

Life in the UK Index

Technical Report September 2026

Karl Ashworth, Emily Gray,
Christian Stow, Alex Walker
Ipsos



Contents

1 Research overview	5
2 Survey design.....	6
3 Index content	8
4 Data processing	12
4.1 Data preparation and cleaning	12
5 Analysis	14
5.1 Data analysis procedure.....	14
5.2 Replicating the factor analysis	14
5.3 Computing domain scores	15
5.4 Computing collective wellbeing.....	16
6 Regression – UK Report.....	17
Research overview	17
Contents of this analysis.....	17
6.1 Collective wellbeing	18
6.2 Summary by sociodemographic factors.....	20
Appendix A – Profile of weights	24
Appendix B – Questionnaire	28
Appendix C – Regression analysis reports.....	33
Regression analysis of the 2026 Life in the UK Index – England	33
Regression analysis of the 2026 Life in the UK Index – Wales	38
Regression analysis of the 2026 Life in the UK Index – Scotland.....	42
Regression analysis of the 2026 Life in the UK Index – Northern Ireland	47
Appendix D – Wellbeing domain regression results.....	52
UK-level regression results	52
England regression results	56
Wales regression results	61
Scotland regression results.....	65
Northern Ireland regression results	70
Technical note: interpreting p-values.....	74

List of tables

Table 3.1: Questions included in each domain	9
Table 4.1: Mean, standard deviation and percentage of missing cases per variable	13
Table 5.1: Cronbach’s Alpha by domain.....	15
Table 5.2: Descriptive statistics of domain scores	16
Table 6.1: UK Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores	19

Table 6.2: England Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores	35
Table 6.3: Wales Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores	40
Table 6.4: Scotland Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores	44
Table 6.5: NI Regression results: demographic variables predicting collective wellbeing scores	49
Table 6.6: UK Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores ...	52
Table 6.7: UK Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores	53
Table 6.8: UK Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores	54
Table 6.9: UK Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores	55
Table 6.10: England Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores	56
Table 6.11: England Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores	57
Table 6.12: England Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores.....	58
Table 6.13: England Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores	59
Table 6.14: Wales Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores	61
Table 6.15: Wales Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores	62
Table 6.16: Wales Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores.....	63
Table 6.17: Wales Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores	64
Table 6.18: Scotland Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores	65
Table 6.19: Scotland Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores	66
Table 6.20: Scotland Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores.....	67
Table 6.21: Scotland Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores.....	68
Table 6.22: NI Regression results: demographic variables predicting social wellbeing scores ..	70
Table 6.23: NI Regression results: demographic variables predicting economic wellbeing scores	71
Table 6.24: NI Regression results: demographic variables predicting environmental wellbeing scores	72
Table 6.25: NI Regression results: demographic variables predicting democratic wellbeing scores	73

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 in 2024, 2025 and 2026. Results from all four 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 2026 implementation of the index, 6,731 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 survey¹, 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 2026 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 21st and 27th May 2026, with a total of 6,731 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 by education, ethnicity² in each country, and by religious upbringing ('community background') in Northern Ireland.

A total of 13,375 panellists in the United Kingdom (16+) were selected and invited to take part in the survey. Of these, 6,731 respondents completed the survey – a response rate of 50%.

² Note that, whilst an ethnicity 'boost' to achieve 800 ethnic minority respondents overall was requested, 800 were achieved naturally in the fallout of stratifying to nationally representative, unadjusted ethnicity targets. In other words, no 'boost' was applied and 800 was achieved as part of a natural fallout.

Weighting

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

Up to three people per household were allowed to complete this survey. To account for this and varying household sizes, we employed a design weight to correct for unequal probabilities of selection of household members.

Calibration weights have also been applied using appropriate 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 to account for any over or under sampling within each of these countries.

The calibration weights were applied in two stages:

- The first set of variables were an interlocked variable of Gender by Age (*using ONS 2024 mid-year estimates as targets*), and region (*using ONS 2024 mid-year population estimates*).
- The second set were (*using ONS mid-year population estimates and the ONS Annual Population Survey as the weighting targets*): Education (*Census 2021 for England, Wales and Northern Ireland, Census 2022 for Scotland*), Ethnicity (*APS 2025*), Index of Multiple Deprivation (quintiles) (*ONS Mid-Year Population Estimates 2022*), number of adults in the household (*Census 2021 for England and Wales and Northern Ireland, Census 2022 for Scotland*), and Community Background (*Northern Ireland*)

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

3 Index content

The finalised questionnaire 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, 2025, and 2026 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 2024–2026, 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	• <i>General health</i>: How is your health in general? (5-point Likert scale; commonly asked on UK-wide surveys such as OECD's Better Life Index) • <i>Mental health</i>: And how would you describe your mental health in general? (5-point Likert scale; Ipsos Levelling Up Index) • <i>Neighbourhood safety</i>: How safe do you feel walking alone in your local neighbourhood after dark? (5-point Likert scale; Crime Survey for England and Wales) • <i>Rely on neighbours</i>: 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) • <i>Access to supermarket</i>: 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) • <i>Discrimination</i>: 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	• <i>Job opportunities</i>: 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) • <i>Afford warm house</i>: My household can afford to keep our home adequately warm (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • <i>Afford holiday</i>: 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) • <i>Afford unexpected expense</i>: My household can afford to pay an unexpected, but necessary, expense of £850 (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • <i>Afford enough food</i>: My household can afford to buy enough food for everyone in the household (5-point Likert scale; European Quality of Life survey) • <i>Afford socialising</i>: 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) • <i>Satisfaction with skills</i>: How satisfied are you with your education and skills? (5-point Likert scale)

Environmental wellbeing	• <i>Noise pollution</i>: 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) • <i>Air pollution</i>: 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) • <i>Litter</i>: 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) • <i>Satisfaction with open spaces</i>: 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) • <i>UK's environmental efforts</i>: How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with efforts to preserve the environment in the UK? (5-point Likert scale; Gallup)
Democratic wellbeing	• <i>Trust in UK government</i>: 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) • <i>Trust in UK local council</i>: 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) • <i>Trust in the legal system</i>: 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) • <i>Trust in the media</i>: 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) • <i>Trust in the police</i>: 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) • <i>Trust in banks</i>: 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) • <i>Influence in UK decision-making</i>: 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)

	• <i>Influence in local area decision-making:</i> 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 values³ 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 2%, Table 4.1) except for the question on satisfaction with the availability of job opportunities, where a response was missing in 12% 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.

³ Here missing values refers to cases where we expect a response to be given and excludes any logically missing responses through filtering.

When combining multiple questionnaire item responses into domain scores, an available-case approach was used. Domain scores were calculated as the mean of all non-missing items within a domain. Consequently, respondents could receive a domain score provided they gave a valid response to at least one item in the domain. This approach maximises the use of available data while minimising the loss of respondents due to item non-response. This procedure was established in the first study year in 2023 and, to maintain consistency across years, this same procedure has been followed in each subsequent year.

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

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Missing Percent
<i>Social wellbeing</i>				
General health	6723	69.04	21.84	0.12%
Mental health	6718	68.48	23.55	0.19%
Neighbourhood safety	6667	62.95	28.26	0.96%
Rely on neighbours	6666	66.86	27.36	0.97%
Discrimination	6530	79.51	25.96	3.08%
Access to supermarket	6708	83.41	22.63	0.34%
<i>Economic wellbeing</i>				
Job opportunities	5990	43.79	25.46	12.36%
Afford warm house	6706	76.17	26.74	0.37%
Afford holidays	6672	67.25	33.59	0.88%
Afford unexpected expense	6682	62.79	35.61	0.74%
Afford enough food	6712	83.84	22.53	0.29%
Afford socialising	6703	77.01	27.00	0.42%
Satisfied with skills	6707	75.89	22.35	0.36%
<i>Environmental wellbeing</i>				
Noise pollution	6693	69.24	28.60	0.58%
Air pollution	6528	73.23	29.07	3.12%
Litter	6700	56.79	29.26	0.47%
Satisfaction with open spaces	6669	69.35	25.62	0.93%
UK's environmental efforts	6593	44.67	25.63	2.10%
<i>Democratic wellbeing</i>				
Trust in UK government	6656	30.74	25.81	1.13%
Trust in local council	6537	41.34	24.75	2.96%
Trust in the legal system	6571	48.79	25.88	2.43%
Trust in the media	6665	36.12	24.04	1.00%
Trust in the police	6659	52.33	25.49	1.08%
Trust in banks	6645	56.12	24.99	1.30%
Influence in the UK	6586	23.95	24.13	2.20%
Influence in local area	6580	34.63	25.60	2.29%

5 Analysis

5.1 Data analysis procedure

For the 2023, 2024 and 2025 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 2026 index, the factor analysis was repeated with the same input variables as in previous waves. 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 in subsequent years, 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 2026.

5.2 Replicating the factor analysis

For the 2026 index, the factor analysis, first conducted in 2023, was replicated to ensure that the index model was still suitable for the 2026 dataset. Re-running the factor analysis provided a check that the relationships between the variables identified in 2023 remained similar enough in 2026 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 2026 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 2026 data confirmed the structure revealed in 2023 and the two factors were again positively correlated ($R^2 = 0.28$) 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	0.70
Economic wellbeing	0.86
Environmental wellbeing	0.70
Democratic wellbeing	0.84

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}).⁴

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

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.

⁴ *n* in this case refers to the number of response categories. For GENHEALTH this is 5.

5.3.2 Calculation of domain scores

Once values had been rescaled, an individual domain wellbeing score was calculated for each respondent. For each respondent, domain scores were computed as the mean of all valid, non-missing items belonging to that domain. This available-case approach ensures that respondents are not excluded from a domain score solely because one or more constituent items are missing. Missing responses, including "Don't know" and "Prefer not to say", were treated as missing values and excluded from the individual-level mean calculation.

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

Collective wellbeing scores were calculated by taking the mean of the four domain scores (social, economic, environmental and democratic) available for each respondent. Where one or more domain scores were missing, the collective wellbeing score was calculated using all available non-missing domain scores. This ensured that respondents continued to contribute to the overall collective wellbeing measure whenever sufficient information was available.

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	6727	.00	100.00	71.62	15.84
Economic wellbeing score	6725	.00	100.00	70.10	20.97
Environmental wellbeing score	6721	.00	100.00	62.65	18.73
Democratic wellbeing score	6716	.00	100.00	40.56	17.22
Collective wellbeing score	6727	2.63	96.15	61.25	13.59

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 2026 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 sociodemographic characteristic and wellbeing, over and above the relationship of other sociodemographic 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 (e.g. demographic characteristics such as between gender groups, ethnicity groups, etc.). These estimates reveal the direction and size of the relationship between the characteristics and the wellbeing scores.

Contents of this analysis

Chapter 6.1 provides regression analysis results for collective wellbeing.

Chapter 6.2 provides a summary of the ways in which sociodemographic characteristics are associated with the four wellbeing domains.

Appendix D provides the regression analysis results in table format for each of the four wellbeing domains – social, economic, environmental and democratic. It also provides a technical note about interpreting p-values.

6.1 Collective wellbeing

In 2026, collective wellbeing varied according to a wide range of sociodemographic characteristics. The only sociodemographic characteristics we tested that did not have a significant association with collective wellbeing were the presence or absence of a personal religious belief and the presence of children in the household.

Household **income** was significantly associated with 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 +4.32 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with an increase of +7.23 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above was associated with an increase of +8.86 points in collective wellbeing.

The level of **area deprivation** also distinguished higher and lower levels of collective wellbeing. As the level of area deprivation increased, collective wellbeing decreased. Living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) added +5.51 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 -6.53 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 -5.73 points lower than being a homeowner. Private renters had a score between these two groups, scoring on average -1.96 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, **sexual orientation** was moderately associated with collective wellbeing, people who were LGB+ scored on average -2.19 points lower than those who were straight or heterosexual.

Education status was also moderately associated with collective wellbeing; on average, graduates scored +3.51 points higher than non-graduates.

A smaller association was found between **working status** and collective wellbeing. Those who were not working full-time scored +1.88 points higher than those who were working full-time.

Smaller associations with collective wellbeing were also found among:

- those living in an **urban area**, who scored on average -2.42 points lower than those living in a rural area;
- **men**, who scored on average +1.75 points higher than women;
- and **ethnic minorities** (inc. white minorities), who scored on average -1.38 points lower than white British people.

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 slightly higher collective wellbeing score, of +1.67 points.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	53.93	1.15	0
Men	1.75	0.43	0
Aged 35-54	1.04	0.7	0.14
Aged 55+	4.76	0.71	0
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	4.32	0.62	0
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	7.23	0.69	0
Income of £100,000+	8.86	0.84	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-1.38	0.62	0.03
Having a disability	-6.53	0.55	0
Private tenant	-1.96	0.79	0.01
Social housing tenant	-5.73	0.9	0
Children in household	-1.03	0.59	0.08
IMD2	2.1	0.72	0
IMD3	3.56	0.75	0
IMD4	4.81	0.72	0
IMD5	5.51	0.72	0
Urban area	-2.42	0.47	0
Scotland	1.67	0.6	0.01
Wales	-0.95	0.69	0.17
Northern Ireland	0.75	0.74	0.32

Graduate	3.51	0.47	0
Religious	-0.39	0.44	0.37
Not working full time	1.88	0.52	0
LGB+	-2.19	0.92	0.02

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual.

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.

Household **income** was a consistent predictor of social, economic, environmental, and democratic wellbeing. Each of these associations showed a steady gradient: in most cases, the higher the income of a person's household, the higher their social, economic and democratic wellbeing score. In particular, the relationship between income and economic wellbeing showed a comparatively large difference in economic wellbeing between the lowest and highest income groups.

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 +4.02 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +8.12 points on average; for environmental wellbeing, of +2.8 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +2.17 points on average.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +6.21 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +14.85 points on average; for environmental wellbeing, of +4.1 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +3.41 points on average.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +6.3 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +20.06 points on average; for environmental wellbeing, of +3.32 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +5.58 points on average.

The level of **area deprivation** was also a consistent predictor of social, economic, environmental and democratic wellbeing⁵. 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:

- +4.09 points to a person's social wellbeing score,
- +3.26 points to a person's economic wellbeing score,
- +11.28 points to a person's environmental wellbeing score, and
- +3.33 points to a person's democratic wellbeing score.

Between these extremes, as deprivation levels improved, so did social and environmental wellbeing scores. However, economic and democratic wellbeing showed a different pattern when comparing less deprived areas to the most deprived area (IMD1):

- For economic wellbeing, there were no observed differences in wellbeing scores for people living in medium levels of deprivation (IMD2 and IMD3) compared to people living in the most deprived area.
- For democratic wellbeing, there were no observed differences in wellbeing scores for people living in IMD2 areas of deprivation, however, those living in IMD3 areas of deprivation were associated with a democratic wellbeing score +2.27 points higher, compared to people living in the most deprived area.
- People living in areas of low deprivation (IMD4) were associated with an economic wellbeing score +3.17 points higher, and democratic wellbeing score +2.77 points higher, than those living in the most deprived area.

Having a **disability** had a negative association with all four wellbeing domains, most notably with social wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -11.82 points lower on social wellbeing, -7.34 points lower on economic wellbeing, -2.97 points lower on environmental wellbeing and -3.88 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

Housing tenure showed a significant association with the social and economic wellbeing domains:

- Living in social housing was associated with a social wellbeing score -6.94 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -12.77 points lower, than being a homeowner.

⁵ The only exception to this linear (straight line) relationship by area deprivation was found among environmental wellbeing. For this domain, earning between £52,000 - £99,999, and earning over £100,000 had roughly the same association (+3.6 and 3.07, respectively, compared to those earning less than £26,000).

- Living in privately rented accommodation was associated with a social wellbeing score -2.49 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -6.47 points lower, than being a homeowner.

Education status showed a significant association with all the wellbeing domains, particularly social and democratic wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of non-graduates, graduates showed higher scores on social wellbeing (+2.78), economic wellbeing (+5.42), environmental wellbeing (+1.62), and democratic wellbeing (+4.34).

For three out of the four wellbeing domains, a positive association was found between the youngest and oldest **age** groups. Those aged 55+ scored higher on social wellbeing (+5.14 points), economic wellbeing (+6.53 points), and environmental wellbeing (+5.36 points), compared to those aged 16 to 34. No association was found between age and democratic wellbeing. For social wellbeing, as age increased so did average wellbeing scores; those aged 35-54 also scored +2.17 points higher on average, compared to those aged 16 to 34. A similar pattern was observed for environmental wellbeing, where those aged 35-54 scored +2.16 points higher on average than those aged 16-34.

People living in an **urban area** had a lower environmental wellbeing score (-7.5 points) compared to those living rurally. There was a smaller difference for social wellbeing, with those living in an urban area showing a -2.32 point lower score in social wellbeing compared to those living in rural areas.

Having **children in the household** was linked with an economic wellbeing score -3.56 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.

Gender was associated with the social and economic wellbeing domains. Men had a higher social wellbeing score (+2.94) and economic wellbeing score (+2.70) than women.

People from **ethnic minorities** (inc. white minorities) showed lower levels of social wellbeing (-3.27 points) and environmental wellbeing (-3.03 points), compared to people from a white British ethnic background.

Sexual orientation was related to social wellbeing. LGB+ people had lower social wellbeing scores, by -3.82 points, than people who were straight or heterosexual (reference group).

Working status was associated with two of the wellbeing domains. People **not working full-time** scored higher on economic and democratic wellbeing (+1.89 and +4.3 respectively) than their counterparts in full-time work.

Having a **religious belief** reduced economic wellbeing by an average of -2.36 points compared to the reference group of people with no religion.

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 +2.08 points, and a higher environmental wellbeing score, of +4.45 points.
- Living in **Wales** was associated with a lower democratic wellbeing score, of -2.59 points.
- Living in **Northern Ireland** was associated with a higher social wellbeing score, of +1.83 points, and a higher environmental wellbeing score, of +2.3 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	6.7%	6.4%	0.2%	0.1%
25-34	8.1%	8.4%	0.1%	0.1%
35-44	7.9%	8.5%	0.2%	0.1%
45-54	7.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.1%
55-64	7.5%	7.8%	0.0%	0.1%
65-74	5.5%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
75+	4.9%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%

Region	
North East	4.8%
North West	13.2%
Yorkshire And The Humber	9.7%
East Midlands	8.7%
West Midlands	10.4%
East Of England	11.2%
London	15.5%
South East	16.4%
South West	10.3%

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

Education	
Degree level or above	33.4%
Below degree level	65.1%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	1.4%

Ethnicity	
White	79.6%
Ethnic minorities (excluding White minorities)	17.3%
Don't know / Prefer not to say	3.1%

Number of adults in the household	
One adult	21.0%
Two or more adults	79.0%

The below table presents the weighting profile targets for **Wales**:

Age & Gender				
	Man	Woman	In another way	PNTS
16-34	13.9%	13.6%	0.0%	0.6%
35-44	7.2%	7.7%	0.0%	0.1%
45-54	6.8%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
55-64	8.0%	8.4%	0.0%	0.1%
65-74	6.4%	6.8%	0.0%	0.4%
75+	5.6%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%

Ethnicity	
White	92.5%
Ethnic minorities (excluding White minorities)	5.3%
Don't know/Prefer not to say	2.2%

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

Number of adults in the household	
One adult	23.1%
Two or more adults	76.9%

Education	
Degree level or above	31.0%
Below degree level	67.4%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	1.6%

The below table presents the weighting profile targets for **Scotland**:

Age & Gender					
		Man	Woman	In another way	PNTS
16-34		13.9%	14.2%	0.4%	0.2%
35-44		7.5%	7.9%	0.1%	0.00%
45-54		7.1%	7.5%	0.1%	0.1%
55-64		8.2%	8.7%	0.00%	0.2%
65-74		6.2%	6.8%	0.00%	0.00%
75+		4.8%	6.4%	0.1%	0.00%

Region		
Central Scotland and Lothians West		12.6%
Edinburgh and Lothians East		8.2%
Glasgow		13.0%
Highlands and Islands		12.8%
Mid Scotland and Fife		12.2%
North East Scotland		13.9%
South Scotland		13.6%
West Scotland		13.7%

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

Education		
Degree level or above		32.0%
Below degree level		66.6%
Prefer not to say/Not stated		1.4%

Ethnicity		
White		93.1%
Ethnic minorities (excluding White minorities)		5.9%
Don't know/Prefer not to say		1.0%

Number of adults in the household		
One adult		23.5%
Two or more adults		76.5%

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

Age & Gender				
	Man	Woman	In another way	PNTS
16-34	14.4%	14.0%	0.1%	0.0%
35-44	8.1%	8.6%	0.2%	0.1%
45-54	7.7%	8.0%	0.1%	0.0%
55-64	7.9%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
65-74	5.8%	6.1%	0.0%	0.1%
75+	4.6%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Region	
Belfast	18.6%
South/East Outer Belfast	16.7%
North/North East Outer Belfast	15.1%
North	15.3%
West	13.7%
South	20.6%

Community Background	
Protestant	44.5%
Catholic	43.2%
Neither	8.5%
DK/PNTS	3.8%

Ethnicity	
White	95.4%
Ethnic minorities (excluding White minorities)	4.0%
Don't know/Prefer not to say	0.5%

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

Education	
Degree level or above	32.0%
Below degree level	67.6%
Prefer not to say/Not stated	0.4%

Number of adults in the household	
One adult	22.8%
Two or more adults	77.2%

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

JOB AVAIL

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 2026 Life in the UK Index – England

Collective wellbeing

In 2026, collective wellbeing in England varied according to a wide range of sociodemographic characteristics. The majority of categories of sociodemographic characteristic we tested were significantly associated with collective wellbeing in some way. The exception to this were the presence of children in the household and religion, for which there were no significant associations with collective wellbeing.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of collective wellbeing. The higher the household income, the higher the average 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 +4.16 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with an increase of +7.01 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above was associated with an increase of +8.42 points in collective wellbeing.

Similarly, the level of **area deprivation** was a strong predictor of collective wellbeing. As the level of area deprivation increased, average collective wellbeing decreased. Living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5) added +5.54 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 -6.26 points lower on average than those without a disability.

Housing tenure displayed a strong association with collective wellbeing. Living in social housing was associated with a collective wellbeing score -5.46 points lower than being a homeowner. Private renters had a score between these two groups, scoring on average -2.35 points lower 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+ displayed a higher collective wellbeing score (+4.59 points) than those aged 16 to 34.

A moderate association was found between **region** and collective wellbeing, but only between the South West and North East of England. Those living in the South West scored an average of +4.03 points higher on collective wellbeing, compared to the reference group living in the North East.

Education status displayed a moderate association with collective wellbeing. Graduates had a collective wellbeing score +3.79 points higher on average than non-graduates.

Smaller associations with collective wellbeing were found among:

- Those living in an **urban area**, who scored on average -2.27 points lower than those living in a rural area;
- **Men**, who scored on average +2.22 points higher than women;
- Those **not working full time**, who scored an average of +2.03 points higher than those working full time;
- **Ethnic minorities** (inc. white minorities), who scored on average -1.42 points lower than white British people;
- **LGB+ people**, who scored an average of -2.36 points lower than people who are straight or heterosexual.

No association was found between collective wellbeing and the presence of children in the household and having a religion.

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	52.52	1.69	0
Men	2.22	0.48	0
Aged 35-54	1.16	0.77	0.13
Aged 55+	4.59	0.77	0
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	4.16	0.71	0
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	7.01	0.78	0
Income of £100,000+	8.42	0.93	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-1.42	0.68	0.04
Having a disability	-6.26	0.64	0
Private tenant	-2.35	0.9	0.01
Social housing tenant	-5.46	1.02	0
Have children	-0.77	0.65	0.24
IMD2	2.31	0.82	0
IMD3	3.75	0.85	0
IMD4	4.96	0.82	0
IMD5	5.54	0.83	0
Urban area	-2.27	0.57	0
English regions - North West	-0.13	1.32	0.92
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	1.78	1.44	0.22
English regions - East Midlands	-0.51	1.43	0.72
English regions - West Midlands	-0.43	1.45	0.77
English regions - East of England	1.05	1.34	0.43
English regions - South East	1.77	1.3	0.17
English regions - South West	4.03	1.35	0
English regions - London	0.54	1.35	0.69
Graduate	3.79	0.53	0
Religious	-0.56	0.5	0.26
Not working full time	2.03	0.57	0
LGB+	-2.36	1.06	0.03

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **Bold** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

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.

Household **income** was a strong predictor of social, economic and environmental wellbeing. The association with economic wellbeing tended to show a gradient: the higher the income of a person's household, the higher their economic wellbeing score. For income and environmental wellbeing, the increase in wellbeing tapered off for the top income group (£100,000+).

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 +3.91 higher points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +7.58 points higher on average; and for environmental wellbeing, of +3.08 points on average.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +5.86 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +14.18 points on average; and for environmental wellbeing, of +4.33 points on average.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +5.63 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +19.0 points on average; and for environmental wellbeing, of +3.83 points on average.

A moderate association was found between income and democratic wellbeing, with differences observed between the two highest income groups and the lowest income group. Those with a household income of £52,000 to £99,999 had a democratic wellbeing score on average +3.32 points higher than those with a household income of less than £26,000, while those with a household income of £100,000 and above had a democratic wellbeing score on average +5.07 points higher.

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

- +11.66 points higher environmental wellbeing score,
- +4.34 points higher social wellbeing score,
- +3.07 points higher economic wellbeing score, and a
- +3.01 points higher democratic wellbeing score.

Between these extremes, there tended to be a gradient for those living in areas of the middle quintiles of deprivation (IMD2, IMD3 and IMD4) for social and environmental wellbeing. For economic wellbeing people living in areas classified as IMD4 had +3.16 points added to their wellbeing score compared to those living in the most deprived quintile of areas. For democratic wellbeing, people living in areas classified as IMD4 had +2.56 points added to their wellbeing score compared to those living in the most deprived quintile of areas.

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with all four wellbeing domains, the strongest association being with social wellbeing. Disabled people scored -11.92 points lower on social wellbeing, -7.01 points lower on economic wellbeing, -2.75 points lower on environmental wellbeing and -3.26 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

Being a **social housing** tenant was also negatively associated with a person's wellbeing score, particularly for economic wellbeing. Living in social housing was associated with a social wellbeing score -6.53 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -12.58 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 -3.09 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -6.80 points lower, than being a homeowner.

For three of the four wellbeing domains, there were moderate associations between **age** and wellbeing scores. Compared to those aged 16 to 34, those aged 55+ scored on average:

- +4.92 points higher on social wellbeing,
- +6.45 points higher on economic wellbeing,
- +4.79 points higher on environmental wellbeing.

Those aged 35-54 also scored +2.15 points higher on average on social wellbeing, compared to those aged 16-34.

There was a strong association between living in an **urban area** and having a lower environmental wellbeing score (-6.43 points), compared to those living rurally. Urban living was also associated with a deficit of -2.4 on the social wellbeing score.

Region also showed a moderate association with each of the remaining wellbeing domains. Compared to living in the North East of England, those in the South West scored higher on social wellbeing (+3.87 points), economic wellbeing (+4.11 points), and democratic wellbeing (+4.78).

Similarly, living in **London** was strongly associated with having a lower environmental wellbeing score, of -6.1 points compared to those living in the North East of England. Meanwhile, living in London was moderately associated with having a higher democratic wellbeing score of +3.85 points.

The only other region to show an association with democratic wellbeing was the South East, with people scoring an average of +3.67 points higher than those in the North East on this wellbeing domain.

Education status was moderately associated with all of the four wellbeing domains. Compared to non-graduates, graduates scored an average of +3.05 points on social wellbeing, +5.69 on economic wellbeing, +2.26 on environmental wellbeing, and +4.28 on democratic wellbeing.

The presence of **children** in the household showed a moderate association with economic wellbeing. Compared to having no children in the household, having one or more children in the household was associated with an economic wellbeing score of -3.11 points lower on average. The presence of children in the household was not associated with any other wellbeing domains.

Sexual orientation displayed a moderate association with social wellbeing only. Compared to being straight or heterosexual, those who were LGB+, scored an average of -4.5 points lower on social wellbeing.

There was an association between **work status** and democratic and economic wellbeing. Those not working full time scored an average of +4.64 points higher on democratic wellbeing, and +1.77 points higher on economic wellbeing, compared to those working full time.

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 +3.4 point increase in social wellbeing, a +3.14 point increase in economic wellbeing and a +1.64 point increase in democratic wellbeing.

Being from an **ethnic minority** (inc. white minorities) was associated with lower social wellbeing (-3.31 points) compared with having a white British ethnic background.

Having a **religion** was associated with lower economic wellbeing (-2.40 points) compared with those without a religion.

Regression analysis of the 2026 Life in the UK Index – Wales

Base size limitations

In total, 519 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 in Wales's dataset.

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
- Those with children in their household

- IMD1 (most deprived quintile of areas)
- IMD5 (least deprived quintile of areas).

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)
- Private tenants
- Social housing tenants
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other (LGB+)
- Household income of £100,000 and above.

Collective wellbeing

In 2026, collective wellbeing in Wales varied according to a few key sociodemographic characteristics, including disability status, income, age, education status, presence of children in household, and index of multiple deprivation.

Having a **disability** was strongly associated with collective wellbeing. Those with a disability scored -8.85 points less on average than those without a disability.

A strong association was found between **income** and collective wellbeing. Those with a household income of between £26,000–£51,999 scored an average of +4.05 points higher on collective wellbeing compared with households earning less than £26,000, while those with a household income of between £52,000 and £99,999 scored an average of +8.77 points higher.

Age was associated with collective wellbeing, but this was only the case when comparing the oldest age group with the youngest*. Those aged 55+ scored an average of +6.52 points higher than those aged 16–34.

Graduates scored higher than non-graduates on collective wellbeing, with an average score of +4.58 points higher than the reference group.

The **presence of children in the household*** showed a moderate association with collective wellbeing. Those with children scored an average of -4.15 points lower than those without.

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 +6 points higher in collective wellbeing.

Associations were not found to be statistically significant between collective wellbeing and gender, work status, religion, 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 (overleaf).

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	53.8	2.87	0
Men	1.35	1.24	0.28
Aged 35-54	1.93	2.1	0.36
Aged 55+	6.52	1.79	0
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	4.05	1.78	0.02
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	8.77	2.1	0
Income of £100,000+^	9.78	2.75	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-4.45	2.21	0.04
Having a disability	-8.85	1.48	0
Private tenant^	-1.6	2.47	0.52
Social housing tenant^	-8.71	2.31	0
Children in household*	-4.15	1.93	0.03
IMD2	0.84	1.88	0.65
IMD3	2.88	1.94	0.14
IMD4	1.51	2.27	0.51
IMD5*	6	1.88	0
Urban area	-2.18	1.3	0.09
Graduate	4.58	1.39	0
Religious	-0.54	1.24	0.66
Not working full time	2.24	1.5	0.14
LGB+^	-2.71	2.49	0.28

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34*, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1*), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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: IMD5 n=97, Children in household n=78.

Note: Asterisk (*) indicates low base sizes, between n=50 and n=99, and results for these should be treated with caution. Unweighted base sizes are: IMD1 n=98, IMD5 n=97, Children in household n=78, age 16-34 n=56.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities) n=44, Private tenants n=49, Social housing tenants n=36, LGB+ n=36, Income of £100,000 and above n=24.

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.

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 +11.41 points on average.

Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +19.62 points on average. For democratic wellbeing, households in this income group scored +7.64 points higher than the reference group.

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with three of the four wellbeing domains, with no association for democratic wellbeing. Disabled people scored -15.27 points lower on social wellbeing, -11.07 points lower on economic wellbeing and -6.17 points lower on environmental wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

The level of **area deprivation** was a strong predictor of economic and environmental wellbeing only. 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 +8.77 points higher scores for environmental wellbeing.

Living in the fourth least deprived quintile of areas (IMD4) was associated with +8.86 points higher scores for environmental wellbeing.

Living in the least deprived quintile of areas (IMD5)* was associated with +15.08 points higher scores for environmental wellbeing and +6.22 points higher scores for economic wellbeing.

No association was found between the level of area deprivation and social 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*:

Those aged 35-54 had an environmental wellbeing score of +7.66 points higher on average, while those aged 55+ had an environmental wellbeing score of +11.05 points higher on average.

Those aged 55+ also had an average social wellbeing score +6.49 points higher, and an economic wellbeing score of +6.53 points higher on average.

There was also a moderate association between **education status** and economic and democratic wellbeing. Graduates had an average economic wellbeing score of +5.95 higher than non-graduates, as well as a +7.68 point higher democratic wellbeing score.

There was also a moderate association between living in an **urban area** and having a lower environmental wellbeing score (-6.57 points), compared to those living rurally. No association was found between urbanity and any of the other wellbeing domains.

There was a moderate association between **gender** and economic wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of women, being a man was associated with a +5.01 point increase in economic wellbeing.

Regression analysis of the 2026 Life in the UK Index – Scotland

Base size limitations

In total, 1,046 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 (incl. white minorities)
- Household income of £100,000 and above
- Private tenants
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other (LGB+)
- Highlands and Islands.

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

Collective wellbeing

In 2026, collective wellbeing in Scotland varied according to various sociodemographic characteristics, including disability status, income, and housing tenure.

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 strong association was also found between **income** and collective wellbeing. Compared to the reference group of people on an income of less than £26,000:

- Having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with an increase of +5.15 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with an increase of +7.57 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income of £100,000* and above was associated with an increase of +10.47 points in collective wellbeing.

Housing tenure showed a strong association with collective wellbeing, with households living in social housing associated with a collective wellbeing score -8.64 points lower than being a homeowner.

Region showed that collective wellbeing was 4.05 points higher in South Scotland than elsewhere.

Associations were not found to be statistically significant between collective wellbeing and gender, age, ethnicity, having children in the household, the level of area deprivation, rurality, education status, religion, work status, or sexual orientation. 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	60.72	2.58	0
Men	-1.91	0.99	0.05
Aged 35-54	-0.74	1.97	0.71
Aged 55+	3.49	2.23	0.12
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	5.15	1.42	0
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	7.57	1.63	0
Income of £100,000+*	10.47	2.58	0
Ethnic minorities (incl. white minorities)*	0.82	1.81	0.65
Having a disability	-6.74	1.14	0
Private tenant*	-1.08	1.75	0.54
Social housing tenant	-8.64	2.15	0
Children in household	-2.21	1.54	0.15
IMD2	-1.28	1.82	0.48
IMD3	-0.06	1.87	0.98
IMD4	1.91	1.69	0.26
IMD5	2.46	1.67	0.14
Urban area	-2.46	1.46	0.09
Graduate	1.14	1.16	0.33
Religious	0.61	0.91	0.51
Not working full time	1.3	1.41	0.36
LGB+*	-2.05	2.04	0.32
Glasgow	1.32	1.75	0.45
Highlands and Islands*	-0.47	2.61	0.86
Lothian	1.9	2.09	0.36
Mid Scotland and Fife	2.18	1.74	0.21
North East Scotland	0.61	1.52	0.69
South Scotland	4.05	1.87	0.03
West Scotland	-2.22	2.13	0.30

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual, living in Central Scotland. **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: Highlands and Islands n= 98, Income of £100,000 and above n=92, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) n=91, LGB+ n=81, Private renters n=61.

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.

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

- On average, having a household income between £26,000 to £51,999 was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +9.31 points, as well as a higher social wellbeing score of +4.91.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +16.42 points on average, a higher social wellbeing score of +9.09, and a higher environmental wellbeing score of +4.82.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above* was associated with a higher economic wellbeing score of +24.17 points on average, and a higher social wellbeing score of +9.89.

No significant association was found between income and democratic wellbeing.

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with three of the four wellbeing domains, with no association for environmental wellbeing. Disabled people scored -8.47 points lower on social wellbeing, -8.38 points lower on economic wellbeing and -7.54 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

Economic and environmental wellbeing was also associated with the **region** within Scotland that people lived in:

- Living in the West of Scotland was associated with economic wellbeing, with people living in this region scoring an average of -6.59 points lower, compared to the reference group living in Central Scotland.
- Living in the Highlands and Islands* was associated with economic wellbeing, with people living in this region scoring an average of -8.35 points lower, compared to the reference group living in Central Scotland.
- Living in the South of Scotland was associated with environmental and social wellbeing, with people living in this region scoring an average of +9.03 points higher on environmental wellbeing and +5.08 points higher on social wellbeing, compared to the reference group living in Central Scotland.

- Living in Mid Scotland and Fife was associated with environmental wellbeing, with people living in this region scoring an average of +6.37 points higher, compared to the reference group living in Central Scotland.
- Living in the North East of Scotland was associated with environmental wellbeing, with people living in this region scoring an average of +6.64 points higher, compared to the reference group living in Central Scotland.

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 -11.65 points lower, and an economic wellbeing score -16.27 points lower, than being a homeowner.

There was a moderate association between **age** and economic wellbeing, but only between the oldest and the youngest age groups. Compared to being aged 16 to 34, those aged 55+ scored an average of +6.32 points higher on their economic wellbeing score.

There was a moderate association between living in an urban area and having a lower environmental wellbeing score (-6.27 points), compared to those living rurally. No association was found for any of the other domains, however.

The presence of **children** was a moderate predictor of economic wellbeing scores only. Households with children on average scored -6.26 points lower than households who had no children. The presence of children in the household was not associated with any other wellbeing domains.

Having a **religion** was associated with economic and democratic wellbeing. On average, those with a religion had a slightly lower economic wellbeing score (-2.98) than those without a religion. Meanwhile, those with a religion scored on average +3.19 points higher on their democratic wellbeing score.

Being from an **ethnic minority*** (inc. white minorities) was associated with higher democratic wellbeing (+5.14 points) compared with having a white British ethnic background. No association was found for any of the other domains, and the low base size means this finding should be treated as indicative only.

Associations were not found to be statistically significant between any of the four wellbeing domains and the level of area deprivation, work status, education or sexual orientation. For a full list of regression estimates for each wellbeing domain in Scotland, along with standard error and p-values, see Tables 2.1 – 2.4 (overleaf).

Regression analysis of the 2026 Life in the UK Index – Northern Ireland

Base size limitations

In total, 714 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 sample size for Northern Ireland's dataset.

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
- Age 16-34
- Private tenants
- Social housing tenants
- Community Background: Other, None or Prefer not to say
- Northern Irish regions – Belfast
- Northern Irish regions – North.

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)
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Other (LGB+)

Collective wellbeing

In 2026, collective wellbeing in Northern Ireland varied according to household income, disability status, housing tenure, education status, 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 +3.39 points in collective wellbeing.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with an increase of +6.33 points in collective wellbeing.

- Having a household income of £100,000 and above* was associated with an increase of +13.79 points in collective wellbeing.

Having a **disability** showed a moderate association with collective wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -6.58 points less than those without a disability.

A moderate association was also found between **housing tenure** and collective wellbeing, but only when comparing social housing tenants* with homeowners. Social housing tenants scored, on average, -6.53 points lower than homeowners.

Education status showed a small association with collective wellbeing with graduates scoring an average of +2.25 points higher than non-graduates.

Those from a Catholic **community background** scored, on average, -3.84 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, age, presence of children in household, area deprivation level (IMD), religion, work status, 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	59.82	3.4	0
Men	1.94	1.17	0.10
Aged 35-54	-1.23	1.87	0.51
Aged 55+	3.1	2.36	0.19
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	3.39	1.64	0.04
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	6.33	1.86	0
Income of £100,000+*	13.79	2.5	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	2.73	2.59	0.29
Having a disability	-6.58	1.47	0
Private tenant*	2.09	2.2	0.34
Social housing tenant*	-6.53	2.49	0.01
Children in household	-3.42	1.81	0.06
IMD2	0.37	1.92	0.85
IMD3	2.14	1.96	0.28
IMD4	2.48	2.15	0.25
IMD5	3.36	2.15	0.12
Urban area	-0.45	1.37	0.74
Graduate	2.25	1.1	0.04
Religious	0.99	1.58	0.53
Not working full time	0.54	1.71	0.75
LGB+^	-1.65	2.91	0.57
Catholic community background	-3.84	1.14	0
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say*	-2.23	2.47	0.37
Northern Irish regions – East	-1.95	1.8	0.28
Northern Irish regions – North*	-0.52	2.06	0.80
Northern Irish regions – Outer Belfast	-2.12	2.08	0.31
Northern Irish regions – West and South	-2.75	2.09	0.19

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background, from Belfast region, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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=62, Private tenants n=51, Social housing tenants n=55, Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say n=70, Northern Irish regions – Belfast n=99, Northern Irish regions – North n=93.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (including White minorities) n=42 LGB+ n=41.

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.

Household **income** was associated with all four wellbeing domains, with the strongest relationship observed for 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 an economic wellbeing score that was +6.09 higher points on average.
- Having a household income between £52,000 to £99,999 was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +6.19 points on average, and for economic wellbeing, of +13.45 points on average.
- Having a household income of £100,000 and above* was associated with higher scores for social wellbeing, of +13.55 points on average; for economic wellbeing, of +24.04 points on average; for environmental wellbeing, of +10.62 points on average; and for democratic wellbeing, of +7.2 points on average.

Having a **disability** was negatively associated with three of the four wellbeing domains, the strongest association with social wellbeing. Those living with a disability scored -10.56 points lower on social wellbeing, -6.89 points lower on economic wellbeing, and -5.99 points lower on democratic wellbeing, compared to those without a disability.

Education status was associated with three of the four wellbeing domains. Compared to non-graduates, graduates scored higher on economic wellbeing (+8.41 points higher) and democratic wellbeing (+3.45 points higher), but lower on environmental wellbeing (-4.15 points lower).

Age displayed a moderate association with environmental and democratic 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: Income of £100,000 and above n=62, Private tenants n=51, Social housing tenants n=55, Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say n=70, Northern Irish regions – Belfast n=99, Northern Irish regions – North n=93.

Compared to those aged 16–34:

- For environmental wellbeing, those aged 35–54 scored an average of +6.32 points higher, and those aged 55+ scored an average of +7.91 points higher.
- For democratic wellbeing, those aged 35–54 scored an average of -7.92 points lower.

Living in **social housing*** was associated with an economic wellbeing score -14.44 points lower than being a homeowner. Living as a **private tenant*** was associated with +5.9 advantage for environmental wellbeing.

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

Region within Northern Ireland was also associated with social, environmental, and democratic wellbeing.

Compared to living in Belfast:

- Those living in the East had an average social wellbeing score of -5.55 points lower.
- Those living in Outer Belfast had an average social wellbeing score of -4.87 points lower.
- Those living in the North* had an average environmental wellbeing score of +8.9 points higher.

Finally, those from a Catholic **community background** scored, on average, -3 points lower on social wellbeing, -4.89 points lower on economic wellbeing, and -6 points lower on democratic wellbeing, when compared with those from a Protestant community background.

Appendix D - Wellbeing domain regression results

UK-level regression results

Social wellbeing

The greatest difference in average social wellbeing scores between people distinguished by a 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	66.95	1.31	0
Men	2.94	0.49	0
Aged 35-54	2.17	0.82	0.01
Aged 55+	5.14	0.85	0
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	4.02	0.7	0
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	6.21	0.8	0
Income of £100,000+	6.3	0.95	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-3.27	0.73	0
Having a disability	-11.82	0.63	0
Private tenant	-2.49	0.89	0.01
Social housing tenant	-6.94	1.02	0
Have children	0.07	0.68	0.91
IMD2	1.65	0.8	0.04
IMD3	3.17	0.84	0
IMD4	3.98	0.83	0
IMD5	4.09	0.81	0
Urban area	-2.32	0.57	0
Scotland	2.08	0.76	0.01
Wales	0.95	0.86	0.27
Northern Ireland	1.83	0.88	0.04
Graduate	2.78	0.53	0
Religious	-0.25	0.5	0.62
Not working full-time	0.86	0.6	0.15

LGB+	-3.82	1.09	0
-------------	--------------	-------------	----------

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual.

Economic wellbeing

Economic wellbeing varied most notably by household income, followed by housing tenure and having a disability.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	60.21	1.67	0
Men	2.7	0.62	0
Aged 35-54	-1.02	1.01	0.31
Aged 55+	6.53	1.04	0
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	8.12	0.94	0
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	14.85	1.03	0
Income of £100,000+	20.06	1.24	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-0.85	0.93	0.36
Having a disability	-7.34	0.82	0
Private tenant	-6.47	1.15	0
Social housing tenant	-12.77	1.33	0
Have children	-3.56	0.85	0
IMD2	1.61	1.05	0.13
IMD3	1.58	1.09	0.15
IMD4	3.17	1.06	0
IMD5	3.26	1.09	0
Urban area	-0.72	0.7	0.3
Scotland	0.13	0.87	0.88
Wales	-1.47	1.07	0.17
Northern Ireland	-1.46	1.01	0.15
Graduate	5.42	0.68	0
Religious	-2.36	0.65	0
Not working full-time	1.89	0.75	0.01
LGB+	-1.5	1.35	0.27

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual.

Environmental wellbeing

The greatest difference in environmental wellbeing scores was seen for area deprivation, followed by urbanity and age.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	57.79	1.75	0
Men	0.14	0.65	0.83
Aged 35-54	2.16	1.05	0.04
Aged 55+	5.36	1.1	0
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	2.8	0.92	0
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	4.1	1.05	0
Income of £100,000+	3.32	1.27	0.01
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-3.03	0.96	0
Having a disability	-2.97	0.81	0
Private tenant	0.99	1.17	0.4
Social housing tenant	-1.82	1.32	0.17
Have children	-0.3	0.88	0.73
IMD2	3.12	1.13	0.01
IMD3	7.16	1.11	0
IMD4	9.27	1.08	0
IMD5	11.28	1.06	0
Urban area	-7.5	0.72	0
Scotland	4.45	0.85	0
Wales	-0.52	1.12	0.64
Northern Ireland	2.3	1.13	0.04
Graduate	1.62	0.72	0.02
Religious	0.57	0.67	0.4
Not working full-time	0.27	0.79	0.74
LGB+	-2.81	1.44	0.05

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual.

Democratic wellbeing

Income group most clearly distinguished low and high democratic wellbeing scores, followed by graduate and working status.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	31.31	1.68	0
Men	1.17	0.63	0.06
Aged 35-54	0.68	1.03	0.51
Aged 55+	2	1.08	0.06
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	2.17	0.86	0.01
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	3.41	1.02	0
Income of £100,000+	5.58	1.27	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	1.35	0.94	0.15
Having a disability	-3.88	0.77	0
Private tenant	0.15	1.24	0.9
Social housing tenant	-1.83	1.24	0.14
Have children	-0.14	0.87	0.87
IMD2	1.65	1.01	0.1
IMD3	2.27	1.05	0.03
IMD4	2.77	1.07	0.01
IMD5	3.33	1.07	0
Urban area	0.78	0.74	0.29
Scotland	-0.11	0.79	0.89
Wales	-2.59	1.11	0.02
Northern Ireland	0.3	1.05	0.78
Graduate	4.34	0.71	0
Religious	0.37	0.67	0.58
Not working full-time	4.3	0.76	0
LGB+	-0.65	1.32	0.62

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual.

England regression results

Social wellbeing

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

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	65.77	1.92	0
Men	3.4	0.55	0
Aged 35-54	2.15	0.9	0.02
Aged 55+	4.92	0.91	0
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	3.91	0.79	0
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	5.86	0.9	0
Income of £100,000+	5.63	1.03	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-3.31	0.79	0
Having a disability	-11.92	0.72	0
Private tenant	-3.09	0.98	0
Social housing tenant	-6.53	1.15	0
Have children	0.44	0.76	0.56
IMD2	1.99	0.92	0.03
IMD3	3.49	0.94	0
IMD4	4.19	0.94	0
IMD5	4.34	0.93	0
Urban area	-2.4	0.69	0
English regions - North West	1.28	1.48	0.39
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	1.35	1.57	0.39
English regions - East Midlands	-1.87	1.63	0.25
English regions - West Midlands	0.89	1.6	0.58
English regions - East of England	-0.02	1.49	0.99
English regions - South East	2.24	1.42	0.12
English regions - South West	3.87	1.48	0.01
English regions - London	1.15	1.5	0.44
Graduate	3.05	0.6	0
Religious	-0.58	0.56	0.3
Not working full time	0.98	0.66	0.14
LGB+	-4.5	1.23	0

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **Bold** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Economic wellbeing

The largest association between economic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of household income, followed by housing tenure and having a disability.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	59.00	2.53	0
Men	3.14	0.71	0
Aged 35-54	-0.91	1.13	0.42
Aged 55+	6.45	1.16	0
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	7.58	1.08	0
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	14.18	1.17	0
Income of £100,000+	19.00	1.41	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-1.15	1.03	0.26
Having a disability	-7.01	0.95	0
Private tenant	-6.80	1.3	0
Social housing tenant	-12.58	1.52	0
Have children	-3.11	0.96	0
IMD2	1.88	1.21	0.12
IMD3	1.74	1.25	0.16
IMD4	3.16	1.23	0.01
IMD5	3.07	1.27	0.02
Urban area	-1.24	0.85	0.14
English regions - North West	0.32	2.02	0.87
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	3.30	2.06	0.11
English regions - East Midlands	1.02	2.14	0.63
English regions - West Midlands	-0.35	2.16	0.87
English regions - East of England	1.30	1.99	0.51
English regions - South East	2.09	1.93	0.28
English regions - South West	4.11	1.98	0.04
English regions - London	2.95	2.02	0.14
Graduate	5.69	0.78	0
Religious	-2.40	0.74	0
Not working full time	1.77	0.85	0.04

LGB+	-1.27	1.54	0.41
------	-------	------	------

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **Bold** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

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 living in an urban area.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	57.24	2.39	0
Men	0.58	0.73	0.43
Aged 35-54	1.78	1.17	0.13
Aged 55+	4.79	1.22	0
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	3.08	1.07	0
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	4.33	1.18	0
Income of £100,000+	3.83	1.4	0.01
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	-2.11	1.07	0.05
Having a disability	-2.75	0.94	0
Private tenant	0.57	1.33	0.67
Social housing tenant	-0.83	1.52	0.58
Have children	-0.08	0.98	0.93
IMD2	3.74	1.3	0
IMD3	7.84	1.27	0
IMD4	9.84	1.24	0
IMD5	11.66	1.22	0
Urban area	-6.43	0.89	0
English regions - North West	-2.23	1.86	0.23
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	-0.7	2.02	0.73
English regions - East Midlands	-2.1	1.96	0.29
English regions - West Midlands	-3.77	2	0.06
English regions - East of England	0.12	1.88	0.95
English regions - South East	-0.89	1.78	0.62
English regions - South West	3.37	1.85	0.07
English regions - London	-6.1	1.93	0
Graduate	2.26	0.83	0.01

Religious	0.55	0.77	0.48
Not working full time	0.57	0.88	0.52
LGB+	-2.8	1.73	0.11

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **Bold** indicates significant associations at P<0.05.

Democratic wellbeing

The largest association between democratic wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was found for region, followed by income, education status and work status.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	28.59	2.4	0
Men	1.64	0.72	0.02
Aged 35-54	1.4	1.15	0.23
Aged 55+	2.16	1.22	0.08
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.93	1	0.05
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	3.32	1.17	0
Income of £100,000+	5.07	1.44	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)	0.73	1.04	0.48
Having a disability	-3.26	0.91	0
Private tenant	-0.04	1.41	0.98
Social housing tenant	-2.46	1.43	0.09
Have children	-0.09	0.97	0.93
IMD2	1.33	1.18	0.26
IMD3	1.88	1.21	0.12
IMD4	2.56	1.25	0.04
IMD5	3.01	1.26	0.02
Urban area	0.99	0.91	0.28
English regions - North West	0.1	1.83	0.95
English regions - Yorkshire and The Humber	3.14	1.97	0.11
English regions - East Midlands	0.9	1.91	0.64
English regions - West Midlands	1.46	1.92	0.45
English regions - East of England	2.81	1.84	0.13
English regions - South East	3.67	1.77	0.04
English regions - South West	4.78	1.87	0.01
English regions - London	3.85	1.88	0.04

Graduate	4.28	0.81	0
Religious	0.08	0.77	0.91
Not working full time	4.64	0.86	0
LGB+	-0.88	1.55	0.57

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, living in North East England, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **Bold** indicates significant associations at $P < 0.05$.

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	72.43	3.82	0
Men	2.21	1.52	0.15
Aged 35-54	2.94	2.84	0.30
Aged 55+	6.49	2.41	0.01
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	2.1	2.11	0.32
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	4.01	2.56	0.12
Income of £100,000+ [^]	5.61	3.25	0.09
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities) [^]	-3.43	2.47	0.17
Having a disability	-15.27	2	0
Private tenant [^]	-3.35	2.98	0.26
Social housing tenant[^]	-13.55	3.25	0
Children in household*	-1.12	2.28	0.62
IMD2	0.34	2.19	0.88
IMD3	1.87	2.55	0.46
IMD4	-1.95	2.84	0.49
IMD5*	1.64	2.69	0.54
Urban area	-1.93	1.65	0.24
Graduate	2.9	1.5	0.05
Religious	-0.59	1.44	0.68
Not working full time	0.95	1.94	0.62
LGB+ [^]	-0.2	2.97	0.95

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34*, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1*), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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: IMD1 n=98, IMD5 n=97, Children in household n=78, age 16-34 n=56.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities) n=44, Private tenants n=49, Social housing tenants n=36, LGB+ n=36, Income of £100,000 and above n=24.

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	56.67	4.79	0
Men	5.01	1.88	0.01
Aged 35-54	-2.7	2.94	0.36
Aged 55+	6.53	2.94	0.03
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	11.41	2.92	0
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	19.62	3.41	0
Income of £100,000+^	20.8	3.86	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-8.43	4.5	0.06
Having a disability	-11.07	2.24	0
Private tenant^	-6.61	3.47	0.06
Social housing tenant^	-18.04	4.08	0
Children in household*	-6.88	2.74	0.01
IMD2	1.43	3.18	0.65
IMD3	0.5	3.12	0.87
IMD4	1.72	3.36	0.61
IMD5*	6.22	2.99	0.04
Urban area	0.75	2.11	0.72
Graduate	5.95	2.22	0.01
Religious	-2.62	2	0.19
Not working full time	3.84	2.37	0.11
LGB+^	-5.19	4.25	0.22

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34*, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1*), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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: IMD1 n=98, IMD5 n=97, Children in household n=78, age 16-34 n=56.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities) n=44, Private tenants n=49, Social housing tenants n=36, LGB+ n=36, Income of £100,000 and above n=24.

Environmental wellbeing

The largest associations between environmental wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic were those of age and level of area deprivation.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	53.68	4.59	0
Men	-1.72	1.98	0.39
Aged 35-54	7.66	3.34	0.02
Aged 55+	11.05	3.26	0
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	0.84	2.39	0.72
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	3.45	3.3	0.3
Income of £100,000+ [^]	6.68	3.75	0.08
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities) [^]	-3.98	4.84	0.41
Having a disability	-6.17	2.71	0.02
Private tenant [^]	5.16	3.3	0.12
Social housing tenant [^]	-5.16	3.81	0.18
Children in household*	-4.07	3.49	0.24
IMD2	1.29	3.1	0.68
IMD3	8.77	3.51	0.01
IMD4	8.86	3.23	0.01
IMD5*	15.08	3.06	0
Urban area	-6.57	1.95	0
Graduate	1.71	2.19	0.44
Religious	-0.32	2.23	0.89
Not working full time	1.71	2.22	0.44
LGB+	0.96	3.61	0.79

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34*, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1*), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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: IMD1 n=98, IMD5 n=97, Children in household n=78, age 16-34 n=56.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities) n=44, Private tenants n=49, Social housing tenants n=36, LGB+ n=36, Income of £100,000 and above n=24.

Democratic wellbeing

Household income showed the strongest significant association with democratic wellbeing.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	33.1	4.79	0
Men	0.1	2.02	0.96
Aged 35-54	-0.82	3.72	0.83
Aged 55+	1.55	3.83	0.69
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.9	2.75	0.49
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	7.64	3.5	0.03
Income of £100,000+ [^]	5.58	4.89	0.25
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities) [^]	-1.92	3.62	0.60
Having a disability	-2.9	2.16	0.18
Private tenant [^]	-1.88	4.05	0.64
Social housing tenant [^]	1.73	3.52	0.62
Children in household*	-3.85	3.31	0.25
IMD2	0.36	2.9	0.90
IMD3	0.33	3.04	0.91
IMD4	-2.2	3.05	0.47
IMD5*	1.15	3.04	0.71
Urban area	-1.16	2.18	0.60
Graduate	7.68	2.4	0
Religious	1.28	2.09	0.54
Not working full time	2.2	2.49	0.38
LGB+ [^]	-6.37	3.94	0.11

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34*, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1*), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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: IMD1 n=98, IMD5 n=97, Children in household n=78, age 16-34 n=56.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities) n=44, Private tenants n=49, Social housing tenants n=36, LGB+ n=36, Income of £100,000 and above n=24.

Scotland regression results

Social wellbeing

The largest associations between social wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristics was that of disability status and having an income of over £100,000.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	71.4	3.18	0
Men	-1.57	1.29	0.22
Aged 35-54	2.41	2.65	0.37
Aged 55+	4.66	3.14	0.14
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	4.91	1.77	0.01
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	9.09	2.03	0
Income of £100,000+*	9.89	3.18	0
Ethnic minorities (Incl. white minorities)*	-2.89	2.22	0.20
Having a disability	-8.47	1.47	0
Private tenant*	0.25	2.47	0.92
Social housing tenant	-11.65	2.87	0
Have children	-2.94	1.84	0.11
IMD2	-1.69	2.23	0.45
IMD3	-0.62	2.55	0.81
IMD4	1.79	2.22	0.42
IMD5	2.25	2.21	0.31
Urban area	-2.86	1.93	0.14
Graduate	-0.3	1.5	0.84
Religious	1.03	1.13	0.36
Not working full-time	0.41	1.76	0.82
LGB+*	-1.51	2.77	0.59
Glasgow	2.47	2.26	0.27
Highlands and Islands*	1.39	3.54	0.69
Lothian	1.85	2.4	0.44
Mid Scotland and Fife	1.5	2.05	0.47
North East Scotland	2.1	1.87	0.26
South Scotland	5.08	2.43	0.04
West Scotland	-1.84	2.67	0.49

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual, living in Central Scotland. **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: Highlands and Islands n= 98, Income of £100,000 and above n=92, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) n=91, LGB+ n=81, Private renters n=61.

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	69.74	5.09	0
Men	-2.13	1.43	0.14
Aged 35-54	-0.29	2.7	0.91
Aged 55+	6.32	2.83	0.03
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	9.31	2.3	0
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	16.42	2.67	0
Income of £100,000+*	24.17	3.17	0
Ethnic minorities (Incl. white minorities)*	0.14	2.36	0.95
Having a disability	-8.38	1.9	0
Private tenant*	-6.03	3.12	0.05
Social housing tenant	-16.27	3.22	0
Have children	-6.26	2.12	0
IMD2	-4.6	2.56	0.07
IMD3	-2.43	2.82	0.39
IMD4	0.32	2.62	0.90
IMD5	1.57	2.53	0.54
Urban area	-0.99	2.09	0.64
Graduate	1.76	1.62	0.28
Religious	-2.98	1.42	0.04
Not working full time	2.88	1.74	0.10
LGB+*	-3.37	3.27	0.30
Glasgow	0.52	2.96	0.86
Highlands and Islands*	-8.35	3.92	0.03
Lothian	-1.44	3.17	0.65

Mid Scotland and Fife	-3.57	2.79	0.20
North East Scotland	-4.64	2.72	0.09
South Scotland	-0.37	3.18	0.91
West Scotland	-6.59	3.1	0.03

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual, living in Central Scotland. **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: Highlands and Islands $n=98$, Income of £100,000 and above $n=92$, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) $n=91$, LGB+ $n=81$, Private renters $n=61$.

Environmental wellbeing

The largest association between environmental wellbeing and any sociodemographic characteristic was that of region within Scotland.

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	65.05	3.74	0
Men	-1.98	1.43	0.17
Aged 35–54	-0.42	2.57	0.87
Aged 55+	4.53	3.01	0.13
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	3.78	1.96	0.05
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	4.82	2.25	0.03
Income of £100,000+*	4.42	3.74	0.24
Ethnic minorities (Incl. white minorities)*	-0.14	2.72	0.96
Having a disability	-2.47	1.54	0.11
Private tenant*	1.62	2.65	0.54
Social housing tenant	-3.93	2.84	0.17
Have children	-0.88	2.24	0.69
IMD2	-1.79	2.78	0.52
IMD3	0.81	2.57	0.75
IMD4	3.22	2.29	0.16
IMD5	3.21	2.4	0.18
Urban area	-6.27	1.86	0
Graduate	0.53	1.59	0.74
Religious	0.95	1.44	0.51
Not working full time	-1.22	2.07	0.56

LGB+*	-4.68	2.75	0.09
Glasgow	-1.61	3.01	0.59
Highlands and Islands*	6.62	3.52	0.06
Lothian	4.87	3.02	0.11
Mid Scotland and Fife	6.37	2.91	0.03
North East Scotland	6.64	2.66	0.01
South Scotland	9.03	2.65	0
West Scotland	0.71	3.38	0.83

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual, living in Central Scotland. **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: Highlands and Islands n= 98, Income of £100,000 and above n=92, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) n=91, LGB+ n=81, Private renters n=61.

Democratic wellbeing

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

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	36.7	4.02	0
Men	-1.89	1.29	0.14
Aged 35-54	-3.85	2.23	0.08
Aged 55+	-0.79	2.47	0.75
Income of £26,000 – £51,999	2.19	1.86	0.24
Income of £52,000 – £99,999	-0.2	2.14	0.92
Income of £100,000+*	3.53	3.01	0.24
Ethnic minorities (Incl. white minorities)*	5.14	2.15	0.02
Having a disability	-7.54	1.51	0
Private tenant*	0.37	2.79	0.89
Social housing tenant	-2.36	2.19	0.28
Have children	0.68	2	0.73
IMD2	2.21	2.3	0.34
IMD3	1.85	2.16	0.39
IMD4	2.14	2.35	0.36
IMD5	2.48	2.27	0.27

Urban area	0.3	1.63	0.85
Graduate	2.97	1.54	0.05
Religious	3.19	1.31	0.02
Not working full time	2.74	1.78	0.12
LGB+*	1.77	2.69	0.51
Glasgow	2.99	2.9	0.3
Highlands and Islands*	-1.54	3.08	0.62
Lothian	2.62	2.9	0.37
Mid Scotland and Fife	4.39	2.54	0.08
North East Scotland	-1.71	2.81	0.54
South Scotland	2.53	2.67	0.34
West Scotland	-1.19	2.88	0.68

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with an income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual, living in Central Scotland. **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: Highlands and Islands $n=98$, Income of £100,000 and above $n=92$, ethnic minorities (including white minorities) $n=91$, LGB+ $n=81$, Private renters $n=61$.

Northern Ireland regression results

Social wellbeing

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

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

Characteristics	Estimate	S.E.	P-value
Reference Group	76.56	4.01	0
Men	3.06	1.39	0.03
Aged 35-54	-0.77	2.36	0.75
Aged 55+	2.12	2.7	0.43
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	3.82	2.05	0.06
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	6.19	2.41	0.01
Income of £100,000+*	13.55	2.65	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	-2.48	2.98	0.41
Having a disability	-10.56	1.81	0
Private tenant*	1.1	2.31	0.64
Social housing tenant*	-5.5	3.28	0.09
Children in household	-2.64	2.2	0.23
IMD2	0.32	2.58	0.90
IMD3	3.43	2.38	0.15
IMD4	4.69	2.44	0.06
IMD5	2.42	2.57	0.35
Urban area	-2.34	1.75	0.18
Graduate	1.41	1.32	0.28
Religious	1.46	1.83	0.43
Not working full time	-0.9	1.91	0.64
LGB+^	-5.32	3.54	0.13
Catholic community background	-3	1.51	0.05
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say*	-0.03	2.8	0.99
Northern Irish regions – East	-5.55	2.11	0.01
Northern Irish regions – North*	-4.56	2.88	0.11
Northern Irish regions – Outer Belfast	-4.87	2.2	0.03
Northern Irish regions – West and South	-7.35	2.31	0

Reference group: Female, aged 16-34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background, from Belfast region, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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=62, Private tenants n=51, Social housing tenants n=55, Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say n=70, Northern Irish regions – North n=93.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (including White minorities) n=42, LGB+ n=41.

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	59.48	4.74	0
Men	3.23	1.67	0.05
Aged 35-54	-2.72	2.75	0.32
Aged 55+	4.63	2.88	0.11
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	6.09	2.6	0.02
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	13.45	2.78	0
Income of £100,000+*	24.04	3.55	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	0.52	3.5	0.88
Having a disability	-6.89	2.1	0
Private tenant*	-1.23	3.37	0.72
Social housing tenant*	-14.44	3.56	0
Children in household	-7.6	2.47	0
IMD2	3.48	2.96	0.24
IMD3	2.14	2.89	0.46
IMD4	4.24	3.16	0.18
IMD5	5.99	2.86	0.04
Urban area	0.57	2.19	0.79
Graduate	8.41	1.89	0
Religious	0.8	1.87	0.67
Not working full time	0.69	2.22	0.76
LGB+^	1.93	3.52	0.58
Catholic community background	-4.89	1.63	0

Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say*	-2.45	3.76	0.51
Northern Irish regions – East	-3.08	3.08	0.32
Northern Irish regions – North*	-2.83	3.22	0.38
Northern Irish regions – Outer Belfast	1.11	2.84	0.70
Northern Irish regions – West and South	-2.24	3.56	0.53

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background, from Belfast region, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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 $n=62$, Private tenants $n=51$, Social housing tenants $n=55$, Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say $n=70$, Northern Irish regions – North $n=93$.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (including White minorities) $n=42$, LGB+ $n=41$.

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	54.44	5.01	0
Men	0.64	1.76	0.72
Aged 35-54	6.32	2.79	0.02
Aged 55+	7.91	3.37	0.02
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	2.83	2.36	0.23
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	3.36	2.74	0.22
Income of £100,000+*	10.62	3.68	0
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	4.19	4.2	0.32
Having a disability	-2.75	2	0.17
Private tenant*	5.9	2.99	0.05
Social housing tenant*	-5.78	4.02	0.15
Children in household	-1.13	2.43	0.64
IMD2	-1.08	2.67	0.69
IMD3	-1.7	2.73	0.53
IMD4	1.86	3.26	0.57
IMD5	5.65	3.06	0.07

Urban area	0.79	2.08	0.71
Graduate	-4.15	1.81	0.02
Religious	1.67	2.42	0.49
Not working full time	1.77	2.64	0.50
LGB+^	-0.87	4.03	0.83
Catholic community background	-1.38	1.78	0.44
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say*	-3.53	3.44	0.31
Northern Irish regions – East	3.29	2.63	0.21
Northern Irish regions – North*	8.9	2.74	0
Northern Irish regions – Outer Belfast	0.71	2.93	0.81
Northern Irish regions – West and South	3.02	2.75	0.27

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background, from Belfast region, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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: Aged 16–34 n=65, Income of £100,000 and above n=62, Private tenants n=51, Social housing tenants n=55, Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say n=70, Northern Irish regions – Belfast n=99, Northern Irish regions – North n=93.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (including White minorities) n=42, LGB+ n=41.

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	48.39	5.5	0
Men	0.97	1.78	0.59
Aged 35-54	-7.92	2.76	0
Aged 55+	-2.27	3.04	0.46
Income of £26,000 - £51,999	1.15	2.39	0.63
Income of £52,000 - £99,999	2.63	2.77	0.34
Income of £100,000+*	7.2	3.33	0.03
Ethnic minorities (Inc. white minorities)^	8.94	3.92	0.02
Having a disability	-5.99	2	0
Private tenant*	1.95	4.09	0.63

Social housing tenant*	-0.31	3.57	0.93
Children in household	-2.16	2.52	0.39
IMD2	-1.26	2.77	0.65
IMD3	4.65	3.09	0.13
IMD4	-0.85	3.16	0.79
IMD5	-0.92	3.41	0.79
Urban area	-0.89	1.9	0.64
Graduate	3.45	1.7	0.04
Religious	0.29	2.11	0.89
Not working full time	0.74	2.17	0.73
LGB+ ^	-2.13	3.75	0.57
Catholic community background	-6	1.79	0
Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say*	-2.67	3.29	0.42
Northern Irish regions – East	-2.6	2.76	0.35
Northern Irish regions – North*	-3.76	3.17	0.24
Northern Irish regions – Outer Belfast	-5.7	3.08	0.06
Northern Irish regions – West and South	-4.68	3.18	0.14

Reference group: Female, aged 16–34, with HH income of less than £26,000, white British, no disability, homeowner, with no children, living in the most deprived quintile of areas (IMD1), in a rural area, from a Protestant community background, from Belfast region, non-graduate, with no religion, working full-time, straight or heterosexual. **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 $n=62$, Private tenants $n=51$, Social housing tenants $n=55$, Community background: Other, None / Prefer not to say $n=70$, Northern Irish regions – Belfast $n=99$, Northern Irish regions – North $n=93$.

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. Unweighted base sizes are: Ethnic minorities (including White minorities) $n=42$, LGB+ $n=41$.

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 it 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

4 Wemyss Place
Edinburgh

EH3 6DH

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

www.ipsos.com/en-uk
<https://x.com/ipsosScotland>

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.