

10. Productive and valued activities

Domain: The capability to engage in productive and valued activities

Sub-domains:

- A. have a decent paid job, with support where necessary
- B. care for others, including children and parents
- C. do something useful and have the value of your work recognised even if unpaid
- D. have rest and leisure, including holidays, and respite from caring responsibilities
- E. choose a balance between paid and unpaid work, care and leisure on an equal basis with others
- F. work in just and favourable conditions, including health and safety, fair treatment during pregnancy, maternity and paternity, fair pay, reasonable hours, and freedom from harassment or discrimination
- G. not be forced to work in a particular occupation or without pay
- H. not be prevented from working in a particular occupation without good reason

Final short list

Indicator 1: Employment

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

Indicator 2: Earnings

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

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

Indicator 3: Occupation

Measure 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)

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

Measure 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

Measure 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

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

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

Indicator 1: Employment

Measure 1.1: Percentage of working age population in paid employment

Source: Labour Force Survey / Annual Population Survey / Integrated Household Survey (LFS / APS / IHS)¹

Sub-domain: A

Evaluation of measure 1.1 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics, with partial exception of age
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class
	- within England	As for GB
	- within Scotland	As for GB (combining years for ethnicity and religion/belief)
	- within Wales	As for GB (combining years for ethnicity and religion/belief)
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	Quarterly
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

The employment rate is a widely-used indicator of basic access to the labour market (for example, Public Service Agreement 8, Sustainable Development Indicator 40, National Indicator for Local Authorities 151, Scottish Government participation target). It was also recommended as a secondary indicator by the Lancaster review (Walby and colleagues, 2008). It is of central importance to people of working age and is the locus of entrenched inequalities. Using the Labour Force Survey (LFS) (and the boosts in Scotland and in Wales), and combining more than one year of data where necessary, it can be measured robustly and disaggregated by most equality characteristics in each country, except transgender status and sexual orientation. Questions on the latter are now to be included in the Integrated Household Survey.

The employment rate is usually calculated for people under state retirement age. While it may be interesting to chart trends in employment for people over state

¹ The boost to the Labour Force Survey in Scotland and in Wales is known as the Annual Population Survey. The Labour Force Survey will in future be part of the Integrated Household Survey.

retirement age, an increase or decrease does not have an unambiguous interpretation, so it is not proposed as part of this indicator.

Economic activity, or inactivity rates, are alternative potential indicators. However, economic activity includes the unemployed, so a rise in economic activity is not unambiguously a good thing from an equality perspective. Economic inactivity encompasses a diverse range of situations, including some positive (being in full-time education, for example) and some negative (being unemployed). Unemployment itself was not included because of the differences in the way unemployment is reported and recorded for different population sub-groups (for example men and women, disabled and non-disabled). The Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) work on missing dimensions of human development recommended a measure of 'discouraged unemployed' be included (Lugo, 2007) as an adjunct but it is not suitable as a stand-alone indicator.

Participants in both rounds of the specialist consultation, including the Welsh and Scottish events, agreed that the employment rate was an important indicator for the EMF and it was generally preferred to unemployment or inactivity measures.

However, it was pointed out that refugee status is not recorded for employment, while for claimant unemployment it is, at least in some cases. Other comments included the desirability of including informal employment (although there is no reliable source), and the importance of disaggregating employment rates for women by the age of their youngest child.

There was some discussion about whether unpaid work and volunteering should be included in this indicator. On balance, however, participants agreed that the focus of this indicator should remain on the unequal distribution of paid work, reserving unpaid work for separate consideration (see indicator 5).

There was also discussion about whether the number of hours worked and type of employment contract (for example fixed term or indefinite), in addition to rates of employment, should be included either within this indicator or separately. Some participants thought that this was not informative unless one knew whether the individual wanted to work more or fewer hours (for example, part-time work may be through choice or the result of other constraints). Further consideration is given to measures of hours worked under indicator 5 below.

Table 10.1 Measure 1.1 Percentage of working age population employed or self-employed

Authors' calculations using Labour Force Survey (not including Annual Population Survey), Sept 2007 – Oct 2008, GB

	GB	Scotland	Wales
All	76	78	73
Socio-economic group			
higher managerial and professional	93	94	92
lower managerial and professional	91**	91**	90
intermediate	87**	89**	85**
small employers and own a/c	91**	90**	90
lower supervisory and technical	87**	89**	85**
semi-routine	80**	81**	79**
routine	78**	79**	76**
Male	81	81	77
Female	72**	75**	69**
White	78	78	74
Black and Black British	65**	79	
Indian	72**	76	77
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	49**	60**	53**
Mixed	66**	67	56**
Other	63**	59**	52**
Non-disabled	82	84	81
Disabled	48**	46**	42**
Age 18-24	64	0.66	64
Age 25-44	81**	83**	80**
Age 45-64	76**	77**	70**
No religion	76	77	71
Christian	78**	79	74**
Buddhist	66**	60**	63
Hindu	75	65	
Jewish	76	72	
Muslim	49**	54**	58**
Sikh	68**	94	
Other	71**	73	70

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first category listed in group, at 95 per cent level

Blank cell indicates fewer than 30 respondents in this group.

Indicator 2: Earnings

Measure 2.1: Percentage earning less than 60 per cent of median hourly earnings of employees (excluding unpaid overtime)

Measure 2.2: Median hourly earnings of employees (excluding unpaid overtime) (pay gaps)

Source: LFS / APS / IHS

Sub-domains: A, F

Evaluation of measures 2.1 and 2.2 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics, with partial exception of age
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class
	- within England	As for GB
	- within Scotland	As for GB (combining years for ethnicity and religion/belief)
	- within Wales	As for GB (combining years for ethnicity and religion/belief)
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	Quarterly
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Adequate

Access to 'decent' paid work means more than getting any job. Measure 2.1 uses avoiding low earnings as a proxy for a decent job. Earnings are also a key indicator of vertical inequalities (top to bottom of the distribution) and horizontal inequalities (between groups). Measure 2.2 reflects this.

Hourly earnings are a widely-used indicator in various forms (for example Public Service Agreement 15, Scottish HLSES, Office for Disability Issues). Income from employment (earnings or self-employment income) was recommended as an indicator by the OPHI work on missing dimensions of human development (Lugo, 2007) and pay gaps were recommended by Walby and colleagues (2008) in their review of equality statistics for the EHRC.

Although the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) is the source preferred by ONS for data on earnings, the ASHE data cannot be disaggregated beyond

gender, age and social class. For this reason, the LFS and related datasets are the proposed source for these indicators. This choice was endorsed by participants in the first round of specialist consultation. One response to the web consultation suggested that the ASHE could be used for Scotland, if disaggregation beyond age and gender using the LFS turned out not to be feasible.

The original proposal was for the low earnings threshold in measure 2.1 to be two-thirds of median earnings (in line with previous academic work on the subject, for example, McKnight, 2005). However, consultation participants thought that aligning the definition with the definition of low income used in government publications (namely, 60 per cent of median), would be preferable.

An important issue raised during the consultation was whether the low earnings threshold should be calculated on a regional or UK-wide basis. Views on both sides were expressed. On balance, a common GB threshold was preferred. One respondent observed that poverty statistics are always presented relative to a GB (or indeed UK) median, so using a GB threshold for low earnings would be a consistent approach. Views among respondents at the Scottish and Welsh consultation events, and subsequent representations from Scotland and Wales in the web consultation, were mixed. A compromise – if space allows – would be to present supplementary measures using thresholds specific to each of England, Scotland and Wales.

Median values are proposed rather than means because the mean is more sensitive to measurement error at the top and bottom of the distribution. Hourly earnings are proposed rather than weekly because the latter conflates the effects of working hours with rates of pay. Again, this was discussed during the specialist consultation and views on both sides were expressed; weekly earnings may involve less measurement error. The majority opinion was that hourly earnings were a clearer indicator of inequality. Consultation participants also discussed whether part-time earnings should be included as well as full-time earnings in the calculation of median hourly earnings, and concluded after some discussion that they should.

Whether or not measure 2.2 should control for various characteristics of the employees (such as age and educational qualifications) was discussed during the consultation. It was argued that including controls of this kind gets closer to identifying pure discrimination in pay (for example on the grounds of gender) by removing confounding factors. On the other hand, which characteristics should be stripped out and which should remain is controversial, for example, should disability be controlled for? Controlling for these factors might obscure some of the inequality we are seeking to measure. Moreover, including controls complicates the presentation of the indicator (which is disfavoured by selection criterion 21 on

simplicity and ease of communication), and may reduce the sample size available. Our recommendation following consultation feedback is to monitor and report raw pay gaps (that is, with no controls) for the EMF, with a view to stimulating more detailed follow-up work to analyse the reasons for any apparent pay gaps, as in Longhi and Platt (2008).

Some support for a measure of in-work poverty as an alternative to measure 2.1 was expressed during first round of the specialist consultation. However, such a measure would overlap considerably with the risk of income poverty measure proposed for inclusion under the Standard of Living domain and is therefore not included here.

A number of attractive alternative indicators for decent work are available in European surveys, including whether the work is insecure, boring or stressful, and the degree of autonomy enjoyed by the worker. Unfortunately many of these indicators do not appear to be standard inclusions in UK surveys, and given that **some** indicators of decent work are available (including information on health and safety at work – see measure 3.2), we are proposing to refrain from recommending new data collection for this sub-domain, in accordance with selection criterion 17 (taking account of cost implications and adequacy of existing sources).

Table 10.2 Measure 2.1 Percentage of employees earning less than 60 per cent median hourly earnings, excluding unpaid overtime

Authors' calculations using Labour Force Survey (not including Annual Population Survey), Oct 2007 – Sept 2008, GB

	GB	Scotland	Wales
All	14	14	18
Socio-economic group			
higher managerial and professional	2	1	2
lower managerial and professional	4**	3**	5
intermediate	10**	8**	14**
small employers and own a/c	n/a	n/a	n/a
lower supervisory and technical	31**	32**	34**
semi-routine	32**	32**	32**
routine	42**	45**	52**
Male	10	10	14
Female	18**	18**	21**
White	14	14	17
Black and Black British	13		
Indian	12		
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	28**		
Mixed	14		
Other	19**		38**
Non-disabled	014	14	18
Disabled	17**	18	15
Age 18-24	35	36	39
Age 25-44	10**	12**	14**
Age 45-64	12**	10**	14**
Age 65-74	27**	34	25
No religion	14	15	20
Christian	14	14	17
Buddhist	13		
Hindu	12		
Jewish	6**		
Muslim	23**		
Sikh	15		
Other	13	29	

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first category listed in group, at 95 per cent level

Blank cell indicates fewer than 30 respondents in this group.

Table 10.3 Measure 2.2 Median hourly earnings of employees, excluding unpaid overtime

Authors' calculations using Labour Force Survey (not including Annual Population Survey), Oct 2007 – Sept 2008, GB

	GB	Scotland	Wales
All	9.77	9.63	8.75
Socio-economic group			
higher managerial and professional	18.18	18.18	15.86
lower managerial and professional	12.83**	13.12**	12.49**
intermediate	8.67**	8.49**	7.84**
small employers and own a/c	n/a	n/a	n/a
lower supervisory and technical	8.65**	9.00**	7.90**
semi-routine	6.69**	6.71**	6.42**
routine	6.75**	6.67**	6.97**
Male	10.90	10.69	9.75
Female	8.76**	8.67**	8.00**
White	9.82	9.63	8.80
Black and Black British	9.63		
Indian	10.42		
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	7.55**		
Mixed	9.83		
Other	9.23		
Non-disabled	9.88	9.74	8.78
Disabled	8.97**	9.15**	8.65
Age 18-24	6.59	6.58	6.31
Age 25-44	10.75**	10.33**	9.62**
Age 45-64	10.15**	10.36**	9.47**
Age 65-74	7.45**	6.31	6.90
No religion	10.00	9.37	8.38
Christian	9.71**	9.75	12.66**
Buddhist	10.63		
Hindu	11.00		
Jewish	15.00**		
Muslim	8.00**		
Sikh	9.07		
Other	9.62	8.61	

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first category listed in group, at 95 per cent level

Blank cell indicates fewer than 30 respondents in this group.

Indicator 3: Occupation

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

Source: LFS / APS / IHS

Sub-domains: H, F, A

Evaluation of measure 3.1 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics, with exception of social class and partial exception of age
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity*, disability, age, religion/belief*,
	- within England	As for GB
	- within Scotland	As for GB, but sample sizes too small to disaggregate by ethnicity or religion/belief, even if combining 3 years of data
	- within Wales	As for GB, but sample sizes too small to disaggregate by ethnicity or religion/belief, even if combining 3 years of data
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	Three year averages
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Adequate

* Broader occupational classifications may be necessary for breakdowns by ethnicity and religion for the smaller minorities

Although these three measures relate to the distribution of individuals with different equality characteristics across occupations, their focus is rather different. Measure 3.1 is a measure of the extent to which individuals with particular characteristics are concentrated in certain occupations (and excluded from others). Measures 3.2 and 3.3 reflect the extent to which an individual's occupation exposes him or her to hazards, giving rise to work-related illness or injury.

The proposed measure of occupational segregation originally included two components, one on under-representation in high-status occupations (vertical segregation) and one on lack of access to a broad range of occupations (horizontal segregation). Following the first round of specialist consultation, it was proposed to drop the vertical segregation indicator.

Vertical segregation was included in the original proposed short list because it is used by the Office for Disability Issues (ODI) in its annual report, it was recommended in the Lancaster review (Walby and colleagues, 2008), and it can be measured across a wide range of equality characteristics using the Labour Force Survey and associated datasets. It reflects the idea of the 'glass ceiling'. Several consultation participants in the second round – where we proposed dropping the vertical segregation measure – said that they thought it was important. However, given the requirement to keep the overall number of indicators for this domain to five or less, and given the overlap with provided by other measures of earnings inequality and occupational safety, the vertical segregation measure has not been reinstated.

Measures of horizontal segregation such as the one proposed here (measure 3.1) have been used extensively in research on gender inequality in the labour market. It can be measured across a wide range of equality characteristics among the working age population using the Labour Force Survey and related datasets.

Feedback during the consultation suggested that it might be necessary to combine LFS years to enhance sample size and to ensure that a fine-grained occupational coding could be used. It was pointed out that the measure could become complex if applied to more than two groups (for example, several ethnic minority groups in comparison to the majority White group). There was also a suggestion that the calculation should control for differences in educational qualifications, but – as with pay gaps discussed above – this could obscure the kinds of inequality we want to detect.

More specific data are collected on some high-status occupations like judges and the senior civil service but these are only a minority of senior positions in general, and moreover the full range of equality characteristics are not currently monitored. Perceptions of discrimination in recruitment and promotion (for example from the Citizenship Survey) were alternatives for this indicator, but there is overlap with indicator 4 (see below), and drawbacks in terms of the geographical coverage of the survey.

Measure 3.1: Authors' calculations using Labour Force Survey (not including Annual Population Survey), **Sept 2007-Oct 2008, GB**

The score has a minimum value of 0, representing exactly equal distribution of men and women across occupations, and a maximum score of 100, representing the case in which men and women are completely segregated by occupation. The result is sensitive to how fine-grained the occupational classification used is; in this example 3-digit occupational classifications are used.

The score for GB for men and women is 2.33.

For disabled and non-disabled people, the score is 2.17.

Calculations for other groups, and for Scotland and Wales, are also possible using the same method and source. Trends over time would reveal whether workers with different characteristics were becoming more or less segregated in the labour market.

Measure 3.2: Weighted average prevalence of work-related illness per 100,000 employed, based on occupation

Measure 3.3 : Weighted average prevalence of non-fatal work-related injury per 100,000 employed, based on occupation

Source: LFS / APS / IHS plus Health and Safety Executive statistics

Sub-domains: F, A

Evaluation of measures 3.2 and 3.3 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics, with partial exception of age
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity*, disability, age, religion/belief*, social class
	- within England	As for GB
	- within Scotland	As for GB but sample sizes too small for disaggregation by ethnicity or religion/belief, even if combining 3 years of data
	- within Wales	As for GB but sample sizes too small for disaggregation by ethnicity or religion/belief, even if combining 3 years of data
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	Three year averages
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Adequate

* Broader occupational classifications may be necessary for breakdowns by ethnicity and religion for the smaller minorities

Measures 3.2 and 3.3 were in response to consultation feedback and reflect the importance of considering not only access to employment, but the hazards associated with that employment. This is emphasised in the proposal for internationally comparable indicators of employment proposed by Lugo (2007) for OPHI.

The questions used by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) to calculate their prevalence rates of work-related ill health and incidence of work-related injuries are similar to those proposed by Lugo. They derive from a specific module in the Labour Force Survey. One set of questions ask about illness which in the respondent's opinion was caused by or made worse by his or her current or most recent job, and another set of questions ask about serious ('reportable') non-fatal injuries sustained in the current or most recent job. HSE then calculates a prevalence rate of ill health,

and an incidence rate of injuries, by occupational group (HSE, 2008). How fine-grained the occupational coding can be depends on the number of cases reported.

The recommendation for measures 3.2 and 3.3 is to use the HSE estimates of rates of ill health and injuries associated with each occupational group to create a index giving an indication of the health and safety risk associated with each occupation. The average value of this index for different equality groups can then be compared, for example, men and women, or disabled and non-disabled. The index relates to occupations, so the average value for a particular group will depend on their distribution across different occupations.

There are a number of limitations to this measure. Those relating to the ill health and injury estimates themselves are described in detail in HSE (2008). In addition, the average for an occupation, especially where sample numbers are insufficient to allow a fine-grained occupational coding to be used, may not reflect the risk a particular individual faces. Nevertheless, obtaining some measure of the different conditions in which men and women, young and old, disabled and non-disabled, white and ethnic minority and higher and lower social class employees are working is important, and an approximate measure in this case is better than no measure at all.

The figures in the table show, for example, the very strong gradient by socio-economic group in risk of injury, that men are more exposed to injury than women, and that both the youngest (18-24) and oldest (65-74) workers are at higher risk than those in the middle.

Table 10.4 Measures 3.2 and 3.3: Average prevalence of work-related illness and non-fatal work related injury

Authors' calculations using Labour Force Survey (not including Annual Population Survey), Sept 2007-Oct 2008, GB

	Per 100,000 employed, based on occupation Weighted average prevalence	
	(i) Illness	(ii) Injury
All	3504	1093
Socio-economic group		
higher managerial and professional	3276	350
lower managerial and professional	3909	567
intermediate	3137	762
small employers and own a/c	3917	1582
lower supervisory and technical	3675	1784
semi-routine	3110	1400
routine	3277	2037
Male	3534	1271
Female	3466	869
White	3509	1096
Black and Black British	3519	1130
Indian	3395	981
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	3306	1184
Mixed	3424	959
Other	3491	1046
Non-disabled	3505	1088
Disabled	3489	1137
Age 18-24	3232	1235
Age 25-44	3548	1058
Age 45-64	3543	1085
Age 65-74	3424	1172
No religion	3504	1100
Christian	3512	974
Buddhist	3568	837
Hindu	3272	701
Jewish	3519	1172
Muslim	3330	1139
Sikh	3409	1045
Other	3572	1087

Notes: (i) HSE statistics 2004/5-2006/7 on occupational risk of self-reported illness caused or made worse by current or most recent job for people working in last 12 months, matched to 2-digit occupational codes by equality characteristics in Oct 2007 – Sept 2008 LFS

(ii) HSE statistics 2004/5-2006/7 on occupational risk of self-reported reportable non-fatal injury to workers for people working in last 12 months, matched to 2-digit occupational codes by equality characteristics in Oct 2007 – Sept 2008 LFS

Indicator 4: Discrimination in employment

Measure 4.1: Percentage with experience of unfair treatment, harassment or bullying at work in the last 2 years

Source: Fair Treatment at Work Survey

Sub-domains: F, H, E

Evaluation of measure 4.1 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class
	- within England	As for GB
	- within Scotland	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class collected. But sample sizes too small to disaggregate by ethnicity, sexual orientation or religion/belief.
	- within Wales	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class collected. But sample sizes too small to disaggregate by ethnicity, sexual orientation or religion/belief.
5	Aspect of inequality	Process
6	Frequency	Ad hoc
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

This measure combines responses from two questions in the Fair Treatment at Work (FTW) Survey, both of which ask about employees' own experiences in work over the previous two years. One focuses on personal experience of unfair treatment in relation to any of a list of 18 characteristics (including all of the equality characteristics specified in the EMF, except transgender). The second question asks about personal experience of bullying or harassment at work, and is preceded by a broad definition: 'Bullying and harassment is any unwelcome behaviour that creates a hostile working environment'. The recommendation for measure 4.1 is to combine those who answer in the affirmative to either of these questions, to get an overall measure of unfair treatment, bullying or harassment at work.

The FTW Survey was first carried out in 2005/6 and was repeated in 2008. The sample size for the first survey was small – 4000 – but includes boosts to ensure sufficient number of respondents from ethnic and religious minorities. Although it covers England, Scotland and Wales, it is not large enough in its current format to

allow disaggregation by smaller sub-groups within Scotland or Wales. The Living in Wales (LiW) survey asks a general question about experience of discrimination, harassment and victimisation, but it is not specific to the workplace.

Participants in the first and second rounds of specialist consultation thought that this was an important indicator. A number of suggestions were made to improve the wording of the questions in future versions of the survey:

- adding transgender status to the list of characteristics in relation to which unfair treatment, bullying or harassment may have occurred²;
- adding asylum / refugee status
- broadening 'the way you dress' to 'the way you look', to capture other ways in which non-conformity can give rise to discrimination and unfair treatment.

There was some concern that respondents to the survey might use a looser definition of 'harassment' than the legal definition. (This had been the experience in an NHS survey on bullying and harassment in the workplace). The interpretation of this indicator must therefore be about perceptions of unfair treatment, rather than being used as an estimate of the amount of actionable mistreatment.

Participants also pointed to the importance of monitoring forced labour and human trafficking as critical human rights issues, but it was agreed that household or workplace surveys were not the right vehicle.

Alternative process indicators – focusing on how people are treated in employment - include discrimination in applying for a job and/or promotion, from the Citizenship Survey (CS). The discrimination in applying for promotion component would be picked up the FTW Survey questions as well, although the discrimination in recruitment would not. The CS indicator was preferred by one respondent to the web consultation, on the grounds that it could detect age discrimination in recruitment. In other ways, however, the CS questions are narrower in scope. In addition, the CS is not carried out in Scotland, and participants in the first round of specialist consultation thought that the effective sample size even for England and Wales on these discrimination questions was too small to be useful.

² The current version includes 'the way you dress', but not transgender status.

Table 10.5 Measure 4.1 Percentage of workers experiencing unfair treatment, bullying or harassment at work

Published statistics from Fair Treatment at Work Survey, 2005/6, GB (Grainger and Fitzner, 2007)

	% of workers who experienced unfair treatment, bullying or harassment at work in last 2 years	% of workers who experienced unfair treatment at work in last 2 years	% of workers who experienced bullying or harassment at work in last 2 years
All	8.9	6.9	3.8
Men	9.8	6.6	2.8
Women	8.0	7.3	4.9
White	8.6		
Non-white	11.2		
White		6.5	
Black		12.5	
Asian		8.0	
Non-disabled	7.6		
Disabled	19.7	15.1	10.6
Non-disabled men			2.4
Non-disabled women			3.6
Disabled men			6.4
Disabled women			14.4
Lesbian, gay or bisexual		13.8	
Age under 45		7.7	
45 plus		5.6	
Christian		7.3	
Muslim		8.5	

Note: Gaps in the table indicate that statistic not reported in the publication. Analysis could be completed, and statistical significance calculated, once the data are released to the Data Archive (expected in 2009).

Indicator 5: Unpaid care and free time**Measure 5.1 (E): Percentage of those with unpaid caring responsibilities who are fully satisfied with the gains and feel adequately recognised (England)**

Source: English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing **plus new data required**

Sub-domains: C, B

Evaluation of measure 5.1 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class plus new data required
	- within England	As for GB
	- within Scotland	New data required
	- within Wales	New data required
5	Aspect of inequality	Process and Outcome
6	Frequency	Annual, but new data needed
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

Indicators 1 to 4 focus on various aspects of paid employment but the 'Productive and Valued Activities' domain is broader than that, including the value of unpaid work in its own right - for example looking after children or other caring activities - and the balance between paid work, unpaid work and free time. Indicator 5 was selected for the short list in order to ensure that unpaid work, including the activities of the population over state retirement age, are given due attention in the basket of indicators for this domain.

Two questions in the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) are jointly a close match for sub-domain C (do something useful and have the value of your work recognised even if unpaid). The questions ask those who are caring for another person (including those who may be receiving carers benefits) whether they feel fully satisfied with the gains from that activity and whether they feel adequately recognised. These are used for Measure 5.1.

Because the source is ELSA, data availability is currently restricted to England, and to the 50-plus age group, but these questions could be broadened to encompass parents (or others, including grandparents) caring for children and other caring activities of the under-50 population. The questions could potentially be carried on

other surveys to widen the scope for disaggregation and to cover Wales and Scotland.

Participants in both rounds of specialist consultation thought that carers were a very important group and that this indicator did a good job of capturing the value of caring. However, they pointed to the need to include (unpaid) childcare as well as other forms of caring, and advised against including volunteering in the same indicator (as had been originally proposed).

Participants argued that other aspects of caring would ideally be picked up elsewhere in the overall basket of indicators, in particular, whether caring responsibilities were limiting a person's ability to undertake paid employment, and whether someone's paid work was preventing him or her from spending as much time as s/he would like caring for others.

Alternative indicators on unpaid work focus more narrowly on formal volunteering and on the amount of time, rather than the extent to which the activity is valued by the individual and by others.

Table 10.6 Measure 5.1 People aged 50+ who spend some time caring for another person (grandchild, spouse, or someone else)

Authors' calculations using English Longitudinal Study of Ageing, 2004, England

	% who are fully satisfied with the gains from caring and feel adequately appreciated	Number in sample	Statistical significance
Men	88	304	
Women	85	808	
Age 50-64	84	672	
Age 65-74	89	371	
Age 75 plus	87	149	
Non-disabled	87	500	
Disabled	85	692	

Note: pooling two or more waves of ELSA data should generate sufficient numbers of ethnic minority respondents to disaggregate this indicator by ethnicity, and could also help to establish statistically significant differences between other subgroups.

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

Source: ONS Opinions Survey time use module

Sub-domains: E, F, D

Evaluation of measure 5.2 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class
	- within England	As for GB
	- within Scotland	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class But sample numbers too small to disaggregate by ethnicity, sexual orientation or religion/belief
	- within Wales	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class But sample numbers too small to disaggregate by ethnicity, sexual orientation or religion/belief
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	Ad hoc
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

Measure 5.2 also covers those with caring responsibilities and other unpaid work, as well as those in paid work. By examining inequalities in the amount of time left over after work (paid or unpaid) and personal care (such as sleeping, eating and washing), the degree to which individuals and groups are able to have rest and leisure can be ascertained. The definition is a standard one in international time use research and has been implemented by the ONS in the Time Use Survey 2000 and in the time use module in the Omnibus (now known as the Opinions Survey).

The Opinions survey is conducted monthly and over the course of a year achieves a sample of around 22,000 adults in the UK. This is large enough for disaggregation by equality characteristics across GB and in England. Pooling three years of data would permit disaggregation of the largest ethnic minority group and largest religious minority groups in Scotland, but not in Wales.

Participants in the specialist consultation liked this measure because of its broad coverage, the recognition of the potential twin burdens of paid and unpaid work, and the fact that it was a relatively objective measure.

In the second round of consultation, there was a request that this measure be broken down into its components, especially paid work and unpaid work (ideally separating domestic work from childcare and other caring responsibilities). Although the total amount of free time enjoyed by men and women may be roughly equal, the division of paid and unpaid labour is not, for example.

An alternative measure based on the LFS focusing on whether respondents would prefer to work more, or fewer, hours in paid work, was rejected by participants in the first round of specialist consultation. A version of this alternative measure is used by the ODI in their annual report and a version of it is recommended by the OPHI work on missing dimensions of human development (Lugo, 2007). However participants argued that hypothetical questions of this kind can produce unreliable or even misleading responses. It was suggested that a measure of this kind could be picked up as an autonomy measure rather than as an outcome or process indicator.

Alternative measures of working hours which could be considered include the proportion working over a given threshold of hours (for example, more than the European Working Time Directive), or those working anti-social hours. These reflect over-employment or unsatisfactory employment, but not under-employment.

Alternative indicators of engagement in specific leisure activities, or satisfaction with leisure time, were rejected partly because some will be picked up in the 'Individual, family and social life' domains, and partly because of the limitations of satisfaction data.

Recommendations

Recommendations arising from assessment of short list against criteria for individual indicators

The data available for shortlisted indicators in this domain are generally excellent. However, there are some shortcomings.

Complementary strategies will need to be adopted:

- for monitoring discrimination and disadvantage for transgender people in productive and valued activities, especially with respect to paid employment and the opportunity to care for others. A commitment to repeat a specialist on-line survey (Whittle and colleagues, 2007) on a regular basis would be a good starting point; and

- to ensure adequate coverage of Gypsies and Travellers, and of refugees and asylum seekers, including those not in the household population.

These issues cut across several domains and are discussed further in the general recommendations in chapter 15.

Some relatively minor adjustments to existing data would be desirable to facilitate more fine-grained disaggregation:

- a question on sexual orientation is now to be included in the Integrated Household Survey and could usefully be extended to the ONS Opinions survey;
- an increase in the sample size of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey so as to be able to analyse results separately in Scotland and Wales;
- adding transgender status and asylum / refugee status to the list of characteristics in relation to which unfair treatment, bullying or harassment may have occurred in the Fair Treatment at Work Survey and broadening ‘the way you dress’ to ‘the way you look’, to capture other ways in which non-conformity can give rise to discrimination and unfair treatment;
- the extension of the duration for which the Time Use Module is carried on the ONS Omnibus, to facilitate disaggregation by sub-group within Scotland and Wales, and a commitment to repeat it at least every three years.

A more significant gap is in relation to measure 5.1 on the gains from, and recognition of, unpaid caring. The proposed measure is drawn from the English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing, so this covers the population in England aged 50 plus. We recommend:

- the adoption of questions from the English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing on the gains from, and recognition of, unpaid caring, in a general population and GB-wide survey, such as the ONS Omnibus Survey or the UK Household Longitudinal Survey
- extending the scope of the questions to explicitly include looking after children (including own children or grandchildren).

Recommendations arising from assessment of short list against whole domain selection criteria

Looking at the proposed short list as a whole, the portfolio of indicators reflects sub-domains A-F and H, and contains at least some process indicators (4, 5). Autonomy indicators will be identified through a parallel project being undertaken by the LSE/OPHI team for the Government Equalities Office. A number of consultation respondents were keen to point out the importance of autonomy in relation to this domain, especially issues of work-life balance.

Indicators 2 and 3 (earnings and occupational inequalities), and to some extent 5 (unpaid work and free time), allow inequalities between groups towards the top of the distribution to be monitored as well as inequalities at the bottom.

Although no indicators could be found for sub-domain G (including the particular human rights concern about forced labour) which were sufficiently statistically robust, a number of possible sources for in-depth analysis have been identified that could be reviewed and analysed as a regular monitoring tool: data from Operation Pentameter and any subsequent exercises carried out by the police to identify victims of people-trafficking in sex establishments (UK Human Trafficking Centre, 2008); the annual report of the Employment Agency Standards Inspectorate (part of BERR; EASI, 2008) particularly the number of complaints received or initiated and the number of infringements identified; and the number of licenses revoked by the Gangmasters Licensing Authority (GLA, 2008). Each of these sources suffers from the problem that the amount of abuse identified is dependent on the intensity of activity being carried out by the various agencies at a particular point. However, the agencies could be encouraged to produce estimates of the scale of the problem based on the fraction of activity which has come to their attention (as the Home Office did for Operation Pentameter), and this could be combined with evidence from the voluntary sector who may come into contact with victims (ILO, 2005; Craig et al, 2007) to give an overall picture of the scale and nature of the problem.

We recommend:

- A question on sexual orientation continues to be included in the Integrated Household Survey and is extended to other surveys like the ONS Opinions Survey.
- The sample size of the Fair Treatment at Work Survey is increased so as to be able to analyse results separately in Scotland and Wales.
- Transgender status and asylum / refugee status is added to the list of characteristics in relation to which unfair treatment, bullying or harassment

may have occurred in the Fair Treatment at Work Survey and ‘the way you dress’ is broadened to ‘the way you look’, to capture other ways in which non-conformity can give rise to discrimination and unfair treatment.

- The duration for which the Time Use Module is carried on the ONS Opinions Survey is extended, to facilitate disaggregation by sub-group within Scotland and Wales, and a commitment is made to repeat it at least every three years.
- EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations pursue the possibility of adopting the questions from the English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing on the gains from, and recognition of, unpaid caring, in a general population and GB-wide survey, such as the ONS Opinions Survey or the UK Household Longitudinal Survey, and extending the scope of these questions to explicitly include looking after children (including own children or grandchildren).