TECHNICAL REPORT 1, 2013





LEFT BEHIND: 2013 MONITORING THE SOCIAL INCLUSION OF YOUNG AUSTRALIANS WITH SELF-REPORTED LONG TERM HEALTH CONDITIONS, IMPAIRMENTS OR DISABILITIES 2001 – 2011

LEFT BEHIND: 2013

MONITORING THE SOCIAL INCLUSION OF YOUNG AUSTRALIANS WITH SELF REPORTED LONG TERM HEALTH CONDITIONS, IMPAIRMENTS OR DISABILITIES 2001 - 2011

TECHNICAL REPORT 1, 2013 February 2013

Centre for Disability Research and Policy Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney

ISBN: 978-1-74210-245-0

Professor Eric Emerson, Professor of Disability Population Health Dr Anne Honey, Senior Lecturer, Occupational Therapy Professor Gwynnyth Llewellyn, Professor of Family and Disability Studies

Contact details:

Eric Emerson Centre for Disability Research and Policy Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney PO Box 170, Lidcombe NSW 1825, Australia eric.emerson@sydney.edu.au

SUMMARY

Disabled Australian adolescents and young adults are more likely to experience social exclusion than their non-disabled peers. Social exclusion in adolescence leads to poor outcomes, such as lower educational achievement and unemployment in adulthood. It affects not only the health and wellbeing of the individual; it also impacts on their family and the wider community. The inability of people with disabilities to participate socially and economically is a loss to the whole of society.

This report maps the extent of social inclusion or exclusion of young disabled Australians, aged between 15 and 29, over the years 2001 to 2011. It found that although the social inclusion of young disabled Australians increased on a number of key indicators, the gap between disabled and non-disabled young Australians actually increased over the 11 year period.

On 13 key indicators of social inclusion including employment, living in a jobless household, having support from family or friends in times of crisis and feeling safe, young disabled Australians are now more disadvantaged compared to their non-disabled peers than they were in 2001.

IN 2011

Young disabled Australians were **five times more likely** than their non-disabled peers to experience long-term unemployment and entrenched multiple disadvantage. (Entrenched multiple disadvantage is defined as experiencing disadvantage in at least three areas - income, work, education, safety and support and health - for two years or more).

Compared to their non-disabled peers, young disabled Australians in 2011 were significantly **less likely** to:

- Be employed
- Be fully engaged in education or work
- Attain Year 12 or equivalent educational qualification
- Obtain non-school qualifications
- Feel they have someone to turn to in time of crisis
- Have a voice in the community
- Have social contact with family or friends

Compared to their non-disabled peers, young disabled Australians in 2011 were significantly **more likely** to:

- Live in a jobless household
- Experience long-term unemployment
- Have lower economic resources and to experience financial stress and material deprivation
- Have mental illness
- Have fair or poor health

- Have a lower satisfaction with their life
- Feel unsafe in their local community
- Report being a victim of personal crime

OVER THE PAST DECADE

Between 2001 and 2011 the gap between the inclusion of disabled and non-disabled young Australians has **widened markedly** in 13 critical areas:

- Employment
- Long-term unemployment
- Living in a jobless household
- Economic resources
- Being fully engaged in work or education
- Volunteering
- Mental illness
- Subjective well-being
- Having a voice in the community
- Support from family/friends in time of crisis
- Feeling safe
- Multiple disadvantage
- Entrenched multiple disadvantage

Multiple disadvantage is defined as experiencing disadvantage in at least three of the following areas: income, work, education, safety and support.

The gap has **narrowed** in only three areas:

- Attaining Year 12 or equivalent qualifications
- Participation in community groups
- Being a victim of personal crime

Despite social policy interventions, such as employment schemes for those in long-term unemployment and policies to include people with disabilities in community activities and organisations, the aspiration for young disabled Australians to become more socially included appears even further out of reach. Australia is a prosperous nation, committed to redressing the profound social disadvantages people with disability experience and to promoting their participation in society. But it has yet to redress the significant and pervasive social exclusion faced by Australian adolescents and young adults with a disability.

TECHNICAL REPORT

The social inclusion of people with disabilities is attracting increasing attention. Most countries in the world have ratified the *UN Convention on the Rights of Person with Disabilities* (UNCRPD). Ratification obliges nations to work to redress the "profound social disadvantage of persons with disabilities and promote their participation in the civil, political, economic, social and cultural spheres with equal opportunities, in both developing and developed countries".¹ Countries are also obligated to report to the UN at regulated intervals on their progress towards the equalisation of opportunity and social inclusion of disabled people.

On June 9th 2011 the World Health Organization and World Bank presented to the United Nations the first-ever *World Report on Disability*; a report which aims to draw recommendations from a synthesis of the best available scientific information in order to promote the well-being, dignity, social inclusion and human rights of people with disabilities around the globe.²

The aim of this *Technical Report* is to present information on the social inclusion of young disabled Australian adults over a ten year period leading up to and following Australia's ratification of the optional protocol of UNCRPD on 21/08/2009. It is accompanied by a Policy Bulletin that can be downloaded from http://sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/cdrp/publications/

BACKGROUND

The relationship between being disabled, socially excluded and poor is well documented.²³ Historically, negative social outcomes associated with disability were typically regarded as

inevitable consequences of health conditions or impairments. Current understanding of the nature of disability suggests otherwise. Increasingly over the past three decades, disability has come to be seen as the result of the dynamic interplay between discriminatory social and environmental processes that perpetuate the social exclusion of people with particular health conditions or impairments.²⁻⁵

Adolescents and young adults with disabilities are particularly vulnerable to these exclusionary processes.⁶ They are engaged in the transition to adulthood, marked in our society primarily by educational attainment, employment, family formation and having a voice in the community. Sitting on the margins of or excluded from reaching satisfying outcomes in these important domains of adulthood can further entrench the disadvantage experienced in childhood, multiplying the likelihood of socially excluded status in adulthood.⁶

"The Australian Government's social inclusion agenda aims to make sure every Australian has the capability, opportunity and resources to participate in the economy and their community while taking responsibility for shaping their own lives"

(From A Stronger, Fairer Australia)

Current Australian government policy is to build a stronger, fairer nation.⁷ In order to measure progress toward this goal, Australia has developed an **Indicator Framework for Social Inclusion**.⁸ This tool contains 27 headline and 23 supplementary indicators. It is designed to identify where there may be significant shortfalls in achieving social inclusion and to monitor ongoing progress toward a more socially inclusive Australia.

This *Technical Report* describes the social inclusion of young disabled Australians using the above indicator framework for social inclusion in Australia.

METHOD

We analysed data extracted from Waves 1 (2001) to 11 (2011) of the annual survey of Household Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA:

http://melbourneinstitute.com/hilda/). Full details of HILDA are available in a series of technical reports and annual reports.^{9 10} Briefly, HILDA is a panel survey originating from a national probability sample of approximately 7,500 Australian households in 2001 (Wave 1). Continuing panel members include all panel members of Wave 1 households, any children subsequently born to or adopted by panel members and all new entrants to a household who have a child with an existing panel member. In addition, information is collected on temporary panel members (people who share a household with a continuing panel member. All household members aged 15 or above are invited to participate in a personal interview. The sample was replenished in 2011 with the inclusion of an additional 2,153 households.

IDENTIFICATION OF PARTICIPANTS WITH A SELF-REPORTED LONG-TERM HEALTH CONDITION, IMPAIRMENT OR DISABILITY

Participants were identified as having a long-term health condition, impairment or disability if they answered in the positive to a question '*Do you have any impairment, long-term health condition or disability such as these [shown list] that restricts you in your everyday activities and has lasted or is likely to last for 6 months or more?*⁴

The examples provided are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Examples provided of	"long-term condition.	impairment or disability"

Sight problems not corrected by glasses / lenses
Hearing problems
Speech problems
Blackouts, fits or loss of consciousness
Difficulty learning or understanding things
Limited use of arms or fingers
Difficulty gripping things
Limited use of feet or legs
A nervous or emotional condition which requires treatment
Any condition that restricts physical activity or physical work (e.g., back problems, migraines)
Any disfigurement or deformity
Any mental illness which requires help or supervision
Shortness of breath or difficulty breathing
Chronic or recurring pain
Long term effects as a result of a head injury, stroke or other brain damage
A long-term condition or ailment which is still restrictive even though it is being treated or
medication being taken for it
Any other long-term condition such as arthritis, asthma, heart disease, Alzheimer's disease,
dementia etc

INDICATORS

The Monitoring and Reporting Framework – Headline and Supplementary Indicators of Social Inclusion consists of 12 Domains under the three broad headings of Participation, Resources and Multiple Entrenched Disadvantage.⁸ For each of the first two broad headings there are a number of domains, each with at least one headline indicator and a varying number of supplementary indicators. Under Participation, there are four domains. These are: work; learn; engage (social participation); have a voice (political, civic, community participation). The domains within the Resources section are: material/economic resources; health and disability; education and skills; social resources; community and institutional resources; housing; and personal safety. In the final section, Multiple and Entrenched Disadvantage, there is only one domain of the same name.

Following the approach we developed using the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to understand the well-being of young disabled Australians,^{11 12} we identified items contained within Waves 1-11 of HILDA that could be employed as indicators of social inclusion identical to or very similar to the headline and supplementary indicators of social inclusion in the **Monitoring and Reporting Framework**. We identified 22 indicators in all, 12 of which correspond to headline indicators, 10 to supplementary indicators. Two indicators (multiple disadvantage and entrenched multiple disadvantage) include self-assessed health as one component in an overall index. Given the inherent association between health conditions or impairments and disability, we have presented two versions of these indicators, one including the health component, the other excluding it.

MEASURING SOCIAL INCLUSION OVER TIME

Our judgements of the social significance of trends in social inclusion over time were based on the strength of the non-parametric correlation coefficient between the year and group scores on the relevant indicator. To measure trends in the absolute social inclusion of both disabled and non-disabled Australians we use the percentage score for that particular group on each indicator. To measure trends in the relative social inclusion between disabled and non-disabled Australians we used a measure of the **relative** risk or disadvantage (the odds ratio) experienced by disabled people when compared to non-disabled people on each indicator. We followed convention by designating correlation coefficients greater than +0.4 or lower than -0.4 as evidence of 'strong' effects over time.¹³ It should be noted that these effects are not necessarily 'statistically' significant. That is, we cannot necessarily rule out with confidence that these changes could not have occurred due to chance fluctuations resulting from measurement or sampling error. However, it is being increasingly recognised in the health and social sciences that the social significance of patterns and associations are best estimated by consideration of their 'effect sizes' (as we have done here) than by their statistical significance.^{13 14}

RESULTS

Detailed results are provided in Table 2 (see Appendix).

THE EXTENT OF SOCIAL INCLUSION OF YOUNG DISABLED AUSTRALIANS IN 2011

Relative to their non-disabled peers, young disabled Australians in 2010 were significantly less likely to do well on indicators of **participation**. Full results are presented in Table 2 in the Technical Appendix.

They were less likely to:

- Be employed
- Be fully engaged in education or work
- Attain Year 12 or equivalent educational qualification
- Obtain non-school qualifications

They were more likely to:

- Live in a jobless household
- Experience long-term unemployment
- Experience low economic resources and financial stress/material deprivation

Relative to their non-disabled peers, young disabled Australians in 2011 were significantly less likely to do well on indicators of **resources**.

They were less likely to:

- Feel they have someone to turn to in time of crisis
- Have a voice in the community
- Have social contact with family or friends

They were more likely to:

- Have mental illness
- Have fair or poor health
- Have a lower subjective quality of life
- Feel unsafe in their local community
- Report being a victim of personal crime

The standout finding is that in 2011 young disabled Australians were *five times more likely* than their non-disabled peers to experience **long-term unemployment** and **entrenched multiple disadvantage**.

Entrenched multiple disadvantage Long-term unemployment Self-assessed health Multiple disadvantage Jobless households Mental illness Subjective quality of life Victim of personal crime Feelings of safety Low economic resources Employment Financial stress/material deprivation Support from family/friends in crisis Full engagement in education or work Year 12 or equivalent attainment Got together socially with family or friends Having a voice in the community Non-school qualifications Contact with family/friends Participation in community groups Victim of household crime Voluntary work 2 7 0 1 3 4 5 6 8

To demonstrate visually what this means for the situation of disabled young Australians in 2011, the extent of relative *social exclusion* is shown below in Figure 1 for the 22 indicators.¹

Figure 1: Social Exclusion of Disabled Young Australians 2011

¹ **Reading Figure 1:** The bars in Figure 1 show the risk for social exclusion experienced by disabled young Australians when compared to their non-disabled peers. The measure of risk used is the *odds ratio* (OR). An OR of one indicates that there is no difference between disabled and non-disabled young Australians. An OR of *less than one* indicates that disabled young Australians are *less* excluded than their non-disabled peers. An OR of *more than one* indicates that disabled young Australians are *more* excluded than their non-disabled peers. An OR of *more than one* indicates that disabled young Australians are *more* excluded than their non-disabled peers. An odds ratio of five, for example, indicates that the odds (chances) of exclusion are five times greater for disabled young Australians when compared to their non-disabled peers. The 'T' lines show the 95% confidence intervals for each risk estimate. That is, in 95% of instances the true level of risk will lie within these T-lines. If the T lines do not cross 1 (no difference) then the difference between disabled and non-disabled young Australians is considered *statistically significant*.

CHANGES IN THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL INCLUSION OVER TIME FOR YOUNG DISABLED AUSTRALIANS

It is obviously important to determine whether the social inclusion of disabled young Australians is increasing or decreasing over time. Between 2001 and 2011, the social inclusion of young disabled Australians **increased** over time on 10 of the 22 indicators including five headline indicators (in bold):

- Not living in an jobless household
- Achieving Y12 or Certificate II at school
- Not experiencing low economic resources and financial stress/ material deprivation
- Not experiencing low economic resources and financial strain
- Having better self-rated health
- Feeling safe in the community
- Not being a victim of household crime
- Not being a victim of personal crime
- Not experiencing multiple disadvantage
- Not experiencing entrenched multiple disadvantage.

At the same time, the social inclusion of young disabled Australians **decreased** over time on two of the 22 indicators including one headline indicator (in bold):

- Volunteering
- Having less contact with family and friends in the past week

While these improvements are to be welcomed, it was also the case that the social inclusion of non-disabled young Australians also increased on 14 (and decreased on 2) of the 22 indicators. Therefore we need to examine changes in *relative* social inclusion over time.

CHANGES IN THE GAP BETWEEN YOUNG DISABLED AUSTRALIANS AND THEIR NON-DISABLED PEERS OVER TIME

Did the gap in the social inclusion between disabled and non-disabled young Australians narrow or widen between 2001 and 2011? Over this period the *gap in social inclusion* between disabled and non-disabled young Australians *widened* on 13 indicators (including 8 of the 12 headline indicators):

- Being employed
- Living in a jobless household
- Being long-term unemployed
- Being fully engaged in work or education
- Volunteering
- Having low economic resources and financial stress
- Having mental illness
- Having lower subjective well-being
- Having someone to turn to in times of crisis

- Having a voice in the community
- Feeling safe in the community
- Multiple disadvantage
- Entrenched multiple disadvantage.

It narrowed in just three areas (including 2 of the 12 headline indicators):

- Attaining Y12 qualifications
- Being a member of a community organisation
- Being a victim of personal crime.

We have summarised Australia's progress in promoting the social inclusion of young Australians with disabilities between 2001 and 2011 in the following scorecard.

Social Inclusion Domain	Indicator (Shaded Cells = Headline Indicator)	D	ND	Ga p
Work	1. Employment rate			↑
	2. Jobless households	~	~	↑
	3. Long-term unemployment		~	▲
Learn	4. Young people fully engaged in education or work			<u> </u>
	5. Year 12 or equivalent attainment	~		Ŷ
Engage	6. Contacted family/friends	X	X	
	7. Participation in community groups		×	Û
Engage	8. Got together socially with family or friends			
	9. Voluntary work	X		♠
Material &	10. Low economic resources and financial stress/ material deprivation	~	~	↑
Economic Resources	11. Financial stress/material deprivation	~	~	-
Health	12. People with mental illness		~	♠
	13. Self-assessed health	~	~	
	14. Subjective quality of life		~	♠
Education & Skills	15. Non-school qualifications		~	
Social	16. Support from family/friends in time of crisis		~	♠
Resources	17. Autonomy—having a voice in the community		✓	♠
Personal	18. Feelings of safety	~	~	♠
Safety	19. Victim of personal crime	~		Ŷ
	20. Victim of household crime	~	~	
Multiple &	21. Multiple disadvantage	~	~	♠
entrenched disadvantage	22. Multiple disadvantage (excluding health)	~	~	↑
uisauvaillaye	23. Entrenched multiple disadvantage	~	~	Ť
	24. Entrenched Multiple disadvantage (excluding health)		~	Ť
✓ marked prog	ress X marked deterioration	reased	ł	

A SCORECARD OF AUSTRALIA'S PROGRESS IN PROMOTING THE SOCIAL INCLUSION OF YOUNG AUSTRALIANS WITH DISABILITIES: 2001-2011

CONCLUSIONS

While it is heartening to observe some trends in increasing social inclusion over time for young disabled Australians (e.g., in relation to being exposed to multiple disadvantage), the extent of their social inclusion over time *relative to their non-disabled peers* presents a different story. Despite social policy interventions with greater attention given to employment schemes for people in long-term unemployment, income support benefits for those experiencing financial hardship, and disability inclusive policies in community activities and organizations, the aspiration for young disabled Australians to become more socially included appears even further out of reach, with a widening gap between their life conditions and those of their non-disabled peers on eight of the twelve headline indicators:

- Being employed
- Being fully engaged in work or education
- Having low economic resources and financial stress
- Having mental illness
- Having someone to turn to in times of crisis
- Having a voice in the community
- Feeling safe in the community
- Multiple disadvantage

On only two of the headline indicators did the gap narrow:

- Attaining Y12 qualifications
- Being a member of a community organisation.

It is notable that the narrowing of the gap on being a member of a community organisation resulted from a more rapid decline in social inclusion on this indicator among non-disabled young Australians, rather than any evidence of increasing social inclusion.

Building on our previous analyses,¹² the analyses presented here confirm that despite the implementation of policies and services related to disability (and at a time when Australia led by example in the development and ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities which promotes social inclusion), this economically prosperous nation has yet to redress the significant and pervasive social exclusion founded on multiple and entrenched disadvantage faced by Australian adolescents and young adults with a self-reported long term health condition, disability or impairment.

The approach taken in this study utilized the social indicators framework developed by the Australian Social Inclusion Board. We successfully aligned indicators with items in HILDA, an easily accessible, robust national longitudinal panel survey of Australian households. Given the commitment of the Australian government to the equalization of opportunities for people with disabilities, this framework provides a useful tool to assist in monitoring the effectiveness of policy and service initiatives introduced under the social inclusion program to progress toward a

stronger and fairer Australia. The framework also offers an approach to monitor Australia's progress toward meeting the nation's obligations under the UNCRPD.

The results demonstrate how the common set of drivers of social exclusion noted in many studies worldwide play out in the lives of young Australians with a long term health condition, impairment or disability and at a critical point in their lives as they emerge into adulthood. These drivers include poverty, low income and income inequality, lack of access to the job market, poor educational outcomes, poor health and wellbeing, lack of access to social supports and networks, exclusion from services and discrimination. As noted in *A Stronger, Fairer Australia* report "These drivers are often inter-related. When they combine, they can have a compounding effect, deepening disadvantage and creating a vicious cycle that undermines people's resilience and reduces their ability to participate" (p. 5).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper uses unit record data from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey. The HILDA Project was initiated and is funded by the Australian Government Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) and is managed by the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research (MIAESR). The findings and views reported in this paper, however, are those of the authors and should not be attributed to either FaHCSIA or the MIAESR. This paper was produced under ARC Discovery Project DP0984936, *Improving the life chances of young disabled Australians*, 2009-2011.

REFERENCES

1. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities New York: United Nations, 2006.

2. World Health Organization and the World Bank. World Report on Disability. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2011.

3. Watson N, Thomas C, Roulstone A, editors. *Routledge Companion to Disability Studies*. London: Routledge, 2012.

4. Emerson E, Vick B, Rechel B, Muñoz I, Sørensen J, Färm I. Health inequalities and people with disabilities in Europe. Copenhagen: European Regional Office of the World Health Organization, in press.

5. Officer A, Groce NE. Key concepts in disability. Lancet 2009;374:1795-6.

6. Unicef. The State of the World's Children 2011: Adolescence - An Age of Opportunity. New York: UNICEF, 2011.

7. Commonwealth of Australia. A stronger fairer Australia. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 2009.

8. Australian Social Inclusion Board. Social Inclusion in Australia: How Australia is faring. Canberra: Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2010.

9. Summerfield M, Freidin S, Hahn M, Ittak P, Li N, Macalalad N, et al. HILDA User Manual -Release 11 Melbourne: Melbourne Institute, University of Melbourne, 2012.

10. Wilkins R, Warren D. Families, Incomes and Jobs, Volume 7: A Statistical Report on Waves 1 to 9 of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey. Melbourne: Unviversity of Melbourne, 2012.

11. Emerson E, Honey A, Llewellyn G. The Well-Being and Aspirations of Australian Adolescents and Young Adults with a Long-term Health Condition, Disability or Impairment Canberra: Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth, 2008.

12. Emerson E, Honey A, Madden R, Llewellyn G. The Well-Being of Australian Adolescents and Young Adults with Self-Reported Long-Term Health Conditions, Impairments or Disabilities: 2001 and 2006 *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 2009;44(1):37-53.

13. Dunst CJ, Hamby DW. Guide for calculating and interpreting effect sizes and confidence intervals in intellectual and developmental disabilities research studies. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability* 2012;37:89-99.

14. Wilkinson L, The Task Force on Statistical Inference. Statistical methods in psychology journals: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist* 1999;54:594-604.

APPENDIX: TABLE 2 - TRENDS IN SOCIAL INCLUSION

Social Inclusion Domain Work	Indicator (Shaded Cells = Headline Indicator) Employment rate:	D Not	2001 n=3,903 14.2% disabled 57% 69% 0.60***	2002 n=3,532 11.1% disabled 58% 71% 0.57***	2003 n=3,455 14.9% disabled 61% 72% 0.60***	2004 n=3,419 15.7% disabled 58% 74% 0.47***	2005 n=3,519 16.9% disabled 64% 74% 0.62***	2006 n=3,632 14.1% disabled 62% 73% 0.61***	2007 n=3,640 13.5% disabled 61% 75% 0.51***	2008 n=3,643 13.3% disabled 63% 74% 0.58***	2009 n=3,954 15.3% disabled 58% 71% 0.56***	2010 n=3,867 13.5% disabled 57% 72% 0.53***	2011 n=5,249 13.6% disabled 54% 72% 0.46***
	Employment / population ratio (15–29 years) ⁱ	OR/p CI	0.49- 0.72	0.46- 0.71	0.49- 0.73	0.39- 0.57	0.51- 0.76	0.49- 0.75	0.42- 0.61	0.38 0.47- 0.72	0.46- 0.68	0.33 0.43- 0.64	0.40 0.39- 0.55
	Jobless	D	18%	17%	17%	16%	13%	14%	13%	15%	16%	14%	16%
	households:	Not	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	6%	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%
	Percentage of persons living in jobless households	OR/p CI	2.68*** 2.10- 3.43	2.27*** 1.71- 3.02	2.33*** 1.80- 3.02	2.38*** 1.83- 3.11	2.17*** 1.64- 2.87	2.74*** 2.04- 3.67	2.86*** 2.19- 3.72	3.38*** 2.48- 5.59	3.10*** 2.36- 4.07	2.95*** 2.20- 3.96	3.47*** 2.72- 4.42
	Long-term	D	5%	6%	3%	6%	4%	3%	4%	2%	4%	4%	5%
	unemployment:	Not	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%
	Percentage of labour force continuously unemployed for last 12 months	OR/p CI	2.74*** 1.58- 4.74	2.77*** 1.62- 4.76	2.01* 1.01- 4.03	4.04*** 2.21- 7.40	3.04** 1.56- 5.92	3.13** 1.51- 6.49	2.36** 1.33- 4.20	3.21* 1.22- 8.42	2.99** 1.61- 5.57	2.99** 1.55- 5.80	5.20*** 2.88- 9.41

Learn	Young people	D	59%	62%	58%	58%	63%	55%	56%	61%	62%	62%	44%
	fully engaged in	Not	68%	66%	68%	66%	71%	71%	74%	73%	73%	71%	59%
	education or	OR/p	0.68**	0.84	0.64***	0.73**	0.70**	0.49***	0.46***	0.59***	0.61***	0.66**	0.56***
	work:	CI	0.55-	0.64-	0.51-	0.58-	0.56-	0.38-	0.37-	0.46-	0.48-	0.52-	0.46-
	WORK.		0.85	1.10	0.81	0.91	0.87	0.62	0.56	0.75	0.76	0.84	0.68
	Percentage of												
	15-24 year olds												
	fully engaged in												
	education and/or												
	work												
	Year 12 or	D	61%	57%	61%	73%	69%	64%	65%	64%	78%	71%	67%
	equivalent	Not	75%	75%	80%	79%	79%	79%	78%	79%	78%	78%	79%
	attainment:	OR/p	0.53***	0.45***	0.39***	0.71	0.59**	0.48**	0.51***	0.48***	1.02	0.69	0.56***
		CI	0.37-	0.29-	0.27-	0.47-	0.41-	0.33-	0.37-	0.32-	0.68-	0.47-	0.40-
	Percentage of		0.74	0.70	0.56	1.05	0.84	0.70	0.71	0.70	1.52	1.00	0.80
	20–24 year olds												
	attaining Year 12												
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·												
	or Certificate II												

Engage	Contacted	D	76%	72%	71%	71%	70%	66%	69%	72%	74%	62%	68%
	family/friends:	Not	79%	79%	80%	77%	76%	77%	77%	75%	78%	73%	73%
	•	OR/p	0.82	0.68**	0.60***	0.74*	0.76*	0.59***	0.68**	0.83	0.80	0.62***	0.77*
	Percentage of	CI	0.64-	0.51-	0.47-	0.57-	0.59-	0.45-	0.54-	0.62-	0.61-	0.49-	0.61-
	people aged 18		1.06	0.91	0.78	0.97	.097	0.76	0.86	1.12	1.05	0.80	0.97
	years and over												
	who contacted												
	family/friends in												
	past week												
	Participation in	D	36%	31%	36%	30%	28%	30%	35%	36%	33%	29%	34%
	community	Not	38%	39%	39%	39%	38%	34%	35%	38%	38%	31%	36%
	groups:	OR/p	0.90	0.71*	0.88	0.69**	0.65**	0.80	0.97	0.92	0.81	0.92	0.93
	gioups.	CI	0.72-	0.53-	0.69-	0.53-	0.50-	0.61-	0.78-	0.69-	0.63-	0.71-	0.74-
	Percentage of		1.13	0.93	1.12	0.89	0.83	1.04	1.21	1.21	1.04	1.19	1.16
	people aged 18												
	years and over												
	who were												
	involved in a												
	community group												
	in the last 12												
	months												

Engage	Got together	D	95%	96%	95%	96%	98%	95%	96%	97%	98%	95%	95%
	socially with	Not	98%	98%	98%	97%	97%	98%	99%	98%	98%	98%	97%
	socially with family or friends: Percentage of people who get together socially with friends or relatives not living with at least once every three months ⁱⁱ	OR/p CI	0.39*** 0.23- 0.66	0.53 0.27- 1.03	0.48* 0.27- 0.85	0.64 0.35- 1.18	1.61 0.68- 3.80	0.31*** 0.17- 0.60	0.31*** 0.17- 0.59	0.59 0.26- 1.36	0.93 0.41- 2.11	0.50* 0.27- 0.90	0.59 0.35- 1.01
	Voluntary work: Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who undertook voluntary work in past 12 months	D Not OR/p CI	15% 13% 1.16 0.85- 1.58	11% 9% 1.16 0.75- 1.79	14% 12% 1.12 0.79- 1.61	9% 11% 0.87 0.56- 1.35	10% 9% 1.07 0.73- 1.56	10% 11% 0.96 0.64- 1.43	11% 9% 1.25 0.89- 1.75	9% 10% 0.88 0.56- 1.41	10% 11% 0.90 0.60- 1.36	10% 11% 0.85 0.56- 1.28	10% 10% 0.99 0.69- 1.43

Material &	Low economic	D	17%	22%	17%	19%	16%	12%	17%	15%	13%	n/a	14%
Economic	resources and	Not	12%	11%	9%	9%	8%	7%	7%	6%	5%	n/a	6%
Resources	financial stress/	OR/p	1.58**	2.47***	2.14***	2.36***	2.04***	1.72**	2.64***	2.60***	2.66***	n/a	2.45***
	material	CI	1.22-	1.85-	1.61-	1.77-	1.52-	1.22-	2.00-	1.81-	1.88-		1.83-
	deprivation:		2.04	3.29	2.84	3.15	2.73	2.44	3.84	3.74	3.74		3.28
	deprivation.												
	Percentage of												
	population in												
	income poverty												
	(< 60% median												
	equivalised												
	household												
	income) and												
	,												
	hardship (one or												
	more out of												
	seven possible												
	items) ⁱⁱⁱ												
	Financial	D	55%	47%	45%	40%	38%	38%	42%	36%	33%	n/a	37%
	stress/material	Not	40%	32%	30%	27%	26%	26%	25%	22%	23%	n/a n/a	25%
		OR/p	1.82***	1.84***	1.86***	1.77***	1.77***	1.75***	2.23***	2.05***	1.72***	n/a	1.80***
	deprivation:	CI	1.50-	1.46-	1.51-	1.42-	1.43-	1.39-	1.83-	1.59-	1.37-	n/a	1.48-
			2.20	2.32	2.29	2.20	2.19	2.19	2.72	2.65	2.16		2.20
	Percentage of												
	population with												
	one or more out												
	of seven possible												
	financial stress /												
	deprivation												
	items ^{iv}												

Health	People with	D	24%	21%	25%	19%	22%	25%	23%	23%	23%	23%	21%
	mental illness:	Not	9%	8%	9%	10%	10%	9%	8%	8%	9%	8%	7%
		OR/p	3.12***	2.93***	3.20***	2.13***	2.70***	3.28***	3.51***	3.46***	3.16***	3.39***	3.43***
	Percentage of people with	CI	2.45- 3.97	2.17- 3.95	2.47- 4.14	1.61- 2.82	2.08- 3.50	2.51- 4.29	2.73- 4.50	2.57- 4.68	2.41- 4.13	2.60- 4.42	2.66- 4.42
	probable mental illness ^v												
	Self-assessed	D	27%	23%	21%	19%	21%	20%	20%	23%	16%	22%	19%
	health:	Not	5%	6%	6%	7%	6%	5%	5%	5%	4%	4%	5%
	Percentage of	OR/p Cl	7.57*** 5.78- 9.89	4.59*** 3.37- 6.26	4.11*** 3.09- 5.46	3.33*** 2.48- 4.47	4.59*** 3.44- 6.13	4.57*** 3.35- 6.24	4.35*** 3.31- 5.72	5.99*** 4.34- 8.26	4.32*** 3.10- 6.01	5.99*** 4.44- 8.09	4.84*** 3.67- 6.38
	population with fair or poor self- assessed health												
	Subjective	D	75%	78%	80%	78%	83%	75%	78%	80%	78%	79%	77%
	quality of life:	Not	88%	89%	90%	90%	89%	90%	91%	92%	90%	92%	91%
	Percentage of population	OR/p Cl	0.38*** 0.31- 0.48	0.44*** 0.33- .057	0.40*** 0.31- 0.52	0.39*** 0.30- 0.50	0.56*** 0.44- 0.73	0.33*** 0.26- 0.42	0.33*** 0.26- 0.41	0.36*** 0.28- 0.48	0.37*** 0.30- 0.48	0.36*** 0.28- 0.46	0.32*** 0.26- 0.40
	reporting overall satisfaction with their lives (score												
	7+ on 0-10 scale) ^{vi}												

8. Skills qualifications: DR/p Percentage of people aged 25- 29 years with non-school qualifications Not Cl L 1 62% 0.74 0.52 68% 0.86 67% 0.45*** 70% 0.58** 69% 0.98 67% 0.77 70% 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88 0.77 0.88* 0.54 0.51 0.51 0.51 0.51 0.89 0.41* 0.42* 0.42* 0.42* 0.42* 0.42* 0.42* 0.56 0.56 0.64** 0.64** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.56** 0.57* 0.57* 0.57* 0.57* <th>Education</th> <th>Non-school</th> <th>D</th> <th>62%</th> <th>61%</th> <th>66%</th> <th>49%</th> <th>55%</th> <th>56%</th> <th>66%</th> <th>63%</th> <th>63%</th> <th>64%</th> <th>62%</th>	Education	Non-school	D	62%	61%	66%	49%	55%	56%	66%	63%	63%	64%	62%
Social Percentage of people aged 25- 29 years with non-school qualifications D.74+ Cl 0.73 0.74+ 1.39 0.93 0.74+ 0.74+ 1.39 0.93 0.82+ 0.81 0.56* 0.62+ 0.81 0.98}{0.77} 0.77 0.66+ 0.52+ 0.52+ 0.62+ 0.52+ 0.54+ 0.77 0.68+ 0.52+ 0.77 0.68+ 0.52+ 0.77 0.68+ 0.52+ 0.52+ 0.52+														
Percentage of people aged 25- 29 years with non-school qualifications Ci 0.52- 1.39 0.62- 1.31 0.62- 0.81 0.62- 0.81 0.62- 0.79 0.62- 1.34 0.62- 1.12 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.19 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 1.08 0.62- 0.81 0.62- 1.08 0.67- 0.81 0.67- 0.84 0.68- 0.64- 0.44- 0.45- 0.72 0.79 0.79 0.79 0.74- 0.67+ 0.61^{**} 0.67+ 0.61^{**} 0.66^{***********************************		4	OR/p	1.01	0.73	0.93	0.45***	0.59**	0.56**	0.98	0.77	0.86	0.77	0.68**
29 years with non-school qualifications Image: Social problem Support from time of crisis: Image: Social problem Support from shape (1) Support from shape (1		-												
qualifications Image: second sec														
Resources family/friends in time of crisis: Not 83% 84% 86% 87% 0.61** 0.60*** 0.61*** 0.60*** 0.41*** 0.60*** 0.41*** 0.61** 0.61** 0.61** 0.41*** 0.60*** 0.41*** 0.61** 0.43** 0.43** 0.72 0.79 0.57 0.92 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.77 0.77 0.77 0.77 0.77 0.77														
Resources family/friends in time of crisis: Not 83% 84% 86% 87% 0.61** 0.60*** 0.61*** 0.60*** 0.41*** 0.60*** 0.41*** 0.61** 0.61** 0.61** 0.41*** 0.60*** 0.41*** 0.61** 0.43** 0.43** 0.72 0.79 0.57 0.92 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.77 0.77 0.77 0.77 0.77 0.77	Social	Support from	D	75%	80%	78%	78%	77%	74%	79%	75%	81%	78%	76%
time of crisis: OR/p Cl 0.63*** 0.49- 0.81 0.61** 0.49- 0.81 0.61** 0.49- 0.82 0.64** 0.46- 0.45- 0.73 0.60*** 0.41- 0.72 0.64** 0.46- 0.30- 0.79 0.67* 0.46- 0.30- 0.57 0.67* 0.49- 0.43- 0.92 0.67* 0.43- 0.43- 0.77 0.67* 0.43- 0.72 0.67* 0.44- 0.45- 0.79 0.67* 0.46- 0.30- 0.57 0.67* 0.49- 0.49- 0.57 0.68** 0.43- 0.77 0.72 Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who feel that they have someone to turn to in crisis** D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 56% 59% Autonomy— having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 61% 57% 61% 68% 69% 66% 69% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 68% 69% 66% 69% 66% 0.63*** 0.52- 0.54* 0.42*** 0.72** 0.56*** 0.63*** Cl 0.66*** 0.73** 0.75* 0.81 0.67* 0.54 0.45 0.52- Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local														
Autonomy- having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 0.84 0.43- 0.72 0.43- 0.79 0.43- 0.79 0.43- 0.57 0.43- 0.57 0.43- 0.92 0.43- 0.77 0.43- 0.72 0.43- 0.79 0.43- 0.57 0.43- 0.57 0.43- 0.92 0.43- 0.77 0.72 0.79 0.79 0.57 0.92 0.77 0.72 0.79 0.57 0.92 0.77 0.72 0.79 0.57 0.92 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.79 0.72 0.79 0.57 0.99 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.72 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.79 0.77 0.79 0														
Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who feel that they have someone to turn to in crisis ^{vii} D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 56% 59% Autonomy- having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 61% 67% 69% 66% 69% 60% 69% 60% 69														
people aged 18 years and over who feel that they have someone to turn to in crisis ^{vii} D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 56% 59% Autonomy- having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 61% 67% 68% 69% 66% 68% 69% 66%		Dereentere of		0.81	1.08	0.82	0.73	0.79	0.72	0.79	0.57	0.92	0.77	0.72
years and over who feel that they have someone to turn to in crisis ^{vii} D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 56% 59% Autonomy— having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 67% 49% 59% 56% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66% 69% 66%		-												
who feel that they have someone to turn to in crisis ^{vii} D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 59% 59% Autonomy— having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 61% 67% 69% 66% 69% 69% 65% 66% 65% 66%<														
they have someone to turn to in crisis ^{vii} D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 56% 59% Autonomy— having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 61% 67% 69% 66% 66% <		-												
someone to turn to in crisis ^{vii} D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 59% 59% Autonomy— having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 56% 59% Not 61% 64% 65% 66% 64% 65% 68% 69% 66% 69% 60% 69% 60% 69% 60% 69% 60% 69% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60% 60%														
to in crisis ^{vii} Image: second														
Autonomy having a voice in the community: D 50% 57% 59% 57% 61% 57% 49% 59% 59% 59% Not 61% 64% 65% 66% 64% 65% 68% 69% 66% 69% 0.63		someone to turn												
having a voice in the community: Not 61% 64% 65% 64% 65% 68% 69% 66% 69% 69% In the community: OR/p Cl 0.66*** 0.73** 0.76* 0.73** 0.75** 0.84 0.62*** 0.42*** 0.72** 0.56*** 0.63*** Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local 0.81 0.93 0.95 0.91 0.93 0.61- 0.76* 0.		to in crisis ^{vii}												
having a voice in the community: Not 61% 64% 65% 64% 65% 68% 69% 66% 69% 69% In the community: OR/p Cl 0.66*** 0.73** 0.76* 0.73** 0.75** 0.84 0.62*** 0.42*** 0.72** 0.56*** 0.63*** Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local 0.81 0.93 0.95 0.91 0.93 0.61- 0.76* 0.		Autonomy—	D	50%	57%	59%	59%	57%	61%	57%	49%	59%	56%	59%
OR/p community: 0.66*** CI 0.73** 0.53- 0.81 0.76* 0.57- 0.93 0.73** 0.58- 0.95 0.75** 0.61- 0.93 0.84 0.67- 1.06 0.62*** 0.51- 0.76 0.42*** 0.33- 0.54 0.72** 0.58- 0.58- 0.69 0.63*** 0.52- 0.69 Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local 0.76* 0.71** 0.93 0.91 0.93 1.06 0.62*** 0.51- 0.76 0.42*** 0.54 0.72** 0.58- 0.58- 0.69 0.63*** 0.52- 0.69 0.63*** 0.52- 0.76		-												
community: CI 0.53- 0.81 0.57- 0.93 0.61- 0.95 0.61- 0.95 0.61- 0.93 0.67- 0.93 0.51- 0.76 0.53- 0.54 0.45- 0.89 0.45- 0.69 0.52- 0.76 Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local Image: Classic constraints of the constraints of th		_								0.62***				
Percentage of people aged 18 years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local			CI											
people aged 18 years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local		community.		0.81	0.93	0.95	0.91	0.93	1.06	0.76	0.54	0.89	0.69	0.76
people aged 18 years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local		Porcontago of												
years and over who report being satisfied in belonging to their local		-												
who report being satisfied in belonging to their local														
satisfied in belonging to their local														
belonging to their local		• •												
local														
community ^{viii}														
		community ^{viii}												

Personal	Feelings of	D	22%	19%	13%	13%	12%	14%	11%	12%	10%	11%	14%
Safety	safety:	Not	11%	9%	7%	6%	7%	6%	5%	5%	4%	4%	6%
		OR/p	2.33***	2.32***	2.02***	2.51***	1.84***	2.69***	2.19***	2.87***	2.76***	3.12***	2.54***
	Percentage of	CI	1.79-	1.69-	1.44-	1.76-	1.32-	1.88-	1.58-	1.94-	1.89-	2.14-	1.89-
	people aged 18		3.05	3.19	2.82	3.59	2.58	3.84	3.03	4.26	4.04	4.55	3.42
	years and over												
	who feel unsafe												
	in their local												
	community ^{ix}												
	Victim of	D		10%	7%	7%	5%	6%	6%	7%	3%	4%	5%
	personal crime:	Not		3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%
		OR/p	-	3.55***	3.20***	2.89***	1.74*	2.88***	2.36**	2.47**	1.51	2.43*	2.65***
	Percentage of	CI		2.17-	1.91-	1.68-	1.02-	1.64-	1.43-	1.40-	0.77-	1.30-	1.54-
	people aged 18			5.80	5.36	4.95	2.97	5.04	3.89	4.35	2.96	4.56	4.56
	years and over												
	who report												
	having been the												
	victim of violence												
	in last year ^x												
	Victim of	D	-	12%	10%	7%	7%	6%	8%	6%	7%	4%	5%
	household	Not	_	10%	8%	8%	7%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
	crime:	OR/p		1.29	1.16	0.81	1.02	0.94	1.61*	1.09	1.40	0.77	1.07
		CI		0.86-	0.78-	0.50-	0.66-	0.56-	1.05-	0.61-	0.87-	0.42-	0.67-
	% of people			1.92	1.72	1.31	1.59	1.57	2.45	1.95	2.27	1.42	1.72
	aged 18+												
	reporting being												
	victim of property												
	crime in last												
	year ^{xi}												

Multiple &	Multiple	D	16%	16%	13%	12%	14%	14%	10%	17%	7%	8%	12%
entrench-	disadvantage:	Not	5%	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%
ed	Ū	OR/p	3.65***	4.54***	3.21***	3.31***	4.93***	5.03***	4.40***	8.88***	3.44***	5.12***	5.39***
disadvant- age	Three or more of six selected	CI	2.62- 5.10	3.03- 6.81	2.18- 4.72	2.19- 5.01	3.30- 7.38	3.31- 7.66	2.92- 6.63	5.61- 14.06	2.05- 5.76	8.62	3.65- 7.97
	areas of												
	disadvantage												
	(covering												
	income, work,												
	health,												
	education, safety												
	& support) ^{xii}												
	a supporty												
	Multiple	D	11%	10%	8%	8%	8%	10%	6%	12%	6%	4%	8%
	disadvantage (excluding	Not	4%	3%	3%	4%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%
		OR/p	2.70***	3.30***	2.70***	2.39***	3.41***	4.89***	3.22***	9.07***	3.82***	3.34**	4.13***
	health):	CI	1.85-	2.04-	1.70-	1.49-	2.08-	2.98-	1.97-	5.22-	2.09-	1.73-	2.59-
	nourinj.		3.96	5.31	4.31	3.85	5.60	8.03	5.28	15.78	6.99	6.47	6.57
	Three or more of	D		9%	7%	8%	12%	16%	6%	14%	8%	4%	5%
	five selected areas of	Not		2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
	disadvantage	OR/p		4.81***	4.93***	4.24***	7.19***	12.62***	6.68***	9.77***	5.89*	5.87***	6.87***
	(covering	CI		2.57-	2.42-	1.96-	3.37-	5.19-	2.11-	3.14-	1.28-	2.56-	3.14-
	income, work,		-	9.00	10.05	9.14	15.35	30.70	21.12	30.40	27.06	13.45	15.03
	education, safety	D		4%	5%	5%	7%	8%	3%	14%	7%	3%	4%
	& support, but excluding health)	Not		2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
		OR/p		2.44*	3.90**	2.75*	4.15**	9.96***	3.85	14.73***	5.92*	5.62**	7.10***
		CI		2.44	3.90 1.71-	1.16-	4.15	9.90 3.19-	0.91-	4.14-	1.29-	2.15-	2.91-
				5.51	8.91	6.65	10.05	31.15	16.34	52.38	27.19	14.69	17.30

Multiple &	Entrenched	D	9%	7%	8%	12%	16%	6%	14%	8%	4%	5%
entrench-	multiple	Not	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
ed disadvant- age	disadvantage: As above for 2 consecutive	OR/p CI	4.81*** 2.57- 9.00	4.93*** 2.42- 10.05	4.24*** 1.96- 9.14	7.19*** 3.37- 15.35	12.62*** 5.19- 30.70	6.68*** 2.11- 21.12	9.77*** 3.14- 30.40	5.89* 1.28- 27.06	5.87*** 2.56- 13.45	6.87*** 3.14- 15.03
	years Entrenched Multiple	D Not	4% 2%	5% 1%	5% 2%	7% 2%	8% 1%	3% 1%	14% 1%	7% 1%	3% 1%	4% 1%
	disadvantage (excluding health):	OR/p CI	2.44* 1.08- 5.51	3.90** 1.71- 8.91	2.75* 1.16- 6.65	4.15** 1.71- 10.05	9.96*** 3.19- 31.15	3.85 0.91- 16.34	14.73*** 4.14- 52.38	5.92* 1.29- 27.19	5.62** 2.15- 14.69	7.10*** 2.91- 17.30
	As above for 2 consecutive years											

D = Disabled young people

Not = Non-disabled young people

OR = Odds ratio

CI = Confidence interval

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

i. ASIB indicator is age range 15-64

ii. ASIB indicator is 'in the last three months'

iii. ASIB indicator yet to be defined

iv. ASIB indicator based on 5 or more out of 15 items

v. ASIB indicator also based on employment rate of people with mental health problems

vi. ASIB indicator uses variety of scales and reporting methods

vii. ASIB indicator based on support from 'persons living outside the household'

viii. ASIB indicator based on people reporting that 'they have a say in the community on issues that are important to them'

ix. ASIB indicator based on 'feeling unsafe at home alone or in their local community at night (excluding family violence)'

x. ASIB indicator based on set of specific crimes

xi. ASIB indicator based on set of specific crimes

xii. Some minor changes made to two of the constituent indicators

CENTRE FOR DISABILITY RESEARCH AND POLICY General Enquiries T +61 2 9351 9721 E disabilitypolicy.centre@sydney.edu.au

sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/cdrp

FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES



Produced by the Faculty of Health Sciences, the University of Sydney, February 2013. The University reserves the right to make alterations to any information contained within this publication without notice.

ABN 15 211 513 464 CRICOS 00026A