Executive summary

Background and aims

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) and the Government Equalities Office (GEO) are jointly developing an Equality Measurement Framework, in consultation with the devolved administrations. The Commission has a legal duty under the Equality Act (2006) to monitor and evaluate progress towards equality and human rights, taking account of gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, transgender status, and religion or belief. The GEO has in addition a particular interest in inequality by social class.

The Equality Measurement Framework (EMF) is *not* a performance measurement tool. Rather it is intended to monitor social outcomes from an equality and human rights perspective, providing a baseline of evidence to inform policy priorities and helping to identify inequalities that need further investigation.

The development of the EMF has drawn on three key inputs:

- the theoretical underpinning of the capability approach developed by Amartya Sen;
- the international human rights framework; and
- consultation with the general public, and individuals and groups at risk of discrimination and disadvantage.

This has produced a concept of inequality based on the idea of 'substantive freedom' or equality in the central and valuable things in life that people can actually *do* and *be*, which can be thought of as having three aspects:

- inequality of outcomes;
- inequality of process (unfair treatment, or being treated with dignity and respect); and
- inequality of autonomy (empowerment, or the degree of choice and control).

A list of central and valuable freedoms has been derived from the international human rights framework and consultation with the general public and 'at risk' groups (see chapter 1). These have been grouped into ten domains:

- Life
- Health
- Physical security

- Legal security
- Education and learning
- Standard of living
- Productive and valued activities
- Individual, family and social life
- Identity, expression and self-respect
- Participation, influence and voice.

The framework proposes that inequality in these ten domains should be evaluated in terms of outcomes, process and autonomy, by a range of equality characteristics (gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, transgender status, religion or belief and social class, and the interactions between them). A fuller description of the EMF is given in Chapter 1.

If the whole of the EMF were to be populated with data, it would be vast in scope. To make it manageable and to realise its potential as a tool for measuring equality, 'spotlight' indicators needed to be identified. The objectives of this project were to identify and agree, through a programme of consultation with stakeholders and subject specialists, three to five indicators for each of the 10 domains relating to inequality of outcomes and process. (Indicators relating to autonomy require more methodological development and are the subject of a separate project.)

Methods

The stages for the selection of indicators were as follows:

1. **Drawing up a set of criteria with which to select indicators**
   This stage is described in Chapter 2 and consultation participants were invited to comment on the appropriateness of the selection criteria.

2. **Developing a long list and provisional short list of indicators**
   The long list built on the ONS Equality Data Audit and the work carried out for EHRC by Sylvia Walby and colleagues at the University of Lancaster[1], among other sources. The provisional short list for each domain was arrived at by applying the 'essential' and 'desirable' selection criteria.

3. **First round of consultation with subject specialists and stakeholders**
   This was through a series of domain-specific workshops looking at GB-wide issues, and human rights perspectives.

---

[1] Walby, S., Armstrong, J. and Humphreys, J. (2008) *Review of Equality Statistics.* EHRC Research Report No.1. http://www.equalityhumanrights.com

4. Revision of short list of indicators and second round of consultation
The provisional short list was revised in the light of first round consultation responses and subjected to a second round of consultation, including full-day events in Scotland and Wales, and a web-based consultation. We also held several one-to-one meetings and discussions with stakeholders and subject specialists.

5. Detailed technical assessment and production of a final list of indicators
Following analysis of responses to the second round of consultation, the short list of indicators for each domain was revised. The short list was then subjected to rigorous testing and analysis, including accessing the relevant microdata wherever possible, to ensure the measures were statistically robust and to make recommendations as necessary for future data collection.

Nearly 200 people attended the consultation events in total, 18 organisations responded to the web consultation (many responding to multiple domains), and we held one-to-one meetings and discussions with at least 20 individuals and organisations. The project was advised throughout by the Policy and Analysis Group, a cross-government group of analysts and policy experts convened by the Government Equalities Office and including representatives of the devolved administrations.

Final list of indicators
As a result of this study, 48 indicators have been identified across the 10 domains, comprising 88 measures overall. Some data are already available for over three-quarters of the measures across a number of equality characteristics. The final list of indicators is given at the end of this Executive Summary.

Summary of general recommendations
Recommendations relating to specific domains are summarised in section 8 of each of chapters 15, 16 and 17 for GB (including England), Scotland and Wales respectively. What follows here is a summary of the general recommendations which cut across all the domains and the three countries.

Revision of the shortlist of indicators
- We recommend that EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations give consideration to involving the general public in scrutinising the shortlist of indicators produced by the specialist consultation, for example by means of a citizen's jury.

- We recommend that EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations revisit the selection of indicators in three years time; with a view to ensuring the indicators continue to reflect the most important equality and human rights issues, while retaining a degree of continuity, to facilitate analysis of trends over time.

Data availability

- We recommend that data providers look again at whether variables and datasets which are collected but not yet publicly available can be made publicly available, with special access and usage conditions if necessary. Examples includes the Prison Quality of Life Survey in England and Wales and ethnicity coding in the Healthcare Commission and Scottish Household Survey.

- We recommend that the domestic violence and hate crime statistics from police recorded crime are checked and made available in a timely fashion, and integrated into the EMF as soon as possible.

- We recommend that EHRC keeps in contact with all data providers on the question of data availability, and that relevant new data is integrated into the EMF as soon as it becomes available.

Disaggregation by equality characteristics

- We recommend that the sexual identity question developed by ONS become a standard part of the demographic information collected in all major surveys, as soon as practicable.

- We recommend that indicators on inequality by sexual identity based on survey data are supplemented by EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations with in-depth research through organisations trusted by lesbian, gay and bisexual people, to help to provide insights on the experiences of lesbian, gay and bisexual people who are not 'out', in relation to each of the ten domains.

- Where there is a list of grounds of discrimination or unfair treatment, as for example in the British Crime Survey questions on hate crime or the Fair Treatment at Work Survey questions on experiences in the workplace, transgender status should be included as a characteristic.

- We recommend that EHRC undertake a regular (triennial) specialist survey of transgender people, building on the on-line survey carried out for the Equalities Review by Whittle and colleagues[2]. The survey should include questions for the full set of EMF indicators, asked in the same way as in existing sources, to aid comparability with the general population, as well as asking in more detail about issues of particular concern to the transgender community.

- We recommend that disaggregations by equality characteristics should be as fine-grained as is possible given the data source.

- We recommend that intersectionalities between equality characteristics are analysed and presented, where relevant and revealing.

Population coverage of the indicators
- We recommend EHRC works with the GEO to develop a standard questionnaire module, based on the recommended indicators across the ten domains, together with harmonised questions on equality characteristics, which can be modified to suit each intended setting.

- We recommend EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations use the standard questionnaire to monitor inequality and human rights among Gypsies and Travellers, asylum seekers and refugees, homeless people, and people with learning difficulties, building on existing best practice in the voluntary sector.

- We recommend EHRC works with the Audit Commission to coordinate and pool information from the reports of the various inspectorates (the Audit Commission, Commission for Social Care Inspection, Healthcare Commission, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and HM Inspectorate of Prisons) relevant to monitoring the equality and human rights position of the non-household population. In Scotland and Wales, engagement with stakeholders including audit, inspection and other regulation bodies will be required. In some cases, data gaps will also need to be addressed. Important priorities in taking forward this work arise in relation to Life (indicator 4), Physical security (indicator 3) and Legal security (indicator 4). The need for joined-up frameworks for

---

[2] Whittle, S., Turner, L. and Al-Alami, M. (2007) *Engendered penalties: Transgender and Transsexual People's Experiences of Inequality and Discrimination.* The Equalities Review www.theequalitiesreview.org.uk

conceptualising and measuring new and emerging equality and human rights indicators – such as the indicators of dignity and respect that are increasingly being included in the frameworks adopted by inspectorates and audit bodies - is another important priority.

- We recommend that EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations continue to work with ONS to develop measurement of equality and human rights in the non-household population, in accordance with the Equality Data Review recommendation R5.3. In particular, where surveys are being developed or carried out in non-household settings (such as the Life Opportunities Survey, previously known as the Longitudinal Disability Survey), the inclusion of harmonised equality characteristic questions and questions in relation to the EMF indicators should be actively pursued.

Geographical coverage
- We recommend the Living in Wales survey is continued or replaced with another survey of sufficient frequency (preferably continuous or annual), sample size and topic coverage to support the range of indicators required for the EMF and disaggregation by a full range of equality characteristics.

Presentation and interpretation of the data
- We recommend EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations take forward the development of a user-friendly web tool for the EMF, in collaboration with Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion, with a view to making the EMF publicly available and accessible.

- We recommend that contextual data, on the demographics of different equality groups, and on overall inequality, be presented alongside the EMF indicators.

- We recommend that the temptation to pluck single statistics out of the framework is resisted, and that wherever possible, indicators from a given domain (or across domains) are presented jointly or in comparison with disaggregations by other equality characteristics.

- We recommend that intersectional and cross-domain inequalities be presented and reported wherever relevant.

- We recommend that reports using the EMF database supplement the statistical information with qualitative research and case studies, for example, from EHRC's legal or advice line casework (with consent, and suitably anonymised). To facilitate this, we recommend that the EMF domains and indicators be mapped to legal and advice line cases.

Summary of indicators and measures

A. LIFE

Indicator 1: Life expectancy

1.1 (E,S,W): Period life expectancy at birth, and ages 20, 65 and 80

Indicator 2: Homicide

2.1 (E,S,W): Homicide rate

2.2 (E,W): Domestic homicide rate (with separate reporting of relationship of victim to principal suspect, including partner homicide)

2.3 (E,W): Homicides involving sharp implements and shootings

2.4 (E,W): Racially motivated, religiously motivated and homophobic homicide

Indicator 3: Other specific-cause mortality rates

3.1 (E,S,W): Cardiovascular disease mortality rate (age-standardised)

3.2 (E,S,W): Cancer mortality rate (age-standardised)

3.3 (E,S,W): Suicide rate

3.4 (E,S,W): Accident mortality rate

Indicator 4: Death rates from non-natural causes for people resident or detained in public or private institutions

4.1 (E,W): Deaths from non-natural causes during or following police custody

4.2 (E,S,W): Self-inflicted deaths in prisons

4.3 (E,W): Deaths from non-natural causes for people resident or detained in health or social care establishments *(under development)*

B. HEALTH

Indicator 1: Limiting illness, disability and mental health

1.1 (E,W): Percentage who report a long-standing health problem or disability that substantially limits their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities

1.1 (S): Percentage who report a long-standing illness that substantially limits their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities

1.2 (E,S,W): Percentage who report poor mental health and well-being

Indicator 2: Subjective evaluation of current health status

2.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who report poor current health status

Indicator 3: Dignity and respect in health treatment

3.1 (E,W): Percentage with low perceptions of treatment with dignity and respect in healthcare

3.1 (S): Percentage with low perceptions of treatment with dignity and respect in healthcare (*under development*)

3.2 (E,W): Percentage reporting lack of support for individual nutritional needs during hospital stays

Indicator 4: Healthy living

4.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who are living a healthy lifestyle, covering (a) smoking (b) alcohol (c) physical activity (d) consumption of fruit and vegetables (e) body mass

4.2 (E,W): Percentage who are living in an area with less favourable environmental conditions

Indicator 5: Vulnerability to accidents

5.1 (E,S,W) Accident & Emergency accident and injury rate, by location (*under development*)

C. PHYSICAL SECURITY

Indicator 1: Violent crime

1.1 (E,S,W): Percentage that are victims of violent crime (all types)

1.2 (E,W,S): Percentage that are victims of violent crime involving knives, sharp stabbing instruments and guns

1.3 (E,W): Percentage that are victims of sexual violence (with separate reporting of rape and assault by penetration, including attempts, and other sexual violence)

1.3 (S): Percentage that are victims of sexual violence (with separate reporting of rape, including attempts, and sexual assault)

1.4 (E,W): Percentage that are victims of domestic violence (with reporting of relationship of victim to principal suspect, including partner violence)

1.4 (S): Percentage that are victims of partner violence

Indicator 2: Hate crime

2.1 (E,W,S): Percentage that are victims of hate crime (race)

2.2 (E,W,S): Percentage that are victims of hate crime (religion)

2.3 (E,W,S): Percentage that are victims of hate crime (age)

2.4 (S): Percentage that are victims of hate crime (gender)

2.5 (E,W,S): Percentage that are victims of hate crime (disability)

2.6 (E,W,S): Percentage that are victims of hate crime (sexual orientation)

2.7(E,W,S): Percentage that are victims of hate crime (transgender) (*under development*)

Indicator 3: Physical security for people resident or detained in public and private institutions

3.1 (E,W,S): Elder abuse and other abuse of the non-private household population (*under development*)

Indicator 4: Fear of crime

4.1 (E,W,S): Percentage that feel very unsafe or unsafe being alone at home and /or in local area (during the day and after dark)

4.2 (E,W): Percentage that feel very worried / worried about physical attack, sexual assault, intimidation and acquisitive crime

4.2 (S): Percentage that feel very worried / worried about physical attack, sexual assault and acquisitive crime

D. LEGAL SECURITY

Indicator 1: Offences reported and brought to justice: rape, domestic violence and hate crime

1.1 (E,W): The number of cases of rape estimated from general population survey sources, compared with the number of cases reported to and recorded by the police, and the number of legal cases successfully prosecuted

1.2 (E,W): The number of cases of domestic violence estimated from general population survey sources, compared with the number of cases reported to and recorded by the police, and the number of legal cases successfully prosecuted

1.3 (E,W): The number of cases of hate crime estimated from general population survey sources, compared with the number of cases reported to

and recorded by the police, and the number of legal cases successfully prosecuted

Indicator 2: Equal treatment by the police and criminal justice system (objective and subjective measures)

2.1 (E,W): Percentage (a) stopped on foot or in vehicles (b) stopped and searched

2.1 (S): Percentage who had contact with police because they were stopped in a car, on a motorcycle or on foot, to be asked questions or searched

2.2 (E,W): Percentage who are confident that the criminal justice system (police, CPS, courts, prison and probation service) (a) meets the needs of victims (b) respects the rights of those accused of an offence and treats them fairly

2.2 (S): Percentage who are confident that the Scottish criminal justice system provides (a) equal access to the legal system for all (b) serves all communities of Scotland equally and fairly (c) provides an appropriately high standard of service for victims of crime (d) provides an appropriately high standard of service for witnesses

2.3 (E,W): Percentage of those who have lodged an official complaint against the police in past 12 months who are fairly or very satisfied with the handling of the complaint

2.3 (S): Percentage of those who have reported an incident to the police who are very dissatisfied with the way that the police handled the matter

Indicator 3: Detention: Numbers and conditions

3.1 (E,S,W): Percentage of the population in prisons

3.2 (S): Perceptions of being treated with dignity and respect in prisons (E,W data not yet publicly released)

3.3 (E,S,W): Detention in other establishments (*under development*)

Indicator 4: Equal protection and support for individuals with civil justice problems

4.1 (E,W): Percentage of civil justice problems where respondents gave up or did nothing as opposed to other outcomes

4.1 (S): Percentage who had civil justice problems who tried to solve the problem but had to give up

4.2 (E,W): Percentage of civil justice problems where respondents obtained advice (*S under development*)

E. EDUCATION AND LEARNING

Indicator 1: Basic skills

1.1 (E,S,W): Percentage of people of working age achieving functional literacy and numeracy skills

1.2 (E,W): Percentage who can speak, read and write English or Welsh very or fairly well

Indicator 2: Educational qualifications

2.1 (E,S,W): Percentage of each age group with no educational qualifications

2.2 (E,S,W): Percentage of each age group with degree-level qualification

Indicator 3: Participation in lifelong learning

3.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who have participated in formal or informal learning in last 12 months

Indicator 4: Use of the internet

4.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who have used the internet for any purpose within the last 3 months

Indicator 5: Being treated with respect in education

5.1 (E,W): Percentage of those attending school or college who say they are treated with respect

F. STANDARD OF LIVING

Indicator 1: Housing quality and security

1.1 (E,S,W): Percentage of individuals living in sub-standard, overcrowded or unadapted accommodation

1.2 (E,S,W): Percentage who were a victim of domestic burglary or vandalism to the home in the last 12 months

Indicator 2: Poverty and security of income

2.1 (E,S,W): Percentage of individuals living in households below 60 per cent of contemporary median income, after housing costs

2.2 (E,S,W): Mean deprivation score among those above the income poverty threshold

2.3 (E,S,W): Share of total personal wealth relative to share of population

Indicator 3: Access to care

3.1 (GB): Percentage of disabled people (including older people) who do not receive practical support that meets their needs

3.1 (E): Percentage of older disabled people who do not receive practical support that meets their needs

3.1 (S): Percentage of disabled people (including older people) who do not receive practical support, or lack equipment/adaption that would help

3.2 (E): Percentage of parents who do not have access to childcare which meets their and their children's needs

3.2 (S): Percentage of parents who would prefer to change their childcare arrangements but are unable to do so

Indicator 4: Quality of the local area

4.1 (E): Percentage living in an area with 'unsatisfactory' or 'poor' local environmental conditions

4.1 (S,W): Average number of problems cited with local environmental quality

4.2 (E,S,W): Percentage able to reach local facilities in reasonable time / fairly easily without private transport

Indicator 5: Being treated with respect by private companies and public agencies in relation to your standard of living

5.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who report being treated unfairly by financial institutions, utility companies, housing officials or private landlords, social services, Jobcentre Plus or the Pension Service, or who have avoided contacting them for fear of being treated unfairly (*to be developed*)

G. PRODUCTIVE AND VALUED ACTIVITIES

Indicator 1: Employment

1.1 (E,S,W): Percentage of working age population in paid employment

Indicator 2: Earnings

2.1 (E,S,W): Percentage earning less than 60 per cent of median hourly earnings of employees (excluding unpaid overtime)

2.2 (E,S,W): Median hourly earnings of employees (excluding unpaid overtime) (pay gaps)

Indicator 3: Occupation

3.1 (E,S,W): Difference in proportions of group x and group y (for example, men and women) in each occupation, summed across all occupations (horizontal segregation)

3.2 (E,S,W): Weighted average prevalence of work-related illness per 100,000 employed, based on occupation

3.3 (E,S,W): Weighted average prevalence of non-fatal work-related injury per 100,000 employed, based on occupation

Indicator 4: Discrimination in employment

4.1 (E,S,W): Percentage with experience of unfair treatment, harassment or bullying at work in the last 2 years

Indicator 5: Unpaid care and free time

5.1 (E): Percentage of those with unpaid caring responsibilities who are fully satisfied with the gains and feel adequately recognised

5.2 (E,S,W): Free time (24 hours minus paid work, unpaid work and personal care)

H. INDIVIDUAL, FAMILY AND SOCIAL LIFE

Indicator 1: Availability of support

1.1 (GB): Percentage meeting relatives or friends at least once a week

1.1 (S): Percentage meeting family members at least once a week, or talking to them on the phone

1.2 (GB): Score on five yes/no questions about availability of support

1.2 (S): Score on three agree/disagree questions about availability of support

Indicator 2: Being free from domestic abuse (emotional or financial)

2.1 (E,W): Percentage experiencing domestic abuse (emotional or financial) in the last 12 months (reporting the relationship of victim to principal suspect, including partner abuse)

Indicator 3: Being able to participate in key social and cultural occasions which matter to you

3.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who say they have been unable to participate in one or more social or cultural occasions which mattered to them in the last three years (*under development)*

Indicator 4: Being able to be yourself

4.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who feel able to be themselves (a) with their family, (b) with friends, and (c) in public (*under development*)

Indicator 5: Being able to form and pursue the relationships you want

5.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who feel able to form and pursue the relationships they want (*under development*)

I. IDENTITY, EXPRESSION AND SELF-RESPECT

Indicator 1: Freedom to practice your religion or belief

1.1 (E,W): Percentage who feel able to practice their religion or beliefs freely

Indicator 2: Cultural identity and expression

2.1 (E,W): Percentage who believe that people with diverse backgrounds, beliefs and identities get on well together (a) where they live, (b) where they work or study

Indicator 3: Ability to communicate in the language of your choice

3.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who have the opportunity to communicate in the language of their choice (a) at work/study, (b) when accessing services (*under development*)

Indicator 4: Self respect

4.1 (E,S,W): Mean score on Rosenberg self-esteem scale (*under development*)

Indicator 5: Freedom from stigma

5.1 (E,S,W): Mean accumulated humiliation score (*under development*)

J. PARTICIPATION, VOICE AND INFLUENCE

Indicator 1: Formal political participation

1.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who voted in most recent general, national or local election

1.2 (E,S,W): Equality characteristics of elected representatives in House of Commons, Scottish Parliament, National Assembly for Wales and local councils, relative to national population

Indicator 2: Perceived influence in local area

2.1 (E,S,W): Percentage who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area

Indicator 3: Political activity

3.1 (E,W): Percentage undertaking at least one of the following activities in the last 12 months: contacting a councillor, local official, government official or MP (other than in relation to personal issues); attending public meeting or rally; taking part in demonstration or signing petition

3.1 (S): Percentage who have ever contacted an MP or MSP, government official, or media outlet about a government action that s/he felt was harmful or unjust

Indicator 4: Taking part in civil organizations

4.1 (E,W): Percentage who were a member of a local decision-making body in last 12 months

4.1 (S): Percentage active in a local or national campaigning or solidarity organisation or group in last 12 months

4.1 (W): Percentage active in a local or national campaigning or solidarity organisation or group in last 3 years

Indicator 5: Being treated with dignity and respect while accessing and participating in decision-making forums

5.1: Percentage treated with dignity and respect while accessing and participating in local or national decision-making forums *(under development)*