

9. Standard of living

Domain: The capability to enjoy a comfortable standard of living, with independence and security

Sub-domains:

- A. enjoy an adequate and secure standard of living including nutrition, clothing, housing, warmth, social security, social services and utilities, and being cared for and supported when necessary;
- B. get around inside and outside the home, and to access transport and public places;
- C. live with independence, dignity and self-respect;
- D. have choice and control over where and how you live;
- E. have control over personal spending;
- F. enjoy your home in peace and security;
- G. access green spaces and the natural world; and
- H. share in the benefits of scientific progress including medical advances and information and technology.

Final short list

Indicator 1: Housing quality and security

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

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

Indicator 2: Poverty and security of income

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

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

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

Indicator 3: Access to care

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator 4: Quality of the local area

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator 1: Housing quality and security**Measure 1.1 (E): Percentage of individuals living in non-decent, overcrowded or unadapted accommodation (England)**

Source: English Housing Survey (part of Integrated Household Survey in future)

Measure 1.1 (S): Percentage of individuals living in substandard, overcrowded or unadapted accommodation (Scotland)

Source: Scottish House Condition Survey, including social survey

Measure 1.1 (W): Percentage of individuals living in substandard, overcrowded or unadapted accommodation (Wales)

Source: Living in Wales property survey and household survey

Sub-domains: A, C and D

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, religion/belief, social class |
| | - within Scotland | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age But sample size may be too small to disaggregate by ethnicity |
| | - within Wales | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, social class collected But sample size too small to disaggregate by ethnicity and social class will need to be in wide bands |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Continuous/annual (England; Scotland); frequency in Wales to be decided |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Measure 1.1 for each of England, Scotland and Wales, reflects housing quality – which is relevant primarily to sub-domain A (standard of living), but also to C (living with independence, dignity and respect) and D (choice and control over where and how you live); while Measure 1.2 – discussed in more detail below - reflects the extent to which individuals can enjoy their home in peace and security (sub-domain F).

Each country in Great Britain has its own definitions and data sources in relation to housing quality. However the English understanding of non-decent homes, the Welsh definition of homes failing the Welsh Housing Quality Standard and the Scottish dwellings that fall below the Scottish Housing Quality Standard capture similar concepts of being warm and free from damp, weatherproof and having reasonably modern facilities. They can be considered broadly comparable. In addition, all three recognise the concept of overcrowding and the surveys also include questions on whether accommodation is unsuitable for its occupants because adaptations needed to facilitate the occupants' mobility around or into and out of the house, or to use its facilities, have not been made. In line with consultation responses, we have included these three components (quality of accommodation, overcrowding and whether unadapted) for this measure.

Because all three property surveys are embedded within, or associated with, a household survey, information about individuals can be linked to information about their home, and this allows disaggregation by a good range of equality characteristics, with the exception of sexual orientation. The English survey has about 8,000 properties each year matched with information on household members, the Scottish survey has about 3,000 and the Welsh survey about 2,500. The smaller sample sizes in Scotland and Wales restrict the disaggregation potential by religion/belief and ethnicity.

The Integrated Household Survey (of which the English Housing Survey will be a part) will adopt a question on sexual orientation following completion of the ONS pilot study, and the Scottish Government has indicated an intention to expand the range of surveys it funds which include sexual orientation questions, so the future potential for disaggregation by sexual orientation also looks promising. The Scottish House Condition Survey could usefully add religion/belief and social class to the characteristics of household members it records in the social survey questionnaire.

One key omission from this indicator is people who are homeless. Many potential measures of homelessness were discussed during the first and second rounds of specialist consultation, but none were regarded as adequate. They included a measure of the number of households accepted as homeless and placed in temporary accommodation, but participants argued such measures were (a) too susceptible to manipulation, for example, by re-housing families in other equally unsuitable but not 'temporary' accommodation, or not accepting them as homeless in the first place; (b) an inadequate measure of homelessness; and (c) could not be disaggregated by many equality characteristics.

Other possible indicators on homelessness include administrative statistics from other stages of the homelessness registration process (households found to be homeless; households accepted for re-housing), and counts of rough sleepers. The former suffers from similar problems to those identified by participants in the consultation for the measure of households in temporary accommodation; the latter is potentially important as an indicator of a very basic human rights deprivation, and should be considered as part of a broader strategy for data collection on the non-household population. Some other population groups of particular significance from an equality and human rights perspective are also unlikely to be well covered by household survey data, including Gypsies and Travellers, and asylum seekers (see general recommendations in Chapter 15).

Measure 1.2: Percentage who were a victim of domestic burglary or vandalism to the home in the last 12 months

Sub-domain: F

Sources: British Crime Survey; Scottish Crime and Justice Survey

Evaluation of measure 1.2 against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Strong |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, social class |
| | - within England | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class |
| | - within Scotland | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, social class. Sample size for disaggregation by ethnicity to be checked in follow-up project. |
| | - within Wales | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class But sample size too small for disaggregation by ethnicity, sexual orientation or religion/belief even if combining 3 years of data |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Annual |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Measure 1.2, on security of the home, was included in the provisional shortlist for the first round of specialist consultation, but was dropped in response to feedback that it was not a sufficiently high priority for inclusion in the Standard of Living domain, especially since physical security of the person, including domestic violence, were already included in the Physical Security domain. However, participants in the

second round of specialist consultation, including the events in Scotland and Wales, disagreed, and this measure has therefore been re-instated.

Inclusion of a measure of this kind can also be seen as justified on the grounds that it is an important component of the overall description of this domain: the capability to enjoy a comfortable standard of living, with independence **and security**, and has been included in international best practice in developing indicators of valuable human freedoms (Diprose, 2007).

The British Crime Survey (BCS) covers England and Wales and the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) covers Scotland. There are some definitional and methodological differences between the surveys (for example, BCS results use the term 'burglary' while Scottish crime statistics refer to 'housebreaking') but the differences in this area are sufficiently minor to permit comparison between the surveys.

Careful consideration was given to which elements of property crime to include in this measure. Although theft of, or vandalism to, a vehicle can also be distressing and disruptive to the victim's standard of living, on balance it seemed preferable to retain the focus of this measure on the home. Theft from the person was rejected for similar reasons; any violence associated with such an incident would be picked up in the Physical Security domain.

Table 9.1 Measure 1.2 (EW) Percentage who were a victim of domestic burglary/vandalism in the last 12 months

Authors' calculations using British Crime Survey, 2007/8, England and Wales

| | % |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| All | 3.9 |
| Socio-economic group | |
| managerial and professional | 4.0 |
| intermediate | 3.5 |
| small employers and own a/c | 3.2 |
| lower supervisory and technical | 4.0 |
| semi-routine and routine | 3.8 |
| never worked and long-term u/e | 4.2 |
| FT students | 4.9 |
| not classified | 3.9 |
| Male | 3.7 |
| Female | 4.0 |
| White | 3.7 |
| Black and Black British | 5.0 |
| Asian and Asian British | 4.1 |
| Mixed | 6.0 |
| Chinese or Other | 5.5 |
| Non-disabled | 3.8 |
| Disabled | 4.5** |
| Age 16-24 | 4.5 |
| Age 25-44 | 4.2 |
| Age 45-64 | 4.1** |
| Age 65-74 | 2.4** |
| Age 75+ | 2.5** |
| No religion | 4.0 |
| Christian | 3.8 |
| Buddhist | 2.3 |
| Hindu | 3.0 |
| Jewish | 4.9 |
| Muslim | 4.7 |
| Sikh | 5.7 |
| Other | 5.8 |

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

Note: Although differences between each ethnic group and White majority are not statistically significant, a comparison of White and non-White indicates significantly higher risk among ethnic minorities as a whole.

Indicator 2: Poverty and security of income**Measure 2.1: Percentage of individuals living in households below 60 per cent of contemporary median income, after housing costs**

Source: Households Below Average Income and Family Resources Survey

Sub-domains: A, C, D, E

Evaluation of measure 2.1 against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Strong |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, social class |
| | - within England | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, social class |
| | - within Scotland | Gender, ethnicity (combining 3 years), disability, age, social class |
| | - within Wales | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, social class collected But sample size too small to disaggregate by ethnicity, even if combining years |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Annual |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes – but based on household income |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Measure 2.2: Mean deprivation score among those above the income poverty threshold

Source: Family Resources Survey **plus new data collection needed**

Sub-domains: A, C, D, E

Evaluation of measure 2.2 against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Strong |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, social class |
| | - within England | As for GB |
| | - within Scotland | Gender, ethnicity (combining 3 years), disability, age, social class |
| | - within Wales | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, social class collected |

| | | |
|---|----------------------|---|
| | | But sample size too small to disaggregate by ethnicity, even if combining years |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Annual |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes – though some components household level |
| 8 | Robustness | Adequate |

Measure 2.3: Share of total personal wealth relative to share of population

Source: Wealth and Assets Survey

Sub-domains: A, C, D, E

Evaluation against essential selection criteria:

| | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|
| 1 | Relevance | All equality characteristics |
| 2 | Legitimacy | Strong |
| 3/4 | Disaggregation | |
| | - at GB level | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, same-sex cohabitation, social class |
| | - within England | As for GB |
| | - within Scotland | Not yet known |
| | - within Wales | Not yet known |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Two-yearly (panel) |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes – but based on household wealth |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Income and wealth are the most commonly used indicators of living standards and are readily comparable across people and across time. Measure 2.1 focuses on income poverty, while measure 2.3 considers inequalities in the distribution of wealth (including debt). Both reflect the level of a person's standard of living, and wealth is also useful as an indication of the degree of security in a person's standard of living, for example if they were to experience a sudden fall in their income.

Income and wealth are indirect and in some ways limited measures of standards of living, because they focus on the means to securing a standard of living rather than standard of living itself. A deprivation score, the metric used for Measure 2.2, is a more direct measure, since it focuses on particular goods and services a person is unable to afford. However it is less comprehensive than income or wealth, both in terms of its vertical range (high to low) and in terms of its breadth (the aspects of

standard of living it captures). Measure 2.2 should therefore be read in conjunction with the other two measures.

The source for Measures 2.1 and 2.2 is the Family Resources Survey (FRS), from which the Households Below Average Income (HBAI) series is derived. It facilitates disaggregation by a wide range of equality characteristics. Questions about sexual orientation and religion/belief would need to be added to disaggregate by these characteristics. The HBAI sample size is such that three years of data in Scotland need to be combined to gain within-country disaggregation by ethnicity (assuming minimum cell size of 30 is acceptable); and for Wales 4 years, which is considered too broad a timespan to be useful for the purposes of the EMF.

Limitations in standard poverty measurements were discussed during the consultation. Since income is measured at a household level, only some aspects of gender inequality in incomes are reflected in measure 2.1, namely, those affecting single-adult households (for instance, lone parents and single elderly). Earnings inequality, including the gender pay gap, is included as an indicator for the Productive and Valued Activities domain. Other aspects of unequal intra-household distribution of resources could in principle be picked up in Measure 2.2 (see below).

The extra costs of living incurred by disabled people are also not reflected in standard measures of income poverty, despite a range of methodologies being available (for example, Zaidi and Burchardt, 2005). One way forward would be to present results without adjustment for extra costs (to retain comparability with official statistics) and also with adjustment (providing a more accurate reflection of the circumstances of disabled people relative to the rest of the population). Measure 2.2 is also informative here, since extra costs are likely to mean a higher proportion of disabled people experience deprivation at a given level of income, compared to non-disabled people. This is indeed suggested by the figures in the table above.

There are alternatives for a number of aspects of the definition of measure 2.1: for example, using a threshold of 50 per cent of contemporary median, 1998/99 median income uprated in line with prices, or using a before housing costs (BHC) measure. The reason for proposing low income after housing costs (AHC) is that housing costs represent a very significant part of household expenses especially for those on low incomes and that they vary considerably throughout Great Britain. The threshold of 60 per cent of median income is a commonly used as a central estimate of poverty (for example in the Households Below Average Income series), and features in Public Service Agreement (PSA) 9 indicator 2, PSA 17 indicator 2 (for children and pensioners respectively) and Scottish National Indicator 14. It was also recommended by Walby and colleagues (2008) in their Review of Equality Statistics,

in both the AHC and BHC forms. A number of different equivalisation scales are in use; the HBAI publication now uses the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Companion scale for AHC incomes and it is proposed to follow this practice for measure 2.1.

Consultation respondents differed in their views about whether we should adopt the AHC or BHC definition of income. The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) produce all their reports with both versions of income, and argued in their consultation response that either can be misleading on its own. On the other hand, a submission from the Welsh Assembly Government said that they preferred the AHC measure. Given the imperative to limit the overall numbers of measures, we recommend using the AHC measure as the headline indicator and referring readers to other sources, such as the HBAI reports, for statistics using BHC income.

A number of consultation respondents in the first round and at the Welsh event thought we should consider including a measure of persistent poverty. Persistent poverty is included in the HBAI tables, based on data from the British Household Panel Survey. Although it provides useful information about a particularly serious form of poverty, inequalities in the risk of persistent poverty do not take a significantly different pattern to inequalities in cross-sectional poverty (see, for example, DWP, 2007), so we do not think that adding an additional measure is justified.

Respondents to both rounds of specialist consultation were keen to point out that whatever definition of income we use, the disaggregations of income poverty by equality characteristic need to be contextualised by an overall measure of income inequality (the stretch of the distribution as a whole), such as the Gini coefficient or the ratio of the 90th percentile to the 10th percentile of the distribution.

For Measure 2.2, further development is needed and to some extent is already underway. Existing FRS deprivation questions were developed to help measure child poverty, and although they are asked of all family types, they are not well-designed to capture deprivation for other parts of the population. For a list of goods and activities which have been deemed to be 'necessities', one respondent per household is asked whether they have the item, and if not, whether this is because they don't want it or can't afford it. Those who can't afford the item are counted as deprived in that particular respect, and a deprivation score is calculated based on a weighted sum of the items on which the respondent is deprived. The weights are 'prevalence weights', that is, they are proportional to the percentage of the population who have the item in question (lacking an item which a larger proportion of the rest of the population have, is thus treated as a more serious deprivation than lacking an item which many other people also lack).

For working-age adults, the existing questions have two limitations. Firstly, many of them relate to household-level items (such as keeping the house warm, or being able to replace furniture), and secondly they are asked of only one individual per household. This limits the possibility of using the deprivation data to examine within-household inequalities, for example by gender. Two of the existing FRS questions are in principle individual-level indicators:

- Do you have a small amount of money to spend each week on yourself (not on your family)?
- And do you have a hobby or leisure activity?

We recommend that these questions are in future asked of all adult members of the household. We also recommend that the range of questions suitable for detecting intra-household inequalities – namely those that relate to individual deprivation rather than household deprivation - be expanded. Questions used in other surveys (such as the 1999 Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey) could be a useful starting point.

Despite the predominance of household-level questions in the suite of questions on deprivation in the existing FRS, a deprivation score based on the existing questions is still revealing with respect to the extra costs of disability – see table above. Disabled people and their households often face higher costs of living through, for example, paying for aids and adaptations, additional household costs (heating, clothing, special diets), and transport. This means the same level of income translates into a lower standard of living (or, conversely, a higher risk of deprivation) for a household containing a disabled person than for an otherwise similar household not containing a disabled person. This difference is ignored in standard income poverty measures but can be detected by comparing deprivation scores of disabled and non-disabled people and their families above the income poverty line: the average deprivation score of families containing a disabled adult is around twice that of families without a disabled adult. A similar analysis by ethnicity suggests that Black and Black British families are at greater risk of experiencing material deprivation than White families, even when they are above the income poverty threshold. This is consistent with findings in Brewer and colleagues (2008).

For pensioners, research has found that they are unwilling to state that they ‘can’t afford’ basic necessities, even when they have low incomes (McKay, 2008). New questions have now been developed for pensioners, permitting a wider range of reasons for lacking basic goods and services to be recorded, and these are being implemented in the FRS in 2008/9. The first published results are not expected to be available before 2011, however. When they become available, they could also be

used to look at material deprivation among the non-income poor above state pension age.

Measure 2.2 (deprivation) is included in response to comments at both rounds of consultation. Participants in the first round of consultation discussed the pros and cons but were not decisively in favour. In the second round, including the Scottish and Welsh events, stronger support for a deprivation measure was expressed, although as an adjunct to, rather than as a substitute for, the income poverty measure. In particular, participants were keen to capture aspects of low standard of living not detected by a household income poverty measure – especially important for women and disabled people. For this reason, the form of measure 2.2 we are recommending differs from that usually employed by DWP. DWP report those who have a deprivation score above a given level **and** fall below an income poverty line (usually 70 per cent of median income, a slightly higher threshold than that used for the low income statistics). Instead, measure 2.2 focuses on the deprivation scores of those not captured by an income-poverty measure. Inequalities in this measure, read in conjunction with inequalities in the risk of poverty (measure 2.1) will provide a more comprehensive understanding of inequalities in standards of living.

Measure 2.3 (wealth, including debt) was added in response to the first round of specialist consultation. The proposed measure is the share of total personal wealth held by individuals with a given equality characteristic, compared to their share of the population. For example, if women make up 50 per cent of the population but hold only 20 per cent of total personal wealth, that indicates an inequality. It is important that the measure captures inequality at the top of the distribution as well as at the bottom.

A new survey, the Wealth and Assets Survey has effectively 30,000 fully or partially responding households over the two years 2006 to 2008 (excluding a boost sample of the most wealthy). Although the data are not yet public, we understand they will be able to be disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity, disability, same-sex cohabitation, and social class at GB level. The Welsh Assembly Government are considering adding a boost to facilitate fuller analysis within Wales.

A precise measure will need to be developed once the data are made available (expected in 2009). Some general matters of definition were discussed through the consultation:

- housing wealth and debt can be measured only at the household level and is not a liquid asset - on the other hand it is one of the main sources of wealth and wealth inequality, so it probably should be included in an overall measure;

- debt is crucially important and should be included;
- it is to be expected that people will accumulate and decumulate wealth at different points in the lifecycle, so this may need to be an age-specific measure.

In order to make room for the measures of deprivation and of wealth and debt, we have dropped a measure which was presented and discussed at the first round of specialist consultation, namely, the proportion of individuals living in households with AHC income in the top quintile, by equality characteristics (based on HBAI). This is a measure of inequality at the top of the income distribution, which we believe would be highly correlated with the measure of wealth and assets now selected for the shortlist.

Table 9.2 Measure 2.1 Percentage of individuals living in households below 60 per cent of median income, after housing costs, UK

Published statistics from Households Below Average Income, 2006/7, UK

| | Adults of working age % | Individuals in pensioner households % |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Men | 19 | 17 |
| Women | 21 | 20 |
| Age 60-64 | | 17 |
| Age 65-69 | | 16 |
| Age 70-74 | | 17 |
| Age 75-79 | | 21 |
| Age 80-84 | | 21 |
| Age 85+ | | 25 |
| White | 18 | 17 |
| Mixed | 37 | 25 |
| Indian | 22 | 29 |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | 58 | 43 |
| Black/Black British | 38 | 29 |
| Other | 35 | 30 |
| No disability in household | 18 | 20 |
| Disabled child, no disabled adult | 28 | |
| Disabled adult, no disabled child | 30 | 18 |
| Disabled adult and disabled child | 31 | |

Note: Breakdown by ethnicity among pensioners uses 3-year average

Table 9.3 Measure 2.1 Percentage of individuals living in households below 60 per cent of median income by occupational class, after housing costs, UK

Authors' calculations using Family Resources Survey and Households Below Average Income dataset, 2006/7, UK

| | Adults of working age % |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| managers & senior officials | 9 |
| professional occupations | 6 |
| associate prof. & technical occupa | 8 |
| admin & secretarial occupations | 10 |
| skilled trades occupations | 15 |
| personal service occupations | 13 |
| sales & customer service | 19 |
| process, plant & machine operatives | 15 |
| elementary occupations | 24 |
| undefined | 46 |

Table 9.4 Measure 2.1 (S) Percentage of individuals living in households below 60 per cent of median income, after housing costs

Authors' calculations using Family Resources Survey and Households Below Average Income dataset, 2006/7, Scotland

| | Adults of working age % | Individuals in pensioner households % |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Men | 15 | 15 |
| Women | 16 | 16 |
| Age 16-24 | 22 | |
| Age 25-44 | 15 | |
| Age 45-64 | 15 | |
| Age 65-74 | | 13 |
| Age 75+ | | 17 |
| Disabled adult | 32 | 15 |
| Non-disabled adult | 13 | 16 |
| Occupational class | | |
| managers & senior officials | 8 | |
| professional occupations | 4 | |
| associate prof. & technical occupa | 7 | |
| admin & secretarial occupations | 6 | |
| skilled trades occupations | 13 | |
| personal service occupations | 8 | |
| sales & customer service | 17 | |
| process, plant & m/c operatives | 6 | |
| elementary occupations | 19 | |
| undefined | 43 | |

Note: Disaggregation by ethnicity within Scotland will require combining 3 years of survey data.

Table 9.5 Measure 2.1 (W) Percentage of individuals living in households below 60 per cent of median income, after housing costs

Authors' calculations using Family Resources Survey and Households Below Average Income dataset, 2006/7, Wales

| | Adults of working age % | Individuals in pensioner households % |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Men | 18 | 17 |
| Women | 19 | 21 |
| Age 16-24 | 27 | |
| Age 25-44 | 21 | |
| Age 45-64 | 13 | |
| Age 65-74 | | 17 |
| Age 75+ | | 23 |
| Disabled adult | 30 | 19 |
| Non-disabled adult | 17 | 19 |
| Occupational class | | |
| managers & senior officials | 8 | |
| professional occupations | 9 | |
| associate prof. & technical occupa | 6 | |
| admin & secretarial occupations | 10 | |
| skilled trades occupations | 13 | |
| personal service occupations | 8 | |
| sales & customer service | 13 | |
| process, plant & machine | | |
| operatives | 9 | |
| elementary occupations | 22 | |
| undefined | 49 | |

Note: Disaggregation by ethnicity within Wales will require combining 4 years of survey data, or 3 years if pensioners and non-pensioners are analysed jointly.

Table 9.6 Measure 2.2 Working-age families with or without children, above 60 per cent median income poverty threshold

Authors' calculations using Family Resources Survey, 2006/7, UK

| | Adult deprivation score | Statistical significance |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| No disabled adult in family | 0.75 | |
| One disabled adult | 1.43 | ** |
| Two disabled adults | 1.28 | ** |
| White | 0.93 | |
| Mixed | 0.58 | |
| Indian | 0.83 | |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | 1.38 | |
| Black / Black British | 1.72 | ** |
| Other | 0.91 | |

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first sub-group listed in group (at 95 per cent level)

Indicator 3: Access to care**Measure 3.1: Percentage of disabled people (including older people) who do not receive practical support that meets their needs**

Source: Life Opportunities Survey (Longitudinal Disability Survey)

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

Source: English Longitudinal Study of Ageing

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

Source: Scottish Household Survey

Sub-domains: A, B, C, 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 yet available |
| | - within England | Gender, ethnicity, disability, (age), social class |
| | - within Scotland | Gender, ethnicity (combining years), disability, age, religion/belief (combining years), social class |
| | - within Wales | Not yet available. Gender, disability, age, social class expected. |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Annual |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Participants in the first round of the specialist consultation argued that access to care and support needed to be more fully reflected in the shortlisted indicators across all the domains. In particular, access to effective and high-quality care and support, whether formal or informal, is essential to standard of living for many people (see sub-domains A, B, C and D). Accordingly, we are recommending one set of measures of unmet need for care and support for older and disabled people (measure 3.1), and another measure for unmet need for childcare among parents (measure 3.2). (Children's own needs will be reflected in the indicator set for children, which is outside the scope of the current exercise). Both sets of measures were welcomed in the second round of specialist consultation and various suggestions

were made for strengthening the measures, which have been incorporated into these final recommendations.

The Life Opportunities Survey, a longitudinal survey of disability currently being developed by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and the Office for Disability Issues will cover England, Scotland and Wales and is likely to include questions on unmet needs for support. The Welsh Assembly Government are considering a boost to facilitate within-Wales disaggregation. In the future, this could be a very useful source for all three countries, and it is recommended that Measure 3.1 migrates to this data source once it becomes available for analysis.

For now, however, Measure 3.1 (E) is drawn from the English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing (ELSA), which firstly asks whether the respondent has any problems with any of a list of activities of daily living (including instrumental activities like managing money or remembering things), and then asks:

Thinking about the activities that [you have] problems with, does anyone ever help with these activities (including partner or other people in household)?

and if the person does receive help, the follow-up question:

Would you say that the help [you] receive...

- 1 meets needs all the time,
- 2 usually meets needs,
- 3 sometimes meets needs,
- 4 or, hardly ever meets needs?

From these questions, a measure of the percentage of older people (the sample is aged 50 or over) who have unmet needs for help with daily activities can be derived.

The Scottish Household Survey (SHS) contains a less detailed module covering similar ground. It has the advantage over ELSA that it specifically mentions adaptations and equipment as possible sources of help (that is, not just limited to help provided by another person), but has the disadvantage that it asks whether the help is satisfactory rather than focusing on whether the needs are met. ELSA could usefully expand its questions to cover adaptations and equipment, while the SHS could usefully rephrase the follow-up question along the lines of ELSA.

Unfortunately no similar questions have been identified in existing surveys covering Wales.

For now, data for England are available for the 50-plus age group only, and can be disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, and social class. The Scottish data cover all age groups and can be disaggregated by a full range of equality characteristics, with a sexual orientation question expected to be added in due course.

Table 9.7 Measure 3.1 (E) People aged 50+ who have difficulties with activities of daily living or instrumental activities of daily living

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

| | % who receive help which always or usually meets their needs | Number in sample |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Men | 39 | 2,106 |
| Women | 48** | 3,288 |
| Age 50-64 | 37 | 2,047 |
| Age 65-74 | 40 | 1,677 |
| Age 75 plus | 57** | 1,670 |
| Men aged 50-64 | 33 | 796 |
| Women aged 50-64 | 40** | 1,251 |
| Men aged 65-74 | 36 | 683 |
| Women aged 65-74 | 43** | 994 |
| Men aged 75+ | 49 | 627 |
| Women aged 75+ | 62** | 1,043 |
| White | 45 | 5,261 |
| Non-white | 41 | 129 |

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first sub-group listed in group (at 95 per cent level)

Note: Ethnicity is recorded with detailed categories but the variable in the publicly-available dataset is collapsed into White/Non-White. Sample numbers indicate that more detailed analysis by ethnicity would in principle be possible, even without pooling data from more than one year ('wave'). Disaggregating the very varied 'non-white' group might help to detect statistically significant differences.'

Table 9.8 Measure 3.1 (S) People who have some illness or disability and have difficulty with at least one activity

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

| | % who have adaptations/equipment needed and receives satisfactory help | Number in sample |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Men | 34 | 1859 |
| Women | 42** | 3157 |
| Age 18-24 | 32 | 54 |
| Age 25-44 | 36 | 570 |
| Age 45-64 | 35 | 1640 |
| Age 65-74 | 36 | 1188 |
| Age 75 plus | 50** | 1553 |
| Non-disabled | 37 | 1946 |
| Disabled | 40 | 3070 |
| Occupational class | | |
| 3 Lower prof and higher tech | 39 | 85 |
| 4 Lower managerial | 29 | 55 |
| 6 Intermediate | 29 | 90 |
| 9 Lower supervisory | 29 | 84 |
| 10 Lower technical | 31 | 43 |
| 11 Semi-routine | 31 | 182 |
| 12 Routine | 24 | 172 |
| No religion | 35 | 1208 |
| Church of Scotland | 42** | 2442 |
| Roman Catholic | 36 | 917 |
| Other Christian | 42 | 381 |
| Other # | 37 | 43 |

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first sub-group listed in group (at 95 per cent level). However, the Scottish Household Survey has a complex sampling structure which has not yet been taken into account in the calculation of statistical significance for this table. Final results may vary slightly from those indicated here.

Sub-groups with less than 30 respondents omitted from table.

Not including Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, Jewish or Sikh, for whom sample numbers are too small to report.

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

Source: Childcare and Early Years - Parents' Survey

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

Source: Scottish Household Survey

Sub-domains: A

Evaluation of measure 3.2 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, social class |
| | - within Scotland | Gender, ethnicity (combining years), disability, age, religion/belief (combining years), social class |
| | - within Wales | Not available |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Annual |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Measures 3.2 (E) and 3.2 (S) turn the spotlight on unmet needs for childcare among parents, for England and Scotland respectively. The Childcare and Early Years survey of parents carried out by the Department for Children, Schools and Families in England, asks parents of children aged 14 or under who have not used any childcare (formal or informal) in the last year, what were the reasons. Possible responses include, among others:

- I cannot afford childcare
- There are no childcare providers available that I could trust
- The quality of childcare is not good enough
- My child(ren) need special care
- I have had bad experience using childcare in the past
- I would have transport difficulties getting to a provider
- I cannot afford the initial registration/ administration fees

These can be interpreted as constraints on availability of childcare that meets the parents and the child's needs. Other responses, including 'I'd rather look after my children myself', 'I rarely need to be away from my children', and 'My children are old enough to look after themselves' can be interpreted as reflecting a lack of need for childcare and/or the parents' values and preferences.

The English data can be disaggregated by the parental characteristics of gender, ethnicity, disability, age and social class.

From 2007, the SHS asks about formal and informal (including parental) childcare for a randomly-selected child within the household aged under 16. It then asks,

If you were able to change {your main} childcare provider, would you prefer to...

- Use a different childcare provider
- Have more hours of childcare
- Have fewer hours of childcare
- Not use any childcare outside your household,
- Leave things as they are
- Don't know

Parents who would like to use a different childcare provider or have more hours of childcare are invited to indicate the reason they have not made such a change, including 'Couldn't afford the fees', 'Couldn't afford to reduce working hours', 'Nothing available locally', 'Too far to travel' and 'Need specialist care'.

Together these questions allow us to construct a measure of unmet need for childcare, which can be disaggregated by the equality characteristics of the parent. The measure is not directly comparable to the measure for England but both measures address an aspect of unmet need.

The figures presented in the table above are from 2005-6 SHS data, prior to the introduction of the new childcare questions. Instead, they represent an average satisfaction score with seven aspects of childcare, among parents using any formal or informal childcare. Although there are trends in the figures (less satisfaction among older parents, disabled parents, non-religious parents and parents with lower socio-economic status), the differences do not reach statistical significance.

No comparable measures have been identified for Wales. The British Household Panel Survey / UK Household Longitudinal Survey asks about the childcare providers used but not whether the parents regard those arrangements as adequate or

suitable. The Living in Wales (LIW) survey asks about parental satisfaction, but only with a limited range of types of childcare (local authority nursery or playgroup). A Childcare and Early Years Provision Survey, due to commence in Autumn 2009 and covering Wales, could prove a useful source in future, if it collects information on parents' views and experiences of the suitability of available childcare.

Consultation participants welcomed the inclusion of a measure of unmet need for childcare although it was pointed out that these questions are from the parent's perspective, which may or may not coincide with those of the child. A separate indicator of childcare adequacy will be needed for the Children's Framework, when it is developed.

Table 9.9 Measure 3.2 (S) Parents' satisfaction with childcare

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

Sub-sample: parents using formal or informal childcare.

Each of 7 aspects of childcare are rated on a score of 1 to 5: quality, difficult to get to, hard to pay for, meets needs of child, easy to get a place, times convenient, difficult to find out about.

For the aggregate score, a **lower** number indicates **greater** satisfaction.

| | Mean satisfaction score with 7 aspects of childcare | Number in sample |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| All | 13.5 | 1430 |
| Men | 13.5 | 456 |
| Women | 13.5 | 818 |
| Age 18-24 | 13.1 | 78 |
| Age 25-44 | 13.5 | 1040 |
| Age 45-64 | 13.8 | 143 |
| Non-disabled | 13.5 | 1227 |
| Disabled | 14.0 | 47 |
| Occupational class | | |
| 1 Higher managerial | 13.7 | 40 |
| 2 Higher professional | 13.5 | 112 |
| 3 Lower prof and higher tech | 13.5 | 187 |
| 4 Lower managerial | 13.7 | 95 |
| 5 Higher supervisory | 12.3 | 65 |
| 6 Intermediate | 13.7 | 167 |
| 9 Lower supervisory | 13.7 | 62 |
| 10 Lower technical | 13.0 | 30 |
| 11 Semi-routine | 14.0 | 156 |
| 12 Routine | 13.9 | 95 |
| No religion | 13.8 | 554 |
| Church of Scotland | 13.1 | 383 |
| Roman Catholic | 13.2 | 192 |
| Other Christian | 13.3 | 117 |

Note: sub-groups with less than 30 respondents omitted from table.

The 2007 survey which asks the question on which measure 3.2 (S) is based is not yet available for analysis. The figures above are from the 2005-6 surveys, which asked a slightly different form of question on childcare.

Indicator 4: Quality of local area**Measure 4.1 (E): Percentage living in an area with ‘unsatisfactory’ or ‘poor’ local environmental conditions (England)**

Source: ENCAMS Local Environmental Quality Survey for DEFRA Sustainable Development Indicator 65, matched to household survey (for instance Integrated Household Survey)

Measure 4.1 (S): Average number of problems cited with local environmental quality (Scotland)

Source: Scottish Household Survey

Measure 4.1 (W): Average number of problems cited with local environmental quality (Wales)

Source: Living in Wales Survey

Sub-domains: G, B, A

Evaluation of measure 4.1 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, religion/belief, social class |
| | - within Scotland | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class |
| | - within Wales | Gender, ethnicity disability, age, religion/belief,, social class collected But sample size too small to disaggregate by ethnicity, and religion/belief disaggregation limited, even if combining 3 years of data |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Two-yearly (England); Annual (Scotland, Wales) |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Measures 4.1 (E, S, W) aim to capture the quality of the local environment in terms of the conditions of the streets and other public spaces, for England, Scotland and Wales respectively.

For England, the assessment is made by a charity called ENCAMS, based on a two-year cycle of local authorities which are visited several times over the course of a year (ENCAMS, 2008). The measure includes litter, dog fouling, detritus, waste placed out on the street, maintenance of litter bins, fly-posting, graffiti, condition of street furniture, horticultural maintenance, condition of pavements and highways, and pedestrian and traffic flows. Scores are aggregated and grouped into 'good', 'satisfactory', 'unsatisfactory' and 'poor'. This is used as the basis for Sustainable Development Indicator number 65 by DEFRA (DEFRA 2008). For the purposes of Measure 4.1, we would seek to match these data to an individual-level survey, such as the Integrated Household Survey, in order to provide analysis of the equality characteristics of people living in areas rated as 'poor' or 'unsatisfactory', compared to people living in 'satisfactory' or 'good' areas. The Integrated Household Survey would be a strong candidate for matching, given its large sample size. (The matching might need to be carried out by ONS to protect confidentiality and prevent inadvertent disclosure). Disaggregation based on where people live by gender, age, disability, ethnicity, religion/belief and social class within England would then be possible, and sexual orientation questions may be added to the IHS in future.

For Scotland, individuals are asked directly about problems in their local area as part of the SHS. Responses which are listed in 2007 include:

- Area poorly maintained / run down
- Vandalism and graffiti
- Environmental noise
- Too much traffic
- Litter and rubbish
- Needles or syringes lying around
- Dog or cat mess
- Dumped electrical goods or furniture
- Broken glass
- Uneven or dangerous pavements

Other responses can be slotted where relevant into pre-coded categories, including:

- Property /gardens in poor condition
- Problems with road/pavements/drainage
- Smells from factories or sewage works
- Inadequate street lighting

For measure 4.1 (S), the average number of these problems in their local area mentioned will be calculated.

The data source for Wales is similar to that for Scotland in terms of methodology, but has a more general and shorter list of potential problems, including:

- Not well-maintained, dirty or litter
- Noisy or not peaceful
- High levels of traffic congestion
- Dangerous roads or speeding traffic
- Poor / no street lighting.

For measure 4.1 (W), the average number of these problems cited can be calculated. This is not directly comparable to the Scottish measure because of the differences in the number of prompts.

Two alternative measures of local conditions were discussed during the consultation. Participants in the first round of specialist consultation rejected a proposed measure based on access to and use of green space, on the grounds that it was too narrow an interpretation of the quality of the local environment and individuals' access to the natural world. Moreover, it was regarded as irrelevant to the rural population.

At the second round of consultation, we proposed to use data on a range of environmental indicators like air pollution, flood risk, derelict land, green space and river quality, as used by DEFRA (DEFRA 2008) in Sustainable Development Indicator number 60, and, as for Measure 4.1, matched to individual characteristics via a household survey. This was welcomed by consultation respondents but they suggested that these high-level aspects of the environment were perhaps more relevant to health than to standard of living. Accordingly, we are now including this indicator in the Health domain.

We also discussed Measure 4.1 with consultation respondents in the second round. This was regarded as having more immediate relevance to people's standard of living. A participant at the Scottish consultation event mentioned that dog mess had been the number one concern in a recent survey of residents in Glasgow, and other participants confirmed that these kinds of issues mattered a great deal to quality of life.

Table 9.10 Measure 4.1 (S) Average number of 13 problems mentioned by respondents about their local area

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

The 13 problems are: poorly maintained, fast traffic, roads pavements & drainage, pollutions smells & industry, street lighting, weather hills & flooding, dogs, vandalism & graffiti, drug abuse & dealing, environmental noise, too much traffic, litter & rubbish, property in poor condition. Many respondents report no problems, so the mean scores for all groups are below 1.

| | Mean score | Number in sample |
|------------------------------|------------|------------------|
| All | 0.44 | 28263 |
| Men | 0.42 | 12065 |
| Women | 0.45** | 16196 |
| Age 18-24 | 0.46 | 1811 |
| Age 25-44 | 0.50 | 9140 |
| Age 45-64 | 0.44 | 9072 |
| Age 65-74 | 0.43 | 4175 |
| Age 75 + | 0.27** | 3616 |
| Non-disabled | 0.44 | 24365 |
| Disabled | 0.46 | 3870 |
| Occupational class | | |
| 2 higher managerial | 0.49 | 343 |
| 3 Higher professional | 0.43 | 998 |
| 4 Lower prof and higher tech | 0.46 | 2439 |
| 5 Lower managerial | 0.39 | 1304 |
| 6 Higher supervisory | 0.45 | 784 |
| 7 Intermediate | 0.48 | 1978 |
| 8 Employers in small orgns | 0.36 | 194 |
| 9 Own a/c workers | 0.41 | 407 |
| 10 Lower supervisory | 0.46 | 1301 |
| 11 Lower technical | 0.45 | 617 |
| 12 Semi-routine | 0.49 | 3053 |
| 13 Routine | 0.44 | 2341 |
| No religion | 0.49 | 9641 |
| Church of Scotland | 0.39** | 11899 |
| Roman Catholic | 0.49 | 3969 |
| Other Christian | 0.41** | 2200 |
| Buddhist | 0.74 | 34 |
| Hindu | 0.16** | 52 |
| Muslim | 0.43 | 177 |
| Jewish | 0.30** | 33 |
| Other (not incl Sikh) | 0.51 | 239 |

Table 9.10 contd.

| | Mean score | Number in sample |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| White | 0.44 | 27795 |
| Non-White | 0.44 | 456 |

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first sub-group listed in group (at 95 per cent level). However, the SHS has a complex sampling structure which has not yet been taken into account in the calculation of statistical significance for this table. Final results may vary slightly from those indicated here.

Table 9.11 Measure 4.1 (W) Average number of 6 problems mentioned by respondents about their local area

Authors' calculations using Living in Wales Survey, 2006, Wales

The 6 problems are: not well-maintained/dirty/litter; noisy/not peaceful; traffic congestion; dangerous roads/speeding traffic; condition of roads; poor environment/pollution. Nearly four-fifths of respondents report no problems, so the mean scores for all groups are less than 1.

| | Mean score | Number in sample |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------------|
| All | 0.27 | 7443 |
| Men | 0.27 | 3112 |
| Women | 0.27 | 4331 |
| Age 16-24 | 0.32 | 316 |
| Age 25-44 | 0.31 | 2323 |
| Age 45-64 | 0.26 | 2699 |
| Age 65-74 | 0.25 | 1090 |
| Age 75 + | 0.19** | 1015 |
| Non-disabled | 0.26 | 5705 |
| Disabled | 0.28 | 1727 |
| Occupational class | | |
| higher managerial/professional | 0.24 | 652 |
| lower managerial/professional | 0.27 | 1842 |
| intermediate | 0.29 | 721 |
| small employers/own account | 0.24 | 685 |
| lower supervisory and tech | 0.30 | 795 |
| semi-routine | 0.25 | 1190 |
| routine | 0.23 | 1066 |
| not classified | 0.36 | 492 |
| No religion | 0.29 | 1627 |
| Buddhist | 0.13 | 31 |
| Christian | 0.26 | 5554 |
| Hindu | | |
| Jewish | | |
| Muslim | 0.27 | 34 |
| Sikh | | |
| Other | 0.41 | 113 |
| White | 0.27 | 7336 |
| Indian | | |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | | |
| Black | | |
| Mixed | | |
| Other | 0.26 | 33 |

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first sub-group listed in group (at 95 per cent level)

Note: Sub-groups with less than 30 respondents for this measure not reported. Combining two or more years of data would help to fill in the gaps.

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

Source: National Travel Survey (England and Wales); Scottish Household Survey; Living in Wales Survey

Sub-domains: G, B, A

Evaluation of measure 4.2 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, social class |
| | - within Scotland | Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class |
| | - within Wales | Gender, ethnicity disability, age, religion/belief,, social class collected But sample size too small to disaggregate by ethnicity, and religion/belief disaggregation limited, even if combining 3 years of data |
| 5 | Aspect of inequality | Outcome |
| 6 | Frequency | Annual |
| 7 | Individual level | Yes |
| 8 | Robustness | Good |

Measure 4.2 concerns transport and ease of access to local facilities. The precise wording varies between the data sources, but in all cases they refer to journeys without private transport (that is, essentially on foot or by public transport). The National Travel Survey for England and Wales asks about the time taken to get to the nearest GP, chemist, hospital, shopping centre, grocery shop, post office, and schools at all levels. The survey itself does not set a threshold for what constitutes a reasonable journey time, and further consultation would be necessary to define a threshold of each kind of journey.

The SHS offers respondents a five point scale from 'very easy' to 'very difficult' and invites them to grade their access to a small food-shop, supermarket, town centre, evening leisure facilities, visiting friends, GP, and library. Unfortunately these questions are filtered by whether you always use a car to access these facilities; if you do not, in other words if you ever use public transport or walking or cycling, no further follow up is asked. This implicitly assumes that it is 'fairly easy' for people to access these facilities if they are in practice using public transport, whereas in fact the journeys may be very complex, difficult or expensive. It would be preferable to ask all respondents, even if they are currently using public transport or travelling by foot or bicycle, how easy or difficult it is to reach local facilities.

The Welsh sample in the National Travel Survey is small (about 300 households each year). The LIW survey contains some relevant questions, with similar wording to the Scottish Household Survey but the range of facilities listed was (in 2007) restricted to the local library, and an Accident and Emergency department. The Living in Wales survey questions would need to be extended if they were to be used as the basis for this indicator.

The data for England can be disaggregated by gender, age, disability, ethnicity, and social class, and the Scottish and Welsh surveys can in addition be disaggregated by religion/belief.

One possibility for extending the conceptual coverage of the transport measure would be to combine it with information on disability-related difficulties in using public transport or walking, available in the National Travel Survey and in the ONS Omnibus Survey.

Consultation respondents broadly agreed that a measure of ease of access to local facilities was useful and should be included in the short list.

Table 9.12 Measure 4.2 (S) Whether or not a car is needed to make a certain journey

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

For those who sometimes make the following types of journey, whether they do so without a car or could do so fairly easily: shopping for small amounts of food, supermarket shopping, town centre shopping, evenings out, visiting friends & relatives, going to the GP. Score from 0 (cannot reach any of these without a car) to 6 (can reach all without a car).

| | Mean score | Number in sample |
|--|------------|------------------|
| All | 3.2 | 7235 |
| Men | 3.3 | 3596 |
| Women | 3.2 | 3636 |
| Age 18-24 | 4.1 | 324 |
| Age 25-44 | 3.5** | 2899 |
| Age 45-64 | 3.1** | 2624 |
| Age 65-74 | 2.9** | 943 |
| Age 75 + | 2.7** | 435 |
| Non-disabled | 3.3 | 6681 |
| Disabled | 2.1** | 549 |
| Occupational class | | |
| 2 higher managerial | 2.4 | 156 |
| 3 Higher professional | 3.4 | 398 |
| 4 Lower prof and higher tech | 3.6 | 949 |
| 5 Lower managerial | 3.3 | 494 |
| 6 Higher supervisory | 3.4 | 293 |
| 7 Intermediate | 3.5 | 646 |
| 8 Employers in small orgns | 2.6 | 68 |
| 9 Own a/c workers | 3.0 | 165 |
| 10 Lower supervisory | 3.3 | 405 |
| 11 Lower technical | 3.4 | 184 |
| 12 Semi-routine | 3.3 | 741 |
| 13 Routine | 3.6 | 527 |
| No religion | 3.4 | 2546 |
| Church of Scotland | 3.2** | 3063 |
| Roman Catholic | 3.3 | 857 |
| Other Christian | 2.9** | 629 |
| Muslim | 2.7 | 43 |
| Other (not incl Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Sikh) | 2.9 | 58 |
| White | 3.3 | 7133 |
| Non-White | 2.9 | 98 |

** indicates figure is statistically significantly different from first sub-group listed in group (at 95 per cent level). However, the SHS has a complex sampling structure which has not yet been taken into account in the calculation of statistical significance for this table. Final results may vary slightly from those indicated here.

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

Measure 5.1: Percentage who report being treated unfairly by financial institutions, utility companies, housing officials or private landlords, social services, Jobcentre Plus or the Pension Service, or who have avoided contacting them for fear of being treated unfairly

Source: to be developed

Sub-domain: A (process indicator)

In the terms of the EMF, process indicators aim to capture the way people are treated by others in relation to each of the ten domains of central and valuable human freedoms (Life, Health, Physical security and so on). So the purpose of a process indicator in this domain is to reflect the extent to which people are treated with dignity and respect, or are discriminated against, in pursuit of their standard of living. Generating a source of income is one important aspect of pursuing a good standard of living - for most people, through earnings or social security benefits or both. Financial management is another important aspect – dealing with banks, building societies and insurance companies. Other services are crucial to having a warm and decent home – housing itself (whether provided by a social or private landlord), and utilities. Finally, for some people, receipt of care services is a critical contribution to standard of living, possibly involving social services. People therefore come into a contact with a wide range of private and public service providers in pursuit of their standard of living.

One aspect of how people are treated in pursuit of their standard of living is covered in the Productive and Valued Activities domain, namely experiences of discrimination in the workplace (that is, while generating earnings). The process indicator for this domain therefore needs to capture how people are treated in pursuit of their standard of living other than at work. The proposal discussed at the first and second rounds of specialist consultation was a measure based on the Jobcentre Plus and Pension Service customer surveys. The majority of those not earning and on a low income will be in contact with Jobcentre Plus (for people of working age) or the Pension Service, so their customer base is a good sampling frame for gauging the extent to which people who are disadvantaged in the Standard of Living domain are being treated with dignity and respect.

Consultation participants agreed that people who were poor were often treated dismissively and made to feel ashamed by the way organisations treated them. Many participants thought that the stigma associated with poverty was an important issue to try to capture. However, nearly all participants were doubtful about the Jobcentre

Plus and Pension Service measure, on the grounds that it was too narrow, and possibly unreliable. They preferred a measure which included how people are treated by private companies and service providers (for example utility companies), which often intentionally or inadvertently stigmatise or discriminate against people on a low income.

Unfortunately customer survey data from private companies are not made publicly available and relevant questions do not appear to be asked on existing household surveys. We are therefore recommending the development of a new measure, covering respondents' experience of interactions with both public and private organisations relevant to their standard of living. Depending on the sources of data that are used to develop this measure, it may be necessary to split the measure into two parts, one for public organisations and one for private companies. The Scottish Government thought this would in any case be desirable, since they believe the issues raised for the two sectors are different. However, it is important to keep in mind that this measure is not intended to be a performance indicator for particular organisations but rather to be an indicator of a social outcome: how people on a low income are treated by the organisations and companies with which they interact in pursuit of maintaining or improving their standard of living.

In addition to the Jobcentre Plus and Pension Service customer surveys, the Citizenship Survey contains some questions that could be generalised, although in their present form they are overly specific in terms of equality characteristics and forms of bad treatment:

- Would a council housing department or housing association/ a private landlord/ the police/ your local police treat you worse than people of other races, better than people of other races or the same as people of other races?
- Do you think that a council housing department or housing association/ a private landlord or letting agent/ the Police has ever discriminated against you because of your religion?

Another useful starting point for developing a measure of this kind is the module of questions recommended by Zavaleta Reyles (2007) for an internationally comparable set of indicators of poverty. This includes, for example, a question with prompts for a wider range of forms of mistreatment than is used in existing UK surveys. It includes being:

- excluded
- put down
- ridiculed
- discounted

- cruelly criticized
- called names or referred to in derogatory terms.

This is now included as a general indicator of stigma in the Identity, Expression and Self-respect domain. Applying these questions to the particular context of pursuit of standard of living (in relation to interactions with financial and utility companies, and with public agencies) could form the basis for Measure 5.1 for the Standard of Living domain. Consultation participants mentioned other concepts which could usefully be added to this list, including being patronised and being humiliated.

In addition, there was discussion during the consultation about the possibility that people may avoid contacting an organisation because of previous bad experience or fear of being treated disrespectfully. This needs to be taken into account in developing a new measure.

Recommendations

Recommendations arising from evaluation of short list against individual indicator selection criteria

The potential to disaggregate by equality characteristics is good for many of the measures proposed for this domain. A number of minor changes would enhance the possibilities for disaggregation:

- including a question on sexual orientation in all the surveys used in this domain (the Integrated Household Survey is likely to do so and the Scottish Government has already indicated its intention to do so for the surveys it funds);
- including a measure of social class in the Scottish House Condition Survey social questionnaire (for measure 1.1(S));
- including questions on religion/belief in the Scottish House Condition Survey, the FRS (already asked in Northern Ireland), ELSA, and the Childcare and Early Years Parents Survey (for measures 1.1 (S), 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 (E) and 3.2 (E)).

Transgender people constitute too small a percentage of the population to be reliably represented in a general population survey. However, targeted research has highlighted the extent and severity with which transgender people face discrimination and inequality in nearly all aspects of their lives, including several relevant to this domain including lack of security in the home and loss of earnings resulting in low income (Whittle and colleagues, 2007). Repeating targeted research of this kind on a

regular basis may be a good way forward for monitoring discrimination and inequality for the transgender community – see general recommendations in chapter 15. Similarly, population groups such as Gypsies and Travellers, and asylum seekers and refugees may not be identified or covered sufficiently well in standard household surveys. In the Standard of Living domain, the homeless population are of particular importance. Separate, focused, monitoring will be required, in line with good practice already established by some of the relevant voluntary sector organisations representing these interests.

Coverage of Scotland and Wales and disaggregation potential within each of those countries is also generally good for this domain. For Wales, improvements could be made by:

- increasing the sample size of the BCS in Wales (for measure 1.2);
- developing questions on unmet need for childcare, for example for inclusion in the Living in Wales survey (for comparison with measure 3.2 for England and Scotland).

A number of revisions to question wording or routing were suggested in the course of the consultation process and subsequent analysis:

- ELSA could usefully expand its questions on help received by people with difficulties in carrying out activities of daily living to cover adaptations and equipment (for indicator 3.1 (E))
- SHS could ask all respondents how easy or difficult it is to reach local facilities, even if they are currently using public transport or travelling by foot or bicycle (for measure 4.2 (S))

Questions on material deprivation among pensioners are already coming on stream for the FRS, and we recommend that the methodology is developed and extended to include adults of working age. In particular, the questions should aim to shed light on within-household inequality (for example, between men and women in couples), and on the impact of the extra costs of disability. This means expanding the number of questions that relate to individual deprivation rather than household deprivation and asking the questions of each adult member of the household separately.

More immediately, income poverty statistics such as for measure 2.1 should be presented with and without equivalisation for the extra costs of disability, using one of the several scales now available (see Stapleton, 2008, for a recent review).

Further consultation is needed to set a threshold for 'reasonable journey time' to local facilities, to firm up the definition of measure 4.2 (E, S, W).

Data from two new surveys are expected to become available in 2009/10: the Wealth and Assets Survey and the Life Opportunities Survey (the Longitudinal Survey of Disability). These are exciting developments covering areas not well captured by existing surveys and will facilitate the specification of measures 2.3 and 3.1.

Finally, new survey questions on how people are treated by public and private organisations with a key role to play in securing people's standard of living (indicator 5), should be developed and piloted for inclusion in a large-scale household survey. This should be the top priority for new data collection efforts in this domain.

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

The short list proposed represents good coverage of the wide-ranging sub-domain A (standard of living), and of B (mobility and transport), and F (enjoying your home in peace and security). Elements of D (choice and control over where and how you live) and G (access to green spaces and the natural world) are also included, but only in part. Sub-domains C and E (independent living; control over personal spending) will be included in indicators of the autonomy aspect of inequality, which are being developed through a separate project. No indicators of sub-domain H (sharing in the benefits of scientific progress) have been found, although use of the internet is included in the Education and Learning domain, and the effects of medical advances are included to some extent in the Life and Health domains.

Measures which reflect inequality at the top as well as the bottom of the distribution have been included (especially measure 2.3 on wealth and debt). Development of a measure for indicator 5 (being treated with respect by organisations in relation to your standard of living) will ensure that a process aspect of inequality is reflected in the indicator set for this domain, along with several outcome indicators. Autonomy indicators are yet to be developed, but the concept of independent living is clearly going to be important here.

Consultation respondents stressed the importance of locating all the measures of inequality between groups in the Standard of Living domain in the context of overall income inequality (the stretch of the distribution as a whole). We recommend that commonly used measures of overall income inequality, such as trends in the Gini coefficient and the ratio of the 90th percentile to the 10th percentile, be included as contextual information for this domain.

Finally, while all of the measures suggested here can be seen as human rights indicators, some extreme forms of disadvantage in the Standard of Living domain, such as homelessness, represent particular human rights concerns. As discussed under indicator 1 above, there are difficulties in incorporating measures of homelessness directly into the indicator set, but supplementary monitoring of street homelessness should be reported alongside the shortlisted indicators for this domain. The Welsh Assembly Government recently commissioned research on multi-agency methodologies for measuring rough sleeping (due to report in 2009), one aspect of homelessness, and this could provide the basis for good practice elsewhere.

We recommend:

- A question on sexual orientation is included in the Family Resources Survey, the Wealth and Assets Survey, the Life Opportunities study (the longitudinal disability survey), the successor to the Living in Wales survey, the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing, the Childcare and Early Years Parents Survey (for parents), and the National Travel Survey (as well as the Integrated Household Survey and the Scottish Household survey, which have already signalled an intention to include such a measure).
- A measure of social class is added to the Scottish House Condition Survey social questionnaire.
- A question on religion/belief is added to the GB Family Resources Survey (already asked in Northern Ireland), the Scottish House Condition Survey, the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing and the Childcare and Early Years Parents Survey (for England).
- Consideration is given to increasing the sample size of the British Crime Survey in Wales.
- Questions on unmet need for childcare are included in the successor to the Living in Wales survey.
- The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing could usefully expand its questions on help received by people with difficulties in carrying out activities of daily living to cover adaptations and equipment.
- The Scottish Household Survey could ask all respondents how easy or difficult it is to reach local facilities, even if they are currently using public transport or travelling by foot or bicycle.

- The methodology for developing questions on material deprivation for children and pensioners for the Family Resources Survey is extended to include adults of working age, with a view to shedding light on within-household inequality and on the impact of the extra costs of disability. This means expanding the number of questions that relate to individual deprivation rather than household deprivation and asking the questions of each adult member of the household separately.
- EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations include trends in the Gini coefficient and the 90:10 ratio as contextual information for this domain.
- EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations ensure that new data becoming available from the Wealth and Assets Survey and the Life Opportunities study (longitudinal survey of disability) in 2009/10 be incorporated into measures 2.3 and 3.1 for this domain.
- EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations develop and pilot new survey questions on how people are treated by public and private organisations with a key role to play in securing people's standard of living (for indicator 5).
- EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations work with voluntary sector organisations to include homeless people in the scope of the EMF – a group of particular human rights concern in this domain – possibly by means of a specialist survey.