

12. Identity, expression and self-respect

Domain: The capability of being and expressing yourself, and having self-respect

Sub-domains:

- A. have freedom of conscience, belief and religion
- B. have freedom of cultural identity and expression of gender
- C. have freedom of expression
- D. communicate, including using information and communication technologies and use your own language
- E. engage in cultural practices, in community with other members of your chosen group or groups, and across communities
- F. have self-respect
- G. live without fear of humiliation, harassment, or abuse based on who you are
- H. be confident that you will be treated with dignity and respect
- I. access and use public spaces freely

Final short list

Indicator 1: Freedom to practice your religion or belief

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

Indicator 2: Cultural identity and expression

Measure 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

Measure 3.1: 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

Measure 4.1: Mean score on Rosenberg self-esteem scale (under development)

Indicator 5: Freedom from stigma

Measure 5.1: Mean accumulated humiliation score (under development)

Indicator 1: Freedom to practice your religion or belief**Measure 1.1 (EW): Percentage who feel able to practice their religion or beliefs freely (England and Wales)**

Source: Citizenship Survey (subject to revision)

Sub-domain: A

Evaluation of measure 1.1 against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Strong |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Not available |
| | - within England | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class |
| | - within Scotland | Not available |
| | - 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, even if combining 3 years of data |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome, Process, Autonomy |
| 6 | Frequency | Annual |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Measure 1.1 is defined as the percentage of people who feel they are able to practice their religion or beliefs freely. The proposed measure is based on a revised version of a question included in the Citizenship Survey (CS), which it is proposed should be expanded to include (non-religious) beliefs. As in the CS, responses to this question can be categorised as 'yes', 'no' or 'partly', with 'yes' constituting freedom and the other categories indicating constraints.

The proposed measure succinctly captures the essence of the 'freedom of conscience, belief and religion' sub-domain and also overlaps significantly with 'freedom of expression'. It is also one of the few measures that relates to the outcome, process and autonomy aspects of freedom.

Results in the table based on the existing CS question suggest a high degree of religious freedom for most groups, but with a lower proportion of Muslims reporting that they are free to practice their religion (and, correspondingly, a lower proportion of

people from a Pakistani/Bangladeshi ethnic minority). In addition, those who profess a religion not listed in the survey report more restrictions, although the difference does not reach statistical significance.

The available measure from the CS does not cover Scotland and would involve combining data for multiple years in Wales in order to realise a sufficient sample for monitoring a reduced number of equality strands (which does not include ethnicity). Alternative sources for Scotland and Wales could not be located, which implies two options:

- Revise the current question in the CS to include the freedom to practice (non religious) beliefs and add a corresponding question to the Scottish Household Survey (SHS); or
- Introduce new questions to monitor the freedom to practice religion/ belief in the Integrated Household Survey (IHS) or other GB-wide surveys.

The latter option may be more expensive, but is likely to permit superior monitoring across equality strands in Wales – most notably by covering ethnic groups. The CS covers around 500 people per annum in Wales (and is not currently due to receive a boost), which makes it effectively impossible to distinguish among the relatively low numbers of ethnic minorities or religious minorities in Wales (although it may be possible to distinguish between Christian and non-Christian groups).

Measure 1.1 was endorsed by most of the stakeholders who participated in the specialist consultations. While most stakeholders at the London-based consultation agreed that freedom to practice religion captures a salient aspect of inequality for a particular group, a number of participants were reluctant to endorse it. Some wanted to expand the measure to include non-religious beliefs or cover other equality groups. Most wanted to qualify this measure in some way to ensure that freedom of religion for some is compatible with broader freedoms and beliefs for others. Some argued that this indicator is offensive to people with non-religious beliefs.

Some of these sentiments were echoed at the Welsh consultation, where some participants pointed out that freedom not to practice or profess a religion is important too. Others reiterated the need to include non-religious beliefs for humanists and pagans (although it is reasonable to assume this point extends to agnostics and atheists as well). Few people took issue with the proposed measure at the Scottish consultation or during the web consultation. Together, these findings provide a strong case for expanding the definition and coverage of the existing CS question in line with our proposed measure, despite the interruption to the time series which would thereby be caused.

A possible objection raised by Stonewall relates to the argument that this type of indicator 'does not cover individuals who do not have freedom to practice their religion because of discrimination within their faith, denomination or community (for example lesbian, gay and bisexual people unable to practice their faith openly about their sexual orientation within their chosen denomination)'. While this may be an important concern in some contexts, one might expect that people who experience discrimination within their faith would not respond positively to a question intended to gauge their ability to practice their religion freely. Indeed the results presented above suggest that lesbian, gay and bisexual people are reporting a lower degree of freedom to practice their religion (although it does not reach statistical significance in this sample based on a single year; combining more than one year would help to test this result more thoroughly).

Table 12.1 Measure 1.1 (EW) Respondents who say they have some religion

Authors' calculations using Citizenship Survey, 2007, England and Wales

| | Percentage able to practice their religion freely | Number (unweighted) |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| All | 93 | 6,122 |
| Christian | 94 | 3,589 |
| Buddhist | 95 | 67 |
| Hindu | 96 | 551 |
| Jewish | 95 | 27 |
| Muslim | 88** | 1,426 |
| Sikh | 98 | 242 |
| Any other religion | 88 | 220 |
| | | |
| Heterosexual or straight | 93 | 5,556 |
| Gay, lesbian or bisexual | 84 | 66 |
| Prefer not to say | 92 | 167 |
| | | |
| White | 94 | 2,361 |
| Indian | 95 | 1,019 |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | 87** | 819 |
| Black | 93 | 1,151 |
| Mixed | 93 | 216 |
| Other | 93 | 482 |

** indicates figures is statistically significantly different from first category listed in group, at 95 per cent level. Statistical significance has been calculated taking into account the complex sampling structure of the CS.

Indicator 2: Cultural identity and expression

Measure 2.1 (EW): 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 (England and Wales)

Sources: Citizenship Survey (subject to revision)
 Living in Wales Survey (subject to revision)

Sub-domains: B and E

Evaluation of measure 2.1 against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Strong |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Not available |
| | - within England | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class |
| | - within Scotland | Not available |
| | - within Wales | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class collected But sample size too small to disaggregate by ethnicity or religion/belief, even if combining 3 years of data |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome and process |
| 6 | Frequency | Annual |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Measure 2.1 is defined as the percentage of people who believe that people with diverse backgrounds, beliefs and identities get on well together (a) where they live; and (b) where they work or study. In addition to telling us something about the ability to ‘engage in cultural practices’ within and across groups and the broader community, this measure provides a good proxy for ‘freedom of cultural identity’ as it highlights the ability to mix with and relate to people from a wide range of backgrounds.

The proposed measure is a revised and expanded version of a question included in the CS, which attempts to capture the percentage of people who believe that people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area (that is, the area within 15-20 minute walking distance from where the respondent lives). Available data for England and Wales are reported above for illustrative purposes.

The results suggest a high degree of social cohesion in England and Wales with people from different 'backgrounds' mostly agreeing that they are able to get along with other groups. No obvious disparities emerge in comparing differences in responses across social class (occupation) or between men and women. Older people are more likely to agree than younger people. People who have no religion or a religion other than the six main religions are less likely to feel that people from different backgrounds get along in their area than are Christians, while Hindus report high levels of social cohesion. Disabled people report slightly lower levels of people getting along than non-disabled people, and Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual people report substantially lower levels than Straight people.

As mentioned in relation to indicator 1, the CS does not cover Scotland and consists of a relatively small sample in Wales, which means data from more than one year must be combined to monitor a reduced number of equality strands (gender, disability, age and social class only).

An alternative measure is available for Wales, that asks about the proportion of people who agree/ disagree that their neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds can live harmoniously (Living in Wales (LIW) Survey 2007, p. 37). This measure is based on a larger sample (almost 7,800 in 2007) and permits disaggregation by additional equality characteristics such as ethnicity and religion (see LIW 2008), although it is not yet clear if this measure will be included in the successor to the LIW Survey.

Given these remarks, the same two policy options advanced for the previous measure emerge. Either the question in the CS could be revised in line with the proposed Measure 2.1 and a question added to SHS; or fresh questions could be added to another survey such as the IHS.

The proposed revisions to the existing CS question reflect key insights from the specialist consultations. Several participants at the initial consultation event in London disputed the original wording, arguing that the term 'background' is likely to be interpreted narrowly to mean 'race' or 'religion' rather than more broadly to encompass other equality groups. The CS question is asked in the context of attitudes towards the local community and neighbourhood and is not preceded by questions on race or religion (as some participants thought might be the case). But the issue of how this question might be interpreted by different equality groups has not been directly investigated. Other participants argued the term 'background' is too broad or questioned the definition of 'community'.

Similar sentiments were raised at the Welsh consultation. Some participants argued the concept behind this indicator should be diversity rather than social cohesion. In other words, what really matters is being able to be different; be recognised for who you are; or put simply, the ability to express your identity. In a similar vein, others pointed to human rights issues, arguing that a person may get on well with others precisely because the person in question has chosen to sacrifice his or her cultural identity in order to be accepted by others. Finally, others pointed out that what is meant by 'local area' in Wales might differ from elsewhere, as it is often possible to walk for 15 or 20 minutes without coming across anyone else (which renders the original wording of the question in the CS unworkable).

Little in the way of additional feedback on this measure was received during the Scottish consultation; however, the web consultation underlined the difficulties associated with defining and capturing 'community' membership. For example, Stonewall argued the original question adopted in the CS will not capture the extent to which 'invisible' minorities are or feel part of the wider community. Asking individuals to what extent they feel different communities get along relies on them being able to identify and understand those communities. Thus, the extent to which people feel the lesbian, gay and bisexual community gets along with other local communities depends upon the identification or recognition of a local lesbian, gay and bisexual community, which is not necessarily 'visible', but which may have serious barriers to integration and poor relations with the wider community.

In an effort to deal with the concerns raised during the specialist consultations, the proposal is to refine the measure initially sourced from the CS in two ways. First, the proposed measure 2.1 refers to 'people with diverse backgrounds, beliefs and identities' (rather than 'people from different backgrounds'), which helps broaden coverage to include all equality strands and engage with issues of cultural diversity and identity. Second, the reference to the local area/community is dropped in favour of asking about where the respondent lives/works instead, which avoids many of the problems associated with defining and interpreting the former.

Table 12.2 Measure 1.1 (EW) Percentage who agree that people with different backgrounds get on well together in the local area

Authors' calculations using Citizenship Survey, 2007, England and Wales

| | % | Number (unweighted) |
|--|------|------------------------|
| All | 82 | 12,855 |
| Higher/lower managerial and professions | 84 | 4,006 |
| Intermediate occupations/ small employers | 83 | 2,285 |
| Lower supervisory & technical/semi-routine | 79** | 3,089 |
| Routine occupations | 81 | 1,396 |
| Never worked/ long-term unemployed | 81 | 1,051 |
| Students | 80 | 419 |
| Not stated/classified | 82 | 177 |
| Christian | 83 | 3,589 |
| Buddhist | 86 | 67 |
| Hindu | 87** | 551 |
| Jewish | 81 | 27 |
| Muslim | 85 | 1,426 |
| Sikh | 82 | 242 |
| Any other religion | 76** | 220 |
| No religion | 77** | 1,470 |
| Heterosexual or straight | 82 | 5,556 |
| Gay, lesbian or bisexual | 73** | 66 |
| Prefer not to say | 80 | 167 |
| White | 82 | 2,361 |
| Indian | 86** | 1,019 |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | 84 | 819 |
| Black | 82 | 1,151 |
| Mixed | 77 | 216 |
| Other | 84 | 482 |
| Men | 82 | 5,617 |
| Women | 81 | 6,816 |
| Age 18-24 | 75 | 1,031 |
| Age 25-44 | 79 | 5,173 |
| Age 45-64 | 83** | 3,623 |
| Age 65-74 | 87** | 1,327 |
| Age 75 plus | 91** | 989 |
| Non-disabled | 82 | 9,948 |
| Disabled | 80** | 2,432 |

** indicates figures is statistically significantly different from first category listed in group, at 95 per cent level. Statistical significance has been calculated taking into account the complex sampling structure of the CS.

Note: 3.3 per cent of respondents spontaneously say that their area is too small or too homogenous to answer this question.

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

Measure 3.1: Percentage who have the opportunity to communicate in the language of their choice (a) at work/study, (b) when accessing services

Source: Living in Wales Survey (subject to revision) plus new data required

Sub-domains: D

Evaluation of measure 3.1 against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|--|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Strong |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Not available |
| | - within England | Not available |
| | - within Scotland | Not available |
| | - within Wales | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class collected But sample size too small to disaggregate by ethnicity or religion/belief even if combining 3 years of data |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Annually (between 2004 and 2008) |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | N/A |

Measure 3.1 is defined as the percentage of people who indicate they have the opportunity to communicate in the language of their choice (a) at work or study; and (b) when assessing services.

Few data are available for monitoring freedom to communicate in the language of first choice in various different contexts and settings. However, the LIW Survey does provide some information on the proportion of people able to access public services in their preferred language if their preferred language is other than English – usually Welsh (LIW 2007). The questions are asked only if respondents have previously expressed a preference for a language other than English (approximately 26 per cent of the total sample in 2006) (Welsh Assembly Government 2009, p.5). This implies that disaggregation by equality strand (other than gender, disability, age and broad social class) will be difficult due to sample size (around 2,000 observations in the 2006 survey).

Plenty of information is currently available for the incidence of language use across institutions in Wales (Welsh Language Board, 2007, tables 2 and 3), but this only partially addresses these concerns. Some information is also available on the number and type of websites in Wales that offer the user a choice of language (Welsh Language Board, pp. 30-31).

Given the lack of existing data, it is recommended that suitable questions to cover Measure 3.1 are added to the IHS or to surveys in each of England, Scotland and Wales. The questions should include places of work or study as well as access to services, and should allow for languages other than English or Welsh, including sign languages. A follow-up question should ask whether respondents who are not able to communicate in their language of choice have access to facilitation or translation services.

Measure 3.1 emerged from feedback received at the specialist consultations. Two distinct arguments emerged from consultation exercises with respect to the communication sub-domain, which covers use of own language and information technology. First, it was suggested that use of English (or one of the other national languages) is centrally important if disadvantaged groups are to communicate effectively in Britain. It was widely felt, particularly at initial consultations held in London, that this measure would capture a more salient aspect of inequality in Britain than the ability to communicate using information technology or the internet. Being able to communicate in English (or Welsh) is included under the Education and Learning domain and discussed further in chapter 8. However, the Education and Learning indicator does not incorporate the person's freedom to communicate in their preferred language in different settings – the priority for an indicator in the Identity, Expression and Self-respect domain.

Second, it was argued, particularly at the Welsh event, that the cultural freedom to use the language of first choice in a broad range of contexts is fundamentally important. The ability to use preferred language may vary in different settings (the home, the workplace, during education or at the point of accessing services, etc) and is important not only for Welsh speakers, but for anyone who speaks a language other than English (for example, Scottish Gaelic, Bengali, Punjabi, Urdu or Polish among many other languages currently spoken in Britain). Measure 3.1 covers these concerns.

The difficulties facing disabled people and the importance of barriers to communication were identified as key issues at specialist consultations. At the first round of consultations, it was argued that people with sensory impairments or learning difficulties may face particular barriers to communication that should be

reflected in the proposed measure. In particular, it may be necessary to ask about the availability of communication support where needed. Similar issues were raised at the Welsh consultation event, where lack of access to translation, facilitation and alternative formats were cited as important issues. Measure 3.1 helps to address some of these concerns, as the language of choice can clearly include British Sign Language and a follow-up question could explicitly ask about access to translation and facilitation and alternative information formats (among other things).

Indicator 4: Self-respect**Measure 4.1: Mean score on Rosenberg's self-esteem scale**

Source: New data collection required

Sub-domains: F

Evaluation of measure 4.1 against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Good |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Not available |
| | - within England | Not available |
| | - within Scotland | Not available |
| | - within Wales | Not available |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | N/A |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | N/A |

A measure of self-respect based on Morris Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale is recommended as our fourth indicator for this domain. The survey instrument normally consists of ten items assessed along a four point scale (see CBSS 2009; EIB n.d.):

Please say whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements:

1. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.
2. At times I think that I am no good at all.
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I certainly feel useless at times.
7. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least the equal of others.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Items are assigned a score between 3 (strongly agree) and 0 (strongly disagree). The scoring for items 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are reversed. Higher scores reflect higher self-

esteem. Scores between 15 and 25 are typically considered to be in the normal range, although there are no discrete cut-off points to distinguish high and low self-esteem (for further discussions see Rosenberg 1965; Crandal 1973; Wylie 1974).

The original measure was applied to a sample of 5,024 High School students in ten randomly selected schools in New York State. The measure has subsequently been widely used in social science. It has also been validated for use with a range of population groups, including men and women, adolescents, adults and the elderly (for example EIB 2009). It has also been used to investigate self-esteem among disabled people and those with learning difficulties and mental illness (for example Nosek et al 2003; Dagnan and Sandhu 2001; van Dongen 1996).

While Rosenberg's self-esteem scale has been used in a variety of contexts around the world, it has not yet been applied at the regional or country level in Britain. It is therefore recommended that relevant questions should be added to a self-completion component of the IHS or to Understanding Society (the UK Household Longitudinal Survey or UKHLS).

Self-respect is an essential component of human well-being that is inextricably linked with inequality, disadvantage and human rights concerns in many complex ways (Clark 2002; Narayan et al 2000; Sennett and Cobb 1972). It is worth noting that self-respect should not be confused with the 'need for respect for others' (Maslow 1987). Nor should it be conflated with the ability to avoid shame or humiliation for which separate measures are available (see Clark 2008; Reyles 2007, and Indicator 5 below).

The importance of self-respect was underlined at the consultation events. While most participants were willing to endorse the scale, a number of issues and questions were raised. First, it was noted that links between mental health and social deprivation are highly relevant. In particular, concern was expressed about discrimination against people with mental health problems. Thus, there are likely to be important interactions between self-respect on the one hand and being subject to unfair treatment or discrimination on the other. The fifth measure recommended for this domain (levels of accumulated humiliation) helps address these concerns.

Second, some participants wanted to know whether the self-esteem measure has been validated among different cultural groups or if meaning might be lost following translation into different languages. These are important concerns in an increasingly multicultural and multilingual society. We have already noted that Rosenberg's self-esteem scale has been validated for use with different population groups. It has also

been applied around the world and translated into many different languages (see Pullmann and Allik 2000; Santos and Maia 2003; Martín-Albo 2007; EIB 2009).

Third, during the Welsh consultations it was suggested that different cultural groups may have differing ideas about what 'respect' means. In a similar vein, some participants at the London-based consultations criticised Rosenberg's measure for being too individualistic and for drawing too heavily on psychology. Specifically, it was suggested that the self-esteem scale might be supplemented with an additional measure that focuses on how individuals feel as part of a broader social group. In particular, the point was made that some people can have high levels of self-respect, while feeling that their ethnic or social group is not well-respected by society. Others argued that a sense of worth and self-respect varies over life spans (for example a young gay adult may work through issues and acquire more self-respect in later life). These concerns are harder to incorporate within the confines of a single headline measure.

Indicator 5: Freedom from stigma**Measure 5.1: Mean accumulated humiliation score**

Source: New data collection required

Sub-domains: G and H

Evaluation of measure 5.1 against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Good |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Not available |
| | - within England | Not available |
| | - within Scotland | Not available |
| | - within Wales | Not available |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Process |
| 6 | Frequency | N/A |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | N/A |

The fifth and final measure draws on recent work on internationally comparable development indicators completed by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative at the University of Oxford (see Alkire 2007). Following Reyles' (2007) contribution, various measures of stigma, shame-proneness and humiliation have been considered as potential indicators.

The proposed measure (measure 5.1) aims to capture the **internal experience of humiliation** defined in terms of Hartling and Luchetta's (1999) Humiliation Inventory Scale. This scale is basically a condensed and amalgamated version of two different sub-scales, and has the dual advantage of being practical (easy to incorporate in existing surveys without taking up too much space), and capturing both the cumulative effect of past discrimination on the one hand, and the current fear of humiliation on the other.

Levels of accumulated humiliation are assessed in terms of a five-point scale ranging from 'Not at all (1)' to 'Extremely (5)' (Reyles 2007, table 6):

- Throughout your life how seriously have you felt harmed by being
- 1) excluded?
 - 2) put down?

- 3) ridiculed?
- 4) discounted?
- 5) cruelly criticized?
- 6) called names or referred to in derogatory terms?

Higher scores signify higher levels of accumulated humiliation.

While measures of internal humiliation have been applied to relatively small population groups within the social sciences (notably Hartling and Luchetta 1999), they have not yet been included in regional or country level surveys in Britain. It is therefore recommended that the above question is added to a self-completion module, for example in the IHS or Understanding Society (the UKHLS).

Following feedback from the specialist consultations, a decision was taken to replace the measure of harassment proposed in the Identity, Expression and Self-respect briefing paper (Clark 2008) with the above measure of humiliation. The original measure was based on a LIW question about the experience discrimination, harassment or victimisation in the last five years. A report by the Local Government Data Unit - Wales (2008) found that 12 per cent of respondents had some such experience, and that in one quarter of cases the reason cited was race. Age, gender, disability and sexual orientation were each mentioned by around 5 per cent of respondents.

The harassment measure originally proposed was criticised by consultation participants for being too narrow and overlapping too much with the proposed measure in the Physical Security domain on hate crime. In particular, participants were worried that discrimination, harassment or victimisation might be interpreted largely in terms of crime. We are including a similar measure, based on self-reported hate crime from the British Crime Survey in the indicators for the Physical Security domain (see chapter 6). It was also argued that relatively minor forms of harassment experienced on a regular or ongoing basis would be overlooked by this measure. In contrast, the proposed measure of humiliation is considerably less susceptible to these sorts of criticisms. In fact it explicitly incorporates relatively minor forms of harassment (name calling, ridicule and hurtful criticism) experienced on a regular basis (that is, over the course of the person's life).

Another reason for including measure 5.1 is explicit recognition of the significance of stigma for disadvantaged groups. As we have seen, the importance of being made to feel humiliated or ashamed as a result of other people's expectations or assumptions has been emphasised by leading philosophers (notably Adam Smith 1776 and Amartya Sen 1999) and repeatedly discussed in a range of social and psychological

studies. In particular, feelings of shame and humiliation are closely associated with a wide range of social, economic and institutional forms of inequality and human rights concerns.

Recommendations

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

All five proposed measures have strong relevance and legitimacy. In other words, they are relevant for all equality strands and were widely endorsed, in their revised forms, at specialist consultations.

In contrast to most other domains, available data for monitoring salient aspects of inequality and human rights concerns in the area of Identity, Expression and Self-respect is poor. Two measures (4.1 and 5.1) are based on questionnaire instruments which have been developed and tested but are not currently incorporated into any UK surveys. Questions in the LIW survey provide a starting point for a third measure (3.1), and questions in the CS could be revised to meet the requirements of measures 1.1 and 2.1.

To ensure coverage for Scotland, similar questions would need to be adopted in the SHS or other Scottish source. There is currently limited potential for disaggregation within Wales based on the CS; options include adding a boost to the CS in Wales, or adding equivalent questions to the LIW survey or its successor. Alternatively new questions could be added to the IHS or to Understanding Society (the UKHLS). Data from these much larger surveys would permit disaggregation across equality strands in all three countries.

The following recommendations emerge from this chapter:

- The existing measure of religious freedom in the CS should be expanded to include (non-religious) beliefs.
- The existing measure of cultural identity and expression in the CS should be revised to cover diversity of backgrounds, beliefs and identities in clearly defined contexts (the neighbourhood, the workplace).
- A new measure of the ability to communicate in the workplace or when accessing services in the language of choice should be developed, using the LIW questions as a starting point, with follow-up questions asking about access to facilitation and translation support.

Finally, new data should be collected to monitor self-respect and stigma, which represent two extremely important psychosocial aspects of inequality and disadvantage. Specifically, Rosenberg's self-esteem scale and a measure of accumulated humiliation should be added to a self-completion component of the IHS or Understanding Society (the UKHLS).

These recommendations should plug most of the gaps in existing data for this domain. As with other domains, separate monitoring will be required for the transgender community and non-household population groups such as the homeless, Gypsies and Travellers, those living in residential care homes and prisoners who are typically excluded from household surveys (see general recommendations in chapter 15).

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

The proposed indicators strike a good balance across the Identity, Expression and Self-respect domain, including freedom of religion and belief (sub-domain A), those believing people with different backgrounds, identities and beliefs get on well together (sub domains B and E), the opportunity to communicate in the language of first choice (sub-domain D), the ability to have self-respect (sub-domain F) and being free of stigma (sub-domains G and H). The most notable gap is freedom of expression (sub-domain C), which is only partially covered by the first two indicators. A measure for access and use of public spaces (sub-domain I) is included in the Physical Security domain (see chapter 6).

The proposed measures should capture inequalities at the top and the bottom of the distribution reasonably well. The measures of 'getting on well-together', communication in the language of preference and self-respect are likely to perform especially well. In contrast, freedom of religion/belief and stigma are more sensitive at the lower end of the distribution.

In contrast to other domains, all of the shortlisted measures in this chapter are subjective, which reflects the nature of this domain and the issues under consideration which largely relate to mental states or rely upon individuals' perceptions of inequality or human rights violations. On the other hand, this domain does include both outcome and process indicators. Finally, it is worth noting that this domain includes three measures (freedom of religion/belief, self-respect, stigma) that are also highly relevant for the autonomy aspect of inequality.

We recommend:

- The CS gives consideration to expanding the question wording on being able to practice your religion freely, to cover 'religion or belief' (measure 1.1).
- The CS gives consideration to revising the question wording on belief that people from different backgrounds get on well together in the local area, to reflect (i) the more inclusive concept of diverse backgrounds, beliefs and identities, (ii) a distinction between where people live and where people work/study (measure 2.1).
- EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations work with data providers and experts to develop a new measure of the ability to communicate in the workplace or when accessing services in the language of choice, using the LIW questions as a starting point, with follow-up questions asking about access to facilitation and translation services for those with communication impairments or unable to use their language of choice (measure 3.1).
- EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations seek funding and support for including measures of self-respect and of stigma (see measures 4.1 and 5.1) in a self-completion component of Understanding Society (the UKHLS) or the IHS. The relevant questionnaire instruments are already developed and tested.