

8. Education and learning

Domain: The capability to be knowledgeable, to understand and reason, and to have the skills to participate in society

Sub-domains:

- A. Attain the highest possible standard of knowledge, understanding and reasoning
- B. Be fulfilled and stimulated intellectually, including being creative if you so wish
- C. Develop the skills for participation in productive and valued activities, including parenting
- D. Learn about a range of cultures and beliefs and acquire the skills to participate in a diverse society, including learning English
- E. Access education, training and lifelong learning that meets individual needs
- F. Access information and technology necessary to participate in society

Final short list

Indicator 1: Basic skills

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

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

Indicator 2: Educational qualifications

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

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

Indicator 3: Participation in lifelong learning

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

Indicator 4: Use of the internet

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

Indicator 5: Being treated with respect in education

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

Indicator 1: Basic skills

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

Sources: Skills for Life Survey (England); National Survey of Adult Basic Skills (Wales); Scottish Adult Literacy and Numeracy Survey (under development)

Sub-domains: A, C, E

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, social class
	- within Scotland	Under development
	- within Wales	Gender, age, social class
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	ad hoc
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

Measure 1.1 and measure 1.2 (ability to speak English or Welsh) together aim to capture some of the basic skills necessary to participate in society.

Measure 1.1 focuses on functional literacy and numeracy skills, which constitute the minimum level needed to participate in society (sub-domain A). While the information for this measure is not yet systematically collected for all three countries, it has been integrated in other indicator frameworks such as the Scottish National Indicators, so there is an existing commitment to future data collection.

Disaggregation by gender, age and social class is currently possible for England and Wales, and for England only also by disability and ethnicity. The basic skills surveys

could be enhanced from an equality perspective by adding questions on other equality characteristics, including sexual orientation and religion/belief.

The frequency of data collection is uncertain. The last Skills for Life Survey in England was in 2003 and another is scheduled for 2010. There is likely to be a Welsh National Basic Skills Survey in 2009, although we understand a final decision is yet to be taken. The Scottish survey is still under development and the definition and methods used may not coincide with the English and Welsh surveys, so it is unlikely that a GB-wide measure can be constructed.

Participants in both rounds of specialist consultation thought that this was an important measure. One issue raised was that the threshold of functional literacy and numeracy may be too **high** to reflect the experience of Gypsies and Travellers, some of whom have had no education at all. The significance of being able to use English specifically (as opposed to literacy in another language) was also discussed. This is now reflected separately in measure 1.2. The report on the Skills for Life Survey for England notes that facility in English is easily confounded with literacy; those who do not speak English as their first language are disproportionately likely to score poorly on literacy and numeracy tests, but this may reflect English language skills rather than literacy itself.

Table 8.1 Measure 1.1 (E) Percentage with functional literacy and numeracy skills

Published results of Skills for Life Survey, 2002/3, England

	% reaching Level 1 literacy or above ¹	% reaching Level 1 numeracy or above ¹	Number in literacy sample (unweighted) ²
All	84	53	7874
Managerial and professional	93	71	3082
Intermediate occupations	94	54	628
Small employers and own account workers	80	50	759
Supervisors/craft-related occupations	82	44	962
Working class	67	31	2132
Men	84	59	3483
Women	84	47	4391
White ³	86	55	7015
Indian	63	39	123
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	53	29	69
Black Caribbean	60	19	80
Black African	62	22	77
Non-disabled	85	56	6083
Disabled	77	44	1784
No learning difficulties	85	54	7507
Learning difficulties	57	24	351
Age 16-19	84	50	444
Age 20-24	88	51	613
Age 25-34	87	57	1774
Age 35-44	85	56	2044
Age 45-54	81	53	1509
Age 55-64	78	47	1488

Source: DfES (2003) *Skills for Life Survey: A national needs and impact survey of literacy, numeracy and ICT skills*.

Notes:

1. Level 1 literacy is described as: 'Understands short straightforward texts of varying length on a variety of topics accurately and independently; Can obtain information from different sources'.

Level 1 numeracy is described as: 'Understands straightforward mathematical information used for different purposes and can independently select relevant information from given graphical, numerical and written material'.

2. Statistical significance is not recorded in the report.
3. The report notes that the differences by ethnicity are largely explained by differences in the proportions of each ethnic group who speak English as a first language. Among those who speak English as their first language, there are few differences by ethnicity.

Figures for Wales may be derived from Williams and Kinnaird (2004) *The National Survey Of Adult Basic Skills In Wales*. Basic Skills Agency.

Measure 1.2 (EW): Percentage who can speak, read and write English or Welsh very or fairly well (England and Wales)

Sources: Citizenship Survey (England and Wales)

Sub-domains: A, C, E

Evaluation of measure 1.2 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, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class
	- within Scotland	Not available
	- within Wales	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class collected But ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion/belief sample size too small to disaggregate
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	Annual
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

Measure 1.2 aims to capture inequalities in a skill which is important for participation in society – ability to communicate in an official language of the country in which you live. This measure was originally included in the ‘Identity, Expression and Self-respect’ domain but was moved to the Education and Learning domain following consultation. A new measure is now proposed for the Identity, Expression and Self-respect domain, based on freedom to use the language of your choice. That was considered a more appropriate formulation to reflect the concept of expression and cultural identity. For the Education and Learning domain, the focus is on the skills to participate in society.

The measure is based on the following set of questions from the Citizenship Survey. Those who do not speak either English or Welsh as their main language, are asked:

How good are you at speaking English when you need to in daily life, for example to have a conversation on the telephone or talk to a professional such as a teacher or a doctor?

How good are you at reading English when you need to in daily life? For example: reading newspapers and magazines or instructions for medicine or recipes?

And how good are you at writing in English when you need to in daily life? For example: writing letters or notes or filling in official forms?

The possible responses to these questions are 'Very good', 'Fairly good', 'Below Average', 'Poor', 'Cannot read/write English' (last two questions only), and 'no opinion'.

While these questions are not perfect, they come closest (from among existing survey questions) to capturing some of the concerns expressed during initial consultations. A similar measure needs to be developed for Scotland; the UK Household Longitudinal Survey will be a potential source in future.

Participants at the Welsh and Scottish consultation events agreed that a basic level of English (English or Welsh in Wales) is necessary to participate in society. Scottish participants pointed out that in principle Scots Gaelic should also be included, since it is an official language in Scotland.

Other aspects of communication inequalities are not captured by this measure. During the consultation, it was pointed out that people with sensory impairments or learning difficulties may face particular barriers to communication, and these are not reflected in the proposed measure. These issues will in part be picked up by the proposed new measure for the Individual, Family and Social Life domain about freedom to communicate in the language of your choice (including for example British Sign Language) but the survey questions on ability to speak, read and write English or Welsh could usefully be supplemented to ask about availability of communication support where needed.

Table 8.2 Measure 1.2 (EW) Percentage who can speak, read and write English or Welsh very or fairly well

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

	%	Number in sample (unweighted)
All	98	14094
Higher/lower managerial and professions	100	4463
Intermediate occupations/ small employers	99	2608
Lower supervisory & technical/semi-routine	98**	3553
Routine occupations	96**	1609
Never worked/ long-term unemployed	92**	1178
Students	97	461
Not stated/classified	97**	208
Men	98	6215
Women	98	7875
White	99	8556
Indian	87**	1368
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	81**	1112
Black	96**	1678
Mixed	97	486
Other	85**	890
Non-disabled	98	11154
Disabled	98	2871
Age 18-24	98	1127
Age 25-44	97	5688
Age 45-64	99	4131
Age 65-74	99	1563
Age 75 plus	99	1275
Heterosexual or straight	99	13045
Gay, lesbian or bisexual	100**	230
Prefer not to say	96	298
Christian	99	8930
Buddhist	88**	129
Hindu	87**	756
Jewish	100	54
Muslim	82**	1784
Sikh	78**	340
Any other religion	97	385

Table 8.2 <i>cont'd</i>	%	Number in sample (unweighted)
Men		
White	99	3720
Indian	90**	371
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	84**	570
Black	97	667
Mixed	98	177
Other	86**	409
Women		
White	99	4832
Indian	83**	697
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	76**	542
Black	95**	1011
Mixed	96	309
Other	83**	481

** indicates figure 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 Citizenship Survey.

Indicator 2: Educational qualifications**Measure 2.1: Percentage of each age group with no educational qualifications****Measure 2.2: Percentage of each age group with degree-level qualification**

= Level 4 or above from the National

Qualifications Framework (England and Wales)

= Level 10 or above from the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework, or 4 or higher from the Scottish Vocational Qualifications (Scotland)

Source: Labour Force Survey / Annual Population Survey / Integrated Household Survey

Sub-domains: A, C, E

Evaluation of measures 2.1 and 2.2 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics
2	Legitimacy	Strong
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class
	- within England	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class
	- within Scotland	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class collected Need to combine years to disaggregate by ethnicity or religion/belief
	- within Wales	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief, social class collected But ethnicity, religion/belief sample sizes too small to disaggregate, even with combined years
5	Aspect of inequality	Outcome
6	Frequency	Quarterly
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

Measures 2.1 and 2.2 are between them intended to capture inequalities at the bottom and at the top of the educational scale. The Review of Equality Statistics for the EHRC (Walby and colleagues, 2008) also recommended the gap in educational attainment by equality characteristics as a leading measure. Formal educational qualifications are very widely used in measures of educational inequality and are also a key signal for employers. They provide a passport to a wider range of employment and higher earnings potential for individuals, and may also contribute to enhanced

self-respect. This measure therefore has significance well beyond the Education and Learning domain.

The potential for disaggregation by equality characteristics is good because the data source is the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and its associated boosts in Scotland and Wales. This large survey contains information on gender, age, ethnicity, disability, religion/belief and social class, and there is a commitment to add a question on sexual orientation. Unfortunately, however, questions on educational qualifications are not currently asked of the sample aged 65 or above. Consultation participants suggested we recommend that the LFS questions be extended to cover the 65 plus age group.

Within Wales, analysis by Welsh Assembly Government statisticians suggests that even were three years of data to be combined, the sample size would be too small for disaggregation by ethnicity or by religion/belief to detect changes over time robustly.

Participants in both rounds of specialist consultation agreed that these were important measures. They noted, however, that this is a 'stock' rather than a 'flow' measure, so could be expected to change only slowly.

A consultation response from the Scottish Government argued that measure 2.1 was likely to decrease in value over time, as changes in school education and certification in Scotland meant that in future there would be few if any pupils leaving with no qualifications at all. Other consultation respondents observed that in any case, there is a trend over successive age cohorts towards higher levels of qualifications and lower proportions of each cohort with no qualifications (Gorard and colleagues, 2002). This is an important observation and confirms our decision to calculate this measure within age groups rather than across the population as a whole. It also suggests that this measure will need to be kept under review in future years. For the time being, there are significant inequalities (by gender, ethnicity, disability and social class, for example) in all age groups in the proportion who have no educational qualifications, so this measure remains informative.

There were a number of concerns expressed about the definition of qualifications. One respondent to the web consultation queried the definition of 'qualifications', arguing that it should be extended to include practical qualifications (such as a driving licence) as well as those usually recognised as educational qualifications. Information on a broader range of qualifications would also be useful, but given the widespread use of the 'currency' of recognised educational qualifications, we think it will be clearer to retain this focus for indicator 2.

In the first round and at the Welsh consultation event, participants noted that overseas qualifications are often incorrectly coded and not taken into account by employers – a particular problem for immigrants.

A number of consultation participants recommended that we include mid-range qualifications, along with the bottom and the top of the distribution. However, as the table above indicates, mid-range qualifications do not reveal significantly different patterns of inequality from the higher (degree-level) or lower (no qualifications) measures, so in the interests of keeping the total number of measures to a minimum, we recommend sticking with measures 2.1 and 2.2.

Consultation participants in the second round urged us to consider using Higher Education Statistics Authority (HESA) data. These are an excellent source for information of participation in higher education by students with different characteristics and backgrounds, and they are standardized across England, Scotland and Wales. However, they focus only on higher education and on current participation, as opposed to levels of qualification in the population as a whole. They are therefore not a substitute for measures 2.1 and 2.2. We considered whether we should introduce a supplementary measure but we felt that measure 2.2 disaggregated by age group will give a sufficient picture of inequality in higher-level educational attainment, while measure 3.1 will provide information about inequalities in participation in a broader range of educational settings than that provided by HESA.

Our attention was also drawn to Learning and Skills Council data on adult participation in further education. Some of the same arguments apply to these data as to HESA data. In addition, there is overlap with indicator 3 on participation in lifelong learning.

Consultation participants pointed to the importance of joining up the adults' and children's framework in the Education and Learning domain, for example by including some 'crossover' indicators tracking children's educational experience into qualifications obtained in early adulthood. This will be taken up in the development of the children's framework.

Table 8.3 Highest qualification level

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

Sub-sample: aged 25-44

	Degree-level qualification	GCSE grade A-C qualification equivalent or higher	No qualifications
	%	%	%
All	26	19	9
Socio-economic group			
higher managerial and professional	64	23	1
lower managerial and professional	42**	23	1
intermediate	17**	22	3**
small employers and own a/c	13**	18**	10**
lower supervisory and technical	7**	19**	7**
semi-routine	6**	16**	14**
routine	3**	12**	20**
never worked, LT unemployed	15**	12**	30**
Male	26	19	8
Female	26	20	9
White	26	20	8
Black and Black British	27	17**	13**
Indian	38**	16**	9
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	23	11**	26**
Mixed	36**	21	7
Other	32**	13**	15**
Non-disabled	28	20	7
Disabled	14**	16**	19**
No religion	28	19	9
Christian	25**	20**	7**
Buddhist	39**	16	11
Hindu	43**	17	6**
Jewish	45**	19	8
Muslim	22**	11**	27**
Sikh	31	15**	15
Other	35	21	6

Sub-sample: aged 45-64

	Degree-level qualification	GCSE grade A-C qualification equivalent or higher	No qualifications
	%	%	%
All	18	17	17
Socio-economic group			
higher managerial and professional	52	23	2
lower managerial and professional	31**	22**	4**
intermediate	10**	19**	9**
small employers and own a/c	12**	17**	18**
lower supervisory and technical	3**	16**	14**
semi-routine	3**	13**	25**
routine	1**	10**	34**
never worked/long-term u/e	8**	10**	43**
Male	20	17	15
Female	17**	17	19**
White	18	18	16
Black and Black British	21	16	16
Indian	18	11**	27**
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	8**	6**	49**
Mixed	23	17	19
Other	24**	13**	17
Non-disabled	21	18	13
Disabled	11**	14**	29**
No religion	27	19	14
Christian	17**	17	17**
Buddhist	33	17	14
Hindu	20	12**	18
Jewish	39**	20	10**
Muslim	15**	8**	38**
Sikh	13**	10	33**
Other	20	19	12**

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

Indicator 3: Participation in lifelong learning**Measure 3.1: Percentage who have participated in formal or informal learning in the last 12 months**

Source: Labour Force Survey / Annual Population Survey / Integrated Household Survey

Sub-domains: E, B, A, C

Evaluation of measure 3.1 against essential selection criteria:

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

This indicator has been included as a result of contributions during the first round of specialist consultation stressing the importance of a measure of this kind, covering the whole of the age distribution, extending beyond formal education, and reflecting current participation rather than past attainment.

The LFS collects information about respondents' current and recent participation in formal educational settings (for example, further education colleges) intended to lead to a qualification and about job-related training. These questions are restricted to the population of working age. In addition, respondents of all ages are asked whether they have acquired a qualification in the last 12 months. Finally, a new set of questions (2007) ask about formal and informal adult learning, and these are addressed to the whole population aged 17 or over.¹ One question asks whether the

¹ One consultation respondent suggested that there may be further changes to the wording of these questions in future. This will need to be kept under review.

respondent has been on a course in the last 12 months which was intended to lead to a qualification, but which was not obtained or has yet to be obtained. This complements the earlier question about actual qualifications obtained. A second question broadens the scope further:

During the last 12 months have you participated in any of the following activities with the intention of improving your knowledge or skills in any area, including hobbies?

and lists lessons or courses, open or distance learning, seminars or workshops, and guided on-the-job training. A third question asks,

In the last 12 months, have you deliberately tried to teach yourself anything [at work or] during your free time?

with a yes/no response. However, the data for this third question have not been released and in any case some consultation participants thought it was too general, so we do not propose to include it in measure 3.1. By combining positive responses to either of the first two questions with information on current or recent participation in formal education (where this is known), an overall measure of participation in learning can be calculated.

As noted above in relation to indicator 2, the LFS and associated boosts has good potential for disaggregation within each country by a range of equality characteristics.

The National Adult Learning Survey (and Scottish boost) is an alternative source of data on lifelong learning but the sample is much smaller than LFS and it has a low response rate.

One concern about the proposed measure expressed during the second round of specialist consultation is that it may be too broad. Inequalities in access to work-based training for example, may be quite different in inequalities in self-directed learning to keep mentally active in old age. However, when disaggregated by equality characteristics, some of these patterns become apparent (see table above), and more in-depth analysis of the forms of learning in which people are engaged can be undertaken to follow up the initial top-level picture.

One consultation response argued in favour of controlling for existing level of educational qualification for this measure, because people with higher qualifications are more likely to participate in learning than those with lower qualifications. This is an important observation and will need to be borne in mind in interpreting the results.

However, as for measures such as pay gaps in the Productive and Valued Activities domain, we are not convinced that the advantages of controlling for other characteristics outweigh the disadvantages of increased complexity of presentation and potentially obscuring inequalities we want to monitor. Further research will be needed to understand the reasons behind the inequalities revealed by many of the measures in the Framework; the purpose of the Framework is to describe and quantify the inequalities rather than to explain them.

Other consultation responses urged consideration of whether participants in formal and informal learning were satisfied with the outcome, and whether non-participants were happy with remaining non-participants. This could be important for example for disabled people, who were sometimes 'stuck' in inappropriate educational courses which were not fulfilling or useful to them. Supplementary information on satisfaction with learning outcomes could therefore be valuable, although 'satisfaction' questions tend not to be very robust, and need to be interpreted in the light of people's expectations.

In a related point, some participants at the consultation event in Scotland thought that this indicator was not properly an outcome indicator because it referred to participation rather than achievement. Other participants in Scotland, at the consultation event in Wales, and in responses to the web consultation, argued that participation itself can be considered a valuable activity.

An alternative measure of lifelong learning could be derived from data held by the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) on participation in further education and work-based learning courses. Disaggregation is currently available by gender, ethnicity, disability, and whether aged 16-18 or 19 plus (presumably a more fine-grained breakdown by age could in principle be provided). Although this is a potentially useful source, it is limited by the fact that the statistics give **numbers** of participants, which would need to be converted into participation **rates** relative to population demographic statistics, and these are not easy to obtain reliably at a small area level. Moreover, the LSC statistics reflect only participation in formal learning, whereas the proposed LFS questions extend to informal learning, which may be particularly significant for older people.

Table 8.4 Measure 3.1 Percentage who have participated in formal or informal learning in the last 12 months

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

	GB	Scotland	Wales
	%	%	%
All	41	42	39
Socio-economic group			
higher managerial and professional	62	69	64
lower managerial and professional	59**	63**	58**
intermediate	47**	49**	48**
small employers and own a/c	25**	23**	21**
lower supervisory and technical	44**	45**	44**
semi-routine	40**	39**	39**
routine	28**	28**	29**
never worked/long-term u/e	27**	26**	24**
Male	41	43	37
Female	41	42	40**
White	40	42	38
Black and Black British	57**	84**	
Indian	46**	71**	59**
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	38**	41	18**
Mixed	55**	75**	57**
Other	52**	64**	74**
Non-disabled	46	49	46
Disabled	23**	22**	21**
Age 18-24	68	71	67
Age 25-44	51**	54**	50**
Age 45-64	39**	40**	36**
Age 65-74	15**	12**	14**
Age 75 +	8**	6**	7**
No religion	48	51	44
Christian	39**	39**	36**
Buddhist	54**	51	65
Hindu	50	65**	
Jewish	41**		
Muslim	42**	47	37
Sikh	40**	56	
Other	45**	47	44

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

Indicator 4: Use of the internet**Measure 4.1: Percentage who have used the internet for any purpose within the last 3 months**

Source: ONS Omnibus Survey / Opinions Survey

Sub-domains: F, C

Evaluation of measure 4.1 against essential selection criteria:

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

This measure is a good match for sub-domain F (access information and technology necessary to participate in society), and also for parts of C (developing the skills to participate in productive and valued activities).

The specification of the measure has been revised following consultation. It now:

- focuses on use of the internet rather than ownership of a PC or internet access (the former implies a skill, the latter a simply resource);
- includes use at any location (work, home, elsewhere) and for any purpose;
- specifies use within the last 3 months, as research shows that some people who use the internet subsequently give up (ONS, 2007; OII, 2007; see also Selwyn and colleagues, 2005).

The data source is the ONS Omnibus Survey (now renamed the Opinions Survey) and the definition is consistent with one of the series produced by ONS. The measure proposed previously was drawn from the the British Social Attitudes Survey. It excluded work-related use and did not specify a time period, both features which consultation respondents thought were undesirable.

The relevant questions are carried on the Omnibus Survey for three months each year, giving a GB sample size of approximately 3,600. This is not sufficient to disaggregate by ethnicity or religion within Scotland or within Wales. Additional measures for Scotland and Wales based on larger country samples are available from the Scottish Household Survey (SHS) and the Living in Wales (LIW) Survey, although these data relate to internet access rather than use. Consideration could be given to revising the questions in the SHS and LIW to provide more detailed information.

During the first round of specialist consultation, participants pointed out to us the particular importance of internet access for small minorities, for example the transgender community, and for people with limited mobility. More generally, using the internet is now a key skill for participation in a range of different activities – consumption, job-searching, political engagement, social networking and so on.

In the second round of consultation, some respondents argued that internet use was too narrow – other technologies such as mobile phone use and digital television should be included. However, analysis by Communities and Local Government (CLG 2008) shows that mobile phone ownership has already reached probable saturation (around 90 per cent of individuals) and digital television ownership is rapidly increasing to around 76 per cent of households, driven by the 2012 analogue switch-off: this does not provide a useful indication of inclusion. On the other hand, use of the internet within the last three months stands at around 67 per cent of adults, and there are significant inequalities in this measure.

Some participants in the Welsh consultation event wanted to see this measure broadened to include computer literacy more generally. Many people in Wales do not have broadband access but this does not mean they are IT illiterate. This points to the need for careful interpretation of this measure.

Indicator 5: Being treated with respect in education**Measure 5.1 (EW): Percentage of those attending who say they are treated with respect at school or college (England and Wales)**

Source: Citizenship Survey (England and Wales)

Sub-domain: A, E

Evaluation of measure 5.1 against essential selection criteria:

1	Relevance	All equality characteristics
2	Legitimacy	Good, would be improved with revisions to question wording
3/4	Disaggregation	
	- at GB level	Not available
	- within England	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class (combined years)
	- within Scotland	Not available
	- within Wales	Gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion/belief, social class collected But ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion/belief sample sizes too small to disaggregate
5	Aspect of inequality	Process
6	Frequency	Annual
7	Individual level	Yes
8	Robustness	Good

This indicator is included to pick up on inequalities in the way people are treated within educational settings such as schools and colleges. Process indicators of this kind are far and few between in existing survey data. The Citizenship Survey is an attractive source because it includes a full range of equality characteristics, including sexual orientation, although a significant limitation is that it covers only England and Wales, and the sample size in Wales is too small for disaggregation by ethnicity or religion/belief.

For Wales, an alternative source is the LIW survey which asks whether parents felt that they were treated with dignity and respect at their children's school (in 2006), and whether the respondent him/herself was treated with dignity and respect in further education (in 2007).

No source of comparable data for Scotland has been located. A number of suggestions were made at the Scottish consultation event, but these focus on

schools. The Scottish Household Survey asks about satisfaction with education, but satisfaction is not a sufficiently close concept to 'being treated with respect' to provide a match for this measure.

Participants in the both rounds of specialist consultation thought that discrimination in education was an important concept but were not convinced that this question for the Citizenship Survey would capture it adequately. They noted that responses would have to be restricted to those currently in education (the question itself refers to 'work, school or college'), and this might mean the number of responses is too small to be robust, even when several years of data are combined. However, preliminary analysis of the data has allayed our concerns on this point to some extent. Combining two or more years would enable more disaggregation and would help to establish more statistical significance, but even with one year's data some differences can be detected.

Participants thought that an objective measure of discrimination might be preferable, such as disproportionality in rates of access to top higher education institutions, or in degree completion rates, but it was acknowledged that these focused on only one part of the educational system. There would also be overlap with measure 2.2 on levels of qualifications.

In the Welsh consultation, there was some discussion about whether 'respect' was the right concept. An example was given of a disabled person being treated respectfully by the staff but being unable to access equipment on the first floor level, and therefore being unable to participate fully in the class. Unfair treatment might be a better concept.

We recommend that consideration is given to revising the wording of the question in the Citizenship Survey:

- to separate experience at school or college from experience at work
- to broaden the effective sample by asking respondents about their most recent experience of education, rather than restricting to current participants
- to offer a range of prompts for ways in which the respondent may or may not have been treated fairly, including whether any support needs were met, whether there were problems of access, whether they were treated with dignity and respect, and so on.

The quality of the Citizenship respect data has been questioned in relation to the monitoring of Public Service Agreement 15 (see National Audit Office 2009) and a current Government Equalities Office project aims to develop improved survey

questions on perceptions of respect in treatment in public services. The outcomes of this project should also be given consideration in the development of this measure.

Table 8.5 Measure 5.1 (EW) Whether treated with respect

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

Sub-sample: those currently attending school or college

Score 1 to 4: treated with respect all of the time / some of the time / rarely / never.
Higher score indicates lower respect.

	Average score	Number in sample (unweighted)
All	1.70	455
Men	1.69	224
Women	1.72	231
White	1.75	117
Indian	1.52	57
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	1.54	72
Black	1.67	104
Mixed	1.71	29
Other	1.44**	76
Non-disabled	1.67	432
Disabled	2.16**	23
Age 18-24	1.54	192
Age 25-44	1.62	102
Heterosexual or straight	1.71	416
Gay, lesbian or bisexual		
Prefer not to say		
No religion	1.84	89
Christian	1.65	172
Buddhist		
Hindu	1.39**	36
Jewish		
Muslim	1.63	125
Sikh		
Any other religion		

** indicates figure 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 Citizenship Survey.

Note: Figures for groups in which there are fewer than 30 respondents are not reported.

Recommendations

Recommendations arising from assessment of shortlist against criteria for individual indicators

Disaggregation by equality characteristics is generally good for the indicators on the shortlist, and will be enhanced further if as expected the Integrated Household Survey adopts a question on sexual orientation, following completion of the ONS pilot study.

The LFS should consider extending questions on educational qualifications to the over-65 age group. The basic skills surveys in the three countries could usefully include some additional equality characteristic questions (religion/belief, and sexual orientation), and there needs to be a commitment to repeat the surveys on a regular (preferably at least triennial) basis.

There are gaps in existing data in terms of disaggregation potential within Scotland and within Wales for indicator 4 (internet use). Consideration could be given to revising the questions in the SHS and LIW to provide more detailed information on internet use (rather than access).

No Scottish source has been found for measure 1.2 (ability to speak, read and write English or Welsh [or Scots Gaelic]), or for indicator 5 (being treated with respect in education).

As for other domains, some groups are missing altogether from existing data. The experiences of the transgender population, Gypsies and Travellers, and asylum seekers and refugees are not well-recorded (even where they are identified) in general household survey data, and specialist surveys will be required. Separate monitoring will also be required for the non-household population including the homeless, prisoners and residents in long-stay hospitals and residential care homes. Many of these groups are at high risk of low educational attainment and low rates of participation in lifelong learning. As the data issues for these groups cut across several domains, they are discussed in more detail in the general recommendations in Chapter 15.

Finally, we recommend that consideration is given to revising the wording of the question on being treated with respect in education in the Citizenship Survey:

- to separate experience at school or college from experience at work;
- to broaden the effective sample by asking respondents about their most recent experience of education, rather than restricting to current participants;

- to offer a range of prompts for ways in which the respondent may or may not have been treated fairly, including whether any support needs were met, whether there were problems of access, whether they were treated with dignity and respect, and so on.

The survey questions on ability to speak, read, write English or Welsh in the Citizenship Survey could also usefully be supplemented to ask about availability of communication support where needed.

Recommendations arising from assessment of shortlist against whole domain selection criteria

The four outcome indicators – basic skills, educational qualifications, participation in lifelong learning and use of the internet – between them give coverage of important elements on all six sub-domains A to F (attaining the highest possible standard, being intellectually fulfilled and stimulated, developing the skills for participation in a diverse society, accessing education training and lifelong learning that meets individual needs, and accessing information and technology). They are accompanied on the provisional short list by a single process indicator, concerning being treated with respect in education.

One important gap is other parts of sub-domain D (learning about a range of cultures and beliefs and acquiring the skills to participate in a diverse society, including learning English). Although the very last part – English language – is picked up in measure 1.2, other elements of this sub-domain are not. This gap is addressed in part through indicators in other domains, especially Identity, Expression and Self-respect.

Finally, in developing the children's framework, GEO / EHRC should be mindful of the importance of joining up with the adults' framework in the Education and Learning domain, for example by including some 'crossover' indicators tracking children's educational experience into qualifications obtained in early adulthood.

We recommend:

- The Labour Force Survey should extend questions on educational qualifications to the over-65 age group.
- The basic skills surveys in the three countries should include questions on a full range of equality characteristics including religion/belief and sexual orientation, and there should be a commitment to repeat the surveys on a frequent (preferably at least triennial) basis.

- Consideration should be given to revising the wording of the question on being treated with respect in education in the Citizenship Survey:
 - to separate experience at school or college from experience at work;
 - to broaden the effective sample by asking respondents about their most recent experience of education, rather than restricting to current participants;
 - to offer a range of prompts for ways in which the respondent may or may not have been treated fairly, including whether any support needs were met, whether there were problems of access, whether they were treated with dignity and respect, and so on.

- The survey questions on ability to speak, read, write English or Welsh in the Citizenship Survey could usefully be supplemented to ask about availability of communication support where needed.

- Consideration should be given to revising the questions in the Scottish Household Survey and the successor to the LIW Survey to provide more detailed information on internet use (rather than access).

- Consideration should be given to including in the Scottish Household Survey additional questions on ability to speak, write and read English or Scots Gaelic, and on the experience of being treated with dignity and respect (or lack of it) in education.

- Particular attention should be given by EHRC, GEO and the devolved administrations in developing the children's Equality Measurement Framework to ensure indicators covering the transition from school to further and higher education are included.