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Notes on the data

Data

Measure used
Data are presented as percentages or rates per population. Where it was considered that variations in the age distribution of the population for any variable could affect the analysis, the data have been indirectly age standardised. However, in order to make the data easily understood, standardised ratios have been converted to percentages (above or below the State rate for that data item).

Quintile of socioeconomic disadvantage of area
In the absence of any direct measure of socioeconomic status in the datasets from which the indicators of health and wellbeing have been constructed, the socioeconomic status (as determined by the Index of Relative Socio-Economic Disadvantage\(^14\) (IRSD) score for the area) of the address has been used as a proxy measure: the address is the usual resident address of the person to whom the statistic refers (e.g. of women smoking during pregnancy; of overweight and obese children). The areas for which the data were available (postcode or SLA) were ranked by their IRSD score. They were then allocated to one of five groups (quintiles) of approximately equal population. Thus, Quintile 1 comprises the areas with the highest IRSD scores (highest socioeconomic status, or most advantaged, areas) and Quintile 5 comprises areas with the lowest IRSD scores (lowest socioeconomic status, or most disadvantaged, areas). The IRSD used was the 1996 Census version, as the 2001 Census version (described on pages 31 and 32) was not available until the final stages of the project.

Maps
The maps show data for the usual resident address of the person to whom the statistic refers (e.g. of women smoking during pregnancy; of overweight and obese children).

Where possible, data have been mapped for Adelaide (the Adelaide Statistical Division) and South Australia. The areas mapped are Statistical Local Areas (SLAs). In Adelaide, four of the 54 SLAs are equivalent to a Local Government Area (LGA) and the remainder are smaller than an LGA (with the exception of Torrens Island, which is not incorporated as an LGA). In the map of South Australia in 2001 (the date of the boundaries used for most indicators), 41 of the 71 SLAs are equivalent to an LGA, ten LGAs are split into smaller SLAs and the nine areas not incorporated as LGAs – the unincorporated areas of the State – are also SLAs. On this State map, Adelaide is shown as one area (i.e., SLAs within Adelaide are not shown) and the remainder of the State (referred to as the country, or country South Australia) is shown by SLA.

Note: For South Australia, the indicator for low birthweight babies is shown by Health Regions, which are aggregations of SLAs, because of the small number of cases at an area level.

In the maps, some areas are shown as data 'not mapped'. For Adelaide, this only affects Torrens Island, whose small population and any associated events (e.g. unemployment, births) are included with Port Adelaide Enfield – Port. In the country, the unincorporated areas frequently are shown as data 'not mapped' e.g., for child abuse and neglect and overweight and obese four year old children.

The map of South Australia is shown as smaller than its actual size. Part of the northern and western area has been cut off – truncated – to allow the remainder of the State, where there are more separate areas to map, to be shown more clearly. The map on the next page shows the extent of the area removed.

\(^{14}\) The IRSD is a summary measure of socioeconomic status, calculated from data collected at the 1996 Population Census.
Area mapped for South Australia
Notes on the indicators and data sources

Disadvantage: Summary measure of socioeconomic disadvantage

The Index of Relative Socio-Economic Disadvantage is one of four socioeconomic indexes produced from the 2001 Census. The data to produce the Index at this area level were purchased from the ABS.

It is derived, using principal component analysis, from attributes such as low income, low educational attainment, high unemployment, jobs in relatively unskilled occupations and variables that reflect disadvantage, rather than measure specific aspects of disadvantage (e.g., Indigenous status and separated/divorced). Full details of the composition and construction of this and the other three indexes are available from the Information Paper, Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas, Australia, 2001 ABS Cat. No. 2039.0.

Income: Low income families

Low income families are defined as families with annual incomes of less than:

- $16,000 (less than $300 per week) at the 1991 Census
- $21,000 (less than $400 per week) at the 1996 Census
- $26,000 (less than $500 per week) at the 2001 Census.

Note: The use of low income as a measure of poverty is compromised to an extent by the fact that it is influenced by differences in family size, age structure and housing tenure and costs (Glover & Tennant 1999). While the variable will normally capture most welfare dependent families, it will also include sizeable numbers of families for which low income is linked to their retirement status. When interpreting the figures for low income families over time, it should be noted that the indicators of low income used are based on categories of income available from each Census selected to approximate the levels of income (including rent allowance) of recipients of the sole parents’ pension and the unemployment benefit.

The data in the Indigenous section for this indicator were obtained from the State Government’s report: Indigenous Profile: Comparing the Indigenous with the non-Indigenous population in South Australia, 2001. The remainder of the data presented are from the 1991, 1996 and 2001 ABS Censuses.

Income: Children living in low income families

The number of children aged under 16 years and living in families receiving an income support payment (Sole Parent or Disability Support Pension; unemployment, sickness or special benefits; or the Family Tax Benefit B) from the Department of Family and Community Services (DFaCS) is expressed as a percentage of all children aged under 16 years.

The data do not include children in families receiving unemployment payments under the Community Development Employment Program, a job creation scheme for Aboriginal communities. To this extent, the percentages of children in some areas will be understated: this is particularly likely to be the case in remote areas of the State, where Indigenous people are a larger proportion of the population.

The pension and benefit data are from DFaCS and for the years 1989, 1992, 1996 and 2001.

Education: School retention and participation

The number of students in Year 10 who stay on to Year 12 is estimated by dividing the total number of full-time students in Year 12 by the total number of full-time students in Year 10. This figure is expressed as a proportion and is referred to as the apparent retention rate.

As retention rates are not available by student address, participation rates have been calculated for young people at ages 14, 15, 16 and 17 years of age. These rates show the estimated proportion of young people at these ages that are full-time students in secondary school, totalling 93.5% (65,307 persons) of persons aged 14 to 17 in full-time education. Excluded from the data analyses were persons attending other educational institutions, including 1.5% (1,074 persons) aged 14 to 17 attending TAFE full-time; 1.9% (1,352 persons) attending other schools (eg business colleges); and 3.0% (2,123 persons) where the institution was not stated or not applicable. The analyses by geographical location and socioeconomic status were also for full-time participation in secondary school education only.

The statement in the key points section that:

Young people completing Year 12 are more likely to make a successful initial transition to further education, training and work than early leavers is from the Dusseldorp Skills Forum (2003).
In the section on trend in school retention rates, the research, which states the two major reasons influencing low retention rates in young people, is from Teese and Polesel (2003), and the longitudinal research is from Marks et al. (2003). The comments regarding the higher participation rates of girls and their relationship to labour market outcomes are from Collins et al. (2000).

The school retention data are from the ABS publication *Schools Australia, 2001*. The school participation data are from the 2001 ABS Census.

The data in the Indigenous section were obtained from the State Government’s report: *Indigenous Profile: Comparing the Indigenous with the non-Indigenous population in South Australia, 2001*.

**Labour force: Participation**

Labour force participation is calculated as the proportion of the civilian population aged 15 years and over who were either employed or unemployed (see below for definition of unemployment).

The data presented for the time series were supplied by Centre for Labour Research, University of Adelaide. The data mapped were extracted from *Small Area Labour Markets, Australia, March Quarter 2003*, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations.

The data in the Indigenous section were obtained from the State Government’s report: *Indigenous Profile: Comparing the Indigenous with the non-Indigenous population in South Australia, 2001*.

**Labour force: Unemployment**

The unemployment rate measures the number of unemployed persons, expressed as a proportion of those in that age group who are participating in the labour force (either working or seeking work).

For the time series data, the ‘official’ rate shown in the figure is the trend rate of unemployment obtained from ABS labour force statistics. The ‘estimate’ rate is the comprehensive rate of unemployment, produced by S Barrett, PhD student (unpublished thesis) at the Centre for Labour Research, University of Adelaide. The comprehensive rate is the trend unemployment rate plus estimates of hidden unemployment (caused by changes in the participation rate) and visible under employment (resulting from the loss of full-time jobs and the creation of part-time jobs).

Indigenous people receiving unemployment benefits under the Community Development Employment Project scheme (CDEP), an employment scheme for Aboriginal people, generally report in the Census that they are ‘employed’. The number of people receiving benefits under each project by geographical location was provided by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Service, and has been included in the estimates presented for the March 2003 analysis.

The data presented for the time series were supplied by Centre for Labour Studies, University of Adelaide. The data mapped were extracted from *Small Area Labour Markets, Australia, March Quarter 2003*, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations.

The data in the Indigenous section were obtained from the State Government’s report: *Indigenous Profile: Comparing the Indigenous with the non-Indigenous population in South Australia, 2001*.

**Additional information:**

Reference is made on page 43 to the fact that, in 2001, there were more people in receipt of a Disability Support Pension (DSP) in South Australia than were receiving an unemployment allowance. This is a reversal of the situation in earlier years (see Figure A1 overleaf). A similar situation applied in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory in 2001, and in Victoria, the numbers were equal, having also shown a striking reversal. The relevance of the DSP to this discussion of unemployment – and what the true level of unemployment might be – of the number of people receiving a DSP, and the growth in this number since 1990, is the widely held view that some who have gone on to the DSP would in earlier years have received the unemployment benefit.

The data on unemployment allowees and disability support pensioners are from the ABS publication *Australian Social Trends*, Catalogue no. 4102.0, 1998 to 2002.
Figure A1: Unemployment allowees and disability support pensioners, South Australia

Note: The disability support pensioners’ data for 2000 were not available; the data point has been interpolated.

Transport: Dwellings without a motor vehicle
The number of occupied private dwellings without a motor vehicle garaged or parked on Census night is expressed as a proportion of all occupied private dwellings.

The data presented are from the 1991, 1996 and 2001 ABS Censuses.

Housing costs: Rent assistance
References for the introductory statement on housing affordability and rent assistance are the SACOSS Submission to the Housing Management Council for the State Housing Plan, June 2003; the ACOSS Submission to the Productivity Commission Inquiry on housing affordability, October 2003; and the ABS publication, Census of Population and Housing: Selected Social and Housing Characteristics, Australia, 2001.

The data presented are Centrelink Income Units, expressed as 'renters', in receipt of Rent Assistance, from June 1999 to June 2002, and provided by Centrelink. The denominator used is the number of households.

Crime: Offences involving apprehension
References for the introductory statement on offences are Boni (1999) and Hawkins et al. (1998).

The data presented are of the number of offences recorded on apprehension reports, by the area of address of the alleged offender. This will usually be where they lived, but could include a prison address, or other place where people are detained. The data are for people aged 10 years and over.

Data were also available for the total number of offences and a summary of these is shown below.

All data were provided by the Office of Crime Statistics and Research, on approval from the SA Police Department.

Total offences (which may or may not result in apprehension)
Total offences include offences against the person (including sexual offences), offences against property, robbery and extortion, offences against good order and drug offences.

There were 290,752 offences in South Australia in 2002/03. The highest offence rates in Adelaide are concentrated in areas to the north and north-west of the city, as well as in the outer north and south (Map A1). By far the highest rate was recorded in the City of Adelaide, with 1,872 offences per 1,000 population. This reflects the higher incidence of offences in areas where groups of people gather (eg places of entertainment, shopping malls).

Readers should note that these data reflect the location of the offence, and not of the offender(s) address.
Gambling: Expenditure and losses

The time series shows proportion of household expenditure going towards gambling for South Australia, with comparisons to New South Wales and Victoria for the years 1983 to 1998.

The data on gambling losses are expressed per adult (aged 18 years and over) and relate only to losses from electronic gaming machines in the metropolitan area, excluding the City of Adelaide, for 2002. Variations in the location of gaming machines are also frequently cited as the most significant factor affecting gambling losses. For example, see Inquiry into management of gaming machine numbers, March 2003 and The Economic Impact of Gambling, Project Report, March 2000.

The data presented for the time series of gambling expenditure are from the project report prepared by the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research for the Victorian Casino and Gaming Authority on The Economic Impact of Gambling, March 2000.

The 2002 data on gambling losses per adult from electronic gaming machines were obtained from the report of the Independent Gambling Authority’s Inquiry into management of gaming machine numbers, December 2003.

Health and wellbeing: Self reported health status

In the 1995 National Health Survey (NHS), the population aged 18 years and over was asked to indicate its perception of its own health status, on a scale of ‘excellent’, ‘very good’, ‘good’, ‘fair’ and ‘poor’. In the analysis in this report, details are shown of that proportion of the population who reported their health as being fair or poor. The ABS report that how people rated their health was strongly related to their illness experience (ABS 1997). This is consistent with the finding by McCallum et al. (1994) that people rate their health as poor on the objective basis of illness and disability.

The data presented are age-standardised estimates for SLAs across South Australia from data in the NHS, using the synthetic prediction technique: the details of this technique are on page 109, A Social Health Atlas of Australia: Volume 5, South Australia (Glover and Tennant 1999). The estimates were initially produced for SLAs in existence at the time. The rates of fair/poor health have been apportioned to the 2001 SLA boundaries used throughout the majority of this report.

Health and wellbeing: Life expectancy

The reference in the introductory statement on life expectancy is from Indicators of Sustainable Development: United Nations Centre for Sustainable Development Methodology Sheets – Life expectancy (at http://esl.jrc.it/envind/un_meths/UN_ME034.htm).
Life expectancy is an estimation of the average length of time (in years) that a person can expect to live, assuming that the prevailing rates of death for each age group will remain the same for the lifetime of that person.

To ensure reliability of the estimates, SLAs were grouped to form areas of approximately 25,000 population. In most cases the groups are formed by the Local Government Area eg. Burnside and Playford.

The life expectancy trend data were obtained from the State Government’s report: *Indigenous Profile: Comparing the Indigenous with the non-Indigenous population in South Australia, 2001*. The remainder of the life expectancy data were produced by the Public Health Information Development Unit (PHIDU), University of Adelaide.

**Health and wellbeing: Smoking during pregnancy**

The introductory statement that *Smoking by mothers while pregnant causes problems for their babies, from prematurity to low birthweight and being smaller at birth than they should be*, is from Chan et al. (2001).

The rate of smoking during pregnancy measures the number of women smoking whilst pregnant, expressed as a proportion of all women who were pregnant over the period. Women were asked at their first antenatal visit if they smoked (as at that visit).

The data presented are from the 1998 to 2001 Perinatal Statistics Collections, Epidemiology Branch, Department of Human Services.

**Health and wellbeing: Low birthweight babies**

The introductory statement that:

> Research has shown that 14.6% of South Australian babies with low birthweight in 1994 were perinatal deaths, compared with a perinatal death rate of 0.99% in those with normal birthweight is from Taylor et al. (1995).

Low birthweight is calculated from data in the Perinatal Statistics Collection. Low birthweight babies are babies (both live-born and stillborn) weighing less than 2500 grams at birth. Areas with fewer than five births over this period have been excluded from the analysis. The low birthweight data for country South Australia were mapped at the Health Region level due to the small numbers.

The data in the Indigenous section for this indicator were obtained from the State Government’s report: *Indigenous Profile: Comparing the Indigenous with the non-Indigenous population in South Australia, 2001*.

**Health and wellbeing: Child abuse and neglect**

The statement in the key points section that:

> While the number of these cases subsequently substantiated has remained relatively stable, rates of re-notification have increased, indicating that many children and young people are being ‘recycled’ through the child protection system is from Layton (2003).

The data presented are of numbers of substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect, not of individual children. Thus, if a child is the subject of more than one substantiated notification, then they will appear in the statistics more than once. Data not coded by age or by area were excluded from the analysis.

In assessing variations between areas, readers should also be aware that there is likely to be an overall under-reporting of child abuse and neglect in these data. However, as noted in the Indigenous section, Indigenous children are clearly over-represented in the child protection system (AIHW 2002).

The data in the Indigenous section for this indicator were obtained from the State Government’s report: *Indigenous Profile: Comparing the Indigenous with the non-Indigenous population in South Australia, 2001*.

**Health and wellbeing: Obesity and overweight in childhood**

The introductory statement that:

> Overweight and obesity in childhood and adolescence can cause a wide range of serious physical and emotional health problems, and increase the risk of premature illness and death in adulthood is from Booth et al. (2001) and Ebbeling et al. (2002).

The Body Mass Index (BMI) is a measure of body fat, based on height and weight: it is defined as weight in kilograms divided by the square of height in metres (kg/m²). The BMI calculation is based on the international...
standard definitions for overweight and obesity proposed by Cole et al. (2000). Using 4.5 years of age, the cut-off point for BMI for overweight is 17.47 for males and 17.19 for females. For obesity, it is 19.26 and 19.12, respectively.

The data were provided by Child and Youth Health. Note that the data available for 2002 were not presented in the analyses due to the sharp increase in the proportion of overweight and obese four year olds between the 2001 and 2002 datasets. For Adelaide, the increase is from 19.2% in 2001 to 21.5% in 2002 for females, and from 15.4% to 18.7% for males. For country South Australia, the increase is from 19.9% to 21.9% for females and from 16.2% to 18.5% for males. The sharp increase from 2001 to 2002 may, in part, reflect a change in data collection practice. In 2002, staff resources were limited and those available were directed to ensuring that coverage in lower socioeconomic status areas was maintained. The effect of this was a reduction in coverage in higher socioeconomic status areas. It is not clear what impact, if any, this has had on the BMI or the proportions of overweight and obese children.

In the country section, it is noted that some areas with low BMIs might reflect the high prevalence of underweight in Indigenous children living in these remote areas, as reported in numerous studies over recent decades. Examples of such studies include Kirke (1969); and Rousham & Gracey (1997). In the Indigenous section, the study that found an excess of both overweight and underweight Aboriginal children is Mackerras et al. (2003).

Access to services: Outside school hours care

References for the introductory statement on outside school hours care are from the ABS publication, Child Care, Australia 2002.

The data on access to after school hours care were obtained from the South Australian Department of Education and Children's Services.

Access to services: Booking lists for non-urgent surgery

The booking list data for non-urgent surgery for June 2002 were obtained from the Data Analysis and Consulting Unit, Department of Human Services.

Other: Homelessness

The definition used to determine homelessness includes ‘primary’, ‘secondary’ and ‘tertiary’ homelessness. Primary homelessness is the same as literal homelessness, such as people living on the streets and sleeping in parks. Secondary homelessness includes people who are staying in any form of temporary accommodation, with no other secure housing elsewhere, for example, people using emergency accommodation or residing temporarily with other families. Tertiary homelessness refers to the occupants of single rooms in private boarding houses who live there on a long-term basis (three months or longer). As noted in the homelessness section, the data on youth homelessness include the addition of students who had been homeless within the last three months.

The homelessness data are from the ABS publication Counting the Homeless, 1996 (ABS Cat. No. 2041) and 2001 (ABS Cat. No. 2050.0). The youth homelessness data are from a report, Youth Homelessness 2001 by Chamberlain and MacKenzie of RMIT University.

Other: Fruit and vegetable intake

The introductory statement was compiled from NPHP (2001); NHMRC (1999; 2003a; 2003b); and SIGNAL of the NPHP (2001). The fruit and vegetable intake data were provided by the Population Research and Outcomes Studies Unit, Department of Human Services.

Further details on data sources and information can be obtained from:

PHIDU, The University of Adelaide, South Australia 5005
Phone: 08-8303 6239 or e-mail: PHIDU@publicheath.gov.au
References for Sections 4 to 6


Additional data: correlations

Introduction

The correlation coefficients from the two tables below have been presented in a summary form in Tables 4 and 5 in the Summary of findings, Section 5. The correlation analysis shows key relationships between indicators at the small area level (between Statistical Local Areas) in Adelaide and in country South Australia.

Note: Correlation is the degree to which one variable is statistically associated with another. The correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength of this association. When high values for one variable are matched by high values for the other (or when low values are matched by low values), then they are positively correlated. Where the interdependence is inverse (i.e. high values for one are matched by low values for another), the two variables are negatively correlated. See Methods, overleaf, for further details.

Table A1: Correlation matrix for Statistical Local Areas in Adelaide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low income families</th>
<th>Children in low income families</th>
<th>School participation at age 16</th>
<th>Labour force participation</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Dwellings without a motor vehicle</th>
<th>IRSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low income families</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in low income families</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent families</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School participation at age 16</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force participation</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female labour force participation</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings without a motor vehicle</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings rented from the State Housing Authority</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent assistance</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous population</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRSD</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences involving apprehension</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self reported health status</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking during pregnancy</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low birthweight babies</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abuse &amp; neglect</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight &amp; obese</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booking lists</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school hours care</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient has been used in the analysis to indicate the degree of correlation between pairs of variables. Pearson correlation coefficients range from +1 (complete positive correlation) through 0 (complete lack of correlation) to –1 (complete negative correlation). As a general rule, correlations of plus or minus 0.5 or above are considered to be of meaningful statistical significance. Correlations of plus or minus 0.71 or above are of substantial statistical significance, because this higher value represents at least 50 per cent shared variation ($r^2$ greater than or equal to 0.5). Correlation coefficients were calculated by comparing the value (expressed as a percentage or as a standardised ratio) for each variable in the SLA (or postcode) with the value of each of the other variables.

The following ranges are those used in Tables 4 and 5, page 77:

**S:** Strong association (correlation coefficients of 0.71 or higher); **M:** Moderate association (correlation coefficients of 0.50 to 0.71); **W:** Weak association (correlation coefficients of below 0.30 to 0.49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low income families</th>
<th>Children in low income families</th>
<th>School participation at age 16</th>
<th>Labour force participation</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Dwellings without a motor vehicle</th>
<th>IRSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low income families</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in low income families</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent families</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School participation at age 16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force participation</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female labour force participation</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings without a motor vehicle</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings rented from the SA Housing Trust</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent assistance</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous population</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRSD</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences involving apprehension</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self reported health status</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking during pregnancy</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abuse &amp; neglect</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight &amp; obese</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>