# SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEX FOR AREAS (SEIFA) IN GREATER WESTERN SYDNEY



## **2021 CENSUS TOPIC PAPER**

BY RAJESH BHUSAL, WESTIR SOCIAL RESEARCHER

DECEMBER 2023



© WESTIR Limited A.B.N 65 003 487 965 A.C.N. 003 487 965

This work is Copyright. Apart from use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part can be reproduced by any process without the written permission from the Executive Officer of WESTIR Ltd.

All possible care has been taken in the preparation of the information contained in this publication. However, WESTIR Ltd expressly disclaims any liability for the accuracy and sufficiency of the information and under no circumstances shall be liable in negligence or otherwise in or arising out of the preparation or supply of any of the information.

WESTIR Ltd is partly funded by the NSW Department of Communities and Justice.

WESTIR Ltd acknowledges that we work on the lands of the Burramattagal People of the Darug Nation and thank them for their custodianship of the land, water and culture.

Photo credit: Andy Wang via Unsplash

Contact WESTIR Ltd:



Suite 7, Level 2, 154 Marsden Street Parramatta NSW 2150 PO Box 136 Parramatta 2124





### **Table of Contents**

Acknowledgements	1
Introduction	2
Understanding SEIFA	5
Indexes of SEIFA	5
SEIFA Terminology	6
Scores	6
Ranks	7
Deciles	7
Percentiles	7
Limitations of SEIFA	7
SEIFA in the LGAs of Greater Sydney and surroundings	9
SEIFA in the LGAs of Greater Western Sydney	16
Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in GWS LGAs	
Fairfield	
Lithgow	
Campbelltown	
Cumberland	
Canterbury-Bankstown	
Liverpool	30
Penrith	32
Blacktown	
Hawkesbury	
Wollondilly	
Wingecarribee	40
The Blue Mountains	
Camden	
Parramatta	
The Hills Shire	

#### <u>Maps</u>

Map 1: Regions (15 LGAs in GWS)	4
Map 2: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Fairfield	
LGA, 2021 Census	21
Map 3: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Lithgow	
LGA, 2021 Census	23
Map 4: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in	
Campbelltown LGA, 2021 Census	25

Map 5: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Cumberland
LGA, 2021 Census
Map 6: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Canterbury-
Bankstown LGA, 2021 Census
Map 7: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Liverpool
LGA, 2021 Census
Map 8: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Penrith
LGA, 2021 Census
Map 9: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Blacktown
LGA, 2021 Census
Map 10: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in
Hawkesbury LGA, 2021 Census
Map 11: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Wollondilly
LGA, 2021 Census
Map 12: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in
Wingecarribee LGA, 2021 Census
Map 13: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in The Blue
Mountains LGA, 2021 Census
Map 14: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Camden
LGA, 2021 Census
Map 15: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Parramatta
LGA, 2021 Census
Map 16: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in The Hills
Shire LGA, 2021 Census

#### <u>Tables</u>

Table 1: SEIFA indexes by scores and deciles across Australia in the LGA	s of Greater
Sydney, 2021 Census	
Table 2: SEIFA indexes (with score, rank and decile) and rankings of GWS	S' LGAs, 2021
Census	

#### <u>Figures</u>

Figure 1: Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage across Australia in the	
LGAs of Greater Sydney in deciles, 2021 Census	10
Figure 2: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage across	
Australia in the LGAs of Greater Sydney in deciles, 2021 Census	11
Figure 3: Index of Relative Economic Resources across Australia in the LGAs of	
Greater Sydney in deciles, 2021 Census	12
Figure 4: Index of Relative Education and Occupation across Australia in the LGAs	of
Greater Sydney in deciles, 2021 Census	13

### **Acknowledgements**

I acknowledge and respect the Aboriginal peoples who are the first inhabitants of the Western Sydney area and who work hard to maintain their cultural identity and connection to the land. I recognise their valuable contributions to the local community and pay my respects to all Elders past and present.

Similarly, the completion of this paper was only possible with the help of others. I would like to acknowledge my colleagues, Ms Niki Baroy and Mrs Christina Klassen, for their constant support and assistance throughout the preparation of this paper. Their attention to detail helped to bring this paper to its current form. I am equally grateful to WESTIR's Executive Officer, Ms Margaret Tipper, who provided guidance and regular mentorship during the process of preparing and finalising the paper. I also acknowledge Vincent Suarez's technical assistance for reviewing and uploading the paper into the organisation's website. I am especially grateful to past social researchers from WESTIR who wrote previous papers on SEIFA, which were helpful while writing this paper. Also, I deeply recognise our board members and readers who regularly read our Census papers and have always inspired us to write more.

Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude to the people living in Greater Western Sydney (including Lithgow and Wingecarribee), Greater Sydney, the Rest of New South Wales and New South Wales who participated in the 2021 Census. I could create this report only because of the time they took to fill out the Census questionnaires.

Thank you all!

Rajesh Bhusal Social Researcher WESTIR



### Introduction

This paper summarises the Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA) in the Local Government Areas (LGAs) of Greater Sydney (GSYD) and Greater Western Sydney (GWS) using the 2021 Census data made available by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). The paper has used the ABS 2021 Census data, including the data on various SEIFA indexes. TableBuilder Pro was used for the crosstabulation and extraction of the data from the 2021 Census. While doing so, small random adjustments were made in the cell values to protect the confidentiality of the data. While this may cause slight differences in the total sum of rows or columns against table totals, it does not affect the interpretation of the data.

The paper compares the findings of GWS with other comparative regions of Greater Sydney, the Rest of New South Wales (RNSW), and New South Wales (NSW), as well as discusses the findings at the Local Government Area (LGA) level of GWS, where applicable.

All regions analysed in this paper are compiled from the ABS Local Government Area (LGA) boundaries.

Greater Western Sydney consists of the following 13 LGAs.

- Blacktown
- Blue Mountains
- Camden
- Campbelltown
- Canterbury-Bankstown
- Cumberland
- Fairfield
- Hawkesbury
- Liverpool
- Parramatta
- Penrith
- The Hills Shire
- Wollondilly

This paper covers two additional LGAs, Lithgow and Wingecarribee, due to these LGAs being included in the NSW State Government's funding districts.

**DCJ Nepean Blue Mountains District (DCJ NBM District)** is made up of Blue Mountains, Hawkesbury, Lithgow and Penrith LGAs.

**DCJ Western Sydney District (DCJ WS District)** is made up of Blacktown, Cumberland, Parramatta and The Hills Shire LGAs.

**DCJ South Western Sydney (DCJ SWS District)** is made up of Camden, Campbelltown, Canterbury-Bankstown, Fairfield, Liverpool, Wingecarribee and Wollondilly LGAs.

Western Sydney Regional Information and Research Service (WESTIR) historically examined the GWS area using only two government-defined districts, DCJ South Western Sydney District and DCJ Western Sydney District. After consultation with DCJ, from the 2021 Census, WESTIR will be partitioning GWS into three separate districts, as mentioned above.

This report has been prepared with the utmost caution and conscientiousness; however, WESTIR Limited explicitly states that it cannot guarantee the accuracy or adequacy of the information quoted in the report. Furthermore, the company cannot be held responsible for



any errors or omissions and shall not be liable for any disputes arising from the information contained in this report.

All data is based on Census respondents' place of usual residence unless otherwise stated.

#### Abbreviations/Acronyms

ABS:	Australian Bureau of Statistics
DCJ:	Department of Communities and Justice
GSYD:	Greater Sydney
GWS:	Greater Western Sydney
IEO:	Index of Education and Occupation
IER:	Index of Economic Resources
IRSAD:	Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage
IRSD:	Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage
Ltd:	Limited
LGA:	Local Government Area
NBM:	Nepean Blue Mountains
NSW:	New South Wales
RNSW:	Rest of New South Wales
SA1:	Statistical Area Level 1
SEIFA:	Socio-Economic Index for Areas
SWS:	South Western Sydney
WESTIR:	Western Sydney Regional Information and Research Service
WS:	Western Sydney



Map 1: Regions (15 LGAs in GWS)

Source: ABS 2021 Census (visualisation produced by WESTIR Ltd)



### **Understanding SEIFA**

SEIFA stands for Socio-Economic Index for Areas. It is a product provided by the ABS that is designed to measure and rank areas in Australia based on their relative socio-economic advantage and disadvantage (ABS, 2023).<sup>1</sup> The SEIFA is a collection of four different indexes, each measuring and summarising different aspects of the socio-economic conditions (advantage and disadvantage) in an area using the Census data.<sup>2</sup> The concept of relative socio-economic advantage and disadvantage and disadvantage as employed in SEIFA can be generally described as people's access to material and social resources and their ability to participate in society. The SEIFA indexes are based on information from the Census done every five years.

Census variables summarised by SEIFA are income, education, employment, occupation, housing and family structure. The Census assigns a SEIFA score to each area, indicating its relative advantage or disadvantage compared to other areas (ABS, 2023). Based on these factors, SEIFA is used to rank different regions within Australia and within states and territories. In this way, SEIFA is a valuable tool for understanding and addressing social and economic inequalities across different geographic areas within Australia, states and territories.

According to the ABS, SEIFA is useful and beneficial for the following:

- determining areas that require funding,
- identifying and creating new business opportunities,
- conducting social and economic research, including the relationship between socioeconomic disadvantage and various social outcomes and
- strategic planning and service/program design.

Additionally, the thematic mapping of SEIFA scores is often done to view the spatial distribution of relative advantage/disadvantage and assist policymakers/planners in place-based decision-making.

#### Indexes of SEIFA

There are four different indexes in SEIFA, namely:

- Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage (IRSD)
- Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage (IRSAD)
- Index of Economic Resources (IER)
- Index of Education and Occupation (IEO)

**Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage (IRSD):** This index focuses on relative socio-economic disadvantage within an area and only includes measures of relative disadvantage. For example, in a particular region/area, the overall score might be low due to factors such as a high number of households with limited income, a significant population lacking qualifications, and a substantial presence of individuals in low-skilled occupations.<sup>3</sup> The IRSD is unique in the sense that 'it ranks areas on a continuum from most

<sup>2</sup> For more details, please see <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-</u>communities/socio-economic-indexes-areas-seifa-australia/latest-release

<sup>3</sup> For more details, please see <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-</u> <u>communities/socio-economic-indexes-areas-seifa-australia/latest-release#index-of-relative-socio-</u> economic-disadvantage-irsd-



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For more details, please see

https://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/censushome.nsf/home/seifa#:~:text=Socio%2DEconomic%20Indexes%20for%20Areas%20(SEIFA)%20is%20a%20product,from%20the%20five%2Dyearly%20Census

disadvantaged to least disadvantaged, while the other three indexes (IRSAD, IER, IEO) rank areas on a continuum from most disadvantaged/least advantaged to most advantaged/least disadvantaged.<sup>4</sup> Generally, a low score or decile indicates a relatively more significant disadvantage and a high score or decile indicates a relative lack of disadvantage.

Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage (IRSAD): This index provides information on the economic and social conditions of people and households within an area by including both relative advantage and disadvantage measures. It focuses on both advantages and disadvantages. Generally, a low score or decile indicates a relatively greater disadvantage and lack of advantage, whereas a high score or decile indicates a relative lack of disadvantage and greater advantage.

**Index of Economic Resources (IER):** This index assesses economic advantages and disadvantages by relying on financial factors. It summarises variables related to income and housing, excluding education and occupation, since they do not directly measure economic resources. A lower score or decile typically suggests limited access to economic resources, while a higher score or decile indicates comparatively better access to economic resources.

**Index of Education and Occupation (IEO):** This index examines the relative advantages and disadvantages in terms of education and occupation within communities. It gauges the educational and occupational levels of residents. A lower IEO score, or decile suggests that people in the area tend to have lower education and occupation status, while a higher score or decile suggests that, on average, people in the area have higher education and occupation status.

#### SEIFA Terminology<sup>5</sup>

The ABS terminology, used to interpret and create the SEIFA summary, includes the terms: scores, deciles, ranks and percentiles. Aligning with the ABS descriptions, the following section offers a description of each of these terms.

#### Scores

The scores represent a weighted combination of selected indicators related to advantage and disadvantage. These indicators have been adjusted to fit a distribution with an average (mean) of 1000 and a standard deviation of 100. If all of an area's indicators match the national average, its score will be 1000. The ABS (2023) states that 'the score for an area will increase if an area has: an indicator of advantage that is greater than the national average; or an indicator of disadvantage that is less than the national average.' A lower score indicates that an area is relatively disadvantaged compared to an area with a higher score. Meanwhile, the ABS clarifies that SEIFA scores are ordinal measures and do not represent the quantity of advantage or disadvantage. For instance, stating that an area with a score of 1000 is twice as advantaged as an area with a score of 500 is inaccurate. Hence, the ABS states that scores are helpful when doing complex analysis and encourages rankings and quantiles (deciles and percentiles) to be used for interpreting the SEIFA summary. For more information, see the Technical Paper on SEIFA.

<sup>4</sup> For more details, please see <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/detailed-methodology-information/concepts-sources-methods/socio-economic-indexes-areas-seifa-technical-paper/2021/using-and-interpreting-seifa#choice-of-index</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> For more details, please see <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/detailed-methodology-information/concepts-sources-methods/socio-economic-indexes-areas-seifa-technical-paper/2021/construction-indexes#basic-output-scores-ranks-deciles-and-percentiles</u>



#### Ranks

Once the scores are allocated, all areas are ordered from the lowest to highest score, with rank one representing the most disadvantaged area. The area with the second lowest score is given a rank of two and so on. Rankings are also provided on a national basis and on a state/territory basis.

#### **Deciles**

Depending on their scores, the areas are divided into ten equal-sized groups while computing the deciles. All areas are ordered from the lowest to highest score. The lowest 10% of areas are given a decile number of one. The next lowest 10% of areas are given a decile number of two and so on, up to the highest 10% of areas which are given a decile number of 10. It ranks the areas from one (the lowest) to 10 (the highest). A decile of one means an area ranks in the bottom 10%; a decile of two means an area sits in the next 10% (11-20%) and so forth.

#### **Percentiles**

Unlike deciles, in percentiles, the areas are divided into one hundred equal-sized groups, depending on their score. All areas are ordered from the lowest to highest score. The lowest 1% of areas are given a percentile number of one, the next lowest 1% of areas are given a percentile number of two and so on, up to the highest 1% of areas which are given a percentile number of 100.

The ABS publishes different output values for each of these indexes: score, rank, decile and percentile. For ease of interpretation, the ABS recommends using deciles or index rankings instead of index scores.<sup>6</sup> However, it is important to note that the index scores are initially calculated at the Statistical Area Level 1 (SA1), which are small geographic areas of between 200 to 800 persons and an average population of 400.<sup>7</sup> The scores at SA1 have been standardised to a mean of 1000, with a standard deviation of 100.<sup>8</sup>

#### **Limitations of SEIFA**

While SEIFA has much to offer in terms of picturing the socio-economic aspects of an area in a given time, it also comes with multiple limitations. It is strongly recommended that the users should be cautious when using SEIFA to guide their planning. SEIFA has the following limitations:

• **SEIFA is a relative measure:** SEIFA is an ordinal measure, ranking areas from lowest to highest without indicating specific quantities of advantage or disadvantage. For example, a score of 500 doesn't mean an area is twice as disadvantaged as a score of 1000. Hence, it simply reflects relative positions.

methodology/2021#:~:text=SA1%20scores%20are%20created%20by%20adding%20together%20the,equals%201%2C000%20and%20the%20standard%20deviation%20is%20100.



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> For more details, please see ABS Technical paper on SEIFA at

https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/detailed-methodology-information/concepts-sources-methods/socioeconomic-indexes-areas-seifa-technical-paper/latest-

release#:~:text=The%20index%20scores%20are%20based%20on%20an%20arbitrary,for%20analysi s%2C%20rather%20than%20using%20the%20index%20scores.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> For more details, please see <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/standards/australian-statistical-geography-standard-asgs-edition-3/jul2021-jun2026/main-structure-and-greater-capital-city-statistical-areas/statistical-area-level-1</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For more details, please see <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/methodologies/socio-economic-indexes-areas-</u> seifa-australia-

- SEIFA is non-comparable across time: SEIFA is designed for comparing the relative socio-economic aspects of an area at a specific time period, not tracking changes over time. In general, it is unsuitable for measuring trends due to factors such as shifting populations and variable changes between the Censuses. For example, Dwelling Internet Connection data was not collected in the 2021 Census and was not used in creating the SEIFA 2021.<sup>9</sup> However, if comparisons has to be made, deciles are preferable for temporal comparisons over ranks or scores.
- SEIFA interprets the area, not the individual: SEIFA provides summary information about the people in an area, not information about a person in an area. A SEIFA score is an average of people and households within a given area. Therefore, not everyone in the area would have that same score. Using a football analogy, a team with some excellent players may not necessarily qualify for the finals. In the same way, a person could be employed in a high-paying job but may also live in an area of generally high unemployment and low incomes.
- SEIFA is influenced by other demographic factors: Some areas lack a SEIFA score due to non-responses and low populations, which creates challenges in fully understanding disadvantage. Likewise, considering specific factors like age can display disparities within a region, such as the older population being more prevalent in lower deciles, indicating lower incomes and fewer economic assets compared to the younger population.
- SEIFA is limited to what is collected in the Census only: Topics represented in SEIFA are a limited collection of variables included in the Census. For example, other relevant variables such as wealth, infrastructure and long-term health conditions were not considered when computing SEIFA. Furthermore, crime and environmental data are not collected in the Census although they are sometimes associated with advantage and disadvantage.

Overall, the ABS emphasises that the notion of disadvantage is subjective and can vary significantly across diverse regions and cultures. Different communities may have varying perspectives on which variables are considered more indicative of disadvantage than others. As a result, relying only on single measures like SEIFA may not provide a comprehensive assessment of socio-economic disadvantage. Therefore, it is advisable to employ various measures when making decisions that affect communities facing these challenges.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> For more details, please see <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/methodologies/socio-economic-indexes-areas-</u> seifa-australia-methodology/2021#constructing-seifa



### **SEIFA** in the LGAs of Greater Sydney and surroundings

According to the ABS (2023)<sup>10</sup>, 6 out of the 10 relatively most advantaged LGAs in Australia were in Greater Sydney, with Woollahra on Sydney Harbour's south shore being the most advantaged LGA in Australia. Other top relatively highly advantaged LGAs across Australia from Greater Sydney were Mosman, Ku-ring-gai, North Sydney, Waverley and Lane Cove.

Although 19 out of 34 LGAs in Greater Sydney were relatively highly advantaged with most of them belonging to decile 10, looking more closely into different SEIFA indexes returns varying results.

In the Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage, the 2021 Census showed that 25 out of 34 LGAs in Greater Sydney had a score above the average of 1000 (see **Table 1**). This means that most of the LGAs in Greater Sydney were the least disadvantaged and belonged to the top three deciles. A closer analysis of the top three deciles showed that almost half of the Greater Sydney LGAs belonged to decile 10 (16), some belonged to decile 9 (5) and few belonged to decile 8 (3). There were two other LGAs on decile 7, one with an above-average score (Bayside) and the other with a score below the average (Central Coast). The rest of the LGAs (8) fell into the lowest deciles, with Fairfield being the most disadvantaged LGA in decile 1.

**Figure 1** over the next page lists Greater Sydney's 34 LGAs and their corresponding deciles across Australia.

<sup>10</sup> For more information, please see <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-</u>communities/socio-economic-indexes-areas-seifa-australia/latest-release







Source: ABS 2021 Census



Likewise, in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage, the 2021 Census showed that 27 out of 34 LGAs in Greater Sydney had a score above the average of 1000 (see **Table 1**). Again, most of the LGAs in Greater Sydney were relatively advantaged and were also in the top three deciles in this SEIFA index. A closer analysis of the top three deciles showed that more than half of the Greater Sydney LGAs belonged to decile 10 (19), while some LGAs belonged to decile 9 (7) and a couple belonged to decile 8 (2). The rest of the LGAs (6) fell into the lowest deciles, with Fairfield again being the most disadvantaged LGA in the region, belonging to decile 2.

Figure 2 below shows the LGAs and their corresponding deciles across Australia.

#### Figure 2: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage across Australia in the LGAs of Greater Sydney in deciles, 2021 Census



Source: ABS 2021 Census



Similarly, in the Index of Economic Resources, the 2021 Census showed that 20 out of 34 LGAs in Greater Sydney had a score above the average of 1000 (see **Table 1**). Although most of the LGAs in Greater Sydney may have had higher access to economic resources, there were fewer LGAs in the top three deciles in this index than in the previous two indexes. For example, there were only 12 LGAs in decile 10 and 4 LGAs in both decile 9 and decile 8. The rest of the LGAs (14) have relatively less access to economic resources and are categorised into the lowest deciles. Four other LGAs (Fairfield, Cumberland, Burwood and Sydney) had the least access to economic resources and fell into the lowest 20% (decile 2) of all LGAs in Australia in the 2021 Census.

Figure 3 below shows LGAs and their corresponding deciles across Australia.

### Figure 3: Index of Relative Economic Resources across Australia in the LGAs of Greater Sydney in deciles, 2021 Census



Source: ABS 2021 Census



Moreover, in the Index of Education and Occupation, the 2021 Census showed that many of the LGAs (24 out of 34) in Greater Sydney had a score above the average of 1000 (see **Table 1**). Notably, 19 LGAs were in decile 10, 4 LGAs in decile 9 and 5 LGAs in decile 8, suggesting that people living in those LGAs had higher education and occupation status. The rest of the LGAs, but very few (6), were relatively less advantageous regarding education and jobs. Again, Fairfield LGA, which fell into decile 4, was recorded to be the relatively least advantaged LGA in Greater Sydney regarding the education and occupation of people living there.

Figure 4 below shows the LGAs and their corresponding deciles across Australia.

### Figure 4: Index of Relative Education and Occupation across Australia in the LGAs of Greater Sydney in deciles, 2021 Census



Source: ABS 2021 Census

In addition to the above information, **Table 1** below presents the individual scores and corresponding deciles of each LGA in Greater Sydney in the four SEIFA indexes. Deciles are based on ranking across all LGAs in Australia.

2021 Local Government Area (LGA) Name	Index of Relative Socio-Economic Disadvantage		Index of Relative Index of Relative Socio- Socio-Economic Disadvantage and Disadvantage		Index of Economic Resources		Index of Education and Occupation		Usual Residents
	Score	Decile	Score	Decile	Score	Decile	Score	Decile	
Hornsby	1082	10	1116	10	1082	10	1121	10	151,811
Hunters Hill	1101	10	1156	10	1088	10	1163	10	13,559
Ku-ring-gai	1108	10	1165	10	1117	10	1174	10	124,076
Lane Cove	1105	10	1162	10	1058	10	1180	10	39,438
Mosman	1110	10	1169	10	1065	10	1185	10	28,329
Northern Beaches	1089	10	1125	10	1087	10	1109	10	263,554
The Hills Shire	1098	10	1136	10	1132	10	1112	10	191,876
Woollahra	1110	10	1176	10	1043	10	1193	10	53,496
Canada Bay	1067	10	1116	10	1021	9	1123	10	89,177
Willoughby	1075	10	1142	10	1034	9	1162	10	75,613
Ryde	1055	10	1099	10	1007	8	1120	10	129,123
Waverley	1092	10	1163	10	1009	8	1170	10	68,605
Inner West	1057	10	1118	10	993	7	1141	10	182,818
Randwick	1059	10	1113	10	995	7	1122	10	134,252
North Sydney	1096	10	1164	10	985	6	1193	10	68,950
Sutherland Shire	1079	10	1090	10	1078	10	1064	9	230,211
Parramatta	1029	9	1070	10	983	6	1097	10	256,729
Sydney	1031	9	1126	10	887	2	1158	10	211,632
Blue Mountains	1048	9	1042	9	1039	9	1063	9	78,121
Camden	1045	9	1050	9	1098	10	1002	8	119,325
Wollondilly	1041	9	1020	9	1093	10	960	7	53,961
Strathfield	1011	8	1066	10	961	4	1098	10	45,593
Georges River	1011	8	1048	9	999	7	1060	9	152,274
Hawkesbury	1026	8	1008	9	1056	10	969	7	67,207

Table 1: SEIFA indexes by scores and deciles across Australia in the LGAs of Greater Sydney, 2021 Census



Bayside	1004	7	1044	9	966	4	1051	9	175,184
Central Coast	994	7	978	7	1005	8	967	7	346,596
Blacktown	987	6	1006	8	1020	9	993	8	396,776
Penrith	991	6	981	8	1015	8	949	6	217,664
Burwood	977	5	1050	9	926	2	1082	10	40,217
Liverpool	931	3	968	7	999	7	976	8	233,446
Campbelltown	947	3	952	5	981	5	949	6	176,519
Canterbury-	917	2	966	7	949	3	996	8	371,006
Bankstown									
Cumberland	904	2	961	6	931	2	995	8	235,439
Fairfield	814	1	885	2	937	2	919	4	208,475

Source: ABS 2021 Census

### SEIFA in the LGAs of Greater Western Sydney

Greater Western Sydney is comprised of 13 LGAs. As stated above, because of the DCJ funding districts, this report also includes two additional LGAs, Lithgow and Wingecarribee. **Table 2** below displays the SEIFA data for each LGA within the GWS region by four distinct SEIFA indexes (IRSD, IRSAD, IER and IEO), with ranks and deciles with respect to all LGAs across Australia. Additionally, it shows the rankings of these LGAs within GWS, which have been calculated by WESTIR using the SEIFA scores provided by the ABS. For the purposes of this paper, Lithgow and Wingecarribee were also included in the GWS rankings. It is helpful to note that the relatively least advantaged LGA has a rank of 1 and the relatively least disadvantaged/highly advantaged has a rank of 15.

SEIFA Indexes	Ranki	ng within Aus	tralia	Ranking w	ithin NSW	Ranking in GWS (of 15 LGAs)	Relation to Average score (1000)		
	Score	Rank	Decile	Rank	Decile	By SEIFA score	Position		
Blacktown									
IRSD	987	306	6	76	6	7	Below average		
IRSAD	1006	437	8	96	8	8	Above average		
IER	1020	442	9	104	9	9	Above average		
IEO	993	420	8	94	8	8	Below average		
Blue Mountains									
IRSD	1048	492	9	110	9	14	Above average		
IRSAD	1042	474	9	103	8	12	Above average		
IER	1039	488	9	111	9	10	Above average		
IEO	1063	483	9	109	9	13	Above average		
Camden									
IRSD	1045	483	9	107	9	12	Above average		
IRSAD	1050	483	9	106	9	13	Above average		
IER	1098	540	10	127	10	14	Above average		

#### Table 2: SEIFA indexes (with score, rank and decile) and rankings of GWS' LGAs, 2021 Census



IEO	1002	435	8	99	8	11	Above average
Campbelltown							
IRSD	947	154	3	31	3	6	Below average
IRSAD	952	270	5	61	5	3	Below average
IER	981	269	5	57	5	5	Below average
IEO	949	304	6	67	6	3	Below average
Canterbury-Bankstown	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	·			·	
IRSD	917	90	2	10	1	3	Below average
IRSAD	966	333	7	79	7	5	Below average
IER	949	125	3	16	2	3	Below average
IEO	996	428	8	96	8	10	Below average
Cumberland							
IRSD	904	68	2	7	1	2	Below average
IRSAD	961	309	6	71	6	4	Below average
IER	931	91	2	9	1	1	Below average
IEO	995	426	8	95	8	9	Below average
Fairfield					- -		
IRSD	814	35	1	1	1	1	Below average
IRSAD	885	63	2	4	1	1	Below average
IER	937	99	2	11	1	2	Below average
IEO	919	177	4	32	3	2	Below average
Hawkesbury							
IRSD	1026	437	8	103	8	9	Above average
IRSAD	1008	440	9	97	8	9	Above average
IER	1056	515	10	116	9	12	Above average



IEO	969	370	7	82	7	6	Below average			
Liverpool										
IRSD	931	113	3	20	2	4	Below average			
IRSAD	968	341	7	82	7	6	Below average			
IER	999	361	7	83	7	7	Below average			
IEO	976	386	8	87	7	7	Below average			
Parramatta										
IRSD	1029	451	9	104	9	10	Above average			
IRSAD	1070	502	10	112	9	14	Above average			
IER	983	277	6	59	5	6	Below average			
IEO	1097	505	10	112	9	14	Above average			
Penrith						- -				
IRSD	991	328	6	82	7	8	Below average			
IRSAD	981	384	8	90	7	7	Below average			
IER	1015	430	8	102	8	8	Above average			
IEO	949	308	6	68	6	4	Below average			
The Hills Shire										
IRSD	1098	537	10	124	10	15	Above average			
IRSAD	1136	534	10	121	10	15	Above average			
IER	1132	547	10	129	10	15	Above average			
IEO	1112	510	10	115	9	15	Above average			
Wollondilly										
IRSD	1041	473	9	106	9	11	Above average			
IRSAD	1020	454	9	99	8	10	Above average			
IER	1093	538	10	125	10	13	Above average			

IEO	960	347	7	77	6	5	Below average				
Lithgow											
IRSD	935	120	3	23	2	5	Below average				
IRSAD	912	118	3	20	2	2	Below average				
IER	960	163	3	28	3	4	Below average				
IEO	889	73	2	6	1	1	Below average				
Wingecarribee											
IRSD	1045	486	9	108	9	13	Above average				
IRSAD	1031	465	9	102	8	11	Above average				
IER	1055	512	10	115	9	11	Above average				
IEO	1020	457	9	101	8	12	Above average				

Source: ABS 2021 Census

# Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in GWS LGAs

The following sections will examine the performance of the GWS LGAs across Australia in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage. While the other three indexes hold importance in interpreting the overall SEIFA summary, this specific index (IRSAD) places a strong emphasis on assessing the relative advantages and disadvantages of various areas, considering a range of variables that includes income, education, employment, occupation, housing and family structure (ABS, 2023).<sup>11</sup> As a result, among the four different indexes, IRSAD is the most appropriate index for discussing the relative advantages of a specific area at a given point in time.

The following section discusses the LGAs in GWS from relatively most disadvantaged to relatively most advantaged across Australia. Please note that the scores differ by different indexes and the scores mentioned here only correspond to the IRSAD. Again, it is essential to note that the lower SEIFA values in terms of scores, ranks and deciles all signify areas being relatively disadvantaged. In contrast, the higher values indicate areas being relatively advantaged. Please refer to the section SEIFA Terminology (page 6) above to understand more about SEIFA scores, deciles, ranks and percentiles.

#### <u>Note</u>

Some of the SEIFA maps on the next pages may not display all the suburbs in each LGA. While all possible attempts have been made, the maps have been presented in the best possible way, considering the risk of overlapping names, especially where suburb boundaries are very small within an LGA.

#### Fairfield

Fairfield LGA (208,475 usual residents) was identified as one of the most disadvantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census, having a score of 885 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage. Fairfield was recorded in the 1<sup>st</sup> decile (lowest 10%) in NSW and the 2<sup>nd</sup> decile (11-20%) across Australia. This means that Fairfield was one of the most disadvantaged LGAs in the state (lowest 10%) as well as across the country (lowest 20%). In terms of ranking, it ranked 4<sup>th</sup> out of 129 LGAs in NSW and 63<sup>rd</sup> out of 547 LGAs across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 1<sup>st</sup> out of 15 LGAs.

The Fairfield LGA map showed that most of the relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were concentrated in the eastern part of the LGA. These SA1s were in and around the suburbs of Fairfield, Old Guilford, Cabramatta, Canley Heights, Fairfield East and Bonnyrigg. Nevertheless, a few SA1s with relative advantage (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100) were in and around the suburbs of Horsley Park, Abbotsbury, Cecil Park and Bossley Park. The 2021 Census did not record any relatively highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) in Fairfield LGA.

Map 2 over the next page shows this in detail.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> For details, please see SEIFA methodology on <u>https://www.abs.gov.au/methodologies/socio-</u> economic-indexes-areas-seifa-australia-methodology/2021









#### Lithgow

After Fairfield, Lithgow (20,842 usual residents) was also among the most disadvantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. Lithgow was recorded in the 2<sup>nd</sup> decile (11-20%) in NSW and the 3<sup>rd</sup> decile (21-30%) across Australia. This means that, although Lithgow had an IRSAD score above 10% of NSW LGAs, it is still relatively disadvantaged among LGAs in GWS. In terms of ranking, it ranked 20<sup>th</sup> in NSW and 118<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> out of 15 LGAs. Lithgow had a SEIFA score of 912 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Lithgow LGA map showed that most of the relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were next to Brogans Creek, Portland and Bowenfels. Furthermore, the map interestingly showed that most of the other relatively disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 850 to 1000) were in the north west part of the LGA. Meanwhile, relatively advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100) were in the central to the southern part of Lithgow. The 2021 Census did not record any relatively highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) in Lithgow LGA.

Map 3 over the next page visualises this in detail.





## Map 3: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Lithgow LGA, 2021 Census



#### Campbelltown

Campbelltown (176,519 usual residents) was also among the relatively disadvantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. Nevertheless, it was in the 5<sup>th</sup> decile (41-50%) in both NSW and Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 40% of the LGAs across the state and country. In terms of ranking, it ranked 61<sup>st</sup> in NSW and 270<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> out of 15 LGAs. Campbelltown had a SEIFA score of 952 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Campbelltown LGA map showed that most of the relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were located around the central suburbs, such as Ruse, Airds and Ambarvale, with some in the north of the LGA (Glenfield, Macquarie Fields and Ingleburn). On the other hand, a couple of SA1s in and around the suburbs, such as Minto Heights, Kentlyn, Bardia, Menangle Park and Blair Athol were relatively advantaged (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100) and SA1s around the suburbs of Blairmount and Denham Court were relatively highly advantaged (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273).

Map 4 over the next page visualises this in detail.



#### Map 4: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Campbelltown LGA, 2021 Census





#### Cumberland

Cumberland (235,439 usual residents) had a SEIFA score of 961 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census which is below the national average score of 1000. However, as it was recorded in the 6<sup>th</sup> decile (51-60%) in both NSW and Australia, it was more advantaged than 50% of LGAs across the state and country. In terms of ranking, it ranked 71<sup>st</sup> in NSW and 309<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 4<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs.

The Cumberland LGA map showed that most of the relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were in and around the suburbs of Auburn, Merrylands, Guildford and Berala. The other relatively disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 850 to 1000) were all over the LGA, ranging from the east (Berala and Regents Park), central (Holroyd, Wood Park and Guildford West) to the west (Pendle Hill). Conversely, the relatively advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100) were in the west of the LGA (Greystanes and Girraween) and some pockets of small areas in the east (Lidcombe and Rookwood).

Map 5 over the next page visualises this in detail.



# Map 5: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Cumberland LGA, 2021 Census





#### **Canterbury-Bankstown**

Canterbury-Bankstown (371,006 usual residents) had a SEIFA score of 966 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census which is below the national average score of 1000. However, as it was recorded in the 7<sup>th</sup> decile (61-70%) in both NSW and Australia, it was more advantaged than 60% of LGAs across the state and country. In terms of ranking, it ranked 79<sup>th</sup> in NSW and 333<sup>rd</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 5<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs.

The Canterbury-Bankstown LGA map showed that most of the relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were next to Bankstown, Villawood, Yagoona, Riverwood and Wiley Park. The other relatively disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 850 to 1000) were all over the LGA, mainly ranging from the central to the northern parts of the LGA. In contrast, the advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100) were in and around the suburbs of Earlwood, Hurlstone Park, Ashbury, Padstow Heights, Revesby and Picnic Point. In general, the LGA's north eastern and south western parts were relatively advantaged.

Map 6 over the next page visualises this in detail.



#### Map 6: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Canterbury-Bankstown LGA, 2021 Census





#### Liverpool

Liverpool (233,446 usual residents) had a SEIFA score of 968 in the Index of Relative Socioeconomic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census which is below the national average score of 1000. However, as it was recorded in the 7<sup>th</sup> decile (61-70%) in both NSW and Australia, it was more advantaged than 60% of LGAs across the state and country. In terms of ranking, it ranked 82<sup>nd</sup> in NSW and 341<sup>st</sup> across Australia. In GWS, it ranked 6<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs.

The Liverpool LGA map showed that most of the relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were in the north eastern part of the LGA, especially in and around the suburbs of Heckenberg, Ashcroft, Cartwright and Lurnea. The other relatively disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 850 to 1000) were dispersed across the LGA, such as around the suburbs of Casula, Horningsea Park, West Hoxton, Rossmore and Austral. Conversely, the relatively advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100) were also dispersed across the LGA. They were next to the suburbs of Wallacia, Cecil Hills, Elizabeth Hills and Carnes Hills. The relatively highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1000 to 1273) were mainly in the eastern parts of the LGA, such as Edmondson Park, Pleasure Point, Moorebank and Chipping Norton.

Map 7 below projects this in detail.



# Map 7: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Liverpool LGA, 2021 Census





#### Penrith

Penrith (217,664 usual residents) had a SEIFA score of 981 in the Index of Relative Socioeconomic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census which is below the national average score of 1000. However, as it was recorded in the 7<sup>th</sup> decile (61-70%) in NSW and in the 8<sup>th</sup> decile (71-80%) in Australia, it was more advantaged than 60% and 70% of LGAs across the state and country, respectively. In terms of ranking, it ranked 90<sup>th</sup> in NSW and 384<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 7<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs.

The Penrith LGA map showed that a few of the relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were located around the suburbs of Jamisontown, Kingswood, North St Marys and Cranebrook. The other relatively disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 850 to 1000) were dispersed across the LGA but were mainly concentrated across central Penrith. They were located around Kemps Creek, Orchard Hills, Cambridge Park, Cambridge Gardens, Llandilo and Londonderry. In contrast, the relatively advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100) were located in the LGA's south western and north eastern parts. The relatively highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) were in and around Mount Vernon, Glenmore Park and close to Jordan Springs.

Map 8 over the next page portrays this in detail.





# Map 8: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Penrith LGA, 2021 Census

Source: ABS 2021 Census (visualisation produced by WESTIR Ltd)



#### **Blacktown**

Blacktown (396,776 usual residents) was among the relatively advantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. It was recorded in the 8<sup>th</sup> decile (71-80%) in both NSW and Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 70% of LGAs across NSW and Australia. In terms of ranking, it ranked 96<sup>th</sup> in NSW and 437<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 8<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs. Blacktown had a SEIFA score of 1006 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Blacktown LGA map showed that most of the relatively highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) were in the northern part of the LGA, such as Riverstone to Kings Langley. In particular, the SA1s in and around the suburbs of Tallawong, Schofields, Kellyville Ridge, were relatively highly advantaged. On the other hand, the southern half of the LGA appeared to be relatively disadvantaged (scores ranging from 850 to 1000). The relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were in and around the south west of the LGA, and included the suburbs of Whalan, Emerton and Bidwill. The other relatively disadvantaged SA1s were found across the LGA, spanning from east (Seven Hills, Lalor Park and Blacktown), to central (Dean Park, Plumpton and Rooty Hill), to south (Mount Druitt and Minchinbury), to west (Shanes Park and Angus) as well as to the north of the LGA (Grantham Farm and Richards).

Map 9 over the next page visualises this in detail.





### Map 9: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Blacktown LGA, 2021 Census



#### Hawkesbury

Hawkesbury (67,207 usual residents) was also among the relatively advantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. It was recorded in the 8<sup>th</sup> decile (71-80%) in NSW and the 9<sup>th</sup> decile (81-90%) in Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 70% of LGAs across NSW and 80% across Australia. Out of all LGAs, it ranked 97<sup>th</sup> in NSW and 440<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 9<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs. Hawkesbury had a SEIFA score of 1008 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Hawkesbury LGA map showed that, in general, the vast majority of SA1s in the LGA were relatively advantaged (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100). The relatively highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) were around the suburbs such as Bowen Mountain, Kurrajong and Grose Wold). Nevertheless, some relatively disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 850 to 1000) were also found, especially in the north west part of the LGA, such as Mellong, Womerah and Colo Heights. Similarly, some parts of Lower MacDonald were also disadvantaged and pockets of Bligh Park were relatively highly disadvantaged (scores ranging from 435 to 850).

Map 10 over the next page shows this in detail.





#### Map 10: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Hawkesbury LGA, 2021 Census



#### Wollondilly

Wollondilly (53,961 usual residents) was also among the relatively advantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. It was recorded in the 8<sup>th</sup> decile (71-80%) in NSW and the 9<sup>th</sup> decile (81-90%) in Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 70% of LGAs across NSW and 80% across Australia. In terms of ranking, it ranked 99<sup>th</sup> in NSW and 454<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 10<sup>th</sup> out of the 15 LGAs. Wollondilly had a SEIFA score of 1020 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Wollondilly LGA map showed that, in general, the vast majority of SA1s were relatively advantaged (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100). The relatively highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) were around Mowbray Park, Picton and Razorback. At the same time, it is also important to note that almost all of the population only lives in half of the area located in the east of the LGA, excluding the Blue Mountains National Park, the private town Yerranderie and some parts of Lakesland. Nevertheless, some SA1s that were relatively disadvantaged (scores ranging from 850 to 1000) were also found, especially in the south eastern part of the LGA, such as Wallacia, central LGA (such as Nattai) and south east part of the LGA (such as Couridjah, Buxton and Bargo).

Map 11 over the next page projects this in detail.



## Map 11: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Wollondilly LGA, 2021 Census





#### Wingecarribee

Wingecarribee (52,709 usual residents) was also among the relatively advantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. It was recorded in the 8<sup>th</sup> decile (71-80%) in NSW and the 9<sup>th</sup> decile (81-90%) in Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 70% of LGAs across NSW and 80% across Australia. In terms of ranking, it ranked 102<sup>nd</sup> in NSW and 465<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 11<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs. Wingecarribee had a SEIFA score of 1031 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Wingecarribee LGA map showed that, in general, the majority of SA1s were relatively advantaged (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100). A couple of highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) were located in and around the suburbs of Mittagong, East Kangaloon and Werai. At the same time, only a few of the SA1s were considered disadvantaged (scores ranging from 850 to 1000). They were around Bundanoon, Bowral, Balaclava and Balmoral. Given that Wingecarribee is a relatively advantaged LGA, no SA1s displaying a notably high level of disadvantage (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were identified within Wingecarribee.

Map 12 over the next page visualises this in detail.





#### Map 12: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Wingecarribee LGA, 2021 Census



#### **The Blue Mountains**

The Blue Mountains (78,121 usual residents) was also among the relatively advantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. It was recorded in the 8<sup>th</sup> decile (71-80%) in NSW and the 9<sup>th</sup> decile (81-90%) in Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 70% of LGAs across NSW and 80% across Australia. In terms of ranking, it ranked 103<sup>rd</sup> in NSW and 474<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 12<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs. The Blue Mountains had a SEIFA score of 1042 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Blue Mountains LGA map showed that, in general, the vast majority of SA1s were relatively advantaged (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100). A few highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) were around Glenbrook, Sun Valley and Faulconbridge. Meanwhile, only a few of the SA1s were relatively disadvantaged (scores ranging from 850 to 1000). They were around the suburbs of Katoomba, Blackheath and Bullaburra. Being a relatively advantaged LGA, no relatively highly disadvantaged (scores ranging from 435 to 850) SA1s were found in the Blue Mountains.

Map 13 over the next page shows this in detail.





#### Map 13: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in The Blue Mountains LGA, 2021 Census



#### Camden

Camden (119,325 usual residents) was also among the relatively highly advantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. It was recorded in the 9<sup>th</sup> decile (81-90%) in both NSW and Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 80% of LGAs across NSW and Australia. In terms of ranking, it ranked 106<sup>th</sup> in NSW and 483<sup>rd</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 13<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs. Camden had a SEIFA score of 1050 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Camden LGA map showed that, in general, the vast majority of SA1s were relatively advantaged (scores ranging from 1000 to 1100). A couple of highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) were located in Kirkham and Gledswood Hills. In contrast, only a few of the SA1s were relatively disadvantaged (scores ranging from 850 to 1000). They were around the suburbs of Grasmere, Camden, Narellan, Catherine Field and Leppington. Only some SA1s had relatively higher levels of disadvantage (scores ranging from 435 to 850). They were in the east of Narellan and west of Narellan Vale.

Map 14 over the next page visualises this in detail.





# Map 14: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Camden LGA, 2021 Census



#### Parramatta

Parramatta (256,729 usual residents) was among the relatively highly advantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. It was recorded in the 9<sup>th</sup> decile (81-90%) in NSW and 10<sup>th</sup> decile (91-100%) in Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 80% of LGAs across NSW and more than 90% in Australia. Out of all LGAs, it ranked 112<sup>th</sup> in NSW and 502<sup>nd</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 14<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs. Parramatta had a SEIFA score of 1070 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Parramatta LGA map showed that most of SA1s were relatively highly advantaged. Most of the northern parts of the LGAs were relatively highly advantaged (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273). They were in and around Epping, North Rocks, Northmead, Winston Hills, Carlingford and Parramatta. However, a few of the SA1s were relatively disadvantaged (scores ranging from 850 to 1000). They were around the suburbs of North Parramatta, Old Toongabbie, Constitution Hill, Dundas Valley and Harris Park. Only two SA1s with a relatively high level of disadvantage (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were found in the north of Dundas and part of Constitution Hill.

Map 15 over the next page portrays this in detail.



### Map 15: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in Parramatta LGA, 2021 Census





#### The Hills Shire

The Hills Shire (191,876 usual residents) was also among the relatively highly advantaged LGAs across Australia in the 2021 Census. It was recorded in the 10<sup>th</sup> decile (91-100%) in both NSW and Australia, indicating that it was more advantaged than 90% of LGAs across NSW and Australia. In terms of ranking, it ranked 121<sup>st</sup> in NSW and 534<sup>th</sup> across Australia. Within GWS, it ranked 15<sup>th</sup> out of 15 LGAs. The Hills Shire had a SEIFA score of 1136 in the Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage during the 2021 Census.

The Hills Shire LGA map showed that the LGA was relatively highly advantaged. The highly advantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 1100 to 1273) ranged from the south east of the LGA (such as West Pennant Hills, Baulkham Hills and Bella Vista) towards the north (Kenthurst, Glenorie and Cattai). Only one SA1 in the LGA was considered relatively disadvantaged (scores ranging from 850 to 1000), in the northmost area of the LGA around the suburb of Wisemans Ferry. No relatively highly disadvantaged SA1s (scores ranging from 435 to 850) were found in the Hills Shire.

Map 16 over the next page projects this in detail.





#### Map 16: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage in The Hills Shire LGA, 2021 Census

Source: ABS 2021 Census (visualisation produced by WESTIR Ltd)



## Please read previous Census papers on SEIFA on WESTIR's website <a href="https://www.westir.org.au/">https://www.westir.org.au/</a>



Census 2016

Census 2011

Census 2011

