Appendix G Survey items results by year and region

	۷	Veste	stern Downs Region				2018 regions			
2014-2016-2018 results	2014		2016		2018		WD		EM	
COMMUNITY WELLBEING										
Place attachment – Thinking about [local ar the following statements:	ea nam	e] ar	nd surr	ound	ds, how	much	n do you	agre	ee witl	h
I feel that I belong to this area	4.16		4.18		4.17		4.17	L	4.44	
I am pleased to come back to the area, if I go away	4.15		4.17		4.16		4.16	L	4.37	
Overall, I feel very attached to this local area	4.01		4.05		3.99		3.99	L	4.35	
Personal safety – Now a few questions abou you agree that:	ut perso	onal	safety.	On a	a scale	from 1	1 to 5, hc	w n	nuch d	lc
It is safe to be alone at home during the night	4.33		4.23		4.25		4.25	L	4.44	
It is safe to walk alone outside at night	3.86		3.86		3.80		3.80	L	4.02	
It is safe to leave the car on the side of the road	3.08		3.00		3.01		3.01	L	3.46	
at night Overall, I feel safe living in the area	4.31	н	4.16	L	4.24		4.24	L	4.47	
Income sufficiency – Thinking about your he	ousehol	d ind	:ome, l	now	much c	lo you	ı agree th	nat:		
Your income is enough for household expenses	3.62		3.73		3.64		3.64		3.67	
Your income is enough for the lifestyle you enjoy	3.61		3.57		3.62		3.62		3.68	
Your rent or mortgage repayments impact greatly on your household finances	3.28	н	3.31	н	2.80	L	2.80	L	3.08	
Overall, I am satisfied that my income covers living expenses	3.74		3.86		3.76		3.76		3.88	
Health – Thinking about your health and we	ellbeing,	, hov	v satisf	ied a	are you	with:				
Your diet and eating habits	3.96	н	3.82	L	3.80	L	3.80	н	3.63	
/our exercise habits	3.47		3.43		3.42		3.42	н	3.20	
our physical health	3.77		3.66		3.75		3.75		3.63	
Your mental health	4.22	н	4.08	L	4.08	L	4.08		4.02	
Your job security, if applicable*	4.02	н	3.88		3.82	L	3.82		3.80	
Your work-life balance*	3.56	н	3.56	н	3.37	L	3.37		3.53	
Overall, how satisfied are you with your health and wellbeing	3.98		3.88		3.91		3.91		3.91	
Services and facilities – Thinking of services with:	and fa	cilitie	es for y	/our	local ar	ea, ho	ow satisfi	ed a	are yo	ι
Local schools	3.74	н	3.82	н	3.52	L	3.52	L	3.76	
Child care facilities	3.30		3.39	н	3.19	L	3.19	L	3.45	

Table 18 Survey item statistics for Western Downs region by Year (weighted data for all three years)

	١	Neste	ern Dowr	ns Re	gion		2018 regions			
2014-2016-2018 results	2014		2016		2018		WD		EM	
Sports and leisure facilities	3.48		3.56	Н	3.38	L	3.38	L	3.72	Н
Cultural facilities	3.28		3.29		3.15		3.15	L	3.40	н
Shopping for food and everyday items	3.54		3.58		3.55		3.55		3.42	
Other shopping (e.g., clothes and household goods)	2.64		2.69		2.70		2.70		2.81	
Medical and health services	3.06	L	3.42	Н	3.22	L	3.22	L	3.56	Н
Community support services (e.g. meals on wheels, youth workers) Overall, how satisfied are you with the services	3.60 3.43	Н	3.62 3.51	н	3.30 3.46	L	3.30 3.46	L	3.63 3.67	н н
and facilities of [local area name]										
Built environment – Thinking about [local a with the following:	area nan	ne]'s	genera	al ap	pearan	ce, ho	ow satisfi	ed a	are you	I
Cleanliness in the town	3.63		3.59		3.63		3.63		3.77	
Greenery and Parks in the town	3.45	L	3.58		3.61	н	3.61		3.63	
Overall, how satisfied are you with the general appearance of the town	3.55		3.58		3.62		3.62		3.78	
Roads – Thinking about the roads outside	of [local	area	name]	, ho	w satisf	ied a	re you wi	th t	he:	
Condition of the roads	2.26		2.40	н	2.22	L	2.22	L	2.72	н
Safety on the roads	2.35	L	2.74	н	2.66	н	2.66	L	3.09	н
Amount of traffic on roads	2.43	L	3.14	н	3.13	н	3.13	L	3.33	н
The roads overall	2.41	L	2.66	Н	2.58	н	2.58	L	2.93	Н
Environmental quality – Thinking about po you with the:	llution i	n the	egener	al er	vironm	ient, l	how satis	fied	are	
Level of dust	3.15	L	3.46	н	3.42	н	3.42		3.60	
Level of noise	3.73	L	3.97	н	4.03	н	4.03		4.10	
Overall quality of the general environment in [local area name]	3.63	L	4.15	н	3.94	м	3.94	L	4.14	н
Environmental management – Now thinkin name], how satisfied are you with the mar	-			l en	vironme	ent ar	ound [loo	al a	irea	
Quality of underground water for the future	2.43		2.51		2.59		2.59	L	2.95	н
Nature reserves for the future	2.96	L	3.13	н	3.08		3.08	L	3.38	н
Sustainability of local farming land for the future	2.74	L	3.01	М	3.20	н	3.20		3.24	
The overall management of the natural environment for the future	2.85	L	3.01	н	3.06	н	3.06	L	3.34	Н
Decision making and citizen voice – Thinkin name] and surrounds, how much do you a			v decisi	ons	are ma	de aff	fecting [lo	ocal	area	
The local council informs residents of important developments	2.67	н	2.63	н	2.41	L	2.41	L	2.96	Н
There are opportunities for your voice to be heard on issues that are important to you	2.81	н	2.78	н	2.55	L	2.55	L	3.01	Н
Coal seam gas companies involve local residents in their decisions	2.47	Н	2.27	L	2.30	L	2.30		2.43	

	Western Downs Region						2018 regions			
2014-2016-2018 results	2014		2016		2018		WD		EM	
Overall, I am satisfied with how decisions are made that affect [local area name]	2.59		2.62		2.47		2.47	L	2.88	Н
Employment and business opportunities – I the local area of [local area name], how mu	-	-			and bu	isiness	opport	unit	ies in	
There are good job opportunities	3.11	н	2.23	L	2.45	М	2.45	L	3.08	Н
Local business have done well out of CSG development	3.08	н	2.18	L	2.59	М	2.59	L	2.98	н
Overall, I am satisfied with employment and business opportunities in [local area name]	3.08	н	2.27	L	2.55	М	2.55	L	3.00	н
Community spirit – Thinking about commur that:	nity spir	it in	your lo	ocal a	area, ho	ow mu	ch do yc	ou a	gree	
People can rely upon one another for help	3.79		3.75		3.68		3.68	L	3.87	н
People have friendly relationships	3.84		3.86		3.83		3.83		3.96	
People can work together if there is a serious problem	4.09		4.13		4.06		4.06		4.12	
Overall, I am satisfied with community spirit in the area	3.85		3.88		3.89		3.89	L	4.01	Н
Community cohesion – Thinking about how that:	inclusi	ve th	ie comi	mun	ity is, h	ow mι	ich do ye	ou a	igree	
Your community is welcoming of newcomers	3.55		3.49		3.51		3.51	L	3.78	Н
Your local community is welcoming of people of different cultures	3.54	н	3.30	L	3.45		3.45	L	3.73	Н
Overall, your community includes everyone no matter who they are	3.65	н	3.48	L	3.52		3.52	L	3.81	Н
Community trust – Thinking about levels of	trust in	i you	r local	area	, how r	nuch c	lo you a	gree	e that:	
There are local community leaders I can trust	3.32		3.26		3.21		3.21	L	3.50	Н
People that you see around [local area name] can generally be trusted	3.35		3.41		3.29		3.29	L	3.53	н
Your local council can be trusted	3.05	н	2.98		2.85	L	2.85	L	3.11	Н
Coal Seam Gas companies in your local area can be trusted	2.61	н	2.42	L	2.54		2.54		2.74	
Overall, I am satisfied with levels of trust in my ocal area	3.24		3.19		3.31		3.31	L	3.53	н
Community participation – Thinking now at name] (like school, sport, craft and service g	1 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C							ocal	area	
You regularly help out a local group as a volunteer (e.g., once a week)	2.94		2.99		2.95		2.95		3.16	
You have attended several community events in the past year	3.37		3.52		3.41		3.41	L	3.80	Н
You are a very active member of a local organisation or club	3.03		3.14		3.01		3.01		3.26	
Overall, you participate regularly in a variety of community activities	3.03		3.17		3.04		3.04	L	3.35	Н

community activities

	We	stern Downs R	Region	2018 re	gions
2014-2016-2018 results	2014	2016	2018	WD	EM
Social interaction – Now we have some qu than those you may live with. How much o regularly in [local area name]:					
Visit someone's home	3.26	3.24	3.16	3.16	3.28
Go out together socially	3.03	3.04	2.99	2.99 ^L	3.22 ^H
Speak or text on the phone	3.60	3.64	3.72	3.72	3.85
Overall, I am satisfied with the amount of my social interaction in the local area	3.84	3.78	3.76	3.76	3.92
Overall Community wellbeing – Thinking a and surrounds , how much do you agree t		ll communi	ty wellbeing i	n [local area	name]
This community is suitable for young children	3.88	3.88	3.75	3.75 ^L	4.09 ^н
This community is suitable for teenagers	3.24 ^н	3.30 ^H	3.05 ^L	3.05 ^L	3.40 ^н
This community is suitable for seniors	3.90	3.91	3.89	3.89	4.00
Overall, this local area offers a good quality of life	3.97	3.95	3.97	3.97	4.09
Overall, I am happy living in this local area	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.10	4.24

EXPECTED FUTURE COMMUNITY WELLBEING

Expected future wellbeing – Imagining what it might be like in 3 years time, how much do you agree that:

Overall, this local area will offer a good quality of	3.52 ^L	3.67	3.81 ^H	3.81	3.94
life Overall, I will be happy living in this local area	3.73	3.64	3.75	3.75	3.88

COMMUNITY RESILIENCE AND ADAPTATION

Community resilience actions – Thinking about how your local community in [local area name] and surrounds is responding to CSG activities, how much do you agree that there is:

Good planning for future changes	2.80	2.71	2.71	2.71 ^L	2.95 ^H
Adequate leadership to deal with the changes	2.84 ^н	2.84 ^H	2.56 ^L	2.56 ^L	2.90 ^H
Sufficient access to relevant information	2.94 ^н	2.94 ^H	2.74 ^L	2.74 ^L	3.01 ^H
Key people to help get things done	3.21 ^M	3.43 ^H	2.80 ^L	2.80 ^L	3.03 ^н
The community supports its volunteers	3.32 ^L	3.33 ^L	3.53 ^H	3.53	3.68
Perseverance to find solutions	3.30 ^H	3.27 ^H	2.87 ^L	2.87	3.02
Overall, I am satisfied with the way the community is responding to the changes from CSG development	3.23 [™]	3.37 ^н	3.07 ^L	3.07 ^L	3.33 ^H

Collective efficacy – Now thinking about local residents, government, business and resource companies working together, how much do you agree that:

All these groups can work together to address	3.17 ^H	3.08	2.98 ^L	2.98 ^L	3.31 ^H
problems associated with CSG development					

	V	Vestern Dow	ns Region	20	18 re	gions	_
2014-2016-2018 results	2014	2016	2018	WD)	EM	
All these groups can work together to take advantage of the opportunities associated with CSG development	3.24	н 3.15	3.07	L 3.07	' L	3.34	
evel of community adaptation – Which o surrounds is dealing with the CSG activitie		owing best	describes l	now [local area	a na	me] and	ł
Resisting it	6.1%	5.2%	4.8%	4.8%		4.1%	
Not coping	8.5%	7.3%	6.9%	6.9%		7.0%	
Only just coping	33.3%	37.3%	39.2%	39.2%		28.0%	
Adapting to the chang	46.2%	45.5%	44.9%	44.9%	,	54.1%	
Changing into something different but better	5.9%	4.7%	4.1%	4.1%		6.9%	
Average from 1 = 'Resisting it' to 5 = 'Changing nto something different but better'	3.37	3.37	3.37	3.37	L	3.53	
ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF CSG AC	TIVITIES						
Feelings toward CSG -Thinking about CSG feel	developr	ment in thi	s region, ho	w much do yo	u ag	gree you	۲
feel pleased to have the coal seam gas industry n our region	2.96	^н 2.79	2.76	L 2.76	L	3.08	
When I look at what is happening around coal eam gas I feel optimistic	2.82	^н 2.59	L 2.83	^н 2.83	L	3.13	
When I think about how much coal seam gas iffects everyday life, it makes me angry	2.69	^н 2.74	н 2.35	^ـ 2.35		2.19	
When I think about how things are changing because of coal seam gas I get worried	3.00	3.13	^н 2.90	L 2.90	н	2.64	
Attitude to CSG – Which of the following l region:	best desc	ribes your	attitude to	coal seam gas	in t	his	
reject it	8.8%	12.4%	9.3%	9.3%		6.6%	
tolerate it	27.8%	22.0%	21.7%	21 7%		20.6%	

l reject it	8.8%	12.4%	9.3%	9.3%	6.6%	
I tolerate it	32.8%	33.9%	34.2%	34.2%	20.6%	
l accept it	36.5%	34.4%	30.6%	30.6%	38.3%	
l approve of it	14.2%	12.3%	16.3%	16.3%	22.6%	
l embrace it	7.7%	6.9%	9.7%	9.7%	11.9%	
Average from 1 = 'I reject it' to 5 = 'I embrace it'	2.79	2.67	2.83	2.83 ^L	3.13	н

Notes: Superscripts indicate significant differences: H higher; M middle; L lower. Table only includes items measured in 2014, 2016 and 2018; for extra items collected in 2018, see Appendix F.

Appendix H Tables of demographic differences

Regions

Table 19 Demographic differences: Mean scores based on Regions

Community wellbeing dimensions	Western Downs	eastern Maranoa
Personal safety	3.82 ^L	4.10 ^H
Income sufficiency	3.67	3.74
Health	3.72	3.65
Services and facilities	3.27 ^L	3.49 ^H
Town appearance	3.62	3.73
Roads	2.65 ^L	3.02 ^H
Environmental quality	3.80 ^L	3.94 ^H
Environmental management	2.98 ^L	3.23 ^H
Local decision making	2.57 ^L	2.99 ^H
Economic opportunities	2.53 ^L	3.02 ^H
Community cohesion	3.49 ^L	3.78 ^H
Local trust	3.27∟	3.52 ^H
Community participation	3.10 ^L	3.39 ^H
Community spirit	3.87	3.99
Social interaction	3.41	3.57
Overall community wellbeing	3.75 ^L	3.96 ^H
Expected future wellbeing	3.78	3.91
Place attachment	4.11 ^L	4.38 ^H
Community resilience	2.93 ^L	3.17 ^H

Note: Bold font indicates a significant difference; Means with different superscript letters are significantly different (L = lower; H=higher)

Perceptions and attitudes about CSG and the sector	Western Downs	eastern Maranoa
Perceived impacts	3.46 ^H	3.28 ^L
Perceived benefits	3.05	3.21
Distributional fairness	3.02 ^L	3.24 ^H
Procedural fairness	2.46	2.65
Relationship quality	2.48 ^L	2.66 ^H
Governance overall	2.58 ^L	2.80 ^H
Formal governance	2.77 ^L	3.07 ^H
Informal governance	2.51 ^L	2.72 ^H
Trust in CSG governing bodies	2.47	2.61
Trust in CSG companies	2.65	2.82
Knowledge confidence	3.22	3.35
Information need	3.39	3.39
Community attitudes and feelings toward CSG	3.03 ^L	3.30 ^H

Subregion towns

Table 20 Demographic differences: Mean scores based on subregion

Community wellbeing dimensions	Dalby	Chinchilla	Miles / Wandoan	Tara	Western Downs
Personal safety	3.88 ^{MH}	3.40 ^L	4.16 ^H	3.83 [™]	3.82
Income sufficiency	3.85 ^н	3.79 ^H	3.54	3.44 ^L	3.67
Health	3.76	3.75	3.66	3.70	3.72
Services and facilities	3.61 ^H	3.41 ^M	3.02 ^L	2.93 ^L	3.27
Town appearance	3.61	3.64	3.72	3.50	3.62
Roads	2.58 ^{ML}	2.89 ^H	2.75 ^{MH}	2.36 ^L	2.65
Environmental quality	3.87	3.72	3.82	3.76	3.80
Environmental management	3.09	2.98	2.97	2.84	2.98
Local decision making	2.70	2.46	2.62	2.44	2.57
Economic opportunities	2.87 ^H	2.54 ^{MH}	2.34 ^{LM}	2.24 ^L	2.53
Community cohesion	3.51	3.53	3.53	3.39	3.49
Local trust	3.30	3.22	3.42	3.11	3.27
Community participation	3.00	3.14	3.23	3.05	3.10
Community spirit	3.89	3.83	3.99	3.74	3.87
Social interaction	3.47 ^H	3.59 ^H	3.41 ^H	3.11 ^L	3.41
Overall community wellbeing	3.85 ^H	3.82 ^H	3.81 ^H	3.46 ^L	3.75
Expected future wellbeing	3.90	3.71	3.71	3.76	3.78
Place attachment	4.05	4.17	4.21	3.99	4.11
Community resilience	3.04 ^H	3.06 ^н	2.73 ^L	2.84	2.93

Note: Bold font indicates a significant difference; Means with different superscript letters are significantly different (L = lower; H=higher)

Perceptions and attitudes about CSG and the sector	Dalby	Chinchilla	Miles / Wandoan	Tara	Western Downs
Perceived impacts	3.29	3.46	3.58	3.54	3.46
Perceived benefits	3.26 ^н	3.15	2.79 ^L	2.96 ^L	3.06
Distributional fairness	2.95	3.14	3.15	2.83	3.02
Procedural fairness	2.66 ^н	2.45	2.22 ^L	2.46	2.46
Relationship quality	2.65	2.48	2.27	2.47	2.48
Governance overall	2.77 ^H	2.63 ^H	2.38 ^L	2.49 ^L	2.58
Formal governance	2.92	2.84	2.64	2.65	2.77
Informal governance	2.67 ^H	2.55	2.31 ^L	2.45	2.51
Trust in CSG governing bodies	2.72 ^H	2.51 ^H	2.19 ^L	2.38 ^L	2.47
Trust in CSG companies	2.84 ^H	2.74	2.44 ^L	2.52 ^L	2.65
Knowledge confidence	3.05 ^L	3.44 ^H	3.52 ^н	2.89 ^L	3.22
Information need	3.20 ^L	3.41 ^L	3.23 ^L	3.82 ^H	3.39
Community attitudes and feelings toward CSG	3.13	3.11	2.92	2.94	3.03

In-town and Out-of-town

Community wellbeing dimensions	In-town	Out-of-town	Western Downs
Personal safety	3.77	3.87	3.82
Income sufficiency	3.71	3.64	3.67
Health	3.74	3.70	3.72
Services and facilities	3.37 ^H	3.18 ^L	3.27
Town appearance	3.60	3.64	3.62
Roads	2.78 ^H	2.52 ^L	2.65
Environmental quality	3.77	3.83	3.80
Environmental management	3.09	2.88	2.98
Local decision making	2.53	2.60	2.57
Economic opportunities	2.53	2.53	2.53
Community cohesion	3.58	3.41	3.49
Local trust	3.37 ^H	3.17 ^L	3.27
Community participation	3.14	3.06	3.10
Community spirit	3.96 ^н	3.78 ^L	3.87
Social interaction	3.58 ^H	3.24 ^L	3.41
Overall community wellbeing	3.84 ^H	3.66 ^L	3.75
Expected future wellbeing	3.78	3.78	3.78
Place attachment	4.14	4.07	4.11
Community resilience	3.04 ^H	2.82 ^L	2.93

Table 21 Demographic differences: Mean scores based on living In-town and Out-of-town

Note: Bold font indicates a significant difference; Means with different superscript letters are significantly different (L = lower; H=higher)

Perceptions and attitudes about CSG and the sector	In-town	Out-of-town	Western Downs
Perceived impacts	3.25 ^L	3.65 ^н	3.46
Perceived benefits	3.17 ^H	2.94 ^L	3.06
Distributional fairness	3.17 ^H	2.86 ^L	3.02
Procedural fairness	2.61 ^H	2.32 L	2.46
Relationship quality	2.60 ^H	2.36 ^L	2.48
Governance overall	2.74 ^H	2.44 ^L	2.58
Formal governance	2.96 ^H	2.60 ^L	2.77
Informal governance	2.60 ^H	2.42 ^L	2.51
Trust in CSG governing bodies	2.65 ^H	2.29 ^L	2.47
Trust in CSG companies	2.79 ^H	2.52 ^L	2.65
Knowledge confidence	3.16	3.29	3.22
Information need	3.16	3.62 ^H	3.39
Community attitudes and feelings toward CSG	3.27 ^H	2.81 ^L	3.03

Table 22 Demographic differences: Mean scores based on age

Community wellbeing dimensions	Less than 35 years	35 to 54 years	55 + years	Western Downs
Personal safety	3.74	3.85	3.86	3.82
Income sufficiency	3.81	3.65	3.60	3.67
Health	3.72	3.57 ^L	3.87 ^H	3.72
Services and facilities	3.11 ^L	3.16 ^L	3.50 ^H	3.27
Town appearance	3.54	3.58	3.71	3.62
Roads	2.54	2.59	2.78	2.65
Environmental quality	3.85	3.75	3.81	3.80
Environmental management	3.14	2.93	2.92	2.98
Local decision making	2.47	2.59	2.63	2.57
Economic opportunities	2.61	2.51	2.49	2.53
Community cohesion	3.43	3.50	3.54	3.49
Local trust	3.31	3.20	3.30	3.27
Community participation	3.03	3.16	3.10	3.10
Community spirit	3.89	3.84	3.87	3.87
Social interaction	3.65	3.29	3.34	3.41
Overall community wellbeing	3.67	3.67 ^L	3. 89 ^н	3.75
Expected future wellbeing	3.62	3.73	3.94	3.78
Place attachment	3.79	4.03	4.41	4.11
Community resilience	3.07	2.81	2.93	2.93

Note: Bold font indicates a significant difference; Means with different superscript letters are significantly different (L = lower; H=higher)

Perceptions and attitudes about CSG and the sector	Less than 35 years	35 to 54 years	55 + years	Western Downs
Perceived impacts	3.11 ^L	3.62 ^H	3.56 ^H	3.46
Perceived benefits	3.32 ^H	2.99 ^L	2.92 ^L	3.06
Distributional fairness	3.26 ^H	3.05 ^H	2.80 ^L	3.02
Procedural fairness	2.70	2.33	2.41	2.46
Relationship quality	2.69	2.38	2.42	2.48
Governance overall	2.89	2.50	2.43	2.58
Formal governance	3.26 ^н	2.63 ^L	2.55 ^L	2.77
Informal governance	2.66	2.47	2.43	2.51
Trust in CSG governing bodies	2.75 ^H	2.41 ^L	2.32 ^L	2.47
Trust in CSG companies	3.00 ^н	2.53 ^L	2.51 ^L	2.65
Knowledge confidence	3.25	3.37 ^H	3.06 ^L	3.22
Information need	3.17	3.40	3.55	3.39
Community attitudes and feelings toward CSG	3.37 ^H	2.92 ^L	2.8 9 ^L	3.03

Gender

Table 23 Demographic differences: Mean scores based on gender

Community wellbeing dimensions	Male	Female	Western Downs
Personal safety	4.00 ^H	3.64 ^L	3.82
Income sufficiency	3.75	3.60	3.67
Health	3.72	3.72	3.72
Services and facilities	3.36 ^H	3.19 ^L	3.27
Town appearance	3.72 ^H	3.52 ^L	3.62
Roads	2.68	2.62	2.65
Environmental quality	3.90 ^H	3.70 ^L	3.80
Environmental management	3.06	2.91	2.98
Local decision making	2.60	2.53	2.57
Economic opportunities	2.69 ^H	2.37 ^L	2.53
Community cohesion	3.48	3.51	3.49
Local trust	3.25	3.29	3.27
Community participation	2.86 ^L	3.35 ^н	3.10
Community spirit	3.82	3.91	3.87
Social interaction	3.24 ^L	3.58 ^н	3.41
Overall community wellbeing	3.80	3.71	3.75
Expected future wellbeing	3.78	3.78	3.78
Place attachment	4.00	4.22	4.11
Community resilience	2.89	2.97	2.93

Note: Bold font indicates a significant difference; Means with different superscript letters are significantly different (L = lower; H=higher)

1		r
Male	Female	Western Downs
3.40	3.52	3.46
3.04	3.07	3.06
3.12	2.90	3.02
2.39	2.53	2.46
2.39	2.58	2.48
2.56	2.61	2.58
2.73	2.82	2.77
2.51	2.50	2.51
2.44	2.51	2.47
2.59	2.72	2.65
3.47 ^H	2.97 ^L	3.22
3.40	3.38	3.39
3.03	3.03	3.03
	3.40 3.04 3.12 2.39 2.39 2.56 2.73 2.51 2.44 2.59 3.47^H 3.40	3.40 3.52 3.04 3.07 3.12 2.90 2.39 2.53 2.39 2.58 2.56 2.61 2.73 2.82 2.51 2.50 2.44 2.51 2.59 2.72 3.47^H 2.97^L 3.40 3.38

Income level

Table 24 Demographic differences: Mean scores based on household income

Community wellbeing dimensions	Less than \$40,00	Between \$40,000 and \$80,000	\$80,000 or more	Western Downs
Personal safety	3.82	3.83	3.85	3.82
Income sufficiency	3.13 ^L	3.65 ^M	4.11 ^H	3.67
Health	3.75	3.68	3.73	3.72
Services and facilities	3.19	3.27	3.30	3.27
Town appearance	3.68 ^н	3.78 ^H	3.45 ^L	3.62
Roads	2.67	2.77	2.54	2.65
Environmental quality	3.75	3.86	3.78	3.80
Environmental management	2.82 ^L	3.08 ^H	3.05	2.98
Local decision making	2.47 ^L	2.76 ^H	2.52	2.57
Economic opportunities	2.32 ^L	2.60 ^H	2.63	2.53
Community cohesion	3.31 ^L	3.66 ^H	3.55	3.49
Local trust	3.25	3.45	3.21	3.27
Community participation	2.89 ^L	3.09	3.33 ^H	3.10
Community spirit	3.80	4.00	3.86	3.87
Social interaction	3.16 ^L	3.48 ^H	3.61	3.41
Overall community wellbeing	3.68	3.81	3.77	3.75
Expected future wellbeing	3.66	3.92	3.78	3.78
Place attachment	4.07	4.07	4.21	4.11
Community resilience	2.85	3.07	2.91	2.93

Note: 8.6% of respondents declined to answer this question about household income; Bold font indicates a significant difference; Means with different superscript letters are significantly different (L = lower; H=higher)

Perceptions and attitudes about CSG and the sector	Less than \$40,00	Between \$40,000 and \$80,000	\$80,000 or more	Western Downs
Perceived impacts	3.54 ^H	3.72 ^H	3.25 ^L	3.46
Perceived benefits	2.92	3.05	3.18	3.06
Distributional fairness	2.95	2.92	3.11	3.02
Procedural fairness	2.35	2.44	2.52	2.46
Relationship quality	2.38	2.51	2.54	2.48
Governance overall	2.41 ^L	2.64 ^H	2.68 ^H	2.58
Formal governance	2.59 ^L	2.78	2.94 ^H	2.77
Informal governance	2.40	2.63	2.52	2.51
Trust in CSG governing bodies	2.26 ^L	2.53 ^H	2.60 ^H	2.47
Trust in CSG companies	2.55	2.64	2.76	2.65
Knowledge confidence	2.90 ^L	3.17 ^H	3.56 ^H	3.22
Information need	3.51 ^H	3.67 ^H	3.13 ^L	3.39
Community attitudes and feelings toward CSG	2.89 ^L	2.89 ^L	3.29 ^H	3.03

Note: 8.6% of respondents declined to answer this question about household income; Bold font indicates a significant difference; Means with different superscript letters are significantly different (L = lower; H=higher)

Farm ownership

Table 25 Demographic differences: Mean scores based on farm ownership, Western Downs region 2018

Community wellbeing dimensions	No	Yes	Western Downs
Personal safety	3.69 ^L	4.05 ^H	3.82
Income sufficiency	3.59	3.82	3.67
Health	3.71	3.74	3.72
Services and facilities	3.29	3.25	3.27
Town appearance	3.57	3.70	3.62
Roads	2.68	2.59	2.65
Environmental quality	3.75	3.89	3.80
Environmental management	3.04	2.88	2.98
Local decision making	2.51	2.67	2.57
Economic opportunities	2.46	2.65	2.53
Community cohesion	3.46	3.56	3.49
Local trust	3.24	3.33	3.27
Community participation	3.04	3.20	3.10
Community spirit	3.86	3.87	3.87
Social interaction	3.43	3.37	3.41
Overall community wellbeing	3.71	3.82	3.75
Expected future wellbeing	3.67	3.97 ^H	3.78
Place attachment	3.98	4.33 ^H	4.11
Community resilience	3.00 ^H	2.80	2.93

Note: only 35 indigenous respondents in the sample; Bold font indicates a significant difference; Means with different superscript letters are significantly different (L = lower; H=higher)

Perceptions and attitudes about CSG and the sector	No	Yes	Western Downs
Perceived impacts	3.30 ^L	3.72 ^H	3.46
Perceived benefits	3.10	2.98	3.06
Distributional fairness	3.12	2.84	3.02
Procedural fairness	2.60 ^H	2.24 ^L	2.46
Relationship quality	2.56 ^H	2.34 ^L	2.48
Governance overall	2.71 ^H	2.37 ^L	2.58
Formal governance	2.93 ^H	2.51 ^L	2.77
Informal governance	2.57	2.40	2.51
Trust in CSG governing bodies	2.64 ^H	2.19 ^L	2.47
Trust in CSG companies	2.79 ^H	2.42 ^L	2.65
Knowledge confidence	3.08 ^L	3.47 ^H	3.22
Information need	3.32	3.51	3.39
Community attitudes and feelings toward CSG	3.23 ^L	2.70 ^H	3.03