Life in the UK Index

Technical Report
September 2025

Karl Ashworth, Emily Gray,
Christian Stow, Ipsos

collective wellbeing Carnegie UK

Ipsos

Contents

List of tables

1 Research overview

The Life in the UK index measures the wellbeing of UK residents by considering key factors across social, economic, environmental, and democratic domains. Designed by Carnegie UK and Ipsos, this annual index was first conducted in May 2023 and has been repeated in May 2024 and May 2025. Results from all three years enable Carnegie UK to assess change and stability in wellbeing over time, both at overall collective wellbeing level and for social, economic, environmental and democratic wellbeing domains specifically.

To create the index, a measure of each of the four wellbeing 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 process ensured that the wellbeing measures captured a comprehensive understanding of wellbeing across the four domains.

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 2025 implementation of the index, 7,106 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 2025 with similar levels of cohesion and consistency as in previous years. A bootstrapping factor analysis was also performed in 2023 to measure the stability of each model.

[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 8th and 14th May 2025, with a total of 7,106 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 12,822 panellists in the United Kingdom (16+) were selected and invited to take part in the survey. Of these, 7,106 respondents completed the survey – a response rate of 55%.

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 only).

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

3 Index content

The finalised questionnaire first developed for the index 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 and 2025, the same set of 26 question items was used for the index for consistency. 34 of the original 36 question items were included in the questionnaire for 2024 and 2025, 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 1.4%, Table 4.1) except for the question on satisfaction with the availability of job opportunities, where a response was missing in 11.8% of cases, which related to respondents answering, "Don't know". Although the percentage of missing cases in this variable was relatively high, as in previous years of the index, it was not particularly associated with a broader pattern of missingness and its impact on the final economic wellbeing domain was limited.

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

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.

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

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Missing Percent
				Social wellbeing
General health	7097	69.56	21.41	0.1%
Mental health	7092	71.92	22.57	0.2%
Neighbourhood safety	7043	65.59	27.75	0.9%
Rely on neighbours	7053	70.53	26.16	0.7%
Discrimination	6962	82.09	24.60	2.0%
Access to supermarket	7088	84.56	22.24	0.3%
				Economic wellbeing
Job opportunities	6267	48.85	24.89	11.8%
Afford warm house	7081	77.70	26.63	0.4%
Afford holidays	7067	71.86	32.26	0.5%
Afford unexpected expense	7042	66.65	34.80	0.9%
Afford enough food	7083	86.65	21.16	0.3%
Afford socialising	7073	79.11	26.56	0.5%
Satisfied with skills	7086	78.16	21.73	0.3%
				Environmental wellbeing
Noise pollution	7082	72.74	27.43	0.3%
Air pollution	6889	76.52	28.17	3.1%
Litter	7085	58.65	28.68	0.3%
Satisfaction with open spaces	7046	72.12	24.82	0.8%
UK's environmental efforts	6961	44.87	25.32	2.0%
				Democratic wellbeing
Trust in UK government	7024	31.88	26.20	1.2%
Trust in local council	6960	40.91	24.77	2.1%
Trust in the legal system	6948	51.91	25.70	2.2%
Trust in the media	7040	38.63	24.41	0.9%
Trust in the police	7036	54.25	25.32	1.0%
Trust in banks	7029	55.11	25.35	1.1%
Influence in the UK	6991	22.78	23.23	1.6%
Influence in local area	6963	34.03	25.20	2.0%

5 Analysis

5.1 Data analysis procedure

For the 2023 and 2024 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 2025 index, the factor analysis was repeated with the same input variables as 2023 and 2024. 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 and 2025 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 2025.

5.2 Replicating the factor analysis

For the 2025 index, the factor analysis, first conducted in 2023, was replicated to ensure that the index model was still suitable for the 2025 dataset. Re-running the factor analysis provided a check that the relationships between the variables identified in 2023 remained similar enough in 2025 to justify continuing with the 2023 scale construction.

The factor analysis revealed that the patterns of correlation observed in the previous years were almost identical to the 2025 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 2025 data confirmed the structure revealed in 2023 and the two factors were again positively correlated ($R^2 = 0.33$) 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	**0.68**
Economic wellbeing	**0.86**
Environmental wellbeing	**0.69**
Democratic wellbeing	**0.85**

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.

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.

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

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 and 2024 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 0.1% and 3.1%), similar to 2023 and 2024 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	**7104**	**.00**	**100.00**	**73.98**	**15.14**
Economic wellbeing score	**7097**	**.00**	**100.00**	**73.23**	**20.49**
Environmental wellbeing score	**7096**	**.00**	**100.00**	**64.95**	**18.06**
Democratic wellbeing score	**7088**	**.00**	**99.00**	**41.20**	**17.41**
Collective wellbeing score	**7104**	**5.00**	**100.00**	**63.36**	**13.25**

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 2025 Index and can be found in Appendix C.

Research overview

The annual Life in the UK Index measures the wellbeing of UK residents by considering key factors across social, economic, environmental, and democratic domains. Each year, a score for each of these four domains is calculated separately from a short survey of questions. A score for overall collective wellbeing is then created by averaging the individual scores across the four domains.

Analysis approach

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), and social characteristics (such as tenancy or the number of children in the household), are associated with different outcomes of the dependent variable. By using regression, we can isolate the effects of specific sociodemographic factors while controlling for other variables that may also be influential.

A key advantage of regression is that it explains the relationship between each socio-demographic characteristic and wellbeing, over and above the relationship of other socio-demographic characteristics. Consequently, we can, for example, say that age has an effect of increasing or decreasing wellbeing by a value of *x* irrespective of any other sociodemographic characteristic.

It is important to note that regression models cannot establish causation. Rather, they provide valuable insights into the associations between variables. The estimates represent the expected change in the 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 wellbeing scores.

6.1 Collective wellbeing

In 2025, collective wellbeing varied according to a wide range of socio-demographic characteristics. Indeed, every category of socio-demographic characteristic we tested was significantly associated with collective wellbeing in some way.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of collective wellbeing. The higher the income of a person's household, the higher their collective wellbeing score. Compared to the reference group of people with a household income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with an increase of +3.42 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with an increase of +6.03 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above was associated with an increase of +8.47 points in collective wellbeing.

Similarly, the level of **area deprivation** was a strong predictor of collective wellbeing. As the level of area deprivation increased, collective wellbeing decreased. Living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) added +6.18 points to a person's collective wellbeing score, compared to a person living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1). Between these extremes, there was a steady gradient for those living in the middle quintiles of area deprivation (IMD2, IMD3 and IMD4).

Having a **disability** was strongly associated with collective wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -7.69 points less than those without a disability.

Housing tenure displayed a moderate association with collective wellbeing scores. Living in social housing was associated with a collective wellbeing score -5.60 points lower than being a homeowner. Private renters had a score between these two groups, scoring on average -2.67 points less than homeowners.

A moderate association was found between **age** and collective wellbeing, but only between the oldest and the youngest age groups. Those aged 55+ had a higher collective wellbeing score (+4.76) than those aged 16 to 34.

Similarly, the presence of **children** in the household was associated with collective wellbeing, but only for people with three or more children, who scored on average -3.10 points lower than those with no children.

Smaller associations with collective wellbeing were found among:

- those living in an **urban area**, who scored on average -2.51 points lower than those living in a rural area;
- **ethnic minorities** (inc. white minorities), who scored on average -1.93 points lower than white British people; and
- **men**, who scored on average +1.55 points higher than women.

Compared to the reference group of people living in England, there was one difference in collective wellbeing by jurisdiction. Living in **Scotland** was associated with a slight boost to a person's collective wellbeing score, of +1.48 points.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	58.09	0.99	0.00
Men	**1.55**	**0.39**	**0.00**
Aged 35-54	-0.28	0.60	0.64
Aged 55+	**4.76**	**0.60**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**3.42**	**0.58**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**6.03**	**0.61**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+	**8.47**	**0.78**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	**-1.93**	**0.61**	**0.00**
Having a disability	**-7.69**	**0.52**	**0.00**
Private tenant	**-2.67**	**0.72**	**0.00**
Social housing tenant	**-5.60**	**0.83**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	-0.71	0.66	0.29
Having 2 children	-0.88	0.70	0.21
Having 3 or more children	**-3.10**	**1.38**	**0.02**
IMD2	**2.13**	**0.69**	**0.00**
IMD3	**3.42**	**0.71**	**0.00**
IMD4	**4.85**	**0.69**	**0.00**
IMD5	**6.18**	**0.70**	**0.00**
Urban area	**-2.51**	**0.44**	**0.00**
Scotland	**1.48**	**0.57**	**0.01**
Wales	-0.11	0.72	0.88
Northern Ireland	-0.61	0.69	0.37

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 quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

6.2 Summary by sociodemographic factors

The Life in the UK index considers a variety of key aspects of wellbeing across social, economic, environmental, and democratic domains. Several common themes emerged from the regression analysis; for some sociodemographic characteristics, we found significant associations across more than one wellbeing domain, and often in the same direction. Regression results for each wellbeing domain at the overall UK level are reported in Appendix D.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of social, economic and democratic wellbeing. Each of these associations showed a steady gradient: the higher the income of a person's household, the higher their social, economic and democratic wellbeing score. The strongest of these relationships was between income and economic wellbeing.

Compared to the reference group of people with a household income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +2.50 points on average; and for economic wellbeing, of +8.26 points on average.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +4.26 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +14.95 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +3.01 points on average.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +6.11 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +19.78 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +5.59 points on average.

Notably, no significant associations were found between income and environmental wellbeing.

The level of **area deprivation** was a strong predictor of social, economic, environmental and democratic wellbeing, and displayed a broadly linear (straight line) relationship with each. Relative to a person living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) added on average:

- +4.36 points to a person's social wellbeing score,
- +4.50 points to a person's economic wellbeing score,
- +11.43 points to a person's environmental wellbeing score, and
- +4.93 points to a person's democratic wellbeing score.

Between these extremes, there was a steady gradient for those living in areas of the middle quintiles of deprivation (IMD2, IMD3 and IMD4).[4]

[4] The only exception to this linear (straight line) relationship by area deprivation was found among democratic wellbeing. For this domain, living in an IMD2, IMD3 or IMD4 area had roughly the same association (+3.06, +2.82 and +3.59 points, respectively, compared to those living in IMD1 areas).

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with all four wellbeing domains, the strongest association being with social wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -12.20 points lower on social wellbeing, -8.98 points lower on economic wellbeing, -4.60 points lower on environmental wellbeing and -4.41 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

The relationship between **housing tenure** and collective wellbeing (discussed in Chapter 1) was mirrored in the social and economic wellbeing domains:

- Living in social housing was associated with a social wellbeing score -5.40 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -13.52 points lower, than being a homeowner.
- Living in privately rented accommodation was associated with a social wellbeing score -2.76 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -7.57 points lower, than being a homeowner.

Across all four wellbeing domains, a positive association was found between the youngest and oldest **age** groups. Those aged 55+ scored higher on social wellbeing (+4.72 points), economic wellbeing (+4.77 points), environmental wellbeing (+7.11 points) and democratic wellbeing (+2.84 points), compared to those aged 16 to 34.

However, the relationship between age and wellbeing was not linear. Rather, being aged 35-54 was associated with a lower economic wellbeing score, by -2.28 points, compared to the youngest group.

There was a strong association between living in an **urban area** and having a lower environmental wellbeing score (-7.70 points) compared to those living rurally. There was a much smaller – but still statistically significant – association for social wellbeing too. Living in an urban area was linked with a -1.77 point drop in social wellbeing.

The presence of **children** was a strong predictor of economic wellbeing scores. The more children in the household, the lower a person's economic wellbeing score – although it is worth noting that all those with three or more children were banded into the same group. At the furthest extreme, having three or more children in the household was linked with an economic wellbeing score -10.44 points lower, compared to having no children in the household. The number of children in the household was not associated with any other wellbeing domains, neither positively nor negatively.

There was a small association with **gender**, across most of the wellbeing domains. Compared to the reference group of women, being a man was associated with a +2.65 increase in social wellbeing, a +1.82 increase in economic wellbeing and a +1.46 increase in democratic wellbeing.

Being from an **ethnic minority** (inc. white minorities) was associated with lower social wellbeing (-3.67 points) and environmental wellbeing (-2.48 points), compared with having a white British ethnic background.

Finally, some unique associations with individual wellbeing domains emerged according to jurisdiction. Compared to the reference group of those living in England:

- Living in **Scotland** was associated with a higher social wellbeing score, of +2.62 points, and a higher environmental wellbeing score, of +3.99 points.
- Living in **Wales** was associated with a higher social wellbeing score, of +1.69 points, but a lower democratic wellbeing score, of -2.35 points.
- Living in **Northern Ireland** was associated with a higher environmental wellbeing score, of +3.31 points, but lower scores for both economic wellbeing (-2.23 points) and democratic wellbeing (-3.91 points).

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	6.6%	6.3%	0.2%	0.1%
25-34	8.3%	8.2%	0.2%	0.3%
35-44	7.7%	7.8%	0.1%	0.2%
45-54	8.1%	8.3%	0.0%	0.1%
55-64	7.2%	7.5%	0.0%	0.2%
65-74	5.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.1%
75+	4.4%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%

Region	
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	20.0%
2	20.0%
3	20.0%
4	20.0%
5	20.0%

Education	
Degree level or above	29.8%
Below degree level	67.7%

Ethnicity	
White	85.2%
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	81.8%

The below table presents the weighting profile targets for Wales:

Age & Gender				
	Male	Female	In another way	PNTS
16-34	14.5%	13.8%	0.2%	0.3%
35-44	6.7%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%
45-54	7.8%	8.2%	0.0%	0.1%
55-64	7.6%	8.0%	0.1%	0.2%
65-74	6.7%	7.1%	0.0%	0.1%
75+	5.0%	6.5%	0.3%	0.0%

Education	
Degree level or above	25.8%
Below degree level	72.6%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	1.5%

Ethnicity	
White	94.8%
Non-White	4.2%
Don't know/Prefer not to say	1.1%

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

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

The below table presents the weighting profile targets for Scotland:

Age & Gender				
	Male	Female	In another way	PNTS
16-34	14.4%	14.3%	0.3%	0.2%
35-44	7.2%	7.4%	0.1%	0.0%
45-54	8.0%	8.5%	0.2%	0.2%
55-64	7.8%	8.3%	0.0%	0.3%
65-74	6.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.2%
75+	4.2%	5.9%	0.0%	0.1%

Region	
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	94.2%
Non-White	4.7%
Don't know/Prefer not to say	1.1%

IMD Quintiles	
1	20.00%
2	20.00%
3	20.00%
4	20.00%
5	20.00%

Education	
Degree level or above	27.5%
Below degree level	70.6%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	1.9%

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

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

Age & Gender				
	Male	Female	In another way	PNTS
16-34	15.2%	14.8%	0.2%	0.1%
35-44	7.7%	8.2%	0.0%	0.1%
45-54	8.3%	8.7%	0.0%	0.2%
55-64	7.5%	7.7%	0.0%	0.1%
65-74	5.5%	5.8%	0.1%	0.0%
75+	4.0%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%

Region	
Belfast	15.5%
East	24.5%
North	15.7%
Outer Belfast	21.8%
West and South	22.5%

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

Community Background	
Protestant	44.5%
Catholic	41.6%
Neither	10.6%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	3.3%

Education	
Degree level or above	23.2%
Below degree level	75.6%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	1.2%

Ethnicity	
White	97.2%
Non-White	1.8%
Don't know/Prefer not to say	1.0%

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

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 – Regression analysis reports

Regression analysis of the 2025 Life in the UK Index - England

Collective wellbeing

In 2025, collective wellbeing in England varied according to a wide range of socio-demographic characteristics. Almost every category of socio-demographic characteristic we tested was significantly associated with collective wellbeing in some way. The only exception to this was English region, for which there were no significant associations with collective wellbeing.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of collective wellbeing. The higher the income of a person's household, the higher their collective wellbeing score. Compared to the reference group of people with a household income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with an increase of +3.51 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with an increase of +6.34 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above was associated with an increase of +8.77 points in collective wellbeing.

Similarly, the level of **area deprivation** was a strong predictor of collective wellbeing. As the level of area deprivation increased, collective wellbeing decreased. Living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) added +6.11 points to a person's collective wellbeing score, compared to a person living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1). Between these extremes, there was a steady gradient for those living in the middle quintiles of area deprivation (IMD2, IMD3 and IMD4).

Having a **disability** was strongly associated with collective wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -7.72 points less on average than those without a disability.

A moderate association was found between **age** and collective wellbeing, but only between the oldest and the youngest age groups. Those aged 55+ had a higher collective wellbeing score (+4.54) than those aged 16 to 34.

Similarly, the presence of **children** in the household was associated with collective wellbeing, but only for people with three or more children, who scored on average -3.52 points lower than those with no children.

Housing tenure displayed a moderate association with collective wellbeing. Living in social housing was associated with a collective wellbeing score -4.77 points lower than being a homeowner. Private renters had a score between these two groups, scoring on average -2.81 points less than homeowners.

Smaller associations with collective wellbeing were found among:

- those living in an **urban area**, who scored on average -2.33 points lower than those living in a rural area;
- **ethnic minorities** (inc. white minorities), who scored on average -1.71 points lower than white British people; and
- **men**, who scored on average +1.68 points higher than women.

For a full list of regression estimates for collective wellbeing in England, along with standard error and p-values, see Table 1.1 (overleaf).

Table 6.2: England regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	58.77	1.53	0.00
Men	**1.68**	**0.45**	**0.00**
Aged 35-54	-0.44	0.67	0.51
Aged 55+	**4.54**	**0.68**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**3.51**	**0.66**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**6.34**	**0.69**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+	**8.77**	**0.87**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	**-1.71**	**0.69**	**0.01**
Having a disability	**-7.72**	**0.59**	**0.00**
Private tenant	**-2.81**	**0.81**	**0.00**
Social housing tenant	**-4.77**	**0.95**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	-0.98	0.75	0.19
Having 2 children	-1.06	0.77	0.17
Having 3 or more children	**-3.52**	**1.53**	**0.02**
IMD2	**1.86**	**0.81**	**0.02**
IMD3	**3.18**	**0.83**	**0.00**
IMD4	**4.75**	**0.81**	**0.00**
IMD5	**6.11**	**0.81**	**0.00**
Urban area	**-2.33**	**0.53**	**0.00**
English regions - North West	-1.24	1.26	0.33
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	-1.51	1.28	0.24
English regions - East Midlands	-1.22	1.30	0.35
English regions - West Midlands	-1.54	1.34	0.25
English regions - East of England	-0.53	1.28	0.68

English regions - South East	0.43	1.19	0.71
English regions - South West	0.39	1.22	0.75
English regions - London	-2.11	1.29	0.10

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.

Summary by sociodemographic factors

The Life in the UK index considers a variety of key aspects of wellbeing across social, economic, environmental, and democratic domains. Several common themes emerged from the regression analysis for England; for some sociodemographic characteristics, we found significant associations across more than one wellbeing domain, and often in the same direction. Regression results for each wellbeing domain are reported in Appendix D.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of social, economic and democratic wellbeing. Each of these associations showed a gradient: the higher the income of a person's household, the higher their social, economic and democratic wellbeing score. The strongest of these relationships was between income and economic wellbeing.

Compared to the reference group of people with a household income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +2.51 points on average; and for economic wellbeing, of +8.29 points on average.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +4.62 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +15.11 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +3.63 points on average.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +6.61 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +19.48 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +5.82 points on average.

A small to moderate association was found between income and environmental wellbeing, but only between the highest and lowest income groups. Those with a household income of £100,000 and above had an environmental wellbeing score on average +3.11 points higher than those with a household income of less than £26,000.

The level of **area deprivation** was a strong predictor of social, economic, environmental and democratic wellbeing, and displayed a broadly linear relationship with each. Relative to a person living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) added on average:

- +4.45 points to a person's social wellbeing score,

- +3.94 points to a person's economic wellbeing score,
- +11.98 points to a person's environmental wellbeing score, and
- +4.56 points to a person's democratic wellbeing score.

Between these extremes, there was a gradient for those living in areas of the middle quintiles of deprivation (IMD2, IMD3 and IMD4).[5]

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with all four wellbeing domains, the strongest association being with social wellbeing. Disabled people scored -12.04 points lower on social wellbeing, -8.80 points lower on economic wellbeing, -5.41 points lower on environmental wellbeing and -3.81 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

Being a **social housing** tenant was negatively associated with a person's wellbeing score, particularly for economic wellbeing. Living in social housing was associated with a social wellbeing score -4.09 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -12.69 points lower, than being a homeowner. There were similar associations related to being a **private tenant**, albeit these were less strong. Living in privately rented accommodation was associated with a social wellbeing score -2.63 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -7.99 points lower, than being a homeowner.

For three of the four wellbeing domains, there were moderate associations between **age** and wellbeing scores, but only between the oldest and the youngest age groups. Compared to those aged 16 to 34, being aged 55+ added on average:

- +4.74 points to a person's social wellbeing score,
- +4.95 points to a person's economic wellbeing score, and
- +6.76 points to a person's environmental wellbeing score.

There was a strong association between living in an **urban area** and having a lower environmental wellbeing score (-6.29 points), compared to those living rurally. Similarly, living in **London** was strongly associated with having a lower environmental wellbeing score, of -9.16 points compared to those living in the North East of England.

The presence of **children** was a strong predictor of economic wellbeing scores. The more children in the household, the lower a person's economic wellbeing score – although it is worth noting that

[5] The only exception to this linear (straight line) relationship by area deprivation was found among democratic wellbeing. For this domain, living in an IMD2, IMD3 or IMD4 area had roughly the same association (+2.68, +2.35 and +3.06 points, respectively, compared to those living in IMD1 areas).

all those with three or more children were banded into the same group. Compared to having no children in the household:

- Having three or more children in the household was linked with an economic wellbeing score -10.98 points lower, on average.
- Having two children in the household was linked with an economic wellbeing score -4.61 points lower, on average.

The number of children in the household was not associated with any other wellbeing domains, either positively or negatively.

There was a small association with **gender** across three of the four wellbeing domains. Compared to the reference group of women, being a man was associated with a +2.56 point increase in social wellbeing, a +2.09 point increase in economic wellbeing and a +1.76 point increase in democratic wellbeing.

Being from an **ethnic minority** (inc. white minorities) was associated with lower social wellbeing (-3.30 points) and economic wellbeing (-2.38 points), compared with having a white British ethnic background.

Regression analysis of the 2025 Life in the UK Index – Wales

Base size limitations

In total, 686 adults were surveyed in Wales, which provides robust measures of wellbeing at a total sample level and across most sociodemographic subgroups. However, there are base size limitations for some subgroups which have a low incidence rate among Wales's population.

For the following sociodemographic subgroups, we achieved sample sizes between 50 and 99. Findings for these groups are included in this report but should be treated with caution:

- Aged between 16-34
- Private tenants
- Those with 1 or 2 children in the household.

Where they are referenced in this report, these subgroups are indicated with an asterisk (*).

For the following sociodemographic subgroups, the sample size was less than 50. As such, findings for these groups are not commented on in this report:

- Ethnic minorities (inc. white minorities)
- Social housing tenants
- Household income of £100,000 and above
- Those with 3 or more children in the household.

Collective wellbeing

In 2025, collective wellbeing in Wales varied according to a few key socio-demographic characteristics, including income, disability status, housing tenure and index of deprivation.

Having a **disability** was strongly associated with collective wellbeing. Those with a disability scored -8.24 points less on average than those without a disability.

The level of **area deprivation** showed a moderate association with collective wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of people in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), households in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) scored +5.31 points higher in collective wellbeing.

A small to moderate association was found between **income** and collective wellbeing. Having a household income of between £26,000-£51,999 was associated with an increase of +3.59 points in collective wellbeing compared to those on an income of less than £26,000.

Associations were not found to be statistically significant between collective wellbeing and gender, age, number of children or urbanity. For a full list of regression estimates for collective wellbeing in Wales, along with standard error and p-values, see Table 1.1.

Table 6.3: Wales regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	60.57	2.80	0.00
Men	-0.03	1.24	0.98
Aged 35-54	-1.13	2.13	0.60
Aged 55+	3.46	2.05	0.09
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**3.59**	**1.58**	**0.02**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	3.27	1.95	0.09
Income of £100,000+^	4.96	2.75	0.07
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-0.59	2.23	0.79
Having a disability	**-8.24**	**1.47**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	-2.04	2.55	0.42
Social housing tenant^	**-15.55**	**2.18**	**0.00**
Having 1 child*	1.90	1.77	0.28
Having 2 children*	-0.47	2.67	0.86
Having 3 or more children^	-4.34	5.67	0.44
IMD2	1.14	2.10	0.59
IMD3	2.82	2.31	0.22
IMD4	4.24	2.16	0.05
IMD5	**5.31**	**2.16**	**0.01**
Urban area	-0.53	1.34	0.69

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.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Aged 16-34 n=68, Private renters n=64, households with 1 child n=59, households with 2 children n=50.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Summary by sociodemographic factors

The Life in the UK index considers a variety of key aspects of wellbeing across social, economic, environmental, and democratic domains. In some instances, common themes emerged from the regression analysis whereby sociodemographic characteristics were associated with higher or lower scores across several wellbeing domains. Regression results for each wellbeing domain are reported in Appendix D.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of economic wellbeing in particular. This relationship showed that the higher the income of a person's household, the higher their economic wellbeing score. Compared to the reference group of people with a household income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +8.92 points on average. For social wellbeing, this relationship was somewhat weaker; households in this income group scored +4.08 points higher than the reference group.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +11.17 points on average.

No significant association was found between income and environmental or democratic wellbeing.

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with three of the four wellbeing domains, with no association for environmental wellbeing. Disabled people scored -12.42 points lower on social wellbeing, -11.31 points lower on economic wellbeing and -5.79 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

The level of **area deprivation** was a strong predictor of environmental wellbeing only. Relative to a person living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1):

- Living in the second least deprived quintile of areas (IMD4) was associated with higher scores for environmental wellbeing of +8.14 points on average.
- Living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) was associated with higher scores for environmental wellbeing of +8.32 points on average.

No association was found between the level of area deprivation and social, economic and democratic wellbeing.

For three of the four wellbeing domains, there were moderate associations between **age** and wellbeing scores. The subgroups with significant differences varied by wellbeing domain. Compared to those aged 16 to 34:

- Being aged 55+ added on average +5.04 points to a person's social wellbeing score and +8.72 points to a person's environmental wellbeing score.

- Being aged 35-54 lowered a person's economic wellbeing score by-9.05 points on average.

Meanwhile, living in **privately rented accommodation*** was associated with a social wellbeing score -5.75 points lower than being a homeowner.

There was also a moderate association between living in an **urban area** and having a lower environmental wellbeing score (-5.36 points), compared to those living rurally. No association was found for any of the other domains, however.

There was a small association between **gender** and social wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of women, being a man was associated with a +3.06 point increase in social wellbeing.

* Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Aged 16-34 n=68, Private renters n=64, households with 1 child n=59, households with 2 children n=50.

Regression analysis of the 2025 Life in the UK Index – Scotland

Base size limitations

In total, 1,035 adults were surveyed in Scotland, which provides robust measures of wellbeing at a total sample level and across most sociodemographic subgroups. However, there are base size limitations for some subgroups which have a low incidence rate among Scotland's population.

For the following sociodemographic subgroups, we achieved sample sizes between 50 and 99. Findings for these groups are included in this report but should be treated with caution:

- Ethnic minorities (inc. white minorities)
- Household income of £100,000 and above
- Private tenants
- Those with 2 children in the household.

Where they are referenced in this report, these subgroups are indicated with an asterisk (*).

For the following sociodemographic subgroup, the sample size was less than 50. As such, findings for this group are not commented on in this report:

- Those with 3 or more children in the household.

Collective wellbeing

In 2025, collective wellbeing in Scotland varied according to a number of socio-demographic characteristics, including index of area deprivation, disability status, age, income, housing tenure and.

The level of **area deprivation** was a strong predictor of collective wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of people in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1):

- Living in a household in the third least deprived quintile of areas (IMD3) was associated with an increase of +4.97 points in collective wellbeing.
- Living in a household in the fourth least deprived quintile of areas (IMD4) was associated with an increase of +4.18 points in collective wellbeing.
- Living in a household in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) was associated with an increase of +5.65 points in collective wellbeing.

Having a **disability** was strongly associated with collective wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -6.74 points less on average than those without a disability.

A moderate association was found between **age** and collective wellbeing, but only between the oldest and the youngest age groups. Those aged 55+ had a higher collective wellbeing score (+5.74 points) than those aged 16 to 34.

A moderate association was also found between **income** and collective wellbeing. Having a household income of £100,000 and above* was associated with an increase of +5.95 points in collective wellbeing compared to those on an income of less than £26,000.

Housing tenure showed a moderate association with collective wellbeing, with households living in social housing associated with a collective wellbeing score -7.84 points lower than being a homeowner.

Those living in an **urban area** had a smaller association with collective wellbeing, scoring on average -3.73 points lower than those living in a rural area.

Associations were not found to be statistically significant between collective wellbeing and gender, number of children or ethnic minorities. For a full list of regression estimates for collective wellbeing in Scotland, along with standard error and p-values, see Table 1.1 (overleaf).

Table 6.4: Scotland regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	60.64	2.70	0.00
Men	1.55	0.98	0.11
Aged 35-54	1.11	1.58	0.48
Aged 55+	**5.74**	**1.64**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.65	1.56	0.29
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	2.53	1.72	0.14
Income of £100,000+*	**5.95**	**1.93**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)*	0.90	1.91	0.64
Having a disability	**-6.74**	**1.26**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	-0.53	1.92	0.78
Social housing tenant	**-7.84**	**2.19**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	0.14	1.42	0.92
Having 2 children*	1.71	2.12	0.42

* Asterisk indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=89, Private renters n=69, ethnic minorities (excluding white minorities) n=51, households with 2 children n=54.

Having 3 or more children^	-0.33	3.11	0.92
IMD2	2.64	1.83	0.15
IMD3	**4.97**	**1.52**	**0.00**
IMD4	**4.18**	**1.71**	**0.01**
IMD5	**5.65**	**1.72**	**0.00**
Urban area	**-3.73**	**1.03**	**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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=89, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) n=88, private renters n=69, households with 2 children n=54.

Caret (^) indicates very low base size, less than 50. This has been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for this group are not commented on in this report.

Summary by sociodemographic factors

The Life in the UK index considers a variety of key aspects of wellbeing across social, economic, environmental, and democratic domains. In some instances, common themes emerged from the regression analysis whereby sociodemographic characteristics were associated with higher or lower scores across several wellbeing domains. Regression results for each wellbeing domain are reported in Appendix D.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of economic wellbeing only. This relationship showed that the higher the income of a person's household, the higher their economic wellbeing score. Compared to the reference group of people with a household income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +7.07 points on average.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +11.78 points on average.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above* was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +16.51 points on average.

No significant association was found between income and social, environmental, or democratic wellbeing.

The level of **area deprivation** was a moderate predictor of social and environmental wellbeing. Relative to a person living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1):

- Living in the third least deprived quintile of areas (IMD3) was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing of +4.77 points on average; and for environmental wellbeing of +6.55 points on average.
- Living in the second least deprived quintile of areas (IMD4) was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing of +3.65 points on average; and for environmental wellbeing of +7.04 points on average.
- Living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing of +4.48 points on average; and for environmental wellbeing of +8.28 points on average.

A smaller association was present between area deprivation and democratic wellbeing. Those in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) had a higher democratic wellbeing score of +5.56 compared to those in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1). No association was found between area of deprivation and economic wellbeing.

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with three of the four wellbeing domains, with no association for environmental wellbeing. Disabled people scored -12.46 points lower on social wellbeing, -6.47 points lower on economic wellbeing and -5.65 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

Being a **social housing** tenant was negatively associated with a person's wellbeing score, particularly for economic wellbeing. Living in social housing was associated with a social wellbeing score -9.07 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -18.20 points lower, than being a homeowner. Meanwhile, living in **privately rented accommodation*** was associated with an economic wellbeing score -7.01 points lower than being a homeowner. However, for environmental wellbeing, this was associated with a score +5.91 points higher, though the small base size means this finding is indicative only and should be treated with caution.

For three of the four wellbeing domains, there were moderate associations between **age** and wellbeing scores, but only between the oldest and the youngest age groups. Compared to being aged 16 to 34, being aged 55+ added on average:

- +4.12 points to a person's social wellbeing score,
- +7.49 points to a person's environmental wellbeing score, and
- +7.49 points to a person's democratic wellbeing score.

There was a strong association between living in an **urban area** and having a lower environmental wellbeing score (-11.14 points), compared to those living rurally. No association was found for any of the other domains, however.

The presence of **children** was a small to moderate predictor of environmental wellbeing scores only. Households with 2 children* on average scored +5.80 points higher than households who had no children. The number of children in the household was not associated with any other wellbeing domains, either positively or negatively.

There was a small association with **gender** and social wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of women, being a man was associated with a +2.89 point increase in social wellbeing.

Regression analysis of the 2025 Life in the UK Index – Northern Ireland

Base size limitations

In total, 919 adults were surveyed in Northern Ireland, which provides robust measures of wellbeing at a total sample level and across most sociodemographic subgroups. However, there are base size limitations for some subgroups which have a low incidence rate among Northern Ireland's population.

For the following sociodemographic subgroups, we achieved sample sizes between 50 and 99. Findings for these groups are included in this report but should be treated with caution:

- Household income of £100,000 and above
- Private tenants
- Social housing tenants.

Where they are referenced in this report, these subgroups are indicated with an asterisk (*).

For the following sociodemographic subgroups, the sample size was less than 50. As such, findings for these groups are not commented on in this report:

- Ethnic minorities (inc. white minorities)
- Those with 3 or more children in the household.

Collective wellbeing

In 2025, collective wellbeing in Northern Ireland varied according to household income, disability status, age, housing tenure, and community background.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of collective wellbeing. The higher the income of a person's household, the higher their collective wellbeing score. Compared to the reference group of people with a household income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with an increase of +6.78 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with an increase of +10.52 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above* was associated with an increase of +16.57 points in collective wellbeing.

Having a **disability** was strongly associated with collective wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -9.26 points less than those without a disability.

A moderate association was found between **age** and collective wellbeing, but only between the oldest and the youngest age groups. Those aged 55+ had a higher collective wellbeing score (+4.94) than those aged 16 to 34.

Housing tenure displayed a moderate association with collective wellbeing scores. Living in social housing* was associated with a collective wellbeing score -7.69 points lower than being a homeowner. Private renters* had a score between these two groups, scoring on average -5.11 points less than homeowners.

Those from a Catholic **community background** scored, on average, -4.40 points lower on collective wellbeing when compared with those from a Protestant community background.

Associations were not found to be statistically significant between collective wellbeing and gender, number of children, area deprivation level (IMD) or rurality. For a full list of regression estimates for collective wellbeing in Northern Ireland, along with standard error and p-values, see Table 1.1 (overleaf).

Table 6.5: NI regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	59.00	3.00	0.00
Men	0.35	1.04	0.73
Aged 35-54	-0.26	1.72	0.88
Aged 55+	**4.94**	**2.07**	**0.02**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**6.78**	**1.53**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**10.52**	**1.69**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+*	**16.57**	**1.94**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-0.31	2.34	0.89
Having a disability	**-9.26**	**1.49**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	**-5.11**	**1.96**	**0.01**
Social housing tenant*	**-7.69**	**2.10**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	0.35	1.49	0.82
Having 2 children	-4.45	2.88	0.12
Having 3 or more children^	1.77	3.17	0.58
IMD2	2.02	1.66	0.22

* Asterisk indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=67, Private renters n=61, Social housing renter n=64.

IMD3	-1.26	1.88	0.50
IMD4	0.28	1.83	0.88
IMD5	-0.38	1.78	0.83
Urban area	0.82	1.40	0.56
Catholic community background	**-4.40**	**1.24**	**0.00**
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	**-4.63**	**1.73**	**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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=67, Private tenants n=61, Social housing tenants n=64.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Summary by sociodemographic factors

The Life in the UK index considers a variety of key aspects of wellbeing across social, economic, environmental, and democratic domains. In some instances, common themes emerged from the regression analysis whereby sociodemographic characteristics were associated with higher or lower scores across several wellbeing domains. Regression results for each wellbeing domain are reported in Appendix D.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of social, economic and democratic wellbeing. Each of these associations showed a gradient: the higher the income of a person's household, the higher their social, economic and democratic wellbeing score. The strongest of these relationships was between income and economic wellbeing.

Compared to the reference group of people with a household income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +4.85 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +10.59 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +7.72 points on average.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +7.63 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +19.99 points on average; for environmental wellbeing, of +5.68 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +8.77 points on average.

- Having a household income of £100,000 and above* was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +12.10 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +27.96 points on average; for environmental wellbeing, of +10.20 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +16.21 points on average.

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with all four wellbeing domains, the strongest association being with social wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -14.35 points lower on social wellbeing, -10.11 points lower on economic wellbeing, -4.41 points lower on environmental wellbeing and -7.87 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

Living in **social housing*** was associated with a social wellbeing score -9.69 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -17.37 points lower, than being a homeowner.

Finally, those from a Catholic **community background** scored, on average, -4.78 points lower on economic wellbeing, -4.52 points lower on environmental wellbeing, and -6.66 points lower on democratic wellbeing, when compared with those from a Protestant community background.

* Asterisk indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=67, Private tenants n=61, Social housing tenants n=64.

Appendix D – Wellbeing domain regression results

UK-level regression results

Social wellbeing

The largest association between social wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of disability status, followed by income and area deprivation.

Table 6.6: UK regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	70.39	1.20	0.00
Men	**2.65**	**0.44**	**0.00**
Aged 35-54	0.72	0.69	0.30
Aged 55+	**4.72**	**0.69**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**2.50**	**0.67**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**4.26**	**0.70**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+	**6.11**	**0.88**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	**-3.67**	**0.69**	**0.00**
Having a disability	**-12.20**	**0.63**	**0.00**
Private tenant	**-2.76**	**0.83**	**0.00**
Social housing tenant	**-5.40**	**0.92**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	0.74	0.76	0.33
Having 2 children	0.48	0.87	0.58
Having 3 or more children	-2.30	1.65	0.16
IMD2	0.70	0.78	0.37
IMD3	**2.47**	**0.82**	**0.00**
IMD4	**2.84**	**0.82**	**0.00**
IMD5	**4.36**	**0.82**	**0.00**
Urban area	**-1.77**	**0.55**	**0.00**
Scotland	**2.62**	**0.62**	**0.00**
Wales	**1.69**	**0.82**	**0.04**
Northern Ireland	0.39	0.79	0.62

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 quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

Economic wellbeing

The largest association between economic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of household income, followed by housing tenure and the number of children in the household.

Table 6.7: UK regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	64.42	1.62	0.00
Men	**1.82**	**0.62**	**0.00**
Aged 35-54	**-2.28**	**0.94**	**0.02**
Aged 55+	**4.77**	**0.98**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**8.26**	**0.96**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**14.95**	**1.03**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+	**19.78**	**1.19**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-1.73	0.94	0.07
Having a disability	**-8.98**	**0.87**	**0.00**
Private tenant	**-7.57**	**1.21**	**0.00**
Social housing tenant	**-13.52**	**1.28**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	**-2.04**	**0.95**	**0.03**
Having 2 children	**-4.58**	**1.16**	**0.00**
Having 3 or more children	**-10.44**	**2.45**	**0.00**
IMD2	1.87	1.11	0.09
IMD3	2.26	1.18	0.06
IMD4	**4.49**	**1.13**	**0.00**
IMD5	**4.50**	**1.11**	**0.00**
Urban area	-0.47	0.69	0.50
Scotland	1.19	0.89	0.18
Wales	0.24	1.17	0.84
Northern Ireland	**-2.23**	**1.07**	**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 quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

Environmental wellbeing

The largest association between environmental wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of area deprivation, followed by urbanity and being aged 55+.

Table 6.8: UK regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	59.35	1.57	0.00
Men	0.65	0.62	0.30
Aged 35-54	1.43	0.98	0.14
Aged 55+	**7.11**	**1.02**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.44	0.90	0.11
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	2.00	1.00	0.05
Income of £100,000+	2.46	1.28	0.05
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	**-2.48**	**0.94**	**0.01**
Having a disability	**-4.60**	**0.76**	**0.00**
Private tenant	-0.23	1.14	0.84
Social housing tenant	-1.67	1.21	0.17
Having 1 child	-0.34	1.03	0.74
Having 2 children	1.49	1.16	0.20
Having 3 or more children	1.73	2.04	0.40
IMD2	**3.60**	**1.06**	**0.00**
IMD3	**6.72**	**1.07**	**0.00**
IMD4	**8.75**	**1.07**	**0.00**
IMD5	**11.43**	**1.04**	**0.00**
Urban area	**-7.70**	**0.68**	**0.00**
Scotland	**3.99**	**0.84**	**0.00**
Wales	0.18	1.03	0.86
Northern Ireland	**3.31**	**1.01**	**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 quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

Democratic wellbeing

The largest association between democratic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of income, followed by area deprivation and disability status.

Table 6.9: UK regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	37.04	1.80	0.00
Men	**1.46**	**0.65**	**0.02**
Aged 35-54	-0.56	0.98	0.57
Aged 55+	**2.84**	**1.05**	**0.01**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.35	1.06	0.20
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**3.01**	**1.06**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+	**5.59**	**1.30**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-0.21	1.03	0.84
Having a disability	**-4.41**	**0.84**	**0.00**
Private tenant	-0.34	1.18	0.78
Social housing tenant	**-3.27**	**1.60**	**0.04**
Having 1 child	-0.71	1.05	0.50
Having 2 children	-0.48	1.16	0.68
Having 3 or more children	-0.75	1.90	0.69
IMD2	**3.06**	**1.13**	**0.01**
IMD3	**2.82**	**1.17**	**0.02**
IMD4	**3.59**	**1.14**	**0.00**
IMD5	**4.93**	**1.08**	**0.00**
Urban area	-0.17	0.72	0.82
Scotland	-1.58	0.86	0.07
Wales	**-2.35**	**1.01**	**0.02**
Northern Ireland	**-3.91**	**1.02**	**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 quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England.

England regression results

Social wellbeing

The largest association between social wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of disability status, followed by income and being aged 55+.

Table 6.10: England regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	71.45	1.82	0.00
Men	**2.56**	**0.51**	**0.00**
Aged 35-54	0.77	0.78	0.33
Aged 55+	**4.74**	**0.79**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**2.51**	**0.77**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**4.62**	**0.81**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+	**6.61**	**1.00**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	**-3.30**	**0.77**	**0.00**
Having a disability	**-12.04**	**0.73**	**0.00**
Private tenant	**-2.63**	**0.92**	**0.00**
Social housing tenant	**-4.09**	**1.05**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	0.71	0.85	0.40
Having 2 children	0.64	0.96	0.50
Having 3 or more children	-3.12	1.85	0.09
IMD2	0.60	0.93	0.52
IMD3	**2.19**	**0.97**	**0.02**
IMD4	**2.95**	**0.96**	**0.00**
IMD5	**4.45**	**0.96**	**0.00**
Urban area	**-1.84**	**0.67**	**0.01**
English regions - North West	-1.18	1.38	0.39
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	-0.92	1.44	0.52
English regions - East Midlands	-2.61	1.50	0.08
English regions - West Midlands	-1.88	1.46	0.20
English regions - East of England	-1.89	1.47	0.20
English regions - South East	-0.75	1.36	0.58
English regions - South West	0.05	1.43	0.97
English regions - London	-2.57	1.51	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, living in North East England.

Economic wellbeing

The largest association between economic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of household income, followed by housing tenure and the number of children in the household.

Table 6.11: England regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	64.27	2.26	0.00
Men	**2.09**	**0.71**	**0.00**
Aged 35-54	-1.87	1.06	0.08
Aged 55+	**4.95**	**1.11**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**8.29**	**1.09**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**15.11**	**1.15**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+	**19.48**	**1.33**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	**-2.38**	**1.07**	**0.03**
Having a disability	**-8.80**	**1.02**	**0.00**
Private tenant	**-7.99**	**1.34**	**0.00**
Social housing tenant	**-12.69**	**1.45**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	-2.04	1.07	0.06
Having 2 children	**-4.61**	**1.30**	**0.00**
Having 3 or more children	**-10.98**	**2.64**	**0.00**
IMD2	1.07	1.32	0.42
IMD3	1.45	1.39	0.30
IMD4	**3.92**	**1.31**	**0.00**
IMD5	**3.94**	**1.30**	**0.00**
Urban area	-1.04	0.84	0.22
English regions - North West	-0.15	1.84	0.94
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	-1.07	1.88	0.57
English regions - East Midlands	0.22	1.84	0.90
English regions - West Midlands	-0.60	1.86	0.75
English regions - East of England	1.08	1.78	0.54
English regions - South East	1.84	1.67	0.27
English regions - South West	1.48	1.76	0.40
English regions - London	3.25	1.94	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, living in North East England.

Environmental wellbeing

The largest association between environmental wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of area deprivation, followed by living inside or outside of London, and being aged 55+.

Table 6.12: England regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	60.78	2.41	0.00
Men	0.78	0.71	0.27
Aged 35-54	1.04	1.10	0.35
Aged 55+	**6.76**	**1.15**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.32	1.05	0.21
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	2.07	1.15	0.07
Income of £100,000+	**3.11**	**1.43**	**0.03**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-0.87	1.08	0.42
Having a disability	**-5.41**	**0.89**	**0.00**
Private tenant	-0.22	1.32	0.87
Social housing tenant	-0.85	1.38	0.54
Having 1 child	-0.85	1.16	0.46
Having 2 children	0.73	1.29	0.57
Having 3 or more children	1.73	2.24	0.44
IMD2	**3.89**	**1.25**	**0.00**
IMD3	**7.29**	**1.24**	**0.00**
IMD4	**9.29**	**1.25**	**0.00**
IMD5	**11.98**	**1.20**	**0.00**
Urban area	**-6.29**	**0.83**	**0.00**
English regions - North West	-2.87	1.89	0.13
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	-2.69	2.05	0.19
English regions - East Midlands	-2.83	2.03	0.16
English regions - West Midlands	-3.69	1.99	0.06
English regions - East of England	-0.70	1.89	0.71
English regions - South East	-1.49	1.83	0.42
English regions - South West	0.16	1.83	0.93
English regions - London	**-9.16**	**1.96**	**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, living in North East England.

Democratic wellbeing

The largest association between democratic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was found for income, followed by area deprivation and disability status.

Table 6.13: England regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	35.10	3.59	0.00
Men	**1.76**	**0.76**	**0.02**
Aged 35-54	-1.20	1.12	0.28
Aged 55+	2.10	1.22	0.08
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.85	1.24	0.14
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**3.63**	**1.24**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+	**5.82**	**1.50**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-0.88	1.14	0.44
Having a disability	**-3.81**	**1.03**	**0.00**
Private tenant	-0.73	1.34	0.58
Social housing tenant	-3.54	1.97	0.07
Having 1 child	-1.14	1.21	0.35
Having 2 children	-0.44	1.33	0.74
Having 3 or more children	-0.73	2.17	0.74
IMD2	**2.68**	**1.33**	**0.04**
IMD3	2.35	1.33	0.08
IMD4	**3.06**	**1.31**	**0.02**
IMD5	**4.56**	**1.25**	**0.00**
Urban area	-0.30	0.88	0.74
English regions - North West	1.93	2.94	0.51
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	0.62	3.02	0.84
English regions - East Midlands	2.17	2.88	0.45
English regions - West Midlands	2.87	3.06	0.35
English regions - East of England	1.90	2.86	0.51
English regions - South East	4.72	2.81	0.09
English regions - South West	2.33	2.83	0.41
English regions - London	3.00	2.93	0.31

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.

Wales regression results

Social wellbeing

The largest association between social wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of disability status.

Table 6.14: Wales regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	74.40	3.17	0.00
Men	**3.06**	**1.36**	**0.03**
Aged 35-54	1.16	2.29	0.61
Aged 55+	**5.04**	**2.21**	**0.02**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**4.08**	**1.67**	**0.01**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	0.59	2.05	0.77
Income of £100,000+^	2.87	3.28	0.38
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-3.07	3.89	0.43
Having a disability	**-12.42**	**1.81**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	**-5.75**	**2.70**	**0.03**
Social housing tenant^	**-16.10**	**3.03**	**0.00**
Having 1 child*	1.30	2.26	0.57
Having 2 children*	-4.55	3.60	0.21
Having 3 or more children^	-0.37	4.70	0.94
IMD2	-1.55	2.24	0.49
IMD3	3.21	2.27	0.16
IMD4	0.06	2.62	0.98
IMD5	2.91	2.37	0.22
Urban area	-0.70	1.49	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. **Bold** values are significant at P<0.05**.**

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Aged 16-34 n=68, Private renters n=64, households with 1 child n=59, households with 2 children n=50.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Economic wellbeing

The largest associations between economic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic were those of disability status and income.

Table 6.15: Wales regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	71.12	4.51	0.00
Men	-1.67	2.03	0.41
Aged 35-54	**-9.05**	**3.19**	**0.00**
Aged 55+	-1.93	3.05	0.53
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**8.92**	**2.71**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**11.17**	**3.50**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+^	**17.44**	**3.58**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-7.30	4.11	0.08
Having a disability	**-11.31**	**2.27**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	-6.29	4.51	0.16
Social housing tenant^	**-23.40**	**3.46**	**0.00**
Having 1 child*	-1.30	3.06	0.67
Having 2 children*	-2.77	3.26	0.40
Having 3 or more children^	-11.68	10.43	0.26
IMD2	1.01	3.39	0.77
IMD3	1.72	3.67	0.64
IMD4	6.50	3.60	0.07
IMD5	5.73	3.48	0.10
Urban area	3.41	2.21	0.12

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** values are significant at P<0.05**.**

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Aged 16-34 n=68, Private renters n=64, households with 1 child n=59, households with 2 children n=50.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Environmental wellbeing

The largest association between environmental wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of age.

Table 6.16: Wales regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	59.09	4.40	0.00
Men	-1.65	1.75	0.35
Aged 35-54	3.86	2.99	0.20
Aged 55+	**8.72**	**2.78**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	3.39	2.16	0.12
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	0.87	2.78	0.76
Income of £100,000+^	0.77	4.87	0.87
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	2.84	2.89	0.33
Having a disability	-3.46	2.19	0.12
Private tenant*	-1.60	2.91	0.58
Social housing tenant^	**-13.17**	**3.98**	**0.00**
Having 1 child*	3.49	3.15	0.27
Having 2 children*	3.68	4.05	0.37
Having 3 or more children^	-6.88	8.64	0.43
IMD2	3.29	3.01	0.28
IMD3	3.98	3.37	0.24
IMD4	**8.14**	**3.07**	**0.01**
IMD5	**8.32**	**3.14**	**0.01**
Urban area	**-5.36**	**1.81**	**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** values are significant at P<0.05**.**

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Aged 16-34 n=68, Private renters n=64, households with 1 child n=59, households with 2 children n=50.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Democratic wellbeing

The largest association between democratic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of disability status.

Table 6.17: Wales regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	37.67	3.73	0.00
Men	0.13	1.72	0.94
Aged 35-54	-0.49	2.88	0.86
Aged 55+	2.00	3.07	0.52
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	-2.04	2.29	0.37
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	0.47	2.43	0.85
Income of £100,000+^	-1.23	3.75	0.74
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	5.16	3.34	0.12
Having a disability	**-5.79**	**1.82**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	5.46	3.18	0.09
Social housing tenant^	**-9.52**	**2.94**	**0.00**
Having 1 child*	4.12	2.69	0.13
Having 2 children*	1.77	2.90	0.54
Having 3 or more children^	1.57	4.52	0.73
IMD2	1.80	2.67	0.50
IMD3	2.36	3.10	0.45
IMD4	2.26	3.01	0.45
IMD5	4.27	2.54	0.09
Urban area	0.53	1.98	0.79

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** values are significant at P<0.05**.**

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Aged 16-34 n=68, Private renters n=64, households with 1 child n=59, households with 2 children n=50.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Scotland regression results

Social wellbeing

The largest association between social wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of disability status.

Table 6.18: Scotland regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	74.66	2.80	0.00
Men	**2.89**	**1.11**	**0.01**
Aged 35-54	0.89	1.73	0.61
Aged 55+	**4.12**	**1.70**	**0.02**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	0.28	1.77	0.87
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	1.36	1.89	0.47
Income of £100,000+*	2.53	2.07	0.22
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)*	-1.72	2.00	0.39
Having a disability	**-12.46**	**1.36**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	-1.61	2.20	0.46
Social housing tenant	**-9.07**	**2.46**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	-0.24	1.83	0.89
Having 2 children*	1.98	2.26	0.38
Having 3 or more children^	0.37	4.67	0.94
IMD2	1.51	2.02	0.45
IMD3	**4.77**	**1.77**	**0.01**
IMD4	**3.65**	**1.68**	**0.03**
IMD5	**4.48**	**1.90**	**0.02**
Urban area	-1.82	1.11	0.10

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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=89, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) n=88, private renters n=69, households with 2 children n=54.

Caret (^) indicates very low base size, less than 50. This has been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for this group are not commented on in this report.

Economic wellbeing

The largest associations between economic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic were found with tenure and income.

Table 6.19: Scotland regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	68.33	4.23	0.00
Men	2.54	1.53	0.10
Aged 35-54	-2.09	2.60	0.42
Aged 55+	3.88	2.71	0.15
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**7.07**	**2.45**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**11.78**	**2.71**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+*	**16.51**	**2.98**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)*	1.18	3.12	0.70
Having a disability	**-6.47**	**2.05**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	**-7.01**	**2.94**	**0.02**
Social housing tenant	**-18.20**	**3.30**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	-2.98	2.34	0.20
Having 2 children*	-1.98	3.54	0.58
Having 3 or more children^	-1.27	5.73	0.82
IMD2	0.47	2.83	0.87
IMD3	4.18	2.59	0.11
IMD4	1.66	3.01	0.58
IMD5	4.28	2.65	0.11
Urban area	-1.92	1.63	0.24

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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=89, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) n=88, private renters n=69, households with 2 children n=54.

Caret (^) indicates very low base size, less than 50. This has been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for this group are not commented on in this report.

Environmental wellbeing

The largest association between environmental wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of urban living.

Table 6.20: Scotland regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	65.08	4.27	0.00
Men	-0.36	1.38	0.80
Aged 35-54	1.41	2.33	0.54
Aged 55+	**7.49**	**2.42**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.67	2.15	0.44
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	0.96	2.36	0.68
Income of £100,000+*	3.38	2.73	0.22
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)*	-0.23	2.48	0.93
Having a disability	-2.38	1.83	0.19
Private tenant*	**5.91**	**2.64**	**0.03**
Social housing tenant	-0.92	3.05	0.76
Having 1 child	1.84	2.05	0.37
Having 2 children*	**5.80**	**2.76**	**0.04**
Having 3 or more children^	2.44	8.08	0.76
IMD2	4.34	2.56	0.09
IMD3	**6.55**	**2.57**	**0.01**
IMD4	**7.04**	**2.51**	**0.01**
IMD5	**8.28**	**2.46**	**0.00**
Urban area	**-11.14**	**1.47**	**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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=89, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) n=88, private renters n=69, households with 2 children n=54.

Caret (^) indicates very low base size, less than 50. This has been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for this group are not commented on in this report.

Democratic wellbeing

The largest association between democratic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of age.

Table 6.21: Scotland regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	34.48	3.53	0.00
Men	1.14	1.44	0.43
Aged 35-54	4.23	2.17	0.05
Aged 55+	**7.49**	**2.22**	**0.00**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	-2.43	2.09	0.25
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	-3.99	2.43	0.10
Income of £100,000+*	1.38	2.89	0.63
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)*	4.37	2.69	0.10
Having a disability	**-5.65**	**1.71**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	0.60	3.06	0.85
Social housing tenant	-3.18	2.63	0.23
Having 1 child	1.94	2.36	0.41
Having 2 children*	1.03	3.12	0.74
Having 3 or more children^	-2.86	5.05	0.57
IMD2	4.23	2.45	0.08
IMD3	4.37	2.43	0.07
IMD4	4.38	2.58	0.09
IMD5	**5.56**	**2.42**	**0.02**
Urban area	-0.03	1.68	0.98

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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=89, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) n=88, private renters n=69, households with 2 children n=54.

Caret (^) indicates very low base size, less than 50. This has been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for this group are not commented on in this report.

Northern Ireland regression results

Social wellbeing

The largest association between social wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of disability status.

Table 6.22: NI regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	71.59	3.34	0.00
Men	1.95	1.25	0.12
Aged 35-54	-1.09	2.01	0.59
Aged 55+	3.16	2.32	0.17
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**4.85**	**1.75**	**0.01**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**7.63**	**1.80**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+*	**12.10**	**2.17**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-3.24	2.78	0.24
Having a disability	**-14.35**	**1.80**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	-4.89	2.49	0.05
Social housing tenant*	**-9.69**	**2.44**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	3.50	1.88	0.06
Having 2 children	-2.37	3.42	0.49
Having 3 or more children^	7.94	4.09	0.05
IMD2	1.17	1.90	0.54
IMD3	-2.45	2.21	0.27
IMD4	-0.59	2.30	0.80
IMD5	-0.27	2.13	0.90
Urban area	2.24	1.67	0.18
Catholic community background	-1.12	1.44	0.44
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	-3.93	2.03	0.05

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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=67, Private tenants n=61, Social housing tenants n=64.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Economic wellbeing

The largest association between economic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of household income.

Table 6.23: NI regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	63.08	4.90	0.00
Men	1.93	1.76	0.27
Aged 35-54	-4.97	2.87	0.08
Aged 55+	4.90	3.26	0.13
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**10.59**	**2.76**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**19.99**	**2.89**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+*	**27.96**	**3.21**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-3.94	3.56	0.27
Having a disability	**-10.11**	**2.22**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	-6.29	3.31	0.06
Social housing tenant*	**-17.37**	**3.75**	**0.00**
Having 1 child	-0.42	3.00	0.89
Having 2 children	-6.15	4.00	0.12
Having 3 or more children^	-3.12	3.63	0.39
IMD2	2.32	2.97	0.44
IMD3	-1.85	2.71	0.50
IMD4	1.76	3.04	0.56
IMD5	-1.94	2.91	0.51
Urban area	3.68	2.36	0.12
Catholic community background	**-4.78**	**2.00**	**0.02**
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	**-6.55**	**2.90**	**0.02**

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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=67, Private tenants n=61, Social housing tenants n=64.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Environmental wellbeing

The largest association between environmental wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of household income.

Table 6.24: NI regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	64.35	3.67	0.00
Men	-2.63	1.71	0.12
Aged 35-54	4.62	2.77	0.10
Aged 55+	**7.06**	**2.67**	**0.01**
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	3.54	2.20	0.11
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**5.68**	**2.39**	**0.02**
Income of £100,000+*	**10.20**	**2.76**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-2.30	2.80	0.41
Having a disability	**-4.41**	**2.01**	**0.03**
Private tenant*	-3.20	3.12	0.30
Social housing tenant*	-2.08	3.58	0.56
Having 1 child	-0.80	3.25	0.80
Having 2 children	-4.66	3.59	0.19
Having 3 or more children^	1.83	3.79	0.63
IMD2	5.03	3.11	0.11
IMD3	0.83	3.21	0.80
IMD4	3.63	2.93	0.21
IMD5	3.36	2.78	0.23
Urban area	-2.86	1.62	0.08
Catholic community background	**-4.52**	**1.87**	**0.02**
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	-3.22	2.38	0.18

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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=67, Private tenants n=61, Social housing tenants n=64.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Democratic wellbeing

The largest association between democratic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of household income.

Table 6.25: NI regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	35.35	4.62	0.00
Men	0.60	1.65	0.72
Aged 35-54	-0.18	2.53	0.94
Aged 55+	5.00	2.99	0.09
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	**7.72**	**2.23**	**0.00**
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	**8.77**	**2.74**	**0.00**
Income of £100,000+*	**16.21**	**3.35**	**0.00**
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	**8.65**	**4.39**	**0.05**
Having a disability	**-7.87**	**1.89**	**0.00**
Private tenant*	-5.74	3.58	0.11
Social housing tenant*	-0.93	2.94	0.75
Having 1 child	-0.32	2.55	0.90
Having 2 children	-4.05	2.60	0.12
Having 3 or more children^	0.94	4.16	0.82
IMD2	0.68	2.78	0.81
IMD3	-0.48	2.88	0.87
IMD4	-2.37	2.92	0.42
IMD5	-1.45	2.88	0.62
Urban area	-0.05	1.94	0.98
Catholic community background	**-6.66**	**1.83**	**0.00**
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say	-4.28	2.84	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** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: Income of £100,000 and above n=67, Private tenants n=61, Social housing tenants n=64.

Caret (^) indicates very low base sizes, less than 50. These have been included in the tables for completeness, but findings for these groups are not commented on in this report.

Technical note: interpreting p-values

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, based on this dataset, we cannot say with confidence that differences in the wellbeing of the general population are associated with this characteristic.

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 specific standard for market, opinion and social research, including insights and data analytics. Ipsos UK was the first company in the world to gain this accreditation.

Market Research Society (MRS) Company Partnership

By being an MRS Company Partner, Ipsos UK endorse and support the core MRS brand values of professionalism, research excellence and business effectiveness, and commit to comply with the MRS Code of Conduct throughout the organisation & we were the first company to sign our organisation up to the requirements & self-regulation of the MRS Code; more than 350 companies have followed our lead.

ISO 9001

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

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

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

Ipsos UK is required to comply with the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the UK Data Protection Act (DPA). These cover the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy.

HMG Cyber Essentials

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. This is a government-backed, key deliverable of the UK's National Cyber Security Programme. Ipsos UK was assessed and validated for certification in 2016.

Fair Data

Ipsos UK is signed up as a "Fair Data" company by agreeing to adhere to twelve 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.200 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.