



## King's Research Portal

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxac005>

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Schmid, C., Cook, R., & Jones, L. (2022). Measuring Gender Inequality in Great Britain: Proposal for a Sub-National Gender Inequality Index. *SOCIAL POLITICS*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxac005>

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **Measuring Gender Inequality in Great Britain: Proposal for a Sub-National Gender Inequality Index**

Caitlin Schmid, Dr Rose Cook, Laura Jones

Global Institute for Women's Leadership, King's College London

### **Abstract**

Tackling gender inequality is a key focus for both civil society and government policy in Great Britain (GB). Yet, there is currently no consensus on how to conceptualize or operationalize gender inequalities, nor any detailed measurement of gender inequalities at the sub-national level, despite high levels of regional inequality. This is a barrier to the development and evaluation of gender equality programs and policies, and to holding the government accountable. To address this gap, we propose a framework for a sub-national index of gender inequalities in GB based on a review of relevant indices, theoretical models and policy. This framework was further developed in a workshop with stakeholders. We also scope the data currently available from survey and administrative sources to capture the proposed framework, highlighting gaps in our ability to comprehensively measure gender inequalities at the sub-national level in GB.

### **1. Introduction**

There is widespread awareness that women and men's lives are structured in unequal ways, illustrated by disparities in pay, health, and life expectancy as well as the prevalence of sexual harassment and violence. This 'gender order' has long been recognized as multi-dimensional, operating across diverse domains (Connell 1987). One way to expose patterns of inequality is by operationalizing them as measurable constructs. While imperfect, quantitative indicators have become influential in the development and evaluation of policy interventions addressing gender inequalities. We propose a sub-national gender equality index for Great Britain (GB), which can be used for this purpose, while also functioning as an advocacy tool with which the government can be held accountable. The proposed index is intended as one instrument amongst a range of feminist approaches to understanding gender inequality in GB to be used alongside qualitative, contextual, and longitudinal analyses.

In this article, we investigate which dimensions and indicators should and could be included in a sub-national measure of gender inequalities in GB, highlighting where current data is under-

utilized as well as data gaps. We focus on GB (England, Scotland and Wales) as opposed to the whole UK (which additionally includes Northern Ireland) for both substantive and pragmatic reasons. Unlike the rest of the UK, Northern Ireland is not subject to the Equality Act 2010, the primary legislation governing equalities in England, Scotland and Wales and has a distinctive approach to equalities provision (Hankivsky et al. 2019). Secondly, much of the data that are available to measure gender inequalities are not comparable between Northern Ireland and the rest of the UK.

First, we explain the need for a new sub-national gender equality index for GB, while also addressing the limitations of quantitative indicators for the measurement of a diverse and complex social phenomenon such as gender inequality. Second, we introduce an initial conceptual framework developed through a review of theories of gender equality. Third, we present the findings of a workshop conducted in November 2020 with representatives from the government and third sector across GB. The workshop was intended to include a diverse range of stakeholders and to involve potential users in index development. The challenges and opportunities of a GB sub-national gender equality index identified by workshop participants further refined the proposed conceptual framework. This discussion is complemented by a review of existing national and sub-national indices from other countries, to show possible approaches to dealing with the challenges. Finally, we present the findings of our data scoping, contrasting the identified ideal indicators with relevant and readily available data resources. We conclude with recommendations for future data collection.

This paper makes a significant contribution by a) proposing a conceptual framework to identify what domains and indicators should be included in a sub-national measure of gender inequalities in GB; b) scoping what data are currently available from survey and administrative data sources and c) comparing the conceptual framework and available data resources to highlight gaps in our ability to meaningfully measure local area gender inequalities, allowing us to recommend future innovations to data collection to make this possible.

## **2. Background**

Over the past 25 years, we have witnessed a proliferation of global and international gender equality indices (see Schmid 2021 for an overview). The UK has been included in many of these, including the UNDP's *Gender Development Index* (UNDP 2019a) and *Gender Inequality Index* (UNDP 2019b), the World Economic Forum's *Global Gender Gap Index* (World

Economic Forum 2019) and the European Institute for Gender Equality's *Gender Equality Index* (EIGE 2021). Yet, existing indices fall short in providing a nuanced picture of the gender inequality context in the region for the following reasons:

- 1) The set of indicators commonly used to measure gender equality is limited by global data availability:

According to the 2020 *Global Gender Gap* report, the UK ranks highly on women's health and education, and slightly worse on political participation and economic opportunity, though still well above the global average (World Economic Forum 2019). However, global rankings are partly a function of indicator selection, which is often driven by the availability of data across multiple countries rather than having a robust theoretical foundation. The need for global coverage results in the use of a limited range of indicators meant to capture the key inequalities universally faced by women; usually focusing on measures of educational attainment, health outcomes or labor market participation. Yet, the process in determining what is 'universal' is structured by power dynamics in that a) indicators are usually conceptualized in the Global North, giving it an advantage to knowledge production (Merry 2011), and b) domains with affinities to the Western mainstream (especially to employment) are more readily translated into indicators (Verloo and van der Vleuten 2009). In instances where indicators are used to benchmark and rank country performance, actors with control over the data generation process can use this bias to their advantage, at times with adverse impact on progress (Verloo and van der Vleuten 2009).

It comes as no surprise then, that across the existing global indices, women in the Global North are generally shown to be 'doing well' in terms of economic opportunity, education, and health, with modest variation between countries at a similar stage of economic development. This is especially the case when indices take into account absolute levels of achievement (e.g. EIGE's *Gender Equality Index*) rather than focusing exclusively on gender gaps (e.g. WEF's *Global Gender Gap Index*). Yet, the absence of context in the production of global indicators lessens their informative value, portraying a simplistic vision of women's position in rich Global North countries like the UK. For instance, indicators of educational attainment and formal employment rates are less insightful in settings where women have overtaken men in university enrolments and are widely employed (Fine, Sojo & Lawford-Smith 2020). Instead, less globally available indicators of educational and occupational segregation would be more informative

and would show women doing less ‘well’ by many measures. In other words, we see a need for a measurement of gender equality in GB that is tailored to its specific national circumstances.

Although focusing on (sub)national rather than global indicators of gender equality avoids the power dynamics between the Global North and South, we are aware that social and political dynamics are at play within GB – its startling regional inequality is partly what drives our ambition to develop a sub-national gender equality index which can help challenge this. We thus recognize that the generation of indicators in this context is also shaped by power. For instance, below in our data scoping we show that – as in the EU and global context – gender equality domains with affinities to the mainstream are more widely available in GB data. Still, data gaps need not necessarily limit the theoretical richness of our framework. As discussed in more detail below, the index can serve an additional function as an advocacy tool for increased efforts to improve data availability and relevance for capturing and challenging patterns of inequality in GB.

2) There is a lack of information below the national level:

While a move away from the global to a regional or national picture can provide theoretical richness, it can still mask wide sub-national variation in gender equality. For instance, the EIGE’s *Gender Equality Index* benefits from a much broader range of indicators due to well-developed national data infrastructure in European countries. Still it cannot address country-specific contexts or unpick differences beneath the national level. The lack of sub-national information on gender equality is a particular problem in GB, which has one of the highest levels of regional inequality in the developed world (Davenport & Zaranko 2020). While *The Index of Multiple Deprivation* (IMD), a widely used measure of relative deprivation for small areas in England, reveals stark inequalities in earnings and living conditions between regions and even between adjacent neighborhoods, it does not capture gender differences.

Gender inequalities in GB will be shaped by the high levels of regional inequalities. To take one example, while nationally men’s employment rate is 8 percentage points higher than women’s, this varies from 6 percentage points in the North East, to 12 percentage points in London (Francis-Devine, Ward & Foley 2020). Further, there is evidence that neighborhood characteristics influence outcomes like intimate partner violence and health (Pinchevsky & Wright 2012; Stafford et al. 2005), and that area-level gender inequalities are related to other

inequalities (e.g. Backhans, Lundberg & Månsdotter 2007; Chen et al. 2005; Perrons 1995). This highlights the need for a measure which is sensitive to regional differences so as not to homogenize the diversity of experiences faced by men and women in GB.

If the British government is serious about tackling regional inequalities via its ‘Levelling up’ agenda, the gendered dimensions of this need to be addressed. An obvious but to-date neglected way to do so is through the harnessing of finer-grained data. Plenty of data relevant to measuring gender inequalities are already routinely collected in GB, but either their potential impact is overlooked, or issues of access prevent their integration. Making better use of the existing sub-national data can facilitate the evaluation of area-level gender equalities in GB to understand its impact on community and individual outcomes. Incorporating data reflecting gender inequalities at a sub-national level requires a firm theoretical foundation and comprehensive data scoping, both of which we seek to provide.

But before we turn our attention to theory, we want to touch upon wider critiques of quantitative indicators and indices to call into mind that these instruments are social constructs shaped by power dynamics. Feminist scholars have highlighted points of contestation in relation to their epistemology, the power relations embedded in their generation, and their relationship to governance. Sally Merry (2011, 2016) argues that complex and context-specific phenomenon such as gender equality and violence against women cannot be reduced to a universal indicator for measurement over time and space. Moreover, the process and consequences of abstraction can be problematic since the generation of gendered indicators produce “representations of the gendered world that are somewhat removed from women’s direct experiences” (Walby 2005, 372). The concept of gender in quantitative data itself can be limited for investigating gender inequalities since it is often represented as a dichotomous variable (Lindqvist, Sendén and Renström 2020) and intersecting inequalities modifying experiences depending on context, time and place are not necessarily taken into consideration (Crenshaw, 1989). Further, we recognize the limitations of “‘outcome’-focused and quantitative analyses, as part of a closed policy cycle” (Minto, Mergaert and Bustelo 2020, 278), especially as it risks placing focus on improving indicators rather than promoting social change (Desrosières 2015). The complex and cross-cutting nature of gender equality and pace of social change requires a holistic approach to policy development and evaluation, meaning that the interpretation of quantitative indicators must be enriched by qualitative, contextual, and longitudinal analyses (Minto, Mergaert and Bustelo, 2020; Razavi 2019).

Given the valid critiques of quantitative indicators for measuring gender inequality, the proposed index is intended as one instrument amongst a range available in feminist approaches to governance and has the potential to offer longitudinal analyses if updated regularly. Within the limitations, our aim is to offer a tool which can help expose patterns of inequality in GB in order to challenge them. For now, this paper proposes a conceptual framework for a GB sub-national gender equality index. As a next step, this framework would need to be translated into an index by compiling, analyzing and harmonizing the data. Our hope is that the index can eventually be developed into an easily accessible application for exploring patterns of gender inequality at the local area level, serving multiple purposes for different users. The granularity of the data adds a spatial dimension to analyses of inequality in GB which can aid researchers and guide policy makers in monitoring existing initiatives and developing new ones. At the same time, this can help civil society hold the government to account for their (lack of) effort and against their own stated aims (e.g. The Equality Act). Moreover, to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty stipulated by the Equality Act, public authorities frequently conduct Equality Impact Assessments prior to implementing policy to estimate the potential impact on different groups. The proposed sub-national gender equality index could be used to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of these assessments, especially if measured over time. In light of the prominence of quantitative indicators in governance, we especially see value in strengthening the capacity of “grassroot and advocacy and non-state actors [...] to employ the high credibility of numeric evidence to promote alternative understandings of dominant institutions.” (Rottenburg and Merry 2015, 4). In this objective, we also take inspiration from the Women’s Budget Group’s (2021) Local Data Project which seeks to put data into the hands of grassroots organizations in the UK by providing resources and training to strengthen the data literacy of women’s equality advocates. Ideally, the index can evolve into a democratic tool where the existing quantitative data (i.e. administrative and large-scale survey data) are enriched by data collected by local charities, although data harmonization poses a significant challenge.

### **3. Identifying Domains of Gender Inequality in GB: Mapping Theory and Policy**

What should be included in a sub-national index of gender inequalities? Feminist scholarship has long attempted to define and systematize the diverse areas of life and society where women’s disadvantage is manifested, often as a way to create appropriate measurements or to describe a vision of what true equality would look like. To identify which domains should be

included in our potential new index, we reviewed a selection of prominent scholarship relevant to Western Anglophone contexts published within the past few decades that define and systematise the diverse areas where gender inequalities manifest themselves. We also note where similar themes are reflected within GB policy documents concerned with gender inequalities, as well as international treaties the UK is party to.<sup>1</sup> The domains are summarized in Table 1.

### *Power and participation*

Raewyn Connell (1987, 181) defines power as “the balance of advantage or inequality of resources in a workplace, household, or larger institution”. Women’s participation in influential roles within society’s key institutions is an important indicator of gender equality since representative institutions are more likely to promote policy change towards gender equality as well as implement policies that benefit women directly (Pascall & Lewis 2004, 389). This is very much how the issue of power is addressed in policies such as the UN’s the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women (CEDAW), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Equality Act, wherein the focus is on women’s numerical representation in conventional positions of power.

However, women’s lack of power can be manifested across multiple domains. For example, within Nancy Fraser’s (1997) principles of gender equality, women’s full participation in public life, including employment and civil society, as well as politics, is central (the principle of *anti-marginalization*). Her principle of *equality of respect* focuses on respect and recognition for women’s personhood. Sylvia Walby’s (1990) theory of patriarchy distinguishes between its ‘private’ and ‘public’ manifestations. ‘Public’ patriarchy is based in sites such as employment and the state and could be manifested as the absence of women from positions of power (though for Walby, the patriarchal character of the state is much more expansive than women’s lack of representation within it). More broadly, gender equality in ‘social power’ implies equity in the ability to define and frame key social issues, to ‘formulate ideals and morality, in short to assert hegemony’ (Connell, 1987, 181). Instead of power, Gillian Pascall and Jane Lewis (2004) refer to ‘voice’, which again can operate within the household as well as in the public sphere such as civil society and state. Martha Nussbaum (2003) and Ingrid Robeyns (2003) also conceptualize power and participation in terms of fair involvement in decision-making as well as the right to free speech and association.

Indicators of women's power and participation could thus include representation in politics but also voice within civil society and social movements. As well as numerical and substantive representation, policies which enable representation, such as the presence of policies like proportional representation and quotas, as well as the strength of women's organizations, could provide indicators of women's power and participation.

### *Economic resources*

Inequality in economic resources is probably the most studied aspect of gender inequality. For many theorists, this is mainly centered around work. Pascall and Lewis (2004) emphasise 'the equal opportunity to earn', which includes equal pay but also minimum wage levels and sufficiency of work to support oneself, including in retirement. Robeyns (2003) also focuses on the ability to generate one's own economic resources through employment. However, both Robeyns (2003) and Nussbaum (2003) also acknowledge access to activities that do not involve paid work but could bring resources such as wellbeing or access to relationships. Inequalities in work and economic resources feature centrally in policy priorities set out by both Westminster and the devolved nations which commit to increasing women's labor market participation by reducing the barriers that women face in returning to or entering the labor market. This is illustrated for example, by the requirement on larger UK companies to report their gender pay gaps annually. However, many feminist theorists would go further; Walby (1990) argues that women's position within the employment structure is also crucial. Connell (1987) also focuses on the sexual division of labor which is argued to be a manifestation of a larger patriarchal structure of production, consumption and distribution within capitalism.

Theorists also focus more directly on women's economic exploitation. Walby argues that the patriarchal exploitation of women's labor has moved from the private sphere (i.e. within households) to the public sphere (e.g. workplaces) which can be observed through women working in low paid, poor quality jobs. For Fraser (1997), poverty among women is key, especially among groups of women more vulnerable to poverty, such as single mothers. Her principle of *anti-exploitation* is strongly linked to poverty prevention. The level of exploitation could be assessed through women's dependence on others such as male partners for survival or the sufficiency of their independently owned resources.

### *Education & skills*

Fraser (1997), Walby (1990) and Pascall & Lewis (2004) do not mention education and skills

as a key site of gender inequality. Indeed, it is unclear how gender inequalities in education and skills should be measured in a context like the UK where women participate in education to an equal or even greater extent than men. Connell (1987) focuses on the sexual division of labor and the differential training and ‘skilling’ that leads to this. Robeyns (2003) cites differences in the attention paid to boys and girls within educational institutions and in the subjects chosen and career aspirations (e.g. STEM).

### *Unpaid work*

For some (e.g. Walby), women’s disproportionate share of domestic work and care for children, the elderly and the sick indicates their exploitation by men, a clear indicator of gender inequality. For others, unpaid work is important because it limits access to paid employment, an independent income, the chance to access positions of power and influence, and participation in civil society. Unpaid care work also represents the ‘other side’ of equality on which progress has been slower – while women have entered the labor force (a previously male domain) this has not been matched by men doing more unpaid work. Therefore, this domain can focus more on men’s behavior and actions towards reducing inequalities rather than on where women have made progress. Though women’s unpaid work receives relatively little attention within GB legislation, it has been acknowledged more recently in Scottish and Welsh roadmaps for gender equality and is somewhat recognized by the promotion of ‘family-friendly’ workplace policies (Scottish Government 2020; Welsh Government 2020).

An indicator of whether women perform these domestic and caring activities or not would not be enough to signal advantage or disadvantage; the amount of time spent on these activities as well as the frequency (as the degree to which these activities are detrimental or limiting to the individual depends on these time aspects) in relation to other domains of activity (paid work, leisure) is important as it relates to “the gender division of time and responsibilities for market work, nonmarket work, and leisure” (Robeyns 2003, 82). This is important for gender inequality since it relates to time autonomy and wellbeing. Critical to Fraser (1997) is the recognition and respect of women’s work, especially care work. This implies measuring not only women’s engagement in unpaid work but also the respect and value accorded to this work (in the ‘universal caregiver model’ proposed by Fraser, childbearing, childrearing and informal domestic labor are given the same status as formal paid labor). However, this is more challenging to measure.

*Health & well-being*

Health and wellbeing play a minor role across the theoretical frameworks consulted, except among theorists informed by the capabilities approach, where they are central: indicators would include mortality, good health including reproductive health, access to adequate nutrition and shelter (Nussbaum 2003). Robeyns (2003) centers both physical health and mental well-being, citing life expectancy at birth, access to and quality of healthcare; rates of ill health and unhealthy behaviors and the prevalence of psychological distress. However, other theorists do not see these as central to gender inequalities, perhaps because they focus on disadvantages to women whereas health inequalities often disadvantage men. Fraser (1997) and Pascall & Lewis (2004) refer to time poverty and lack of time autonomy as potentially leading to poor wellbeing among women and mention lack of leisure time as an indicator. However, overall there is no consensus that health and wellbeing should form part of any comprehensive measurement of gender inequality.

*Violence against women and girls*

There is considerable debate about the place of violence within gender equality frameworks. For theorists such as Walby, male violence against women and girls (VAWG) is absolutely central to any definition and measurement of gender inequality (Walby 1990, 2020; Walby et al. 2017) and should constitute a domain in its own right. She refers to explicit examples of male violence against women – rape, sexual assault, workplace sexual harassment - but also views patriarchal violence as a wider social structure with diverse manifestations, also connected to the masculine character of ‘institutionalized violence’ e.g. the military, police, and prison system. Others argue that the importance of violence is under-estimated and rather than being a separate domain, it is “central, hierarchical, and regulates and works across all domains” (Hearn et al. 2020 , 4); reflecting the view that violence against women is often ‘symbolic’, involving the objectification and denigration of women as well as overt acts of violence. However, being difficult to measure in quantitative terms, the place of such constructs in gender equality indices is disputed.

Table 1. Mapping theory and policy: Key sites of gender equality

Domain	Theoretical underpinnings	Policy areas
Power & Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Equality of respect; Anti-marginalization; Anti-androcentrism (Fraser 1997)</li> <li>- The state; Culture (Walby 1990)</li> <li>- Power relations (Connell 2002)</li> <li>- Voice (2004)</li> <li>- Control over one's environment; Equal worth (Nussbaum,2003)</li> <li>- Political empowerment; Respect (Robeyns 2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 50:50 by 2020 public sector board commitment (Scotland)</li> <li>- Women in Finance Charter, Tech Talent Charter (UK)</li> <li>- “We want a Wales where Diverse women are fairly represented in positions of influence and empowered to play a meaningful role in society”</li> </ul>
Economic Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anti-exploitation; Anti-poverty; Income equality (Fraser 1997)</li> <li>- Paid work (Walby 1990)</li> <li>- Paid work, Income (Pascall and Lewis 2004)</li> <li>- Paid work and other projects (Robeyns 2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fair Work in Scotland (Scotland)</li> <li>- Fair Work Wales (Wales)</li> <li>- Action on financial instability for women in later life (UK)</li> </ul>
Education & Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Senses, imagination, and thought; Practical reason (Nussbaum 2003)</li> <li>- Education and knowledge (Robeyns 2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Occupation and segregation in the young workforce (Scotland)</li> <li>- Improving gender balance in school subject choice pilot (Wales)</li> <li>- Investment in programs to increase girls’ participation in STEM subjects (UK)</li> </ul>
Unpaid work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anti-exploitation; Equality of respect (Fraser 1997)</li> <li>- Household production (Walby 1990)</li> <li>- Symbolic relations (Connell 2002)</li> <li>- Care work (Pascall &amp; Lewis 2004)</li> <li>- Emotions; Affiliation; Play (Nussbaum 2003)</li> <li>- Domestic work and non-market care (Robeyns 2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “We want a Wales where all women can have economic independence, and paid and unpaid work is valued” (Wales)</li> <li>- “Tackling gendered assumptions about who cares” (Scotland)</li> <li>- Two of the key drivers of inequality are the fact that women take more time out to care for children, and women provide more informal care and unpaid work for others (UK)</li> </ul>
Health & Well-being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Life; Bodily health; Bodily integrity (Nussbaum 2003)</li> <li>- Life and physical health; Mental well-being (Robeyns 2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building an evidence base around improving women’s reproductive health (UK)</li> <li>- Development of a period dignity strategic plan (Wales)</li> <li>- Commitment to improving parental wellbeing through access to family support services via the National Parenting Strategy (Scotland)</li> </ul>
Violence against women and girls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Equality of respect (Fraser 1997)</li> <li>- Sexuality; Violence (Walby 1990, 2009)</li> <li>- Power relations; Symbolic relations; Emotional relations (Connell 2002)</li> <li>- Bodily integrity (Nussbaum 2003; Robeyns 2003)</li> <li>- Bodily integrity and safety; Respect (Robeyns 2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “We want a Wales where violence against women, domestic abuse and sexual violence stops” (Wales)</li> <li>- Violence against Women and Girls Strategy (UK)</li> <li>- Equally Safe Strategy (Scotland)</li> </ul>

#### **4. Challenges in Developing a GB Sub-National Gender Equality Index: Findings from the Workshop**

Following the initial review and identification of key sites of gender inequality relevant to the GB context (see Table 1), we now turn to presenting findings of a workshop conducted in 2020 with a diverse group of experts and potential users, inviting them to respond to our proposed framework and explore the challenges and opportunities offered by a sub-national GB gender equality index. This discussion is complemented by a review of existing national and sub-national indices from other countries, to show possible approaches to dealing with these challenges.

In total, 24 academics, researchers, activists, and policy practitioners from various disciplines across England, Wales and Scotland participated in the two-hour online session, contributing their expertise in gender equality as well as their knowledge of regional disparities and data in GB. The interactive consultation was structured around three main questions: 1) What would an ideal GB gender equality index be composed of? 2) Who could make use of it? 3) How would it advance our understanding of gender equality in GB?

The intention of the workshop was to include a range of individuals from different backgrounds to enrich our theoretical and policy review, informing the conceptual framework of the index. We refer to the participants as stakeholders although we are conscious that this is not an exhaustive group with interests in promoting gender equality in GB. Moreover, the selection process and attendance will have been shaped by structural factors resulting in exclusion of other viewpoints. For instance, in the selection of participants occurred through institutional channels (universities, charities, government institutions, trade unions, research institutions). Further, we faced particular difficulties in getting individuals working on ending VAWG to join the workshop, potentially due to skepticism of quantitative approaches to studying this field.

In light of this, we acknowledge that we may not have sufficiently incorporated a diversity of voices in this process and ideally the workshop would be repeated to further enrich the discussion and framework. The resulting framework therefore represents an initial proposal and we invite contributions and critiques in the interest of incorporating diverse perspectives to promote gender equality in GB. With this in mind, the results of the workshop are presented

below, starting with a discussion of the challenges to the development of a GB gender equality index.

### Choice of domains

Participants were divided into six groups broadly representing the domains in Table 1. There was general agreement that these domains reflect key sites of gender inequalities in the GB context. The Economic Resources group did however argue that inequalities in the sphere of paid employment should be captured separately from gender differences in financial resources and poverty to facilitate analysis of their relationship. The discussions also confirmed that gender inequalities in the economic, educational, or political sphere are easier to operationalize and translate into quantitative indicators than those relating to health and violence. The choice of domains within the 19 existing sub-national gender equality indices support this finding (see Table 2).

Including a Health & Well-being domain as part of the index was viewed critically, since analyses of the relationship between gender equality levels and health outcomes might be more informative if health indicators are excluded. The *Additive Index of Gender Equality for Swedish Municipalities* (Backhans et al. 2007) follows this logic, using compound indicators to measure gender equality levels and then analyzing their correlation with morbidity and mortality rates. Participants noted that there are multiple ways to conceptualize health, resulting in a disparate choice of indicators. For instance, if built around women's empowerment, the indicators selected would allow gender-specific measures to be included. An example of this is the *US Women, Peace and Security Index* by the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security (GIWPS 2019), which includes women-specific health outcomes as part of the core index (i.e. maternal mortality rate and access to abortion clinics). If the aim is to capture gender differences, indicators will be included in which women might be at an advantage (e.g. life expectancy), as is the case in the *Sub-national Gender Development Index* by Jeroen Smits and Iñaki Permanyer (2019). *Scotland's Gender Equality Index* (Scottish Government 2020) proposes a novel way of combining the two approaches by including a core domain measuring gender differences in health outcomes, complemented with a satellite domain capturing women-specific health outcomes.

Since the EIGE index is one of the most comprehensive gender quality indices to date, includes GB and has conceptually influenced at least three local area indices<sup>2</sup>, it is worth briefly

contrasting its dimensions (Work, Money, Knowledge, Time, Power and Health) to that of our proposed index. Table 3 summarizes our choice of domains and includes key subdomains identified by the workshop participants.

As mentioned, participants argued for the separation of employment (i.e. labor market participation, quality of work, segregation) from financial resources (e.g. income, wealth). We therefore propose splitting Economic Resources into the two separate dimensions - Paid Work and Money, as in the EIGE index. Our domain Education & Skills mirrors the EIGE domain of Knowledge. The EIGE includes the domain Power, which measures women's representation in political and civil institutions and commercial organizations. Participants argued for the importance of also measuring gender differences in political participation (i.e. voting behaviors, party membership). We therefore label this domain Power & Participation.

Further, we propose including a distinct domain of Unpaid Work, covering unpaid care for children and adults, domestic labor and volunteering, as also recommended by the participants. While the EIGE index covers these indicators, it places them alongside measures of time spent on leisure, a sporting and cultural activities. The approach taken by EIGE has been argued to obscure the centrality of unpaid work in perpetuating gender inequalities (Schmid 2021). Including Unpaid Work alongside Paid Work helps signal the equal value of 'productive' and 'reproductive' labor, while also highlighting their interrelation.

We decided against including Health & Well-being in the core index, following participants' suggestions. Instead, we propose a satellite domain measuring gender differences in health outcomes, which could potentially be complemented by an analysis of differences in women's reproductive health and access to services. Similarly, we recognize that varied forms of VAWG are central to understanding gender inequalities (Strid et al. 2021) and therefore suggest including a satellite domain. We strongly advise interpreting this satellite domain alongside qualitative data to highlight its structural and cross-cutting nature and include the voices of affected individuals. Going beyond quantitative data is particularly important in the case of VAWG considering limitations in the richness and quality of existing quantitative data identified by the participants as well as in the literature (e.g. Merry 2016; Walby and Towers 2017).

Table 2. Overview of existing Gender Equality Indices on national and sub-national level.

Gender Equality Indices	Scope	Index Dimensions*						
		Education & Skills	Paid Work	Money	Power & Participation	Unpaid Work	Health	VAWG
Status of Women Index (Yllö 1984)	US States	X	X	X	X			
Gender Equality Index (Sugarman & Strauss 1988)	US States		X	X	X			X
Gender Equality Index (Harvey, Blakely & Tepperman 1990)	Ontario Province, Canada	X	X	X				
Norwegian Regional Gender Equality Index (Kjeldstad & Kristiansen 2001)	Norwegian municipalities	X	X	X		X		
Gender Equality Index (Di Noia, 2002)	US States		X	X	X			X
Additive index of gender equality for Swedish municipalities (Backhans, Lundberg & Mansdotter 2007)	Swedish municipalities		X	X	X	X		
Gender Equality Index of Mexican States (Frias 2008)	Mexican states	X	X	X	X	X		X
Measurement of gender inequality in neighbourhoods of Québec, Canada (Tamambang et al. 2011)	Québec neighborhoods, Canada	X	X	X	X	X		
The Italian Gender Gap Index (Bozzano 2012)	Italian regions	X	X	X	X		X	
Total Earnings Gap Index (Georgiadis & Christopoulos 2017)	Greek regions		X	X				
Gender equality index of the autonomous communities of Spain (Gil-Lafuente et al. 2016)	Spanish Autonomous Communities (i.e. regions)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Regional Gender Equality Monitor (Norlén, Papadimitriou & Dijkstra 2019)	EU regions	X	X	X	X		X	X
Women's Hour Index (Dunatchik et al. 2017)	GB Local authorities	X	X	X			X	
US Women Peace and Security Index (GIWPS 2020)	US States	X	X	X	X			X
Sub-national Gender Development Index (Smits & Permanyer 2020)	Global, Sub-national regions	X		X			X	
Regional Gender Equality applied to Italy (Di Bella et al. 2020)	Italian regions	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Scotland's Gender Equality Index (Scottish Government 2020)	Scotland	X	X	X	X	X	X	

\* Indicators of existing national and sub-national indices have been categorized into the domains identified in this paper according to our reviews and workshop findings and do not necessarily reflect the domains present in each index.

Table 3. Overview of proposed domains and subdomains for a sub-national GB gender equality index.

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Subdomain</b>
Power & Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Distribution of power</li> <li>- Political participation</li> <li>- Representation in civil society</li> </ul>
Paid Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Labor market participation</li> <li>- Quality of work</li> <li>- Segregation</li> </ul>
Money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Income</li> <li>- Poverty levels</li> <li>- Wealth</li> </ul>
Education & Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Literacy and numeracy rates</li> <li>- Educational achievement</li> <li>- Subject choices</li> <li>- Adult learning</li> <li>- Educational experience</li> <li>- Returns to qualification</li> </ul>
Unpaid work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Childcare</li> <li>- Care of adults</li> <li>- Domestic work</li> <li>- Volunteering</li> </ul>
<b>Satellite domains:</b>	
Health & Well-being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Health risk</li> <li>- Health status</li> <li>- Health behavior</li> </ul>
VAWG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple forms of VAWG</li> </ul>

### Intersectionality

A central challenge to the development of a gender equality index is to avoid obscuring other forms of inequality. Participants stressed the importance of the index adopting an intersectional approach, ideally drawing on harmonized data disaggregated by local area level for each nation and protected characteristic (including sex, age, disability, race, religion or belief, gender reassignment, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity). This way, sub-national variation in gender equality could be analyzed for different groups of women.

However, disaggregated data are still largely absent in GB (discussed below) and beyond, making this aim challenging to fulfil. For this reason, most existing sub-national gender equality indices fail to incorporate an intersectional approach. Notable exceptions include the EIGE index, which adds a satellite domain on intersecting inequalities, enabling analysis of variation

in gender gaps across social categories (e.g. citizenship, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, religion or age) (EIGE 2013, 31). A further exception is the *Women's Hour Index* (Dunatchik et al. 2017) which measures women's quality of life across 380 British local authorities. It too includes satellite domains aimed at capturing variation across age groups.

#### Data availability and quality

An intersectional approach requires harmonized data disaggregated by local area level for each GB country and as many relevant protected characteristics as possible. Workshop participants raised concerns regarding the current availability of such data and consistency across the three nations. One approach might be to develop different indices for each nation using the available indicators, similar to the IMD. Data availability is a commonly cited problem, especially when seeking to go beneath the national level, affecting the choice of indicators and therefore the scope of the index (e.g. Di Bella et al. 2020; Bozzano 2012; Dunatchik et al. 2017; Gil-Lafuente et al. 2019; Harvey, Blakely & Tepperman 1990; Kjeldstad and Kristiansen 2001; Di Noia 2002).

#### Absolute and relative levels

The challenge of capturing multiple forms of inequality further points to the question of whether to measure relative or absolute levels of equality. This is a longstanding dilemma in the gender equality index literature, especially since the introduction of the UNDP's 1995 global indices (UNDP, 1995) which led to the development of direct measures of gender equality (including indices by Dijkstra 2002; Dijkstra and Hanmer 2000; Klasen and Schüller 2011). Our project had set out to measure the differences between the values for women and men (i.e. relative levels). In some instances, however, regional differences in the total values for both women and men (i.e. absolute levels) prove more telling than gender differences.

For example, in 2020 Greater Manchester reported a gender pay gap of 9.1%, which is below the GB average of 16.3%. Yet, this narrower gap is due to men's median earnings in Greater Manchester falling 9.1% below the GB average of male earnings rather than due to women's high earnings. In fact, women's earnings in Greater Manchester also fall below the national average by 1.2% (Rubery et al. 2021). This exemplifies how measuring gender differences poses challenges in instances where a whole region is relatively disadvantaged. Further, it raises questions around defining relevant gender equality benchmarks for regions when the required policy strategy might necessitate structural socio-economic changes.

The *Regional Gender Equality Index Applied to Italy* by Di Bella et al. (2020) applies a similar correction coefficient to the EIGE index intended to ‘correct’ gender gaps of each region by its overall level of achievement (i.e. both women and men) in each indicator. Yet, this approach has attracted critique; in the case of the EIGE, Iñaki Permanyer (2015), and Caitlin Schmid and Mark Elliot (n.d.) show that overall achievement levels, rather than their gender differences, primarily drive the index scores and rankings thereby unjustly penalizing lower-income countries. A useful approach to balancing absolute and relative levels is proposed the *Regional Gender Equality Monitor* (Norlén, Papadimitriou & Dijkstra 2019). It offers two separate indices, one of which measures gender gaps (i.e. *Female Disadvantage Index*) and the other over overall achievement levels (i.e. *Female Achievement Index*).

#### Level of measurement

Trade-offs of focusing on the national versus local area level were highlighted. Individuals may work or study in different areas from where they live. Further, policy solutions required to reduce the gender division of labor, for instance, would operate above the local area level, although quality of service provision might well vary on the sub-local authority level. Yet, participants noted that local campaign groups could benefit considerably from the index measuring below the national level, as this could support cases for policy intervention and applications for government funding. In addition, it could help strengthen a dialogue between regions, local authorities or neighborhoods, facilitating knowledge sharing of effective policy strategy and gender equality campaigns. By raising media attention to the performance of local areas, pressure to increase efforts could be exerted on local government. Looking below the national level would also be relevant for capturing the effectiveness of the devolution strategy or ‘levelling up’ agenda for empowering women. In either case, participants stressed that the usefulness of the index is dependent on accessibility: the data and results must be easily accessible and interpretable for researchers, activists and practitioners. This would be especially valuable in light of a tendency towards underutilization of regional data due to lack of awareness and accessibility.

A trade-off also exists in relation to the granularity of measurement and the substantive scope of gender equality indices. Amongst the existing sub-national indices, only a handful manage to look below the national or regional level, yet often at the expense of the theoretical comprehensiveness, suggested by the number of indicators included. A remarkable exception

is the *Women's Hour Index* (Dunatchik et al., 2017), which includes thirty-two indicators of women's quality of life and is indexed to the local authority level. To achieve this, the index imputes regional averages in instances where local authority data are missing or uses combined values of women and men where lower-layer data are not disaggregated by sex.

#### Aggregation of scores:

Participants highlighted the advantages and uses of different levels of aggregation; an overall index score may be less directly engaging for policy makers and less useful in decision making, even if more popular with the media due to the ability to rank areas. Therefore, the data must be available on a disaggregated level, not just in form of an overall index score. The domain scores and underlying data must be easily accessible, which would also allow regional differences in achievement levels of both women and men to be identified more readily and compared to GB averages.

Two UK specific scorecards measure aspects of gender equality without aggregating them into a summary score. The *Feminist Scorecard*, produced by Oxfam Cymru and the Women's Equality Network Wales (2020), assesses the gender equality context in Wales, while the *Pankhurst-Fawcett Scorecards* (2018) by GM4Women2028 focuses on gender inequalities across the local authorities of Greater Manchester.

### **5. Towards a GB sub-national gender equality index: Ideal versus existing indicators**

The domains and subdomains ideally included in a sub-national GB gender equality index are summarized in Table 3. We contrast these domains and sub-domains with existing data from relevant survey and administrative sources, noting whether the indicators are disaggregated by local area level and by protected characteristics, in particular sex. This provides an initial data catalogue (see Online Appendix 2) showing how close we are to comprehensively and intersectionally measuring gender inequalities on the sub-national level in GB. While our proposal is for a GB-wide index, we included Northern Ireland in the data scoping. The relative lack of comparative data between Northern Ireland and the rest of the UK provides part of the rationale for a GB focus. This is a provisional table of readily available data with potential gaps. In the spirit of the collaborative approach previously taken in this project, we invite contributions towards completing this table.

The data catalogue shows that with the exception of Violence, UK or GB data sets are available for each domain even if not for each ideal indicator. Yet frequently, the GB and UK data only provide national averages for Wales, Scotland and especially Northern Ireland, even if the data set is measured on the regional or local authority level for England. A central challenge to the development of an intersectional measurement on the sub-national level has been previously noted by Sylvia Walby, Jo Armstrong, and Les Humphreys (2008): robust data are currently rarely available for minority populations below the UK, GB or national level. While this is less the case for disaggregation by sex, it is a particular issue for capturing characteristics such as ethnicity, sexual orientation and religion. Although a number of the available data sets included in the catalogue are broken down by ethnicity, age, citizenship, and disability, sample sizes may be too small for reliable analyses of intersecting inequalities. A next step is to establish where data permit a combination of different characteristics for an intersectional analysis at the local authority level.

The matching of ideal and existing data corroborates the finding that in GB too, dimensions which are closer to the mainstream are more readily conceptualized and operationalized (Walby 2005, Verloo and Van der Vleuten 2009). We found a significant number of sex-differentiated indicators for the domains of Power & Participation, Paid Work, and Money. Further, the indicators relevant to these domains more frequently cover all four UK countries and are available at lower geographical areas. None of the available indicators in the domain of Violence are available on the sub-national level, nor do relevant GB or UK data sets exist. Online Appendix 2 provides a more detailed discussion of each of the domains and the available data.

The data catalogue highlights the need for increased efforts to collect and improve sex-disaggregated data covering all four nations of the UK with consistent geographical units and sample sizes large enough to permit intersectional analyses on lower geographical areas. Although data gaps remain, the data catalogue shows that we could nonetheless make a substantial start in the construction of a GB sub-national gender equality index. Rather than eliminating the sub-domains and indicators for which data are missing completely or on the sub-national level, we insist on retaining the indicators identified by the participants, even if it initially results in incomplete index scores. As Nancy Folbre (2006) notes, presenting concrete examples of policy-relevant measures can help mobilize support for closing data gaps. Therefore, we insist on the theoretical adequacy and policy relevance of our framework, so the

index can serve an additional function as an advocacy tool for increased efforts in collecting harmonized and disaggregated data in the UK.

The next steps towards developing this theoretically comprehensive index will involve exploration of conceptual and methodological issues related to the combination of indicators at different levels of geography. Using the data catalogue, data measured at different levels will have to be integrated into a harmonized dataset. For indicators measured at the household/individual level this will involve ensuring that the same units of measurement are used to aggregate up to an area level. For other indicators based upon relatively small numbers, GB combining the individual area data in a weighted combination with data from a larger encompassing area, may be necessary. Where data are only available at larger area levels, it is possible to experiment with modelling methods to generate data at the lower area level. Alternatively, the index could impute regional averages where data are missing on the local area, as done in the *Women's Hour Index* (Dunatchik et al., 2017).

## **6. Conclusion**

Tackling gender inequality is a key focus for both civil society and government policy in GB. Yet, there is currently no appropriate measurement of gender inequalities tailored to the GB context, nor is there any detailed measurement of gender inequalities at the sub-national level. This highlights the need for a measure that is both GB-specific and sensitive to regional differences, given the high levels of regional inequality found in GB. Based on a review of relevant theory and policy, existing regional indices from other countries and a consultation with stakeholders, we propose a sub-national index consisting of the domains Paid Work, Money, Power & Participation, Education & Skills and Unpaid Work, with Health & Well-being and VAWG as satellite domains. We invite contributions and critiques to the proposed framework in the interests of incorporating additional perspectives to the promotion of gender equality in GB.

The scoping of data sources available in the UK confirms that domains closer to the mainstream have more frequently been translated into sex-disaggregated indicators, for instance those related to employment. The presented data catalogue in Online Appendix 2 highlights the need for increased efforts to collect high-quality data covering all four UK nations with consistent geographical units, disaggregated by protected characteristics to permit intersectional analyses on the national and sub-national level. Alongside gender differences (i.e. relative levels), the

index should aim to capture regional variation in achievement levels of both women and men (i.e. absolute levels) while keeping these two approaches separate. Whether the index combines the indicator values into an overall score for each local area or keeps them disaggregated, it is essential that the underlying data are easily accessible and interpretable to increase the relevance and usefulness of the index for policy, research and activism purposes. We suggest that the index be constructed using the proposed indicators and subdomains, even if this results in incomplete scoring. By exposing data gaps and thus gaps in the understanding of gender inequalities at a sub-national level, the index can serve as an advocacy tool for improved data collection.

Given the limitations of quantitative indicators for measuring gender inequalities, the index is intended as one instrument amongst a range of available feminist approaches to exposing and challenging patterns of inequality. The granularity of the data the index seeks to collate would offer a spatial dimension to analyses of inequality in GB that can guide policy makers in monitoring and evaluating of existing policy, developing new initiatives and targeting limited resources. As such, the index would refine and complement the picture of regional and area-level inequalities offered by existing instruments such as the *IMD*. Simultaneously, the index could operate as an advocacy tool, helping civil society hold the government accountable for their (lack of) actions and against their own stated policy aims. In light of the prominence of quantitative indicators in governance, we especially see value in strengthening the capacity of “grassroot and advocacy and non-state actors [...] to employ the high credibility of numeric evidence to promote alternative understandings of dominant institutions.” (Rottenburg and Merry 2015, 4). The index would be a particularly effective tool if collaboration with local campaign groups and organizations is sought to develop policy briefs and recommendations. Taken together, the multiple benefits signal that a sub-national gender equality index following the above principles would offer a valuable resource to policy makers, researchers and activists in the pursuit of gender equality in GB.

## Notes

1. These include the 2010 Equality Act, the main legislative framework for gender equality in GB, as well as the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against women (CEDAW), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Beijing Platform for Action. For more information on legislative frameworks for gender equality in the GB context, please see the Online Appendix.

2. This includes the *Regional Gender Equality Monitor* (Norlén, Papadimitriou & Dijkstra, 2019), *Scotland's Gender Equality Index* (Scottish Government, 2020) and the *Regional Gender Equality applied to Italy* (Di Bella et al., 2020).

## Bibliography

- Backhans, Mona C., Michael Lundberg, and Anna Månsdotter. 2007. Does increased gender equality lead to a convergence of health outcomes for men and women? A study of swedish municipalities. *Social Science and Medicine* 64 (9): 1892–1903.
- Bella, Enrico Di, Lucia Leporatti, Luca Gandullia, and Filomena Maggino. 2020. Proposing a regional gender equality index (R-GEI) with an application to italy. *Regional Studies* 0 (0): 1–12.
- Chen, Ying-Yeh, S V Subramanian, Doloros Acevedo-Garcia, and Ichiro Kawachi. 2005. Women's status and depressive symptoms: A multilevel analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, 60 (1): 49–60.
- Connell, Raewyn. 1987. *Gender and power: society, the person, and sexual politics*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press in association with B. Blackwell.
- . 2002. *Gender*. Short Introductions. Cambridge: Polity.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139–167. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0011-9164\(90\)80039-E](https://doi.org/10.1016/0011-9164(90)80039-E).
- Davenport, Alex, and Ben Zaranko. 2020. Levelling up: Where and how? *IFS Green Budget*, 315–71.
- Dijkstra, A. Geske. 2002. Revisiting UNDP's GDI and GEM: Towards an alternative. *Social Indicators Research* 57 (3): 301–38.
- Dijkstra, A. Geske, and Lucia C. Hanmer. 2000. Measuring socio-economic gender inequality: toward an alternative to the UNDP gender-related development index. *Feminist Economics* 6 (2): 41–75.
- Desrosières, Alain. 2015. Retroaction: How indicators feed back onto quantified actors. In *The world of indicators: The making of governmental knowledge through quantification*, edited by Richard Rottenburg, Sally E. Merry, Sung-Joon Park, and Johanna Mugler, 329–53. Cambridge Studies in Law and Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781316091265.013.

- Dunatchik, Allison, Javiera Cartagena-Farias, Julia Griggs, and Elena Mylona. 2017. Woman's hour report: The best places in Britain for women. <https://downloads.bbc.co.uk/mediacentre/bbc-radio-4-womans-hour-best-place-analysis.pdf>.
- European Institute for Gender Equality (2013). *Gender equality index report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union
- European Institute for Gender Equality (2015). *Gender equality index 2015: Measuring gender equality in the European Union 2005-2012*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Institute for Gender Equality (2021). *Gender equality index 2021: Health*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fine, Cordelia, Victor Sojo, and Holly Lawford-Smith. 2020. Why does workplace gender diversity matter? Justice, organizational benefits, and policy. *Social Issues and Policy Review* 14 (1): 36–72.
- Folbre, Nancy. 2006. Measuring care: Gender, empowerment, and the care economy. *Journal of Human Development* 7 (2): 183–99.
- Francis-Devine, Brigid, Matthew Ward, and Niamh Foley. 2020. Briefing paper CBP06838: Women and the economy. House of Commons Library.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the postsocialist condition*. New York ; Routledge.
- Frias, Sonia M. 2008. Measuring structural gender equality in Mexico: A state level analysis. *Social Indicators Research* 88 (2): 215–46.
- Georgetown Institute for Women Peace and Security, and Peace Research Institute Oslo. 2017. *Peace and security index 2017/18: Tracking sustainable peace through inclusion, justice, and security for women*. Washington, DC.
- Georgiadis, Thomas, and George Christopoulos. 2017. Gender inequalities in labour market outcomes: Evidence for greek regions before and throughout the crisis. *International Journal of Manpower* 38 (5): 675–95.
- Gil-Lafuente, Anna María, Agustín Torres-Martinez, Luis Amigué-Molina, and Sefa Boria-Reverter. 2019. Gender equality index of the autonomous communities of Spain: A multidimensional analysis. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy* 25 (5): 915–33.
- GM4Women2028. 2018. *Pankhurst-Fawcett Scorecards*. Accessed 25 May 2021: <https://www.gm4women2028.org/scorecards>.

- Ham, Maarten. van, David. Manley, Nick. Bailey, Ludi. Simpson, and Duncan. Maclennan. 2012. *Neighbourhood effects research: New perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Harvey, Edward B., John H. Blakely, and Lorne Tepperman. 1990. Toward an index of gender equality. *Social Indicators Research* 22 (3): 299–317.
- Kjeldstad, Randi, and Jan Erik Kristiansen. 2001. Constructing a regional gender equality index: Reflections on a first experience with norwegian data. *Statistical Journal of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe* 18 (1): 41–49.
- Klasen, Stephan, and Dana Schüler. 2011. Reforming the gender-related development index and the gender empowerment measure: Implementing some specific proposals. *Feminist Economics* 17 (1): 1–30.
- Lindqvist, Anna, Marie Gustafsson Sendén, and Emma A. Renström. 2021. What is gender, anyway: A review of the options for operationalising gender. *Psychology and Sexuality* 12 (4): 332–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2020.1729844>.
- Merry, Sally Engle. 2011. Measuring the world indicators, human rights, and global governance. *Current Anthropology* 52 (SUPPL. 3): 83–95. <https://doi.org/10.1086/657241>.
- . 2016. *The seductions of quantification: Measuring human rights, gender violence, and sex trafficking*. Book. Chicago Series in Law and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Minto, Rachel, Lut Mergaert, and María Bustelo. 2020. Policy evaluation and gender mainstreaming in the European Union: The perfect (mis)match? *European Journal of Politics and Gender* 3 (2): 277–94. <https://doi.org/10.1332/251510819X15725988471100>.
- Norlén, Hedvig, Eleni Papadimitriou, and Lewis Dijkstra. 2019. *The regional gender equality monitor. measuring female disadvantage and achievement in EU region*. Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union
- Nussbaum, Martha. 2003. Capabilities as fundamental entitlements: Sen and social justice. *Feminist Economics* 9 (2–3): 33–59.
- OECD and European Commission, Joint Research Centre. (2008). *Handbook on constructing composite indicators: Methodology and user guide*. OECD Publishing.
- Office for National Statistics. (n.d.). Census geography. Accessed 25 May 2021: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/censusgeography>.

- Oxfam Cymru, & Women's Equality Network Wales. (2020). Feminist scorecard 2020: Tracking Welsh government action to advance women's rights and gender equality. Accessed 25 May 2021: <https://wenwales.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Feminist-Scorecard-Report-2020-Eng.pdf>.
- Pascall, Gillian, and Jane Lewis. 2004. Emerging gender regimes and policies for gender equality in a wider Europe. *Journal of Social Policy* 33 (3): 373–94.
- Permanyer, Iñaki. 2015. Why call it 'equality' when it should be 'achievement'? A proposal to un-correct the 'corrected gender gaps' in the EU gender equality index. *Journal of European Social Policy* 25 (4): 414–30.
- Perrons, Diane. 1995. Gender inequalities in regional development. *Regional Studies* 29 (5): 465–76.
- Pinchevsky, Gillian M, and Emily M Wright. 2012. The Impact of neighborhoods on intimate partner violence and victimization. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* 13 (2): 112–32.
- Razavi, Shahra. 2019. Indicators as substitute for policy contestation and accountability? Some reflections on the 2030 agenda from the perspective of gender equality and women's rights. *Global Policy* 10 (January): 149–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12633>.
- Robeyns, Ingrid. 2003. Sen's capability approach and gender inequality: Selecting relevant capabilities. *Feminist Economics* 9 (2–3): 61–92.
- Rubery, Jill, Caitlin Schmid, Eva Herman, Abbie Winton, and Daiga Kamerade. 2021. GM4Women employment group brief. <https://www.gm4women2028.org/employment>.
- Schmid, Caitlin B. 2021. Neglecting reproductive labor: A critical review of gender equality indices. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*.
- Schmid, Caitlin B., Mark Elliot. n.d. 'Why call it equality' revisited: An extended critique of the EIGE index. Working paper.
- Scottish Government. (2020). Scotland's Gender Equality Index. Retrieved from <https://data.gov.scot/genderindex/gender-equality-index-2020.html>
- Stafford, M, S Cummins, S Macintyre, A Ellaway, and M Marmot. 2005. Gender differences in the associations between health and neighbourhood environment. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), *Social Science & Medicine*, 60 (8): 1681–92.
- Strid, Sofia, Anne Laure Humbert, Jeff Hearn, and Dag Balkmar. 2021. States of violence: Exploring welfare state regimes as violence regimes by developing a violence regimes index. *Journal of European Social Policy*, April.
- Sugarman, David B, and Murray A Straus. 1988. Indicators of gender equality for American

- states and regions. *Social Indicators Research* 20 (3): 229–70.
- Tamambang, Lum, Nathalie Auger, Ernest Lo, and Marie France Raynault. 2011. Measurement of gender inequality in neighbourhoods of Québec, Canada. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 10: 1–9.
- United Nations Development Programme. 1995. Human Development Report 1995. New York.
- . 2019a. Gender development index (GDI). 2019.  
<http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-development-index-gdi>.
- . 2019b. Gender inequality index (GII). Human Development Report. 2019.  
<http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii>.
- Verloo, Mieke, and Anna van der Vleuten. 2009. The discursive logic of ranking and benchmarking: Understanding gender equality measures in the European Union. In *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policy-Making*, edited by Emanuela Lombardo, Petra Meier, and Mieke Verloo, 169–85. London: Routledge.
- Walby, Sylvia. 1990. *Theorizing patriarchy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- . 2005. Measuring women’s progress in a global era. *International Social Science Journal*, no. 184: 371–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2451.2005.00556.x>.
2009. *Globalization and inequalities: Complexities and contested modernities*. *Globalization & Inequalities*. London: SAGE.
- . 2020. Varieties of gender regimes. *Social Politics* 27 (3).  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxaa018>.
- Walby, Sylvia, Jo Armstrong, and Les Humphreys. (2008). *Review of equality statistics*. Manchester.
- Walby, Sylvia, and Jude Towers. 2017. Measuring violence to end violence: Mainstreaming gender. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence* 1 (1): 11–31.
- Welsh Government. (2020). *Advancing gender equality in Wales plan*. Accessed 25 May 2021:  
<https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2020-03/advancing-gender-equality-plan.pdf>.
- World Economic Forum. 2019. *Global Gender Gap Report 2020: Insight Report*.  
[http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_GGGR\\_2020.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2020.pdf).
- Women's Budget Group. Local Data Project. Accessed 15 December 2021:  
<https://wbg.org.uk/ldp/>
- Yllö, Kersti. 1984. The status of women, marital equality, and violence against wives: A

contextual analysis. *Journal of Family Issues* 5 (3): 307–20.

### **Online Appendix 1 - Policy and legislative frameworks in Great Britain**

Here, we provide a review of GB policy documents and international treaties the UK is party to, highlighting the commitments and aims made by UK or GB governments. Matching the policy themes to the gender equality domains identified in the theoretical review (see Table 1 in the main paper) shows how the index results might assist civil society in holding the government to account on progress and in guiding policy makers in the monitoring, evaluation and development of policy.

To identify domains that are considered important within GB policy context, we consulted the 2010 Equality Act, the main legislative framework for gender equality in GB, as well as international treaties the UK is party to, including the UN's Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Beijing Platform for Action. Additionally, we consulted strategy documents prepared by the Government Equalities Office (HM Government 2019) and the Scottish (Scottish Government, 2019) and Welsh governments (Welsh Government 2020).

The main legislative framework for gender equality in the UK is the 2010 Equality Act, which draws together previous equality and anti-discrimination legislation, and applies to a set of nine protected characteristics, including sex. It places a duty on public authorities (the Public Sector Equality Duty) to have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate sex discrimination, harassment and victimization; advance equality of opportunity between women and men; and foster good relations. The regulations and mechanisms to support the act vary greatly between Scotland and Wales and Westminster (Hankivsky et al. 2019). With some minor exceptions the act does not apply to Northern Ireland, where the main equality legislation is section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 which states that "public authorities need to consider equality in all aspects of their organisations" (Northern Ireland Office 2013). The UK is also party to international treaties which relevance to gender equality including the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women (CEDAW), the Beijing Declaration, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Gender equality policy in the UK is formulated both at a UK wide and national level. From their beginning the devolved parliaments of Scotland and Wales have made a more explicit commitment to gender equality than that of post-2010 Westminster, and this is reflected in the

far more extensive regulations supporting the Equality Act in Scotland and Wales, as well as distinctive institutional mechanisms, including equality impact assessments and gender budgeting (Hankivsky et al. 2019).

In 2019, the Gender Equalities Office situated at Westminster published a strategic gender equality document - *Gender equality at every stage: a roadmap for change* (HM Government, 2019) - which outlines eight priority areas, alongside objective and actions, while emphasizing their connection to other key strategic policies, such as the Industrial strategy and Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy, and the intention of including the commitments across individual departmental plans. Strategic roadmaps published by the Scottish government in 2019 (*A fairer Scotland for Women*) and by the Welsh government in 2020 (*Advancing gender equality in Wales*) similarly set out specific measures while highlighting an approach of mainstreaming gender concerns across broader strategic documents.

#### *Power and participation*

Gender inequality in power and decision-making is a focus of Domain G of the Beijing Platform for Action. Article 7 of CEDAW places a requirement on states to ensure equality between men and women in political and public life, while article 8 includes the stipulation of gender equal representation in international governance and organizations. The Sustainable Development Goal 5.5 includes a commitment to ensuring “women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life”. Similarly, numerical representation in positions of power features explicitly in the Welsh government’s vision for a gender equal Wales as one where “diverse women are fairly represented in positions of influence and empowered to play a meaningful role in society” (Welsh Government 2020, 4), while the broader notion of participation features in their commitment to work “to advance equality and remove the barriers against all women's participation in the economy, public and social life” (Welsh Government 2020, 5). In Scotland amendments to the Equality Act place a requirement on public bodies to supply the Scottish Government with data on the gender composition of their boards, and there has been a policy focus on increasing women’s representation on boards and in senior management of public bodies. A concern with the under-representation of women in senior roles also features in Westminster’s gender equality road map, and in government-led initiatives such as the Women in Finance charter (HM Government 2019).

*Economic resources*

Inequalities in the domain of work and economic resources feature centrally in policy priorities set out by both Westminster and the devolved nations which commit to increasing women's labor market participation by reducing the barriers that women face in returning to or entering the labor market (Scottish Government 2019; HM Government 2019). Beyond participation the quality of work is highlighted, with a focus on the over-representation of women in low-paid, precarious work, and emphasis on the links between gender equality strategy and wider strategies focusing on improving the quality of work, including the UK wide Taylor Review, Fair Work Scotland and Fair Work Wales. The role of employers and employee policies in creating inclusive workplaces is stressed in initiatives such as Family Friendly Working Scotland and in legislation supporting the right to request flexible working. Similarly, both the Scottish and English gender equality road maps highlight action of maternity and pregnancy discrimination as a priority area.

Gender disparities in pay have been prioritized in UK-wide legislation obliging large employers to publish their gender pay gaps, and a focus on action to close these gaps. Strategic gender action plans from all three nations highlight women's over-representation in low-paying jobs and lack of progression from low-pay as a priority, acknowledging the links between gender and poverty. Beyond working life, the GEO's roadmap for change includes a commitment to tackle women's increased financial instability in later life caused by the gender gap in retirement income.

As well as the vertical segregation of women into lower-paid roles national policy places an emphasis on their horizontal segregation into lower-paid occupations and sectors. Initiatives to tackle this tend to focus on increasing the representation of women in traditionally male dominated (particularly STEM) sectors. In Scotland this approach is also complemented by a focus on increasing the representation of men in the traditionally female sector of childcare and working towards improving pay and conditions in the social care sector through the Fair Work Convention Social Care Working Group.

As well as gender gaps in employment gender gaps in self-employment and enterprise are addressed through commitments to tackle the gender gap in entrepreneurial investment (HM Government 2019) and through the Scottish Government's (2017) *Women in Enterprise Action Framework*.

### *Education and skills*

In the policy domain, education and skills are mainly addressed within a commitment to improving the gender balance in uptake of STEM subjects, STEM focused apprenticeships and subsequent careers. The Scottish government strategy also includes a corresponding focus on encouraging men to study care subjects.

### *Unpaid work*

There is evidence at the policy level of both an emphasis on the valuing of unpaid care and a concern with its currently unequal distribution. The Welsh Government's (2020, 4) vision for gender equality in Wales includes the aspiration that "paid and unpaid work is valued", while the Scottish Government (2020, 27) problematizes that "childcare responsibility still sits predominantly with women". The Westminster gender equality road map cites the fact that "Women take more time out to care for children" and "women provide more informal care and unpaid work for others" as two of the eight key drivers of inequality identified (HM Government 2019, 8). Actions in response to these identified issues include initiatives to directly redress gender imbalances, such as increasing father's involvement in childcare by reforming parental leave, and those to strengthen the economic position of those with caring responsibilities, including a focus on inclusive workplace practices and employment rights for carers.

### *Health & well-being*

At the policy level, a focus on gender inequalities in health is present in international policy documents such as Article 12 of CEDAW which commits parties to ensuring equality of access to health care and adequate reproductive care, SDG 5.6, which similarly centers on access to sexual and reproductive health, and the health domain of the Beijing Platform for Action. An emphasis on reproductive health, as opposed to gender inequalities in health *per se* also features with the UK policy documentation, as for example, in the Westminster roadmap's commitment to working with Public Health England on building the evidence base on improving reproductive health from puberty to the menopause. The negative impact on gender stereotypes on wellbeing – and particularly men's wellbeing, as well as their contribution to an enabling environment for harassment and violence is another focus.

### *Violence against women and girls*

The eradication of gender-based violence features prominently in policy at both the international and national level. Sustainable Development Goal 5.2 includes the commitment to “Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres”. At the national level separate strategies to address violence against women and girls have been formulated by both the devolved parliaments and Westminster. As well as focusing on violence within the domestic sphere these strategies also discuss sexual harassment in the workplace and discuss the role of gender stereotypes in creating an enabling environment

## **Bibliography**

- Hankivsky, Olena, Diego De Merich, and Ashlee Christoffersen. 2019. Equalities ‘devolved’: experiences in mainstreaming across the UK devolved powers post-equality act 2010. *British Politics*, 14(2): 141-161.
- HM Government. 2019. Gender equality at every stage: A roadmap for change. Accessed 15 December 2021: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gender-equality-at-every-stage-a-roadmap-for-change>
- Northern Ireland Office. 2013. Northern Ireland Office Equality Scheme. Accessed 15 December 2021: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/273408/NIO\\_Equality\\_Scheme.DOC](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/273408/NIO_Equality_Scheme.DOC)
- Scottish Government. 2019. A fairer Scotland for women: Gender pay gap action plan. Accessed 15 December 2021: <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/strategy-plan/2019/03/fairer-scotland-women-gender-pay-gap-action-plan/documents/fairer-scotland-women-gender-pay-gap-action-plan/fairer-scotland-women-gender-pay-gap-action-plan/govscot%3Adocument/fairer-scotland-women-gender-pay-gap-action-plan.pdf>
- Scottish Government. 2017. Women in enterprise action framework. Accessed 15 December 2021: <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/strategy-plan/2017/08/scottish-framework-action-plan-women-enterprise/documents/00524024-pdf/00524024-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/00524024.pdf>
- Welsh Government. 2020. Advancing gender equality in Wales plan. Accessed 15 December 2021: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2020-03/advancing-gender-equality-plan.pdf>



## **Online Appendix 2 – Data catalogue matching indicators identified in the workshop to existing data.**

Below we summarize the findings of the data scoping conducted to match the ideal indicators to existing data. Appendix Table 1 provides a data catalogue of the existing indicators and their source.

### *Power & participation*

The key sub-domains within Power & Participation can broadly be matched by existing data. First, indicators measuring gender differences in the *distribution of power* in councils and parliaments are available for the UK, although data must be drawn together from national data sets. Ideally, this subdomain would also include indicators measuring the gender distribution of power outside of the political sphere such as in committee chairs, boards and school ‘governorship’. Second, indicators capturing *political participation* can be accessed from the UK-wide survey Understanding Society, which can be indexed to the LSOA<sup>1</sup> level and disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation and disability. Possibilities of exploring intersectional differences therefore exist. These indicators allow measurement of gender gaps in engagement with social and political organizations, (e.g. political parties, trade unions, environmental groups, parents association) political interest, and political support. Indicators capturing gender differences in voting patterns (i.e. whether vote regularly) could not be identified. Third, indicators of *representation in civil society* (i.e. measuring share of female judges, vice-chancellors and higher education governing board members, and health board members) can be captured, however only on the national if not UK level. Data on equal representation on public health boards are not readily available for Wales. Finally, only a limited number of indicators measuring *equal participation in business* (e.g. proportion of small and medium businesses majority-led by women) could be found and fail to offer indication of regional inequalities beyond the UK average.

### *Paid work*

Indicators measuring gender differences in *labor market participation* (i.e. part-time versus full-time employment rates, (in)activity, (un)employment and self-employment rates) from the

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2004 the ONS introduced Super Output Areas (SOAs) as a new geographical hierarchy system to facilitate comparison of small area statistics in England and Wales: Lower Layer Super Output Areas (LSOA; minimum population 1000) and Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOA; minimum population of 5000). The Scottish LSOA and MSOA equivalents are Data Zones (minimum population of 500) and Intermediate Geographies (minimum population 2500), respectively. In Northern Ireland only LSOAs were introduced (minimum population 1300) (Office for National Statistics, n.d.).

Annual Population Survey (APS) are available at the local authority level for GB. These data are also disaggregated by sex, age, ethnicity and disability, but again, further investigation is needed to establish whether these characteristics can be combined at the local authority level. The APS data could be matched with the Labour Force Survey Women in Northern Ireland, which however only provides national averages by sex. To measure gender differences in *quality of work*, indicators covering the UK at the LSOA level can be taken from the APS, Understanding Society, and the LFS (zero-hours, flexitime, permanent contracts, low pay, unsatisfactory hours, overtime, shift patterns). Additional relevant indicators can assess autonomy over work (job tasks, task order, working hours or work pace), negative health impacts of work, and training opportunities. Although relevant, data on participation in workplace pension schemes is only available for England and Northern Ireland. Finally, *Segregation*, both horizontal and vertical, can be measured again using data from the APS for the UK, these are however only available at the regional level. Additional national surveys for England and Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland are available yet definitional inconsistencies in the occupation or industry classification might undermine harmonization.

### *Money*

To measure differences in *income*, the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings provides gender pay gap data for both full-time and part-time employees across the UK at the local authority level. Similarly, the LFS offers gross hourly pay and take-home pay after deductions at the UK local area level (i.e. NUTS-3), which could be used to construct gender pay gap indicators. To assess *poverty levels*, Understanding Society and the LFS offer variables to measure differences in benefits claims at the sub-national level for the UK and potentially for different groups. Finally, gender differences in *wealth* can be assessed using sub-national UK data from the LFS on housing tenure (i.e. whether accommodation is owned outright, being bought with a mortgage or loan, or rented), while Understanding Society provides a measure of property wealth. Additionally, gender differences in pensions, household wealth and ownership of savings and current accounts are relevant to capture. Although a range of UK and GB data sets would provide such variables, data disaggregated by sex are only available at the national level. An exception is the variable from Understanding Society that asks respondents whether they receive pension income (including private pension), although the latest data is from 2014.

### *Education & skills*

UK data by lower geographical area capturing gender differences in *literacy and numeracy rates, educational achievement, and employment in education* could be found. In contrast, indicators relating to gender differences in *subject choices* and *'returns' to qualification* were mainly available for England on a national level. No data capturing gender differences in educational experience, such as student's wellbeing and relationships with peers and teachers, were readily available. To measure *adult learning*, the LFS can be drawn on although the related data was collected in 2010 only. Alternatively, the derived variable from the LFS can be used to calculate the proportion of adults who have engaged in non-formal and/or informal learning in the past four weeks by age group.

### *Unpaid work*

For *childcare, care for adults, domestic work and volunteering*, time use data collected by the UK Time Use Survey and survey data from Understanding Society can be drawn on to measure gender differences on the sub-national level. Ideally, gender differences in childcare and care for adults are captured separately, as done by the UK Time Use Survey, since different policy interventions would be required to address the gender differences.

### *Health & well-being*

As a satellite domain, Health & Well-being could draw on UK data on gender differences in *health risks* (i.e. healthy life years, disability free life expectancy, life expectancy) by local authority. As indicated by the participants, health risks should cover prevalence of illness, which might include suicide rates or alcohol-related deaths for which sex disaggregated data is only available on the regional level for England. Further, Understanding Society provides two UK sex-differentiated indicators relevant to *health status*, capturing satisfaction with life overall and health. Other related measures, such as gender differences in personal well-being or body mass index, are only available as UK averages. Finally, Understanding Society also offers indicators on *health behaviors*, including smoking, diet, and physical activity. Participants had pointed out that regional differences in access to services will likely affect gender differences across the UK, we therefore propose this to be taken into account in the analysis of health outcomes captured in this satellite domain.

*Violence Against Women and Girls*

In contrast to the other domains, participants did not identify concrete indicators for VAWG, so the subdomain labels included in the data catalogue are suggested based on relevant indicators found. Participants stressed the importance of capturing the structural and intersectional nature of VAWG and avoiding predominant focus on domestic violence. Data sets covering the UK are scarce and infrequently disaggregated by characteristics other than sex. Readily available data on violence in Northern Ireland are not even disaggregated by sex. While indicators broadly relating to *physical, psychological and sexual violence* can be used to cover the UK using national data sets, other relevant aspects such as *femicides, workplace abuse, safety in public, modern slavery or forced marriage* are not measured in all four nations. Finally, data in this domain will prove particularly challenging to harmonize as discrepancies will likely exist in conceptual definitions of different forms of violence across national crime surveys.

**Appendix Table 1 - Data catalogue.**

<b>Indicators identified in workshop</b>	<b>Existing indicators</b>	<b>Geographical scope</b>	<b>Disaggregated by</b>	<b>Years</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>Power &amp; Participation</b>					
<b>Distribution of power</b>	Council by Gender by Year	England, Councils	Sex	2019, 2018, 2017	Fawcett Society, Women's Representation after the 2019 Council Elections
	Local councilors	Scotland, National	Sex	2017, 2021	Engender – Sex and Power in Scotland 2020
	Local councilors	Wales, National	Sex	2020	Chwarae Teg (2020). State of the Nation.
	Local councilors	Northern Ireland, Council	Sex	2019	Yvonne Galligan (2019), The Northern Ireland local elections May 2019 – a gender analysis
	Proportion of seats held by women in (a) national parliaments and (b) local authority councils	UK, National and Local authority	n/a	1918-2018	ONS, SDG
	Members of the Scottish Parliament	Scotland, National	Sex	2017, 2020	Engender – Sex and Power in Scotland 2020
	Members of the Welsh Parliament	Wales, National	Sex	2020	Chwarae Teg (2020). State of the Nation.
	Members of Northern Ireland Legislative Assembly	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2019, 2020	Porter (2020). Northern Ireland Assembly. Research and Information Service Briefing Paper
	UK Parliament elections	UK, Constituency	Sex	2017, 2019	50:50 Parliament, 50:50 Data
<b>Political participation</b>	Active in organizations: political party	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 6, 9
	Active in organizations: trade unions	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 6, 9
	Active in organizations: environmental group	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 6, 9
	Active in organizations: parents /school association	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 6, 9

	Active in organizations: tenants /residents group or neighborhood watch	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 6, 9
	Supports a particular political party	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 6, 9
	Level of interest in politics	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 6, 9
<b>Representation in civil society</b>	Primary appointment of Judges in Courts	England and Wales, Region	Sex, ethnicity, professional background, age, payment type	2014-2018	Judiciary UK; Judicial Diversity Statistics
	Primary appointment of Judges in Tribunals in England and Wales and Employment Tribunal Scotland	England and Wales; Scotland, n/a	Sex, ethnicity, professional background	2014 - 2018	Judiciary UK; Judicial Diversity Statistics
	Primary appointment of serving Magistrates	England and Wales, Advisory Committee Area	Sex, ethnicity, age, disability	2018, 2019	Judiciary UK; Judicial Diversity Statistics
	Judges at the supreme courts	Scotland, National	Sex	2017, 2021	Engender – Sex and Power in Scotland 2020
	Senator of the College of Justice (inner & outer house)	Scotland, National	Sex, Age	2018, 2017, 2016	Judiciary of Scotland – Judicial Diversity statistics - Gender and Age
	High and County Court Judges	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2019, 2020	Porter (2020), Northern Ireland Assembly, Research and Information Service Briefing Paper
	Representation of women in charities, a) trustee, b) most senior executive	Wales, n/a	n/a	2012	WomenCount: charity leaders in Wales in 2012
	Representation of women in higher education, a) governing body, b) vice-chancellors	UK, n/a	n/a	2013, 2016, 2018	WomenCount: Women in Higher Education
	University Vice Chancellors and Pro- or Deputy Vice Chancellors	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2017/2018	NI Department of Education (2018), Teacher Workforce Statistics in Grant-Aided Schools in Northern Ireland 2017/18:
	NHS Hospital and Community Health Services (HCHS): Very Senior Managers in NHS Trusts, CCGs, Support Organisations and Central Bodies in England	England average only	Sex; age	2018	NHS Digital, NHS Hospital & Community Health Service (HCHS) workforce statistics.

	Health Trust Chairs and CEOs	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2018, 2019	Porter (2020). Northern Ireland Assembly. Research and Information Service Briefing Paper
	NHS Board Chairs by gender	Scotland, National	Sex	2019	Scottish NHS Board Chairs by gender or self-identified as LGBT: FOI release
	Proportion of managerial positions held by women	UK Region	n/a	2012-2017	ONS, SDG
<b>Equal participation in business</b>	Proportion of small and medium businesses (SMEs) that are majority-led by women	UK average only	Sex, ethnicity	2018, 2019, 2020	Department for Business, Innovation and Industrial Strategy; SME_LSBS_2019_employers_data_rev
	FTSE Women Leaders	UK average only	Sex	2011 - 2015; 2016- 2020	Davies Review; Hampton-Alexander Review
	Female FTSE 100 Index: number of women executive directors on the corporate boards of the UK's top 100 companies	UK average only	n/a	2005-2020	Gender, Leadership and Inclusion Centre, Cranfield University
<b>Paid Work</b>					
<b>Labor market participation</b>	Gap in full-time employment rates	GB, Local Authority	Sex	2004-2020	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Employment by age and full-time/part-time	GB, Local Authority	Sex, age	2004-2020	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Labor market participation – economically active	GB, Local Authority	Sex, age; ethnicity; disability	2004-2020	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Labor market participation - in employment	GB, Local Authority	Sex, age; ethnicity; disability	2004-2020	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Labor market participation– employees	GB, Local Authority	Sex, age; ethnicity; disability	2004-2020	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Labor market participation – self-employed	GB, Local Authority	Sex, age; ethnicity; disability	2004-2020	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Labor market participation – unemployed	GB, Local Authority	Sex, age; ethnicity; disability	2004-2020	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Labor market participation – economically active	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2016, 2017, 2018	NISRA - Labour Force Survey Women in Northern Ireland
	Labor market participation - in employment	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2016, 2017, 2018	NISRA - Labour Force Survey Women in Northern Ireland
	Labor market participation– employees	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2016, 2017, 2018	NISRA - Labour Force Survey Women in Northern Ireland

	Labor market participation – self-employed	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2016, 2017, 2018	NISRA - Labour Force Survey Women in Northern Ireland
	Labor market participation – unemployed	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2016, 2017, 2018	NISRA - Labour Force Survey Women in Northern Ireland
	Employment rates with and without dependent children	UK, National	Sex	1918-2018	ONS, SDG
<b>Quality of work</b>	Number of overtime hours in normal week	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	1997-2019	Understanding Society, all waves
	Has a second paid job	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	1997-2019	Understanding Society, all waves
	Participation in workplace pension schemes	England, Region	Sex	2008-2018	Department for Work and Pensions; Workplace pension participation and saving trends statistics
	Proportion of employees with workplace pensions by gender and type of pension	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2012, 2019	NISRA – NI Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings Pensions Results 2019
	Percentage of residents who are employees – (un)satisfactory hours	UK, Local Authority	Sex, age, ethnicity; nationality	2018	ONS, Annual Population Survey 2018
	Percentage of residents who are employees – (not) desired contract	UK, Local Authority	Sex, age, ethnicity; nationality	2018	ONS, Annual Population Survey 2018
	Percentage of residents who are employees – (not) in low pay	UK, Local Authority	Sex, age, ethnicity; nationality	2018	ONS, Annual Population Survey 2018
	Autonomy over job task	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 10
	Autonomy over work hours	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 10
	Autonomy over task order	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 10
	Autonomy over work manner	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 10
	Autonomy over work pace	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 10

	Job security in next 12 months	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 10
	Informal flexible working arrangements	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 11
	Flexible work use: Flexi-time	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 12
	Flexible work use: Zero-hours	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 13
	Flexible work use: work from home on a regular basis	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Waves 2, 4, 6, 8, 14
	Type of agreed work arrangement: Flexitime	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of agreed work arrangement: Zero hours	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Usual hours of unpaid overtime	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Whether job permanent	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of shift pattern: Evening or twilight shifts, Night shifts, Weekend shifts	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Whether in past 12 months, has suffered any (other) illness, disability or physical or mental problem caused or made worse by job or work done in the past	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Whether employer has offered any training or education, on or away from job	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2011-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey

<b>Segregation</b>	Sector workforce by industry	UK, Region	Sex	2002-2019	ONS workforce jobs by industry (SIC 2007) and sex - unadjusted
	Employment - corporate managers and directors (SOC2010)	UK, Region	Sex	2002-2019	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Employment - science, research, engineering and technology profs (SOC2010)	UK, Region	Sex	2002-2019	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Employment – health professionals (SOC2010)	UK, Region	Sex	2002-2019	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Employment - teaching and educational professionals (SOC2010)	UK, Region	Sex	2002-2019	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Employment – business, media and public service professionals (SOC2010)	UK, Region	Sex	2002-2019	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Employment – caring personal service occupations (SOC2010)	UK, Region	Sex	2002-2019	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Public versus private sector workforce	GB, Local authority	Sex	2004-2020	ONS, Annual Population Survey
	Occupation by sex	England, Wales Local Authority	Sex	2011	ONS, NS-SeC by sex
	Industry by sex	England, Wales Local Authority	Sex	2011	ONS, DC6104EW1a - Industry by sex by age
	Employment (16-64) by industry, age and sex	Northern Ireland, National	Sex; Age	2019	NISRA, Labour Force Survey
	Employment (16-64) by occupation, age and sex	Northern Ireland, National	Sex; Age	2019	NISRA, Labour Force Survey
	Proportion of all in employment (16+) by sector and gender	Scotland, National	Sex	2009-2018	Scottish Government, Annual Population Survey
	Proportion of all in employment (16+) by occupation and gender	Scotland, National	Sex	2009-2018	Scottish Government, Annual Population Survey

Indicators identified in workshop	Existing indicators	Geo. scope	Disaggregated by	Years	Source
<b>Money</b>					
<b>Income</b>	Gender pay gap (GPG) - median or mean full-time employees	UK, Local Authority	n/a	1997-2019	ONS, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings
	Gender pay gap (GPG) - median or mean part-time employees	UK, Local Authority	n/a	1997-2019	ONS, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings
	Average gross hourly pay	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010-2020	Labour Force Survey
	Take home pay after deductions	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
<b>Poverty levels</b>	People on Universal Credit	GB, LSOA	Sex	2013-2020	Department of Work and Pensions, People on Universal Credit
	Universal Credit Claimant by sex and age	GB, LSOA	Sex, Age	2001-2020	ONS, Claimant count by sex and age
	Claimant count (Job Seeker and Universal Credit)	Northern Ireland, Ward	Sex	2017 -2020	NISRA, Labour Market and Social Welfare Claimant Count, Claimant Count by Area
	Type of benefit or payment: income support	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009-2014	Understanding Society, Wave 1- 5
	Type of benefit or payment: sickness, disability or incapacity benefits	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009-2014	Understanding Society, Wave 1- 5
	Type of benefit or payment: child benefit	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009-2014	Understanding Society, Wave 1- 5
	Type of benefit or payment: tax credits such as the working tax credit	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009-2014	Understanding Society, Wave 1- 5
	Housing benefit: receives rent rebate or rent allowance	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009-2019	Understanding Society, Wave 1-10

	Problems paying for housing: Behind with rent/mortgage	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society each wave
	Behind with paying council tax	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society each wave
	Type of benefit claimed: Universal Credit	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2014-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of benefit claimed: Income support	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2014-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of benefit claimed: Housing Benefit, or Council Tax Reduction	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2014-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of benefit claimed: Job Seeker's Allowance	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2014-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of benefit claimed: Sickness or Disability benefits	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2014-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of benefit claimed: Child benefits	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2014-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
<b>Wealth</b>	Type of letting: Age and sex of Household Reference Person	England average only	Sex, Age	2018-19	ONS, English Housing Survey data on social and private renters: FA3501 (S518): Age and sex of HRP by type of letting
	Household type by dwelling tenure	Northern Ireland, National	-	2016, 2017, 2018	NISRA, NI Housing Statistics, Household characteristics
	Total amount secured against property	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009-2014	Understanding Society, Wave 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
	Housing tenure: Owned outright	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2006-2019	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Housing tenure: Being bought with mortgage or loan	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2006-2019	ONS, Labour Force Survey

	Housing tenure: Rented	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2006-2019	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Workplace pension type for employees aged 60 years: by sex	GB average only	Sex; Age	2019	ONS, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings: Workplace pension results by region, age, sex and gross weekly earnings band, UK
	Pension Type - For all employee jobs (full-time/part-time, private/public)	Northern Ireland, National	Sex	2018, 2019	NISRA, NI Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings Pensions Results
	Percentage and frequency of individuals aged 16 + actively contributing to a private pension scheme, by pension type and sex	GB average only	Sex, age	2006 -2016, 2014-2018	ONS, Pension Wealth: Wealth in Great Britain, July 2006 to June 2016 / April 2014 to March 2018
	Private pension wealth (active, preserved, in payment), summary statistics by age and sex	GB average only	Sex, age	2007 -2016, 2014-2018	ONS, Pension Wealth: Wealth in Great Britain, July 2006 to June 2016 / April 2014 to March 2018
	Average incomes of single pensioners by gender and type of income	UK, Region	Sex (but then no region)	1994/1995 - 2018/2019	Department of Work and Pensions, Pensioners' Income Series
	Type of benefit or payment: any sort of pension including a private pension	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009-2014	Understanding Society, Wave 1- 5
	Household wealth: Individuals by gender and marital status, by household total wealth	GB, Region	Sex (but then not by region)	2006, 2018	ONS, Total Wealth: Wealth in Great Britain
	Individual Savings Account	GB, Region	Sex (but then not by region)	2020	HM Revenue and Customs, Individual Savings Account
	Individuals who do not hold current accounts, by gender and age band	GB average only	Sex, Age	2012-2016, 2014-2018	ONS - Individuals who do not hold current accounts, by gender and age band
<b>Education &amp; Skills</b>					
Literacy and numeracy rates	English language proficiency: The proportion of working age adults who cannot speak English or cannot speak English well, women aged 25 to 59 and men aged 25 to 64.	UK, LSOA	Sex	2015	Indices of Multiple Deprivation - adult skills sub-domain, ID19
	Digital literacy: Internet use	UK, lower geographical area	Sex, age, ethnicity, disability (but then only national level)	2012-2019	ONS, Internet users

Educational achievement	Highest level of qualification by sex (including apprenticeship)	England, Wales, LSOA	Sex	2011	ONS, Census
	Qualification level	GB, LSOA	Sex	2008-2015	British Population Survey
	Type of qualification	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2015-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of degree already held	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2007-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of higher degree	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	1993-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Highest qualification/trade apprenticeship	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2011-2020	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Adult skills: The proportion of working age adults with no or low qualifications, women aged 25 to 59 and men aged 25 to 64	UK, LSOA	Sex	2015	Indices of Multiple Deprivation - adult skills sub-domain, ID19
	Qualification level of adults	UK, LSOA	Sex ethnicity, religion, age, qualification, employment	2011	ONS UK Census
	Apprenticeships Achievement Rates	UK, Local authority	Sex, ethnicity (but then not by LA)	2015/2016	Department for Education, Further education and skills National Achievement Rates Tables: June 2017
	UK domiciled student enrolments by ethnicity and sex	UK average only	Sex, ethnicity	2014/15 - 2019/20	HESA, UK domiciled student enrolments by ethnicity and sex 2014/15 to 2019/20
	HE qualifications obtained by level of qualification	UK, National	Sex	2015/16- 2019/20	HESA, HE qualifications obtained by level of qualification
	How many A Levels or equivalent	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2017-2018; 2018-2019	Understanding Society, Wave 9, 10
Subject choices	Gap in proportion of GCSE exam entries by subject	England average only	Sex	2010-2019	Department for Education, Key stage 4 performance 2019 (Provisional)
	Gap in proportion of A Level exam entries by subject	England, Region	Sex (but then not by region)	2011	Join Council for Qualifications
	HE qualifications obtained by subject and sex	UK, National	Sex	2021	HESA, HE qualifications obtained by CAH level 1 subject and sex

	Undergraduate subject areas	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2012-2020	ONS, ONS, Labour Force Survey
Adult learning	Participation in learning in the last 12 months, by sex	England average only	Sex	2016	Department for Education, Adult Education Survey
	Whether non-formal and/or informal learning undertaken within last 4 weeks	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2016-2019	ONS, Labour Force Survey
	Type of adult learning	UK, NUTS 3 areas	Sex, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, disability,	2010 only.	ONS, Labour Force Survey
Returns to qualification	Earnings returns by subject of undergraduate degree – all, males and females	England average only	Sex	2011	Department for Business Innovation & Skills, The Returns to Higher Education Qualifications
	Lifetime benefits associated with higher education qualification attainment	England average only	Sex	2011	Department for Business Innovation & Skills, The Returns to Higher Education Qualifications
	Employment effects by subject of undergraduate degree – all, males and females	England average only	Sex	2011	Department for Business Innovation & Skills, The Returns to Higher Education Qualifications
<b>Unpaid Work</b>					
<b>Childcare</b>	Hours of unpaid childcare	UK, Counties	Sex	2014-2015	UK Data service, United Kingdom Time Use Survey, 2014-2015
	Help given to children: Providing or cooking meals	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, religion, age, qualification, employment	2001, 2002, 2006, 2011-12, 2013-14, 2015-16, 2017-18	Understanding Society, Wave B11, B12, B16, 3, 5, 7, 9
	Help given to children: Washing, ironing or cleaning	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, religion, age, qualification, employment	2001, 2002, 2006, 2011-12, 2013-14, 2015-16, 2017-18	Understanding Society, Wave B11, B12, B16, 3, 5, 7, 9
	Help given to children: Shopping for them	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, religion, age, qualification, employment	2001, 2002, 2006, 2011-12, 2013-14, 2015-16, 2017-19	Understanding Society, Wave B11, B12, B16, 3, 5, 7, 10
<b>Care for adults</b>	Hours of adult assistance and care	UK, Counties	Sex	2014-2015	UK Data service, United Kingdom Time Use Survey, 2014-2018
Combined	Hours per week spent caring	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, religion, age, qualification, employment	1997-2018	Understanding Society, all waves
	Percentage of people providing informal care by age and gender	UK average only	Sex, age	2010/11-2018/19	Family Resources Survey

<b>Domestic work</b>	Hours of food management	UK, Counties	Sex	2014-2015	UK Data service, United Kingdom Time Use Survey, 2014-2020
	Hours of shopping and services	UK, Counties	Sex	2014-2015	UK Data service, United Kingdom Time Use Survey, 2014-2021
	Hours of household upkeep	UK, Counties	Sex	2014-2015	UK Data service, United Kingdom Time Use Survey, 2014-2022
	Main shopper	GB, LSOA	Sex	2008-2015	British Population Survey (LSOA)
<b>Volunteering</b>	Hours of volunteer work	UK, Counties	Sex	2014-2015	UK Data service, United Kingdom Time Use Survey, 2014-2022
	Active in organisations: voluntary services group	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 2011-2012
	Volunteer in last 12 months	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Wave 2, 4, 6, 8, 10
	Frequency of volunteering	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Wave 2, 4, 6, 8, 10
	Hours spent volunteering in last 4 weeks	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2019	Understanding Society, Wave 2, 4, 6, 8, 10
<b>Health &amp; Well-being</b>					
<b>Health risk</b>	Healthy life expectancy at birth and age 65	UK, Local authority	Sex	2016-2018	ONS, Life expectancy (LE), healthy life expectancy (HLE) and disability-free life expectancy (DFLE) at birth and age 65 by sex, UK
	Disability free life expectancy at birth and age 65	UK, Local authority	Sex	2016-2018	ONS, Life expectancy (LE), healthy life expectancy (HLE) and disability-free life expectancy (DFLE) at birth and age 65 by sex, UK
	Life expectancy estimates at birth and age 65	UK, Local authority	Sex	2016-2018	ONS, Life expectancy (LE), healthy life expectancy (HLE) and disability-free life expectancy (DFLE) at birth and age 65 by sex, UK
	Life expectancy estimates, all ages	UK, Local authority	Sex, age	2001-2003, 2017-2019	ONS, Life expectancy for local areas of the UK: between 2001 to 2003 and 2017 to 2019

	Suicide registrations by local authority	England, Wales, Local authority	-	2002-2019	ONS, Suicides in England and Wales by local authority
	Age-standardised suicide rates by sex	England (region), Wales	Sex	1981 - 2018	ONS, Suicide occurrences, England and Wales
	Alcohol-related age-specific death rates per 100,000 population	UK, National; England, Region	Sex	1994 - 2016	ONS, Alcohol-related deaths in the United Kingdom: 1994 to 2016
<b>Health status</b>	Personal wellbeing scores by sex	UK average only	Sex	2012-2017	ONS, Personal well-being estimates by age and sex
	Personal wellbeing by LA	UK, Local authority	-	2011-2019	ONS, Personal well-being in the UK
	Life satisfaction	UK, Local authority	-	2012-2020	ONS, Annual Populations Survey
	Satisfaction with life overall	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009/10-2018/19	Understanding Society, all waves
	Satisfaction with health	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2009/10-2018/20	Understanding Society, all waves
	Hospital admissions attributable to obesity	England, local authority	Sex	2019	NHS, Statistics on Obesity, Physical Activity and Diet
	Body mass index (BMI), prevalence of underweight, overweight and obesity, waist circumference, waist: hip ratio, and prevalence of abdominal obesity	UK average only	Sex, age	2012/13 - 2016/17	Public Health England, National Diet and Nutrition Survey. Results from Years 1-9 of the Rolling Programme (2008/09-2016/17).
<b>Health behaviour</b>	Proportion of cigarette smokers, by sex and age	GB average only	Sex, age	1974 - 2019	ONS, Adult smoking habits in Great Britain
	Smoker	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	1997-2019	Understanding Society, all waves
	Drinking habits	GB, Region	Sex, age (but then not region)	2014 -2017	ONS, Adult drinking habits in Great Britain
	Types of Food consumed (including alcohol)	UK average only	Sex, age	2012/13 - 2016/17	Public Health England, National Diet and Nutrition Survey. Results from Years 1-9 of the Rolling Programme (2008/09-2016/17).
	Days each week eat vegetables, fruit	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2011; 2013-2018	Understanding Society, Wave 2, 5, 7, 9

	Physical activity of adults and children	England, Local authority	-	2018/2019	Public Health England, Statistics on Obesity, Physical Activity and Diet, England, Part 5: Physical Activity
	Mild intensity sports frequency	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2011-2012	Understanding Society, Wave 3, 2011-2012
	Number of days walked at least 10 minutes in last four weeks	UK, LSOA	Sex, ethnicity, citizenship, age, sexual orientation, proxy disability	2010-2011, 2013-2014	Understanding Society, Wave 2, 5
<b>VAWG</b>					
<b>Physical, psychological and sexual violence</b>	Percentage of women/girls aged 16 to 59 who experienced partner abuse in the last 12 months	England, Wales, Region	Ethnicity, age, disability status, qualification, country of birth	2018-2019	ONS, SDG
	Percentage of women/girls aged 16 to 59 subjected to sexual assault in the last 12 months	England, Wales, Region	Ethnicity, age, disability status, qualification, migratory status, household income,	2016-2018	ONS, SDG
	Any domestic abuse (partner or family non-physical abuse, threats, force, sexual assault or stalking)	England, Wales, National	Sex	2005-2018	ONS, Crime Survey for England and Wales
	Any partner abuse (non-physical abuse, threats, force, sexual assault or stalking)	England, Wales, National	Sex, age	2018	ONS, Crime Survey for England and Wales
	Any partner family (non-physical abuse, threats, force, sexual assault or stalking)	England, Wales, National	Sex, age	2018	ONS, Crime Survey for England and Wales
	How many types and which types of abuse victims of domestic abuse suffered	England, Wales, National	Sex, age	2016-2018	ONS, Crime Survey for England and Wales
	Number of domestic violence orders in Family Courts	England, Wales, National	Sex	2011-2018	Ministry of Justice, Number of domestic violence orders in Family Courts in England & Wales
	Gender and age of clients accessing Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA) services, Victim Support	England, Wales, National	Sex	2018	Victim Support
	Sex of defendants and victims in domestic abuse-related prosecutions	England, Wales, National	Sex	2010-2018	Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)
	Crimes Recorded with a Domestic Abuse Motivation (excluding fraud)	Northern Ireland, local authority	-	2005-2019	NISRA, Crimes with a domestic abuse motivation (NRA)
	Type of physical partner abuse experienced since age 16, by gender	Scotland, National	Sex	2008/09 - 2017/19	Scottish Government, Scottish Crime and Justice Survey

	Percentage of respondents experiencing types of partner abuse in the 12 months prior to interview and since age 16, by age and gender	Scotland, National	Sex, Age	2008/09 - 2017/18	Scottish Government, Scottish Crime and Justice Survey
	Percentage of respondents experiencing types of serious sexual assault since age 16	Scotland, National	Sex	2008/09 - 2017/18	Scottish Government, Scottish Crime and Justice Survey
	Percentage of respondents experiencing types of less serious sexual assault since age 16, by gender	Scotland, National	Sex	2008/09 - 2017/18	Scottish Government, Scottish Crime and Justice Survey
	Sexual offences	Northern Ireland, administrative geographies	-	2001-2019	NISRA, Police Recorded Crime (administrative geographies)
	Proportion of girls and women aged 15–49 years who have undergone female genital mutilation/cutting, by age	England, Local authority	n/a	2015/2016 - 2018/2019	ONS, NHS Digital; ONS, SDG
<b>Femicide</b>	Number of women who were victims of homicides carried out by a partner/ex-partner 2009-10 to 2018-19	Scotland, National	n/a	2017/8-2018/9	Scottish Government, Homicide in Scotland
	Characteristics of domestic and other homicides for victims aged 16 years and over	England, Wales, National	Sex, age; ethnicity	2015-2017	Homicide Index, Home Office
<b>Safety in public</b>	Proportion of adults who felt safe walking alone after dark in their local area	Scotland, National	Sex	2008/09 - 2017/18	Scottish Government, Scottish Crime and Justice Survey
	Feeling Very Unsafe: Walking alone in area after dark (%)	Northern Ireland, administrative geographies	-	2014-2018	Department of Justice, Crime and Personal Safety (administrative geographies)
<b>Modern Slavery</b>	Modern Slavery: Number of referrals to the National Referral Mechanism, by sex and age at time of exploitation	UK	Sex, age	2009-2018	Home Office - National Referral Mechanism
	Modern Slavery: Number of potential victims who received a positive reasonable grounds decision within National Referral Mechanism, by sex, age at time of exploitation and type of exploitation	UK, National	Sex, age	2009-2019	Home Office - National Referral Mechanism

<b>Forced marriage</b>	Number of women aged 20 to 24 who have been married by age 17 and by age 18	England, Wales, National	n/a	2000-2020	ONS, SDG
------------------------	---	--------------------------	-----	-----------	----------