# measuring what matters – detailed OECD indicator SUMMARIES

* Budget Statement 4 includes assessment of Australia’s progress and wellbeing performance based on the OECD Framework for Progress and Well-being.
* The following pages provide:
  + An overview table summarising Australia’s performance on each of the 36 OECD Framework headline indicators.
  + A summary page for each indicator, including its purpose, definition, data source, calculation, detailed performance, and limitations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MEASURING WHAT MATTERS – DETAILED INDICATOR SUMMARIES** | | | | | | |
| NB: Trend text indicates direction of indicator over time. Green shows performance stable/improving, red shows not improving. | | | | | | |
| **#** | **Indicator** | **Trend** | **OECD**  **Ranking** | **Aus Value** | **OECD Average** | **Aus Data Range** |
| 01 | Educational attainment among young adults | ↑ | 13/37 | 90.9% | 85.2% | 2004-2020 |
| 02 | Employment rate | ↑ | 18/38 | 78.2% | 76.3% | 2004-2021 |
| 03 | Exposure to outdoor air pollution | ↓ | 4/38 | 0.004% | 70.0% | 2005-2019 |
| 04 | Financial Net worth of General Government | ↓ | 15/37 | -29.8% | -30.5% | 2004-2021 |
| 05 | Gender Gap in Feeling Safe | ↑ | 37/37 | 30.1% | 16.1% | 2006-12 – 2013-18 |
| 06 | Gender Gap in Hours Worked | ↑ | 9/24 | 15 mins | 25.8 mins | 2006-2021 |
| 07 | Gender Parity in Politics | ↑ | 20/38 | 31.1% | 31.7% | 2012-2021 |
| 08 | Gender wage gap | ↓ | 23/38 | 12.3% | 11.6% | 2004-2020 |
| 09 | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ↓ | 38/38 | 20.5t | 8.8t | 2004-2020 |
| 10 | Having a say in government | N/A | 16/29 | 67.7% | 65.7% | 2012 |
| 11 | Homicides | Stable | 22/38 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 2004-2020 |
| 12 | Household debt | ↑ | 30/34 | 203.0% | 122.4% | 2004-2020 |
| 13 | Household Income | ↑ | 4/32 | $37,656 | $28,806 | 2004-2020 |
| 14 | Household Wealth | ↑ | 2/29 | $277,824 | $148,636 | 2012-2018 |
| 15 | Housing Affordability | Stable | 11/35 | 81.3% | 79.7% | 2004-2020 |
| 16 | Labour underutilisation rate | ↑ | 28/34 | 20.8% | 15.4% | 2007-2021 |
| 17 | Life Expectancy | ↑ | 5/38 | 83.2 yrs | 80.4 yrs | 2004-2020 |
| 18 | Life Satisfaction | ↓ | 18/33 | 7.5 | 7.39 | 2014-2020 |
| 19 | Long hours in paid work | ↓ | 30/36 | 12.5% | 7.2% | 2004-2018 |
| 20 | Material Footprint | ↑ | 36/38 | 46.8t | 26.2t | 2005-2019 |
| 21 | Negative affect balance | ↑ | 17/38 | 11.6% | 12.9% | 2006-2021 |
| 22 | Premature mortality | ↓ | 11/38 | 3408.8 | 4739.7 | 2004-2020 |
| 23 | Produced fixed assets | ↑ | 9/33 | $155,840 | $135,190 | 2004-2020 |
| 24 | Red List Index of threatened species | ↓ | 30/38 | 0.816 | 0.884 | 2004-2021 |
| 25 | S80/S20 income share ratio | Stable | 24/37 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 2012-2018 |
| 26 | Social Interactions | ↑ | 4/24 | 8.0 | 6.1 | 2006-2021 |
| 27 | Social support | ↓ | 19/38 | 91.7% | 89.9% | 2006-2021 |
| 28 | Student skills in science | ↓ | 12/37 | 503.0 | 488.7 | 2006-2018 |
| 29 | Students with Low Skills (science) | ↑ | 15/37 | 18.9% | 22.0% | 2006-2018 |
| 29 | Students with Low Skills (maths) | ↑ | 23/37 | 22.4% | 24.0% | 2003-2018 |
| 29 | Students with Low Skills (reading) | ↑ | 15/36 | 19.6% | 22.6% | 2009-2018 |
| 30 | Time Off | Stable | 19/20 | 14.3 hrs | 15.0 hrs | 2006-2021 |
| 31 | Trust in government | ↓ | 16/38 | 51.9% | 47.8% | 2006-2021 |
| 32 | Voter Turnout | ↓ | 1/38 | 89.8% | 66.4% | 2007-2019 |
| Following Indicators excluded due to lack of data, out of date data, or data that is not directly comparable to the OECD indicators | | | | | | |
| 33 | Access to Green Space | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 34 | Gap in Life Expectancy by education | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 35 | Trust in Others | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 36 | Overcrowding Rate | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **01 – EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AMONG YOUNG ADULTS** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** to measure the stock of knowledge and skills available for future generations.  **Definition:** the share of young adults (aged 25 to 34) with at least an upper secondary education. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has improved over time.   * Educational attainment among young adults ↑ from 76.8% to 90.9% between 2004 – 2020 (Δ18.3%) * Better than OECD average (85.2%) * Rank: 13th of 37 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? database. * Upper secondary education uses the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) definition, of education at or above level 3.   + This includes both general programmes geared towards preparation for higher education, as well as vocational education and training (VET) programmes |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **02 – EMPLOYMENT RATE** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Measure of access to employment opportunities.  **Definition:** the share of the adult population (aged 25 to 64) who report having worked in gainful employment for at least one hour in the past week. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has improved over time.   * Employment rate ↑ from 72.4% to 78.2% between 2004 – 2021 (Δ8.0%) * Better than OECD average (76.3%) * Rank: 18th of 38 OECD countries (all countries 2021) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is ABS Labour Force Survey, compiled in the OECD Labour Force Statistics Database. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **03 – EXPOSURE TO OUTDOOR AIR POLLUTION** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicate exposure to polluted air.  **Definition:** the share of the population living in areas with a high degree of air pollution.   * High pollution areas are those with annual concentrations of fine particulate matter (less than 2.5 microns in diameter) exceeding 10 micrograms per cubic metre. * This is consistent with the WHO Air Quality Guideline. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has improved over time.   * Exposure to outdoor air pollution ↓ from 0.005 to 0.004 between 2005 – 2019 (Δ -13.3%) * Better than OECD average (61%) * Rank: 4th of 38 OECD countries (all countries 2019) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Only measures particulate matter exposure. It does not measure exposure to other dangerous air pollutants such as Ozone, Nitrogen Oxides, Carbon Monoxide or Sulphur Dioxide. * The accuracy of exposure estimates varies by location, with accuracy best in regions with dense networks of monitoring stations and worst in snow-covered areas. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? database. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **04 – FINANCIAL NET WORTH OF GENERAL GOVERNMENT** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicate sustainability of government finances and risks to financial and economic stability.  **Definition:** the total value of general government assets minus the total value of its outstanding liabilities, as a percentage of GDP. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Financial net worth of general government ↓ from 7.1% to -29.8% between 2004 – 2021 (Δ -518.8%) * Better than OECD average (-30.5%) * Rank: 15th of 37 OECD countries (Australia 2021, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Indicator is high level/general in nature – finances and economies of countries with low government net worth may not necessarily be at risk. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is OECD Annual National Accounts * General government includes central, state and local governments. * Calculated as: (Financial net worth / GDP)\*100 |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **05 – GENDER GAP IN FEELING SAFE** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** to measure gender inequality in perceptions of personal safety.  **Definition:** the gender gap in the share of people declaring that they feel safe when walking alone at night in the city or area where they live. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, and performance has worsened over time.   * Gender gap in feeling safe ↑ from 27.7% to 30.1% between 2006-2012 and 2013-2018 (Δ8.9%) * Worse than OECD average (16.1%) * Rank: 37th of 37 OECD countries (all countries 2013-18) * Australia ranks 19/37 (80%) for men feeling safe and 31/37 (50%) for women feeling safe. | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * The time series data is reported in two periods rather than two years. The two periods are 2006-2012 and 2013-2018. * The increase in the gender gap for Australia over the period is a result of men feeling safer, not women feeling less safe. * Australia’s low score is partly explained by men’s perceived safety being above the OECD average. * This is a measure of perceived safety not actual safety. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? iLibrary. * The percentage point difference between women who say they feel safe and men who say they feel safe. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **06 – GENDER GAP IN HOURS WORKED** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** measure gender equality in hours of paid or unpaid work.  **Definition:** minutes of paid and unpaid work per day that women work in excess of men among the working age population. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Gender gap in hours worked ↑ from 6.4 minutes to 15.0 minutes from 2006 – 2021 (Δ 133.1%) * Better than OECD average (25.8 mins) * Rank: 9th of 24 OECD countries (Australia 2021, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Though similar, the 2006 and 2020-21 ABS TUS estimates are not fully comparable due to changes in methodology. * The OECD acknowledges that methodology may differ slightly between countries. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? Database and the ABS Time Use Survey (TUS) for Australia in 2021. * The source of the OECD data is the ABS TUS. The OECD Database does not include data from the most recent release of the TUS in October 2022. * Includes employment related activities, domestic activities, childcare activities, adult care activities and voluntary work activities. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **07 – GENDER PARITY IN POLITICS** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Measure inclusivity and representation of women in the political system.  **Definition:** The number of women parliamentarians as a share of total filled seats (lower/single house of parliament). | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, but performance has improved over time.   * Gender parity in politics ↑ from 24.7% to 31.1% between 2012 – 2021 (Δ17.6%) * Worse than OECD average (31.7%) * Rank: 20th of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2021, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data Source is the Inter-Parliamentary Union’s PARLINE database. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **08 – GENDER WAGE GAP** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** show difference in wages between women and men.  **Definition:** the difference between male and female median wages as a share (%) of the male median wage (for full-time employees). | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, but performance has improved over time.   * Gender wage gap ↓ from 14.4% to 12.3% between 2004 – 2020 (Δ -14.5%) * Worse than the OECD average (11.6%) * Rank: 23rd of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data is from the OECD employment database, which draws from the ABS monthly labour force survey. * Data refers to full-time employees only. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **09 – GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicate per capita contribution to climate change.  **Definition:** tonnes of CO2 equivalent per capita.   * CO2 equivalent is a proxy for all types of greenhouse gas emissions. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, but performance has improved over time.   * Greenhouse gas emissions per capita ↓ from 26.0t to 20.5t between 2004 – 2020 (Δ -21%) * Worse than OECD average (8.9t) * Rank: 38 of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Excludes emissions from land-use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF). * While Australia’s emissions per capita have fallen, the indicator does not show whether this reduction is sufficient to meet Australia’s emissions reduction targets, or reduce the impact of climate change in line with the Paris Agreement. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * The data source is the OECD How’s Life? Database. * It excludes emissions from land-use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF). * It includes the following greenhouse gases: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, perfluorocarbons hydrofluorocarbons, and sulphur hexafluoride. * Emissions of each type of gas are weighted by their “warming potential”. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10 – HAVING A SAY IN GOVERNMENT** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of civic engagement.  **Definition:** The share of people who feel that they have a say in what the government does. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD. No data is available on performance over time.   * 67.7% of respondents said they had a say in government in 2012. * Better than OECD average (65.7%) * Rank: 16th of 29 OECD countries (Australia 2012, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * No time series data available for Australia. * Data point for Australia is old (2012). | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Source is OECD Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) * Based on disagreement or strong disagreement with the survey question “people like me don’t have any say in what the government does”. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series**  No Australian time series available |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11 – HOMICIDES** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of safety.  **Definition:** the number of deaths due to assault per 100,000 people. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has remained stable over time.   * Homicides stable (0.8 to 0.9 between 2004 – 2020, Δ 12.5%) * Better than OECD average (2.7) * Rank: 22nd of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * ABS data shows improvement over time, likely due slight definition differences. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Source is OECD health status database. * Assessed as stable due to small increase over time and conflicting ABS data. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12 – HOUSEHOLD DEBT** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of potential risks to household finances and the broader financial system.  **Definition:** the total outstanding debt of households as a share of household net disposable income. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD, and performance has worsened over time.   * Household debt ↑ from 172.7% to 203.0% between 2004 – 2020 (Δ17.6%) * Worse than OECD average (122.4%) * Rank: 30th of 34 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Limited data – only available for Australia for 2012, 2014 and 2018 years. * Household debt in Australia reflects high household wealth (debts used to purchase assets). * Data only to 2020 – household debt has likely increased through 2021 housing boom. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is OECD National Accounts. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13 – HOUSEHOLD INCOME** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of household income  **Definition:** Household net adjusted disposable income per capita (USD 2015 PPP). | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD, and performance has improved over time.   * Household income ↑ from $28,482 to $37,656 between 2004 – 2020 (Δ32.2%) * Better than OECD average ($28,806) * Rank: 4th of 32 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year). | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is OECD National Accounts. * Calculated by:   + summing all (gross) income flows (earnings, self employment and capital income, current transfers received from other sectors) paid to the household sector; and   + subtracting current transfers (such as taxes on income and wealth) paid by households to other sectors of the economy. * Measured in USD at 2015 purchasing power parities per capita. * ‘Adjusted’ refers to inclusion of social transfers in-kind (such as education and health care) that households receive from government. * Also takes into account the replacement of capital assets of households, which is deducted from their income. |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14 – HOUSEHOLD WEALTH** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of household wealth  **Definition:** The difference between all financial and non-financial assets owned by households and all their financial liabilities. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has improved over time.   * Household wealth ↑ from $262,040 to $277,824 between 2012 – 2018 (Δ6%). * Better than OECD average ($148,636) * Rank: 2nd of 29 OECD countries (Australia 2018, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Australia has only recorded three periods of data | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? database. * Calculated as the sum of non-financial (e.g. dwellings) and financial assets (e.g. deposits, shares and equity), net of their financial liabilities (e.g. loans), held by private households resident in the country measured in microdata. * Reported for the median household to reduce the impact of differences across countries in measuring the top end of the distribution. * Measured in USD at 2019 purchasing power parities per capita. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15 – HOUSING AFFORDABILITY** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** show the impact of housing costs on household income.  **Definition:** the share of household gross adjusted disposable income that remains available to the household after deducting housing costs.   * Housing costs include rent (including imputed rents for housing held by owner-occupiers) and maintenance (expenditure on the repair of the dwelling, including miscellaneous services, water supply, electricity, gas and other fuels, as well as expenditure on furniture, furnishings, household equipment and goods and services for routine home maintenance). | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has been stable over time.   * Income remaining after housing costs has remained stable (80.7% to 81.3% between 2004 – 2020, Δ 0.7%). * Better than OECD Average (79.7%) * Rank: 11 of 35 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * The indicator is an aggregate measure of income after housing costs using national accounts data: * It is not intended to be representative of out-of-pocket costs experienced by actual households. * It does not distinguish between different household income levels, housing tenure (rent, mortgaged, or own outright), or location. * It is not a measure of house purchase affordability. * OECD data for this measure is only available to 2020, and does not capture increases in house prices, interest rates and rents since then. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data are sourced from the OECD National Accounts database, and refer to both households and non-profit institutions serving households. * “Gross adjusted disposable income” includes the value of social transfers in kind, such as health or education provided for free or at reduced prices by governments or not-for-profits organisations. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16 – LABOUR UNDERUTILISATION RATE** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:**   * Provide a wider view of joblessness and unrealised potential than unemployment. * Capture the permanent effects of labour market slack in reducing skills and learning opportunities.   **Definition:** the share of the labour force that is either unemployed, underemployed, or discouraged. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, and performance has worsened over time.   * Labour underutilisation ↑ from 18.3% to 20.8% between 2007 – 2021 (Δ13.7%) * Worse than OECD average (15.4%) * Rank: 28th of 34 OECD countries (Australia 2021, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is OECD National Accounts Household Dashboard. * Discouraged workers: those not in the labour force who wish to and are available to work, but who did not actively seek work in the previous four weeks. * Underemployed workers: full-time workers working less than usual during the survey reference week for economic reasons, and part-time workers who wanted but could not find full-time work. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17 – LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of overall health outcomes.  **Definition:** the number of years a child born today could expect to live based on currently prevailing age-specific death rates. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has improved over time.   * Life expectancy ↑ from 80.5 to 83.2 between 2004 – 2020 (Δ3.4%) * Better than OECD average (80.4) * Rank: 5th of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Australia only has data up to 2020 – so the impact of COVID-19 on life expectancy is not yet clear (as it is in the US and the UK). | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? Database. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18 – LIFE SATISFACTION** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of subjective individual wellbeing.  **Definition:** summary measure of life satisfaction based on survey responses against a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means ‘not at all satisfied’ and 10 means ‘completely satisfied’. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has fallen over time.   * Life satisfaction ↓ from 7.6 to 7.2 between 2014 and 2020 (Δ -5.3%). * Better than OECD average (7.4) * Rank: 18th of 33 OECD countries (Australia 2019, other countries 2018). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Life satisfaction result in 2020 may be temporarily affected by impact of COVID-19. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Source is ABS general social survey for Australia, which is consistent with OECD data. * 2020 year used for time series calculation, but 2019 used for OECD comparison as most recent year for other countries is 2018. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19 – LONG HOURS IN PAID WORK** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Measure of work-life balance  **Definition:** the share of employees whose usual working hours are 50 or more per week. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, but performance has improved over time.   * Long hours in paid work ↓ from 15.2% to 12.5% between 2004 – 2018 (Δ -17.7%) * Worse than OECD average (7.2%) * Rank: 30th of 36 OECD countries (Australia 2018, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Long hours can be a choice to increase income and may not reflect lower quality of life. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is OECD Labour Force Statistics Database |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20 – MATERIAL FOOTPRINT** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of natural materials extracted to service an economy.  **Definition:** expressed in tonnes per capita, the global allocation of used raw material extracted to meet the final demand of an economy, including materials used in the production of imported products. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, and performance has worsened over time.   * Material footprint ↑ from 45.3t to 46.8t between 2005 – 2019 (Δ3.3%) * Worse than OECD average (26.2) * Rank: 36th out 38 OECD countries (all countries 2019) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Data for Australia is available from 2015 to 2019 but is missing prior to then except for two years: 2005 and 2010. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? Database. * The resources captured include metals (ferrous, non-ferrous) non-metallic minerals (construction minerals, industrial minerals), biomass (wood, food) and fossil energy carriers. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21 – NEGATIVE AFFECT BALANCE** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of happiness or wellbeing of individuals.  **Definition:** the share of people with more negative feelings than positive feelings. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Negative affect balance ↑ from 10.8% to 11.6% between 2006 – 2021 (Δ7.3%) * Better than OECD average (12.9%) * Rank: 17th of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2021, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Australian series volatile year to year and final year may be affected by Covid‑19. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the Gallup World Poll (1000 people sample per country, designed to be nationally representative of 15+ population. * Survey participants respond yes/no to a range of questions on feelings experienced the previous day.   + Positive feelings relate to enjoyment, feeling well-rested, and laughing or smiling.   + Negative feelings relate to anger, sadness, and worry. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22 – PREMATURE MORTALITY** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of deaths that could potentially have been avoided.  **Definition:** potential years of life lost due to a range of medical conditions and fatal accidents, per 100,000 population. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has improved over time.   * Premature mortality ↓ from 4373 to 3408 between 2004 – 2020 (Δ -22.1%) * Better than OECD average (4739) * Rank: 11th of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? database. * Premature mortality is calculated by subtracting the selected age of premature mortality (75 years in OECD calculations) from the actual age of death of each person, then multiplying this by the number of deaths at each age, and finally adding up the numbers across all age groups to come up with an overall total. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23 – PRODUCED FIXED ASSETS** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of a country’s ability to produce goods and services.  **Definition:** the value of a country’s stock of produced economic assets, per capita at 2020 PPP. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has improved over time.   * Produced fixed assets ↑ from $130,103 to $155,840 between 2004-2020 (Δ19.8%) * Better than OECD average ($135,190) * Rank: 9th of 33 OECD countries (Australia 2020, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? database. * Economic assets include (but not limited to): dwellings, buildings, structures, machinery, equipment, livestock, software, entertainment, artistic originals, and inventories. * Reflects reductions in value due to depreciation or deterioration. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24 – RED LIST INDEX** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of biodiversity loss.  **Definition:** index of the overall extinction risk of species within a country.   * A value of 1 on the Index implies that all species qualify as “least concern” and 0 implies that all species have gone extinct. * The Index draws from the International Union for Conservation of Nature. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, and performance has worsened over time.   * Red List Index ↓ from 0.868 to 0.816 between 2004 – 2021 (Δ -6%) * Worse than OECD average (0.884) * Rank: 30th of 38 OECD countries (all countries 2021) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * The Red List Index does not include all species groups of significant conservation concern to Australia, like reptiles and the majority of plants native to Australia. * The Red List Index does not capture well the status of species that remain common but are declining slowly. * In Australia, the Red List is usually supplemented by other indicators, like the Australian Threatened Species Index (TSX). | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? Database. * It is calculated by multiplying the number of species in each category (‘near threatened’, ‘extent’, etc.), summing these values, dividing it by a maximum threat score, and subtracting it from 1. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25 – S80/S20 INCOME SHARE RATIO** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Measure of income inequality  **Definition:** The ratio of the average (equivalised) household disposable income of the top 20% to that of the bottom 20%.   * Higher ratio implies greater income inequality. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, but performance has remained stable over time.   * S80/S20 income share remained stable (5.50 to 5.60 between 2012 – 2018, Δ1.8%) * Worse than OECD average (5.5) * Rank: 24th of 36 OECD countries (Australia 2018, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Limited data - only available for 2012, 2014, 2016 and 2018 years. * Indicator is volatile from year to year. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD’s income distribution database * Calculated by taking all income received by the top quintile divided by the share of the first quintile. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26 – SOCIAL INTERACTIONS** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** to measure the extent to which people engage in social activities.  **Definition:** the number of hours spent per week interacting with friends and family as a primary activity. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, and performance has improved over time.   * Social interactions ↑ from 4.7 hours to 8.0 hours from 2006 – 2021 (Δ72.1%) * Above the OECD average (6.1 hours) * Rank: 4th of 24 OECD countries (Australia 2021, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Though similar, the 2006 and 2020-21 ABS TUS estimates are not fully comparable due to changes in methodology. * The OECD acknowledges that methodology may differ slightly between countries due different parameters in national time use surveys. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? Database for OECD countries and the ABS Time Use Survey (TUS) for Australia in 2021. * The source of the OECD data is the ABS TUS. The OECD Database does not include data from the most recent release of the TUS in October 2022. * Calculated by multiplying ‘social and community interactions’ in the ABS TUS by seven. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27 – SOCIAL SUPPORT** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of social connections  **Definition:** the share of people surveyed that report having friends or relatives that can assist them when needed. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Social support ↓ from 96.7% to 91.7% between 2006 – 2021 (Δ-5.2%). * Better than OECD average (89.9%). * Rank: 19th of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2021, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Source is Gallup World Poll. * Measured as the share of people answering “Yes” to the question “If you were in trouble, do you have relatives or friends you can count on to help you whenever you need them, or not?” |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28 – STUDENT SKILLS IN SCIENCE** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** to measure the ability of students to understand scientific concepts.  **Definition:** the average (mean) score per country on Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) tests that are conducted every three years for 15 year old students in OECD countries. | **Summary:** Australia’s performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Student skills in science ↓ from 527 to 503 from 2006 – 2018 (Δ -4.5%) * Better than OECD average (489) * Rank: 12th out 37 OECD countries (all countries 2018) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Countries differ in their formal encouragement of student preparation for the PISA tests. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? database. * Scores within each individual country are scaled to fit a normal distribution and then the average of those scores is the score for each country. * PISA scores are indicative of student performance, rather than just ranking. * It is unclear why science was selected over maths and reading as the OECD headline indicator. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29 – STUDENTS WITH LOW SKILLS (MATHS)** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of a country’s level of low-performing students in mathematics.  **Definition:** share of 15- year-old students below OECD Programme on International Students Assessment (PISA) level 2 in maths. There are 6 levels in the PISA tests. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Students with low skills in maths ↑ 14% to 22% between 2003 – 2018 (Δ 56.6%) * Better than the OECD average (24%) * Rank: 23rd of 37 OECD countries (all countries 2018) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD’s education database. |
| **International Comparison – latest available (maths)** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29 – STUDENTS WITH LOW SKILLS (SCIENCE)** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of a country’s level of low-performing students in science.  **Definition:** share of 15- year-old students below OECD Programme on International Students Assessment (PISA) level 2 in science. There are 6 levels in the PISA tests. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Students with low skills in science ↑ 13% to 19% between 2006 – 2018 (Δ 46.5%) * Better than the OECD average (22%) * Rank: 15th of 37 OECD countries (all countries 2018) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD’s education database. |
| **International Comparison – latest available (science)** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29 – STUDENTS WITH LOW SKILLS (READING)** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of a country’s level of low-performing students in literacy.  **Definition:** share of 15- year-old students below OECD Programme on International Students Assessment (PISA) level 2 in reading. There are 6 levels in the PISA tests. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Students with low skills in reading ↑ 14.2% to 19.6% between 2009 – 2018 (Δ38.0%) * Better than the OECD average (22.6%) * Rank: 15th of 37 OECD countries (all countries 2018) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Nil | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD’s education database. |
| **International Comparison – latest available (reading)** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30 – TIME OFF** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** indicator of engagement in activities unrelated to work and the amount of freedom individuals have in their day.  **Definition:** time allocated to leisure and personal care per day among people in full-time employment. | **Summary:** Australia performs worse than the OECD average, and performance has been stable over time.   * Time off stable (14.4 hours to 14.3 hours from 2006-2021, Δ-0.6%). * Worse than OECD average (15.0 hours) * Rank: 19th of 20 OECD countries (Australia 2021, other countries latest year) | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Though similar, the 2006 and 2020-21 ABS TUS estimates are not fully comparable due to changes in methodology. * The OECD have admitted that the sources for OECD countries may differ slightly in terms of methodology due to differing parameters in national time use surveys. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data source is the OECD How’s Life? Database for OECD countries and the ABS Time Use Survey (TUS) for Australia in 2021. * The OECD Database does not include data from the most recent release of the TUS in October 2022. * Calculated in the ABS TUS by adding personal care activities and total free time. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31 – TRUST IN GOVERNMENT** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of social capital.  **Definition:** the share of the population that express confidence in the national government. | **Summary:** Australia performs better than the OECD average, but performance has worsened over time.   * Trust in government ↓ from 53.2% to 51.9% between 2006 – 2021 (Δ -2.4%) * Better than OECD average (47.8%) * Rank: 16th of 38 OECD countries (all countries 2021). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Australia saw a large, likely COVID-19 related increase in trust in government in 2021. This may not persist in future years. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Source is Gallup World Poll (samples 1000 people per country each year, designed to be nationally representative of 15+ population). * Based on survey question “do you have trust in the national government”. |
| **International Comparison – 2021** | | **Australia time series** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32 – VOTER TURNOUT** | **Australia’s Performance** | |
| **Purpose:** Indicator of civic engagement.  **Definition:** Voter turnout is measured as the number of votes cast in major national elections, as a share of the population registered to vote (i.e., the number of people listed in the electoral register). | **Summary:** Australia is ranked first in the OECD, but performance has worsened over time.   * Voter turnout ↓ from 94.8% to 89.8% between 2006 – 2021 (Δ -2.4%) * Better than OECD average (47.8%) * Rank: 16th of 38 OECD countries (Australia 2022, other countries latest year). | |
| **Indicator Limitations** | |
| * Voter turnout is based on registered voters, not the total population. * Australia (and also Belgium, Luxembourg and Turkey) *enforce* compulsory voting, and so have higher results. Other OECD countries such as Greece have compulsory voting but it is not enforced.   + Compulsory voting may limit usefulness as an indicator of civic engagement. | |
| **Data / Calculation** |
| * Data is sourced from Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). * This information is gathered from National Statistical Offices and electoral management bodies. |
| **International Comparison – latest available** | | **Australia time series** |