

# Australian Unity Wellbeing Index

Report 33.2

June 2016

## *Wellbeing in Australian Federal Electorates*

Australian Unity Wellbeing Research Team:

Dr Edmund Silins,<sup>1,2</sup> Dr Delyse Hutchinson,<sup>1, 2</sup> Dr Ben Richardson,<sup>1</sup> Mr Philip Clare,<sup>2</sup> Ms Tanja Capic,<sup>1</sup> A/Prof Matthew Fuller-Tyszkiewicz,<sup>1</sup> Dr Linda Hartley-Clark,<sup>1</sup> Prof Robert Cummins,<sup>1</sup> Prof Craig Olsson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Psychology, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia

<sup>2</sup>National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre, UNSW Australia, Sydney, Australia

Australian Centre on Quality of Life  
Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway  
Melbourne, Victoria 3125, Australia

<http://www.acqol.com.au/reports/auwbi.php>

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INDEX OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Theory .....	4
1.2 Report 33.2.....	5
1.3 Methodology .....	5
<b>2 Results .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Demographic characteristics of sample .....	6
2.2 Federal Electoral Divisions with Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) significantly different to the normative mean .....	8
2.3 Personal Wellbeing Index of 150 Federal Electoral Divisions .....	10
<b>APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>12</b>

## INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of sample .....	7
Table 2: Federal Electoral Divisions with Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) significantly higher than the normative mean .....	9
Table 3: Federal Electoral Divisions with Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) significantly lower than the normative mean.....	9
Table 4: Personal Wellbeing Index of 150 Federal Electoral Divisions .....	10
Table 5: Personal Wellbeing Index of 150 Federal Electoral Divisions (detailed results).....	13

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index measures quality of life as experienced by the average Australian. This Report provides a 10-year average of how people feel about their life quality in 150 Federal Electoral Divisions using information from 24,022 people surveyed between 2006-2016.

People's feelings about their own wellbeing were measured by the Personal Wellbeing Index. This comprises 7 questions that ask how satisfied people are with their: (1) standard of living; (2) health; (3) relationships; (4) what they are achieving in life; (5) safety; (6) community connection; and, (7) future security. Each item is rated on a 0 to 10 scale and the average of the 7 items is the measure of personal wellbeing. Average scores are then adjusted to lie between 0 and 100 points. The wellbeing of each electorate was compared to the average wellbeing for the population. Electorates were also ranked in terms of their wellbeing from highest to lowest.

Twenty-eight electorates had wellbeing that was significantly higher than average. Most were in Victoria (36%) and New South Wales (25%) with the remainder in South Australia (14%), Queensland (7%), Tasmania (7%), Western Australia (7%), and the Australian Capital Territory (4%). Thirteen electorates had wellbeing that was significantly lower than average. Half were in New South Wales (47%) with the remainder in Victoria (23%), Queensland (15%) and Western Australia (15%). Of the 150 electorates, Mayo (SA) had the highest wellbeing and Blaxland (NSW) had the lowest.

# 1 Introduction

The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index monitors the subjective wellbeing of the Australian population. Unlike most official indicators of quality of life and wellbeing, it is subjective –it measures how Australians feel about life, and incorporates both personal and national perspectives. This report concerns personal wellbeing and represents a measure of life quality as experienced by the average Australian.

The first survey was conducted in April 2001 and the 33rd survey was undertaken in April 2016. Each survey involves a telephone interview with a new sample of Australians, selected to represent the national population geographic distribution. Every survey comprises the Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI), which measures people’s satisfaction with their life. This Index comprises seven questions of satisfaction with broad areas of people’s lives (domains). In this report the domains have been summed to yield an overall measure of subjective wellbeing.

## 1.1 Theory

A considerable body of research has demonstrated that most people are satisfied with their own life. On a population basis the scores that are derived from the PWI are remarkably stable. We hypothesize that personal wellbeing is not simply free to vary over the theoretical 0-100 range. Rather, it is held fairly constant for each individual in a manner analogous to blood pressure or body temperature. This implies an active management system for personal wellbeing that has the task of maintaining wellbeing, on average, at about 75 points. We call this process Subjective Wellbeing Homeostasis (Cummins et al., 2002).

The proper functioning of this homeostatic system is essential to life. At normal levels of wellbeing, which for group average scores lies in the range of 70-80 points, people feel good about themselves, are well motivated to conduct their lives, and have a strong sense of optimism. When this homeostatic system fails, these essential qualities are severely compromised, and people are at risk of depression. This can come about through such circumstances as exposure to chronic stress, chronic pain, failed personal relationships, etc.

Fortunately, the homeostatic system is remarkably robust. Many people live in difficult personal circumstances which may involve low income or medical problems, and yet manage to maintain normal levels of wellbeing. This is why the Index is so stable when averaged across the population. But as with any human attribute, some homeostatic systems are more robust than others. Or, put another way, some people have fragile systems which are prone to failure.

Homeostatic fragility, in these terms, can be caused by two different influences. The first of these is genetic. Some people have a constitutional weakness in their ability to maintain wellbeing within the normal range. The second influence is the experience of life. Here, as has been mentioned, some experiences such as chronic stress can challenge homeostasis. Other influences, such as intimate personal relationships, can strengthen homeostasis.

In summary, personal wellbeing is under active management and most people are able to maintain normal levels of wellbeing even when challenged by negative life experiences. However, a minority

of people have weaker homeostatic systems as a result of either constitutional or experiential influences. These people are vulnerable to their environment and may evidence homeostatic failure and thus lower personal wellbeing.

## 1.2 Report 33.2

This Report provides the average level of wellbeing for people living in Australia's 150 Federal Electoral Divisions. The analyses use cumulative data from May 2006 (Survey 15) to May 2016 (Survey 33) from 24,022 respondents. The report extends previous analyses (Report 23.2) by: (1) geocoding respondents' addresses directly to 2016 electoral boundaries; and, (2) providing estimates of electorate wellbeing using more recent data (this Report used 2006-2016 survey data whereas Report 23.2 used 2001-2010 data).

## 1.3 Methodology

At the time of each survey, respondents were asked if they would like to take part in future surveys. Those who agreed to re-contact (approximately 75% of people surveyed) provided their address. The current analyses were based on cumulative data from 24,022 respondents surveyed between May 2006 (Survey 15) and May 2016 (Survey 33) who provided full addresses. Electoral division was determined for these respondents by:

- (1) recording their addresses onto a Graphic Information Server (GIS) with latitude and longitude;
- (2) the ABS meshblock (at the 'street' level) was assigned to each record (<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/1270.0.55.001Main%20Features1July%202011>); and,
- (3) electoral boundaries for 2016 obtained from the Australian Electoral Commission (<http://www.aec.gov.au/Electorates/gis/index.htm>) were loaded onto a GIS and meshblocks assigned to each electorate. Where a meshblock crossed an electorate, it was assigned to the electorate in which most of it resides. For example, if a particular street crossed an electorate that street was assigned to the electorate which contained most of it. The process of parsing out respondents' address, recording onto a GIS, and appending to electorate was completed by Sample Pages.

Subjective wellbeing was measured by the PWI. This comprises seven questions that asked how satisfied people are with their:

- (1) standard of living;
- (2) health;
- (3) relationships;
- (4) what they are achieving in life;
- (5) safety;
- (6) community connection; and,
- (7) future security.

The numerical rating scale offers 11 choices from zero (completely dissatisfied) to 10 (completely satisfied). The PWI is the average rating across the seven items (domains). All data have been standardised to a 0-100 range. Thus, the magnitude of group differences can be referred to in terms of percentage points.

The PWI of each electorate has been reported and compared to the normative mean PWI (see below) using an independent two-sample t-test ( $p < 0.05$ ). Thus, electorates with a PWI that are significantly different from the norm are identified. The normative mean PWI has been calculated for PWI using the whole data-set (surveys 1-33) by computing the mean PWI for each survey and then determining the average PWI across all surveys (see Report 33). The normative mean PWI used in this report is 75.37 (SD 0.77).

Electorates were also divided into five equal sized groups (or quintiles), where each group of electorates represented one fifth (20%) of PWI scores. So the first group represents the electorates with the highest fifth (81%-100%) of wellbeing scores, the next group represents the electorates with the second highest fifth (61%-80%) of wellbeing scores, and so on down to the last group which represents the lowest fifth (20%) of wellbeing scores.

Statistical analyses were completed using STATA version 14 and Excel 2010.

## 2 Results

### 2.1 Demographic characteristics of sample

The demographic characteristics of the overall sample (N=24,022) are reported in table 1.

The majority of respondents were from New South Wales (33.9%), Victoria (24.3%), and Queensland (19.8%) with the remainder (22.0%) from the other States and Territories (ACT, 1.8%; NT, 1.6%; SA, 7.3%; TAS, 2.4%; WA, 9.0%).

The age of respondents ranged from 18 years to 76 years and over, with those aged 46-55 years (20.7%) and 56-65 years (21.5%) making up a substantial proportion of the overall sample.

Females (49.5%) and males (50.5%) were equally represented.

In terms of yearly gross household income, about one quarter (23.9%) of respondents earned between \$31,000-\$60,000 and a similar proportion (23.1%) earned between \$61,000-\$100,000.

Half of respondents worked full-time (49.4%) and about one third (31.8%) were retired.

The majority of respondents were married (58.8%) and 8.0% were in a defacto relationship. About fourteen (13.7%) percent had never married.

**Table 1: Demographic characteristics of sample**

<b>Demographic characteristic</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>State or Territory</b> (N=24,016)	Australian Capital Territory	426	1.77%
	New South Wales	8140	33.89%
	Northern Territory	392	1.63%
	Queensland	4758	19.81%
	South Australia	1741	7.25%
	Tasmania	567	2.36%
	Victoria	5830	24.28%
	Western Australia	2162	9.00%
<b>Age</b> (N=23,926)	18-25	1742	7.28%
	26-35	2356	9.85%
	36-45	4045	16.91%
	46-55	4963	20.74%
	56-65	5144	21.50%
	66-75	3644	15.23%
	76+	2032	8.49%
<b>Sex</b> (N=24,022)	Female	11897	49.53%
	Male	12125	50.47%
<b>Gross household income</b> (N=21196)	<\$15 000	1401	6.61%
	\$15 000 - \$30 000	3721	17.56%
	\$31 000 - \$60 000	5063	23.89%
	\$61 000 - \$100 000	4890	23.07%
	\$101 000 - \$150 000	3871	18.26%
	\$151 000 - \$250 000	1758	8.29%
	\$251 000 - \$500 000	401	1.89%
	>\$500 000	91	0.43%
<b>Employment status</b> (N=19,177)	Full-time employed	9478	49.42%
	Full-time retired	6100	31.81%
	Full-time volunteer	151	0.79%
	Full-time home duties	1507	7.86%
	Full-time study	907	4.73%
	Unemployed	1034	5.39%
<b>Relationship status</b> (N=22,600)	Married	13288	58.80%
	De facto	1809	8.00%
	Never married	3100	13.72%
	Separated	751	3.32%
	Divorced	1934	8.56%
	Widowed	1718	7.60%

## **2.2 Federal Electoral Divisions with Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) significantly different to the normative mean**

The Federal Electoral Divisions with Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) to the normative mean are reported in Table 2 (significantly higher than the norm) and Table 3 (significantly lower than the norm). The normative mean PWI was calculated for PWI using the whole data-set (surveys 1-33) by computing the mean PWI for each survey and then determining the average PWI across all surveys (see Report 33). The normative mean PWI used in this report was 75.37 (SD 0.77). Results are summarised here and reported in full in the Appendix.

### **2.2.1 Electorates with wellbeing higher than the normative mean**

Twenty-eight electorates had a PWI score that was higher than the normative mean and a difference that was statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), Table 2. Of these electorates, most were in Victoria (10/28; 36%) and New South Wales (7/28; 25%) with the remainder in South Australia (4/28; 14%), Queensland (2/28; 7%), Tasmania (2/28; 7%), Western Australia (2/28; 7%), and the Australian Capital Territory (1/28; 4%).

The ten electorates with the highest PWI scores were Mayo (SA), which had the highest score, followed by Murray (VIC), Mallee (VIC), Gilmore (NSW), Maranoa (QLD), Franklin (TAS), Mitchell (NSW), Kennedy (QLD), O'Connor (WA) and Berowra (NSW). Of the top ten electorates, three were in New South Wales, two each in Queensland and Victoria, and one each in South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia.

### **2.2.2 Electorates with wellbeing lower than the normative mean**

Thirteen electorates had a PWI score that was lower than the normative mean and a difference that was statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), Table 3. Of these electorates, half were in New South Wales (6/13; 47%) with the remainder in Victoria (3/13; 23%), Queensland (2/13; 15%) and Western Australia (2/13; 15%).

The ten electorates with the lowest PWI scores were Blaxland (NSW), which had the lowest score, followed by Holt (VIC), Cowan (WA), Chifley (NSW), McMahon (NSW), Werriwa (NSW), Moncrieff (QLD), Calwell (VIC), Hinkler (QLD) and Scullin (VIC). Of the bottom ten electorates, four were in New South Wales, three were in Victoria, two were in Queensland, and one was in Western Australia.



**Table 2: Federal Electoral Divisions with Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) significantly higher than the normative mean**

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>State/ Territory</b>	<b>PWI</b>
Mayo	SA	79.49
Murray	VIC	79.16
Mallee	VIC	79.06
Gilmore	NSW	78.92
Maranoa	QLD	78.82
Franklin	TAS	78.78
Mitchell	NSW	78.53
Kennedy	QLD	78.41
O'Connor	WA	78.33
Berowra	NSW	78.31
Goldstein	VIC	78.18
Wannon	VIC	78.17
Curtin	WA	78.17
Gippsland	VIC	78.15
North Sydney	NSW	78.13
Lyons	TAS	78.07
Canberra	ACT	77.90
Hunter	NSW	77.83
Flinders	VIC	77.77
Bradfield	NSW	77.68
Adelaide	SA	77.53
Bendigo	VIC	77.50
Boothby	SA	77.39
Jagajaga	VIC	77.39
Sturt	SA	77.36
Corangamite	VIC	77.33
Chisholm	VIC	77.28
Hughes	NSW	77.07

**Table 3: Federal Electoral Divisions with Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) significantly lower than the normative mean**

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>State/ Territory</b>	<b>PWI</b>
Parramatta	NSW	73.84
Lindsay	NSW	72.93
Swan	WA	72.92
Scullin	VIC	72.90
Hinkler	QLD	72.67
Calwell	VIC	72.63
Moncrieff	QLD	72.03
Werriwa	NSW	72.00
McMahon	NSW	71.87
Chifley	NSW	71.57
Cowan	WA	71.48
Holt	VIC	71.38
Blaxland	NSW	71.23

## 2.3 Personal Wellbeing Index of 150 Federal Electoral Divisions

The PWI of all 150 Federal Electoral Divisions is reported in Table 4. The electorates are ranked from highest wellbeing (Mayo, SA) to lowest wellbeing (Blaxland, NSW). Electorates were also divided into five equal sized groups (or quintiles), where each group of electorates represented one fifth (20%) of PWI scores. So the first group represents the electorates with the highest fifth (81%-100%) of wellbeing scores (shaded darkest), the next group represents the electorates with the second highest fifth (61%-80%) of wellbeing scores (shaded slightly lighter), and so on down to the last group which represents the lowest fifth (20%) of wellbeing scores (unshaded). The cut-points used were: 74.53, 75.18, 76.07, and 77.08. Results are summarised here and reported in full in the Appendix.

**Table 4: Personal Wellbeing Index of 150 Federal Electoral Divisions**

Rank	Electorate	State/ Territory	PWI	Rank	Electorate	State/ Territory	PWI
1	Mayo	SA	79.49	33	Ballarat	VIC	76.79
2	Murray	VIC	79.16	34	Hume	NSW	76.76
3	Mallee	VIC	79.06	35	Corio	VIC	76.72
4	Gilmore	NSW	78.92	36	Calare	NSW	76.71
5	Maranoa	QLD	78.82	37	New England	NSW	76.67
6	Franklin	TAS	78.78	38	Eden-Monaro	NSW	76.66
7	Mitchell	NSW	78.53	39	Bowman	QLD	76.66
8	Kennedy	QLD	78.41	40	Riverina	NSW	76.65
9	O'Connor	WA	78.33	41	Aston	VIC	76.65
10	Berowra	NSW	78.31	42	Cunningham	NSW	76.65
11	Goldstein	VIC	78.18	43	Lyne	NSW	76.64
12	Wannon	VIC	78.17	44	Mackellar	NSW	76.62
13	Curtin	WA	78.17	45	McMillan	VIC	76.58
14	Gippsland	VIC	78.15	46	Flynn	QLD	76.55
15	North Sydney	NSW	78.13	47	McEwen	VIC	76.53
16	Lyons	TAS	78.07	48	Page	NSW	76.53
17	Canberra	ACT	77.90	49	Ryan	QLD	76.49
18	Hunter	NSW	77.83	50	Newcastle	NSW	76.48
19	Flinders	VIC	77.77	51	Lingiari	NT	76.33
20	Bradfield	NSW	77.68	52	Wide Bay	QLD	76.32
21	Forrest	WA	77.57	53	Gellibrand	VIC	76.31
22	Adelaide	SA	77.53	54	Farrer	NSW	76.31
23	Bendigo	VIC	77.50	55	Fairfax	QLD	76.27
24	Boothby	SA	77.39	56	Canning	WA	76.21
25	Jagajaga	VIC	77.39	57	Fisher	QLD	76.19
26	Sturt	SA	77.36	58	Parkes	NSW	76.19
27	Corangamite	VIC	77.33	59	Whitlam	NSW	76.13
28	Chisholm	VIC	77.28	60	Cook	NSW	76.07
29	Fremantle	WA	77.23	61	Groom	QLD	76.03
30	Indi	VIC	77.08	62	Bonner	QLD	76.01
31	Hughes	NSW	77.07	63	Durack	WA	76.00
32	Braddon	TAS	76.95	64	Leichhardt	QLD	76.00

Rank	Electorate	State/ Territory	PWI
65	Higgins	VIC	75.99
66	Batman	VIC	75.96
67	Hindmarsh	SA	75.92
68	Capricornia	QLD	75.88
69	Denison	TAS	75.85
70	Fenner	ACT	75.84
71	Moreton	QLD	75.81
72	Warringah	NSW	75.78
73	Paterson	NSW	75.78
74	Kooyong	VIC	75.75
75	Tangney	WA	75.72
76	McPherson	QLD	75.71
77	Casey	VIC	75.68
78	Cowper	NSW	75.67
79	Menzies	VIC	75.66
80	Barker	SA	75.53
81	Melbourne	VIC	75.39
82	Pearce	WA	75.37
83	Dawson	QLD	75.33
84	Bass	TAS	75.26
85	Hotham	VIC	75.26
86	Maribyrnong	VIC	75.22
87	Moore	WA	75.21
88	Wakefield	SA	75.21
89	Melbourne Ports	VIC	75.18
90	Dunkley	VIC	75.18
91	Oxley	QLD	75.17
92	La Trobe	VIC	75.16
93	Shortland	NSW	75.16
94	Brand	WA	75.10
95	Grayndler	NSW	75.09
96	Forde	QLD	75.08
97	Hasluck	WA	75.07
98	Port Adelaide	SA	75.05
99	Kingston	SA	75.03
100	Deakin	VIC	75.03
101	Dobell	NSW	75.02
102	Perth	WA	74.98
103	Richmond	NSW	74.97
104	Bennelong	NSW	74.88
105	Fadden	QLD	74.88
106	Lalor	VIC	74.86
107	Banks	NSW	74.77
108	Griffith	QLD	74.77

Rank	Electorate	State/ Territory	PWI
109	Macquarie	NSW	74.74
110	Bruce	VIC	74.73
111	Robertson	NSW	74.69
112	Makin	SA	74.68
113	Sydney	NSW	74.68
114	Gorton	VIC	74.66
115	Petrie	QLD	74.62
116	Grey	SA	74.58
117	Isaacs	VIC	74.57
118	Blair	QLD	74.56
119	Brisbane	QLD	74.55
120	Greenway	NSW	74.53
121	Wright	QLD	74.47
122	Watson	NSW	74.42
123	Herbert	QLD	74.35
124	Dickson	QLD	74.35
125	Barton	NSW	74.31
126	Kingsford Smith	NSW	74.27
127	Wentworth	NSW	74.11
128	Lilley	QLD	74.09
129	Macarthur	NSW	74.08
130	Parramatta	NSW	73.84
131	Longman	QLD	73.82
132	Stirling	WA	73.64
133	Solomon	NT	73.63
134	Reid	NSW	73.61
135	Rankin	QLD	73.55
136	Burt	WA	73.38
137	Wills	VIC	73.20
138	Fowler	NSW	72.98
139	Lindsay	NSW	72.93
140	Swan	WA	72.92
141	Scullin	VIC	72.90
142	Hinkler	QLD	72.67
143	Calwell	VIC	72.63
144	Moncrieff	QLD	72.03
145	Werriwa	NSW	72.00
146	McMahon	NSW	71.87
147	Chifley	NSW	71.57
148	Cowan	WA	71.48
149	Holt	VIC	71.38
150	Blaxland	NSW	71.23

## APPENDIX

Table 5 on the following pages reports detailed results for the analyses of wellbeing in Australian electorates.

Electorates have been ranked from highest wellbeing (Mayo, SA) to lowest wellbeing (Blaxland, NSW) and divided into five equal sized groups (or quintiles), where each group of electorates represented one fifth (20%) of PWI scores. So the first group represents the electorates with the highest fifth (81%-100%) of wellbeing scores (shaded darkest), the next group represents the electorates with the second highest fifth (61%-80%) of wellbeing scores (shaded slightly lighter), and so on down to the last group which represents the lowest fifth (20%) of wellbeing scores (unshaded). The cut-points used were: 74.53, 75.18, 76.07, and 77.08.

For each electorate, the table reports the mean PWI score and the corresponding standard deviation (SD), standard error (SE), 95% Confidence Interval (95% CI upperbound and lowerbound), and sample size.

The PWI of each electorate was compared to the normative mean PWI using an independent two-sample t-test. A p-value of <0.05 was used to identify electorates with a PWI that were significantly different from the normative PWI (marked with an asterisk). The normative mean PWI was calculated for PWI using the whole data-set (surveys 1-33) by computing the mean PWI for each survey and then determining the average PWI across all surveys (see Report 33). The normative mean PWI used in this report is 75.37 (SD 0.77).

**Table 5: Personal Wellbeing Index of 150 Federal Electoral Divisions (detailed results)**

Rank	Electorate	State/ Territory	PWI	SD	SE	95%CI lb	95%CI ub	Sample size	p value
1	Mayo*	SA	79.49	11.408	0.919	77.688	81.292	154	0.0000
2	Murray*	VIC	79.16	10.589	0.827	77.534	80.776	164	0.0000
3	Mallee*	VIC	79.06	12.580	0.979	77.137	80.976	165	0.0002
4	Gilmore*	NSW	78.92	12.449	0.949	77.060	80.781	172	0.0002
5	Maranoa*	QLD	78.82	10.969	0.839	77.178	80.466	171	0.0000
6	Franklin*	TAS	78.78	10.371	0.980	76.855	80.696	112	0.0005
7	Mitchell*	NSW	78.53	9.846	0.786	76.986	80.066	157	0.0001
8	Kennedy*	QLD	78.41	11.861	0.975	76.496	80.318	148	0.0018
9	O'connor*	WA	78.33	13.050	1.029	76.316	80.348	161	0.0040
10	Berowra*	NSW	78.31	10.610	0.750	76.837	79.778	200	0.0001
11	Goldstein*	VIC	78.18	9.919	0.789	76.636	79.729	158	0.0004
12	Wannon*	VIC	78.17	12.481	0.972	76.269	80.078	165	0.0039
13	Curtin*	WA	78.17	9.506	0.815	76.575	79.770	136	0.0006
14	Gippsland*	VIC	78.15	12.212	0.990	76.207	80.090	152	0.0050
15	North Sydney*	NSW	78.13	10.441	0.861	76.446	79.822	147	0.0013
16	Lyons*	TAS	78.07	13.001	1.154	75.804	80.326	127	0.0195
17	Canberra*	ACT	77.90	10.440	0.740	76.446	79.347	199	0.0006
18	Hunter*	NSW	77.83	12.524	1.009	75.851	79.807	154	0.0148
19	Flinders*	VIC	77.77	13.251	1.035	75.742	79.798	164	0.0204
20	Bradfield*	NSW	77.68	9.244	0.717	76.270	79.083	166	0.0013
21	Forrest	WA	77.57	13.118	1.164	75.289	79.852	127	0.0587
22	Adelaide*	SA	77.53	9.628	0.848	75.869	79.192	129	0.0108
23	Bendigo*	VIC	77.50	11.696	0.616	76.296	78.710	361	0.0005
24	Boothby*	SA	77.39	12.336	0.868	75.689	79.092	202	0.0199
25	Jagajaga*	VIC	77.39	11.549	0.861	75.702	79.076	180	0.0190
26	Sturt*	SA	77.36	9.685	0.734	75.925	78.804	174	0.0066
27	Corangamite*	VIC	77.33	10.516	0.821	75.725	78.944	164	0.0168
28	Chisholm*	VIC	77.28	10.797	0.826	75.658	78.895	171	0.0209
29	Fremantle	WA	77.23	10.789	0.954	75.363	79.101	128	0.0509
30	Indi	VIC	77.08	12.573	1.033	75.059	79.111	148	0.0970
31	Hughes*	NSW	77.07	11.146	0.817	75.472	78.676	186	0.0371
32	Braddon	TAS	76.95	12.431	1.207	74.588	79.321	106	0.1895
33	Ballarat	VIC	76.79	12.021	1.002	74.822	78.749	144	0.1576
34	Hume	NSW	76.76	12.613	0.976	74.845	78.671	167	0.1551
35	Corio	VIC	76.72	14.250	1.317	74.133	79.298	117	0.3071
36	Calare	NSW	76.71	13.190	0.928	74.892	78.530	202	0.1483
37	New England	NSW	76.67	10.639	0.774	75.150	78.183	189	0.0938
38	Eden-Monaro	NSW	76.66	14.187	0.736	75.221	78.105	372	0.0788
39	Bowman	QLD	76.66	11.475	0.988	74.720	78.592	135	0.1929
40	Riverina	NSW	76.65	13.086	0.992	74.706	78.595	174	0.1969
41	Aston	VIC	76.65	11.755	0.970	74.747	78.548	147	0.1877
42	Cunningham	NSW	76.65	11.414	0.900	74.883	78.409	161	0.1561
43	Lyne	NSW	76.64	11.700	0.895	74.888	78.395	171	0.1553

Rank	Electorate	State/ Territory	PWI	SD	SE	95%CI lb	95%CI ub	Sample size	p value
44	Mackellar	NSW	76.62	11.250	0.808	75.037	78.203	194	0.1217
45	McMillan	VIC	76.58	13.333	1.057	74.504	78.649	159	0.2537
46	Flynn	QLD	76.55	11.023	0.922	74.747	78.360	143	0.1992
47	McEwen	VIC	76.53	12.339	0.660	75.238	77.823	350	0.0785
48	Page	NSW	76.53	12.616	0.903	74.757	78.298	195	0.2002
49	Ryan	QLD	76.49	11.015	0.858	74.813	78.174	165	0.1902
50	Newcastle	NSW	76.48	12.973	1.001	74.518	78.441	168	0.2676
51	Lingiari	NT	76.33	13.315	0.782	74.797	77.863	290	0.2195
52	WideBay	QLD	76.32	11.278	0.927	74.505	78.140	148	0.3043
53	Gellibrand	VIC	76.31	12.413	1.115	74.128	78.498	124	0.3974
54	Farrer	NSW	76.31	12.619	0.918	74.512	78.111	189	0.3051
55	Fairfax	QLD	76.27	13.441	1.197	73.923	78.617	126	0.4524
56	Canning	WA	76.21	13.273	1.271	73.720	78.704	109	0.5076
57	Fisher	QLD	76.19	12.936	1.157	73.926	78.462	125	0.4762
58	Parkes	NSW	76.19	12.473	0.893	74.440	77.941	195	0.3583
59	Whitlam	NSW	76.13	12.422	1.046	74.079	78.180	141	0.4677
60	Cook	NSW	76.07	10.948	0.975	74.154	77.977	126	0.4756
61	Groom	QLD	76.03	14.307	1.209	73.661	78.401	140	0.5849
62	Bonner	QLD	76.01	11.779	0.965	74.120	77.903	149	0.5062
63	Durack	WA	76.00	13.809	1.032	73.979	78.025	179	0.5406
64	Leichhardt	QLD	76.00	13.714	1.077	73.885	78.108	162	0.5610
65	Higgins	VIC	75.99	11.475	0.963	74.098	77.873	142	0.5224
66	Batman	VIC	75.96	12.196	0.952	74.092	77.825	164	0.5368
67	Hindmarsh	SA	75.92	12.752	0.970	74.020	77.821	173	0.5700
68	Capricornia	QLD	75.88	13.848	0.738	74.430	77.323	352	0.4925
69	Denison	TAS	75.85	12.346	1.067	73.762	77.943	134	0.6507
70	Fenner	ACT	75.84	10.839	0.801	74.269	77.410	183	0.5582
71	Moreton	QLD	75.81	10.686	0.945	73.963	77.666	128	0.6378
72	Warringah	NSW	75.78	12.509	0.968	73.885	77.680	167	0.6698
73	Paterson	NSW	75.78	11.748	0.989	73.836	77.714	141	0.6822
74	Kooyong	VIC	75.75	13.441	1.040	73.710	77.787	167	0.7159
75	Tangney	WA	75.72	10.730	0.816	74.124	77.322	173	0.6656
76	McPherson	QLD	75.71	13.747	1.299	73.168	78.260	112	0.7910
77	Casey	VIC	75.68	11.786	0.959	73.796	77.556	151	0.7494
78	Cowper	NSW	75.67	13.260	0.988	73.737	77.612	180	0.7579
79	Menzies	VIC	75.66	12.513	0.957	73.780	77.531	171	0.7652
80	Barker	SA	75.53	13.779	1.121	73.327	77.723	151	0.8900
81	Melbourne	VIC	75.39	11.638	0.984	73.460	77.316	140	0.9856
82	Pearce	WA	75.37	11.003	1.026	73.355	77.378	115	0.9972
83	Dawson	QLD	75.33	13.492	1.026	73.316	77.337	173	0.9659
84	Bass	TAS	75.26	11.699	1.240	72.834	77.695	89	0.9324
85	Hotham	VIC	75.26	11.227	1.004	73.289	77.225	125	0.9105
86	Maribyrnong	VIC	75.22	12.326	1.181	72.902	77.530	109	0.8964
87	Moore	WA	75.21	11.060	0.883	73.484	76.944	157	0.8596

Rank	Electorate	State/ Territory	PWI	SD	SE	95%CI lb	95%CI ub	Sample size	p value
88	Wakefield	SA	75.21	14.886	1.220	72.816	77.596	149	0.8931
89	Melbourne Ports	VIC	75.18	10.984	0.960	73.299	77.061	131	0.8430
90	Dunkley	VIC	75.18	11.966	0.866	73.479	76.873	191	0.8225
91	Oxley	QLD	75.17	12.693	1.269	72.684	77.659	100	0.8757
92	La Trobe	VIC	75.16	11.650	0.907	73.382	76.938	165	0.8170
93	Shortland	NSW	75.16	13.029	0.979	73.238	77.077	177	0.8281
94	Brand	WA	75.10	12.881	1.171	72.805	77.396	121	0.8179
95	Grayndler	NSW	75.09	11.348	0.881	73.368	76.821	166	0.7546
96	Forde	QLD	75.08	13.870	1.311	72.508	77.645	112	0.8228
97	Hasluck	WA	75.07	12.782	1.023	73.067	77.079	156	0.7719
98	Port Adelaide	SA	75.05	13.248	1.112	72.871	77.229	142	0.7737
99	Kingston	SA	75.03	10.809	0.898	73.275	76.794	145	0.7086
100	Deakin	VIC	75.03	11.551	0.842	73.379	76.682	188	0.6869
101	Dobell	NSW	75.02	12.572	0.617	73.806	76.225	415	0.5657
102	Perth	WA	74.98	12.017	1.102	72.823	77.141	119	0.7247
103	Richmond	NSW	74.97	13.003	1.095	72.828	77.121	141	0.7181
104	Bennelong	NSW	74.88	11.828	0.907	73.104	76.660	170	0.5909
105	Fadden	QLD	74.88	11.918	1.158	72.610	77.148	106	0.6713
106	Lalor	VIC	74.86	12.205	1.066	72.773	76.954	131	0.6349
107	Banks	NSW	74.77	12.138	0.984	72.845	76.704	152	0.5452
108	Griffith	QLD	74.77	13.307	1.121	72.575	76.969	141	0.5936
109	Macquarie	NSW	74.74	13.237	0.839	73.095	76.383	249	0.4519
110	Bruce	VIC	74.73	12.067	1.054	72.666	76.799	131	0.5456
111	Robertson	NSW	74.69	13.735	0.867	72.991	76.389	251	0.4327
112	Makin	SA	74.68	12.915	1.051	72.623	76.743	151	0.5134
113	Sydney	NSW	74.68	12.117	0.989	72.737	76.615	150	0.4831
114	Gorton	VIC	74.66	13.371	1.344	72.027	77.295	99	0.5977
115	Petrie	QLD	74.62	15.029	0.852	72.951	76.291	311	0.3795
116	Grey	SA	74.58	13.290	1.035	72.552	76.608	165	0.4452
117	Isaacs	VIC	74.57	11.616	0.996	72.617	76.522	136	0.4215
118	Blair	QLD	74.56	12.778	1.013	72.569	76.541	159	0.4214
119	Brisbane	QLD	74.55	12.718	1.064	72.461	76.630	143	0.4382
120	Greenway	NSW	74.53	12.011	1.015	72.541	76.520	140	0.4083
121	Wright	QLD	74.47	14.764	1.164	72.191	76.753	161	0.4403
122	Watson	NSW	74.42	12.171	1.262	71.950	76.898	93	0.4535
123	Herbert	QLD	74.35	13.037	1.054	72.285	76.417	153	0.3337
124	Dickson	QLD	74.35	11.583	0.907	72.569	76.125	163	0.2596
125	Barton	NSW	74.31	12.515	0.717	72.909	75.718	305	0.1405
126	Kingsford Smith	NSW	74.27	12.175	1.085	72.148	76.400	126	0.3124
127	Wentworth	NSW	74.11	12.037	1.085	71.984	76.239	123	0.2462
128	Lilley	QLD	74.09	13.898	0.723	72.676	75.509	370	0.0771
129	Macarthur	NSW	74.08	12.558	1.085	71.957	76.210	134	0.2356
130	Parramatta*	NSW	73.84	12.688	0.718	72.434	75.250	312	0.0334
131	Longman	QLD	73.82	14.385	1.137	71.592	76.050	160	0.1733

Rank	Electorate	State/ Territory	PWI	SD	SE	95%CI lb	95%CI ub	Sample size	p value
132	Stirling	WA	73.64	10.979	1.061	71.565	75.725	107	0.1041
133	Solomon	NT	73.63	13.409	1.454	70.779	76.481	85	0.2317
134	Reid	NSW	73.61	13.545	1.231	71.199	76.026	121	0.1536
135	Rankin	QLD	73.55	12.537	1.164	71.265	75.828	116	0.1173
136	Burt	WA	73.38	12.408	1.235	70.961	75.800	101	0.1071
137	Wills	VIC	73.20	13.633	1.144	70.957	75.442	142	0.0578
138	Fowler	NSW	72.98	13.725	1.629	69.785	76.171	71	0.1420
139	Lindsay*	NSW	72.93	13.362	1.056	70.858	74.999	160	0.0208
140	Swan*	WA	72.92	13.328	1.092	70.784	75.064	149	0.0251
141	Scullin*	VIC	72.90	12.375	1.164	70.613	75.177	113	0.0335
142	Hinkler*	QLD	72.67	14.119	1.334	70.051	75.281	112	0.0427
143	Calwell*	VIC	72.63	13.077	1.378	69.933	75.337	90	0.0472
144	Moncrieff*	QLD	72.03	13.767	1.428	69.229	74.826	93	0.0192
145	Werriwa*	NSW	72.00	15.171	1.665	68.733	75.261	83	0.0428
146	McMahon*	NSW	71.87	15.355	1.396	69.129	74.601	121	0.0121
147	Chifley*	NSW	71.57	15.352	1.379	68.865	74.269	124	0.0058
148	Cowan*	WA	71.48	12.615	1.161	69.201	73.753	118	0.0008
149	Holt*	VIC	71.38	14.664	1.301	68.833	73.934	127	0.0022
150	Blaxland*	NSW	71.23	13.802	1.497	68.293	74.161	85	0.0057

\*p<0.05; PWI=Personal Wellbeing Index; SD=standard deviation; SE=standard error; 95%CI=95% Confidence Interval (lb=lower bound, ub=upperbound); Electorates were divided into five equal sized groups (or quintiles), where each group of electorates represented one fifth (20%) of PWI scores. So the first group represents the electorates with the highest fifth (81%-100%) of wellbeing scores (shaded darkest), the next group represents the electorates with the second highest fifth (61%-80%) of wellbeing scores (shaded slightly lighter), and so on down to the last group which represents the lowest fifth (20%) of wellbeing scores (unshaded). The cut-points used were: 74.53, 75.18, 76.07, and 77.08.