% each).

- The relationship with **age** showed that economic wellbeing was significantly higher for older people, but only at age 55+ (7.05 or 12%). In middle age groups, the difference was negative, but this was not statistically significant, suggesting no difference between those aged 16-34 and those aged 35-54.

- Finally, **ethnicity** was also linked with economic wellbeing above and beyond other characteristics. People from ethnic minority backgrounds (inc. white minorities) were associated with higher average economic wellbeing scores, by 5.22 points (9%) compared with their white counterparts. However, this finding should be treated with caution as the sample size for this subgroup is very small (56).

Gender, urbanity and the presence of children were not associated with any significant differences in economic wellbeing.

Table 3. Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	57.75	3.47	0.00
Men	0.78	1.34	0.56
Aged 35-54	-2.39	2.14	0.26
Aged 55+	***7.05***	***2.04***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***12.12***	***1.95***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***19.00***	***2.22***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***22.07***	***2.65***	***0.00***
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	***5.22***	***2.57***	***0.04***
Having a disability	***-7.05***	***1.62***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-7.52***	***2.92***	***0.01***
Social housing tenant	***-13.10***	***2.34***	***0.00***
Having one child	-4.67	2.66	0.08
Having two children	-4.03	3.27	0.22
Having three or more children	-7.93	5.54	0.15
IMD2	2.92	2.47	0.24
IMD3	4.05	2.37	0.09
IMD4	***5.21***	***2.50***	***0.04***
IMD5	***7.12***	***2.42***	***0.00***
Urban area	1.55	1.61	0.34

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Environmental wellbeing

Demographic variables explained one fifth of the variation in people's environmental wellbeing (adjusted R^2 = 0.20). Relatively few demographic characteristics in the model explained the variation in environmental wellbeing, with just four reaching statistical significance. Table 4 displays the full results.

- **Local area deprivation** showed the strongest association with environmental wellbeing. People living in the most affluent quintile (IMD5) showed an 11.47-point (19%) higher environmental wellbeing score in comparison to those in the most deprived quintile, whilst those living in the second-most-affluent quintile (IMD4) showed a 10.29-point higher score (17%).

- Increased **age** was associated with an increased environmental wellbeing score; people aged 55+, on average, had an environmental wellbeing score 8.8 points (15%) higher than those aged 16-34.

- Living in an **urban area** was associated with a decrease of -8.33 environmental wellbeing points (-14%) in comparison to those living in rural areas.

- **Disability** status was moderately associated with environmental wellbeing, as disabled people showed lower average environmental wellbeing scores (-5.78 or -10%) than their counterparts without a disability.

Gender, household income, ethnicity, tenure and having children were not associated with environmental wellbeing in Scotland.

Table 4. Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	59.80	2.96	0.00
Men	-1.27	1.29	0.33
Aged 35-54	3.94	2.28	0.08
Aged 55+	***8.80***	***2.09***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	2.79	1.81	0.12
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	2.95	1.96	0.13
HH income of £100,000+	2.92	3.00	0.33
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	0.05	2.86	0.99
Having a disability	***-5.78***	***1.63***	***0.00***
Private tenant	0.47	3.22	0.88
Social housing tenant	1.77	2.18	0.42
Having one child	0.30	2.58	0.91
Having two children	0.96	3.10	0.76
Having three or more children	-7.87	6.02	0.19
IMD2	***6.63***	***2.23***	***0.00***
IMD3	***7.77***	***2.46***	***0.00***
IMD4	***10.29***	***2.53***	***0.00***
IMD5	***11.47***	***2.25***	***0.00***
Urban area	***-8.33***	***1.43***	***0.00***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Democratic wellbeing

The demographic variables explained less than one fifth of the variation in Scots' democratic wellbeing (adjusted $R^2 = 0.16$). This indicated that, as a whole, demographic characteristics had relatively little association with this domain. This finding reflects the fact that democratic wellbeing is a complex domain and that other factors beyond core demographic characteristics will be more influential (e.g. general trust levels, political climate, etc.).

Relatively few demographic characteristics in the model explained the variation in democratic wellbeing, with just four reaching statistical significance. Table 5 displays the full results.

- In contrast to other forms of wellbeing, having **children** was strongly associated with democratic wellbeing. This association only appeared for people with three or more children, who showed lower democratic wellbeing scores in comparison to those without children (-9.37 or -25%). However, this finding should be treated with caution as the sample size for this subgroup is very small (17 households with 3+ children).

- People from **ethnic minority backgrounds (inc. white minorities)**, and people **aged 55+**, were associated with having higher democratic wellbeing scores than their counterparts in their respective groups. Again, however, this finding should be treated with caution as the sample size for ethnic minority respondents in Scotland is small (56):

  - People from ethnic minority backgrounds (inc. white minorities) showed democratic wellbeing scores that were, on average, 6.66 points (18%) higher than their white counterparts.
  - People aged 55+ scored, on average, 5.99 points (16%) higher than the 16-34-year-old reference group.

- **Disabled people** had a lower score on this measure, by a margin of -4.42 points (-12%) in comparison to those without disabilities.

No significant associations were found between democratic wellbeing and gender, household income, tenancy, local area deprivation or urbanity.

Table 5. Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	36.85	2.94	0.00
Men	-1.93	1.23	0.12
Aged 35-54	0.62	1.96	0.75
Aged 55+	***5.99***	***1.94***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	2.09	1.57	0.19
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	2.91	1.88	0.12
HH income of £100,000+	3.20	2.54	0.21
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	***6.66***	***2.41***	***0.01***
Having a disability	***-4.42***	***1.51***	***0.00***
Private tenant	-1.74	2.50	0.49
Social housing tenant	0.60	2.14	0.78
Having one child	0.59	2.39	0.81
Having two children	-0.06	2.67	0.98
Having three or more children	***-9.37***	***3.24***	***0.00****
IMD2	-0.25	2.04	0.90
IMD3	0.47	2.03	0.82
IMD4	-2.51	2.35	0.29
IMD5	0.07	1.94	0.97
Urban area	-1.25	1.47	0.40

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05
**The number of respondents with 3 or more children is 17, which is below the threshold of confidence in the accuracy of this result.*

Regression analysis of the 2024 Life in the UK Index - Wales

Overview

Regression is a statistical tool used to understand the relationship between one or more explanatory variables and an outcome variable. For the Life in the UK research, regression models were used to identify those demographic characteristics which were associated with collective wellbeing and the four wellbeing domains that comprise it (social, economic, environmental and democratic wellbeing).

A key advantage of regression is that it explains the relationship between each demographic characteristic and collective wellbeing over and above the relationship between other demographic characteristics and wellbeing. Consequently, we can, for example, say that age has an effect of increasing or decreasing collective wellbeing by a value of *x* irrespective of any other demographic characteristic describing a person. It is important to note that regression models cannot establish causation. Rather, they provide valuable insights into the associations between variables.

Through interpretation of the regression estimates and the significance of the explanatory variables, we can develop a deeper understanding of how different socio-demographic factors contribute to collective wellbeing.
The estimates represent the expected change in the collective wellbeing score for each unit of change in an explanatory variable (i.e. demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, etc.). These estimates reveal the direction and size of the relationship between the characteristics and the collective wellbeing scores.
Furthermore, statistical measures such as p-values help determine whether the relationship observed between the demographic characteristics and the outcome variable is statistically significant. A p-value below a specific threshold (i.e. $P < 0.05$) indicates that the relationship is statistically significant, suggesting that the characteristic has a meaningful impact on the wellbeing score.

Regression analysis results for collective wellbeing and for each of the four wellbeing domains – social, economic, environmental, and democratic – are provided below.

Collective wellbeing

Demographic characteristics included in the model accounted for around slightly less than half of the variation in collective wellbeing between respondents (adjusted $R^2 = 0.45$); a reasonably large proportion which gives us greater confidence in the findings. Full results are displayed in Table 1.

- Housing tenure, and specifically living in **social housing**, was associated with a drop of -11.49 in the average collective wellbeing score (-19%) compared with being a homeowner.
- Conversely, **household income** showed the largest distinction in collective wellbeing between the groups among all variables included in the model.
    - People in a household earning £100,000 or more had a collective wellbeing score which was, on average, 6.44 points (11%) higher than the reference group of those earning under £26,000.
    - Notably, there was little or no difference between this high-earning group and people earning between £52,000 and £99,999, who had collective wellbeing scores 6.23 points (10%) higher than the reference group. This finding indicates that income had a particularly strong association with collective wellbeing for those earning lower incomes.
- Having a **disability** was associated with a drop of -5.61 collective wellbeing points (-9%) compared to people without disabilities.
- Age was a significant contributor to explaining the variance in collective wellbeing, but only among those who were **aged 55+**, compared to the reference group of 16-34s. People aged 55+ reported higher collective wellbeing than 16-34s, by an average of 4.32 points (7%).

- Finally, living in an **urban area** was moderately associated with having a low collective wellbeing score. Compared to those living rurally, urban participants scored -3.65 points lower (-6%) on collective wellbeing.

Gender, ethnicity, number of children and local deprivation were not significantly associated with collective wellbeing.

Table 1. Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	61.32	2.51	0.00
Men	0.93	1.17	0.43
Aged 35-54	-2.21	1.65	0.18
Aged 55+	***4.32***	***1.64***	***0.01***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***4.28***	***1.59***	***0.01***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***6.23***	***1.88***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***6.44***	***2.04***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (inc. white minorities)	-1.93	2.51	0.44
Having a disability	***-5.61***	***1.48***	***0.00***
Private tenant	-3.91	2.44	0.11
Social housing tenant	***-11.49***	***2.60***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	0.36	1.74	0.84
Having 2 children	-3.36	2.55	0.19
Having 3 or more children	1.00	2.74	0.72
IMD2	0.86	1.86	0.64
IMD3	0.36	2.12	0.87
IMD4	1.47	2.12	0.49
IMD5	3.38	1.85	0.07
Urban area	***-3.65***	***1.27***	***0.00***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold and italicised values are significant at P<0.05

Social wellbeing

The demographic variables explained almost half of the variance in social wellbeing scores (adjusted R^2 = 0.47), indicating that demographic characteristics have a large influence on social wellbeing and giving us greater confidence in the findings. Despite this, however, just four characteristics were strong enough predictors of social wellbeing to reach statistical significance. Full results are listed in Table 2.

- Living in **social housing** was particularly influential in explaining social wellbeing. Compared to homeowners, social housing tenants had social wellbeing scores which were -13.00 points (-18%) lower. Being a **private tenant**, meanwhile, was associated with a smaller but significant decrease of -5.51 points (-8%).

- Having a **disability** was also strongly associated with a drop in social wellbeing, as disabled people scored -9.26 points lower (-13%) than those without disabilities.

- **Age** showed that the older someone is, the more likely they are to have a higher social wellbeing score. Those aged 55+ scored significantly higher than 16-34s, by a margin of 6.34 points (9%).

- **Local area deprivation** showed a tentative association with social wellbeing, but these associations were right on the threshold for statistical significance. Living in an area in the middle quintile of deprivation (IMD3) was associated with a 4.26-point (6%) increase in social wellbeing,

compared to those in the most deprived regions (IMD1). While living in the most affluent quintile was associated with a similar increase (4.03, or 6%), this did not quite reach the threshold of statistical significance.

Neither gender, income, ethnicity, number of children nor urbanity were significantly associated with social wellbeing scores.

Table 2. Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	71.11	3.44	0.00
Men	2.00	1.37	0.15
Aged 35-54	2.14	2.00	0.29
Aged 55+	***6.34***	***2.19***	***0.00***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	2.38	1.85	0.20
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	3.31	2.17	0.13
HH income of £100,000+	1.90	2.27	0.40
Ethnic minorities (inc. white minorities)	-2.21	3.37	0.51
Having a disability	***-9.26***	***1.75***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-5.51***	***2.60***	***0.03***
Social housing tenant	***-13.00***	***3.21***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	0.30	1.84	0.87
Having 2 children	-2.17	2.94	0.46
Having 3 or more children	0.48	3.36	0.89
IMD2	1.04	2.15	0.63
IMD3	***4.26***	***2.15***	***0.05***
IMD4	2.43	2.14	0.26
IMD5	4.03	2.07	0.05
Urban area	-1.18	1.40	0.40

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.

Bold and italicised values are significant at P<0.05

Economic wellbeing

The demographic variables explained around four fifths of the variation in economic wellbeing scores (adjusted $R^2 = 0.39$). Full results are listed in Table 3.

- **Tenancy** had the most notable single association with economic wellbeing, with social housing tenants on average -23.18 points (-33%) below homeowners. Private tenants showed a more moderate difference of -9.43 points (-13%).
- **Household income** was another notable predictor of economic wellbeing. People in a household earning between £52,000 and £99,999 were associated with the largest uplift in economic wellbeing (17.13, or 24%), compared to the reference group of those in a household earning less than £26,000. Every income band above £26,000 was associated with a relatively large increase in economic wellbeing, relative to the reference group.
- People having **two children*** showed lower economic wellbeing scores by an average of -10.82 points (-15%) below those without children, whereas there was no significant difference for people with one child, or with three or more children.
- **Age** had an association with economic wellbeing. Compared to 16-34s, those aged 35-54 had a reduction of -8.01 points (-11%), whereas those aged 55+ scored at parity with the reference group. Notably, this is over and above the effect of having children at home..
- Finally, **disabled people** had economic wellbeing scores which were, on average, -6.39 points below people without a disability.

Gender, ethnicity, local deprivation and urbanity were not significantly linked with economic wellbeing.
*The number of respondents with two children in Wales is 41, which is below the threshold of confidence for this result.

Table 3. Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	70.54	3.76	0.00
Men	1.88	2.01	0.35
Aged 35-54	***-8.01***	***2.99***	***0.01***
Aged 55+	2.23	2.81	0.43
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***12.51***	***2.70***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***17.13***	***3.14***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***14.55***	***4.04***	***0.00***
Ethnic minorities (inc. white minorities)	-3.58	3.71	0.34
Having a disability	***-6.39***	***2.62***	***0.02***
Private tenant	***-9.43***	***4.00***	***0.02***
Social housing tenant	***-23.18***	***5.10***	***0.00***
Having 1 child	-3.32	3.09	0.28
Having 2 children	***-10.82***	***4.56***	***0.02****
Having 3 or more children	-8.14	6.81	0.23
IMD2	-1.49	3.46	0.67
IMD3	-1.86	3.44	0.59
IMD4	-1.31	3.83	0.73
IMD5	2.27	3.09	0.46
Urban area	-2.67	2.31	0.25

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold and italicised values are significant at P<0.05

*The number of respondents with two children in Wales is 41, which is below the threshold of confidence for this result.

Environmental wellbeing

Demographic variables explained around a quarter of the variation in environmental wellbeing scores (adjusted $R^2 = 0.26$). This indicates that the majority of the variation in these scores are explained by other factors, which might range from access to green space to attitudes towards climate change. Nevertheless, three demographic variables emerged which can significantly explain some of the variation. Full results are listed in Table 4.

- As with social, economic and collective wellbeing, being a **social housing tenant** was associated with poorer environmental wellbeing. The difference between social housing tenants and homeowners was -9.03 points (15%).
- Living in an **urban area** was also strongly associated with a reduction in environmental wellbeing, by a margin of -7.78 points (-13%) compared to people who were living in rural areas.
- Meanwhile, increased **age** was positively associated with environmental wellbeing. Those aged 55+ had environmental wellbeing scores of 7.45 points (12%) higher than 16-34s.

All other demographic characteristics, including gender, income, ethnicity, disability, number of children and local deprivation, were not significantly linked with environmental wellbeing.

Table 4. Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	61.42	4.36	0.00
Men	1.94	1.83	0.29
Aged 35-54	1.97	2.74	0.47
Aged 55+	***7.45***	***2.72***	***0.01***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	1.47	2.31	0.53
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	2.32	2.74	0.40
HH income of £100,000+	6.09	3.24	0.06
Ethnic minorities (inc. white minorities)	-3.29	4.04	0.42
Having a disability	-3.56	2.20	0.11
Private tenant	0.37	3.44	0.91
Social housing tenant	***-9.03***	***4.15***	***0.03***
Having 1 child	-0.18	2.99	0.95
Having 2 children	-0.09	4.06	0.98
Having 3 or more children	5.13	5.63	0.36
IMD2	2.79	3.18	0.38
IMD3	2.23	3.48	0.52
IMD4	5.83	3.47	0.09
IMD5	5.21	3.29	0.11
Urban area	***-7.78***	***2.00***	***0.00***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold and italicised values are significant at P<0.05

Democratic wellbeing

Less than one fifth of the variation in democratic wellbeing was explained by demographic characteristics in the model (adjusted $R^2 = 0.17$). Furthermore, the strength of associations was shared across many demographic variables, meaning that no individual characteristic reached the level of statistical significance ($P<0.05$). This indicates that democratic wellbeing is more strongly influenced by factors other than the demographics in the model, such as education, political stance or levels of trust in different institutions. Full results are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	42.18	3.78	0.00
Men	-2.11	1.82	0.25
Aged 35-54	-4.87	2.50	0.05
Aged 55+	1.37	2.77	0.62
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	0.81	2.33	0.73
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	2.21	2.75	0.42
HH income of £100,000+	3.25	3.12	0.30
Ethnic minorities (inc. white minorities)	1.39	3.56	0.70
Having a disability	-3.28	2.08	0.12
Private tenant	-1.05	3.77	0.78
Social housing tenant	-0.88	3.79	0.82
Having 1 child	4.68	2.65	0.08
Having 2 children	-0.32	2.80	0.91
Having 3 or more children	6.47	4.10	0.12
IMD2	1.00	2.71	0.71
IMD3	-3.23	3.35	0.34
IMD4	-1.12	2.88	0.70
IMD5	1.93	2.86	0.50
Urban area	-2.95	1.93	0.13

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area.
Bold and italicised values are significant at P<0.05

Regression analysis of the 2024 Life in the UK Index – Northern Ireland

Overview

Regression analysis is a statistical method used to examine the relationship between a dependent variable (in this case, wellbeing scores) and one or more independent variables. It allows for the investigation of how differences in demographic characteristics, such as age, ethnicity, or gender, are associated with different outcomes of the dependent variable. By using regression, we can isolate the effects of specific demographic factors while controlling for other variables that may also be influential.

A key advantage of regression is that it explains the relationship between each demographic characteristic and collective wellbeing over and above the relationship between other demographic characteristics and wellbeing. Consequently, we can, for example, say that age has an effect of increasing or decreasing collective wellbeing by a value of *x* irrespective of any other demographic characteristic describing a person. It is important to note that regression models cannot establish causation. Rather, they provide valuable insights into the associations between variables.

Through interpretation of the regression estimates and the significance of the explanatory variables, we can develop a deeper understanding of how different socio-demographic factors contribute to collective wellbeing.
The estimates represent the expected change in the collective wellbeing score for each unit of change in an explanatory variable (i.e. demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, etc.). These estimates reveal the direction and size of the relationship between the characteristics and the collective wellbeing scores.

Furthermore, statistical measures such as p-values help determine whether the relationship observed between the demographic characteristics and the outcome variable is statistically significant. A p-value below our chosen threshold ($p < 0.05$) suggests that is likely that there are wider, population differences in wellbeing, that are dependent on a demographic characteristic. A p-value greater than the chosen threshold ($p > 0.05$) means that it is not possible, based on this dataset, to say with confidence that there are differences in the wellbeing of the population dependent on this characteristic.

Regression analysis results for collective wellbeing and for each of the four wellbeing domains – social, economic, environmental, and democratic – are provided below.

Collective wellbeing

Collective wellbeing varied substantially between a range of socio-demographic characteristics, which accounted for just over a third of the variation in collective wellbeing between respondents ($R^2 = 0.36$). Health, in the form of a self-reported disability, was a particularly important influence on collective wellbeing in terms of the size of the change in wellbeing score. Having a disability lowered collective wellbeing by a score of -6.7 (which equates to a 12% difference).

- People in the highest **income** bracket (£100,000 or more) scored 13.94, or 24%, more than their counterparts in the reference group (those with under £26,000 in yearly household income) in their collective wellbeing. Those in the median two income brackets scored similarly to each other, with those with income between £26,000 and £51,999 scoring 7.37, or 13% more than the reference group and those with income between £52,000 and £99,999 scored 7.08, or 12% more than those in the lowest income bracket.

- People with **disabilities** scored -6.93, or 12% lower than those without disabilities.

- **Older** respondents (aged 55 and over) scored significantly higher than the younger reference group (aged 34 or younger), with an additional 5.52 points, or 9% higher collective wellbeing score. The median age band and the youngest age band did not differ significantly from one another.

- Respondents with one **child*** scored significantly lower than those without children, scoring -3.68, or 6% less. However, this difference disappears when looking at parents with more children. This finding should be treated with caution as the sample size for this subgroup is small (90).

- Those from a Catholic **community background** differed significantly on collective wellbeing when compared to those from a Protestant community background, scoring -3.21 points, or 5%, lower.

- There were no further significant differences in collective wellbeing score when comparing demographic groups by gender, ethnicity, housing tenure, area deprivation level, or urbanity.

*The number of respondents from Northern Ireland with one child is 90, which is below the threshold of confidence in the accuracy of this result.

Table 1. Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores in Northern Ireland

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	58.51	2.68	0.00
Men	-0.33	1.13	0.77
Aged 35-54	0.65	1.86	0.73
Aged 55+	***5.52***	***2.05***	***0.01***
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	***7.37***	***1.60***	***0.00***
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	***7.08***	***1.81***	***0.00***
Income of £100,000+	***13.94***	***2.16***	***0.00***
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	1.08	2.75	0.69
Having a disability	***-6.93***	***1.50***	***0.00***
Private tenant	-3.63	2.31	0.12
Social housing tenant	-1.29	2.40	0.59
Having 1 child	***-3.68***	***1.83***	***0.04****
Having 2 children	-0.73	2.18	0.74
Having 3 or more children	-1.75	2.23	0.43
IMD2	3.13	1.92	0.10
IMD3	0.30	2.14	0.89
IMD4	1.11	2.16	0.61
IMD5	1.31	2.14	0.54
Urban area	-2.00	1.31	0.13
Catholic community background	***-3.21***	***1.18***	***0.01***
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	-3.40	1.98	0.09

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05
*The number of respondents from Northern Ireland with one child is 90, which is below the threshold of confidence in the accuracy of this result.

Social wellbeing

The demographic variables explained 36% of the variation (adjusted $R^2 = 0.36$) between people's social wellbeing. That is to say, differences in social wellbeing between the demographic groups, explained 36% of the total variation that we see in the data.

- People with a **disability** showed the greatest difference in social wellbeing when compared with those without a disability. Having a disability resulted in scoring -11.11 points lower, or a 15%

reduction in average social wellbeing score.

- People with a **household income** of £100,000 or more per year scored 9.62, or 13% more on social wellbeing when compared to those in the lowest income bracket (£26,000 or less per year). Those in median income brackets also scored more; for those with household income between £26,000 and £51,999 it was 5.33, or 7% higher, and for those with between £52,000 and £99,999 per year, it was 4.56, or 6% more.

- There were no other significant differences in social wellbeing between any of the other demographic groups in Northern Ireland.

Table 2. Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores in Northern Ireland

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	72.90	2.90	0.00
Men	1.79	1.37	0.19
Aged 35-54	-2.32	1.99	0.24
Aged 55+	1.92	2.23	0.39
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***5.33***	***1.92***	***0.01***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***4.56***	***2.10***	***0.03***
HH income of £100,000+	***9.62***	***2.48***	***0.00***
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	-5.09	2.94	0.08
Having a disability	***-11.11***	***1.83***	***0.00***
Private tenant	-3.85	2.76	0.16
Social housing tenant	-1.26	2.21	0.57
Having 1 child	-0.99	1.97	0.62
Having 2 children	1.09	2.77	0.69
Having 3 or more children	0.99	3.00	0.74
IMD2	1.60	2.41	0.51
IMD3	0.08	2.40	0.97
IMD4	1.93	2.28	0.40
IMD5	2.83	2.32	0.22
Urban area	-0.28	1.57	0.86
Catholic community background	-0.61	1.39	0.66
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	-3.63	2.41	0.13

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Economic wellbeing

The demographic variables explained 38% of the variation (adjusted $R^2 = 0.38$) between the economic wellbeing scores of the respondents. This suggests that a moderately large proportion of economic wellbeing is statistically dependent on a number of the demographic variables tested against.

- **Household income** was the most notable predictor of economic wellbeing in Northern Ireland. People with household income more than £100,000 annually scored 30.10 points more than those in the lowest bracket, or 53% more. Those with income between £52,000 and £99,999 scored an additional 16.60 points, or 29% more those with income less than £26,000, while those with a household income of between £26,000 and £51,999 scored 14.80, or 26% more that the

reference group.

- **Area deprivation**: those living in the second most deprived areas scored 10.18, or 18% more than the reference group of those living in the in the most deprived areas. There were no further significant differences in terms of economic wellbeing for those living in less deprived areas.

- **Housing tenure** was a significant factor affecting average economic wellbeing. Private renters scored significantly less than the reference group or homeowners (-9.23, or 16%).

- **Older** respondents (aged 55 and over) also showed a significant uptick in their economic wellbeing score, with 8.32, or 15% more points than the lowest age group (aged 16 – 34).

- Respondents with **one child*** scored -8.29, or 15% lower when compared to those without children. Those with two or more children showed no statistically significant difference to the reference group. However, this finding should be treated with caution as the sample size for the subgroup is small.

- Those with a **disability** scored significantly worse on economic wellbeing on average when compared with those without a disability (-7.83, or 14% lower).

- There was no further difference in economic wellbeing by demographic group in Northern Ireland when looking at; gender, ethnicity, urbanity, or community background.

*The number of respondents from Northern Ireland with one child is 90, which is below the threshold of confidence in the accuracy of this result.

Table 3. Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores in Northern Ireland

Characteristics	**Estimate**	**S.E.**	***p value***
Reference group	56.31	4.97	0.00
Men	-1.41	2.06	0.49
Aged 35-54	-1.36	3.35	0.68
Aged 55+	***8.32***	***3.67***	***0.02***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***14.80***	***3.37***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***16.60***	***3.61***	***0.00***
HH income of £100,000+	***30.10***	***3.99***	***0.00***
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	3.55	3.80	0.35
Having a disability	***-7.83***	***2.35***	***0.00***
Private tenant	***-9.23***	***3.99***	***0.02***
Social housing tenant	-4.00	5.35	0.46
Having 1 child	***-8.29***	***2.81***	***0.00****
Having 2 children	-1.16	3.74	0.76
Having 3 or more children	-4.08	4.41	0.36
IMD2	***10.18***	***3.34***	***0.00***
IMD3	3.53	3.35	0.29
IMD4	2.90	3.52	0.41
IMD5	4.79	4.51	0.29
Urban area	0.77	2.65	0.77
Catholic community background	-4.14	2.13	0.05
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	-1.25	2.70	0.64

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05
*The number of respondents from Northern Ireland with one child is 90, which is below the threshold of confidence in the accuracy of this result.

Environmental wellbeing

Demographic variables explained 24% of the variation between people's environmental wellbeing scores (adjusted $R^2 = 0.24$).

- **Urbanity** was a notable predictor of environmental wellbeing. People living in urban areas scored -9.37 points, or 13% lower on average when compared to those living in rural areas.

- **Older** respondents also scored more highly than the reference group of those aged 34 or under. People aged 55 and over scored 6.47, or 9%, more than the reference group, while those aged between 35 and 54 scored 5.60, or 8%, more than the reference group on average.

- There were no further differences in environmental wellbeing between the other demographic groups.

Table 4. Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores in Northern Ireland

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	69.43	4.07	0.00
Men	-1.39	1.82	0.45
Aged 35-54	***5.60***	***2.68***	***0.04***
Aged 55+	***6.47***	***2.88***	***0.03***
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	2.13	2.51	0.40
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	1.26	2.62	0.63
HH income of £100,000+	4.00	3.10	0.20
Ethnic minority (inc. white minorities)	-2.73	4.49	0.54
Having a disability	-3.57	2.52	0.16
Private tenant	0.36	3.95	0.93
Social housing tenant	4.10	3.45	0.24
Having 1 child	-4.47	2.59	0.08
Having 2 children	-2.06	2.79	0.46
Having 3 or more children	-5.32	3.04	0.08
IMD2	0.73	2.79	0.79
IMD3	-1.68	2.96	0.57
IMD4	0.94	3.11	0.76
IMD5	3.58	3.42	0.30
Urban area	***-9.37***	***1.86***	***0.00***
Catholic community background	-1.57	1.77	0.38
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	-1.93	2.97	0.52

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Democratic wellbeing

The demographic variables explained less than 14% of the variation (adjusted $R^2 = 0.14$) between people's responses to the democratic wellbeing scale. This indicated that, as a whole, demographic characteristics had relatively little association with this domain. This finding reflects the fact that democratic wellbeing is a complex domain and that other factors beyond core demographic characteristics will be more influential (e.g. general trust levels, political climate, etc.).

- **Household income** showed that people in the highest household income bracket (£100,000 or more per year) scored 12.02, or 34%, higher on democratic wellbeing than the reference group of the lowest band (with a household income of £26,000 or less per year). People with an income between £52,000 and £99,999 also scored 5.90, or 17% more than the reference group while those with an income between £26,000 and £51,999 scored 7.21, or 20% more than the reference group.

- There were also significant differences in democratic wellbeing by **community background**. Those from Catholic communities scored -6.54, or 18% lower than the reference group with those from a Protestant community. All other communities, or those that did not wish to disclose, also scored lower than Protestant communities by -6.77, or 19% less.

- People living in the least **deprived areas** scored lower than those living in the most deprived areas by -5.95, or 17%. There were no other differences in democratic wellbeing for the areas by deprivation quintile.

- **Disabled people** scored -5.21, or 15% less than those without a disability.

Table 5. Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores in Northern Ireland

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	*p value*
Reference group	35.40	3.77	0.00
Men	-0.31	1.65	0.85
Aged 35-54	0.69	2.52	0.78
Aged 55+	5.36	2.74	0.05
HH income of £26,000 – £51,999	***7.21***	***2.22***	***0.00***
HH income of £52,000 – £99,999	***5.90***	***2.50***	***0.02***
HH income of £100,000+	***12.02***	***3.24***	***0.00***
White ethnicity	8.60	4.53	0.06
Having a disability	***-5.21***	***1.87***	***0.01***
Private tenant	-1.81	3.43	0.60
Social housing tenant	-4.00	2.31	0.08
Having 1 child	-0.97	2.54	0.70
Having 2 children	-0.79	2.54	0.76
Having 3 or more children	1.43	2.75	0.60
IMD2	0.03	2.65	0.99
IMD3	-0.74	2.87	0.80
IMD4	-1.35	3.08	0.66
IMD5	***-5.95***	***2.81***	***0.03***
Urban area	0.88	1.82	0.63
Catholic community background	***-6.54***	***1.72***	***0.00***
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	***-6.77***	***2.67***	***0.01***

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, in the most deprived area (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background.
Bold italicised indicates significant associations at P<0.05

Our standards and accreditations

Ipsos' standards and accreditations provide our clients with the peace of mind that they can always depend on us to deliver reliable, sustainable findings. Our focus on quality and continuous improvement means we have embedded a "right first time" approach throughout our organisation.

ISO 20252

This is the international market research specific standard that supersedes BS 7911/MRQSA and incorporates IQCS (Interviewer Quality Control Scheme). It covers the five stages of a Market Research project. Ipsos was the first company in the world to gain this accreditation.

Market Research Society (MRS) Company Partnership

By being an MRS Company Partner, Ipsos endorses and supports the core MRS brand values of professionalism, research excellence and business effectiveness, and commits to comply with the MRS Code of Conduct throughout the organisation. We were the first company to sign up to the requirements and self-regulation of the MRS Code. More than 350 companies have followed our lead.

ISO 9001

This is the international general company standard with a focus on continual improvement through quality management systems. In 1994, we became one of the early adopters of the ISO 9001 business standard.

ISO 27001

This is the international standard for information security, designed to ensure the selection of adequate and proportionate security controls. Ipsos was the first research company in the UK to be awarded this in August 2008.

The UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the UK Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018

Ipsos is required to comply with the UK GDPR and the UK DPA. It covers the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy.

HMG Cyber Essentials

This is a government-backed scheme and a key deliverable of the UK's National Cyber Security Programme. Ipsos was assessment-validated for Cyber Essentials certification in 2016. Cyber Essentials defines a set of controls which, when properly implemented, provide organisations with basic protection from the most prevalent forms of threat coming from the internet.

Fair Data

Ipsos is signed up as a "Fair Data" company, agreeing to adhere to 10 core principles. The principles support and complement other standards such as ISOs, and the requirements of Data Protection legislation.

For more information

3 Thomas More Square
London
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

www.ipsos.com/en-uk
http://twitter.com/IpsosUK

About Ipsos Public Affairs

Ipsos Public Affairs works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.275 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. Combined with our methods and communications expertise, this helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.