

MAPPING THE POTENTIAL

Understanding persistent disadvantage to inform community change



MAPPING THE POTENTIAL: Understanding persistent disadvantage to inform community change, preliminary research report is published by Catholic Social Services Australia, in partnership with twenty-one of its member agencies.

ISBN: 978-0-6487748-6-0 (print) 978-0-6487748-9-1 (electronic)

© Catholic Social Services Australia

GPO Box 1947 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia

Email: admin@cssa.org.au Website: www.cssa.org.au

This publication is copyright. Except as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part of this publication may be reproduced by any process, electronic or otherwise, without permission in writing of Catholic Social Services Australia. Neither may information be stored in any form whatsoever without such permission. Any queries should be addressed to Catholic Social Services Australia.

The majority of this report was prepared by Professor Brenton Prosser and Gabriel Helleren-Simpson for CSSA.

Chapters 4 and 5 are the product of separate analysis conducted by the Australian National University Centre for Social Research Methods through a consultancy agreement with CSSA. These chapters were prepared and written by Associate Professor Ben Phillips and Dr Cukkoo Joseph.

This report was independently peer reviewed by Professor Robert Tanton of NATSEM (University of Canberra). Bill Laing and his team at Giraffe Design were responsible for document design and layout. Graphic design was provided by Anna Dixon.

Project management was undertaken by Brenton Prosser.

This report should be cited as follows: Prosser, B. and Helleren-Simpson, G. 2020. (eds). Mapping the Potential: Understanding persistent disadvantage to inform community change, preliminary research report, Catholic Social Services Australia (CSSA): Canberra.

The ANU CSRM analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 can be cited in the form:

Phillips, B. 'Chapter 4: Implementing the Method'/ 'Chapter 5: Detailed Results', in Prosser, B. and Helleren-Simpson, G. 2020. (eds). *Mapping the Potential: Understanding persistent disadvantage to inform community change, preliminary research report*, Catholic Social Services Australia (CSSA): Canberra. Catholic Social Services would like to acknowledge the following project partners. Without their financial and human resource support this project would not have been possible.





1



























J MercyCare











Contents

Project Partners1					
Fo	orev	vord .		6	
E	xecı	itive	Summary	8	
Α	bou	t this	Report	9	
In	troc	luctio	on	. 10	
1	Thi	s Pro	ject in Context	11	
	1.1	What	is this project about?	. 12	
		1.1.1	Promoting community capacity building	12	
		1.1.2	Tackling the systemic challenges of disadvantage	13	
		1.1.3	Recent interest in spatial mapping of disadvantage	14	
		1.1.4	Helping governments to support community capacity building	15	
		1.1.5	Summary: supporting individual dignity and community capability	16	
	1.2	What	is within the scope of this project?	. 16	
		1.2.1	Our definitions reflect the applied approach taken in this project	16	
		1.2.2	Our scope is applied, informative and local	16	
		1.2.3	Summary: what did we do?	16	
	1.3	What	will success look like?	. 17	
		1.3.1	Fostering potential in place-based approaches	17	
		1.3.2	Supporting effective decision-making at multiple levels	18	
		1.3.3	Strengthening local partnerships and enabling communities	18	
		1.3.4	Summary: taking the first step	18	
	1.4	Abou	t this report	. 19	
		1.4.1	Structure of this report	19	
		1.4.2	How will this report be used?	19	
2	Un	derst	anding the Challenge	.20	
	2.1	Conv	entional representations in disadvantage research	. 21	
		2.1.1	A historical perspective	. 22	
		2.1.2	Poverty and economic perspectives	23	
		2.1.3	Disadvantage and community perspectives	24	
		2.1.4	A growing interest in mapping disadvantage	. 25	
		2.1.5	The risk of stigmatisation	. 26	
		2.1.6	Summary: contributions and challenges for disadvantage research	27	

	2.2	The foundations of our research approach	27
		2.2.1 Building on over sixty years of sector experience	27
		2.2.2 Partnering with leading academics in the field	28
		2.2.3 Leveraging this experience to inform our research design	28
		2.2.4 Summary: the approach taken in this project	28
3	Ade	opting an Applied Approach	29
	3.1	Our conceptual frame	30
		3.1.1 Understanding the challenges with data, disadvantage and deficit views	30
		3.1.2 Responding to the challenges through design thinking	.31
		3.1.3 Summary: a 'flipped' approach to persistent disadvantage research	32
	3.2	The importance of coproduction	32
		3.2.1 Our approach to coproduction	32
		3.2.2 Reporting the outcomes of our coproduction process	33
		3.2.3 Summary: the benefits of coproduction	34
	3.3	Delivering an applied methodology	34
		3.3.1 The methodological sequence	34
		3.3.2 Summary: why this methodology?	36
	3.4	Sharing the findings without reinforcing the constraints	36
		3.4.1 Avoiding the risk of reinforcing stigma for communities	36
		3.4.2 Applying a direct, staged and tailored approach with key audiences	37
		3.4.3 Summary: communicating for decision-making and capacity building	38
4	Imp	plementing the Method	39
	4.1	Overview	40
	4.2	Approach	40
		4.2.1 Indexes	.41
		4.2.2 Principal Component Analysis	.41
		4.2.3 Disadvantage Drivers	.41
	4.3	Reliability of results	47
	4.4	Limitations of the method	48
	4.5	Summary	48

3

5	Detailed Results	49			
5.1	Overview	51			
5.2	Detailed results				
	5.21 National themes	51			
	5.2.2 Electorate and party results	52			
	5.2.3 Regional results	53			
5.3	State and territory results	54			
	5.3.1 New South Wales	54			
	5.3.2 Queensland	58			
	5.3.3 Victoria	61			
	5.3.4 Rest of Australia	64			
5.4	Summary	69			
Looki	ng Forward	70			
Influ	iential texts	71			
Appe	ndices	72			
Арр	endix A – List of indicators	72			
Арр	Appendix B – Tables of electorate results				
Арр	endix C – Key Terms	91			
Index		94			

Figures and Tables

Figure 1	Drivers of persistent disadvantage	7
Figure 2	Understanding the influences persistent disadvantage individual	30
Figure 3	Understanding the influences persistent disadvantage collective	.30
Figure 4	The design thinking approach that frames this project	31
Figure 5	The coproduction model adopted in this project	33
Figure 6	Overview of stakeholder engagement	37
Figure 7	Example of an electoral boxplot	. 50
Figure 8	CSSA All Index Disadvantage, by electorate	51
Figure 9	Box plot of SA2 distributions for major political parties	. 52
Figure 10	Map of Disadvantage Index in the NSW and Greater Sydney electorates	54
Figure 11	Disadvantage Index in Greater Sydney at the electorate level	. 55
Figure 12	Disadvantage Index in Rest of NSW/ACT at the electorate level	57
Figure 13	Map of Disadvantage Index in Queensland and Brisbane electorates	58
Figure 14	Disadvantage Index in Brisbane at the electorate level	. 59
Figure 15	Disadvantage Index in Regional Queensland at the electorate level	. 60
Figure 16	Map of Disadvantage Index in Victorian electorates	61
Figure 17	Boxplots of overall disadvantage for Greater Melbourne	. 62
Figure 18	Boxplots of overall disadvantage for regional Victoria	63
Figure 19	Map of Disadvantage Index in Perth electorates	64
Figure 20	Disadvantage Index box plots in Greater Perth at the electorate level	. 65
Figure 21	Map of Disadvantage Index in Adelaide electorates	. 66
Figure 22	Disadvantage Index box plots in Greater Adelaide at the electorate level .	67
Figure 23	Disadvantage Index box plots for Rest of Australia at the electorate level	68
Table 1	Methodological sequence and timing	34
Table 2	Economic disadvantage variables	42
Table 3	Education disadvantage variables	43
Table 4	Health disadvantage variables	44
Table 5	Social disadvantage variables	45
Table 6	Overall CSSA Disadvantage Index	46
Table 7	Correlation matrix: ABS SEIFA Disadvantage Index and CSSA Indexes	47
Table 8	Summary of SA2 based Index results for CSSA regions	53
Table 9	List of Round 1 (current) and Round 2 (intended) variables	72

Foreword

At a time when many Australians are concerned about the widening gap between rich and poor *Mapping the Potential* makes an important contribution to understanding persistent disadvantage and how we might work towards tackling it.

Mapping the Potential is about potential more than it is about poverty, and about modelling as much as it is about measuring. By looking at how Australians may experience disadvantage, beyond the economic dimension, we have been able to provide a much richer understanding of disadvantage and how we might impact it.

Mapping the Potential compliments our previous research, with Jesuit Social Services *Dropping off the Edge 2015.* However, this new research is driven directly by the local needs of our member organisations – addressing the underlying drivers of disadvantage present in the communities they serve.

Mapping the Potential investigates four drivers of persistent disadvantage; economic, education, health and social, and weights each driver for relative influence.

Rather than ranking locations like beads on a string, this approach allows us to make objective assessments of each location's level of disadvantage in each driver and compare it to the average.

The methodology was co-designed by the Australian National University's Centre for Social Methods and 21 Catholic Social Services Australia member project partners. It uses SA2 level (suburb) data for its nationwide analysis. The findings in this report are aggregated up to electorate.

In providing such rich information about persistent disadvantage, its make-up and location, we have the capacity to drive service provider capability to tackle persistent disadvantage in a very tailored way – opening up opportunities so that all Australian communities might reach their potential. By examining the findings in this research we are able to support decision making at the right level, in the right place by the right people in a way that works best for communities.

Mapping the Potential is nation building, increasing the capacity of service providers to drive Australia's effort to impact the prosperity and potential of individuals and their communities across the nation.

As a nation we must do this - to drive towards a society that reflects and supports the dignity, equality and participation of all people.

I thank our project partners for their commitment and collegiality to this research and to this ongoing project.

Dr Ursula Stephens

CEO, Catholic Social Services Australia 2020

Defining the drivers of persistent disadvantage Figure 1 Drivers of persistent disadvantage © ECONOMIC PERSISTENT DISADVANTAGE OCIAL

7

This project is interested in the presence of long-term disadvantage in Australian communities. While 'intergenerational disadvantage' tends to be used to refer to individuals and families, 'persistent disadvantage' is often used to describe regions. For the purposes of this project, we define 'persistent disadvantage' as below the national average of disadvantage score results drawing on selected 2011 and 2016 data.

This project is not only interested in where persistent disadvantage occurs, it also wants to know what keeps it persistent. Our method groups variables into four disadvantage 'driver' categories that have been weighted for relative influence. These four drivers of persistent disadvantage are: economic, education, health and social. The variables within each of these drivers can be found in Section 4.2.3.



The **Economic** driver relates to relative disadvantage in monetary and economic opportunity terms. In Australia this is often understood in terms of low income or welfare. This driver aligns closest to the term 'poverty'.



The **Education** driver relates to relative disadvantage in terms of development for school-aged children and draws from the Australian Early Development Census. This disadvantage can be experienced in terms of illiteracy or early school leaving. In Australia, this driver is often equated with future unemployment.



The **Health** driver relates to relative disadvantage in terms of physical wellbeing. In Australia, disadvantage due to chronic illness and disease is often associated with obesity and old age. This driver can be understood in terms of impairment.



The **Social** driver captures disadvantage due to potential for marginalisation. In Australia, Indigenous, ethnic, single parent or non-English speaking status can be key factors. One way to think of this is in terms of social exclusion.

Executive Summary

This report will help decision-makers at every level understand the complexities of persistent disadvantage in Australia. It will support them to deliver effective community-based responses.

Long-term disadvantage, intergenerational welfare and poverty are major public issues in Australia. The gap between rich and poor features often in the lists of top concerns. Increasingly, research measures the depth and distribution of disadvantage. Yet, the real challenge is not just knowing the size and location of disadvantage, it is knowing what to do about it.

This project takes up this challenge. Its goal is to support community-led responses to community-based needs. It will help local service providers to partner in local action. Its contribution will be to target innovation and investment to where it is needed most.

However, the first step to finding solutions is defining the problem. That is the role of this preliminary research report. The following pages identify drivers of disadvantage in every Australian electorate. It also identifies which are most influential on persistent disadvantage in each.

There are few surprises in the national findings in this report. This is not surprising in a project that focuses on local action. However, some national trends are worth noting.

Eighty per cent of federal electorates have some people experiencing persistent disadvantage. All regional electorates do. On average, National Party seats are the most persistently disadvantaged in Australia.

In the handful of electorates with least disadvantage, the gap between richest and poorest is narrow. In most other electorates, even the poorest, it is wide. This suggests that across much of Australia, rich and poor live nearby.

Of any metropolitan city, Adelaide struggles most with persistent disadvantage. Perth and Sydney struggle least. Brisbane has Australia's widest range of results across its electorates. While Sydney outperforms the rest of Australia, it also has the widest spread of suburbs around its city average.

Of the nine national regions that are considered, regional Victoria experiences the most overall disadvantage in Australia.¹ Every Tasmanian electorate was below the national average for persistent disadvantage. Every ACT electorate was above.

Examination of our 'drivers' of persistent disadvantage also identifies different trends. Considering the range of drivers in regional New South Wales, health is the strongest. Social disadvantage is powerful in parts of the Northern Territory. Across all of Queensland, educational disadvantage is the greatest challenge.

These findings should prompt discussion amongst Australian policy leaders and decision-makers. The findings also highlight the potential for local leaders to target areas where policy, investment and services are needed most.

This preliminary report is part of a broader project that focuses on informing local community action and change. The mapping in this report points to locations where targeting these drivers has potential for new service responses. It does so with the ultimate objective of a fairer and more inclusive society that maximises the immense potential within every Australian community.

¹ Our regional reporting groups electorates into the five largest capital cities, regional NSW, Victoria and Queensland, as well as the rest of Australia (see Chapter 4).

About this Report

Over the last thirty years, research interest in poverty, inequality and disadvantage has grown. Much of this focused on the plight of individuals. Most has adopted a 'top down' perspective.

The *Mapping the Potential: Understanding persistent disadvantage to inform community change* project aims to support community-specific responses to community-based challenges. It adds a 'ground up' view to the existing body of research. It is a project that is about knowing what to do where in a way that is useful for those involved in service delivery.

Twenty-one members of Catholic Social Services Australia (CSSA) coproduced the method with academics from the Australian National University Centre for Social Research Methods (CSRM). The result is a project that draws on the practice and place-based expertise of social service providers. It combines this with recent advances in statistical categories and microsimulation analysis.

What makes this project unique is an approach that involves social service providers at every step from research design, to reporting and response. The result will support practical decision-making by policy-makers, service providers and community leaders. In doing so, it shifts the focus from mapping disadvantage to helping communities know how to respond.

This is not the first Australian study to explore disadvantage. Many previous studies have defined disadvantage in terms of poverty and wealth inequality. While important, that is not the approach taken in this project. We take the view that relative disadvantage extends beyond purely economic factors. This offers a level of complexity that will make sense to those working in the field.

This project is also unique in its approach to persistent disadvantage. While the definition of 'long-term', 'entrenched' and 'persistent' varies in past research, this project uses the SA2 (suburb) category for its nation-wide analysis. This allows us to define 'persistence' as presence in a SA2 (suburb) across a range of 2011 and 2016 Census data. Our use of the SA2 (suburb) category also incorporates suburb-based welfare service data. This information will be important for future policy, practice and place-based responses.

This preliminary report is the first output from this project. It relies on CSRM analysis of every Australian suburb, while it reports by state, territory and federal electorate. The decision to report in this way reduces the potential for suburbs to be singled out for negative stereotyping. This is because our ultimate goal is to help communities address the factors that hold back their potential.

The above approach, while new, is also reliable. It draws on the economic microsimulation expertise of the CSRM. Both the method and results in this preliminary report have been peer reviewed by the University of Canberra National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling (NATSEM).

The next step of this project will be a second round of analysis by CSRM with a wider range of variables and additional population projections. This will also be conducted at the suburb (SA2) level. These results will be released to project partners and decision-makers in May 2020. They will feed into the third phase of the project. Here, project partners will share results with local communities to design community responses and inform service planning.

Introduction

For over twenty-five years, Australia experienced an unprecedented period of economic growth.² While the living standards of most Australians have improved over this time, not all have shared equally in this growth. While the Australian experience is not as extreme as that seen in developing nations, the relative impact of disadvantage is real in communities. When this disadvantage is long-term, persistent and intergenerational, it is not only a significant barrier to social wellbeing and economic participation, it also undermines national productivity and the economy.³

Public awareness of disadvantage and inequality has also grown over the last three decades. Concern about the gap between rich and poor features regularly in polls of the top issues for Australians. There has also been ongoing public debate about what inequality is, how it should be measured, and how much it matters. Recently, the notion of a growing gap between rich and poor, as well as a direct relationship between high levels of disadvantage and reduced economic productivity, have been hotly contested. This topic continues to attract diverse views in public debate.

Meanwhile, the majority of scholarly work in the field produces data that measures rather than models. Much of the evidence work from advocacy groups confirms set policy positions. Recent years have also seen an expansion of online resources that map the location of disadvantage 'hotspots'.⁴ While each of these make their own important contribution, they do little to help with the practical challenge of how to respond.

This project makes a new offer for decision-makers. That is why this project is applied in its focus. It draws on the practice expertise and place-based knowledge of local service providers to coproduce an approach that unpacks the complexity of lived experience with persistent disadvantage. The result is a method that identifies drivers of disadvantage so that decision-makers can have greater confidence in their planning.

Our primary aim is to support positive impact in local communities through better decision-making at every level. This is pursued via three key objectives:

- Practice and place-based: to draw on the expertise of partners across the Catholic social services network to provide a real-world perspective and applied approach with persistent disadvantage;
- 2. Supports decision-making: to provide the right information in the right way to support decision-making at every level (from policy design to service delivery);
- 3. *Minimises negative stigma:* to make every effort to minimise the potential for negative stereotyping of communities through the use and reporting of its findings.

In doing so, this project makes important new contributions through:

- the first nationally consistent analysis of persistent disadvantage by suburb (SA2);5
- a broad range of indicators that have been developed with the practice and place-based expertise of service providers;
- the inclusion of health, education and welfare service data by suburb (SA2) to allow consideration
 of local need and service accessibility.

Based on this data, a key outcome is to devise, innovate and design practical ways to tackle the stubborn challenge that persistent disadvantage presents to communities across the nation.

² O'Brien, G., C. (2019). 27 years and counting since Australia's last recession. <u>https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/</u> Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/BriefingBook46p/LastRecession

³ Cingano, F. (2014), Trends in Income Inequality and its Impact on Economic Growth, *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers*, No. 163, OECD Publishing, Paris, <u>https://doi.org/10.1787/5jxrjncwxv6j-en</u>.

⁴ E.g., Community Insight Australia. https://communityinsightaustralia.org/

⁵ Note: while the widest dataset for persistent disadvantage is sought, some data (such as Indigenous status) is not included in measures of persistence because it cannot change over time (see Chapter 4).

THIS PROJECT

1.1	What	is this project about?	12
	1.1.1	Promoting community capacity building	12
	1.1.2	Tackling the systemic challenges of disadvantage	13
	1.1.3	Recent interest in spatial mapping of disadvantage	14
	1.1.4	Helping governments to support community capacity building	15
	1.1.5	Summary: supporting individual dignity and community capability	15
1.2	What	is within the scope of this project?	16
	1.2.1	Our definitions reflect the applied approach taken in this project	16
	1.2.2	Our scope is applied, informative and local	16
	1.2.3	Summary: what did we do?	16
1.3	What	will success look like?	17
	1.3.1	Fostering potential in place-based approaches	17
	1.3.2	Supporting effective decision-making at multiple levels	18
	1.3.3	Strengthening local partnerships and enabling communities	18
	1.3.4	Summary: taking the first step	18
1.4	Abou	t this report	19
	1.4.1	Structure of this report	19
	1.4.2	How will this report be used?	19



1.1 What is this project about?

Every day, right across Australia, community leaders, social service providers and individuals partner to achieve amazing things. But they face barriers. When these barriers are persistent and long-term, it is because they are held in place by structures and systems. They are not the result of individual misfortune or choices alone.

This is important to recognise because recent evidence suggests that disadvantage is becoming more persistent. A 2018 Productivity Commission report found around ten per cent of Australians experience economic disadvantage at some stage of their life.⁶ The same 2018 report identified that for three percent of Australians, economic disadvantage lasted longer than three years. When considering the last two *Dropping Off the Edge* (DOTE) reports, we see regions registering high levels of disadvantage in both 2007 and 2015 studies.⁷ Such findings suggest significant and long-term place-based challenges around social cohesion, mobility and intergenerational disadvantage.

Decades of place-based expertise tell us there is no 'one size fits all' response to disadvantage in Australia. We are a large and disparate nation. The combination of causes of disadvantage can vary from one place to the next. Thus, research that maps disadvantage by location is critically important. Equally important is considering the different drivers that make it persistent. Analysis of these different drivers will assist policy makers and service providers to understand different suburb's needs and to plan targeted responses. Such knowledge informs effective funding, astute infrastructure investment and smarter service portfolio design.

Practice expertise also tells us that not everyone experiences disadvantage in the same way. Academic evidence suggests the same.⁸ A range of individual, familial, community, cultural, social or economic factors may shape the disadvantage experience of any one family or individual. Due to these factors, an initiative that is successful in one place or with one group may not transfer to another. That is why it is important to work with local communities to draw on their expertise to help improve potential success. In our view, collaboration with place-based providers is essential for research that seeks to build community capacity.

This project draws on the experience of service providers and the expertise of academics to coproduce its research. It offers insight into which drivers of persistent disadvantage limit local potential and contribute to it being long-term. In doing so, it provides new information for leaders at all levels to make decisions that support community capability building.

1.1.1 Promoting community capacity building

The terms 'regional capacity building' and 'community capability building' have their origins in thinking around sustainable development.^{9, 10} This thinking emphasises the need for community engagement with projects that deliver the maximum social, economic and environmental benefit for communities over the long term. At the core of these ideas is the observation that our most valuable resources (our people, our communities and our environment) can be exploited for economic progress. By contrast, a sustainable approach argues for stronger and more respectful connections between these resources to unlock the potential within them. It also argues that often this potential is constrained by systemic imbalances, which results in inadequate opportunity, inequality or

⁶ Productivity Commission. (2018). *Rising inequality? A stocktake of the evidence*. Commission Research Paper, Canberra. https://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-inequality

⁷ Vinson, T. (2007). Dropping off the Edge: the distribution of disadvantage in Australia, Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia: Richmond; Vinson, T., Rawsthorne, M., Beavis, A., Ericson, M., (2015). Dropping off the edge: Persistent communal disadvantage in Australia; Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia. https://dote.org.au/

⁸ Howard-Wagner, D. (2019). Success in Closing the Socio-Economic Gap, But Still a Long Way to Go: Urban Aboriginal Disadvantage, Trauma, and Racism in the Australian City of Newcastle. *International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 10(1); Temple, J. B., Kelaher, M., & Williams, R. (2018). Discrimination and avoidance due to disability in Australia: Evidence from a National Cross Sectional Survey. *BMC Public Health*, 18.

⁹ Capacity-building: Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. (n.d.). <u>https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/</u> capacity-building

Labonte, R. (1999). Social capital and community development, *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 23 (4), 430–433; Prosser, B., Lucas, B., & Reid, A. (2010). Introduction. *Connecting lives and learning: Renewing pedagogy in the middle years*. Wakefield Press: Adelaide.

disadvantage. Such views inform a philosophy within social services that emphasises working with people and communities to reduce the barriers that they face.

It is exactly this view of social services that is shared by the provider partners in this project. For over sixty years, Catholic social service agencies have been working towards an Australian society where the dignity, equality and participation of all people is supported. It is for this reason that Catholic social service agencies in each of the dioceses that span Australia, have established and embedded themselves as a vital part of the life of local communities. Over the decades, this network has built extensive specialist, practice, place-based and client-focused expertise. Their focus is on delivering quality services in an effective manner by using their local knowledge.

From this experience, the Catholic social services network knows first-hand the passion and potential in every community across Australia. Our locally-embedded members know this because it is their close partnerships with their communities that enables them to implement existing services and introduce innovative new programs. This means they are confident in the pride, determination and potential of individuals, families and communities. This experience also tells us that people and communities who face adversity can sometimes find a way to break through, but this will not be the case for everyone. Too often, systemic constraints get in the way. That it is why our network continues to seek to work with governments, communities and other service providers to address system barriers. And while we maintain the view that a postcode should not be used to predict one's destiny, we are also realistic about the significance and power of regional and place-based disadvantage.

1.1.2 Tackling the systemic challenges of disadvantage

The systemic factors that shape how people enter poverty, experience disadvantage and remain there for extended periods are well documented in the literature. Prominent themes include the systemic drivers of disadvantage, the compounding nature of disadvantage factors, the powerful influence of deficit stereotypes and restraints on community capacity building. Each of these are introduced briefly below.

Disadvantage has its roots in a complex interplay of factors. The probability that any one person will experience disadvantage is influenced by family circumstances, community opportunities, broader economic conditions, government policy and social contexts. For over sixty years, it has been recognised that disadvantage in Australia is inseparable from inequalities that are firmly entrenched in our social structure.¹¹

For many Australians, disadvantage occurs in different forms at different times of life, but for a significant number this is not a short-term proposition.¹² Some individuals may move into or out of disadvantage, while others may move away, but for many communities the challenges that they face may not change. In fact, identifying the relative experience of disadvantage across communities is an important tool to understanding how inequality manifests itself to constrain local potential. It is such a perspective that this project adopts.

Many of these individual, community, social and economic determinants of disadvantage, when combined, can have a compounding effect.¹³ Past research tells us that when people experience disadvantage, it is often in multiple forms.¹⁴ This multiplies need and can inhibit their exit from disadvantage.¹⁵ For instance, Miranti & Yu investigated the factors that socially exclude older people

¹¹ Australian Government (1975). *Poverty in Australia*, First Main Report April, Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, AGPS, Canberra, p. viii.

Productivity Commission (2018). *Rising inequality? A stocktake of the evidence*. Commission Research Paper, Canberra, p.4.
 McLachlan, R., Gilfillan, G. and Gordon, J. (2013). *Deep and Persistent Disadvantage in Australia*, Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper, Canberra, p.2; Choi, E., Tang, F., & Copeland, V. C. (2017). Racial/Ethnic Inequality Among Older Workers: Focusing On Whites, Blacks, and Latinos Within the Cumulative Advantage/Disadvantage Framework. Journal of Social Service Research, 43(1), 18–36.; Scutella, R., Wilkins, R., & Kostenko, W. (2013). Intensity and persistence of individuals' social exclusion in Australia. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*; Sydney, 48(3), 273–298,272.

¹⁴ Seabrook, J. A., & Avison, W. R. (2012). Socioeconomic status and cumulative disadvantage processes across the life course: Implications for health outcomes. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 49(1), 50–68. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-618x.2011.01280.x</u>; Russell, J., Grant, C. & Morton, S. (2017). Cumulative socioeconomic disadvantage increases the risk of multi-morbidity in early childhood. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 53(S3), 5. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/jpc.13572_5</u>

¹⁵ Cruwys, T., Berry, H., Cassells, R., Duncan, A., O'Brien, L., Sage, B., & D'Souza, G. (2013). *Marginalised Australians: Characteristics and predictors of exit over ten years 2001-10*. University of Canberra: Canberra.

in Australia to find that disadvantage factors were cumulative in nature.¹⁶ Further, Sun et al. drew on the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children to show how low socioeconomic position can compound the experience of health and education disadvantage for youth.¹⁷

Finding solutions to the compounding nature of disadvantage in communities is difficult. However, it is made even more difficult through the stereotyping of communities or individuals.¹⁸ Negative media reports can present an additional burden on communities. The way we speak about different people and communities can shape not only beliefs about those people and communities, but also their actions. The literature on this is clear: public words are powerful.¹⁹

There are also practical challenges faced by those who would seek to work with communities to reduce the constraints presented by persistent disadvantage. Often programs, funding and reporting are siloed into particular government departments and do not assist integration or coordination around individual needs. It is also rare for policy design to draw on local expertise or allow for flexibility in delivery. Meanwhile, data collection is usually framed around national policy priorities, which provides useful contextual insights, but is rarely detailed enough for local decision-making. And then there is the perennial challenge of collecting information in a form that can be aggregated to the national level, while maintaining the rich descriptive information to inform improved practice or service delivery. All of these factors make it difficult for communities and their service providers to access the evidence they need to tailor local responses.

Finally, there are the restraints presented by the nature of disadvantage itself. One of these is people's lack of trust in government.²⁰ Communities that experience disadvantage are disproportionately studied, scrutinised and stigmatised. They have been the target of multiple initiatives by different levels of government, many with short-term funding and no certainty of continuing. Individuals, professionals and communities can be reluctant to put their trust, change their practices or recruit staff for initiatives that are not certain to continue. Then there is the challenge, as is explored in this project, that communities face in the intersecting and constraining impact of different drivers of disadvantage.

1.1.3 Recent interest in spatial mapping of disadvantage

There has been a steadily growing interest in studies that explore disadvantage in Australia. Broadly, methods fall into three categories. One group defines disadvantage in strictly economic terms and explores the characteristics of individuals who experience poverty. A second group uses location as the primary unit of analysis and seeks to identify patterns of economic disadvantage across communities. A third group expands the definition of disadvantage to include a range of economic and non-economic factors, as well as consider the persistence of these forms of disadvantage over time. This project belongs to the third group.

Each of these approaches have their advantages and limitations. They should not be viewed in competition. Rather, their different perspectives add to the richness of understanding about how disadvantage impacts on communities. They also make different contributions to policy, professional and public debate. For instance, studies that focus on the relationship between affordable housing and levels of poverty provide insight into the potential impact of policy changes around income support and rent assistance.^{21, 22} Conversely, studies that look at a wide range of economic,

¹⁶ Miranti, R., & Yu, P. (2015). Why social exclusion persists among older people in Australia. Social Inclusion, 3(4), 112-126.

¹⁷ Sun, Y., Mensah, F. K., Azzopardi, P., Patton, G. C., & Wake, M. (2017). Childhood social disadvantage and pubertal timing: a national birth cohort from Australia. *Pediatrics*, 139(6): e20164099.

¹⁸ Reeves, A., & Vries, R. de. (2016). Does media coverage influence public attitudes towards welfare recipients? The impact of the 2011 English riots. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 67(2), 281–306; Best, R. (2010). Situation or Social Problem: The Influence of Events on Media Coverage of Homelessness. *Social Problems*, 57(1), 74–91. JSTOR; Towner, T., & Munoz, C. L. (2016). Boomers versus Millennials: Online Media Influence on Media Performance and Candidate Evaluations. *Social Sciences*; Basel, 5(4), n/a.

¹⁹ van der Wal, J., Grace, R., & Baird, K. (2017). It Takes More Than 'Just Scratching the Surface': The Perspectives of Young People on Living in a Disadvantaged Community. *Children Australia*, 42(4), 256–267.

²⁰ Basson, M., Rensburg, H. van, Cuthill, M., & Erdiaw-Kwasie, M. O. (2018). Is regional government-governance nexus delivering on social sustainability promises? Empirical evidence from Moranbah in Australia. *Local Government Studies*, 44(6), 826–847.

²¹ Kelsey-Sugg, A., & Matters, E. N. (2020). Too privileged, too bogan: How "postcode prejudice" affects rich and poor. https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-01-17/postcode-stigma-and-suburb-shaming-in-australia/11802786

²² Davidson, P., Saunders, P., Bradbury, B. & Wong, M. (2020). Poverty in Australia, 2020. ACOSS/UNSW Poverty and Inequality Partnership Report No. 3, Sydney: ACOSS. <u>http://povertyandinequality.acoss.org.au/</u>

educational, health and ecological factors give more insight into the compounding nature of different forms of disadvantage and the importance of systemic change.²³ This project takes this one step further by using the expertise of professionals working at the coalface to produce data to support service provider and local community decision-making.

There are a number of limitations that past spatial and mapping studies share. There has been inconsistency in the units of analysis within and between studies. However, the introduction of the SA2 (suburb) unit by the ABS has provided a new way to address these inconsistencies. This project adopts the SA2 (suburb) category as the key unit for its analysis. The benefit of this approach is that it provides the first nationally consistent assessment of persistent factors in disadvantage across Australia. Its limitation is that this project excludes a range of variables that were not available at SA2 (suburb) level.

Another limitation shared by mapping studies is that data relates to an average in a geographic region and does not necessarily describe each individual within it. This is called the 'ecological fallacy'.²⁴ A further feature of past mapping studies is the alignment of single variables with broad disadvantage categories. However, the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) adopted in this project provides a richer view by combining several variables into driver scores.²⁵ This can show their relative contribution to overall assessments of persistent disadvantage. Hence, this approach not only identifies prominent disadvantage drivers in a region, but also potentially helps decision-makers to know which of these drivers is more influential. More detail on this is provided in section 4 of this report.

It is also important to highlight several features that are due to adopting a coproduction approach with project partners. Coproduction differs from usual consultation practices because project partners are included as decision-makers in research design, reporting and response. In this project, representatives of the 21 partners worked with CSRM academics to coproduce key elements of the method. This relied on partners identifying everyday factors that contribute to persistent disadvantage. It is an 'applied' approach to research in the sense that it is informed by the practice experience of partners. It contrasts with 'pure' studies, which draw on academic convention with a focus on peer-reviewed publication. Both the design and communication of this research has been undertaken with the aim of providing useful information in a form that is most accessible for those who need to apply it. This is because one of the objectives of this approach is to provide additional data to complement existing information and expertise in a way that supports practical decision-making.

1.1.4 Helping governments to support community capacity building

Policy leaders, system designers and social service providers recognise that they need better data to inform their decision-making and support community capacity building. While provider information around persistent disadvantage is powerful, there is also a need to complement this with other forms of data. In this project, practice expertise has supported statistical analysis to produce data that seeks to provide greater confidence in decision-making. Whether the outcomes of this approach confirm or contradict existing views, either contributes to more constructive professional discussion and policy decision-making. Further, when combined with welfare service mapping, it can inform planning and decision-making by providers around service delivery and infrastructure investment.

What local community leaders, including social service providers, recognise is the immense potential in their communities. No suburb in Australia is immune to the challenges of disadvantage. But no suburb is without its own amazing stories of success. What these leaders also realise is that the influence of some forms of disadvantage consistently undermine the potential success of groups in their community. That is why a strong emphasis in this project is practitioner involvement in the design, analysis, meaning-making and application of its results.

Ultimately, the intention of this project is to create an approach that does not just measure disadvantage, but one that gives key stakeholders at different levels greater confidence in deciding how to respond.

²³ Vinson, T., Rawsthorne, M., Beavis, A., Ericson, M., (2015). Dropping off the edge: Persistent communal disadvantage in Australia; Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia. <u>https://dote.org.au/</u>

²⁴ Price-Robertson, R. (2011). What is community disadvantage? Understanding the issues, overcoming the problem. https://aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/what-community-disadvantage-understanding-issues-ov

²⁵ The term 'driver' in this context refers to driving component results, it does not refer to causally driving disadvantage (see Section 1.2.1).

1.1.5 Summary: supporting individual dignity and community capability

The shared knowledge, experience and expertise across the Catholic social services network has informed the decision to undertake this project. It provided the basis for a decision to not only map persistent disadvantage, but also unpack its complexity in a way that better supports local action. Importantly, it does not seek to list Australia's poorest suburbs because we do not believe that this is either realistic or fair. Rather, it supports communities, and the individuals within them to identify areas where we might collectively clear the way for them to promote their dignity, capacity and capability.

1.2 What is within the scope of this project?

In this section, we provide an overview of the definitions, scope and approach of this project.

1.2.1 Our definitions reflect the applied approach taken in this project

The key distinction between the definitions adopted in this project and many others in this space is that they are intended to be applied. As a result, we do not engage with the debate around the relative advantages of different definitions or method. Our starting point (and focus throughout) is what would produce the most useful and accessible information for decision-making by political, policy, provider and local leaders.

Our project partners called for a broad definition of disadvantage based on their practice expertise. For us, disadvantage is any relative deprivation against the national average for that indicator. This definition is ordered according to economic, educational, health and social groupings of measures. As our interest is where disadvantage is more persistent, our results are returned from data across the period 2011 to 2018 (with particular focus on 2011 and 2016 Census data). A fuller discussion of the definitions applied in this project can be found in section 2.1.

1.2.2 Our scope is applied, informative and local

The origins of the project came from a request from CSSA members for more information to inform their decision-making around service delivery, infrastructure investment and program design. Our approach started by listing all the factors that our service provision partners identified as relevant to their decision-making. Inevitably, not all these factors had readily accessible variables (particularly at SA2 level), but those that have been obtained represent a step forward in the range of practical information available at the service provision level.

These gaps in data, along with the process of modelling (which approximates rather than replicates), means that the results from this project are generative rather than predictive. The method of combining variables into drivers produces relative results, not a single cause of persistent disadvantage in a region. Further, the choice to use SA2 (suburb) data means that there are not always enough data points at SA2 (suburb) level to provide relative weighting of each variable to the driver and overall disadvantage score. Instead, the relative weighting of individual variables can be compared and considered against the national average.

In short, the findings of this project are not causal. This project will not produce a finding that says that a particular policy initiative will fix poverty in an area; that is not the intention. Instead, it considers persistent disadvantage as inter-related phenomena that require systemic advocacy and local understanding to shape effective response in local communities.

1.2.3 Summary: what did we do?

Throughout 2019, CSSA joined with 21 of its members to commission research by the ANU CSRM with a new focus on the drivers of persistent disadvantage. It is intended that that this new data can be applied to give greater confidence for community decision-making.

1.3 What will success look like?

This project is the first step in a longer project of work. It is a contribution to a much larger project by Catholic social service providers working across Australia. After more than sixty years of service, our project partners have strong links with their local communities, as well as the vulnerable groups within them. Each day, new examples of partnership, innovation and capacity building emerge across the network. Ultimately, the success of this project will reside in the potential of the information it produces to inform, influence and empower their ongoing work.

17

1.3.1 Fostering potential in place-based approaches

An associated outcome of this project is to prompt reflection on the current prominence of place-based approaches to poverty. In the 2000s, a range of projects emerged that linked place-based approaches to community capacity building.²⁶ At the time, the focus was on engagement of citizens, particularly through closer links between these communities and their environment. Since that time, there has been a shift in place-based approaches in Australia. Increasingly, they have been linked to regions of deep disadvantage.²⁷

Increasingly, Australian governments at federal, state and territory levels recognise that groups in particular places face more persistent challenges than others. The Commonwealth's *Stronger Places, Stronger People* is one example of a federal program supporting place-based initiatives where government and communities collaborate in efforts that are targeted to address disadvantage.²⁸ This initiative aims to interrupt the intergenerational cycle of disadvantage that is concentrated in particular communities around Australia.²⁹ It provides important additional support for local communities that face complex challenges and it has a clear emphasis on working alongside local strengths, needs and opportunities.

Another example is the *Try, Test and Learn Fund,* which supports innovative approaches to work with vulnerable groups (many of whom experience various forms of disadvantage and are dependent on welfare).³⁰ Similar examples of these sorts of approaches can be found across Australian jurisdictions. Where this project supports such government initiatives is the potential to identify which particular needs are more prevalent in what areas. This can support the targeting of place-based initiatives or can identify locations for piloting initiatives under social impact investment approaches.

However, such initiatives target communities with the deepest need and serve to highlight that 'place-based' has become synonymous with poverty within Australian policy thinking. This project does not accept this premise. That is why this research looks at the range of disadvantage factors that are present in *every* Australian suburb. That is why our data reporting identifies persistent disadvantage and our project response will be to assess the constraint placed on all communities. As the title of the project suggests, this project aims to map the locations that hold most potential for community-based responses to persistent disadvantage. The data from CSRM in this first phase of research identifies relative drivers of disadvantage, so that CSSA and project partners can work with communities to develop plans to address them. Hence, one of the long-term measures of success for this project will be the renewal of place-based approaches as part of civic engagement, sustainability and capacity building for all communities.

²⁶ see Prosser, B., Lucas, B., & Reid, A. (2010). Introduction. *Connecting lives and learning: Renewing pedagogy in the middle years*. Wakefield Press: Adelaide.

²⁷ Byron, I. (2010). Place-based approaches to addressing disadvantage: linking science & policy. https://aifs.gov.au/publications/family-matters/issue-84/placed-based-approaches-addressing-disadvantage

²⁸ Department of Social Services. (2019). Families and Children: Stronger Places, Stronger, People. https://www.dss.gov.au/families-and-children-programs-services/stronger-places-stronger-people

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Department of Social Services. (2019). Try, Test, and Learn Fund. <u>https://www.dss.gov.au/review-of-australias-welfare-system/australian-priority-investment-approach-to-welfare/try-test-and-learn-fund</u>

1.3.2 Supporting effective decision-making at multiple levels

A second success factor for this project will be to support good decision-making and new service partnerships across the nation. As a result, the reporting from this project will occur in two ways.

Fist, all data and analysis from CSRM will be provided to project partners in Excel form to inform local activity. It is intended that this data will be used to review existing programs, identify gaps in service profiles, support business model development and guide infrastructure investment. Partners will have all data and analysis in an accessible form, which will also allow them to drill down around local areas of current and emerging interest. A key measure of short-term success will be the level of utilisation of the dataset by project partners in the months following its release.

Second, findings around regional and national trends will also be made available to support decision-making by policy and political leaders. These findings will be aggregated to state, territory and electorate levels to inform considerations. Hence, a measure of medium-term success for this project will be the use of data in expanded public and political engagement around persistent locational disadvantage.

1.3.3 Strengthening local partnerships and enabling communities

Fundamental to our approach is the principle of subsidiarity, which is about decisions being made at the right level, in the right place, by the right people and in the right way. Implicit in this view is the belief that the '*right*' approach incorporates the expertise of those ultimately affected by service and policy decision-making. This means that marginal and vulnerable groups need to be included. To facilitate this, materials will be produced to share the results with local communities in a way that builds strengths and supports advocacy. The purpose of this approach is to help social service leaders to draw on their local knowledge and expertise to plan, design and partner in new responses. The expansion of such initiatives in the years after this data is released will be a long-term measure of success for this project.

1.3.4 Summary: taking the first step...

This project is a first step in an ambitious long-term project. Across its two phases it delivers new data about a range of drivers that contribute to persistent disadvantage. Importantly, this project does not end with this first step. This project has also been designed to inform and guide ongoing practical decision-making. Future steps, both within the project and beyond, aim to result in new service provision, stronger partnerships with communities and new targeted responses to address the constraints to community capacity building.

1.4 About this report

This report provides a preliminary, high-level, national overview. It does this through reporting on the prevalence and relative influence of different disadvantage drivers. Importantly, it reports its data according to groupings that are natural to political and policy decision-makers, including federal electorate, state and territory. In doing so, it aims to raise awareness in the lead up to the release of SA2 (suburb level) data to providers and communities in mid–2020.

1.4.1 Structure of this report

This report is structured in six main sections.

Section 1 provides a general introduction to the project, its objectives and the role of this report within them. This provides the general reader with a clear overview of the main components of this project.

In **Section 2**, our underlying understanding of the challenges associated with persistent disadvantage is examined. This reports a range of perspectives on the challenges, the particular approach taken by this project and why this approach is the best to respond to these challenges. This part covers a range of topics that will be relevant to the reader with an interest in disadvantage policy and research.

Section 3 describes the design and methodology of the project. It outlines not only what was done and why it was done, but also the coproduction processes that significantly shaped the nature of the work. An important aspect of Section 3 is how advice from partners, sector leaders and consumer advocates 'flipped' the framing of the project to emphasise potential not deficit. This section will be of interest to those involved in coproduction as part of research and service design.

In **Section 4**, an overview of the statistical method is presented. Produced and written by the research team at the CSRM, it provides specific detail on the design, implementation and limitations of the analysis. It also provides an overview of the approach to Principal Component Analysis applied in this project. This section will be of interest to others involved in spatial mapping of disadvantage research, as well as those working in the field of Principal Component Analysis.

Section 5 sees the CSRM research team present the key findings of their work on identifying the relative drivers of persistent disadvantage. In doing so, they provide a national view of prominent, regional trends and electorate results grouped by state and territory. It also reports on important variations in federal electorates across different jurisdictions.

Section 6 concludes this report by looking forward to the next stages and future potential of the project.

1.4.2 How will this report be used?

The launch of this report will be followed by a series of meetings with political and policy leaders throughout the first part of 2020. These meetings will discuss early SA2 (suburb) data within electorates, as well as share first-hand accounts of the potential, opportunities and challenges in communities. These discussions will lay the ground work for collaborative and targeted responses after the release of the full dataset in May 2020.

2 UNDERSTANDING THE CHALLENGE

2.1	Conventional representations in disadvantage research				
	2.1.1	A historical perspective	22		
	2.1.2	Poverty and economic perspectives	23		
	2.1.3	Disadvantage and community perspectives	24		
	2.1.4	A growing interest in mapping disadvantage	25		
	2.1.5	The risk of stigmatisation	26		
	2.1.6	Summary: contributions and challenges for disadvantage research	27		
2.2	The f	oundations of our research approach	. 27		
	2.2.1	Building on over sixty years of sector experience	27		
	2.2.2	Partnering with leading academics in the field	28		
	2.2.3	Leveraging this experience to inform our research design	28		
	2.2.4	Summary: the approach taken in this project	28		



2.1 Conventional representations in disadvantage research

Over the last decade, there has been significant public, policy and political debate about what inequality is, how it should be measured, and how much it matters.

For many in Australia, the terms poverty and disadvantage are framed in terms that emphasise the role of personal choice or circumstance. In these terms, low-income individuals are seen to rely on the social security system when they could be employed in meaningful work. This view remains influential. A recent ABC survey found that fifty per cent of Australians believed that if people worked hard enough they can get out of poverty.³¹

Others understand poverty and disadvantage as the result of systemic or structural inequality.³² Those working with people at the frontlines of poverty services agree. They say that the notion that hard work alone can lift everyone out of poverty is naïve and misleading.³³

Such perspectives continue to be hotly contested in public debate. In the words of the Productivity Commission, this topic 'continues to draw diverse and competing views'.³⁴ This project notes these debates, but chooses not to engage with them.

Rather, we look to research that focuses on a more widely shared national concern – that of persistent disadvantage. A recent Parliamentary inquiry into intergenerational reliance on welfare found many complex factors at work, while no single explanation, factor, or mechanism links the outcomes of generations.³⁵ It also noted that most people exit poverty swiftly, creating a significant churn around inequality.

In line with this, our focus is on the impact of persistent disadvantage. It looks beyond individual churn to the systemic factors that keep some communities in disadvantage over the long-term. It argues that the solution to this policy problem extends beyond the individual and that governments, policy leaders, service providers and communities all have a part to play.

A note on definitions

There is no official measure of poverty in Australia. Traditionally, poverty has been measured in terms of relative income. These measures are comparisons with the average situation of other individuals and families across the nation. Poverty is often used to describe the people in a society that cannot participate in the activities that most people take for granted.³⁶

Previously, researchers have used different percentages of median or average income to estimate poverty lines, while some also adjust for housing costs.³⁷ There has also been growing interest in poverty gaps, which have been defined as the difference between the poverty line and a person's weekly income³⁸, or the amount of money needed to lift people back above the poverty line.³⁹ In the review of research that follows, these poverty focused approaches have been grouped together as 'economic' perspectives.

Traditionally, disadvantage has been equated with poverty in Australia. However, it was increasingly recognised that disadvantage took a range of forms beyond the purely economic. In this view,

- 36 ACOSS. (2020). Poverty in Australia. http://povertyandinequality.acoss.org.au/poverty/
- 37 Ibid.

³¹ Aedy, R. (2019). The Money: Inequality and Poverty in Australia. <u>https://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/themoney/inequality-and-poverty/11681612</u>

³² ACOSS. (2015). Disadvantage is entrenched and structural in poorest communities. <u>https://www.acoss.org.au/media_release/disadvantage-is-entrenched-and-structural-in-poorest-communities/</u>

³³ Janda, M. (2019). The Money: Is hard work enough to lift anyone out of poverty? This question divides the nation. <u>https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-11-11/wealth-inequality-and-poverty-australia-talks/11685264?pfmredir=sm</u>

³⁴ Productivity Commission (2018). *Rising inequality? A stocktake of the evidence*. Commission Research Paper, Canberra, p. 1. https://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-inequality/rising-inequality.pdf

³⁵ Parliament of Australia. (2019). Living on the Edge. <u>https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House/</u> Former_Committees/Intergenerational_Welfare_Dependence/IGWD/Final_Report

³⁸ Davidson, P., Saunders, P., Bradbury, B., & Wong, M. (2020). Poverty in Australia, 2020. ACOSS/UNSW Poverty and Inequality Partnership Report No. 3, Sydney: ACOSS. <u>https://www.acoss.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/ACOSS</u> <u>Poverty-in-Australia-Report_Web-Final.pdf</u>

³⁹ Parliament of Australia. (2002). The poor in Australia: who are they and how many are there? <u>https://www.aph.gov.au/</u> About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/Publications_Archive/archive/poverty

disadvantage emerges out of the intersection between diverse social factors (such as education, health, crime, etc.) and the cultural/environmental context (such as place, community histories, ecology, etc.).⁴⁰ Analysts with this perspective note that identifying reliable variables and collecting rich data on the diverse range of indicators is complex (and not always possible). However, they argue that this approach provides a much more rigorous and realistic understanding of the true nature and lived experience of disadvantage. Such approaches have been grouped as 'community' perspectives in this section. It is on this second tradition of research that this project draws.

More recently, the notion of disadvantage has been expanded further, mainly as a critique of traditional economic and welfare perspectives.⁴¹ Informing this range of new perspectives are concepts such as social capital, social inclusion, social exclusion, social participation and isolation, as well as strength-based and capabilities perspectives. While the development of this project is informed by these perspectives, they are beyond the scope of the data available in this analysis. However, in future stages of this project, it is intended to pursue opportunities where the data in this report can complement other research to inform these broader perspectives.

Over the last few years, there has also been a dramatic growth in the number of studies that map disadvantage in Australia. Some of these focus on long-term locational disadvantage. This study is similar in its focus on mapping persistent disadvantage. However, our definition relates to a suburb's presence in ABS Censuses over five years. This differs from other definitions of more than three years⁴² or over a decade.⁴³ Further, our approach seeks to not only identify where different forms of disadvantage are persistent, but also to know what to do in a way that is useful for those working at the coalface of support.

The advantage of mapping approaches is that they can inform national policy and regional program planning. However, a risk of such mapping, when shared in the public sphere, is that it can feed negative representations of regions in the media or increase community stigma in and around suburbs. These issues are discussed later in this section. However, we commence with a brief history of disadvantage research in Australia.

2.1.1 A historical perspective

In his important piece, Peter Saunders provides a flavour of the Australian poverty debate to 1998.⁴⁴ In it, he locates the origins of policy thinking about poverty and wages.

Early in the 20th century, a ruling by Justice Higgins (that costed the basic needs of families) laid the foundation for subsequent work in this field. A Royal Commission on the Basic Wage in 1919 identified Higgins' original estimation about the monetary needs of families might have been 50 per cent lower than needed. This led advocate Seebohm Rowntree to argue the benefits of providing men (sic) with a basic wage to alleviate the *'material anxiety'*.⁴⁵ The theme was taken up again in the 1950s, where the Rowntree method was used to estimate poverty by comparing available income with a budget that excluded housing costs.⁴⁶ These examples illustrate the early links between wages and poverty in thinking about disadvantage in Australia.

In the 1970's, Ronald Henderson and his team at the University of Melbourne set the standard for poverty line studies in Australia. *People in Poverty* was one of the first studies that used empirical data collected from households to define poverty in terms of an income threshold.⁴⁷ This work sought to identify the extent of poverty in Australia in terms of inadequate income relative to need. By their

⁴⁰ Vinson, T., Rawsthorne, M., Beavis, A., Ericson, M., (2015). Dropping off the edge: Persistent communal disadvantage in Australia; Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia. <u>https://dote.org.au/</u>

⁴¹ See: Price-Robertson, R. (2011). What is community disadvantage? Understanding the issues, overcoming the problem. https://aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/what-community-disadvantage-understanding-issues-ov

⁴² Productivity Commission (2018). *Rising inequality? A stocktake of the evidence*. Commission Research Paper, Canberra, p. 1. https://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-inequality/rising-inequality.pdf

⁴³ Vinson, T., Rawsthorne, M., Beavis, A., Ericson, M., (2015). Dropping off the edge: Persistent communal disadvantage in Australia, Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia. <u>https://dote.org.au/</u>

Saunders, P. (1998). Defining Poverty and Identifying the Poor. Social Policy Research Centre Discussion Paper, 84 (March).
 Ibid, p.1

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Henderson, R. F., Harcourt, A., & Harper, R. J. A. (1970). *People in poverty: A Melbourne survey* (Vol. 4). Cheshire for the Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne.

definition, a family with an income below what was considered to be representative of an 'austere' standard of living was considered to be living in poverty. It also examined the poverty line in relation to different cohorts in Australia and found strong relationships between different groups. This insight would prove central to approaches to poverty over the following forty years.

Henderson's work resulted in a number of inquiries, which kept debate alive about the role of poverty in Australia. Amongst these was the *1986 Social Security Review* which investigated income support, social security and workforce issues for families and children, as well as income support for the aged.⁴⁸ This resulted in wide changes to the social security system, including the decision that welfare recipients should be counted as individuals, rather than families. This would flow on to inform policy such as the Newstart Allowance, Disability Support Pension and the Jobs, Education and Training scheme. It would also underpin the logic of mutual obligation as central to social security policy. Henderson's work was able to be updated regularly and was used widely.⁴⁹

While now less prominent, this work continues to be influential.⁵⁰ Saunders identifies that many concepts, ideas and principles that were alien prior to Henderson are now central to poverty researchers.⁵¹ He also notes that Henderson's research recognised that poverty was not just a personal attribute and arises out of the organisation of society. This provides the basis for approaches that look to measure the plight and maximise the wellbeing of those in poverty. In Saunders' view, this perspective has been lost amongst recent poverty debates. This came to form the basis of his edited collection that seeks to revisit Henderson's work for contemporary times.⁵² That said, the majority of current work that draws on this historical legacy is economic and looks to measures of income.

2.1.2 Poverty and economic perspectives

Today, much of the research and many of the tools that we use to measure poverty and disadvantage are still primarily economic. This is true not just in Australia, but globally. For example, the World Bank's International Poverty Line⁵³ – perhaps the most influential global measure of poverty – is a purely income-based measure. Meanwhile, at the international level, Gross Domestic Product – another solely economic measure – is used as a relative measure of national advantage and disadvantage.

Economic approaches have also been the primary means of understanding disadvantage in Australia. Often researchers have limited access to variables that can measure disadvantage in all its complexity, which means data on income and poverty is the easiest to access as an approximation of disadvantage. Hence, data on poverty has been used widely by Australian research leaders in the social services sector. This has included work by the Social Policy Research Centre (SPRC), the National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling (NATSEM), the Centre for Independent Studies and the Smith Family (amongst others).⁵⁴

In recent years, the research team at the University of New South Wales (UNSW)⁵⁵ has focused on research measuring poverty and inequality.⁵⁶ This work defines poverty according to two lines, set at 50 per cent and 60 per cent of Australian median income.⁵⁷ It also takes into account housing costs because these are often fixed and have a large impact on potential spending. Based on these definitions, a series of annual reports measuring poverty lines in Australia has been released in recent years.

This body of work also explores inequality in Australia. It includes an annual assessment of income inequality which is assessed by the unequal distribution of income between groups in society.⁵⁸

- 53 The World Bank. (n.d.). Measuring Poverty. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/measuringpoverty
- 54 Parliament of Australia. (2002). The poor in Australia: who are they and how many are there? https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/Publications_Archive/archive/poverty
- 55 This work has been commissioned by a consortium of social service bodies, led by the Australian Council of Social Services. 56 See: ACOSS, (2020), Research insights in poverty and inequality in Australia, http://povertyandinequality.acoss.org.au/
- See: ACOSS. (2020). Research insights in poverty and inequality in Australia. <u>http://povertyandineguality.acoss.org.au/</u>
 ACOSS. (2020). Poverty in Australia. <u>http://povertyandineguality.acoss.org.au/poverty/#poverty-definition</u>
- 57 ACOSS. (2020). Poverty in Australia. <u>http://povertyandinequality.acoss.org.au/poverty/#poverty-definition</u> 58 ACOSS (2020). Inequality in Australia. <u>http://povertyandinequality.acoss.org.au/inequality/#what.is-income-information</u>

⁴⁸ P. Saunders (ed.), *Revisiting Henderson: poverty social security and basic income*, Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.

 ⁴⁹ Saunders, P. (1998). *Defining Poverty and Identifying the Poor*. Social Policy Research Centre Discussion Paper, 84 (March).
 50 Melbourne Institute. (n.d.). Henderson Poverty Line. <u>https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/research/labour/henderson-poverty-line</u>

⁵¹ Saunders, P. (2019). Introduction, in P. Saunders (ed.), Chapter 3: Revisiting Henderson: poverty social security and basic income, pp.1-18, Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵⁸ ACOSS. (2020). Inequality in Australia. http://povertyandinequality.acoss.org.au/inequality/#what-is-income-inequality

The aim of this work is to highlight statistics relating to gaps between different groups of Australians. This definition of income inequality is also extended to wealth inequality by looking at the distribution of financial assets across households.⁵⁹ Amongst its key findings in 2018 was that the top 20 per cent of households in Australia have five times the disposable income of the lowest 20 percent, and that Australia has higher inequality than most other wealthy nations.⁶⁰

Further to this work, the Productivity Commission recently published a report into disadvantage, which assessed the evidence base around rising inequality.⁶¹ The report examined household incomes, consumption and wealth, and importantly, demographic trends within these categories over time. It found that inequality has risen slightly in Australia over the last three decades, while the living standards for the average Australian in every decile have improved. It also found high economic mobility amongst many Australians, although some experience entrenched economic disadvantage. Importantly, this approach explores inequality according to the distribution of income, wealth and consumption, which provides a richer perspective than a focus on income alone.

However, what these approaches share is a focus on economic wellbeing. There are limitations for such approaches.⁶² Economic measures do not distinguish between those who have an unacceptable low standard of living and those who have a low income but are still rich in resources.⁶³ Further, a focus on poverty lines, poverty gaps and income inequality can misrepresent the complexity of disadvantage, as well as imply that payment measures alone can provide the solution.⁶⁴ This neglects the impact of different forms of disadvantage and the potential for cultural factors to undermine otherwise successful economic solutions. Further, there can be a predisposition to focus on comparing data and measures, as well as place primary responsibility at the feet of policy-makers. This does little to support responses at the provider and service delivery level. It is for this reason that this project adopts a broader approach to understanding persistent disadvantage in its research.

2.1.3 Disadvantage and community perspectives

In recent years, there have been a growing number of studies that consider the broader and multi-faceted concept of disadvantage as an indicator of the plight of different groups in the community. These approaches compare the relative experience of individuals to the average situation of people across a range of factors including community, ecological, educational, health and social, as well as the economic factors. It provides for a range of situations such as when individuals may be financially secure but socially isolated, or when groups may be financially poor but rich in social capital or community capability.

A fundamental source of data for such approaches is the ABS Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA). The purpose of this dataset is to broadly define disadvantage in terms of people's access to resources and ability to participate in society.⁶⁵ While its focus remains on the economic, it includes data on education, employment, family composition, internet access and cultural affiliation (amongst others).⁶⁶ Like many other studies exploring disadvantage, information from SEIFA is central to the perspective adopted in this project. However, due to greater use of Census data for more detailed variables that better target persistent disadvantage, the dataset in this project extends beyond SEIFA to other Commonwealth department, agency and jurisdictional data sources. This applied approach to data design is explained further in section 3 of this report.

59 Ibid.

⁶⁰ Davidson, P., Saunders, P., & Phillips, J. (2018). Inequality in Australia, 2018. <u>http://povertyandinequality.acoss.org.au/</u> publication/inequality-in-australia-2018-2/

⁶¹ Productivity Commission (2018). Rising inequality? A stocktake of the evidence. Commission Research Paper, Canberra. https://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-inequality/rising-inequality.pdf

⁶² Price-Robertson, R. (2011). What is community disadvantage? Understanding the issues, overcoming the problem. https://aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/what-community-disadvantage-understanding-issues-ov

⁶³ Saunders, P. (2005). The poverty wars: Reconnecting research with reality. Sydney: UNSW Press.

⁶⁴ Wolff, J., & De-Shalit, A. (2007). Disadvantage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁶⁵ ABS. (2008). 2039.0 – Information paper: an introduction to socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA), 2006. Chapter 1: Introduction. <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/2039.0Main%20</u> Features32006?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=2039.0&issue=2006&num=&view

⁶⁶ ABS. (2008). 2039.0 – Information paper: an introduction to socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA), 2006. Appendix https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2039.0Appendix82006?opendocument&tabname=Notes&prodno =2039.0&issue=2006&num=&view_

A significant example of a multi-dimensional approach to understanding disadvantage in Australia can be found in Tony Vinson's ground-breaking work over the last two decades.⁶⁷ *Dropping off the Edge* (DOTE) changed the landscape of disadvantage research and significantly influenced policy debate in Australia.⁶⁸ This research measured 22 indicators grouped under five main domains of disadvantage (social distress, health, community safety, economic, and education) by accessing Commonwealth, state and territory data. In choosing its indicators, DOTE placed its emphasis on suitability for peer-reviewed publication and research convention. At the core of this approach is the argument that national policy cannot be effective unless it is supported by rigorous research that recognises the multi-dimensional nature of disadvantage.

Amongst the findings of the DOTE 2015 study was that a small number of areas in each jurisdiction accounted for a large proportion of deep disadvantage. It also found that many areas in Australia experience profound forms of disadvantage in multiple facets of life.⁶⁹ Further, the study included a comparison with most disadvantaged areas in previous studies, to provide a snapshot of longitudinal and persistent disadvantage. The result of this analysis found significant consistency between areas of disadvantage across the studies.⁷⁰

Over time, this strength within Vinson's approach has become a constraint. When this methodology was developed in 2007, the SA2 (suburb) category was not available for analysis. Hence, this methodology relied on different area units in different jurisdictions, depending on what was available. In some cases, the study used Local Government Area (LGA), others Statistical Local Area (SLA), and others postcode (POA). This undermined the potential for nationally consistent comparison. Informed by the DOTE work, this project has used the SA2 (suburb) category consistently across Australia for both its 2011 and 2016 Census data.

2.1.4 A growing interest in mapping disadvantage

Inspired by the work of Vinson and its impact on national policy, there has been a significant growth in locational mapping studies of disadvantage across a range of disciplines and sectors. There have also been significant advances in available data, analysis techniques and online mapping tools. This growing interest in mapping the location has resulted in important work emerging around the urban distribution of disadvantage.⁷¹ Increasingly this has been available online.⁷² In the consultation phase of this project, participants identified a large body of diverse work, much of it focusing on particular aspects of disadvantage (e.g., homelessness). In this section, we focus on work that reports across a range of different forms of community disadvantage.

Recently, the ABS released its map of household advantage and disadvantage.⁷³ This relies on both SEIFA and Index of Household Advantage and Disadvantage (IHAD) data. The advantages of SEIFA have been discussed; however, one of its limitations is that as an average area-based measure it does not apply equally to all individuals and families in an area. This is a limitation shared by this project also. The ABS has sought to address this by complementing SEIFA with IHAD to provide a measure of disadvantage by households.⁷⁴ While an important resource for this project, it is important to reiterate that our variables target the topic of disadvantage and persistence in a way that goes beyond SEIFA to use other Commonwealth department, agency and jurisdictional data sources.

⁶⁷ Vinson, T., (1999). Unequal in Life, Jesuit Social Services: Richmond; Vinson, T. (2004), Community Adversity and Resilience: the distribution of social disadvantage in in Victoria and New South Wales, Jesuit Social Services: Richmond; Vinson, T. (2007). Dropping of the Edge: the distribution of disadvantage in Australia, Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia: Richmond.

⁶⁸ Vinson, T., Rawsthorne, M., Beavis, A., Ericson, M., (2015). Dropping off the edge: Persistent communal disadvantage in Australia; Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia. <u>https://dote.org.au/</u>

⁶⁹ Ibid; <u>https://dote.org.au/key-findings/</u>

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Pawson, H., Hulse, K. and Cheshire, L. (2015). Addressing concentrations of disadvantage in urban Australia, AHURI Final Report No.247. Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute. Available from: <u>http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/projects/myrp704</u>

⁷² Ask Izzy. https://askizzy.org.au/

⁷³ Evershed, N. (2019). Inequality in Australia: an interactive map of disadvantage. <u>https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/datablog/ng-interactive/2019/apr/19/inequality-in-australia-an-interactive-map-of-disadvantage</u>

⁷⁴ ABS. (2019). 4198.0 – Experimental index of household advantage and disadvantage, 2016. https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4198.0Explanatory%20Notes12016?OpenDocument

The NATSEM at the University of Canberra continues to be involved in projects that map economic disadvantage using its STINMOD+ and SpatialMSM tools. Recent projects include NSW⁷⁵ and Victoria⁷⁶ mapping studies, which work at the SA2 (suburb) level and largely mirror SEIFA data categories. Importantly, this work applies microsimulation tools in its analysis, as does this project. For this reason, we invited academics from NATSEM to provide an independent peer-review of this project, its methods and findings.

Community Insight Australia collates and maps publicly available data for communities across Australia.⁷⁷ It allows access to over 500 social indicators through an easy-to-use online mapping interface. A key difference is that this data spans SA1, SA2 and SA3 levels,⁷⁸ while it is driven by what statistics are available. This contrasts with our focus just on SA2 and emphasis on data that complements the practice and place-based expertise of service providers to support better decision-making.

2.1.5 The risk of stigmatisation

One of the challenges facing all research, particularly with an academic focus, is how it is reported publicly. Although there is no question that the intent of the above research has been to improve knowledge, its public release can lose control of how it is represented. The old adage that bad news sells better than good is still influential in some parts of the media. This raises the potential for data and analysis that aims to further the wellbeing of those experiencing disadvantage to be reported in ways that stigmatise communities and label them with negative stereotypes. This was a major concern raised through our national workshop consultation process.

Past research has examined the impacts of negatively stereotyping communities or individuals experiencing poverty. In particular, the research suggests it can place additional burdens on communities, preventing them from reaching their full potential. Theories on deficit language posit that the language used to describe a group can come to define that group.⁷⁹ For example, in the disciplines of psychology and education, this impact is referred to as Stereotype Threat. Specifically, this refers to the potential for people to perform according to a stereotype about their social group,⁸⁰ particularly in the reduction of performance of individuals who belong to negatively stereotyped groups.⁸¹ In the disciplines of sociology and criminology, it is understood through Stigma and Labelling Theory. Central to these ideas is that there is little fault in the individual. Rather, society identifies a particular attribute as undesirable and the dominant aspect of identity.⁸² Once this negative stereotype is applied and accepted by individuals and groups it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy that shapes attitudes and behaviour.⁸³ This can occur both informally or through officially sanctioned categories.⁸⁴ Much of the literature on each of these concepts concludes with a similar message: negative words and images are powerful. The way in which we converse about different people and communities can shape not only beliefs about those people and communities, but also their views of themselves and their very potential.

An example of the impact of such influences in the Australian context can be found in the work of Van der Wal, Grace, & Baird.⁸⁵ This work interviewed young people living in a disadvantaged area of Sydney. Their research aimed to understand the life experiences and support needs of

⁷⁵ Vidyattama, Y., Tanton, & NCOSS. (2019). Mapping economic disadvantage in New South Wales. <u>https://www.ncoss.org.au/sites/default/files/Web%20Version%20Mapping%20%20Economic%20Disadvantage%20%20in%20New%20South%20</u> Wales%20report1.pdf

⁷⁶ Tanton, R., Peel., D. & Vidyattama, Y. (2018). Every suburb every town: poverty in Victoria. <u>https://vcoss.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Every-suburb-Every-town-Poverty-in-Victoria-VCOSS.pdf</u>

⁷⁷ Community Insight Australia. <u>https://communityinsightaustralia.org/</u>

⁷⁸ Community Insight Australia. https://communityinsightaustralia.org/data/

Atkinson, P. (2002). Language, structure and reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein. Routledge.
 American Psychological Association. (2006). Stereotype threat widens achievement gap.

<sup>https://www.apa.org/research/action/stereotype
81 Steele, C. (2003). Stereotype threat and African American student achievement.</sup> *The inequality reader: Contemporary and foundational readings in race, class, and gender,* 276-281.

⁸² Goffman, E. (2009). Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. Simon and Schuster.

⁸³ Becker, H. S. (2008). Outsiders. Simon and Schuster;

⁸⁴ Prosser, B. (2006). ADHD: Who's failing who?. Finch Publishing: Sydney.

⁸⁵ Van Der Wal, J., Grace, R., & Baird, K. (2017). It Takes More Than 'Just Scratching the Surface': The Perspectives of Young People on Living in a Disadvantaged Community. *Children Australia*, 42(4), 256-267.

vulnerable families and children living in disadvantage. They explored how media constructions of their community acted to stigmatise them by reporting details of the negatives of their communities, whilst failing to discuss the many positives. Youth participants also discussed how they felt the negative construction of their community in media stories was reflected in how they themselves were treated as individuals. These reflections by young people speak volumes about how public reporting and debate can have real impact on the lives of people living in different communities across Australia.

One of the main objectives of this project is to make every effort to minimise the potential for negative stereotyping of communities through the reporting of its findings. This is discussed further in Section 3.4.

2.1.6 Summary: contributions and challenges for disadvantage research

The last thirty years of research into poverty and disadvantage has made significant contributions to public policy and debate. It has highlighted that Australia's unprecedented period of economic growth has not been shared equally. It has identified the important role of income support and housing in exacerbating or alleviating poverty. It has also developed a growing range of approaches to map the location, measure the extent and capture the diversity of relative disadvantage.

However, it has not been without its challenges. The complex nature of the issue and the difficulty in obtaining quantifiable indicators that match the components of disadvantage challenges every approach. Further, the success of policy initiatives based on insight from research into the income drivers of poverty can often be undermined by a range of other economic, health, educational, environmental and social factors. Sometimes findings intended to inform better public policy have been reported or represented in ways that have harmed in their efforts to help.

2.2 The foundations of our research approach

The research approach applied in this project has been designed in response to a particular conceptualisation of the nature of the challenge persistent disadvantage presents to communities (see section 3.1). The partnerships that underpin this approach have been formed because they bring expertise that well equips the project to deliver on its shared emphasis on practical decision-making and community capacity building.

2.2.1 Building on over sixty years of sector experience

CSSA is the Catholic Church's peak national body for social services. For over 60 years, CSSA has assisted member agencies work towards a fairer, more inclusive society that reflects and supports the dignity, equality and participation of all people. Its 51 member agencies employ around 12,000 people and 4,000 voluntary contributors in their work across 650 sites. The network provides community services to over 450,000 Australians every year.

These services span the full range of social services provided in the sector, from financial to family services, youth counselling to aged care, support for Indigenous and recently arrived Australians. Hence, CSSA is well positioned to advocate, both at national and local levels, for a broad range of people who are vulnerable, in need or experiencing persistent disadvantage.

The Catholic network spans Australia from its metropolitan centres to the far reaches of the Outback. CSSA members provide services in regional capitals in every state and territory, in areas such as Cairns, Alice Springs, Broome, Whyalla, Ballarat and Wagga Wagga. Members based outside the major cities often have a central office in a regional capital from which they support services in the surrounding regions.

In this way, CSSA's insight reaches from national policy to coalface program expertise. Through our members we have access to deep practice expertise across the range of services that are provided. Based on decades of service embedded in local communities we have access to deep place-based expertise. We also draw on our strong existing networks with specialists, practitioners, intermediaries, informal carers, care workers and clients through collaborative approaches to ensure the success of this project. The experience and expertise within the CSSA organisation and network has been

instrumental to the specific design of the coproduced research process in this project. It has also been fundamental to our unique approach, which emphasises community specific and community led solutions to constraints on community potential.

2.2.2 Partnering with leading academics in the field

This research approach is innovative in the way that it brings together practice and academic expertise in the coproduction of its methodology (see Section 3.2). The ANU CSRM was selected as the academic partner for this project. This choice was made because the research of CSRM focuses on the development of social research methods, the analysis of social issues and policy, and providing access to social scientific data. Amongst the partners' objectives is a commitment to developing and validating new and cost-effective data collection methods.

CSRM has a broad range of around 40 researchers within its centre. Its team was led by Associate Professor Ben Phillips who is the head of the Centre's modelling team. Associate Professor Phillips is well known nationally for his experience with data analysis, modelling and social statistics. This research has drawn extensively on his previous experience working at the Australian Bureau of Statistics and NATSEM. Centre Director, Professor Matt Gray, and Deputy Director, Dr Nick Biddle, were also involved in the project. Both have considerable experience as economics and social researchers and are well known and respected both in Australia and internationally. The expertise of CSRM, its flexibility and commitment to coproduction was fundamental to the success of this project.

2.2.3 Leveraging this experience to inform our research design

The expertise of the project partners brings important insight that is vital to this project. They report that community capability and potential is high, but that they face constraints on a daily basis. They note that previous data has been useful in describing, measuring and raising the profile of poverty in the public consciousness, but has been less successful in support of decision-making in response. They also understand that persistent disadvantage is more than just a matter of income and requires proven and sophisticated analytic tools to assess the relative influence of different disadvantage constraints. They understand that these constraints are complex and compounding, making integrated and coordinated services across sectors and providers vital. The result of this coming together of contributors has been a unique and bespoke research approach.

The approach adopted in this project differs from most others in this space because it has been designed specifically to respond to the understanding and requirements of its project partners (who are all service providers). It has also been designed to leverage off both their practice expertise and the research expertise of our academic partners. All partners have brought a commitment to innovation through a coproduction process.

2.2.4 Summary: the approach taken in this project

There are several unique features of the approach taken in this project. Its data provides the first nationally consistent analysis of persistent disadvantage factors by suburb and mapping of these factors by federal electorate. The approach also applies Principal Component Analysis using multiple variables, as well as presents the relative weighting of components at the suburb level. Its design is driven by practice expertise and practical decision-making requirements, while it adopted a coproduction process to maximise the potential of meeting these requirements. The application of its results point to a range of potential indicators that are broader than those used in most similar studies. Importantly, the intended outcomes of this approach are targeted to deliver greater confidence by decision-makers at all levels about how to respond to the challenges that persistent disadvantage presents in Australian communities.

3 ADOPTING AN APPLIED APPROACH

3.1	Our conceptual frame				
	3.1.1	Understanding the challenges with data, disadvantage and deficit views	30		
	3.1.2	Responding to the challenges through design thinking	31		
	3.1.3	Summary: a 'flipped' approach to persistent disadvantage research	32		
3.2	The i	mportance of coproduction	32		
	3.2.1	Our approach to coproduction	32		
	3.2.2	Reporting the outcomes of our coproduction process	33		
	3.2.3	Summary: the benefits of coproduction	34		
3.3	Deliv	ering an applied methodology	34		
	3.3.1	The methodological sequence	34		
	3.3.2	Summary: why this methodology?	36		
3.4	Shari	ng the findings without reinforcing the constraints	36		
	3.4.1	Avoiding the risk of reinforcing stigma for communities	36		
	242		27		
	3.4.2	Applying a direct, staged and tailored approach with key audiences			



3.1 Our conceptual frame

This project applies a specific conceptual approach throughout its design and implementation. It is built on the foundations of respecting the dignity of individuals, recognising the expertise of those working at the coalface, advocating the capability of communities, and informing decisions at the most appropriate level. As a result, our approach is applied in its focus, it draws on design thinking and it relies on coproduction at every stage. In this section, we outline this approach, its underlying philosophy and rationale, including our 'flipped' approach to stakeholder engagement.

3.1.1 Understanding the challenges with data, disadvantage and deficit views

The relationship between research, data and decision-making has been subject to increased scrutiny in recent years. Public and research leaders have expressed concerns about research-policy gaps,⁸⁶ while there has been debate about how academic research can have more impact on political, policy or practice needs.⁸⁷

In his seminal work on the relationship between scientific research and political decision-making, Roger Pielke describes the need for 'honest brokers' to inform decision-making with research in a context where the public prominence of a policy issue can limit the influence of evidence.⁸⁸ Taking this one-step further, Prosser and Denniss have argued that objective evidence has most influence when the political prominence of an issue is low and that different strategies are required when an issue is highly politicised.⁸⁹ Such insights are relevant to this project because of the prominence of poverty and disadvantage as public issues in Australia.

The approach taken in this project has been one that seeks to provide disadvantage data that supports policy and local decision-making ahead of public campaigning. The approach is also informed by prominent political debates around the role of individual choice in people's experience of disadvantage. This project has not been designed to contribute to these debates because we see limited scope for evidence to influence strong public views around disadvantage that have little grounding in research. Rather, we look to the research that highlights the challenge of the far less publicly contentious concern of persistent disadvantage in Australia.

With this in mind, we conceptualise the challenge of persistent disadvantage in two ways (see Figures 2 and 3).

Figure 2 Understanding the influences on disadvantage



Figure 3 Understanding the influences on persistent disadvantage



Katsonis, M. (2019). Bridging the research policy gap. <u>https://www.themandarin.com.au/102877-research-policy-gap/</u>
 Cairney, P., & Oliver, K. (2018). How should academics engage in policymaking to achieve impact? *Political Studies Review*, 1478929918807714; Geddes, M., Dommett, K., & Prosser, B. (2018). A recipe for impact? Exploring knowledge requirements

in the UK Parliament and beyond. Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice, 14(2), 259-276.

Pielke Jr, R. A. (2007). The honest broker: making sense of science in policy and politics. Cambridge University Press.
 Prosser, B., & Denniss, R. (2015). Minority policy: Rethinking governance when parliament matters. Melbourne University

Publishing: Melbourne.

In Figure 2, we see the situation of many Australians who experience disadvantage. For these Australians, which the Productivity Commission has estimated to be around 2.2 million each year,⁹⁰ their encounter with poverty is short term. While systemic factors still play a part, individual autonomy is important. However, in Figure 3, we see the situation of the around 700,000 Australians who experience disadvantage for periods longer than three years.⁹¹ That their experience of disadvantage is pervasive and persistent suggests that systemic and structural constraints play a vital role. That it is persistent means that governments, communities and service providers must also take responsibility. It is not enough to assume that individual choice can address this alone.

In broad terms, this project assumes that all Australian communities embody energy, capacity and innovation, while the data from the CSRM considers a range of expected drivers of disadvantage that may constrain this. It also conceptualises the challenge presented by persistent disadvantage as an issue for all Australians in every part of Australia.

There are three important outcomes from adopting such a conceptualisation:

- 1. *Greater detail*: by providing a more detailed understanding of the possibilities and constraints presented by persistent disadvantage drivers in all Australian suburbs;
- 2. *Better decisions*: by combining rigorous data collection methods with practice expertise to identify areas to inform community decision-making and action;
- 3. *More impact*: by leveraging the relationships of members with local communities to use evidence to strengthen partnership and service provision.

In line with this conceptualisation, a design thinking approach was used to incorporate coalface expertise, support service innovation and align with unique local needs.

3.1.2 Responding to the challenges through design thinking

Design thinking is a non-linear, iterative process, which seeks to understand stakeholder needs, challenge common assumptions, and redefine problems to create innovative solutions.⁹² It is a process that reframes challenges in practical and human-centric ways, while it brings in new perspectives to expand the range of options under consideration. It is well suited for planning in complex systems (such as social service networks), because the process allows participants to focus on what's most important for users, particularly when their needs are diverse. It also emphasises a flow through to collective action and minimises unintended consequences through repeated cycles of prototyping and testing. This applied, iterative, collaborative and stakeholder focus within design approaches made it the best choice to support the development of this project.

One of the specific advantages of adopting a design thinking approach for this project is the way it places our work within a systematic approach to engagement with communities and decision-makers over time (see Figure 4).



Figure 4 The design thinking approach that frames this project

91 Productivity Commission (2018). Rising inequality? A stocktake of the evidence. Commission Research Paper, Canberra. https://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-inequality/rising-inequality.pdf

92 Interaction Design Foundation. https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/article/what-is-design-thinking-and-why-is-it-so-popular

⁹⁰ Productivity Commission (2018). Rising inequality? A stocktake of the evidence. Commission Research Paper, Canberra. https://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-inequality/rising-inequality.pdf

Figure 4 depicts the two-strand design process that drives this project. Both strands seek to inform and improve decision-making. Based on the understanding that emerges from this research, one strand will work with policy leaders to inform government policy, while the other will work with service providers to innovate new programs and supports. Within both strands, there is an emphasis on testing new initiatives, while underpinning both is an iterative approach that brings policy and practice back together to renew understanding and support better decisions.

It is also important to note the location of this activity within a longer-term project of work. This is vital to accurately appreciate the scope, contribution and limitations of this work. This project seeks to provide a practical foundation for greater community capacity building into the future. As such, it provides a complementary and applied counterpoint to the existing research in the field.

3.1.3 Summary: a 'flipped' approach to persistent disadvantage research

It is important to realise that this project aims to 'flip' some of the conventions within the existing body of disadvantage research. The project first emerged from discussions with service providers within the CSSA network who acknowledged the importance of locating and measuring areas of disadvantage, but also wanted data to help them to decide what to do about it. Based on discussions with these providers about what factors contributed to persistent disadvantage in their practice experience, the CSRM research team then scoured available datasets to find variables that might match. This was developed further through consultations with project partners, sector leaders and advocates. It evolved from a project that framed itself solely in terms of drivers of persistent disadvantage into one that applies this data to identify potential constraints on community development.

We have adopted this approach because we believe that it provides the best way to understand and respond to the challenge of persistent disadvantage for communities by better linking the available data to decision-making processes. For these reasons, the coproduction of methodology, data collection and stakeholder engagement strategies has been central to the development of this project.

3.2 The importance of coproduction

The philosophy of coproduction has underpinned every aspect of the design of this project and it provides an important point of distinction with other research in this space. In this section, we outline our approach to coproduction, the key outcomes from it and the challenges that it has presented.

3.2.1 Our approach to coproduction

In recent years, coproduction has emerged as an important tool to help increase the impact of research and policy work.⁹³ It has been recognised as an effective strategy to bridge the gap between research and policy decision-making. It has also been recognised as an important means to closer align policy with practice, to avoid unintended consequences and improve responses to diverse stakeholder needs. The coproduction approach was suited to this project because it emerged from discussions with service providers within the CSSA network.

The project drew on the British Design Council's 'double diamond' approach to guide its coproduction (see Figure 5).⁹⁴

^{93 &#}x27;Blog Admin'. (2017). On the co-production of research: why we should say what we mean, mean what we say, and learn as we go. <u>https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2017/09/21/on-the-co-production-of-research-why-we-shouldsay-what-we-mean-mean-what-we-say-and-learn-as-we-go/</u>

⁹⁴ See: https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/news-opinion/double-diamond-15-years



33

Figure 5 The coproduction model adopted in this project

The objective of this approach is to disrupt conventional thinking and 'bounded rationality'⁹⁵ by drawing on a wider range of stakeholder experience than is usually consulted. In each diamond (Figure 5), the range of possible options is extended to the widest possible extent, before consensus is sought around the best way forward. Invariably, if genuine engagement with all views has occurred, then the first point of consensus is not that which might have been originally envisioned. Usually, the outcome is more inclusive of different views and diverse experiences.

As can be seen above, this project applied this approach to both defining the dataset and designing its communications. In the first stage, the academic research team, representatives of the project partners and the CSSA support team participated in meetings to identify a range of potential indicators of long-term disadvantage. This process involved more than 15 hours of online workshops. The result was a 'wish list' of persistent disadvantage indicators, which are wider than the set used in other studies. After finalising this list, the CSRM research team then sought to match available variables at the SA2 (suburb) level.

In the second stage, the CSSA support team hosted four workshops in capital cities and one online forum to consult with experienced researchers, sector leaders, government agencies and advocacy peaks. This consultation was supplemented by six interviews with research leaders in the field and an online survey which was promoted to the sector. These activities were promoted through CSSA networks and other peak bodies in the sector. The purpose of this activity was to expand our thinking about how to maximise the impact of the research and enhance its communication.

3.2.2 Reporting the outcomes of our coproduction process

The outcomes of this coproduction process transformed the nature of the project. The first stage of the process resulted in a range of practice-based variables which were broader than those conventionally used in disadvantage mapping research. Important within this was the identification of variables that the CSRM research team could swiftly access and those that would require negotiation with government agencies and take time to access. This preliminary report represents the results from CSRM analysis of readily accessible data in December 2019. Subsequent analysis will include data from additional sources.

The outcomes of the second stage of coproduction changed the approach to communicating the results from this project. This was the result of two main messages from the coproduction process; one positive, one as warning. The positive message welcomed this project and its potential to shift from describing where disadvantage is to identifying what to do about it. The word of warning came from the observations about previous research in this space. While this research was recognised as ground-breaking and significant in terms of national profile and policy advocacy, the negative potential

⁹⁵ Botterill, L. C., & Hindmoor, A. (2012). Turtles all the way down: Bounded rationality in an evidence-based age. *Policy Studies*, 33(5), 367-379.

of this work to stigmatise particular communities was also reported. As a result, the project adopted a threefold strategy in response:

- 1. *Promoting:* research data on persistent disadvantage will be presented impartially, while advocacy from the project will be strengths-based and emphasise the potential within communities;
- 2. *Protecting:* data on the indicators of persistent disadvantage will not be released publicly in a way that can identify or stigmatise any particular suburb (SA2);
- Partnering: local communication of the results from the project will be via CSSA members and trusted community leaders to bring together groups around building capability, supporting advocacy and co-designing new service innovation.

3.2.3 Summary: the benefits of coproduction

The coproduction process has been transformative for this project. It has resulted in a richer, more rigorous and responsible research approach. It has also provided an approach that better aligns with our understanding of the challenge (see 3.1.1). This approach has provided the project with:

- 1. a wider range of potential indicators;
- 2. greater insight into the risks associated with reporting on disadvantage research;
- 3. a renewed emphasis on the importance of partnership with communities as we engage stakeholders in his research.

This coproduction process continues. It was central in developing an applied methodology. It has been central in the branding of the project and tone of this report. It will also guide the future communication of the outcomes from this and future research cycles in this project. Importantly, it will be integral as we move into the advocacy and ideation phases of our approach in coming months.

3.3 Delivering an applied methodology

The methodology developed in this project follows a design thinking logic. This aligns with our understanding of the nature of the challenge, our emphasis on practice and place-based expertise and our key objectives. In this section, we outline this logic, the methodological sequence and key limitations of the project.

3.3.1 The methodological sequence

In this project, we adopted a design thinking logic to order our implementation of methodology (see Table 1).

DESIGN	ITERATE	REPORT	REFINE	TRANSLATE	RELEASE
July–Aug 2019	Sept–Dec 2019	March 2020	March 2020	Apr–May 2020	June–July 2020
 Listen to partners Identify data Design PCA 	 Collate data Conduct PCA Consult with sector 	 State and Territory trends Electorate report Political engagement 	 Expand data Expand PCA Consult with partners 	 Connect with communities Collate extra data Conduct PCA 	 Local trends Suburb results Community engagement

Table 1 Methodological sequence and timing
The activity in each of these phases is outlined below, while a detailed summary of the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is provided in section 4 of this report.

Design phase

The origins of this project were a listening study conducted with the CEOs of CSSA member organisations in the latter half of 2018. A prominent theme from within this exercise was the desire for research that moved beyond mapping disadvantage to providing data to inform decision-making. In response, CSSA sought out potential university researchers to support such work. The outcome of this search was the formation of a partnership with the ANU CSRM in mid-2019.

The coproduction commenced via online meetings where representatives of CSSA partners, the CSRM research team and the CSSA support team identified a range of potential indicators of disadvantage. These indicators were identified based on the expertise of the project partners. The key outcome of this was the production of a project 'wish list' that informed plans for data collection. Associated with this was the identification of variables that the CSRM research team could reliably access, those that would require negotiation with government agencies and those that might not be accessible (particularly at the SA2 suburb level). The result was a two-step approach to designing and conducting PCA analysis as will be described below.

Iteration phase

Once the range of potential datasets had been identified and agreed, the CSRM research team set about collecting and collating all available data. This was followed with a pilot and first sweep of PCA by every Australian suburb (see section 4). While this was occurring, the CSSA research team implemented the second coproduction stage by conducting consultation with the sector (see section 3.2.1). Another important aspect of this phase was the creation of an Expert Advisory Group to guide the research throughout its iteration and delivery. Drawing on the extensive CSSA network, a group of twelve representatives came together with research and advocacy expertise with specific needs and/or harder to reach groups. The range of speciality areas included (but were not confined to): people with disability, carers, consumer advocates, homelessness, Indigenous Australians, LGBTQI, older Australians, vulnerable children and young Australians. This group provided input and oversight into inclusive and equitable research coproduction and communications planning. The outcomes of this iterative process were significant in this first (public) reporting phase.

Report phase

This preliminary project report is the major output from this phase. Its objective is to raise public awareness and to engage policy leaders in subsequent phases of this research. To support this, this report provides analysis on the national, state, territory, and electorate levels. The decision to aggregate the results of suburb (SA2) analysis is significant. It is intended to protect individual suburbs from public stigmatisation and negative reporting. However, electorate-based data on persistent disadvantage levels, components and constraints will be made available to political and policy leaders on a confidential basis.

Refine phase

Once the first PCA and public reporting is complete, the CSRM research and CSSA support teams will continue to pursue the widest possible range of available data. This will involve discussions with Commonwealth, state and territory departments, entities such as the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare and other groups identified through the second coproduction stage. The target will be for as much data as possible to be available for the second PCA process.

Translate phase

In the translation phase, the CSSA research team will continue to work with its project partners to identify the most effective ways of translating the outcomes of this research into tools for local decision-making, advocacy and innovation. Central to this will be supporting partners in the project to develop constructive and effective ways of sharing and using the outcomes of this research in

connection with their local communities. While this is occurring and once the expanded dataset is finalised, a second PCA will be conducted by the CSRM research team in May 2020 (see Section 4).

Data release phase

This project will culminate in a local reporting phase. The objective of this phase is to raise local awareness about the contents of this research and to engage local communities in partnerships around its findings. The findings from this phase will be released to project partners through translation material and an Excel database that reports by regional towns and suburbs (SA2). It is intended to support our project partners, who are embedded in their communities, to design and share this sensitive information in a way that is most appropriate for different groups in those communities. Again, this more detailed data will be made available to political and policy leaders on request and on a confidential basis.

3.3.2 Summary: why this methodology?

This project understands the challenge of community-based solutions to community challenges as one of supporting community strengths and capacity building. It identifies the constraints that persistent disadvantage presents to community decision-making and action in every Australian suburb. Its focus is on what those constraints are, as well as what data can be accessed to help governments, community leaders and service providers to decide what to do. In line with this, it adopts an applied and design thinking orientation in its methodological approach. This approach is one that draws on coproduction to link rigorous and reliable methods in data production with the practice and place-based expertise of providers. This is the most appropriate method to adopt because it involves communities in the process, which will increase future engagement, while it aligns with how service decisions are made, and will increase its potential impact. In addition, the project also provides data that will be of use to policy and community leaders at different levels and it is on these decision-makers that this report focuses.

3.4 Sharing the findings without reinforcing the constraints

The stakeholder engagement strategy for this project was co-produced with the 21 project partners. This approach emphasised awareness-raising with leading researchers, sector peak bodies, advocate representatives and the project partners through a series of national and online workshops (see section 3.2). The main outcome of this consultation was a staged and differentiated approach to communicating with different stakeholder audiences.

3.4.1 Avoiding the risk of reinforcing stigma for communities

A clear message from the workshops was that the communication of general findings from this project had to be strengths-based and reinforce the positive potential within communities. There was significant concern about the impact of stereotypes that are holding communities back, and in particular the potential for the existing trust and relationships between project partners and communities to be harmed if they were associated with negative reporting. As one workshop participant put it:

...plenty of these studies have been completed before and plenty have hurt communities, there is no excuse for this study, you can't say that you did not know it might happen.

Equally, participants were adamant about the hope, energy, potential and capacity in the communities they work with on a daily basis. What they saw were systemic, structural, economic and policy barriers that undermined otherwise successful initiatives or progress. As a result, this report and all materials have overtly sought to frame the challenges of persistent disadvantage as constraints on community potential, rather than predetermined characteristics of suburbs.

Another clear message was that while it would not be possible to guarantee positive reporting, every effort must be made to minimise the potential for negative reporting. This resulted in two approaches to stakeholder engagement.

3. Adopting an Applied Approach

First, findings would not be made publicly available at suburb level (only at electorate, state and territory level). This was decided because it was felt that people more closely identified stigma with a suburb than an electorate. Second, prior to the launch of this report, selected members of the media would receive one-on-one briefings to talk them through the project's approach and findings. In addition to these strategies, the project also developed a direct, staged and tailored approach to stakeholder engagement.

3.4.2 Applying a direct, staged and tailored approach with key audiences

The project produced a stakeholder engagement plan to identify the range of relevant audiences for this report. This was done with the approval of project partners. This approach emphasised targeted approaches to decision-making, rather than public and media audiences (see Figure 6).



Figure 6 Overview of stakeholder engagement

The result of this strategy was a differentiated approach to sharing the project's findings with key stakeholders (see below).

Stage 1: Sector leaders

The engagement of sector and research leaders commenced prior to data analysis. Representatives of these groups were invited to attend national and online workshops to raise awareness about the project. These introduced them to the project, inquired about similar research and sought their advice on how best to communicate findings to stakeholders (including vulnerable groups). Sector leaders who participated in workshops were given the opportunity to receive a prior copy of this report. When the second phase or research is completed with analysis at SA2 (suburb) level, a dataset will be released. Sector representatives who wish to access this data may negotiate to do so through agreement with CSSA. These results will be made available between May and June 2020.

Stage 2: Political and policy leaders (this report)

This report will provide the means to engage with political, policy and public leaders. It reports SA2 (suburb) data aggregated at the national, jurisdiction and electorate level because this is the level at which these decision-makers operate. Following on from the release of this report, individual briefings will be made available to Ministers, Members of Parliament and policy leaders. These meetings will involve representatives from the research team and the project partners who serve local communities. At these briefings, specific suburb data will be made available on the conditions of confidentiality and not making comment that could be harmful to local communities. This will occur between April and May 2020.

Stage 3: Project partners and local communities

The third stage of stakeholder engagement will be with local communities and occur in two steps. Step one will see the CSSA project team work with project partners to coproduce communication materials for regional and local use. This will include producing materials sensitive to the needs of marginalised or vulnerable groups. The research team will support partners to develop local communications strategies that are strengths-based and do not stigmatise suburbs or groups. Step two will be the release of all data to project partners via an Excel spreadsheet for use in their planning. A key feature of this step will be partners working with community leaders, drawing on place-based expertise and leveraging trusted local relationships to develop new services, seek grants and support local advocacy. The CSSA research team will assist smaller or less resourced partners with data analysis support. This work will occur between June and July 2020.

Future: Forming new partnerships

Section 2.1 noted a range of important perspectives around disadvantage and social inclusion, exclusion, participation and isolation. A vibrant body of research is also emerging around these perspectives. Much of this work relies on qualitative research due to the importance of descriptive understandings of human experiences of persistent disadvantage. While the development of this project is informed by these perspectives, the data produced in the initial definition phase of this project will be quantitative. However, one of the objectives of this project is to pursue partnership opportunities where the data may complement other research to inform these broader perspectives and develop further research that addresses the challenge of persistent disadvantage.

3.4.3 Summary: communicating for decision-making and capacity building

The stakeholder engagement strategy developed for this project has been informed by our conceptualisation of the challenge and by the principles of subsidiary and the common good. These principles are evident both in Catholic Social Teaching and the strong messages that came from the consultation phase of this project. At their core is the intent to support decision-making at the right level, in the right place, by the right people and in the right way. Implicit in this view is that a right approach includes all relevant leaders but is as close as possible to those impacted by the decision, while the process to achieve this must help without causing harm. Representatives of the project partners and the Expert Advisory Group have provided oversight of every step in the process of designing, developing and delivering the findings of this report.

IMPLEMENTING THE METHOD

4.1	Over	view	40
4.2	Appr	oach	40
	4.2.1	Indexes	41
	4.2.2	Principal Component Analysis	41
	4.2.3	Disadvantage Drivers	41
4.3	Relia	bility of results	47
4.4	Limit	ations of the method	48
4.5	Sum	nary	48



4.1 Overview

In this section, our CSRM research partners outline the microsimulation method that was applied to produce the findings that underpin this report.⁹⁶ We refer to the product of this analysis as the CSSA Relative Disadvantage Indexes (or Indexes). These indexes attempt to measure the relative disadvantage of regions in Australia.

The indexes are constructed for four separate 'drivers' of disadvantage including health, social, education, economic and a summary index capturing all four combined. They use a broad range of regional level information and relate to a range of 2011 and 2016 data. The indexes are primarily designed for the use by CSSA and its project partners in their service delivery. Therefore, a practical and applied approach has been adopted rather than one that may be more theoretically pure. This is in line with the project's broader vision to support community-based responses to unique place-based challenges. An additional purpose of this section is to allow independent review of this method and attest to its rigour and reliability.

The section is structured around explanations of our approach to elements of the underlying data (including indexes, Principal Component Analysis and disadvantage drivers), and how to interpret these indexes, reliability indicators and limitations with this method.

4.2 Approach

The Indexes are similar in construction to the ABS Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) but include a number of important enhancements providing a more detailed picture of disadvantage. The main enhancements include the development of a broader concept of disadvantage that moves beyond just 'socio-economic' disadvantage. Here we include indexes that expand upon the socio-economic concept to include health, education, economic and social disadvantage. In constructing each Index we have also incorporated more detailed variables. The recent availability of the ABS Table Builder software with very detailed Census data enabled the development of multivariate variables (such as housing stress) and longitudinal variables (such as our analysis of persistence). The indexes also make use of data sets outside of the ABS Census including modelled data for health (such as smoking and alcohol expenditure), education (Australian Early Development Census data) and a range of medical conditions (such as obesity and arthritis).

While data limitations exist, where possible we have attempted to incorporate a longer term or 'persistent' element to disadvantage. One shortcoming of indexes such as SEIFA is that they focus on variables that are snapshots in time (such as weekly income). While not always the case, some regions may appear more or less disadvantaged by using such data and we may not be getting the most accurate picture of longer term disadvantage. As an example, a small farming community may be subject to temporary drought in one period which may show up as low income or high levels of disadvantage. Conversely, another farming community may experience an unusually good year either through more favourable weather or perhaps strong market prices for their product. By incorporating longer term variables, and where possible longitudinal census data we reduce this problem by using data over a longer period of time.

In this section we cover the main elements of the underlying data, the construction and how to interpret the indexes.

⁹⁶ Chapters 4 and 5 are a summary of analysis conducted by the ANU Centre for Social Research Methods as commissioned by CSSA. The contents within them are solely the product of ANU. All other chapters were produced by CSSA.

The indexes are constructed at the SA2 (suburb) level. The SA2 geography roughly equates to suburbs within large cities and towns. There are around 2300 SA2s in total covering all of Australia. The indexes use the 2016 version of the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS). Due to difficulty in obtaining the underlying data for all SA2s and the exclusion of regions with very small populations our indexes cover around 2,100 SA2s. The total population coverage of regions where indexes were calculated is around 98.6 percent of the Australian population.

The indexes are assigned to areas, not individuals. This means they represent the collective characteristics of people living in an area. The indexes are ordinal, meaning that they are useful for ordering regions by disadvantage but do not represent a quantity of disadvantage.

The indexes were constructed using a weighting of a variety of selected variables chosen carefully to relate to a certain 'driver' of disadvantage. It should be remembered that the variables chosen are those that were not only relevant to each driver but also available at the SA2 (suburb) level for 2016 on a consistent basis. This requirement places considerable constraints on what data is available for the construction of each Index and means that we are not able to fully represent all the factors that relate to each driver.

In terms of interpreting each Index, a high number indicates a low proportion of relatively disadvantaged people. This doesn't necessarily also mean that there is a high proportion of advantaged people since the Index only includes information regarding disadvantage. It also doesn't mean that everyone in a low disadvantage area is without disadvantage.

4.2.2 Principal Component Analysis

Each Index is a weighted average of the included variables. The weights are estimated using PCA, which is a statistical technique that summarizes many, usually correlated variables, into a set of uncorrelated variables. If the original variables are highly correlated, much of the variation can be summarised by a reduced set of components, hence enabling some easier analysis. The first principal component accounts for the largest proportion of variance in the original dataset, with each following component explaining less of the variance. The principal component used for each Index is the one that can be interpreted as best explaining the variation in the concept of advantage and disadvantage for that index. For the four indexes in this analysis and also the summary Index measure, the first principal component was used to create the index.

The indexes created in our analysis are converted into a distribution with a mean of 1000 and a standard deviation of 100 – in line with the ABS SEIFA indexes. We also convert the indexes to percentiles. A number above 1000 represents relatively less disadvantage compared to a number below 1000 which represents relatively greater disadvantage for an area. A number of say 900 represents an area with an average disadvantage score one standard deviation below the mean – implying a more disadvantaged area relative to the average area for Australia.

4.2.3 Disadvantage Drivers

This project is interested not only in the presence of disadvantage (both persistent and current), but also the form this disadvantage takes. We have identified four disadvantage 'drivers' to group these indexes because we expect these to be important contributors to people's access to material and social resources, as well as their ability to participate in society. This approach uses a similar methodology to that used by the ABS in their SEIFA index, while it adds a driver-based approach. It should be noted that to develop these drivers we needed to draw more widely than these two datasets. The four main 'drivers' of disadvantage around which indexes were developed are: economic, education, health and social.

Economic Disadvantage



Our economic disadvantage Index combines variables that we consider represent disadvantage with respect to economic circumstance. An important factor in an individual's ability to contribute to society is through their economic contribution, often through employment, or through their circumstances which may be improved by owning a house, education or living in a wealthy area.

While it was not possible to include all variables that may relate to economic disadvantage we expect that the items in Table 2 provide a broad enough list for a single summary measure of economic disadvantage.

Table 2 Economic disadvantage variables (only loadings > 0.3 included*)

VARIABLE	LOADING
% Household low income in both 2011 and 2016 Longitudinal Census (equivalised income < \$25,999 per year) (Census)	0.73
% Persons with low income (<\$25,999 per year) (Census)	0.81
% Families with jobless parents (Census)	0.76
% Unemployment rate (Census)	0.72
% Adult population high school only (Census)	0.68
% Households needing extra bedroom (Census)	0.52
% Households renting	0.35
% Households in public housing	0.61
% Households in housing stress (30/40 rule) (Census/PolicyMod)	0.88
% Working age population on pensions or allowances	0.90
% Adult population on age pension	0.60
SA2 median house price	-0.53
% Households needing extra bedroom 2011 and 2016 persistence (Longitudinal Census)	0.54
% Households in housing stress (approximate 30/40 rule) 2011 and 2016 persistence (Longitudinal Census)	0.55
% Families with jobless parents 2011 and 2016 persistence (Longitudinal Census)	0.79

*Low skill population, Vocational Education, Kindergarten variables not included due to low loadings.

All variables with the exception of low skilled jobs, vocational education and kindergarten were included in the economic driver principal component. No two variables had excessively high correlations with other included variables. In this driver we have included a component that relates not just to current disadvantage, but also persistent disadvantage. The persistence variables included low income households (roughly equating to relative poverty), jobless families, housing stress and the need for extra bedrooms in a dwelling.

We also wanted a variable that captures wealth disadvantage. Some families may be income poor but asset rich and to some extent a high level of wealth can assist households during financial challenges. House price is associated with regional *advantage* rather than *disadvantage* and so we normally would not include in a disadvantage index. Given the difficulty in finding a regional wealth variable for disadvantage we have used house prices as a proxy where we believe that areas with low house prices will tend to have low wealth. As such the variable loading is a negative rather than a positive. Areas with low median house prices will, all other things constant, have lower economic disadvantage indexes – meaning more disadvantage.

Education disadvantage



An important determinant for future wellbeing is a strong education, particularly in the early years of life. We develop an education disadvantage Index based on measures that we expect relate to education disadvantage (such as a high school only education) and more direct measures (such as language and learning issues).

Ideally, we would be able to include a somewhat more comprehensive list of education variables. The list below is heavily weighted towards educational problems for children. The lack of small area data that is available on a consistent basis is a challenge and one we hope to be able to expand upon in future work. With that said, there is likely to be considerable correlation between the variables used in Table 3 and many other potential variables, meaning that our education Index remains a useful indicator of education disadvantage.

We found that our longer term educational developmental variables (where we averaged results between 2009 and 2018) were a better statistical match with the education Index but were also closely correlated with the point-in-time versions of the same variable. In this case, we have only used the longer term average variables. This assists with our stated aim of developing indexes that include a persistent disadvantage concept.

VARIABLE	LOADING
% Adult population high school education only (Census)	0.64
% Children with health problems 2009 [^] to 2018 average	0.92
% Children with social development issues 2009^ to 2018 average	0.93
% Children with language issues 2009^ to 2018 average	0.92
% Children with communication issues 2009^ to 2018 average	0.90
% Children with emotional issues 2009^ to 2018 average	0.89

Table 3 Education disadvantage variables*

[^] For some SA2s not all years from 2009 were available. *Vocational Education population share, kindergarten attendance, and all educational developmental variables at a point in time (2016) not included due to low loadings or higher correlations with other variables.

All variables included in the PCA were included in the final model and the level of correlation between variables was not too high to exclude any variables.

Health disadvantage



Our health disadvantage Index combines a range of variables that were considered to relate to either direct or indirect health problems for people. Variables such as smoking and alcohol expenditure are variables that for an individual at a given point-in-time may not be presently impacting their health. However, they are variables that may have an association at a regional level with health problems. Table 4 shows the underlying data

included in the health disadvantage PCA Index and the associated 'loading'. The loading is the correlation each variable has with the principal component. We adopt the same strategy as that used by the ABS SEIFA in only including variables with a loading greater than 0.3. We also exclude variables that are too highly correlated with other variables that are used for the principal component calculation.

Table 4 Health disadvantage variables (Only loadings > 0.3 included)*

VARIABLE	LOADING
% of population with a disability (AIHW)	0.57
Average spend on tobacco per week (Regional Policymod – synthetic SA2 data combining the ABS Household Expenditure Survey and the ABS Census)	0.44
% of population with Type 2 diabetes (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.86
% of population with mental health problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.68
% of population with mood disorders (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.68
% of population with circulatory problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.80
% of population with heart problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.83
% of population with respiratory problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.52
% of population with asthma problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.71
% of population with pulmonary problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.93
% of population with arthritis (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.83
% of population with obesity (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.74
% of population with disability in 2011 and 2016 ABS longitudinal Census	0.51

*Alcohol expenditure, aged care population and musculoskeletal problems variables not included due to low loading or too high correlations with other variables.

We found that 13 of the original 16 variables satisfied the criteria that loadings (correlations with the first principal component) should be greater than 0.3 and that no two variables should have correlations greater than 85 per cent.

It is important to remember that our health index, like our other indexes, does not contain all dimensions or aspects of health and in an ideal world we would have a broader coverage of health conditions or health related risk factors. It is intended that our future analysis will incorporate additional health variables at the SA2 (suburb) level that were not accessible at the time of producing this report.

Social disadvantage



Socially disadvantaged individuals are those who have been subjected to racial/ethnic prejudice or, cultural bias. Quantitative data is not always directly available from our data sources, but it is possible to use variables that could reasonably be expected to proxy for groups more likely to be exposed to such disadvantage. We use Census data to estimate regional variables on Indigenous status, whether English is spoken at

home, being a single parent, access to the internet, country of birth and volunteering. It is not the case than any or all of these variables imply that a person is socially disadvantaged but they are variables we expect are likely to increase the risk of being disadvantaged. For instance, lack of internet is associated with a limited connectedness while single parent status is often associated with a range of financial, time and social pressures.

Table 5 shows the loadings for the social disadvantage PCA. The original six variables were reduced to just three – single parents, Indigenous status and no internet. A difficulty with the social disadvantage PCA is that while it may make sense at an individual level to think of Indigenous status and poor English as indicative of social disadvantage, at a regional level these two factors tend not to be positively associated. This is due to areas with large populations of recent migrants not usually being the same areas as those with large Indigenous populations. Within our sample of SA2 regions, Indigenous populations tend not to have poor English. PCA works well for variables that are closely correlated and that's not the case for several variables in the social 'driver' index.

Table 5 Social disadvantage variables

VARIABLE	LOADING
% Adults with poor English*	
% Adults volunteering*	
% Adults born overseas*	
% Household single parents	0.75
% Persons Indigenous	0.78
% Dwellings no internet connection	0.86

*Volunteering, poor English, born overseas were not included due to negative correlations with the principal component index.

In the SEIFA Index the ABS also removes variables that are very strongly related to the principal component. The correlation between internet connection and the overall Index is relatively high. However, we have retained this variable. Three variables were dropped due to negative loadings. As we are constructing an index of disadvantage we only retain variables with a positive association with disadvantage. Ideally, a greater range of variables would be included in this PCA.

Overall disadvantage

To attempt to capture an overall measure of disadvantage we bring together all the variables in our analysis. The overall measure of disadvantage incorporates indicators from a range of social, economic, health and education measures (all of which capture some form of disadvantage). This measure is a comprehensive assessment of disadvantage in Australia at the regional level. The Index has a mix of point-in-time and persistence variables that capture disadvantage.

Table 6	Overall	CSSA	Disadvantage	Index

VARIABLE	LOADING
% Household low income in both 2011 and 2016 Census (equivalised income < \$25,999 per year) (Census)	0.74
% Persons with low income (<\$25,999 per year) (Census)	0.74
% Families with jobless parents (Census)	0.78
% Unemployment rate (Census)	0.57
% Adult population high school only (Census)	0.75
% Households in public housing	0.44
% Households in housing stress (30/40 rule) (Census/PolicyMod)	0.82
% Working age population on pensions or allowances	0.95
% Adult population on age pension	0.61
Percent of population with a disability (AIHW)	0.60
Average spend on tobacco per week (Regional Policymod – synthetic SA2 data, ABS HES and the ABS Census)	0.68
% of population with Type 2 diabetes (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.78
% of population with mental health problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.49
% of population with mood disorders (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.76
% of population with circulatory problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.46
% of population with heart problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.56
% of population with asthma problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.55
% of population with pulmonary problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.82
% of population with arthritis (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.51
% of population with obesity (PHIDU, Torrens University)	0.71
% Children with health problems (2009 to 2018)	0.67
% Children with social development issues (2009 to 2018)	0.61
% Children with language issues (2009 to 2018)	0.67
% Children with communication issues (2009 to 2018)	0.58
% Children with emotional issues (2009 to 2018)	0.58
% Household single parents	0.75
% Persons Indigenous	0.47
% Dwellings no internet connection	0.83
SA2 median house price	-0.65

*Vocational education population, kindergarten population, extra bedrooms required (2016 and persistence 2011 to 2016), rental share, volunteer rate, poor English, born overseas population, alcohol expenditure, aged care population, musculoskeletal problems, and all educational developmental problem point in time variables excluded due to low loadings or high correlations with other variables.

Mapping the Potential: Understanding persistent disadvantage to inform community change

Table 6 shows that most variables included in the individual driver indexes were included in the overall disadvantage index. Most of the variables have a reasonably strong correlation with the overall index. While the overall Index does cover a broad spectrum of disadvantage the Index does tend to use more information from the economic list of variables (relative to social). This is not by design, but relates to what is available at an SA2 (suburb) level on a statistically compatible basis for 2016.

Throughout this research we combine the electorates (based on SA2 results) into nine broad regions. We have done so partly for presentational reasons and partly to consider regions that may be considered to be relatively similar. The nine regions include the five major capital cities; regional (or 'rest of state') areas of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland; and one last region that captures the remainder of Australia.

Further, within regional NSW we include the three ACT electorates. The ACT electorates are socioeconomically advantaged relative to regional areas. However, the ACT has only three electorates and was considered too small to be a separate region for analysis. Hence, the construction of the CSSA regions are convenient to the analysis rather than designed along geographical or statistical convention.

4.3 Reliability of results

In Table 7, we provide some aggregate results to show how the CSSA disadvantage indexes compare to the ABS SEIFA index, as well as how they compare to each other. While it is not expected that the CSSA indexes will be exactly the same as SEIFA, it is expected that there will be a reasonably close correlation. The SEIFA has a narrower, more economic focus, but given the inevitable correlations between economic, social, health and education we expect the indexes to be highly correlated.

CORRELATION	SEIFA	ECONOMIC	HEALTH	SOCIAL	EDUCATION	CSSA_ALL
SEIFA	1.00	0.96	0.66	0.88	0.73	0.94
ECONOMIC	0.96	1.00	0.61	0.82	0.71	0.92
HEALTH	0.66	0.61	1.00	0.72	0.38	0.83
SOCIAL	0.88	0.82	0.72	1.00	0.65	0.90
EDUCATION	0.73	0.71	0.38	0.65	1.00	0.76
CSSA_ALL	0.94	0.92	0.83	0.90	0.76	1.00

Table 7 Correlation matrix: ABS SEIFA Disadvantage Index and CSSA Indexes

Table 7 shows that the ABS SEIFA indexes most closely matches the CSSA economic Index with a correlation of 0.96. The lowest correlation is with health at 0.66. Of the CSSA indexes the economic Index correlates most closely with the CSSA 'All' Index while the education Index has the smallest correlation with the 'All' index. Of the CSSA component indexes we find that economic and social have the highest correlation while health and education have the smallest correlation. Based on the above comparison that these results align is a testament to the reliability of this analysis.

4.4 Limitations of the method

The indexes and drivers that have been developed for this analysis are indicators of areas where communities may be experiencing difficulty. The principal component results for health, education, social and economic are indicators that we believe relate closely to disadvantage. They are not 'hard proof' of the cause of disadvantage in any region.

The lay person should also be aware that this research applies to regional averages and the results should be interpreted at the regional level, while inferences should not be drawn at the individual level. The term 'ecological fallacy' describes the situation where not everyone in a disadvantaged community suffers the same degree of difficulty, nor all members the same lack of disadvantage. Further, a regional average can mask the size of the gap between advantaged and disadvantaged groups living side by side. The extent of this variation is something that will be explored through the data in this project.

Also, when considered long-term, we need to note the potential for the plight of individuals or the success of programs to contribute to people leaving the suburbs in which they live. These changes are masked in mapping studies.

There are also a number of technical limitations to this work:

- The lack of availability of variables at the SA2 (suburb) level precluded many variables that otherwise would ideally be included in this research.
- The PCA analysis used regional microsimulation estimation techniques for a small number of variables, which produced modelled estimates (rather than actual estimates) for these input variables.
- Due to the availability of variables and the emphasis on persistence, the overall CSSA Index is weighted more heavily towards the economic variables. Ideally there would be a stronger emphasis on the other principal components of health, social and education. This outcome is driven by data availability rather than design.
- Not all variables are available for 2011 and 2016 and not all are available at the individual level in a longitudinal format. Some were available as a series of point in time variables and where appropriate we have averaged these variables ⁹⁷

4.5 Summary

The Indexes that have been produced for this report make publicly available a nationally consistent analysis of disadvantage drivers by suburb and the mapping of these by federal electorate.

There are important and unique features of the method described in this section. These include the use of a single geographical category (SA2) and the inclusion of a persistence dimension to disadvantage. Importantly, this approach uses a series of indexes to build economic and non-economic drivers that help unpack the complexity of disadvantage and can allow providers to consider potential places and avenues for service response.

⁹⁷ Our view was that some point in time variables are just as meaningful in understanding persistence as a longer term variable can be. This approach does not imply that the same individuals are impacted by the disadvantage variable being measured, but it can assist in understanding the longer term nature of disadvantage for a given community.

5 DETAILED RESULTS

5.1	Over	view	51			
5.2	2 Detailed results					
	5.2.1	National themes	51			
	5.2.2	Electorate and party results	52			
	5.2.3	Regional results	53			
5.3	State	and territory results	54			
	5.3.1	New South Wales	54			
	5.3.2	Queensland	58			
	5.3.3	Victoria	61			
	5.3.4	Rest of Australia	64			
5.4	Sumr	nary	69			



How to read a box plot

The results detailed in this section rely on a combination of electorate level maps and box plots. Box plots have the advantage of showing both the average and the distribution of results of the SA2s within each electorate. By placing the box plots alongside each other we allow for comparison. The best way to think about a box plot is a diagram that tells the story behind an average.





In Figure 7, the average score (mean) for any given electorate is represented by a 'plus' sign (+). The vertical line is the location of the middle result (median), with 50 per cent above and below this point. In the case above, we see a balanced situation where the average and the mid-point are the same. However, in the real world, situations do not always conform to this.

Box plots also show the distribution of results in each electorate. The box in the centre shows the 'quartile range', which is the spread of the middle 50 per cent of results. If this box is narrow (i.e., number is small), it means that the majority of results are very similar, if it is wide (i.e., number is large) it means they are not. In terms of electorates, this is the difference between most of their SA2s being in a similar situation, or there being a large gap in the extent they experience disadvantage. If this box is wide, it warns us that while the average may represent all SA2s as a whole, many of the SA2s results are unlike the average. In Figure 7, we see a situation where the majority of results are similar to the average.

Further information about distribution is supplied by two 'whiskers', which are the ends of the distribution. They represent the range to the lowest (minimum) and highest (maximum) results. These are a less reliable representation of distribution because they could be the result of a single exceptional result, sometimes referred to as an 'outlier'. That said, when each result on these box plots is a SA2 and when these whiskers are long, it shows that there are potentially suburbs that experience disadvantage in a way unlike others around them. In Figure 7, there is quite large difference between the highest and lowest SA2s in this electorate.

While box plots are useful tools to tell the story behind an average and its underlying results, they are even more useful when they are used in comparison. In this report, we include an 'Australian Average' (or national standard) as benchmark to see how electorates fare nationally. We have set this at the 1,000 Index score and placed all box plots relative to this. To help understand how electorates fare overall, we have also included a top and bottom 10 per cent (roughly 1,130 and 870 scores respectively). In the case above (Figure 7), what we see is an electorate that is on average well below the national standard. Even though there are some SA2s that are doing better, it is not enough to balance out a number that are experiencing disadvantage. This is highlighted in the figure by around 30 percent of its SA2s being in the lowest 10 per cent of SA2s nationally.

The story behind this boxplot is not only of an electorate that on average is disadvantaged, it is one where some regions are doing it extremely tough.

The results in the following pages report on the overall disadvantage index in terms of box plots and maps. Appendix B also shows the results for each electorate for the other 'drivers' of disadvantage.

5.1 Overview

In this section, our CSRM research partners outline the detailed results of the economic microsimulation method that was described in the previous section.⁹⁸ The main aim of this work is to produce local data that helps define the challenges to support community-specific responses to community-based need. Although this data has been produced at the SA2 level, it is possible to aggregate reporting to other levels. This chapter reports at the federal electorate level. The decision to report in this way has been to reduce the potential for individual suburbs to be singled out for negative stereotyping (see section 2.1.5).

Reporting in this section is grouped in three ways. First, broad themes from across the nation are presented. This is followed by more specific insights across nine key regions, which includes major metropolitan centres, state regions and a 'Rest of Australia' grouping that brings together areas with small numbers of electorates. Third, these results are broken down by state and territories, including distribution map and box plot summaries. These more detailed summaries also include some illustrative examples at the electorate level.

5.2 Detailed results

5.2.1 National themes

Figure 8 CSSA All Index Disadvantage, by electorate



⁹⁸ Chapters 4 and 5 are a summary of analysis conducted by the ANU Centre for Social Research Methods as commissioned by CSSA. The contents within them are solely the product of ANU. All other chapters were produced by CSSA, but reviewed for accuracy by the CSRM team.

Figure 8 shows the distribution of overall disadvantage for Australian electorates. The map shows considerable variation across the country with disadvantage concentrated in areas outside capital cities (particularly in regional areas outside of WA and NT). A few other summary trends include:

- There is considerable variation in the disadvantage Index across states, regions and electorates.
- More affluent electorates tend to have narrower variation (particularly in Sydney), while average and disadvantaged electorates tend to have greater variation.
- There can be considerable difference between the various 'drivers' of disadvantage. For instance, while some regions may have significant economic disadvantage they may still do well in terms of health disadvantage.
- On the whole, regional areas are below the national disadvantage average.
- There tends to be areas of considerable disadvantage in some capital cities, usually in outer suburbs.
- While the Index is designed to follow a 'normal distribution' we do find that there are a small number of suburbs within electorates that are very significantly disadvantaged.

Our analysis also considers national political party trends.

5.2.2 Electorate and party results

In our detailed results we consider the party results by electorate. Figure 9 shows that the levels of disadvantage in seats held by the different political parties vary.

Figure 9 Box plot of SA2 distributions for major political parties



5. Detailed Results

This Figure presents the distribution of all SA2s within the electorates belonging to the major political parties - ALP, Liberal, Nationals and a group of 'Other' political parties (such as the Australian Greens, Katter and Independents). It shows that the National Party has the most disadvantaged seats both on average and with most SA2s falling below the national average. The Liberal Party tends to have a less disadvantaged profile compared to the Australian Labor Party with around two in three SA2s in the top 50 per cent in terms of low disadvantage. The 'Other' parties are similar to the ALP but of course this hides considerable differences between the profiles of individual parties for this group.

That said, since the Australian population is heavily concentrated in a few major cities the distribution of results within these cities is hard to view from a single party chart or Australian map. To gain a better understanding we need to drill down into our nine regions and look in more detail.

5.2.3 Regional results

Table 8 shows the summary results for each of the nine CSSA regions for each component Index and our 'All' index.

	CSSA	_ALL	ECON	оміс	HEA	LTH	soc	IAL	EDUC	
	Average	Quartile range								
Greater Adelaide	967	118	962	130	973	94	991	90	996	113
Greater Brisbane	1013	145	1008	114	1051	106	1028	111	973	105
Greater Melbourne	1036	104	1016	103	1035	93	1042	81	1038	101
Greater Perth	1053	119	1028	98	1085	73	1042	83	1026	91
Greater Sydney	1053	142	1017	164	1063	101	1037	92	1042	99
Rest of Australia	962	135	981	110	957	135	976	95	992	94
Rest of NSW/ACT	961	131	983	103	930	133	966	97	1019	74
Rest of Qld	955	123	974	97	976	113	985	91	954	88
Rest of Victoria	953	94	978	75	929	85	982	66	1007	89
Total	1006	144	1000	123	1011	133	1013	105	1013	103

Table 8 Summary of SA2 based Index results for CSSA regions

Table 8 shows that for the 'All' Index, on average, the Rest of Victoria has the most disadvantage with an average score of 953 (compared to an all-Australia average of 1000 and standard deviation of 100). Regional areas of NSW / ACT and Queensland, Adelaide and the Rest of Australia also are more disadvantaged than the average. The least disadvantaged CSSA areas are Sydney (1053) and Perth (1053).

In terms of economic disadvantage the weakest CSSA region is Adelaide and the strongest is Perth. Perth, Sydney and Brisbane all do well in terms of health, whereas Regional Victoria and NSW/ACT do not. Social disadvantage is greatest in regional NSW/ACT and rest of Australia. The least social disadvantage is found in Melbourne and Perth and Sydney. Education disadvantage is strongest in Regional Queensland and Brisbane. The least educationally disadvantaged regions were Sydney and Melbourne.

These average results can hide considerable variation within these regions. While Sydney generally outperforms the other CSSA regions it also has considerable variation with the 'quartile range' (difference between the 25th and 75th percentiles) being 142 Index points. At 145 Index points, Brisbane has the most variation. Of all indexes shown Sydney has the largest variation within the economic index. The quartile range of 164 shows the diversity of economic disadvantage in Sydney is considerable. For the economic index, the bottom quartile score for Sydney is lower than that for Brisbane, Perth or Melbourne.

Appendix B provides detailed results for each electorate for each 'driver' of disadvantage and the overall CSSA disadvantage index.

The electorate in Australia with the highest rank for disadvantage is Hinkler in regional Queensland. Hinkler's disadvantage is strong for the economic, health and education components. Other strongly disadvantaged areas include Spence (north of Adelaide), Braddon (West Tasmania), Cowper (Northern NSW) and Lyne (NSW Mid North Coast). Spence is economically and educationally disadvantaged while the remaining three listed are weakest electorates with respect to health (due to an older population).

Economically Australia's most disadvantaged electorate is Blaxland (Western Sydney). Braddon is the most disadvantaged electorate with respect to health. The least disadvantaged with respect to health is the electorate of Sydney. Social and educational disadvantage is most pronounced in Parkes in NSW and Spence in Adelaide respectively. The least socially disadvantaged is Mitchell in Sydney. The least educationally disadvantaged is Warringah.

The least disadvantaged electorate in Australia is North Sydney which performs well across the board in terms of a lack of disadvantage. Other electorates with limited disadvantage include Wentworth, Bradfield, Warringah (all in Sydney) and Kooyong (Melbourne).

5.3 State and territory results

5.3.1 New South Wales



Figure 10 Map of Disadvantage Index in NSW and Greater Sydney electorates

Greater Sydney

The overall disadvantage Index in Greater Sydney is 1053 which (with Perth) scores the highest among the nine CSSA regions in Australia.

The main contributor to lower disadvantage in Greater Sydney is health with an Index of 1063. Considering the variables included in the 'Health' index, we expect this result is driven by a relatively young and healthy population. The other main contributors are education (1042), social and economic, with 1037 and 1017 respectively. Overall Greater Sydney is doing relatively well compared to the other regions. As discussed in the aggregate results section Sydney does have considerable variation in results so it is the case that a strong overall result masks considerable variability with many electorates and indeed SA2s suffering considerable disadvantage. Conversely, many electorates and SA2s have only very limited disadvantage at the area level.

The map in Figure 10 shows how the overall disadvantage Index is spread across the electorates in NSW. It is quite clear that the most disadvantaged areas are in the outer western regions of the state. These regions typically have lower income and wealth, lower levels of education, often have older persons who are more likely to have health issues and these regions tend to have greater social disadvantage.

Considering Greater Sydney, the inner city areas are the least disadvantaged electorates. This mainly includes the regions around the harbour and the inner parts of Sydney. The most disadvantaged areas in Sydney tend to be the electorates towards the west of Sydney, in particular the south west. Pockets of disadvantage also exist in the far northern areas such as Dobell.



Figure 11 Disadvantage Index in Greater Sydney at the electorate level

In Greater Sydney, Fowler (894) and Blaxland (923) are the most disadvantaged electorates which are ranked 9th and 23rd in Australia. Not surprisingly, North Sydney and Wentworth are the least disadvantaged electorates with an Index about 1180. North Sydney and Wentworth are the two least disadvantaged electorates in Australia. Out of 29 electorates in Greater Sydney, only ten electorates

have the overall CSSA Index below 1000 with the rest above the average across Australia. This shows that most electorates in the Sydney region are comparatively less disadvantaged.

The average disadvantage score of an electorate may not be a good indicator of the level of disadvantage of all the suburbs falling into it, thus we provide box plots of each electorate. The box plot only shows the SA2 (suburb) results for each electorate for the overall CSSA index.

There are 29 electorates falling mostly in the Greater Sydney region with a range of average disadvantage indexes for electorates between 894 and 1180. But the regions/suburbs within each electorate vary considerably around these electorate averages.

For instance, the average Index of the electorate 'Werriwa' is 970, as the score indicates it is a little under the average for overall disadvantage Index and is ranked 56th in Australia for disadvantage. However, it is clear from the box plot that Werriwa has the highest length for the whiskers: the score range between 749 and 1065. That is, some SA2 (suburb) regions in this electorate are doing relatively well with an Index above 1055 even though the average Index is quite low. The main contributor to a wide range Index is the higher health Index score (indicating low disadvantage) which usually relates to younger cohorts in a given region.

When considering the different 'drivers' of disadvantage for each electorate, in the Greater Sydney regions, the highly economically disadvantaged electorates are Blaxland, Fowler and Watson in comparison with the least economically disadvantaged regions like Wentworth, Warringah and Bradfield. The main factors we analyse in the economic principal components are employment, housing and welfare income. As expected, the inner city regions are doing much better than the outer western suburbs.

Most of the electorates in Sydney have a relatively higher health disadvantage Index – indicating less disadvantage, on average, than the rest of Australia. The electorates Dobell and Robertson are the most disadvantaged areas in health.

Looking at the social component of the disadvantage index, the electorates Sydney and Mitchell are the least socially disadvantaged areas compared to the most disadvantaged regions like Fowler and Dobell. The education component of the Index score is very similar to the economic disadvantage Index as it aligns with income or employment.

Rest of NSW/ACT

The Rest of NSW and the ACT, is on average, Australia's third most disadvantaged region with an overall CSSA disadvantage score of 961 – modestly ahead of regional Victoria and regional Queensland. The region is particularly disadvantaged with respect to health but does relatively well on education. The rest of NSW has a relatively old population which is likely to be a factor in the region's health disadvantage result.

Like all regions there is considerable variation in results across the four 'driver' indexes and the overall CSSA disadvantage Index for the Rest of NSW. The overall Index at the SA2 (suburb) level varies from a very high 1267 in an ACT suburb (nearly three standard deviations above the mean) to 727 in a suburb in the electorate of Cowper (nearly three standard deviations below the mean). This aligns with the electorate averages where the most disadvantaged area is Cowper and the least disadvantaged is Canberra.

The map in Figure 10 shows a clear pattern that disadvantage is greatest in rural and remote areas to the west and north and also in northern coastal locations where incomes tend to be relatively low and people tend to be older than average.



57

Figure 12 Disadvantage Index in Rest of NSW/ACT at the electorate level

Figure 12 shows the box plots for each electorate that is mostly in the Rest of NSW and the ACT. Of the 21 electorates only the three ACT electorates (Canberra, Bean and Fenner), Hume and Cunningham are clearly not relatively disadvantaged. Electorates which are clearly disadvantaged include Parkes, Cowper, Lyne, New England and Page.

As for most regions of Australia there is considerable variation within electorates with the box plot showing most regions having considerable differences between the most and least disadvantaged SA2s. As an example, the electorate of Eden-Monaro varies from 1134 for the least disadvantaged SA2 to 790 for the most disadvantaged SA2.

Considering the different 'drivers' of disadvantage for each electorate in the Rest of NSW shows that in several electorates the health driver pulls the region results down. The NSW coastal electorates of Cowper, Lyne, Gilmore and Page all have particularly high average levels of health disadvantage. The three ACT electorates all perform relatively well with low average health disadvantage.

Economically, the results mirror those of the overall CSSA Index with ACT and surrounding electorates (Hume and Eden-Monaro) enjoying relatively low economic disadvantage. Cowper, Lyne, New England, Page and Parkes are all relatively economically disadvantaged.

Education disadvantage is a relatively strong point for regional NSW and the ACT with most electorates either above average or only marginally below average. However, there is some variation within SA2s meaning that some have considerable educational disadvantage. The ACT electorates do have a number of SA2s with lower scores. This result is driven by the ACT's relatively low performance in the Australian Early Development Census.

The Rest of NSW / ACT region is relatively disadvantaged socially with all but five electorates in the ACT and surrounding electorates (Hume and Eden-Monaro) relatively disadvantaged. Parkes is the most disadvantaged (858) with New England (912) also exhibiting considerable disadvantage. This result indicates that it is the more rural and remote areas of NSW that are the most socially disadvantaged.

5.3.2 Queensland



Figure 13 Map of Disadvantage Index in Queensland and Brisbane electorates

Brisbane

Brisbane, is on average, modestly less disadvantaged than the rest of the country with an overall CSSA disadvantage score of 1013. Brisbane's strongest point is health with a score of 1051 and its weakest point is education with a relatively disadvantaged 973.

Like all regions there is considerable variation in results across the four 'driver' indexes and the overall CSSA Index for Brisbane. The overall Index at the SA2 (suburb) level varies from a high 1184 in a suburb in Ryan (nearly two standard deviations above the mean) to 693 in a suburb in Rankin (nearly three standard deviations below the mean). At the electorate level the most disadvantaged area is Blair (west of Brisbane) and the least disadvantaged is Brisbane (western suburbs).

The map in Figure 13 shows a clear pattern that disadvantage is greatest in the outer northern and southern suburbs and out towards Ipswich where incomes tend to be relatively low and education levels tend to be lower.



Figure 14 Disadvantage Index in Brisbane at the electorate level

Figure 14 shows the box plots for each electorate that is mostly in the Greater Brisbane area. Of the 14 electorates three electorates (Brisbane, Ryan and Griffith) are clearly relatively less disadvantaged while Rankin, Petrie, Longman and Blair are relatively disadvantaged electorates.

As for most regions of Australia there is considerable variation within electorates with the box plot showing most regions having considerable differences between the most and least disadvantaged SA2s. As an example, the electorate of Rankin is particularly diverse and varies from 693 for the most disadvantaged SA2 to 1082 for the least disadvantaged SA2.

Considering the different 'drivers' of disadvantage for each electorate in Brisbane shows that several electorate's education driver pulls the region results down. The coastal electorates of Blair, Longman, Oxley and Rankin all have particularly high average levels of education disadvantage. The more inner Brisbane electorates of Ryan, Griffith and Brisbane all perform relatively well with low average education disadvantage.

Economically, the results mirror those of the overall CSSA Index with inner city electorates (Ryan, Brisbane and Griffith) enjoying relatively low economic disadvantage. Again, Blair, Longman and Rankin are all relatively economically disadvantaged.

Health disadvantage is a relatively strong point for Brisbane with most electorates either above average or only marginally below average. However, there is some variation within SA2s meaning that some suburbs do perform quite badly with considerable health disadvantage.

Brisbane is modestly socially advantaged with only Blair being, on average, seriously disadvantaged. Both the electorates of Brisbane and Ryan are about one standard deviation above the mean with scores around 1100 – implying considerably less social disadvantage than the rest of Australia. As for most regions and 'drivers' there remains considerable variation within the Greater Brisbane region at the SA2 (suburb) level for social disadvantage with scores ranging from 781 to 1151.

Rest of Queensland

Regional Queensland, is on average, more disadvantaged than the rest of the country with an overall CSSA Index score of 955 (second most disadvantaged of our nine CSSA regions). Regional Queensland is modestly below average across the range of 'drivers' of disadvantage but its area of most disadvantage is education where it has the most disadvantage in Australia on average.

Like all regions there is considerable variation in results across the four 'driver' indexes and the overall CSSA disadvantage Index for regional Queensland. The overall Index at the SA2 (suburb) level varies from a high 1094 in a suburb in Fadden (one standard deviation above the mean) to 485 in a suburb within Kennedy (five standard deviations below the mean). At the electorate level the most disadvantaged area is Hinkler at a national low of 828 and the least disadvantaged is McPherson (western suburbs) modestly above the national average at 1011.

The map in Figure 13 shows a clear pattern that disadvantage is greatest in areas outside south east Queensland. Western and Central Queensland have particularly high levels of disadvantage. These electorates (such as Hinkler, Kennedy, Maranoa, and Wide Bay) experience strong disadvantage across each driver index. In addition to their high levels of average disadvantage many of these electorates have no SA2s with scores much above average levels for any of the driver indexes.



Figure 15 Disadvantage Index in Regional Queensland at the electorate level

Figure 15 shows the box plots for each electorate that is mostly in the Regional Queensland area. Of the 16 electorates only two electorates (McPherson, Fadden) are relatively less disadvantaged while the remainder are relatively disadvantaged. Several electorates, such as Wide Bay, Hinkler, Flynn, Kennedy and Capricornia have some SA2s that are considerably disadvantaged relative to Australia.

As for most regions of Australia there is considerable variation within electorates with the box plot showing most regions having considerable differences between the most and least disadvantaged SA2s. As an example, the electorate of Kennedy has the largest range of results for regional Queensland. For the CSSA Disadvantage Index results range from 485 to 965.

Considering the different 'drivers' of disadvantage for each electorate in regional Queensland shows that in several electorates the education driver pulls the region results down. The Queensland regional electorates of Hinkler, Kennedy and Herbert all have particularly high average levels of education disadvantage. Only Fairfax and McPherson have education indexes that show relatively lower levels of disadvantage.

Economically, the results mirror those of the overall CSSA Index with South East Queensland (Fadden, Fairfax, Wright and McPherson) electorates performing better economically enjoying relatively low economic disadvantage. Again, Hinkler, Wide Bay, Kennedy and Maranoa are all considerably economically disadvantaged. Some of the less disadvantaged electorates such as Groom, Herbert and Flynn have considerable variation with respect to their economic index. As an example, Flynn varies from 710 to 1067.

Regional Queensland also is relatively disadvantaged in health with most electorates having below average levels of disadvantage. Hinkler and Wide Bay face the greatest health disadvantage in regional Queensland and both have SA2s with particularly high levels of disadvantage.

Regional Queensland is modestly socially disadvantaged with Hinkler, Kennedy and Maranoa all having scores below 955. Kennedy and Leichhardt both have SA2s with particularly low scores (high disadvantage) due to relatively large Indigenous populations. Consistent with the theme of considerable variation there are also areas that are less disadvantaged in regional Queensland with electorates such as Groom having high disadvantage and including some SA2s with quite low relative disadvantage.

5.3.3 Victoria



Figure 16 Map of Disadvantage Index in Victorian electorates

Greater Melbourne

The overall average disadvantage Index in Greater Melbourne is 1036 which is ranked 3rd among the nine CSSA regions. Melbourne performs best in the social Index with a score of 1042 while its lowest result is the economic Index at 1016. Greater Melbourne and Greater Perth share the highest social disadvantage score (least socially disadvantaged) in Australia.

The contributors to the disadvantage score in Greater Melbourne are education and health with an Index of 1038 and 1035 respectively and the economic driver with an Index of 1016. Although the overall Index is above the average score for Australia, similar to Greater Sydney, there is considerable variation in the Index within electorates and particularly SA2 regions within each electorate.

The map in Figure 16 shows that some regional parts of Victoria are highly disadvantaged, especially electorates like Gippsland, Mallee and Nicholls. As expected, in Greater Melbourne the least disadvantaged regions are clustered in the inner city along with some disadvantaged electorates like Calwell and Fraser. We expect the higher proportion of aged people, single parents, disabled, unemployed people and so on in regional Victoria are the main contributors to the high disadvantaged Index compared to the metropolitan parts.



Figure 17 Boxplots of overall disadvantage for Greater Melbourne

In Greater Melbourne, the electorates of Fraser, Bruce and Calwell are the most disadvantaged with an Index under 930. These are ranked 20th, 24th and 25th in Australia. However, similar to Sydney, most electorates have an average Index above 1000. The electorates Kooyong and Higgins are the least disadvantaged regions with an average Index above 1130 and are in the top 10 electorates in terms of least disadvantage across Australia.

As the boxplot shows, the electorate of Calwell has the highest range for the disadvantage scores, from 748 to 1074. Even though the electorates Fraser, Calwell, Dunkley and Scullin are relatively disadvantaged electorates, these regions also have considerable variation in their disadvantage Index

score which shows some SA2 (suburb) regions in these electorates are doing relatively well despite the overall low disadvantage index.

The electorates with a narrow range in the Index tend to also be the least disadvantaged regions like Kooyong, Chisholm and Goldstein.

Now looking into the different 'drivers' for the disadvantage score, Melbourne and Macnamara have the least health disadvantage compared to the very most disadvantaged electorate like Flinders (southern suburbs). Most of the electorates in Greater Melbourne have a social disadvantage Index above 1000 except for Fraser and Bruce.

For education, the electorates of Calwell, Fraser and Bruce have the most disadvantage compared to the least disadvantaged inner city regions like Kooyong, Goldstein and Higgins.

Rest of Victoria

The overall disadvantage Index across regional Victoria is 953 which is ranked lowest (highly disadvantaged) among the nine CSSA regions. The main reason behind this is the low health Index of 929. The regional parts tend to have higher proportions of vulnerable groups like aged people, disabled groups and so on which usually relates to a low health disadvantage Index (mostly disadvantaged).

Out of ten electorates in regional Victoria, Mallee and Gippsland are the most disadvantaged regions with an average Index of 905 and 911 compared to the relatively less disadvantaged electorate of Corangamite. All electorates in regional Victoria have an average Index below 1000 except for Corangamite (1046) which shows that the most SA2 (suburb) regions within these electorates are disadvantaged in one form or the other.



Figure 18 Boxplots of overall disadvantage for regional Victoria

As the above Figure shows, the electorate of Corio has the widest range for the Index between 760 and 1090. Some SA2 (suburb) regions in the electorate of Corio are amongst the most disadvantaged parts of Victoria. On the other hand, some suburbs are doing relatively well with an overall average Index of 1090. However, these regions have a moderately low health Index compared to a relatively high economic and social disadvantage index.

Corangamite is the least economically disadvantaged electorate, whereas Mallee and Gippsland have low scores on the economic Index. In Gippsland, out of people in the labour force, over 7.4 per cent were unemployed and the major occupation is technicians and trades work (16.2 per cent).

For the education index, the electorates of Nicholls, Gippsland and Mallee had low scores of 966, 967 and 968 respectively. Some electorates like Corangamite and Ballarat have an Index of 1076 and 1023 (least educationally disadvantaged).

In terms of health disadvantage, Gippsland and Mallee are most disadvantaged with an Index around 890, while the electorates like Corangamite (1004) and Corio (954) score relatively high (least health disadvantaged areas). Similar to other 'drivers', Corangamite has the highest social disadvantaged score (least disadvantaged) compared to low socially indexed electorates like Mallee and Nicholls.

Overall, regional Victoria has the lowest overall disadvantage score (among CSSA regions) with most electorates/SA2 regions with a low health index.

5.3.4 Rest of Australia

Greater Perth

Figure 19 Map of Disadvantage Index in Perth electorates



The overall disadvantage Index in Greater Perth is 1053 indicating the least disadvantage (along with Sydney) among the nine CSSA regions in Australia.

The main contributor to lower disadvantage in Greater Perth is health with an Index of 1085. Considering the variables included in the health index, we expect this result is driven by a relatively young and healthy population. The other main contributors are education (1026), social (1042) and economic (1017). Overall Greater Perth is doing relatively well compared to the other regions. Like all regions, Perth does have some variation in results so it is the case that a strong overall result masks variability with many electorates and indeed SA2s suffering considerable disadvantage. Conversely, many electorates and SA2s have only very limited disadvantage at the area level.

The map in Figure 19 shows how the overall disadvantage Index is spread across electorates in Perth. It is quite clear that, the most disadvantaged areas are in the south and east in the electorates of Canning and Hasluck. The areas in the inner city tend to be electorates with lower levels of disadvantage.



Figure 20 Disadvantage Index box plots in Greater Perth at the electorate level

In Greater Perth all electorates have no worse than average levels of disadvantage. The most disadvantaged electorate is Canning followed by Brand. The most advantaged are Curtin and Moore. Curtin is Australia's 6th least disadvantaged electorate and has no SA2s with Index below the average disadvantage. While there still remain some areas with considerable disadvantage there are no examples of extreme disadvantage in Perth.

There are 13 electorates falling mostly in the Greater Perth region with a range of average disadvantage indexes between 1000 and 1148. But the SA2 regions/suburbs within each electorate vary around these electorate averages.

For instance, one of the more variable electorates is Canning with an average Index of about 1000 (the average across Australia) but a most disadvantaged SA2 of 825 and a least disadvantaged area above 1100.

Considering the different 'drivers' of disadvantage for each electorate we tend to find that Perth does quite well across the board in terms of limited disadvantage across most 'drivers'. For health and social, all electorates have below average levels of disadvantage. For the economic driver most are less disadvantaged than average. However Canning, Burt, Swan and Brand all fall marginally under the average meaning they are modestly above average disadvantage. Most electorates have below average disadvantage for education, while Burt and Hasluck have modestly higher than average disadvantage for education. While Perth generally across all drivers has relatively few SA2s with severe disadvantage for any drivers. However, a suburb in both Canning and Cowan had a very low score for economic disadvantage. These suburbs tend to have an older, lower income and implying significant economic disadvantage. These suburbs tend to have an older, lower income and lower-educated population – largely explaining their high levels of disadvantage.

On a particularly positive note Perth has the least disadvantage for the health Index and this strong result is reflected across all electorates in Perth. Perth also has some of the least disadvantaged SA2s in Australia with regard to the health Index.

Greater Adelaide



Figure 21 Map of Disadvantage Index in Adelaide electorates

The overall disadvantage Index in Greater Adelaide is 967 which is the lowest of Australia's major capital cities and similar to scores in regional Australia. The main contributor to this higher disadvantage is economic disadvantage with an Index of 962. Adelaide does a little better on the social and education indexes with scores just a little below average for Australia. Adelaide typically has an older population and tends to have lower income than the other major capital cities.

Like all regions Adelaide does have some variation in results so it is the case that a weak overall result also includes some SA2s and electorates that are doing reasonably well or indeed at the other end of the spectrum experience considerable disadvantage.

The map in Figure 21 shows how the overall disadvantage Index is spread across electorates in Adelaide. It is quite clear that, the most disadvantaged areas are in the south and north. The areas in the inner city tend to be electorates with lower levels of disadvantage as are those near the Adelaide Hills.



Figure 22 Disadvantage Index box plots in Greater Adelaide at the electorate level

In Greater Adelaide most electorates are relatively disadvantaged with only Boothby and Sturt having modestly below average disadvantage. Adelaide tends to have very few SA2s with very high scores (low disadvantage). Adelaide's highest suburb score is 1114, while its lowest score is 600. This indicates that Adelaide has some pockets of severe disadvantage and it does have some areas of limited disadvantage.

Adelaide's most disadvantaged electorate is Spence with an average score of 840 – Australia's second most disadvantaged electorate. While the average is very low for Spence it does have considerable variation with Australia's second most disadvantaged SA2. Adelaide has seven SA2s with overall disadvantage scores below 800 – more than any other major capital city.

Considering the different 'drivers' of disadvantage for each electorate we find that Adelaide has above average disadvantage across all 'drivers'. Adelaide struggles the most economically, with poorer employment, unemployment and income outcomes compared to other major state capitals. Electorates such as Spence face challenges with several SA2s having very low economic scores – indicating high levels of economic disadvantage. Sturt is the only Adelaide electorate that does not have any SA2s with economic scores below 900 (one standard deviation below the national average).

Adelaide does a little better for the other drivers, particularly so for education and social disadvantage. On both of these dimensions Adelaide records about average compared to the rest of Australia. For health, Adelaide has more electorates below than above average, implying stronger disadvantage than average for Australia. For these three indexes, Adelaide doesn't have the extremes that it does for the economic driver, however considerable disadvantage does exist in some SA2s. In summary, Adelaide's disadvantage levels align more with regional Australia than other major capital cities. There are particular SA2s that have significant disadvantage across the full spectrum of measures in this report but they tend to be particularly economically disadvantaged.

Rest of Australia

Australia is a large land mass and as such some of our electorates are very sparsely populated. Our 'Rest of Australia' region encapsulates those electorates not in a large capital city or major 'rest of state' region. These regions include the rest of Western Australia, South Australia, Northern Territory and Tasmania. As expected in such a diverse range of electorates some very different results are found.

The 'Rest of Australia' has levels of disadvantage that align closely with other regional areas such as regional New South Wales or Queensland and has below average results across the four driver Indexes and the overall disadvantage Index. As for all regions there is considerable variation between electorates and in particular SA2s.

The electorates with the least disadvantage in the Rest of Australia are Lingiari and Solomon. Solomon is largely the metropolitan areas of Darwin and Palmerston while Lingiari is a very large electorate making up the remainder of the Northern Territory. The most disadvantaged areas include three Tasmanian electorates (Braddon, Bass and Lyons) and Grey in regional South Australia. All have average overall disadvantage scores around 900 or below.



Figure 23 Disadvantage Index box plots for Rest of Australia at the electorate level

Figure 23 shows that even the least disadvantaged electorates have considerable variation with some SA2s having very significant disadvantage. As an example, Solomon, on average, is not a disadvantaged electorate but does have some SA2s with considerable disadvantage. Its most disadvantaged suburb has a large Indigenous community and is particularly disadvantaged economically, however, due to its relatively young population it does quite well with regard to health

disadvantage. It is worth pointing out that a strong result in any one dimension or 'driver' does not mean that all persons in a region are not disadvantaged. The SA2 (suburb) results are also averages across a given region which exhibit potentially considerable variation from person to person and dwelling to dwelling.

Given the diverse nature of the 'Rest of Australia' it should be no surprise that electorate results vary considerably for each driver. On the health dimension, Solomon does very well with a score of 1149 while Braddon in Tasmania has a low score at 818. Much of this result is likely driven by the relative age profiles of these electorates with Solomon having an average age of just 33 years compared to 44 years for Braddon.

Most electorates have above average social disadvantage with Braddon in Tasmania the most disadvantaged with a score of 917. The least socially disadvantaged is Mayo in South Australia. Braddon has relatively low internet connection rates, relatively large Indigenous population and modestly high rates of single parent households. At the SA2 (suburb) level results vary substantially. The electorate of Lyons includes an SA2 which has the very low social disadvantage score of 665 (indicating severe disadvantage). This result is driven by very low rates of internet connection and a large Indigenous population.

In regard to educational disadvantage, this CSSA region performs just a little below the rest of Australia. The results are reasonably uniform with some electorates a little above and a little below average disadvantage. A couple of exceptions include Lingiari and Grey with scores of 892 and 943 respectively. Both also include SA2s with considerably lower disadvantage scores.

Economically, the regions in the rest of Australia perform a little below average but there is also considerable variation between and within electorates. The economic results are similar to the overall results with serious disadvantage scores for Bass, Braddon and Lyons in Tasmania and Grey in South Australia. Lyons and Bass both have SA2s that are three to four standard deviations below the mean – between 600 and 700 – indicating severe economic disadvantage.

5.4 Summary

This section has outlined in detail the results of the analysis conducted by academics from the CSRM at ANU. It forms the centrepiece of this report and will provide a basis for subsequent policy, practice and service analysis. The results in this section provide a sense of the richness of data and analysis that will be available to support decision-making by project partners and their local communities.

The results from this preliminary phase of reporting will be enhanced with more variables and further analysis (including population projections) in the next phase of this analysis. Together, this will provide important definitional data for future stages in the project (see section 3.1.2). It aims to become an important resource to support community-specific responses to the community-based constraints presented by disadvantage.

LOOKING FORWARD

This report is the first step in a larger project around supporting community-specific responses to community-based constraints. It provides information about the different drivers of disadvantage in different regions. It intends to raise awareness about the complexity of persistent disadvantage amongst decision-makers.

In coming months, this information will be used as the basis of conversations with political leaders. It will also be shared with policy leaders to support their work. This will assist efforts to put national policy planning in place to enhance local action.

The next phase of this project will be another round of analysis with a wider range of variables. This will provide deeper practical insight into what drives persistent disadvantage. It will also incorporate more data on welfare service delivery and population projections. This will support decision-making around future local investment and service innovation.

The results from this phase will be shared with project partners at the suburb level. This is important because it aligns closely with the level at which they make practice decisions. It will help them to work with their communities to design better targeted responses.

This second phase will present new opportunities to support place-based policy responses. Knowing what drives disadvantage can help policy makers to decide where to target initiatives. It also helps them to know where to prioritise funding for particular initiatives or programs. This will be an important contribution to the important work currently being supported by government.

This information also holds the potential for new approaches to national policy formation. In addition to individual or regional approaches, new policy can target pockets of different drivers of persistent disadvantage where they occur. Such policy offers the potential for local needs to better inform national policy planning. It offers a new option for approaches to population-based policy.

Looking forward, an important contribution will be to support community building and rebuilding. This may be in response to economic hardship or it may be in the wake of natural disasters. The data from this research will be useful to inform approaches to rebuilding that do not re-entrench the persistent disadvantage that existed previously. Whatever the challenge, the experience of our national network of Catholic social service agencies means they are available and ready to help.

The coproduction approach that was described in this report is also an important contribution. Where much of the research into disadvantage is 'pure' in academic terms, this approach is applied. By drawing on the expertise of our project partners it adds a 'ground up' view to the existing body of research. In doing so, it complements 'top down' perspectives as it provides statistical information in a way that is more accessible for service providers. In itself, this is an important methodological innovation. However, it is also an important contribution to the growing body of innovation in coproduction and co-design research.

Looking further forward, there is the potential to share the insights from this project in new initiatives. As has been noted, the method in this project is informed by a range of emerging social inclusion perspectives. These insights are beyond the scope of the data that has been used here. In the future stages, we will pursue opportunities for partnerships that can inform these broader perspectives. Hence, this project can complement and create new and exciting possibilities for research in the years to come.
Influential texts

Davidson, P., Saunders, P., Bradbury, B. and Wong, M. (2020), *Poverty in Australia, 2020. ACOSS/UNSW Poverty and Inequality Partnership Report No. 3,* Sydney: ACOSS.

Davidson, P., Saunders, P., & Phillips, J. (2018). Inequality in Australia, 2018. http://povertyandinequality.acoss.org.au/publication/inequality-in-australia-2018-2/

Henderson, R. F., Harcourt, A., & Harper, R. J. A. (1970). *People in poverty: A Melbourne survey* (Vol. 4). Cheshire for the Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne.

Parliament of Australia. (2019). *Living on the edge*. <u>https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/</u> Committees/House/Former_Committees/Intergenerational_Welfare_Dependence/IGWD/Final_Report

Productivity Commission. (2018). *Rising inequality? A stocktake of the evidence*. Commission Research Paper, Canberra. <u>https://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-inequality</u>

Saunders, P. (1998). *Defining Poverty and Identifying the Poor.* Social Policy Research Centre Discussion Paper, 84 (March).

Saunders, P. (ed.). (2019). *Revisiting Henderson: poverty social security and basic income*. Melbourne University Press: Melbourne.

Vinson, T. (2007). Dropping off the edge; the distribution of disadvantage in Australia. Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia. http://search.proquest.com/docview/215552177/abstract/A963C5BE345545CAPQ/1

Vinson, T., Rawsthorne, M., Beavis, A., Ericson, M., (2015). *Dropping off the edge: Persistent communal disadvantage in Australia*. Jesuit Social Services & Catholic Social Services Australia. <u>http://hdl.handle.net/10070/261284</u>

APPENDICES

Appendix A - List of indicators

This project worked with its 21 provider partners and CSRM academics to coproduce its range of persistent disadvantage categories for analysis. The process used project partner expertise to identify factors that impact on communities on a daily basis. Not all the proposed indicators were available at SA2 (suburb) level and in time for this first round of analysis. The project will continue to seek a wider set of variables for release in round two in support of project partner decision-making.

PCA INDEX	THEME	ROUND 1 VARIABLE	ROUND 2 VARIABLE (TBC)
Economic			
	Income	% Household Low income in both 2011 and 2016 Longitudinal Census (Equivalised income < \$25,999 per year) (Census)	
		% Persons with low income (<\$25,999 per year) (Census)	
	Employment	% Families with jobless parents (Census)	
		Unemployment Rate (%) (Census)	
	Education	% of adult population high school only (Census)	
	Housing	% Households needing extra bedroom (Census)	
		% Households Renting	
		% Households in public housing	
		% Households in housing stress (30/40 rule) (Census/ PolicyMod)	

Table 9 List of Round 1 (current) and Round 2 (intended) variables

PCA INDEX	THEME	ROUND 1 VARIABLE	ROUND 2 VARIABLE (TBC)
	Pensions	% Working age population on pensions or allowances	
		% Adults population on age pension	
		SA2 median house price	
	Persistence	% Households needing extra bedroom 2011 and 2016 persistence (Longitudinal Census)	
		% Households in housing stress (approximate 30/40 rule) 2011 and 2016 persistence (Longitudinal Census)	
		% Families with jobless parents 2011 and 2016 persistence (Longitudinal Census)	
	Crime		Rate of domestic/family violence orders per 1000 population aged 18-64 years in each counting area
	Employment		Proportion of the workforce (ABS definition) classified as lowest skill (ABS definition) in each counting area
	Housing		Proportion of people aged 18 and over in receipt of rental assistance in each counting area
	Welfare		Service type
			Service duration
Education			
	Schooling	% Adult population high school education only (Census)	
		% Children with health problems 2009-2018 Average	
	Social Issues	% Children with Social development issues 2009-2018 Average	

PCA INDEX	ТНЕМЕ	ROUND 1 VARIABLE	ROUND 2 VARIABLE (TBC)
		% Children with Language issues 2009-2018 Average	
	Learning issues	% Children with communication issues 2009-2018 Average % Children with emotional issues 2009-2018 Average	
	Early Years		Childcare/Kinder rate of 0-4 children
	Literacy		Y3 Literacy NAPLAN Y9 Literacy NAPLAN
	Numeracy		Y3 Numeracy NAPLAN Y9 Numeracy NAPLAN
	Higher Education		Bachelor Degree or higher rate, Adult population VET rate, Adult
			Population
Health			
	Disability	Percent of population with a disability (AIHW)	
	Drug	Average spend on tobacco per week (Regional Policymod – synthetic SA2 data combining the ABS Household Expenditure Survey and the ABS Census)	
	Disease	% of population with Type 2 diabetes (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
		% of population with mental health problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
		% of population with mood disorders (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
		% of population with circulatory problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
		% of population with heart problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	

PCA INDEX	ТНЕМЕ	ROUND 1 VARIABLE	ROUND 2 VARIABLE (TBC)
		% of population with respiratory problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
		% of population with asthma problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
		% of population with pulmonary problems (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
		% of population with arthritis (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
	Persistence	% of population with obesity (PHIDU, Torrens University)	
		% of population with disability in 2011 and 2016 ABS longitudinal Census	
	Aged Care		Aged Care Residential (share of population)
			Commonwealth Home Support / Home Care packages
			Aged Care - in home (share of population)
	Health Scheme		MBS
			PBS
Social			
	Family composition	% Household Single Parents	
	Indigenous status	% Persons Indigenous	
	IT connection	% Dwellings no internet connection	
		NESB, born overseas, volunteering variables removed due to advantage correlation	
			Immigrant Share of population
			Christian Share of Population
			Other religion
			No religion

PCA INDEX	THEME	ROUND 1 VARIABLE	ROUND 2 VARIABLE (TBC)
Population Pro	ojection		
	Age		Child
			Youth
			Adult
			Older
	Gender		Male
			Female
	Family		Couple parent
			Family composition
	Sexuality		Heterosexual
			LGBTQI

Table 10 Summary of Electorate Index results for CSSA Regions

GCC2 Greater Adelaide

	QUARTILE QUARTILE	161	100	72	84	100	151	54	113
ATION	XAM	1126	1127	1103	1065	1073	1012	1111	1127
EDUC	NIW	901	948	938	840	925	691	970	691
	AVERAGE	1009	1043	1006	986	666	877	1053	966
	QUARTILE RANGE	89	8	86	121	78	114	74	06
IAL	XAM	1104	1098	1070	1094	1094	1131	1098	1131
soc	NIW	006	954	866	859	956	775	970	775
	AVERAGE	1013	1020	970	993	1003	913	1026	991
	QUARTILE BUNGE	73	52	95	135	67	74	74	94
H	XAM	1121	1037	1033	1022	1044	1010	1062	1121
HEA	NIW	903	914	806	830	901	763	968	763
	AVERAGE	1017	980	963	946	969	913	1020	973
	QUARTILE QUARTILE	174	133	61	154	91	174	97	130
OMIC	XAM	1082	1134	1069	1094	1041	1121	1126	1134
ECON	NIW	171	894	847	755	853	608	945	608
	BDARBVA	958	1017	962	696	967	838	1031	962
	QUARTILE GUARTILE	127	116	84	170	86	152	66	118
	XAM	1113	1114	1081	1079	1045	1065	1112	1114
CSSA	NIW	818	892	860	747	872	600	955	600
	EDARECE	989	1013	964	955	696	840	1040	967
		Adelaide	Boothby	Hindmarsh	Kingston	Makin	Spence	Sturt	Total

Appendices

		CSSA	ALL			ECON	OMIC			HEAI	E			soc	IAL			EDUCA	TION	
	BOARBVA	NIW	XAM	QUARTILE BƏNAR	BOARBVA	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	BOAREVA	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	BOAREVA	ым	XAM	QUARTILE BANGE	ЗЭАЯЗVA	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE RANGE
Blair	910	722	1104	76	928	735	1116	75	971	877	1074	56	955	804	1112	60	893	755	1099	59
Bonner	1046	979	1123	85	1053	977	1126	105	1062	1009	1088	23	1040	979	1126	84	663	939	1078	69
Bowman	1009	761	1111	92	1026	789	1120	76	1009	789	1094	95	1029	901	1113	56	991	910	1062	120
Brisbane	1123	1027	1163	31	1073	934	1143	61	1155	1119	1248	30	1103	1074	1147	32	1061	930	1137	46
Dickson	1043	927	1142	129	1051	939	1147	111	1056	974	1136	95	1055	937	1146	105	066	884	1089	108
Forde	972	786	1073	155	974	798	1073	118	1024	847	1130	145	1005	841	1101	127	937	851	1027	92
Griffith	1096	1037	1164	43	1068	666	1146	41	1126	1080	1202	42	1073	663	1111	36	1034	972	1137	63
Lilley	1023	903	1093	44	1031	896	1111	49	1042	966	1087	23	1019	920	1100	34	983	864	1066	67
Longman	920	834	1056	159	933	842	1081	188	956	757	1087	41	986	897	1118	153	926	827	1068	74
Moreton	1048	816	1165	37	1020	811	1161	64	1093	985	1133	20	1058	910	1108	23	995	739	1101	88
Oxley	663	769	1122	132	971	675	1124	146	1081	979	1216	106	1009	781	1126	92	926	758	1076	129
Petrie	962	845	1077	191	975	889	1092	144	992	904	1151	132	983	908	1062	134	954	823	1054	91
Rankin	945	693	1082	164	931	598	1061	186	1029	880	1133	78	994	827	1112	113	896	761	985	160
Ryan	1113	947	1184	42	1087	996	1179	60	1115	1001	1249	59	1099	944	1151	51	1057	921	1156	51
Total	1013	693	1184	145	1008	598	1179	114	1051	757	1249	106	1028	781	1151	111	973	739	1156	105

		CSSA	ALL			ECON	OMIC			HEA	H			SOC	IAL			EDUCA	TION	
	AVERAGE	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	Ξ ϿΆΫΞνα	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	BOARBVA	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BANGE	BOARBVA	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BANGE	AVERAGE	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE RANGE
	1046	976	1112	66	1051	995	1122	41	1003	950	1054	88	1048	663	1134	67	1061	663	1096	34
	925	816	1086	95	894	781	1109	112	975	606	1026	34	966	907	1136	78	932	813	1079	128
=	927	748	1074	237	875	686	1074	256	1024	856	1129	193	1014	906	1093	104	920	791	997	188
	1031	941	1067	51	1054	989	1101	47	984	910	1018	37	1037	975	1092	52	1047	975	1106	60
alm	1068	1031	1099	35	1038	971	1086	60	1045	1010	1086	37	1049	1025	1077	27	1084	1033	1125	36
r	1024	938	1136	146	992	902	1121	119	1023	953	1133	109	1019	943	1109	101	1065	1015	1123	94
c	1053	1007	1101	54	1055	991	1111	33	1005	972	1038	27	1049	998	1098	48	1074	1023	1133	50
ey	986	832	1124	127	1011	876	1137	130	954	869	1026	96	1000	889	1113	117	1017	874	1124	78
ຽ	980	879	1092	70	1021	946	1132	74	923	784	1006	56	1005	932	1104	32	1018	908	1112	40
	919	808	1051	160	889	800	1069	151	960	875	1073	95	963	896	1069	102	959	848	1071	127
rand	1048	923	1122	126	1036	932	1096	122	1062	947	1186	138	1041	926	1114	57	1025	802	1113	173
tein	1122	1082	1154	41	1119	1046	1166	57	1054	1009	1115	67	1079	1044	1102	30	1117	1082	1149	29
۶	1000	910	1084	116	972	901	1043	111	1038	930	1122	130	1024	921	1107	100	1005	941	1066	74
SI	1130	1091	1175	43	1096	1030	1175	84	1098	1059	1130	30	1096	1043	1115	Ħ	1114	1069	1169	26
	1014	923	1083	128	989	905	1089	134	1052	988	1109	81	1056	996	1134	74	989	888	1043	95

GCC2 Greater Melbourne

	QUARTILE GUARTILE	85	45	42	29	3	28	43	55	69	29	34	88	120	101
ATION	XAM	1083	1121	1129	1147	1083	1023	1152	1121	1148	1142	1155	1078	1126	1169
EDUC	NIW	856	981	947	1100	969	958	1057	971	979	899	1034	912	920	791
	AVERAGE	1023	1076	1088	1128	1045	982	1107	1079	1048	995	1085	985	1045	1038
	QUARTILE BONAR	47	36	34	41	70	06	17	73	55	79	7	144	72	81
IAL	XAM	1092	1113	1121	1131	1093	1134	1155	1084	1121	1157	1130	1101	1092	1157
soc	NIM	979	995	946	1051	666	953	1065	964	986	1041	1022	906	938	889
	AVERAGE	1039	1037	1047	1095	1046	1046	1104	1036	1044	1106	1073	1011	1029	1042
	QUARTILE BONAR	87	44	40	38	45	173	40	87	72	172	20	206	50	63
H	XAM	1176	1060	1060	1159	1103	1175	1270	1094	1123	1292	1053	1121	1113	1292
HEA	NIM	952	981	924	1047	1003	957	1062	958	957	1067	989	899	977	784
	AVERAGE	1033	1023	1017	1094	1036	1070	1112	1044	1040	1169	1031	1020	1043	1035
	QUARTILE QUARTILE	143	47	3	42	06	33	57	85	37	78	64	150	66	103
OMIC	XAM	1092	1106	1162	1169	1086	1070	1153	1123	1134	1153	1156	1075	1081	1175
ECON	NIM	833	984	877	1092	960	890	966	836	1000	823	1025	850	872	686
	BOAREVA	1000	1056	1069	1131	1027	981	1079	1021	1052	979	1091	950	992	1016
	QUARTILE BANGE	96	46	35	19	82	91	45	100	80	67	67	190	144	104
	XAM	1080	1106	1152	1176	1088	1113	1188	1117	1137	1166	1143	1083	1105	1188
CSSA	NIM	879	1021	888	1118	982	921	1047	953	974	967	1034	852	908	748
	AVERAGE	1028	1059	1068	1150	1039	1014	1125	1053	1051	1074	1089	977	1027	1036
		Hotham	saacs	Jagajaga	kooyong	.a Trobe	alor	Macnamara	Maribyrnong	McEwen	Melbourne	Menzies	Scullin	Vills	Fotal

		CSSA	ALL			ECON	OMIC			HEAI	H			soc	IAL			EDUCA	TION	
	ΞϿ ΑΫΞΛΑ	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	ЭЭАЯЗ УА	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	AVERAGE	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	ЭЭАЯЭУА	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BANGE	ЭЭАЯЭУА	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE RANGE
Brand	1016	842	1149	175	966	839	1117	131	1079	948	1232	207	1019	006	1090	139	985	763	1059	34
Burt	1019	865	1167	198	991	857	1103	137	1087	967	1273	167	1027	875	1127	160	978	888	1061	109
Canning	666	825	1099	102	995	811	1098	86	1018	880	1171	135	1022	891	1099	82	1004	855	1069	83
Cowan	1039	888	1127	88	1006	811	1076	93	1087	1020	1183	53	1038	904	1114	53	1012	907	1088	106
Curtin	1148	1073	1202	34	1113	1035	1188	41	1134	1107	1166	26	1086	1025	1119	42	1116	1073	1159	8
Fremantle	1063	933	1155	121	1041	928	1167	84	1084	984	1191	100	1034	919	1158	85	1049	974	1143	73
Hasluck	1017	925	1168	137	1016	922	1131	127	1045	066	1187	45	1014	913	1124	63	066	906	1135	160
Moore	1104	1041	1153	44	1092	1023	1144	59	1087	1070	1108	24	1088	1015	1166	48	1077	1014	1109	41
Pearce	1041	894	1155	92	1020	943	1144	107	1104	929	1247	100	1038	934	1099	66	663	884	1051	33
Perth	1076	1004	1140	87	1033	663	1104	23	1113	1041	1203	66	1056	992	1121	71	1053	992	1127	84
Stirling	1036	888	1143	112	1006	830	1128	122	1078	1046	1128	33	1023	928	1105	69	1020	868	1121	128
Swan	1048	991	1128	103	666	915	1099	66	1105	1057	1133	40	1043	1000	1104	54	1019	953	1118	96
Tangney	1096	945	1151	38	1079	919	1133	56	1079	1023	1097	22	1071	916	1119	28	1068	983	1137	62
Total	1053	825	1202	119	1028	811	1188	86	1085	880	1273	73	1042	875	1166	83	1026	763	1159	91

GCC2 Greater Perth

	QUARTILE BANGE	60	51	27	16	32	37	66	56	101	89	52	67	38
ATION	XAM	1095	1065	1108	1138	1023	1137	1011	1143	1133	1008	1142	1077	1116
EDUC,	NIM	978	982	1045	1034	886	987	887	1053	901	879	1062	997	1019
	Эраяэла	1037	1014	1065	1099	947	1100	949	1102	1010	939	1096	1032	1077
	QUARTILE BONAR	36	49	28	26	51	24	103	68	128	84	48	104	47
IAL	XAM	1073	1073	1103	1149	1056	1131	1046	1147	1095	1027	1098	1134	1136
soc	NIM	925	971	1055	1067	953	1041	785	980	857	878	1019	985	1017
	ЗЭАЯЗУА	1017	1032	1077	1105	066	1108	954	1037	944	936	1059	1056	1070
	QUARTILE BONAR	66	100	54	26	86	37	78	7	104	34	47	121	35
Ę	XAM	1102	1142	1168	1130	1106	1137	1082	1053	1033	1021	1145	1141	1104
HEA	NIM	953	1023	1068	1048	988	1091	902	1029	822	954	1056	1017	1026
	Эраяјуа	1049	1088	1116	1081	1032	1116	1006	1041	922	981	1107	1086	1070
	QUARTILE BONAR	47	47	62	34	70	41	191	66	129	115	107	106	61
OMIC	XAM	1126	1042	1150	1174	668	1194	984	1192	1105	953	1160	1125	1153
ECON	NIM	762	928	1025	1080	711	979	703	1046	855	742	666	938	1058
	ЗЭАЯЗVА	1009	987	1069	1140	808	1151	882	1102	968	815	1073	1031	1103
	QUARTILE BANGE	57	18	28	37	51	26	161	55	145	98	64	128	39
ALL	XAM	1130	1067	1134	1168	978	1203	1024	1162	1094	986	1176	1142	1138
CSSA	NIW	875	1023	1088	1104	879	1063	769	1059	841	840	1047	987	1068
	Эраяэла	1041	1047	1112	1138	923	1161	929	1098	943	894	1113	1062	1102
				ong	ŋ	σ	p					ler	/ay	10
		Banks	Barton	Benneld	Berowr	Blaxlan	Bradfiel	Chifley	Cook	Dobell	Fowler	Graynd	Greenw	Hughes

Mapping the Potential: Understanding persistent disadvantage to inform community cha
--

	QUARTILE RANGE	7	31	53	45	24	54	25	38	33	62	110	50	14
ATION	XAM	1140	1062	1106	1146	1109	1089	1106	1159	1082	1113	1144	1187	1156
EDUC	NIM	985	846	944	1035	1008	901	1044	1084	951	956	955	988	1120
	AVERAGE	1078	1006	995	1094	1069	986	1079	1124	1016	1050	1039	1052	1132
	QUARTILE BANGE	53	87	52	33	97	66	45	വ	61	37	123	47	19
IAL	XAM	1104	1080	1087	1118	1072	1068	1145	1128	1092	1108	1051	1146	1109
soc	NIW	970	841	877	1049	924	906	1078	1070	979	1026	903	1072	1075
	BDAREVA	1044	976	979	1080	1020	984	1116	1104	1044	1073	983	1110	1097
	QUARTILE BANGE	81	61	31	22	45	63	44	63	70	50	93	œ	20
H	XAM	1214	1129	1221	1059	1116	1043	1129	1200	1144	1231	1017	1221	1114
HEA	NIW	1052	893	931	1009	894	945	1065	1096	1023	1092	874	1159	1078
	AVERAGE	1111	1005	1024	1040	663	1005	1103	1147	1079	1142	943	1176	1098
	QUARTILE QUARTILE	136	123	33	19	107	250	22	69	86	112	118	95	48
OMIC	XAM	1125	1126	1099	1172	1113	1068	1143	1188	1072	1141	1098	1122	1191
ECON	МІМ	921	864	862	1073	977	658	1100	1046	830	936	908	957	1128
	EDARECE	1038	1004	696	1133	1055	868	1127	1143	959	1041	1013	1026	1156
	QUARTILE BANGE	78	86	49	23	106	168	31	14	46	54	125	79	35
ALL	XAM	1168	1127	1133	1157	1115	1073	1161	1194	1112	1164	1082	1185	1190
CSSA	МІМ	1004	831	872	1058	964	800	1109	1143	940	1018	877	1062	1134
	Э ЭАЯЭVА	1096	667	986	1118	1038	953	1134	1180	1031	1108	988	1119	1164
		Kingsford Smith	Lindsay	Macarthur	Mackellar	Macquarie	McMahon	Mitchell	North Sydney	Parramatta	Reid	Robertson	Sydney	Warringah

38 876 724 1066 157 1040 116 16 106 160 <th>IVERAGE</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>ALL</th> <th></th> <th>EPAGE</th> <th></th> <th>NAX OMIC</th> <th></th> <th>ERAGE</th> <th>чил нем</th> <th>H XAN</th> <th></th> <th>JOERAGE</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>SUARTILE SUNGE</th> <th>ERAGE</th> <th></th> <th>NOIT XAN</th> <th></th>	IVERAGE			ALL		EPAGE		NAX OMIC		ERAGE	чил нем	H XAN		JOERAGE			SUARTILE SUNGE	ERAGE		NOIT XAN	
6 1158 1117 1216 47 1132 1104 1077 1116 17 1125 1090 1155 42 28 905 637 1031 177 1037 881 1134 69 991 816 1098 117 1006 948 1068 52 42 1017 637 126 1231 101 1037 785 149 92 1042 846 1187 99	967 908 1101	908 1101	1101		888	876	724	1066	157	1040	1016	1160	16 16	1001	955	1038	34	985	930	1087	78
28 905 637 1031 177 1037 881 1134 69 991 816 1098 117 1006 948 1068 52 42 1017 637 1246 163 822 1231 101 1037 785 1149 92 1042 846 1187 99	1176 1140 1204	1140 1204	1204		9	1158	1117	1216	47	1128	1110	1147	22	1104	1077	1116	17	1125	1090	1155	42
42 1017 637 1216 164 1063 822 1231 101 1037 785 1149 92 1042 846 1187 99	970 749 1065 1	749 1065 1	1065	·	128	905	637	1031	177	1037	881	1134	69	991	816	1098	117	1006	948	1068	52
	1053 749 1204	749 1204	1204		142	1017	637	1216	164	1063	822	1231	101	1037	785	1149	92	1042	846	1187	66

		CSSA	ALL			ECON	OMIC			HEAI	H			SOC	IAL			EDUC/	VIION	
	ΞϿ ΑΫΞΛΑ	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	З ЭАЯЗVА	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BANGE	AVERAGE	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	ЭЭАЯЭУА	NIM	XAM	олаятісе Зәиая	ЭЭАЯЭУА	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE RANGE
Barker	942	822	1064	80	096	844	1082	80	956	897	1031	49	971	864	1083	63	968	835	1098	95
Bass	901	650	1022	208	923	656	1049	188	856	737	954	124	957	729	1055	115	1001	776	1107	80
Braddon	876	761	1019	92	916	790	1049	123	818	704	913	37	917	822	1021	113	666	902	1099	67
Clark	967	776	1106	241	971	786	1091	179	937	779	1065	215	970	803	1101	196	1039	936	1139	116
Durack	686	859	1136	74	1009	893	1134	48	1014	904	1164	128	964	868	1076	86	965	854	1127	106
Forrest	666	777	1119	70	1013	834	1117	48	663	905	1102	94	1014	852	1120	42	1004	685	1110	67
Franklin	976	791	1072	103	697	795	1106	100	943	828	1004	81	086	789	1069	50	1028	826	1108	68
Grey	893	796	1111	108	917	819	1138	116	910	795	1127	63	938	807	1104	104	943	853	1048	95
Lingiari	1009	868	1157	136	1061	972	1151	72	1082	1030	1249	97	971	895	1071	117	892	706	1061	85
Lyons	892	636	1057	106	927	623	1080	62	852	724	1022	100	935	665	1047	46	995	677	1088	73
Mayo	1004	892	1114	129	1019	899	1132	148	965	837	1050	60	1037	973	1112	80	1033	944	1125	39
O'Connor	982	885	1067	89	866	915	1085	101	979	918	1082	66	686	907	1061	62	1000	843	1082	47
Solomon	1076	854	1184	130	1056	829	1155	104	1149	1057	1245	76	1015	774	1161	108	1002	810	1143	145
Total	962	636	1184	135	981	623	1155	110	957	704	1249	135	976	665	1161	95	992	685	1143	94

85

GCC2 Rest of Australia

		Bean	Calare	Canberra	Cowper	Cunningham	Eden-Monaro	Farrer	Fenner	Gilmore	Hume	Hunter	Lyne	New England
	ЭЭАЯЭУА	1068	939	1101	878	1001	666	949	1092	919	1033	951	887	917
CSSA	NIM	987	785	1031	727	776	790	834	967	822	912	861	781	782
	XAM	1267	1043	1184	955	1122	1134	1048	1204	1081	1109	1058	1074	966
	QUARTILE BONAR	41	102	48	50	54	158	54	103	68	106	92	116	76
	AVERAGE	1088	974	1102	919	983	1030	982	1087	957	1048	967	929	947
ECON	NIM	866	833	1022	772	778	828	877	970	862	954	877	805	774
IOMIC	XAM	1215	1082	1181	983	1133	1157	1040	1169	1117	1125	1105	1097	1036
	QUARTILE BONAR	55	80	79	45	108	154	61	57	121	49	117	72	97
	ΞϿ ΆΫΞΛΆ	1038	921	1071	825	984	945	911	1099	853	1007	938	833	898 898
HEA	NIW	980	827	1030	663	841	756	848	970	759	893	864	701	768
H	XAM	1299	994	1212	879	1049	1083	1028	1208	978	1115	1045	1006	266
	QUARTILE BONAR	19	107	22	57	35	169	86	152	124	145	85	81	85
	ЭЭАЯЭУА	1045	940	1080	919	992	1003	958	1079	963	1015	952	942	912
soc	NIM	958	790	1000	760	784	885	874	927	878	904	845	846	710
CIAL	XAM	1143	1032	1143	987	1082	1118	1047	1155	1077	1095	1050	1088	965
	QUARTILE BANGE	37	86	63	35	53	113	60	65	98	56	102	8	56
	ЗЭАЯЗУА	1018	995	1038	966	1074	1030	1006	1003	1033	1057	1020	1003	991
EDUC	NIM	883	756	904	886	930	928	892	883	932	991	945	919	930
ATION	XAM	1166	1073	1133	1107	1144	1104	1079	1100	1147	1118	1075	1114	1098
	QUARTILE RANGE	59	54	42	98	47	42	94	49	93	57	69	112	25

GCC2 Rest of NSW/ACT

	QUARTILE BUNAR	53	51	110	71	69	49	43	91	74
ATION	XAM	1149	1064	1043	1093	1106	1071	1103	1069	1166
EDUC	NIM	962	937	803	928	944	917	977	897	756
	Эраяэла	1051	1011	963	1021	1034	1006	1056	1005	1019
	QUARTILE BONAR	72	144	56	108	72	53	33	158	97
IAL	XAM	1056	1048	1021	1040	1093	1068	1087	1068	1155
soc	NIM	927	841	722	853	863	876	831	853	710
	ЭЭАЯЭУА	977	936	858	946	963	934	960	965	996
	QUARTILE BONAR	60	121	84	128	134	131	65	166	133
H	XAM	1073	957	973	1046	988	1005	972	1062	1299
HEA	NIM	916	755	782	819	789	848	823	827	663
	Эраяэла	985	855	879	919	883	915	914	928	930
	QUARTILE BONAR	104	112	64	86	58	91	43	115	103
OMIC	XAM	1101	1054	1088	1051	1077	1034	1104	1113	1215
ECON	NIM	830	848	886	854	864	890	796	836	772
	BOAREVA	985	929	953	950	970	962	985	973	983
	QUARTILE BONAR	93	120	62	75	106	45	86	145	131
	XAM	1111	1023	1039	1054	1052	1032	1077	1066	1267
CSSA	NIM	881	806	776	843	821	849	830	811	727
	Эраяэла	666	896	897	936	939	936	996	951	961
		Newcastle	Page	Parkes	Paterson	Richmond	Riverina	Shortland	Whitlam	Total

-0-	Ανεκαge	Capricornia 969 7	Dawson 980 E	Fadden 1003 8	Fairfax 990 5	Fisher 979 8	Flynn 948 7	Groom 957 E	Herbert 956 8	Hinkler 828 6	Kennedy 897 4	Leichhardt 964 7	Maranoa 915 7	
CSSA	NIW	754	335	390	901	354	710	327	302	395	185	750	776	
ALL	XAM	1079	1090	1094	1082	1026	1067	1085	1083	936	965	1074	993	
	QUARTILE BANGE	109	131	63	17	50	121	149	153	80	74	125	79	
	BOAREVA	994	697	666	1004	992	696	066	965	874	933	967	955	
ECON	NIW	821	795	887	931	869	795	876	845	695	214	737	812	
OMIC	XAM	1102	1080	1079	1062	1017	1067	1109	1080	983	1024	1084	1048	
	QUARTILE BONAR	76	87	59	17	16	100	140	112	95	79	106	74	
	Эраяэла	980	1010	1026	976	971	983	974	1017	837	943	1009	936	
HEA	NIM	854	914	806	889	859	797	884	895	793	006	932	790	
HLI	XAM	1065	1160	1134	1122	1116	1080	1061	1162	922	1031	1076	1035	
	QUARTILE BONAR	66	128	142	48	49	139	145	135	28	23	70	81	
	Эраяјуа	979	982	1022	1027	1016	981	989	967	947	914	958	952	
SO	NIM	783	852	920	961	943	755	869	829	840	210	695	068	
CIAL	XAM	1088	1092	1103	1084	1058	1062	1111	1102	1077	1055	1056	1020	
	QUARTILE BUAR	8	110	56	7	Ω	93	130	131	86	85	8	56	
	ΞϿ ΔЯΞΛΆ	973	962	066	1002	988	935	929	925	886	006	696	926	
EDUC	NIM	782	854	937	923	903	716	807	746	801	743	799	849	
ATION	XAM	1050	1036	1080	1123	1074	1023	1042	1053	953	983	1074	1006	
	QUARTILE RANGE	64	88	60	35	24	114	118	85	63	36	115	64	

		CSSA	∆ ALL			ECON	OMIC			HEA	E			soc	IAL			EDUCA	TION
	ΞϿ ΑΫΞΛΑ	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	Эраяјуа	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	З ЭАЯЗVА	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	Эраяјуа	NIM	XAM	QUARTILE BONAR	ЗЭАЯЗУА	NIM	XAM
Moncrieff	995	911	1083	68	986	853	1087	76	1025	981	1080	42	1010	967	1079	65	983	910	1065
Nide Bay	888	773	1064	175	918	798	1057	161	880	774	1059	97	974	869	1063	129	947	851	1125
Wright	974	870	1045	114	1000	874	1080	116	1007	933	1098	69	1020	918	1084	102	931	822	1021
Total	955	485	1094	123	974	214	1109	97	976	774	1162	113	985	210	1111	91	954	716	1125

QUARTILE RANGE

10

89

44

88

	QUARTILE BANGE	85	111	33	236	64	64	50	42	79	42	89
ATION	XAM	1085	1116	1134	1115	1060	1108	1057	1068	1059	1119	1134
EDUC	NIM	857	903	977	842	656	873	846	911	769	934	656
	Эраяэла	1023	1011	1076	1012	967	1018	968	1015	996	1018	1007
	QUARTILE BONAR	103	72	38	138	29	54	29	50	21	46	66
IAL	XAM	1088	1117	1095	1090	1037	1069	1040	1061	1067	1094	1117
soc	NIM	906	885	984	825	861	920	869	887	874	924	825
	ЭЭАЯЭVА	988	985	1048	696	975	986	948	988	964	979	982
	QUARTILE BONAR	74	66	49	196	79	72	49	79	75	51	85
E	XAM	1050	1064	1054	1037	955	991	1031	1003	1003	1055	1064
HEA	NIM	870	818	816	834	813	811	780	822	804	849	780
	ЗЭАЯЗУА	941	939	1004	954	889	927	890	927	899	932	929
	QUARTILE BONAR	136	106	46	145	27	72	43	69	80	72	75
OMIC	XAM	1058	1098	1107	1085	1027	1085	1053	1062	1073	1059	1107
ECON	NIM	876	877	930	767	800	910	843	847	896	928	767
	ЗЭАЯЗVА	975	982	1051	967	952	989	942	974	961	992	978
	QUARTILE BANGE	119	114	55	224	69	65	54	75	41	73	94
ALL	XAM	1073	1107	1109	1090	981	1061	1043	1051	1035	1076	1109
CSSA	NIM	830	845	885	760	709	840	777	810	810	892	709
	ЗЭАЯЗУА	962	961	1046	961	911	096	905	953	920	962	953
		Ballarat	Bendigo	Corangamite	Corio	Gippsland	Indi	Mallee	Monash	Nicholls	Wannon	Total

Appendix C – Key Terms

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ACOSS	Australian Council of Social Service
ASGS	Australian Statistical Geography Standard
ANU	Australian National University
box plot	A box plot, or box and whisker plot, is a method of visualising quantitative data. It shows the average of results (mean), middle result (median), the middle range of quartile results (25% to 75%) and the full range of all results. An explanation of how to read a box plot is provided in Section 5.1.
Catholic Social Teaching (CST)	CST provides a vision for a just society in which the dignity of all people is recognised, and those who are vulnerable are cared for. For more information see: https://cssa.org.au/catholic-social-teaching/
Census	The Census of Population and Housing Australia is run by the ABS every five years, the next Census will be in August 2021.
co-design	A process where a service, product or approach is created through extensive involvement by those who will be directly affected by the outcome. It differs from coproduction in that it is focused on design to meet end-user needs.
community capacity building	The process of developing and strengthening the abilities, capital, networks, resources and skills that communities need to adapt, thrive and grow in their local and global context.
Component Indexes	Component Indexes are constructed placing selected variables in groups (see 'disadvantage drivers') and weighting their relative influence. These groups relate to economic, education, health and social factors. An overall Index is also created that merges these components into one component score.
Component Score	The numerical result of Principal Component Analysis (PCA) which represents the relative level of overall persistent disadvantage produced from this analysis.
coproduction	A process where a service, product or approach is created and delivered through extensive involvement by those who will be directly involved in its implementation. It differs from co-design in that it is more focused on the involvement of partners at every stage from design to delivery.
CSRM	Australian National University Centre for Social Research Methods
CSSA	Catholic Social Services Australia
deficit	A perspective of communities that emphasises their constraints, challenges and struggles over their capability and potential.
design thinking	A non-linear, iterative process, which seeks to understand stakeholder needs, challenge common assumptions, and redefine problems to create innovative solutions (see section 3.1.2).
Diocese	A section of the Church entrusted to the leadership of a bishop in the Catholic Church. There are 28 geographical dioceses across all Australia, each of which supports education, health and social services.
disadvantage	In this study, disadvantage is any relative deprivation experienced by a region against the national average or standard (see section 2.1).

disadvantage drivers	Disadvantage drivers are constructed placing selected variables in groups (see 'component index') and weighting their relative influence. These groups relate to economic, education, health and social factors. These groups are seen to drive people's access to resources and social participation which influence a region's level of disadvantage.
DOTE	The <i>Dropping off the Edge</i> studies into persistent communal disadvantage in Australia.
ecological fallacy	A term that refers to an inaccurate assumption being made about the characteristics of any individual based on the average characteristics of a group or population to which they belong.
economic microsimulation	Refers to a set of computerised analytical tools that perform detailed economic analyses of selected measures that are associated with distinct populations.
electorate	The geographical region represented by one elected Member of Federal Parliament. Information about Australian Federal Electorates can be accessed at: https://www.aec.gov.au/profiles/
gross domestic product (GDP)	The total value of goods produced and services provided in a country during a single year. GDP is an international yard stick for measuring economic performance between nations.
IHAD	ABS Index of Household Advantage and Disadvantage
inequality	Unequal distribution within society of income, wealth and goods.
inequity	Unequal opportunity for groups in society, including a lack of fairness or impartiality.
intergenerational disadvantage	Situations where the conditions of disadvantage that are experienced by parents or families are transmitted to their children.
JSS	Jesuit Social Services
LGA	Local Government Area
mean	Statistical term meaning the average of a dataset.
median	Statistical term meaning the middle-most score within a dataset.
persistent disadvantage	Disadvantage experienced by populations that is longer than four years in duration and not primarily dependent on individual choice or misfortune. This study uses a definition of 'persistence' that relies on statistical data from the 2011 and 2016 ABS Census.
place-based	The range of collaborative approaches and perspectives that emphasise the unique characteristics of places as the basis to build thriving communities in defined geographic locations.
poverty	Relative deprivation of individuals or groups in terms of income and monetary opportunity.
poverty gap	Refers to the average depth of poverty for people living below the poverty line (i.e., the amount of money needed to lift people back above the poverty line).
poverty line	The minimum level of income deemed adequate to live in a particular country.
practice-based	Refers to the expertise that has arisen through the experiences a practitioner, professional or institution has gained throughout their service and support activities.

Principal Component Analysis (PCA)	A statistical analysis technique that converts a set of potentially correlated variables into a set of linearly uncorrelated variables, which are called principal components. The aim of the principal components is to explain the variability of results against statistical standards of a dataset, such as the mean (see Section 4.2.2).
Project Partners (or financial partners)	The 21 members of the CSSA national network of service providers who invested in this project and participated in its coproduction approach.
qualitative	A research method that focuses on description and the quality of experiences. It often relies on interpretive analysis.
quantitative	A research method that focuses on counting and the quantity of measures. It often relies on statistical analysis.
quartile	One of four equal groups that divide a dataset. An interquartile range refers to the middle fifty percent of results (i.e., scores 25% to 75%).
regional capacity building	The process of developing and strengthening the abilities, capital, networks, resources and skills that regions need to adapt, thrive and grow in their local, national and global contexts. This term does not refer only to regional, rural or remote communities.
SA1, SA2, SA3	Statistical Area levels used by the ABS. SA3 represents regional groupings of SA2s. SA2s are of consistent population size and geographically similar to suburbs. SA1 is the smallest geographical unit used by the ABS.
SEIFA	ABS Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas
social capital	The links, shared values, understandings and networks in society that enable individuals and groups to unite, work together and progress.
social impact investment	SII seeks to generate social impact alongside financial return. It relies on the investment of funds into organisations that are aiming to achieve a social benefit.
SPRC	University of New South Wales Social Policy Research Centre
spatial mapping	A process that models problems geographically, derives results by computer processing and analyses results using statistical tools. It often represents its findings through visual tools such as maps.
stigma	A negative perception based on a generalised characteristic or quality of a group that is used to diminish, disgrace or disadvantage individuals.
strengths-based	Approaches that promote the positive qualities, abilities and capabilities of individuals, groups or communities, particularly in terms of recovery and empowerment.
structural inequality	Inequality in society that results from established patterns of relationships and/or institutional action.
subsidiarity	An approach to decision-making that emphasises decisions being made at the closest appropriate level to those directly impacted by the decision. It particularly highlights the need for minority, marginal and vulnerable groups to be included in decision-making.
sustainable development	Community development that meets the economic, environmental and social needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations

systemic Relates to issues that come from the influence and interaction of multiple aspects of a society, its economy, its institutions and culture. It is the counterpoint to issues that are primarily due to specific, individual or isolated factors.

to meet their own sustainability needs.

INDEX

Α

ACT see Australian Capital Territory Adelaide, 8, 53, 66-68, 77 Australia (detailed results of Project) national themes, 51-53 regional results, 53-54 rest of Australia, 53, 64-69, 84-85 state and territory results, 54-68 see also New South Wales; Queensland; Victoria Australian Bureau of Statistics data, 15, 22, 24, 25, 40 Australian Capital Territory, 8, 53, 56-57, 86-87 Australian Early Development Census, 7, 40, 57 Australian National University Centre for Social Research Methods (CSRM), 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 35, 72 expertise and team, 28 key findings, 49-69 statistical method, 31, 32, 33, 35, 39-48

В

Baird, K., 26 Biddle, N, 28 box plots explained, 50, 91 Brisbane, 8, 53, 58–59, 78

С

Catholic social service agencies, 13, 16, 17, 27 Catholic Social Services Australia (CSSA), 9, 27–28, 40 consultation, 25, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38 CSSA Relative Disadvantage Indexes, 40–48 CSSA Relative Disadvantage Indexes: detailed results, 51–69

stakeholder engagement, 30, 31, 32, 36–38; see also consultation see also Project Catholic Social Teaching (CST), 38, 91 Census data, 9, 16, 22, 24-25, 40, 45.91 Centre for Independent Studies, 23 Centre for Social Research Methods (CSRM) see Australian National University Centre for Social Research Methods (CSRM) co-design, 34, 70, 91 community capacity building, 12-13, 15-16, 17, 91 Community Insight Australia, 26 Component Indexes, 91 Component Score, 91 consultation, 25, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38 see also stakeholder engagement coproduction, 15, 32-34, 70,91 CSRM see Australian National University Centre for Social Research Methods (CSRM)

D

data averages (ecological fallacy), 15, 48, 92 for decision-making, 15, 16, 18, 31 provision to partners, 18 use of, 18 data collection, 35 challenges, 14 ecological fallacy, 15, 49, 92 data release from Project, 36, 38 data sources, 24-26, 32, 33 see also suburb (SA2) data decision-making 'right' approach, 18, 38 support for, 9, 10, 15, 16, 18, 31 deficit, 13, 30-31, 91 deficit language, 26 Denniss, R, 30

design thinking, 31-32, 34, 91 Dioceses, 13, 91 disadvantage community perspectives, 14, 22, 24-25 definitions, 16, 21-22, 91 economic perspectives, 14, 21, 23-24 equated with poverty, 21-22 forms and experiences, 12, 13-14, 30-31 'hotspots', 10 indicators, 25, 33 mapping, 14-15, 22, 25-26 measurement of, 21–24 place-based initiatives, 12-13, 17, 92 research, 14, 22-25, 27 study methods, 14-15 systemic challenges, 13–14 see also persistent disadvantage; poverty; stigmatisation disadvantage analysis (detailed results of Project) electorate and political party, 52 - 53national trends, 51–52 regional, 53–54 state and territory, 54-69 see also electorate disadvantage Index results disadvantage drivers, 10, 12, 17, 41-47 defined, 7, 92 economic, 42-43 education, 43 health, 44 overall, 46-47 social, 45 Dropping Off the Edge (DOTE) reports, 12, 25

Е

ecological fallacy, 15, 48, 92 economic disadvantage, 12, 14

economic disadvantage drivers, 9, 42 - 43defined, 7 electorate results, 77–90 index results summary, 53-54 economic indicators, 72–73 economic microsimulation, 9, 26, 40, 48, 51, 92 see also microsimulation method economic wellbeing, 24 education disadvantage drivers, 10.43 defined, 7 electorate results, 77–90 index results summary, 53-54 education indicators, 73–74 electorate disadvantage Index results, 77-90 Adelaide, 66-68, 77 Australia (national themes), 84-85 Australian Capital Territory, 86-87 Brisbane, 58-59, 78 Melbourne, 61-63, 79-80 New South Wales, 54–57, 86-87 Perth, 64-66, 81 Queensland, 58-61, 88-89 rest of Australia, 68-69 Sydney, 54-56, 82-84 Victoria, 61-64, 89-90 electorate Index results, Australia (detailed results of Project), 68-69.84-85 electorates, 92 disadvantage and political parties, 52–53 overall disadvantage, 51-52

G

gap between rich and poor, 8, 10 glossary, 91-93 government citizen lack of trust in. 14 data required for decisionmaking, 15, 16, 18 initiatives to address disadvantage, 17 policy silos, 14 political decision-making, 30 social security policy, 23 government data sources, 24-26 Grace, R., 26 Grav. M. 28 Greater Adelaide see Adelaide Greater Brisbane see Brisbane Greater Melbourne see Melbourne Greater Perth see Perth Greater Sydney see Sydney Gross Domestic Product, 23, 92

Expert Advisory Group, 35, 38

н

health disadvantage drivers, 10, 44 defined, 7 index results summary, 53–54 health indicators, 74–75 Henderson report, 22–23 Higgins, Justice, 22 housing costs, 14, 21, 22, 23, 27, 40, 43 *see also* economic disadvantage drivers

I

income and poverty, 22–23 Index of Household Advantage and Disadvantage (IHAD), 25 indicators at SA2 (suburb) level (list of) economic, 72-73 education. 73-74 health. 74-75 social, 75-76 individual autonomy, 31, inequality, 10, 13, 21, 23-24, 27, 92, 93 see also wealth inequality inequity, 92 influential texts, 71 intergenerational disadvantage, 7, 10, 12, 21, 92 see also persistent disadvantage

Κ

key terms, 91–93

L

living standards, 24 Longitudinal Study of Australian Children, 14

Μ

mapping of disadvantage, 14–15, 22, 25–26, 93 media reporting, 14, 22, 26, 27, 37 Melbourne, 53, 61–63, 79–80 methodology for project, 30–38 microsimulation, 9, 26, 40, 48, 51, 92 microsimulation method overview, 40, 48 approach, 15, 40–47 limitations of the method, 48 product, 40 reliability, 47 results, 51–69

Ν

National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling (NATSEM), University of Canberra see University of Canberra National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling (NATSEM) National Party electorates, 8 national themes see Australia (detailed results of Project) negative stereotyping, 14, 26–27, 93 prevention of, 10, 27, 51 New South Wales, 8, 53, 54–57, 86–87 Sydney, 8, 53, 54, 55–56, 82–84 Northern Territory see Australia (detailed results of Project): rest of Australia, 8

Ρ

partnership opportunities, 18, 38, 70 People in Poverty, 22-23 persistent disadvantage, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17 challenges in reduction of, 14 compounding nature of disadvantage, 13-15 conceptualisation of, 30-31 defined, 92 national trends, 8 SA2 (suburb data), 9 usage of term, 7 for general discussion of disadvantage see disadvantage, see also disadvantage drivers persistent disadvantage measurement, 54-69, 92 overview, 40, 48 approach, 15, 40-47 limitations of the method, 48 reliability, 47 see also disadvantage analysis (detailed results of Project) Perth, 8, 53, 64-66, 81 Phillips, B, 28 Pielke, R, 30 place-based initiatives addressing disadvantage, 12-13, 17, 92 policy silos, 14 political parties, disadvantaged seats, 52–53 politicisation of issues, 30 povertv Australian perceptions of, 21 community perspectives, 14, 22, 24-25 defined, 92 economic perspectives, 14, 21, 23 - 24measurement of, 21-24 place-based approaches to, 12–13, 17, 92 studies of, 14, 22-25, 27 and wages, 22-23

see also disadvantage; negative stereotyping

wealth inequality poverty lines, 21, 22-24, 92 practice-based variables, 33, 92 Principal Component Analysis (PCA), 15, 28, 34-36, 41, 43, 44, 45, 48, 93 Component Indexes, 91 Component Score, 92 Productivity Commission, 12, 21, 24 Project, 12-15, 30-38 aims, 8, 9, 17, 19, 32, 69 conceptual frame, 30-31 consultation phase, 25, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38 coproduction approach, 15, 32-34, 70, 91 data release, 36, 38 design and methodology, 28, 34-36 Expert Advisory Group, 35, 38 implementing the method, 40-48 looking forward, 70 origins, 16, 32, 35 reporting, 18, 19, 33-34, 35, 36-38 research approach, 27–28 results (detailed), 51-69 scope, 16 success factors, 17-18 Project partners, 1, 15, 17-18, 28, 35-38, 40, 70, 93 Prosser, B., 30

poverty gap, 21, 24, 92 see also

Q

qualitative research, 38, 93
quantitative data, 38, 45, 93
box plot visualisation, 50, 91
Queensland, 8, 53, 58–61, 88–89
Brisbane, 8, 53, 58–59, 78

R

regional capacity building, 12–13, 93 see also community capacity building regional New South Wales see New South Wales regional Queensland see Queensland regional Victoria see Victoria research approach to this project, 27-28 on disadvantage and poverty, 14, 22-25, 27 see also Project resources exploitation, 12-13 Rest of Australia see Australia (detailed results of Project) Rest of NSW/ACT see Australian Capital Territory; New South Wales

Rest of Queensland see Queensland Rest of Victoria see Victoria 'right' approach to decisionmaking, 18, 38 Rowntree method of estimating poverty, 22 Royal Commission on the Basic Wage, 1919, 22

S

SA2 (suburb) data, 9, 15, 16, 19, 25, 26, 41, 93 aggregation for reporting, 18, 35, 37, 51 box plots explained, 50, 91 list of indicators, 72-76 major political party electorates, 52 - 53Saunders, P, 22, 23 SEIFA see Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA) service providers see social service providers Smith Family, 23 social capital, 22, 24, 93 social disadvantage drivers, 10, 45 defined, 7 electorate results, 77-90 index results summary, 53–54 social impact investment (SII), 17, 93 social indicators, 75-76 Social Policy Research Centre (SPRC), 23 Social Security Review 1986, 23 social security system, 21, 23 social service providers, 15-16 importance of place-based providers, 12-13, 17, 92 Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA), 24, 25, 26, 40, 41, 44, 45 CSSA disadvantage indexes compared with, 47 South Australia Adelaide, 8, 53, 66-68, 77 see also Australia (detailed results of Project): rest of Australia spatial mapping of disadvantage, 14-15, 22, 25-26, 93 stakeholder engagement, 30, 31, 32, 36–38 see also consultation stigmatisation, 14, 26-27, 93 prevention of, 10, 27, 35, 51 strengths-based advocacy, 34, 36, 38, 93 Stronger Places, Stronger People program, 17 structural inequality, 21, 93

subsidiarity principle, 18, 93

suburb (SA2) data see SA2 (suburb) data sustainable development, 12, 93 Sydney, 8, 53, 54, 55–56, 82–84 systemic factors, 12–13, 15, 18, 21, 31, 36, 93

Т

Tasmania, 8 see also Australia (detailed results of Project): rest of Australia, terminology, 91–93 texts, 71 trends (summary), 8 trust in government, lack of, 15 *Try, Test and Learn Fund*, 17

U

University of Canberra National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling (NATSEM), 9, 23, 26 University of New South Wales, 23

V

Van der Wal, J., 26 variables economic disadvantage, 42–43 education disadvantage, 43 health disadvantage, 44 overall disadvantage, 46–47 practice-based, 33, 92 social disadvantage, 45 *see also* disadvantage drivers Victoria, 8, 53, 61–64, 89–90 Greater Melbourne, 53, 61–63, 79–80 Vinson, T, 25 vulnerable groups, 17, 18, 27

W

wages and poverty, 22–23 wealth inequality, 24, 48 gap between rich and poor, 8, 10 poverty gap, 21, 24, 92 Western Australia Perth, 8, 53, 64–66, 68, 81 *see also* Australia (detailed results of Project): rest of Australia words, power of, 14, 26 World Bank International Poverty Line, 23



mappingthepotential.cssa.org.au

