

11. Individual, family and social life

Domain: Individual, family and social life

Sub-domains:

- A. develop as a person
- B. develop your moral outlook and other beliefs
- C. formulate and pursue goals and objectives for yourself
- D. hope for the future
- E. develop and maintain self-respect, self-esteem and self-confidence
- F. have a private life and some personal space, including protection of personal data
- G. access emotional support
- H. form intimate relationships, friendships and a family
- I. celebrate on special occasions
- J. be confident that your primary relationships will be treated with dignity and respect
- K. spend time with, and care for, others including wider family
- L. enjoy independence and equality in primary relationships including marriage
- M. be free in matters of sexual relationships and reproduction
- N. enjoy special support during pregnancy, maternity, and paternity
- O. know that someone will look out for you
- P. have peace of mind

Final short list

Indicator 1: Availability of support

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

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

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

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

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

Measure 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) (England and Wales)

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

Measure 3.1: 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

Measure 4.1: 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

Measure 5.1: Percentage who feel able to form and pursue the relationships they want (*under development*)

Indicator 1: Availability of support**Measure 1.1: Percentage meeting relatives or friends at least once a week**

Source: British Household Panel Survey (GB)

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

Source: Scottish Household Survey (Scotland)

Measure 1.2: Score on five yes/no questions about availability of support:

- a) Is there anyone who you can really count on to listen to you when you need to talk?
- b) Is there anyone who you can really count on to help you out in a crisis?
- c) Is there anyone who you can totally be yourself with?
- d) Is there anyone who you feel really appreciates you as a person?
- e) Is there anyone who you can really count on to comfort you when you are very upset?

Source: British Household Panel Survey (GB)

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

- a) If I was alone and needed help, I could rely on one of my friends/relatives in this neighbourhood to help me
- b) If my home was empty, I could count on one of my friend/relatives in this neighbourhood to keep an eye on my home
- c) I feel I could turn to friends/relatives in this neighbourhood for advice or support

Source: Scottish Household Survey (Scotland)

Sub-domains: G, H, K, O, P

Evaluation of measures 1.1 and 1.2 against essential selection criteria

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics
2	Legitimacy	Strong – provided wording of measure 1.2 revised
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class
	- within England	As for GB
	- within Scotland	Gender, ethnicity (combining years), disability, age, religion/belief (combining years), social class
	- within Wales	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class collected.
		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	Every 2 years (BHPS); Annual (SHS)
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

Measures 1.1 for GB and 1.1 (S) for Scotland match sub-domain H – the capability to form intimate relationships, friendships and a family, and sub-domain K – spending time with and caring for others, including wider family. Being able to spend time with family and friends scores high amongst the things people say affect their lives (Sustainable Development Indicators, DEFRA 2008).

The British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) includes every two years a question which can be used to construct this measure, asking about frequency of seeing relatives and friends not living with the respondent. The BHPS is being replaced by the UK Household Longitudinal Survey (UKHLS) and it is unclear whether this exact question will be continued. However, questions in wave 1 of UKHLS include contact with non-resident parents and children, and these could usefully be supplemented in subsequent waves with questions about contact with other relatives and friends.

Consultation participants agreed that family networks can play an important part in people's lives, including providing unpaid care for children, older people and disabled people. However, participants were keen to point out that 'the family' needs to be defined broadly to encompass the variety of forms the family can take. This is reflected in the instructions to interviewers in the Scottish Household Survey (SHS).

Consultation participants also argued that the family is not a positive influence for everyone and can be oppressive in some circumstances (for example, for some people coming out as gay, or as transgender, or rejecting the parental culture or religion). Continuing contact with family may or may not be a positive outcome, depending on the extent to which they are in fact supportive. The wording in the BHPS survey, which refers to contact with friends (who are freely chosen) or relatives (who are not) is therefore preferable for this purpose to the wording in the SHS, which refers to family only. We recommend consideration be given to revising the wording in the SHS. Issues relating to the provision of emotional and other forms of support are picked up in indicator 2.

The definition of 'friend' also came under some scrutiny at the Scottish consultation event. Should it include care workers who are being paid but who the individual

regards as a friend? At present, the question wording allows the respondent to use whatever definition of friend s/he chooses.

Measures 1.2 and 1.2 (S) aim to capture the quality of support, especially emotional support, in line with sub-domain G, as well as the security of knowing that someone will look out for you (sub-domain O) and the peace of mind this brings (sub-domain P). The questions in the BHPS, which it is intended to continue and expand in the UKHLS, provide a close match with strong face validity. The questions have been used in the form of an index in previous research on social isolation and availability of support.

The BHPS samples in Scotland and Wales are not large enough to disaggregate by some equality characteristics. The UKHLS sample will be larger in these countries, expanding the range of analysis that will be possible. An alternative source for Scotland is the SHS, which from 2007 asks about support available within the neighbourhood, but this is narrower in focus.

Participants in the first round of specialist consultation thought that these were an important measures, because they would highlight any systematic differences in who feels isolated. They were also thought to be a good measures of social networks. The measures got strong endorsement at the Scottish and Welsh consultation events, with a preference for the BHPS form of wording over the SHS version for this purpose, since the latter is restricted to geographically local help, while BHPS allows for support to come from afar.

Table 11.1 Measures 1.1 and 1.2 Availability of support

Authors' calculations from the British Household Panel Survey, 2006-7, GB

	Measure 1.1 People meeting relatives or friends at least once a week, %	Measure 1.2 Mean score (range 0-5) on 5 yes/no questions about availability of support
All	85	4.83
Socio-economic group		
managerial and professional	81	4.84
intermediate	87**	4.86
small employers and own a/c	83	4.80
lower supervisory and technical	87**	4.83
semi-routine and routine	87**	4.83
never worked	89**	4.68
unclassified	85**	4.79
Male	83	4.79
Female	89**	4.86**
White	84	4.83
Asian	83	4.64**
Black	91	4.76
Chinese or Other	86	4.35**
Non-disabled	85	4.84
Disabled	84	4.75**
Age 16-24	93	4.85
Age 25-44	86**	4.85
Age 45-64	80**	4.79
Age 65-74	87**	4.88
Age 75 plus	82**	4.81

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

Table 11.2 Measure 1.2 (S) Availability of support

Authors' calculations using Scottish Household Survey, 2005/6, Scotland

	Measure 1.2(S) Mean score on each of three questions about availability of support
Male	4.82
Female	4.57**
White	4.65
Non-White	6.12**
Non-disabled	4.68
Disabled	4.66
Age 18-24	5.36
Age 25-44	4.93**
Age 45-64	4.54**
Age 65-74	4.33**
Age 75 plus	4.28**
No religion	5.03
Church of Scotland	4.31**
Roman Catholic	4.78**
Other Christian	4.73**
Buddhist	
Hindu	
Muslim	5.50
Jewish	
Sikh	
Other	4.95

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

Note: Range 3 to 15; lower score indicates **more** support. Blank cell indicates < 30 respondents

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

Measure 2.1 (EW): Percentage experiencing domestic abuse (emotional or financial) in the last 12 months (reporting the relationship of victim to principal suspect, including partner abuse) (England and Wales)

Sources: British Crime Survey (self-completion module) (England and Wales)

Sub-domains: L, F, E

Evaluation of measure 2.1 (EW) against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Not available
	- within England	Gender, age under 60, ethnicity, disability, religion and belief, social class, sexual orientation – combining years as necessary
	- within Scotland	Not available
	- within Wales	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class Need to combine years to disaggregate by sexual orientation (tbc) Sample sizes too small to disaggregate by ethnicity or religion/belief, even if combining 3 years of data
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome, Process
6	Frequency	Annual
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Moderate – more than thirty respondents overall in sample for partner abuse by all disaggregation characteristics (sexual orientation tbc).

The Physical Security domain contains measures of domestic violence and intimate partner violence. The definitions used for those measures restrict attention to physical and sexual violence and threats of physical and sexual violence. The intention of the measure 2.1 in this domain, Individual, Family and Social Life, is to capture other aspects of domestic and intimate partner abuse, such as verbal, emotional and financial abuse. A full discussion of definitions of domestic and intimate partner violence and abuse is given in the Physical Security domain (chapter 6), including the question of the overlap between the concepts, and the pros and cons of the more focused measure of intimate partner abuse and the more inclusive measure of domestic abuse.

Several consultation respondents were keen that the broader concept of abuse, going beyond physical or sexual violence, was included in the indicators for the EMF. In order to avoid overlap, the measures here are defined as **excluding** those aspects of violence already captured in Measure 1.4 in the Physical Security domain.

For England and Wales, the British Crime Survey (BCS) self-completion questionnaire includes questions on whether a partner (defined to include a boyfriend or girlfriend), and, separately, whether any other family members, have done a list of things to the respondent in the last 12 months. This list includes:

- Prevented you from having your fair share of the household money
- Stopped you from seeing friends and relatives
- Repeatedly belittled you to the extent that you felt worthless

Measure 2.1 is based on the percentage of respondents who mention any of these three things in relation to a partner or other family member, separately identified.

Unfortunately, the BCS self-completion questionnaire is not administered to respondents aged 60 or over. This is a significant limitation for the abuse measure, since we know from other sources that older people are one of the groups who are particularly vulnerable to financial and emotional abuse. We recommend that the BCS investigates ways to enable older respondents to complete the self-completion questionnaire, if necessary offering the option of paper-based rather than computer-assisted methods. It may be possible to learn from the experience of the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey, where the self-completion module on intimate partner violence is administered to respondents aged 60 or over.

The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey module focuses on physical and sexual violence and threats of violence and does not extend to verbal, emotional and financial abuse, so at present there are no survey-based data on the broader concept of domestic or intimate partner abuse for Scotland. The Statistical Bulletin Crime and Justice Series includes an annual publication on intimate partner abuse recorded by the police in Scotland, and this is based on the definition agreed with Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland: 'Domestic abuse is any form of physical, non-physical, or sexual abuse which takes place within the context of a close relationship, committed either in the home or elsewhere. This relationship will be between partners (married, co-habiting or otherwise) or ex-partners' (Statistical Bulletin 2007/8 <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/246304/0069507.pdf>). However, this records only those incidents which come to the attention of the police.

Table 11.3 Measure 2.1 (EW) Percentage of 16-59 year olds that are victims of domestic abuse (emotional and financial) in the last 12 months

Authors' calculations using British Crime Survey, 2007, England and Wales

	Partner abuse		Abuse by other family members (not partner)		All domestic abuse
	%		%		%
Male	2.7		0.9		3.4
Female	3.4	**	1.2	**	4.5
White	3.0		1.0		3.8
Mixed	2.3		1.7		3.6
Asian / Asian British	3.1		2.0		4.7
Black / Black British	3.5		1.9		4.4
Chinese / Other	3.8		1.4		5.6
Non-white	3.0		1.9		
Non-disabled	2.9		0.9		3.6
Disabled	4.7	**	2.5	**	6.6
Age 16-24	4.5		1.9		6.2
Age 25-39	3.4	**	1.1	**	4.2
Age 40-59	2.0	**	0.6	**	2.5
No religion			1.3		3.7
Christian			0.9		2.3
Buddhist			1.3		2.5
Hindu			0.6		1.9
Jewish			0.0		4.1
Muslim			2.5		7.0
Sikh			1.8		9.6
Other			5.0		4.2
Managerial	2.3		0.7		2.9
Intermediate	2.3		0.9		3.2
Small employer	2.7		0.9		3.2
Lower supervisory	3.0		1.2		3.9
Semi-routine	4.2	**	1.3		5.0
Never worked	6.1	**	1.7		7.2
Full-time student	3.7		2.4	**	6.0
Not classified	3.9		0.0		4.1

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

Notes: The number of victims is derived from questions in the self-completion module. The data from the self-completion module has been merged with the main data set to derive the equality characteristics analysis. Individuals from youth sample

who are included in the self-completion module have been excluded from the analysis.

'Don't knows' and 'can't remembers' are coded as missing.

Individual columns may not add up to total figures where individuals are victims of both partner abuse and other domestic abuse.

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

Measure 3.1: 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

Source: Data not yet available

Sub-domains: I, K

Evaluation of measure 3.1 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics
2	Legitimacy	Strong – provided question carefully worded
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Data not yet collected
	- within England	Data not yet collected
	- within Scotland	Data not yet collected
	- within Wales	Data not yet collected
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	Data not yet collected
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Data not yet collected

This indicator reflects sub-domain I (the capability to celebrate on special occasions), which was included in the original specification of the capability list following consultation with the general public and groups and individuals at particular risk of discrimination and disadvantage. It also contributes to sub-domain K (being able to spend time with others, including wider family).

The indicator relates to the individual’s freedom to take part in social and cultural occasions, such as the celebration of a birthday, wedding or civil partnership, or attending a religious or cultural festival, or a funeral. There can be many barriers: poverty (not being able to afford presents, the right kind of clothes, or travel), not being given time off work or school (for example because schedules are organised around Christian festivals, or because the employer does not give time off for bereavement), being made to feel unwelcome by others attending the event or by the nature of the event itself, or being unable to be open about one’s own relationships and hence unable to celebrate them with others.

The measure shortlisted provisionally for the consultation was drawn from the Poverty and Social Exclusion (PSE) survey, a one-off survey in 1999. Consultation

responses were mixed and the measure provoked much discussion at all of the events. On one hand, some participants felt that it reflected an important aspect of being able to participate in the community and cultural expression. There were no shortage of examples of different ways in which people had in their own experience been excluded or made to feel uncomfortable about participating in social or cultural occasions which mattered to them. The stigma and isolation associated with not being able to participate could be very damaging.

On the other hand, many participants felt that the PSE-derived question was too narrow. They were concerned that since the measure began life as a measure of poverty and social exclusion, it might still carry those connotations, rather than encompassing the wider interpretation intended for the EMF. If the measure picked up primarily on poverty, it would belong better in the Standard of Living domain. Some participants felt that this indicator was a lower priority altogether than capturing some of the sub-domains for which no existing questions were currently available, particularly those relating to relationships and personal development (see indicators 4 and 5 below).

The Family Resources Survey (FRS), the Families and Children Survey, and the BHPS contain questions which ask whether children are able to celebrate on special occasions such as birthdays, Christmas or other religious festivals, but there are a number of shortcomings of these questions for our purposes, which consultation participants felt precluded using the existing questions for the EMF. The FRS and other existing survey questions:

- are asked of parents about their children, thus omitting parents in their own right and individuals without children;
- focus on the affordability of celebrating on special occasions, rather than other potential barriers to participation;
- give a narrow range of examples of special occasions.

Summing up, the underlying concept seemed to be regarded by many (but not all) respondents as important, but the specific questions available in existing surveys were regarded by all respondents as inadequate. Therefore our recommendation is to retain this indicator but develop a new measure, based on a new question or questions. These could be considered for inclusion in the UKHLS, since they fit with other topics covered in that survey.

The criticisms of existing questions made by consultation participants will need to be taken into account in developing a new question. Consultation participants made a number of other important observations:

- it should be left up to the respondent to define which occasions s/he regards as important
- the examples of occasions which might be important to people should include civil partnerships if weddings are mentioned, and should also include funerals
- a supplementary question should probe the reasons for being unable to participate, covering the range of barriers which are relevant for different equality characteristics such as feeling unwelcome, relationships not recognised by others, not getting time off work or caring responsibilities, not being able to afford to participate, or not being able to access the venue.
- a further supplementary question should ask whether respondents feel obliged to participate in social or cultural occasions that they would prefer not to (for example religious ceremonies).

Indicator 4: Being able to be yourself

Source: Yet to be developed

Sub-domains: A, E

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

Source: Yet to be developed

Sub-domains: H, J, K, L, M

Development of indicators along these lines was given strong endorsement by consultation respondents in the first round, at the Scotland and Wales events, and through the web consultation. Organisations of lesbian, gay and bisexual people, and of transgender people, pointed out that problems often arise for these groups as a result of other individuals or organisations rejecting or refusing to recognise their identity or their relationships. This is itself a form of discrimination, and can lead to isolation and exclusion. Other participants pointed to the constraints disabled people, especially people with learning difficulties, can face in self-expression and lack of freedom in forming relationships. The need to respect and sustain existing relationships of older people who need care is also not always recognised, especially if one or both of the individuals moves into residential care.

Development of questions to monitor these indicators would need to be undertaken in collaboration with stakeholders, to ensure appropriate wording. For example, one consultation respondent pointed out that 'being yourself' was not necessarily the same as being 'out and proud'.

Consultation participants observed that it was not surprising that there were no existing survey questions with which to monitor inequality in these areas, since they relate particularly to 'new' equality strands, and moreover protecting and promoting equality in personal development and in relationships has not been seen as the responsibility of any government department or agency.

Indicators included on the provisional short list for consultation but not included in the final short list

Two indicators were included in the provisional short list but have been dropped, following consultation, from the final short list in order to make room for the new indicators 4 and 5.

An indicator of perception of belonging to the local community, defined as the area within 15-20 minutes walk of where you live, was included in the provisional short list. It was based on a question from the Citizenship Survey. Consultation participants argued that not all communities are defined geographically (for example, communities of interest) and that these other forms of community could contribute equally to a person's security and his/her 'bridging' and 'bonding' social capital. Some respondents also thought that the question was too vague. Actual involvement in the local community was more informative, but this could be picked up elsewhere, for example in the Participation, Influence and Voice domain.

One consultation respondent thought that being able to combine information on perceptions of community belonging with perceptions of how well people from different backgrounds get on together (included in the Identity, Expression and Self-respect domain) would be useful. However, on balance, the arguments in favour of this indicator, given the requirement to limit the overall number of indicators, were not sufficiently strong to retain it.

The other indicator which appeared on the provisional short list but does not feature in the final short list has been moved rather than dropped. This is the indicator of independent living, measured by self-reported choice and control in terms of assistance, equipment, flexible working and caring arrangements that enable independent living, in the ONS Omnibus Survey (now called the Opinions Survey). This indicator was recommended by Walby and colleagues (2008) and received widespread endorsement in the consultation, especially from organisations of and for disabled people, and organisations representing the interests of older people. (Some doubts were expressed about the desirability or feasibility of extending the concept of independent living to other groups).

As explained in Chapter 1, the current consultation exercise is concentrating on indicators of outcome and process aspects of inequality, while measures of autonomy are being developed in a separate project for the Government Equalities Office (also being carried out by the CASE/OPHI team). On reflection, and given the pressure on the number of indicators in this domain, we decided to reclassify this indicator as a measure of the 'autonomy' aspect of inequality. The autonomy aspect

focuses explicitly on choice, control and empowerment – concepts at the heart of independent living – and provides a better fit for this indicator.

Recommendations

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

The main focus of recommendations for this domain is on the development of new survey questions for indicators 3, 4 and 5. For indicator 3 (being able to participate in key social and cultural occasions which matter to you), there are some sources to build on and consultation respondents have identified key features which they would like to see included a new question. For indicators 4 and 5 (being able to be yourself, and being able to form and pursue the relationships you want), more foundational development will need to take place, to specify and test appropriate question wording.

In terms of topic coverage, questions for indicators 3, 4 and 5 would fit well with the UKHLS, and they could be considered for inclusion in that survey.

For indicator 1, existing data are fairly comprehensive in terms of frequency and quality, and the potential for disaggregation by equality characteristics. Consideration should be given to including a question on sexual orientation in the UKHLS; the SHS is in any case likely to carry a question of this kind in future. Potential for disaggregation by ethnicity and religion/belief within Wales is limited by the sample size of BHPS. This will be increased in UKHLS, but probably not enough to permit analysis for the smaller minorities.

Consideration could also be given to expanding the SHS question on contact with family to include 'family or friends', in recognition of the fact that some people gain greater support from their friends.

For indicator 2, we recommend that the BCS self-completion module on domestic abuse is extended to include respondents aged 60 or over, in line with the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey. However, the SCJS module does not include questions on financial, emotional and verbal abuse (other than threats of violence), so at present there are no existing survey data for indicator 2 for Scotland (as opposed to statistics from police records).

As for other domains, analysis by transgender status is missing and no regular population surveys record this characteristic. It is important that other forms of monitoring are explored to cover this gap, for example repeating the targeted on-line

survey which was carried out for the Equalities Review – see general recommendations in Chapter 15.

The non-household population is also not covered by the data sources for the proposed indicators, and separate monitoring will be required. Some groups which are very significant from an equality and human rights perspective, such as asylum seekers and refugees, Gypsy/Travellers, and the homeless, are found in both the household and non-household populations, but are generally not well identified in either type of data. Again, specialist surveys will be required.

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

The five indicators proposed in this paper cover some of the main aspects of ‘Individual, Family and Social life’: personal development, relationships with family and friends, emotional support, and ability to participate in important social and cultural occasions. However, this is a very broad domain (the largest in terms of number of the number of sub-domains specified) and there are inevitably gaps in what just five indicators can capture.

One important factor is the addition of indicators to reflect the autonomy aspect of inequality. This was highlighted by consultation participants as being particularly important for this domain and they urged the research team to consider how autonomy indicators (being developed as part of a separate project) would be integrated with the outcome and process indicators proposed here. The independent living indicator has been identified as one priority for an autonomy indicator.

There is also considerable interaction between outcomes in this domain with outcomes in other domains, such as Identity, Expression and Self-respect, Participation, Influence and Voice, Productive and Valued Activities and Physical Security. It will be important to explore these interactions in the analysis.

The sub-domains covered in the ‘Individual, family and social life’ domain are not ones with which governments have traditionally concerned themselves. Since the majority of large-scale data collection is funded by government departments, it is not surprising to find that data coverage for this domain is less complete than for some other domains in the framework. The EHRC and GEO could play a useful role in contributing to filling some of the gaps.

We recommend:

- EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations work with data providers and academic experts to develop new survey questions on (1) being able to

participate in key social and cultural occasions which matter to you, (2) being able to be yourself, and (3) being able to form and pursue the relationships you want. These indicators are of particular importance to the so-called 'new' equality strands and should be developed as a high priority.

- A question on sexual orientation is included in Understanding Society (the UK Household Longitudinal Survey), in accordance with the ONS Sexual Identity Project findings.
- Consideration is given to expanding the Scottish Household Survey question on contact with family to include 'family or friends', in recognition of the fact that some people gain greater support from their friends.
- The British Crime Survey self-completion module on domestic abuse is extended to include respondents aged 60 or over, in line with the Scottish Crime and Victimization Survey.
- Consideration is given to including questions on financial, emotional and verbal abuse (other than threats of violence) in Scottish Crime and Victimization Survey module on domestic violence.