Developing and agreeing a capability list in the British context: What can be learnt from social survey data on 'rights'?

Polly Vizard

Table of Contents

CASE/142
November 2010

Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
CASE enquiries – tel: 020 7955 6679

Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion

The Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) is a multi-disciplinary research centre based at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), within the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD). Our focus is on exploration of different dimensions of social disadvantage, particularly from longitudinal and neighbourhood perspectives, and examination of the impact of public policy.

In addition to our discussion paper series (CASEpapers), we produce occasional summaries of our research in CASEbriefs, and reports from various conferences and activities in CASEreports. All these publications are available to download free from our website. Limited printed copies are available on request.

For further information on the work of the Centre, please contact the Centre Manager, Jane Dickson, on:

Telephone:	UK+20 7955 6679
Fax:	UK+20 7955 6951
Email:	j.dickson@lse.ac.uk
Web site:	http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case

Editorial Notes and Acknowledgements

Polly Vizard is a Research Fellow at the Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion at LSE. The author would like to thank Abigail McKnight for editing this paper and providing invaluable support and advice throughout the project. Tania Burchardt has provided support and advice, and the work has benefited from helpful discussions with colleagues around CASE and STICERD, including Frank Cowell, Eleni Karagiannaki and Francesca Bastagli. I am extremely grateful to all of the above for their input. I would also like to thank Joe Joannes and Nic Warner who have provided IT support and Jane Dickson in relation to project administration and management. Thanks also for support and advice from John Hills, Director of CASE. Sarah Tipping at Natcen has assisted with data access and provided additional variables and Kate Millward and Suzanne Cooper from the Citizenship Survey Team at Department of Communities and Local Government have helped with queries and provided contacts. The research has been presented as part of the CASE public seminar series (November 2009), at the Annual Conference of the Human Development and Capability Association (Lima September 2009) and to a session organised by the Society for Empirical Ethics at the Pacific Division Meeting of the American Philosophical Association (San Francisco March 31-April 3 2010). The author is grateful for input and comments from participants at these events. Responsibility for errors of fact or interpretation remain with the author.

The research has been supported by Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Grant RES-000-22-2780 - Developing a capability list in the British context: Should attitudinal data on human rights be given a more direct role?

Data sources acknowledgement

The following datasets were accessed via the UK Data Archive at Essex University during the course of the project:
- Citizenship Survey 2007: SN 5739 Deposited by Communities and Local Government. Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland.
- Home Office. Communities Group and BMRB. Social Research, Home Office Citizenship Survey, 2001 [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], November 2003. SN: 4754.
- Office for National Statistics and Home Office. Communities Group, Home Office Citizenship Survey, 2003 [computer file]. 2nd Edition. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], June 2005. SN: 5087.
- Home Office. Communities Group and National Centre for Social Research, Home Office Citizenship Survey, 2005 [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], June 2006. SN: 5367.

The author is very grateful to the Archive and to the original collectors and depositors for making these data available. However, neither the Archive nor the original

collectors or depositors of the data bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretations presented in this report.

Abstract

The paper examines what can be learnt about the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities (or capabilities) using a general population social survey data source on values. On the assumption that rights can be understood as protecting underlying critical freedoms and opportunities, social survey data on public attitudes towards the rights that people "should have" is interpreted as providing empirical evidence on the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities by individuals and groups. The paper addresses the extent to which data of this type provides empirical evidence of the 'valuation' of the 10 domains of freedom and opportunity that are specified in the capability lists for adults and children that have been developed and applied in previous projects (namely, Life; Health; Physical security; Legal security; Standard of living; Education and learning; Productive and valued activities; Individual, family and social life; Identity and self-respect; Participation, influence and voice). Particular emphasis is put on moving beyond the 'legalistic' methodology for deriving a 'human rights-based capability list' applied in previous projects, and examining whether empirical research on values provides an alternative, overlapping or supplementary informational base for deriving a list of this type. The research findings can be interpreted as providing broad empirical underpinnings for the 'valuation' of nine out of the ten domains of freedom and opportunity specified in the capability lists that have been developed and applied in previous projects. The Life domain was effectively not covered by the research exercise, since the underlying social survey data did not include questions on public attitudes towards the right to life.

JEL Classification: I30, I31, I32
Keywords: Capability approach, capability lists, human rights, public attitudes, values

Introduction

This paper contributes to a broader programme of work that aims to "operationalize" the capability approach as a basis for multidimensional inequality analysis in Britain. A key challenge in this work is to develop and agree a 'capability list' - a list of substantive freedoms and opportunities that are to 'count' for the purposes of measurement, and in terms of which the position of individuals and groups is to be evaluated and compared.

In a serious of previous research outputs, a two-stage procedure for developing and agreeing a capability list in the British context has been proposed. This involves (1) deriving a 'human rights-based capability list from the international human rights framework (2) expanding, refining and orientating the human rights based list for the British context, through a process of deliberative consultation with the general public and individuals and groups who are at risk of discrimination and disadvantage. Capability lists for adults and children have been developed and agreed by applying this two-stage procedure and cover 10 domains of valuable freedoms and opportunity (Life; Health; Physical security; Legal security; Standard of living; Education and learning; Productive and valued activities; Individual, family and social life; Identity and self-respect; Participation, influence and voice). These provide the basis of recent work to monitor and report on the equality and human rights position of individuals and groups in England, Scotland and Wales (see, for example, Burchardt and Vizard 2007ab; Equalities Review 2007: Chapter 1 and Annex A; Alkire et at 2009; EHRC 2010; Burchardt and Vizard forthcoming; Holder et al forthcoming)

The current paper builds on and takes forward this previous research. The central objective is to extend the empirical evidence base for developing and agreeing a capability list in the British context by examining what can be learnt about the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities using general population social survey data on values. On the assumption that rights can be understood as protecting underlying critical freedoms and opportunities, social survey data on public attitudes towards the rights that people "should have" is interpreted as providing empirical evidence on the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities by individuals and groups. The paper addresses the extent to which social survey data of this type provides empirical evidence of the 'valuation' of the 10 domains of freedom and opportunity that are specified in the capability lists for adults and children that have been developed and applied in previous projects. Particular emphasis is put on moving beyond the 'legalistic' methodology for deriving a 'human rights-based capability list' applied in previous projects, and examining whether empirical research on values provides an alternative, overlapping or supplementary informational base for deriving a list of this type.

The deliberative research exercise undertaken in previous projects already provides an initial evidence base for comparing a list of 'valuable' freedoms and opportunities derived from the international human rights framework to a list of 'valuable' freedoms

and opportunities derived from empirical research on values. However, the deliberative research exercise was limited in its scope, did not aim to be scientifically representative and the results were not expected to be statistically significant (Burchardt and Vizard forthcoming). In contrast, the current paper uses a general population social survey source as a basis for examining overall patterns of support for rights and for identifying statistically significant variations in support for rights amongst different population groups using standard statistical techniques. The research findings are based on data from the 2005 Citizenship Survey (Rights and Responsibilities Module). The research exercise examines whether there is public support for a narrow concept of rights (covering civil and political rights) or a broad concept of rights (covering, in addition, economic and social rights) and tests the statistical significance of a series of possible variables that, *a priori*, are theorized as possible 'contenders' in explaining variations in public support for rights. Some general conclusions are drawn about the key 'drivers' of public support for rights and their relative 'importance'.

The paper has seven further parts. Part 1 introduces the problem of developing and agreeing capability lists. Part 2 sets out the idea of a human rights-based capability list. Part 3 discusses the two-stage procedure for developing and agreeing a capability list developed and applied in previous work, involving (1) derivation of a 'human rights-based capability list' from the international human rights framework (2) supplementation, refinement and expansion of the 'human rights-based' capability through a process of deliberative consultation with individuals and groups at risk of discrimination and disadvantage. Part 4 examines the aims and objectives of the research exercise using the 2005 Citizenship Survey Rights and Responsibilities data. Part 5 provides an overview of the research findings. Part 6 discusses the interpretation and implications of the research findings. Part 7 concludes.

1. The problem

The question of domain selection and of how to agree on a capability list in terms of which the position of individuals and groups is to be evaluated and judged has been extensively discussed in the literature on the capability approach. Sen has been famously reluctant to endorse a specific ('final' or 'fixed') list of central and basic capabilities on the ground that (1) different lists of central and basic capabilities may be suitable for different purposes and in different contexts; (2) the development of capability lists ought not to be viewed as a technocratic process or a matter for 'pure theory' – but as one open to challenge and revision, and in which broader processes of public reasoning and democratic deliberation play a *constitutive* role. He has argued that processes of this type are necessary for selecting relevant capabilities and weighing them against each other; and that the problem of domain selection should be treated as *open* and *flexible*, rather than fixed and pre-determined and should be embedded in broader processes of moral reflection and democratic deliberation and debate (Sen, 2004a: 77).

Nussbaum has argued that Sen's position is too vague and that both the theoretical development and practical application of the capability approach require the endorsement of a specific capability list. She has proposed a philosophically derived capability list that is comprehensive in the sense that it aims to capture all central and valuable capabilities (e.g. Nussbaum 2003: 40-50). These are listed as:

1. Life.
2. Bodily Health.
3. Bodily Integrity.
4. Senses, Imagination, and Thought.
5. Emotions.
6. Practical Reason.
7. Affiliation.
8. Other Species.
9. Play.
10. Control over One's Environment.

Nussbaum's List has been applied as the basis of a number of empirical research exercises that aim at measuring capabilities including in Britain (e.g. Anand *et al*, 2005, Anand, Hunger et al 2009; Anand, Santos et al 2009). However, various concerns have been expressed regarding the legitimacy of Nussbaum's List for some purposes. Robeyns (2003; 2005) suggests that Nussbaum's List might be inappropriate as a basis for some research exercises since it may lack legitimacy in some contexts. There is, she suggests, a need for research frameworks that are procedurally sensitive and that recognize the importance of conditions of fair representation and democratic deliberation. Indeed, a valid analytical distinction can be made between lists that are identical in substantive terms, but that are derived under different procedural conditions. Robeyns goes on to propose a series of 'good practice' research principles for developing and agreeing capability lists which include the need for legitimacy, transparency and the possibility of revision. Before the capability approach is applied in practice, explicit agreement should be reached about the domains of freedom and opportunity that are to be treated as 'important' given the evaluative purpose and the context at hand. Agreement is required in both substantive terms (i.e. the nature and scope of the list of central and valuable capabilities to be adopted) and in terms of process (i.e. the procedure by which the list of central and valuable capabilities is to be agreed) (Robeyns (2003 2005: 15).

A significant literature that attempts to elicit information on the valuation of freedoms and opportunities (or capabilities) through 'bottom-up' participative research exercises has also emerged. Alkire's (2002) study examined the 'dimensions' of human freedom and the role of participatory processes in addressing questions of relative value in the development project context. Biggeri *et al* (2006) apply participative methodologies in order to develop a list of capabilities for children. Crocker (2008) argues that the capability approach needs to be combined with the theory and practice of deliberative democracy. Alkire (2007) reviews the plurality of methodologies that have been applied to 'choose dimensions' in the literature. The key options include:

- Existing data or convention;
- Implicit or explicit assumptions with respect to what people do value or should value;
- Selecting a list of dimensions that has achieved a degree of legitimacy as a result of public consensus (e.g. universal human rights and the MDGs internationally);
- Ongoing purposive participatory exercises that periodically elicit the values and perspectives of stakeholders;
- Empirical evidence regarding people's values: choosing dimensions on the basis of expert analyses of people's values from empirical data.

Combinations of these approaches are also possible. Alkire (2007) suggests a 'mixed' method approach that combines the selection of a static set of core dimensions (using explicit criteria which are described) with participatory studies that report the relative importance of each dimensions to the respondents during different waves of a social survey process. De Shalit and Woolf (2008) suggest a "dynamic public reflective equilibrium approach". This is an iterative process combining philosophical reasoning and empirical methods (especially using empirical research methodologies to test, cross-check and revise these categories). The practical application of this methodology by de Shalit and Woolf involves combining the conceptual categories included in Nussbaum's list and empirical research findings (based on 38 in-depth interviews with disadvantaged individuals and relevant professionals). De Shalit and Woolf present a revised version of Nussabum's list based on this research exercise.

2. Human rights-based capability lists

The idea of a 'human rights-based capability selection' is theorized in Vizard (2006; 2007) and involves eliminating (or partially eliminating) the 'substantive incompleteness' of the capability approach by introducing a background or supplementary theory of human rights. Although the idea of human rights is itself contested, Vizard suggests that the international human rights framework provides a 'pragmatic terrain of consensus' for applying this idea in practice. In particular, the international human rights framework can be characterized as providing evidence of a 'partial value ordering' in the space of freedoms and opportunities - where those freedoms and opportunities recognised in international human rights instruments are attributed a positive value (but are not ranked) and all other freedoms and opportunities are zero weighted.

Applications of this methodology to date have involved working backwards (or inductively) from the actual standards recognized in core international human rights treaties to a set of underlying (or implicitly defined) states of 'being' and 'doing'. Legally binding international treaties such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Convention on the Elimination of All of

Forms of Discrimination Against Women create legally binding international obligations on state parties (both individually and collectively through international assistance and co-operation) and have been adopted by the vast majority of states. These international treaties recognize a broad range of civil and political rights, and economic, social and cultural rights, ranging the rights to life and to freedom from torture, cruel and inhuman and degrading treatment, to adequate food and nutrition, to safe water and sanitation, health and education. They can arguably be viewed as implicitly or explicitly affirming the value of certain underlying states of 'being' and 'doing' that are critical for the equal dignity and worth of the human person - and therefore as affirming the value of an underlying basic capability set. For example, applying the method of human rights-based capability selection, international recognition of the human right to an adequate standard of living under Article 25 of the Universal Declaration, Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and Article 27 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child provide a basis for including the capability to achieve an adequate standard of living in a basic capability set. The generalisation of this approach provides a basis for specifying and justifying a 'human rights-based capability list' that covers a range of central and valuable capabilities (from bodily integrity, to adequate nutrition and health, to legal security and self-respect).

As well as providing a 'pragmatic terrain of consensus' for developing and agreeing capability lists, the method of 'human rights-based capability selection' can be viewed as building on important conceptual links between the idea of capabilities and that of human rights. Vizard (2006) suggests that the method of 'human rights-based capability selection' builds on the analysis in Taylor (1985, 192 & 195) - which suggests that all rights-based statements entail an explicit or implicit affirmation of the *value* of certain human capacities that should not be interfered with and / or that should be developed and supported. Human rights might also be viewed as *elliptical statements* in the sense that underlying norms relating to human flourishing that are essential to the understanding of these statements are left inexplicit[i]. We might, for example, assume that the statement "X has a human right to Z" relates to some underlying (inexplicit) notion of human flourishing; (2) that this implicit notion of human flourishing can be captured (or partly captured) by the concept of capability.

The conceptual links between the capability approach and the idea of human rights are discussed in Sen (2000; 2004b; 2005; 2009) and Nussbaum (1995, 1997; 2000: 96-101; 2003; 2004; 2006). Sen suggests that both 'process-freedoms' and 'opportunity-freedoms' that meet a threshold of 'importance' can be characterised as human rights; and that many (although not *all*) human rights can be captured and characterised in the language of capabilities (Sen 2004b 330-337, 2005: 152-157; 2009: 367-372). Nussbaum suggests of "thinking of the basic capabilities of human beings as needs for functioning" that are associated with claims to assistance by others - giving rise to notions of correlated duties and providing a basis for many contemporary notions of human rights (1995: 88). Indeed, the possibility of combing the capability approach with a background or supplementary theory of human rights was an important theme in early debates about the extension and application of the capability approach. In an

important exchange, Williams highlighted the potential role of a background or supplementary theory of basic or human rights in identifying and justifying important and valuable capabilities.

> "[It has been suggested that the problem of relative value] cannot be solved by reference to capabilities in themselves, but that you have to introduce the notion of a right. The apparently innocent and descriptive-looking notions of the standard of living or well-being may then turn out to contain consideration about those goods to which we believe people have a basic right …" (Williams, 1987, 100)[ii]

3. The British context

A series of recent projects have recently been undertaken with the aim of developing and applying the capability approach a basis for multidimensional inequality analysis in England, Scotland and Wales. Capability lists for adults and children were derived in these projects using a two-stage methodology involving (1) deriving a minimum core 'capability list' from the international human rights framework and (2) supplementing, refining and orientating the 'human rights based capability list' through a deliberative research exercise with the general public and individuals and groups at risk of discrimination and disadvantage. Capability lists for adults and children that have been derived using this methodology have been applied as a foundation for recent national equality and human rights monitoring exercises in England, Scotland and Wales. These cover 10 domains of freedom and opportunity:

- Life
- Health
- Physical security
- Legal security
- Standard of living
- Education and learning
- Productive and valued activities
- Individual, family and social life
- Identity and self-respect;
- Participation, influence and voice

Full details of this previous work are given in Burchardt and Vizard (2007a, b), Equalities Review (2007: Chapter 1 and Annex A), Alkire et at (2009), EHRC (2010), Burchardt and Vizard (forthcoming) and Holder et al (forthcoming).

In previous projects, the derivation of a human rights-based capability list in stage-1 of the two-stage procedure discussed above was based on an exclusively 'legalistic' methodology. A list of 'valuable' freedoms and opportunities was derived from the two major human rights treaties, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,

supplemented by other treaties (such as the Convention on the Elimination on All Forms of Discrimination Against Women) for adults and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (for children). This list was then supplemented and refined in the second-stage of the two-stage methodology, through a process of deliberation and debate, giving the general public and those at risk of discrimination and disadvantage a defining role in identifying and justifying the selection of central and basic capabilities. The deliberative research exercise aimed to elicit in-depth and considered attitudinal information on values by (1) providing evidence of the valuation of freedoms and opportunities by individuals and groups (2) by identifying any differences in the valuation of freedoms and opportunities by individuals and groups with different characteristics (3) by compiling a list of central and valuable capabilities based on the views of the general public and individuals and groups at particularly high risk of experiencing discrimination and disadvantage and (4) by facilitating the supplementation, refinement and orientation of the human rights-derived capability list.

Having completed stage-1 and stage-2 of procedure, the question arose as to how to aggregate the stage-1 and stage-2 capability lists. Given the relatively small sample size and the authoritative, legal and quasi-universal status of internationally recognized human rights standards, a decision-rule was developed whereby the human rights based capability list agreed in stage-1 would 'trump' the stage-2 capability list in the event of conflict. Additional elements identified and specified through deliberative consultation were taken to *expand* or *orientate* the human rights-based capability list but elements of the stage-1 capability list could not be 'eliminated' as a result of stage-2. In practice, the application of the trumping rule was for the main unnecessary, since many elements on the lists identified through the Stage-1 and Stage-2 procedure were overlapping. A number of additional elements and some elements that might be viewed as implicit in human rights conventions (but that were not made explicit in the initial human rights-based list) were highlighted and made more specific by participants in the deliberative consultation. These included creativity and intellectual fulfilment; access to information technology; activities with family and friends; personal development, self-esteem and hope for the future; care; being a member of civil organisations and solidarity groups; and 'being yourself in public spaces'. The 'trumping rule' was, however, applied in relation to the ability to form and join a trade union. Trade union formation and membership was retained in the final form of the capability list proposed, notwithstanding this element being viewed as non-essential in a number of the deliberative events.[iii]

Table 1: Capability list derived through 2-stage procedure combining human rights and deliberative consultation[iv]

Underlying states of being and doing (10 domains of freedom and opportunity)	**International human rights instrument**	**Validation of domain in deliberative research exercise**
Life	Article 6 ICCPR right to life	Yes
Physical security	Article 7 ICCPR freedom from cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment	Yes (sub-domains extended though deliberative research exercise)
Legal security	Article 8 ICCPR abolition of slavery and the slave trade, prohibition on servitude, abolition of compulsory labour Articles 9-10 ICCPR, Articles 13 ICCPR liberty and security, prohibition of arbitrary arrest and detention, regulation of conditions of detention and expulsion Article ICCPR 14-15 equality before the courts and fair judicial process Article 16 ICCPR recognition of personhood before the law Article 24 ICCPR right of child to protection of law, to registration and a name, and to nationality Article 26 ICCPR equality before the law / equal protection of law	Yes (sub-domains extended though deliberative research exercise)
Individual, family and social life	Article 17 ICCPR prohibitions on arbitrary interference with privacy, home, correspondence, family, honour, reputation Article 10 ICESCR / Article 23 ICCPR right to marriage and family life; marriage by free consent; equality during marriage and at dissolution	Yes (sub-domains extended though deliberative research exercise and domain label extended to cover 'social life')
Identity, expression and self-respect	Article 19 ICCPR right to opinion and expression Article 18 ICCPR freedom of thought, conscience and religion Article 20 ICCPR prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred Article 27 ICCPR, Article 15 ICESCR right of minorities to cultural life, religion and language	Yes (sub-domains extended though deliberative research exercise and domain label extended to cover 'self-respect')
Education and learning	Article ICESCR 13 right of everyone to education Article ICESCR 14 right to compulsory and free primary education	Yes (sub-domains extended though deliberative research exercise and domain label extended to cover 'learning')
Health	Article 12 ICESCR right to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health	Yes
Standard of living	Article 11 ICESCR right to an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, clothing and housing Article 9 ICESCR social security Article 10 ICESCR protection and assistance for families with dependent children, and special measures for the protection and assistance of mothers and children	Yes (sub-domains extended through deliberative research exercise)

Productive and valued activities	Article 6 ICESCR right to work; Article 7 right to just and favourable conditions of work	Yes (sub-domains extended through deliberative research exercise with emphasis on care)
Participation, influence and voice	Article 21 ICCPR peaceful assembly Article 22 ICCPR freedom of association Article 25 ICCPR participation in public affairs, free and fair elections, equal access to public service ICESCR Article 8 right to form and to join trade union	Yes (some sub-domains extended through deliberative research exercise; right to form a trade union not validated in 'round 1' deliberative consultation)

The deliberative research exercise discussed above already provides an initial evidence base for comparing the list of 'valuable' freedoms and opportunities derived from international human rights treaties to a list of 'valuable' freedoms and opportunities derived from empirical research on values. A total of around two hundred participants were involved in the deliberation, including two full-day workshops with members of the general public, shorter workshops with groups of people at particular risk of discrimination and disadvantage (including lesbian, gay and bisexual people; people with a physical impairment; people from different ethnic minority groups; teenagers; elderly people and their carers; non-English speaking Pakistani women from lower social classes; and Scottish and Welsh participants); and a series of in-depth interviews (with individuals from different religions and faiths; people with sensory impairments and mild learning difficulties; and transgender people) (Table 2). However, the scope of the deliberative research exercise was limited by both time and resources. Recruitment was carried out by Ipsos-MORI using their usual field procedures designed to ensure a wide spread of socio-economic and demographic characteristics (as appropriate for the different group specifications) but the groups were not intended to be scientifically representative, nor were the results expected to be statistically significant (Burchardt and Vizard forthcoming; Ipsos-MORI 2007).

Table 2: The programme of deliberative consultation

	Characteristics of individuals and groups	Location and format	Number of participants
Round 1			
1	General public	London and Edinburgh, 2 x full day	60
2	Lesbian, gay and bisexual people	London, 2 hours	8
3	People with mobility impairments	Bristol, 1.5 hours	8
4	Teenagers (13-16)	Bristol, 1.5 hours	8
5	People from ethnic minority groups	Birmingham, 2 hours	8
6	People with sensory impairments	Depth interviews, 1 hour	2
7	Dyslexic person	depth interview, 1 hour	1
8	Sikh, Muslim and Jewish people	Depth interviews, 1 hour	4
Round 2			
9	Parents and children	Stockport, half day	9 children, 18 parents
10	Elderly people and carers	Newcastle, half day	32
11	Pakistani women	Leicester, 3 hours	10
12	Bangladeshi men	London, 3 hours	6
13	Young adults	East Anglia, paired depth interviews	4
14	Transgender people	various; paired depth interviews *2	4
15	General public, including urban and rural residents	Cardiff and Wrexham, 3 hours	20
Total			**202**

Source: Vizard and Burchardt (forthcoming Table 2)

4 Extending the evidence base

The current paper builds on and takes forward this previous work by examining what can be learnt about the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities using a general population social survey data source on values. On the assumption that rights can be understood as protecting underlying critical freedoms and opportunities, social survey data on public attitudes towards the rights that people "should have" is interpreted as providing evidence on the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities by individuals and groups. The research exercise examines the extent to which the available social survey evidence on values provides empirical underpinnings for the 'human rights-based' capability list derived from the international human rights framework. The central question addressed is whether the concept of rights elucidated and supported by the public is sufficiently broad to incorporate the substantive freedoms and opportunities included in the capability list that has been recommended in previous research outputs opportunity (covering Life; Health; Physical security; Legal security; Standard of living; Education and learning; Productive and valued activities; Individual, family and social life; Identity and self-respect; Participation, influence and voice).

The 2005 Citizenship Survey was identified as the richest and most up-to date dataset that could provide a basis for the research exercise[v]. The Citizenship Survey is a general population survey with a core sample of around 10,000 participants and an ethnic minority boost with a further 4000 participants. In 2005, the 'Rights and Responsibilities' Module included a question on the rights that participants thought that people should enjoy as someone living in the UK today. A broad range of rights including economic and social rights, as well as civil and political rights, were included as options. The rights covered were:

- the right to access to free education for children;
- the right to freedom of speech;
- the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion;
- the right to free elections;
- the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself;
- the right to be protected from crime;
- the right to be treated fairly and equally;
- the right to free health-care if you need it; and
- the right to a job.

The research exercise establishes an overall picture of public support for each of these as rights that the public are willing to endorse at a 'higher' or 'abstract' level – as rights that *should* be enjoyed by people living in the UK today. A key aim is to examine whether the concept of rights understood 'narrowly' in terms of civil and political rights, or more broadly, with economic and social rights also being viewed as fundamental. In order to address this question, overall patterns of public support for economic and social rights, compared with overall patterns of public support for civil and political rights, are investigated. The following thresholds have been applied:

- universal support (95%+);
- near universal support (90%+);
- very high support (80%+);
- high support (70%+);
- moderate high support (60%+);
- majority support (50%+);
- moderate low support (25-50%); and
- low support (<25%).

The research exercise also presents evidence on variations in public support for rights by population subgroups. The Citizenship Survey has 'value-added' in having a sample size that is sufficient for disaggregation by a broad range of characteristics that are, *a priori*, particularly interesting for thinking about public support for rights. The research exercise provides evidence on variations in public support for rights based on these characteristics and identifies those characteristics that are repeatedly important and / or influential in explaining variations of this type. Logistic regression equations are estimated for each category of right included in the 2005 Citizenship Survey and odds ratios for support / not support are reported. The following independent variables are included in the analysis:

- gender;
- long-term limiting illness or disability (LLID);
- ethnicity;
- age;
- religion / belief;
- country of Birth;
- equivalent household income[vi];
- highest educational qualification;
- social class (using the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification NS-SEC, based on the household reference person) [vii];
- social housing status[viii];
- index of multiple deprivation (IMD) ranking; and
- government office region (GOR).

Some general conclusions are also drawn about the key 'drivers' of public support for rights and their relative 'importance'. In thinking about the drivers of public support for rights, a broad distinction can be made between 'social identity characteristics' (such as gender, ethnicity, religion and belief, disability etc), socio-economic variables (such as highest educational qualification, social class, income, and area deprivation) and geographic variables (such as geographical region). The research findings are interpreted in the light of this distinction[ix]. Key interactive effects (such as the interaction of gender and ethnicity, or the interaction of highest educational qualification and area deprivation) are identified.

5. Research findings

5.1 The overall picture

The overall picture of public support for rights in 2005 is presented in Table 3. When asked about the rights that *should* be enjoyed by individuals living in the UK today, two rights (to be protected from crime, and to be treated fairly and equally, achieved the threshold set for 'universal support' (95%+). One civil and political right (the right to freedom of speech) and two economic and social rights (the right to free health-care if you need it, and the right to access to free education for children) achieved the threshold set for 'near universal support' (90%+). With the exception of the right to a job, the remaining rights considered (the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, the right to free elections, the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself) achieved the 'very high support' threshold (80%+). The outlier was the levels of support for the right to a job which generated lower levels of endorsement than other rights. Nevertheless, the right to a job was endorsed by more than 70% achieving the threshold necessary for 'high support'. Respondents views about the rights that people living in the UK today *should have* ('rights-endorsement') can be compared with their views about the rights that they *actually have* ('rights-realization') using the 2005 data. Within each category of rights, the proportion endorsing the right as an ethical category is higher than the proportion that feels that the right is actually respected in practice. For example, the percentage that endorse the right to freedom of speech as a right that individuals *should have* as someone living in the UK today was endorsed by 94%, whereas only 76% felt that this right was a right that individuals 'actually have'.

Table 3: The rights that individuals have, and the rights that they should have, as people living in the UK today

Prompted questions
Citizenship Survey 2005 (Core sample; weighted)

Rights	**Actually have**	**Should have**
To have access to free education for children	81	92
To have freedom of speech	76	94
To have freedom of thought, conscience and religion	79	89
To have free elections	83	87
To be looked after by the State if you cannot look after yourself	62	85
To be protected from crime	67	96
To be treated fairly and equally	70	96
To have free health-care if you need it	81	93
To have a job	59	77

5.2 Variations analysis

A second aim of the research exercise is to explain support for rights in terms of independent predictor explanatory variables. A logistic regression equation was estimated for each category of rights explaining support for rights (civil and political, and economic and social) and the odds ratios for support for each right by population subgroup were estimated. Since Citizenship Survey design departs from the assumption of an underlying random sampling design in important respects (including

the use of sample weights, strata and clustering, as well as in relation to the use of the boost sample), the results have been adjusted for complex survey design.[x] The goodness of fit test recommended in Archer and Lemeshow (2006) for evaluating the fit of logistic regression models in the context of complex survey designs is applied in the current analysis. All of the logistic regression models except one passed the threshold for goodness of fit as indicated by the survey adjusted Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000) goodness of fit statistic (for which a non-significant test statistic is interpreted as no evidence of lack of fit). The exception is the results for the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, which failed this test. However, when the goodness of fit test was repeated with one of the non-significant variables (GOR) omitted, the model passed the adjusted Hosmer and Lemeshow goodness of fit with no other instability in parameter estimates.[xi]

The discussion below reports findings for all of the variables tested (whether or not the results were found to be significant). This approach allows for the possibility of confounding variables. It also reflects the idea that a finding of 'non-significant variation' between population groups is itself of substantive interest for thinking about public attitudes towards rights.[xii] For categorical independent variables with more than two categories, the significance of the overall p-values and of the *individual indicator values* are both reported. It should be noted that, in the context of variables of this type, the *overall* p-values can be significant whilst the p-values at the individual indicator level are non-significant (and vice versa). The results tables accompanying the text are presented in Appendix 1. Further details of the methodological framework are provided in Appendix 2.

5.3 The right to freedom of speech

Table A1 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for freedom of speech. The odds ratio for women relative to men is 0.651, implying that women are less likely to support this right than their male counterparts.

Holding all other variables constant, significant overall variations are established by ethnicity and highest educational qualification (with $p<0$ .05 in the overall omnibus adjusted wald test for ethnicity and highest educational qualification).

For ethnicity, at the individual indicator level, significant variations are established for the Asian, Black, and Chinese/other subgroups in pair-wise comparisons with the White reference subgroup. The odds of support decreases by 50% for individuals from the Asian subgroup, by 44% for individuals from the Black subgroup, and by 64% for individuals from the Chinese / other subgroup, relative to individuals from the White subgroup.

Educational achievement is also associated with significant variations in support for freedom of speech. Significant variations in the odds at the individual indicator level are established for the GCSE D-E or equivalent, foreign or other qualifications, and no qualifications subgroups, relative to the reference group (individuals whose highest educational qualification is degree or equivalent). The odds ratios for individuals with

GCSE D-E or equivalent, and individuals with no qualifications, are 0.514 and 0.494 respectively. This implies that the odds of support for the right to freedom of speech decreases by around 50% for both of these subgroups, relative to individuals whose highest educational qualification is degree or equivalent.

5.4 The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion

Table A2 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

Holding all other variables constant, significant overall variations are established by age, religion and belief, highest educational qualification and social class ($p<0$ .05 for the overall omnibus adjusted wald test in each case).

At the individual indicator level, in relation to age, 65-70 year olds are more likely to support the right to freedom of through, conscience and religion, relative to their counterparts from the 16-19 age group. Holding all other variables constant, the 65-70 year old age group have higher odds relative to 16-19 year olds (with an odds ratio of 1.658).

The findings for educational achievement are again marked. The p-values at the individual indicator level are significant for all of the subgroups relative to the reference group (individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification). The odds for these subgroups are all lower, decreasing by 40% for individuals whose highest educational qualification is higher education below degree level; by 53% for individuals with A level or equivalent; by 58% for individuals with GCSE A-C or equivalent; by 77% for those with GCSE D-E or equivalent; by 71% for individuals with foreign or other qualifications; and by 81% for individuals with no qualifications.

For social class, at the individual indicator level, variations in support for the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion were also found to be significant. The odds were lower for individuals from households where the reference person is from the intermediate and smaller employer subgroup, the lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine subgroup, or from the routine subgroup, relative to individuals from households where the reference person is from the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup group

The relationship between equivalent household income and support for freedom of thought, conscience and religion is positive and significant. This implies that higher household income is associated with higher odds of support for the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion[xiii].

5.5 The right to free elections

Table A3 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for the right to free elections.

Holding all other variables constant, significant variations in support are established by gender, with the odds of support for free elections lower for women than for their male counterparts (an odds ratio for females of 0.782).

Significant overall variations are also established by established by ethnicity, age, religion and belief, country of birth, highest educational qualification, social class ($p<0$ .05 for the overall omnibus adjusted wald test in each case).

For ethnicity, at the individual indicator level, significant variations are established for the Asian, Black and Chinese/other subgroups in pair-wise comparisons with the White reference subgroup. The odds of support for the right to elections for individuals from these subgroups are significantly lower than for individuals from the White subgroup, with odds ratios of 0.399, 0.639, and 0.410 respectively.

For age, at the individual indicator level, significant variations in support for the right to elections are established at the individual indicator level for the 25-34, 35-49, 50-64 and 65-70 age bands relative to the 16-19 year old reference group. The odds of support for the right to elections are significantly higher for each of these subgroups relative to the reference group. For example, the odds ratio for 65-70 year olds relative to 16-19 year olds is 3.158 – implying that the odds of support are more than three times greater.

For religion and belief, at the individual indicator level, significant variations in support for the right to free elections are established for individuals from the Muslim subgroup relative to individuals from the Christian group. The odds ratio of 1.816 suggests higher odds of support for Muslims relative to Christians.

For country of birth, significant variations at the individual indicator level are established for individuals whose country of birth is the Irish Republic, with the odds of support for the right to free elections decreasing by 65% for this subgroup, relative to those whose country of birth is the UK. Conversely, the odds of support are higher for those whose country of birth is the East African New Commonwealth.

Educational achievement is again a significant factor in explaining variations in support for the right to free elections. Significant variations in support for the right to elections are established at the individual indicator level for subgroups for whom the highest level of educational qualifications is A-levels or equivalent and below, relative to the reference group (individuals with a degree or equivalent). The odds ratios are 0.601, 0.435, 0.328 and 0.252 for individuals whose highest educational qualification is A-levels or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent, GCSE D-E or equivalent, and no qualifications, respectively.

Significant variations are also established at the individual indicator level by social class. The odds are lower for individuals living in households where the household reference person is from the intermediate occupations and small employer subgroup, the lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine subgroup, or from the routine subgroup, relative to the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup. The odds ratios are 0.605 and 0.639 respectively.

At the individual indicator level, individuals living in an area ranked as falling within the second Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile were found to have higher odds of support for the right to free elections than those living in an area ranked as falling within the first (least deprived) Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile.

The impact of living in social housing was also found to be significant, with lower odds of support for this subgroup relative to those not living in social housing (with an odds ratio of 0.742).

Higher equivalent household income was found to be associated with higher odds of support for the right to free elections holding all other variables constant[xiv].

5.6 Right to be protected from crime

Table A4 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for the right to be protected from crime.

Relatively few significant variations in public support for the right to be protected from crime were identified.

Holding all other variables constant, significant overall variations are established by highest educational qualification and social class ($p<0.05$ for the overall omnibus adjusted wald test in each case).

For highest educational achievement, at the individual indicator level, significant variations in the odds of support at the individual indicator level are established for individuals with GCSE D-E or equivalent, and individuals with no qualifications, relative to the reference group. The odds for support for the right to be protected from crime are lower for these subgroups, with odds ratios of 0.455 and 0.423 respectively, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest qualification.

For social class, at the individual indicator level, individuals from households where the reference person is a full time student were found to have lower odds of support relative to those from households where the household reference person was from the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup (with an odds ratio of 0.328).

5.7 The right to be treated equally and fairly

Table A5 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for the right to be treated fairly and equally.

Holding all other variables constant, significant overall variations are established by country of birth, highest educational qualification, social class, Government Office Region and Index of Multiple Deprivation Quintile ($p<0.05$ for the overall omnibus adjusted wald test in each case).

For country of birth, at the individual indicator level, significant variations at the individual indicator level are established for individuals whose country of birth is the Rest of the New Commonwealth (i.e. the non-East African Commonwealth) and the Other category. The odds of support for the right to be treated equally and fairly are lower relative to those whose country of birth is the UK, with odds ratios of 0.412 and 0.395 respectively.

For highest educational achievement, at the individual indicator level, significant variations in support for the right to be treated equally and fairly are established for individuals whose highest level of educational qualification is A level or equivalent or below, relative to the reference group. The odds ratios are 0.373, 0.467, 0.35 and 0.226 respectively for those whose highest educational qualification is A level or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent, GCSE D-E or equivalent, and for those with no qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification.[xv]

For social class, at the individual indicator level, significant variations are established, with lower odds of support where the household reference person is from the lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine subgroup, the routine occupations subgroup, or the never worked / long-term unemployed subgroup, relative to where the household reference person is from the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup. The odds of support for the right for to be treated fairly and equally decreases by 50%, 60% and 54% respectively for these subgroups relative to the reference group.

For the Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile, at the individual indicator level, significant variations are established for individuals living in an area ranked as falling within the third IMD quintile, relative to those living in an area ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile, with an odds ratio of 2.051. This suggests that individuals living in an area ranked as falling within the third IMD quintile are more likely to support the right to be treated fairly and equally than those living an area ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile.

For Government Office region, at the individual indicator level, signification variations are also established. The odds of support for the right to be treated fairly and equally are significantly lower for individuals living in the West Midlands, East of England and South East relative to those living in London.

5.8 The right to access to free education for children

Table A6 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for the right to access to free education for children.

Holding all other variables constant, significant overall variations are established by ethnicity, age, religion and belief, country of birth, highest educational qualification and social class (with $p<0.05$ for the omnibus adjusted wald test in each case).

For ethnicity, at the individual indicator level, the Asian subgroup has lower odds of support, with an odds ratio of 0.441 relative to the White subgroup.

For age, at the individual indicator level, higher odds of support for the right to access to free education for children are established in pair-wise comparisons at the individual indicator level for the 25-34, 35-49, 50-64 age groups relative to the 16-19 reference group.

For religion and belief, at the individual indicator level, significant variations in the odds of support for the right to access to free education for children are established for individuals from the Muslim subgroup group relative to their Christian counterparts. The odds of support for individuals from the Muslim subgroup are 1.830 times greater.

For country of birth, at the individual indicator level, lower odds of support were found for individuals whose country of birth is the Irish Republic or East African New Commonwealth, relative to their UK counterparts.

Highest educational qualification is again an important factor at the individual indicator level. Lower odds of support for the right to access to free education for children were found for individuals with GCSE D-E or equivalent, foreign and other qualifications, and no qualifications, relative to the individuals with degrees or equivalent as their highest educational qualification.

For social class, at the individual indicator level, variations in support for the right to access to free education for children are also important. The odds of support decrease by 34% where the household reference person is from the intermediate occupations and small employer subgroup, by 29% where the household reference person is from the routine occupation subgroup and – perhaps most surprisingly – by 66% where the household reference person is a full time student, relative to individuals from households where the household reference person is from the higher, lower and professional subgroup.

Whilst the overall omnibus test for the Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile is non-significant, IMD quintile is nevertheless important in explaining variations in support for the right to access to free education for children at the individual indicator level. The odds of support for the right to access to free education for children are lower for individuals living in an area ranked as falling within the IMD fourth quintile, relative to individuals living in an area ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile (with an odds ratio of 0.655).

5.9 The right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself

Table A7 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself.

Holding all other variables constant, significant overall variations are established by ethnicity, age, religion and belief, country of birth and highest educational qualification ($p<0.05$ for the omnibus adjusted wald test in each case).

For ethnicity, at the individual indicator level, significant variations are established for the Asian, Black and Mixed subgroups, with odds ratios of 0.594, 0.608 and 0.588 respectively, relative to their counterparts from the White subgroup.

For age, at the individual indicator level, significant variations in support for the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself were established for all of the age bands. Older subgroups found to be more likely to support this right. For example, the odds ratio for individuals from the 65-70 age group was estimated to be 2.647. This implies that the odds of support for the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself are almost three times greater for the 65-70 subgroup, relative to individuals from the 16-19 age group.

For religion and belief, at the individual indicator level, significantly higher odds were established for the Sikh subgroup, relative to the Christian subgroup.

For country of birth, at the individual indicator level, the odds of support were found to be significantly lower for individuals whose country of birth is the Irish Republic, India, or the 'Other' category.

At the individual indicator level, highest educational qualification is again an important factor in explaining variations in support for the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself. Significantly lower odds are established for individuals with higher education below degree level, A level or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent, GCSE D-E or equivalent, Foreign or Other qualifications and no qualifications as their highest educational qualification, relative to individuals with degrees or equivalent as their highest educational qualification.

Whilst variations by social class and the Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile are not significant at the overall omnibus level, both exhibit interesting findings at the individual indicator level.

For social class, at the individual indicator level, the odds of support for the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself are significantly lower for all of the occupational sub-groups groups with the exception of the never worked and long-term unemployed, relative to the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup.

At the individual indicator level, the data also suggests that the odds of support for the right to state support are higher for individuals living in areas ranked as falling within the second IMD quintile (with an odds ratio of 1.301), relative to those living in an area that is ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile.

5.10 The right to free health-care if you need it

Table A8 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for the right to free health-care if you need it.

Holding all other variables constant, significant variations in support are established by gender, with higher odds of support for the right to free health-care if you need it for women relative to their male counterparts (an odds ratio of 1.289). This is an interesting reversal of the position established in the context of civil and political rights, where women were found to have significantly lower odds of support for the right to free speech and the right to free elections relative to men.

Perhaps surprisingly, the odds of support for the right to free health-care if you need are *not* significantly increased for individuals reporting a long-term limiting illness or disability. However, it is worth noting that the variation between those without a LLID and those with a LLID is significant when the analysis is based on the core rather than the combined Citizenship sample.

Significant overall variations are established by age, country of birth and highest educational qualification ($p<0.05$ for the omnibus adjusted wald test in each case).

For age, at the individual indicator level, significant variations are established for the 35-49 age subgroup, the 50-64 age subgroup and the 65-70 age subgroup, relative to the 16-19 subgroup. For example, the odds ratio for individuals aged 65-70 relative to the reference group is 3.145. This implies that the odds of support for the right to free health-care if you need it are more than three times greater for this subgroup.

Highest educational qualification is again important in explaining variations in support. The odds ratios for those with GCSE D-E and no qualifications are 0.496 and 0.564 respectively, suggesting the odds of support for the right to free health-care if you need are decreased by 50% and 44% for these subgroups relative to those with degree or equivalent qualifications.

Neither ethnicity nor social class were found to be significant overall (non-significant omnibus adjusted wald test in each case). However, at the indicator level, lower odds were established for the Asian subgroup relative to the White subgroup; and for individuals from households where the reference person was from the intermediate occupations and small employer subgroup, and the full time student subgroup, relative to those from households where the reference person was from the from higher and lower managerial and professional subgroup.

The position with respect to equivalent household income for the right to free health-care if you need it is particularly interesting. The data suggests a significant negative relationship between support for the right to free health-care if you need it and equivalent household income, with higher income associated with lower odds of support for the right to free health-care if you need[xvi]. This finding contrasts with the position in relation to the right to freedom of freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and the right to freedom of elections, where having higher household equivalent income was associated with higher odds of support.

5.11 The right to have a job

Table A9 sets out the findings of the logistic regression analysis for the right to a job.

Holding all other variables constant, significant variations in support are established by gender, with the odds ratio for women of 1.408, implying that women are more likely to support the right to a job than their male counterparts. As in relation to support for the right to free health-care if you need it, this is an interesting reversal of the position compared with that established for civil and political rights.

Significant overall variations are also established by ethnicity, age, highest educational qualification, Index of Multiple Deprivation and Government Office Region ($p<0.05$ for the omnibus adjusted wald test in each case).

For ethnicity, at the individual indicator level, significant variations are established for the Black subgroup relative to the White subgroup. Interestingly, in another interesting reversal of earlier findings, the odds ratio for the Black sub-group is 1.620, implying higher odds of support.

For age, at the individual indicator level, significant variations are again apparent, with higher odds of support for the right to a job for higher age groups relative to the reference group (16-19 year olds). This finding is significant for the 20-24, 25-34, 35-49 and 50-64 subgroups.

Although religion and belief is not significant overall omnibus effects, at the individual indicator level, the Muslim group and the Sikh and Hindu groups have significantly higher odds of support, relative to the Christian subgroup.

Interestingly, the position with respect to highest educational qualification is a reversal of the relationship between educational achievement and support for rights observed so far in the data. The pair-wise comparisons here establish significant variations between the subgroups and the reference group (individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification) with the exception of the higher education below degree level subgroup. However, in relation to other rights, lower educational achievement has been associated with *lower* odds of support for rights. In contrast, in relation to the right to a job, the odds of support are *higher* for those with lower educational qualifications relative to those with degree or equivalent as their

highest educational qualification. For example, the odds ratio for support for the right to a job for those with no qualifications is 1.4501.

As in the context of the right to health, the relationship between equivalent household income and the right to a job is also striking. The data suggests a significant negative relationship between these variables, with higher equivalent household income associated with lower odds of support for the right to a job[xvii]. Again, this finding contrasts starkly with the position in relation to the right to freedom of freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and the right to freedom of elections, where having higher household equivalent income was associated with higher odds of support.

Finally, in relation to the Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile, significant variations are again established at the individual indicator level. Interestingly, those living in more deprived IMD quintile areas have higher odds of support for the right to a job relative to the reference group. The variations are significant for individuals living in areas ranked as falling within the third, fourth and fifth quintile indicator variables relative to those living in areas ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile, with odds ratios of 1.397, 1.403 and 1.483 respectively.

5.12 Relative importance of the independent variables

Table A10 reports standardised odds ratios and the associated p-values for the independent variables involved in the logistic regression analysis for each of the rights discussed above. The Table presents standardised odds ratios for independent variables with a significant (or marginally significant) p-value. Standardised odds ratios that are associated with a non-significant p-value are not reported.

The findings are reported as a general guide to thinking and for validation purposes but are limited in important respects and should be interpreted cautiously[xviii]. Nevertheless, the results in Table A10 are important because they reinforce the general picture of the relative importance of educational achievement as a driver of public support for rights that is apparent from the analysis of the un-standardised ratios. Based on the information presented in Table A10 about the standardised odds ratios, the educational qualifications variable appears to be having a relatively strong effect on support for each category of rights considered. A one standard deviation increase in the 'no educational qualifications' variable is associated with significant variations in the odds of support for each category of right. Further, in each case, the magnitude of the effect of having no educational qualifications appears to be stronger, or relatively strong, compared with the magnitude of the effect of the other independent variables that have been tested.

A second interesting finding that holds for many of the results presented in Table A10 is that the relative strength of the impact of socio-economic variables (e.g. educational attainment, social class and equivalised household income) appears to be strong relative to the strength of the impact of 'social identity characteristics' (e.g. ethnicity, religion and belief, gender, and disability) and geographical variables (such as geographical region)[xix]. For example, in the context of freedom of thought, conscience

and religion, standardized odds ratios for no educational qualifications are 0.723, social class 0.805 and equivalised household income 1.294. Of the 'social identity characteristics', age is significant and has a standardized odds ratio of 1.115. Based on this evidence, the magnitude of the effects of educational qualifications, social class and equivalised household income appear to be relatively large, whilst the magnitude of the effect of age appears to be relatively small[xx].

5.13 Interactions between the independent variables

Variations of the logistic regression models that allowed for interactions among the independent variables have also been developed as part of the research project. Two of the more interesting interactive effect that have been found to be significant as part of the research exercise are presented in Table A11.

In relation to the right to freedom of speech, the results suggest that the interactions of social class and the Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile are significant. The interactive relationship was modelled with social class as the focal variable and IMD quintile as the moderator variable. The results can be interpreted as implying that the impact of social class on support for freedom of speech varies according to the IMD quintile in which an individual lives. The significance of the interactive effect is signalled by the significant adjusted wald test, which provides an omnibus test of whether the variables involved in the interaction term are jointly significant.

In relation to the right to free health-care if you need it, the results suggest that the interactions of long term limiting illness or disability and ethnicity are significant. The interactive relationship was modelled with LLID as the focal variable and ethnicity as the moderator variable. The results can be interpreted as implying that the impact of LLID on support for the right to free health-care if you need it varies by ethnicity. The significance of the interactive effect is signalled by the significant adjusted wald test, which provides an omnibus test of whether the variables involved in the interaction term are jointly significant.

6. Interpretation and discussion

The research findings can be interpreted as providing broad empirical underpinnings for the 'valuation' of nine of the ten domains of freedom and opportunity specified in the capability list that has been developed and applied in previous research exercises (that is, for Health; Physical security; Legal security; Standard of living; Education and learning; Productive and valued activities; Individual, family and social life; Identity and self-respect; Participation, influence and voice), with the Life domain effectively not covered by the research exercise. Table 4 sets out the 10 domains of freedom and opportunity that have been specified in previous research exercises (column 1) and maps these to an information base on the evidence of the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities based on (i) recognition in international human rights framework (column 2) and (ii) social survey evidence based on the 2005 Citizenship Survey Rights and Responsibilities data (column 3). The Table shows that the

research exercise based on the Citizenship Survey provides broad evidence of the 'valuation' of nine of the ten domains of freedom and opportunity included in the capability list, with at least one question in the Citizenship Survey Rights and Responsibilities Module mapping to each domain except life, and with high overall levels of public support ranging from the "high support" (70%+) to the "universal support" (95%) levels.

Within the context of this overall finding, significant variations in support by population subgroups have nevertheless been identified for each right referenced in the Citizenship Survey. The key finding is that highest educational qualification was found to be statistically significant in explaining variations in support for each of the rights covered in the research exercise. For eight of the nine rights examined, individuals with lower level educational qualifications, or no educational qualifications, were found to have lower odds of support, relative to those with higher level educational qualifications. This was the case in relation to the right to access to free education for children; the right to freedom of speech; the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; the right to free elections; the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself; the right to be protected from crime; the right to be treated fairly and equally; and the right to free health-care if you need it. However, individuals with lower level qualifications, or no qualifications, were found to have higher odds of support for the right to employment, relative to those with higher level educational qualifications.

Social class (based on NS-SEC) was also found to be an important factor. For example, statistically significant variations in support for rights by the occupational group of the household reference person were established in relation to support for the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, the right to free elections, the right to be treated fairly and equally, and the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself. In relation to support for the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and the right to free elections, the odds of support were found to be lower for individuals where the household reference person is from the intermediate and small employer occupational sub-group, the lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine occupational sub-group, and the routine occupational sub-group, relative to individuals where the household reference person is from the higher, lower managerial and professional occupational sub-group.

Some general conclusion can also be drawn as a guide to thinking about the relative importance of the different 'drivers' of support for rights (and hence, for the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities). As noted above, highest educational qualification was found to be repeatedly important in explaining variations in support for the rights examined. In general terms, amongst the variables identified as playing a role in explaining support for rights, socio-economic variables (highest educational qualification, social class, income and area deprivation) were found to be having a more influential role as 'drivers' of public attitudes towards human rights, rather than 'social identity characteristics' (such as gender, ethnicity, religion and belief, and country of birth) and geographic variables (such as geographical region).

Table 4: Evidence of the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities: Evidence based on (1) the international human rights framework; (2) social survey data on rights[xxi]

Capability list (10 domains of freedom and opportunity)	**Evidence of 'valuation' based on international human rights framework**	**Evidence of 'valuation' based on empirical social survey based research exercise (England only, 2005, based on Citizenship Survey Rights and Responsibilities Module)**		
	Recognition in ICCPR / ICESCR	**Reference question**	**Overall support level**	**Summary of statistically significant variations in support by population sub-group**
Life	Article 6 ICCPR right to life	-	-	-
Physical security	Article 7 ICCPR freedom from cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment	The right to be protected from crime	'Universal support (95%+)'	Lower odds of support: • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is GCSE D-E or equivalent, and No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals living in a household where the reference person is a full time student
Legal security	Article 8 ICCPR abolition of slavery and the slave trade, prohibition on servitude, abolition of compulsory labour Articles 9-10 ICCPR, Articles 13 ICCPR liberty and security, prohibition of arbitrary arrest and detention, regulation of conditions of detention and expulsion Article ICCPR 14-15 equality before the courts and fair judicial process Article 16 ICCPR recognition of personhood before the law Article 24 ICCPR right of child to protection of law, to registration and a name, and to nationality	The right to be protected from crime	'Universal support' (95%+)	Lower odds of support: • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is GCSE D-E or equivalent, and No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals living in a household where the reference person is a full time student

	Article 26 ICCPR equality before the law / equal protection of law	The right to be treated fairly and equally	'Universal support' (95%+)	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is A level or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent; GCSE D-E or equivalent, and No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals from households where the reference person is from the lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine occupations, routine occupations, never worked / long-term unemployed and the full-time student subgroups, relative to the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup group • Having Rest of the Commonwealth (i.e. non-East African New Commonwealth) or 'Other' as Country of Birth, rather than having the UK as country of birth <u>Higher odds of support:</u> • Being from the Black subgroup, relative to the White subgroup • Living in an area ranked as falling within the third Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile, relative to living in an area ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile • Living in the West Midlands, East of England or South East, relative to living in living in London
Individual, family and social life	Article 17 ICCPR prohibitions on arbitrary interference with privacy, home, correspondence, family, honour, reputation Article 10 ICESCR / Article 23 ICCPR right to marriage and family life; marriage by free consent; equality during marriage and at dissolution	The right to freedom of speech	'Near universal support' (90%+)	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • For women relative to men • Individuals from the Asian, Black, and Chinese/Other subgroups, relative to individuals from the White subgroup • Individuals with GCSE D-E, Foreign or other qualifications and No educational qualifications" as their highest educational qualification, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification

		The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion	'Very high support' threshold (80%+).	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is higher education below degree level, A level or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent; GCSE D-E or equivalent, Foreign and other qualifications, and No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals from households where the reference person is from the intermediate and smaller employer subgroup, the lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine subgroup, or from the routine subgroup, relative individuals from households where the reference person is from the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup group • Those with Irish Republic as their country of birth, relative to those with the UK as country of birth <u>Higher odds of support:</u> • 65-70 age category • Having higher household equivalent income • Those with Bangladesh as their country of birth, relative to those with the UK as country of birth
Identity, expression and self-respect	Article 19 ICCPR right to opinion and expression Article 18 ICCPR freedom of thought, conscience and religion Article 20 ICCPR prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred Article 27 ICCPR, Article 15 ICESCR right of minorities to cultural life, religion and language	The right to freedom of speech	'Near universal support' (90%+)	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • For women relative to men • Individuals from the Asian, Black, and Chinese/Other subgroups, relative to individuals from the White subgroup • Individuals with GCSE D-E, Foreign or other qualifications and No educational qualifications" as their highest educational qualification, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification

		The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion	'Very high support' threshold (80%+).	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is higher education below degree level, A level or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent; GCSE D-E or equivalent, Foreign and other qualifications, and No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals from households where the reference person is from the intermediate and smaller employer subgroup, the lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine subgroup, or from the routine subgroup, relative individuals from households where the reference person is from the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup group • Those with Irish Republic as their country of birth, relative to those with the UK as country of birth <u>Higher odds of support:</u> • 65-70 age category • Having higher household equivalent income • Those with Bangladesh as their country of birth, relative to those with the UK as country of birth
Education and learning	Article ICESCR 13 right of everyone to education Article ICESCR 14 right to compulsory and free primary education	The right to access to free education for children	'Near universal support' (90%+)	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • Being from the Asian subgroup, relative to the White subgroup • Having Irish Republic or East African New Commonwealth as country of birth, rather than the UK • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is GCSE D-E or equivalent, or No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals from households where the reference person is from the intermediate and small employer subgroup, the routine subgroup and the full time student subgroup, relative to individuals from households where the reference person is from the higher, lower and professional groups. • Individuals living in an area ranked as falling within

				the IMD fourth quintile, relative to individuals living an area ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile <u>Higher odds of support:</u> • Being in the 25-34, 35-49, 50-64 age groups, relative to the 16-19 age group • Being from the Muslim subgroup, relative to the Christian subgroup
Health	Article 12 ICESCR right to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health	The right to free health-care if you need it	'Near universal support' (90%+)	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • Being from the Asian subgroup, relative to the White subgroup • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is GCSE D-E or equivalent or No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Having higher equivalent household income • Having Other as country of birth, relative to the UK as country of origin <u>Higher odds of support:</u> • For women relative to men • Being in the 35-49, 50-64 or the 65-70 age bands, relative to the being in the 16-19 age band
Standard of living	Article 11 ICESCR right to an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, clothing and housing Article 9 ICESCR social security Article 10 ICESCR protection and assistance for families with dependent children, and special measures for the protection and assistance of mothers and children	The right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself	'Very high support' threshold (80%+).	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • Individuals from the Asian, Black and Mixed subgroups, relative to the White subgroup • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is Higher education below degree, A level or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent, GCSE D-E or equivalent, Foreign or other qualifications, or No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals from households where the reference person is from the intermediate occupations and smaller employers, lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine occupations, routine occupations, and the never worked / long-term unemployed subgroups, relative to the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup group

				• Individuals whose country of birth is the Irish Republic, India, or 'Other', relative to those whose country of birth is the UK <u>Higher odds of support:</u> • Individuals whose age falls within the 20-24, 25-34, 35-49, 50-64 and 65-70 age-bands, relative to the 16-19 subgroup • Being from the Sikh subgroup, relative to being from the Christian reference subgroup • Individuals living in an area ranked as falling within the second IMD quintile, relative to individuals in an area ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile
Productive and valued activities	Article 6 ICESCR right to work; Article 7 right to just and favourable conditions of work	The right to a job	'High support' (70%+)	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • Having higher equivalent household income <u>Higher odds of support:</u> • For women relative to men • For the Black subgroup, relative to the White subgroup • Being in the 20-24, 25-34, 35-49 and 50-64 age groups, relative to being in the 16-19 age group • Being from the Muslim, Sikh and Hindu subgroups, relative to being from the Christian subgroup • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is A level or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent, GCSE D-E or equivalent, and No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals living in areas ranked as falling within the third, fourth or fifth IMD quintile, relative to individuals living in areas that are ranked as falling within the least deprived IMD quintile

Participation, influence and voice	Article 21 ICCPR peaceful assembly Article 22 ICCPR freedom of association Article 25 ICCPR participation in public affairs, free and fair elections, equal access to public service ICESCR Article 8 right to form and to join trade union		The right to free elections 'very high support' threshold (80%+).	<u>Lower odds of support:</u> • For women relative to men • Asian, Black and Chinese/other relative to the White subgroup • Being in the subgroup with the Irish Republic as the country of birth, relative to being in the subgroup with the UK as the country of birth • Individuals whose highest educational qualification is A level or equivalent, GCSE A-C or equivalent; GCSE D-E or equivalent, Foreign or other qualifications, and No Qualifications, relative to individuals with degree or equivalent as their highest educational qualification • Individuals from households where the reference person is from the intermediate and smaller employer, lower supervisory, technical and semi-routine occupational groups, or from the routine occupational subgroup, relative individuals from households where the reference person is from the higher, lower managerial and professional subgroup group • Living in social housing, relative to not living in social housing <u>Higher odds of support:</u> • Being in the 25-34, 35-49, 50-64 and 65-70 age bands, relative to being in the 16-19 year old age band • Being in the Muslim subgroup relative to the Christian subgroup • Having higher household equivalent income

7. Conclusion

The aim of this paper has been to contribute to broader efforts to 'operationalize' the capability approach as a basis for multidimensional inequality analysis in 21st century Britain. Previous research outputs have set out a two-stage procedure for developing and agreeing a capability list involving (1) deriving a 'human rights based capability list' from the international human rights framework and (2) supplementing, refining and orientating the 'human rights based capability list' through a deliberative research exercise with the general public and individuals and groups at risk of discrimination and disadvantage. The current paper has built on and taken forward these broader research efforts by extending the evidence base for developing and agreeing a capability list in the British context.

More specifically, the paper has examined what can be learnt about the 'valuation' of freedoms and opportunities using a general population social survey data source on public attitudes towards rights and by making statistically significant inferences about the values of individuals and groups. The research exercise reported in the paper provides evidence of high levels of public support for a broad range of rights covering economic and social rights, as well as civil and political rights. When people are asked about their views on rights at a 'higher', more abstract level – as the rights that that *should* be enjoyed by people living in the UK today – very high percentages endorse a broad range of rights. The concept of 'rights' does not appear to be understood by the public 'narrowly' in terms of a limited number of civil and political rights. Rather, there is public support for a broad characterisation covering economic and social rights, as well as civil and political rights. Within the overall context of high overall public support for rights, significant variations in support by population subgroups have nevertheless been identified for each right referenced in the Citizenship Survey, with highest educational qualification and social class (rather than alternative characteristics, such as ethnicity and religion and belief) being identified as important 'drivers' of public support for rights.

The research findings can be interpreted as providing empirical evidence of the valuation of nine of the ten domains of freedom and opportunity included in the capability list specified in previous research exercises (Health; Physical security; Legal security; Standard of living; Education and learning; Productive and valued activities; Individual, family and social life; Identity and self-respect; Participation, influence and voice) with the Life domain effectively excluded from the research exercise. The research findings complement the empirical evidence on values elicited through deliberative consultation with individuals and groups at risk of discrimination and disadvantage in previous work. Although the deliberative consultation provided an initial evidence base for comparing a list of 'valuable' freedoms and opportunities derived from the international human rights framework to a list of 'valuable' freedoms and opportunities, it was limited in its scope, did not aim to be scientifically 'representative' and the results were not expected to be 'statistically significant' (Burchardt and Vizard forthcoming). In contrast, the current paper has examined what

can be learnt from a general population social survey data source and has made inferences about population values (and statistically significant variations in such values) using standard statistical techniques. In doing so, it has moved beyond the 'legalistic' methodology applied in previous research exercises and has established how empirical research on values can provide an alternative, overlapping or supplementary informational base for deriving a 'human rights-based capability list'.

Appendix 1: Results Tables

Table A1: Variations in support for the right to freedom of speech by population subgroup[xxii]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf. Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval	
Gender					**Highest educational qualification (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	0.651	0.000*	0.513	0.826	Higher education below degree	0.886	0.615	0.551	1.424
Disability					A level or equivalent	1.017	0.943	0.643	1.608
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	0.709	0.103	0.468	1.072
LLID	0.842	0.188	0.652	1.088	GCSE D-E or equivalent	0.514	0.012*	0.307	0.861
Ethnicity (p<0.05)					Foreign or other qualifications	0.473	0.017*	0.256	0.874
Reference group = white					No qualifications	0.493	0.001*	0.328	0.741
Asian	0.506	0.005*	0.315	0.810	**Social class (household reference person nssec7 classification)**				
Black	0.561	0.007*	0.368	0.855	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Mixed	0.605	0.066	0.354	1.033	Intermediate occupations / small employer	0.858	0.392	0.603	1.220
Chinese / other	0.364	0.000*	0.213	0.620	Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	0.756	0.096	0.543	1.051
Age					Routine occupations	0.735	0.087	0.516	1.046
Reference group = 16-19					Never worked / longterm unemployed	0.630	0.092	0.367	1.079
20-24	0.894	0.732	0.470	1.700	Full time students	1.890	0.206	0.704	5.070
25-34	0.748	0.297	0.433	1.293	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)**				
35-49	1.058	0.839	0.616	1.816	Reference group=not social housing				
50-64	0.959	0.882	0.551	1.670	Social housing	0.837	0.274	0.609	1.152
65-70	0.960	0.901	0.506	1.823	**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.714	1.000	1.220
Religion / belief					**Index of multiple deprivation (quintile groups)**				
Reference group = Christian					Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Buddhist	1.414	0.453	0.571	3.505	IMD Second Quintile	1.299	0.188	0.879	1.919
Hindu	0.991	0.976	0.548	1.791	IMD Third Quintile	0.782	0.164	0.553	1.106
Jewish	1.628	0.520	0.367	7.217	IMD Fourth Quintile	1.009	0.964	0.684	1.488
Muslim	0.894	0.667	0.535	1.494	IMD Fifth Quintile	1.116	0.606	0.735	1.694
Sikh	1.568	0.180	0.812	3.025	**Government Office Region**				
Any other religion	1.491	0.265	0.738	3.016	Reference group = London				
No religion	0.969	0.847	0.704	1.334	North East	0.736	0.278	0.423	1.282
Country of birth					North West	0.882	0.599	0.552	1.410
Reference group = UK					Yorkshire and the Humber	0.890	0.572	0.592	1.336
Irish Republic	0.472	0.102	0.192	1.162	East Midlands	0.847	0.502	0.521	1.377
India	0.728	0.129	0.483	1.098	West Midlands	0.732	0.164	0.471	1.137
Pakistan	0.958	0.888	0.524	1.751	East of England	1.329	0.281	0.792	2.229
Bangladesh	1.269	0.431	0.700	2.299	South East	1.211	0.482	0.709	2.069
Jamaica	1.312	0.409	0.688	2.501	South West	0.895	0.642	0.561	1.429
East African New Commonwealth	1.125	0.770	0.511	2.476					
Rest of New Commonwealth	0.726	0.228	0.431	1.223					
Other	0.872	0.575	0.539	1.411					Svygof: 0.869

Table A2: Variations in support for the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion by population subgroup[xxiii]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval	
Gender					**Highest educational qualification (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	0.883	0.208	0.728	1.072	Higher education below degree	0.602	0.038*	0.373	0.972
Disability					A level or equivalent	0.468	0.000*	0.308	0.712
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	0.416	0.000*	0.282	0.614
LLID	0.963	0.733	0.777	1.195	GCSE D-E or equivalent	0.232	0.000*	0.146	0.371
Ethnicity					Foreign or other qualifications	0.293	0.000*	0.166	0.517
Reference group = white					No qualifications	0.191	0.000*	0.129	0.283
Asian	0.599	0.079	0.338	1.062	**Social class (HRP nssec7) class (p<0.05)**				
Black	1.030	0.888	0.678	1.567	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Mixed	1.276	0.303	0.802	2.030	Intermediate occupations / small employer	0.643	0.002*	0.483	0.855
Chinese / other	0.642	0.171	0.340	1.211	Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	0.490	0.000*	0.380	0.632
Age (p<0.05)					Routine occupations	0.498	0.000*	0.373	0.666
Reference group = 16-19					Never worked / longterm unemployed	0.714	0.168	0.441	1.154
20-24	0.890	0.639	0.546	1.451	Full time students	0.648	0.544	0.159	2.635
25-34	0.912	0.678	0.590	1.410	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)**				
35-49	1.305	0.197	0.870	1.956	Reference group=not social housing				
50-64	1.417	0.103	0.932	2.154	Social housing	0.847	0.176	0.666	1.077
65-70	1.658	0.037*	1.032	2.665	**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.032*	1.000	1.000
Religion / belief (p<.05)					**Index of multiple deprivation (quintile groups)**				
Reference group = Christian					Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Buddhist	1.168	0.777	0.398	3.429	IMD Second Quintile	1.174	0.334	0.848	1.624
Hindu	0.727	0.340	0.377	1.402	IMD Third Quintile	0.954	0.789	0.672	1.353
Jewish	2.981	0.183	0.596	14.909	IMD Fourth Quintile	0.941	0.719	0.677	1.309
Muslim	1.654	0.124	0.871	3.143	IMD Fifth Quintile	0.884	0.491	0.623	1.256
Sikh	1.909	0.052	0.994	3.666	**Government Office Region**				
Any other religion	1.865	0.055	0.987	3.525	Reference group = London				
No religion	1.001	0.995	0.737	1.359	North East	1.067	0.794	0.656	1.734
Country of birth					North West	0.976	0.911	0.634	1.503
Reference group = UK					Yorkshire and the Humber	1.061	0.776	0.706	1.594
Irish Republic	0.428	0.013*	0.219	0.837	East Midlands	1.027	0.917	0.627	1.682
India	1.341	0.193	0.861	2.090	West Midlands	1.060	0.806	0.666	1.686
Pakistan	1.437	0.199	0.826	2.499	East of England	1.290	0.296	0.800	2.080
Bangladesh	2.578	0.013*	1.221	5.445	South East	1.206	0.401	0.778	1.867
Jamaica	0.943	0.877	0.449	1.982	South West	1.383	0.181	0.859	2.225
East African New Commonwealth	1.751	0.179	0.773	3.966					
Rest of New Commonwealth	1.285	0.272	0.821	2.013					
Other	1.039	0.877	0.641	1.683	svygof: 0.013 (0.6399 without GOR)				

Table A3: Variations in support for the right to free elections by population subgroup[xxiv]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval	
Gender (p<0.05)					**Highest educ. Qual. (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	0.782	0.007*	0.655	0.933	Higher education below degree	0.806	0.296	0.537	1.209
Disability					A level or equivalent	0.601	0.000*	0.432	0.835
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	0.435	0.000*	0.319	0.592
LLID	1.074	0.512	0.867	1.332	GCSE D-E or equivalent	0.328	0.000*	0.212	0.509
Ethnicity (p<0.05)					Foreign or other qualifications	0.330	0.000*	0.196	0.553
Reference group = white					No qualifications	0.252	0.000*	0.185	0.342
Asian	0.399	0.000*	0.256	0.622	**Social class (HRP nssec7) (p<0.05)**				
Black	0.639	0.022*	0.436	0.936	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Mixed	0.830	0.425	0.526	1.312	Intermediate occupations / small employer	0.739	0.017*	0.577	0.947
Chinese / other	0.410	0.000*	0.257	0.654	Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	0.605	0.000*	0.477	0.768
Age (p<0.05)					Routine occupations	0.639	0.003*	0.478	0.855
Reference group = 16-19					Never worked / longterm unemployed	1.320	0.215	0.851	2.047
20-24	1.307	0.157	0.902	1.896	Full time students	1.178	0.638	0.594	2.335
25-34	1.779	0.002*	1.247	2.537	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)(p<0.05)**				
35-49	2.590	0.000*	1.848	3.629	Reference group=not social housing				
50-64	3.095	0.000*	2.171	4.411	Social housing	0.742	0.007*	0.597	0.922
65-70	3.158	0.000*	2.011	4.958	**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.028*	1.000	1.000
Religion / belief (p<0.05)					**IMD (quintile groups)**				
Reference group = Christian					Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Buddhist	2.234	0.066	0.947	5.269	IMD Second Quintile	1.416	0.02*	1.058	1.896
Hindu	0.922	0.724	0.588	1.447	IMD Third Quintile	1.054	0.733	0.780	1.423
Jewish	3.522	0.100	0.786	15.787	IMD Fourth Quintile	1.046	0.777	0.766	1.428
Muslim	1.816	0.011*	1.150	2.869	IMD Fifth Quintile	0.986	0.938	0.695	1.399
Sikh	1.590	0.117	0.890	2.841	**Government Office Region**				
Any other religion	1.032	0.893	0.649	1.642	Reference group = London				
No religion	1.262	0.109	0.949	1.679	North East	0.760	0.215	0.492	1.174
Country of birth (p<0.05)					North West	0.832	0.374	0.554	1.249
Reference group = UK					Yorkshire and the Humber	0.861	0.440	0.589	1.259
Irish Republic	0.339	0.001*	0.180	0.638	East Midlands	0.796	0.318	0.508	1.247
India	0.968	0.876	0.642	1.460	West Midlands	0.725	0.103	0.493	1.067
Pakistan	1.189	0.507	0.713	1.982	East of England	0.774	0.208	0.518	1.154
Bangladesh	1.241	0.447	0.710	2.166	South East	1.026	0.894	0.701	1.502
Jamaica	0.782	0.402	0.440	1.391	South West	0.834	0.413	0.540	1.289
East African New Commonwealth	2.155	0.002*	1.322	3.512					
Rest of New Commonwealth	1.159	0.543	0.720	1.867					
Other	0.746	0.132	0.510	1.092					svygof: 0.753

Table A4: Variations in support for the right to be protected from crime by population subgroup[xxv]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval	
Gender					**Highest educ. Qual. (p<.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	1.273	0.089	0.964	1.681	Higher education below degree	0.952	0.882	0.496	1.826
Disability					A level or equivalent	0.747	0.381	0.388	1.437
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	0.606	0.123	0.321	1.146
LLID	0.996	0.984	0.670	1.481	GCSE D-E or equivalent	0.455	0.046*	0.210	0.985
Ethnicity					Foreign or other qualifications	0.626	0.290	0.262	1.495
Asian	1.073	0.875	0.443	2.598	No qualifications	0.423	0.01*	0.220	0.813
Black	0.696	0.262	0.369	1.312	**Social class (HRP nssec7) (p<0.05)**				
Mixed	1.154	0.666	0.600	2.220	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Chinese / other	0.814	0.634	0.348	1.904	Intermediate occupations / small employer	1.128	0.613	0.707	1.799
Age					Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	0.849	0.441	0.559	1.289
Reference group = 16-19					Routine occupations	0.634	0.085	0.377	1.065
20-24	1.480	0.314	0.690	3.175	Never worked / longterm unemployed	0.752	0.435	0.368	1.539
25-34	1.325	0.333	0.748	2.348	Full time students	0.328	0.027*	0.122	0.879
35-49	1.369	0.234	0.816	2.298	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)**				
50-64	1.539	0.139	0.869	2.727	Reference group=not social housing				
65-70	1.129	0.724	0.574	2.220	Social housing	1.030	0.875	0.708	1.501
Religion / belief					**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.297	1.000	1.000
Reference group = Christian					**IMD (quintile groups)**				
Buddhist	1.204	0.804	0.277	5.235	Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Hindu	0.466	0.095	0.191	1.141	IMD Second Quintile	1.049	0.842	0.652	1.687
Jewish	2.156	0.466	0.272	17.109	IMD Third Quintile	1.151	0.576	0.702	1.889
Muslim	0.674	0.405	0.266	1.709	IMD Fourth Quintile	0.736	0.234	0.444	1.220
Sikh	0.688	0.401	0.287	1.649	IMD Fifth Quintile	0.648	0.173	0.347	1.210
Any other religion	0.807	0.597	0.364	1.788	**Government Office Region**				
No religion	0.790	0.222	0.541	1.154	Reference group = London				
Country of birth					North East	1.247	0.559	0.594	2.618
Reference group = UK					North West	1.030	0.914	0.602	1.764
Irish Republic	0.747	0.632	0.226	2.466	Yorkshire and the Humber	0.949	0.908	0.391	2.303
India	0.589	0.058	0.340	1.019	East Midlands	1.193	0.513	0.702	2.029
Pakistan	0.800	0.486	0.426	1.501	West Midlands	0.979	0.942	0.554	1.729
Bangladesh	0.678	0.289	0.330	1.392	East of England	1.019	0.940	0.630	1.647
Jamaica	0.504	0.153	0.197	1.291	South East	0.717	0.244	0.408	1.257
East African New Commonwealth	0.981	0.970	0.358	2.686	South West	0.984	0.953	0.579	1.674
Rest of New Commonwealth	1.137	0.719	0.565	2.290					
Other	0.729	0.300	0.401	1.326					svygof: 0.733

Table A5: Variations in support for right to be treated fairly and equally by population subgroup [xxvi]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval	
Gender					**Highest educ. Qual. (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	1.102	0.524	0.817	1.486	Higher education below degree	0.559	0.114	0.271	1.151
Disability					A level or equivalent	0.373	0.001*	0.208	0.671
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	0.467	0.017*	0.250	0.874
LLID	1.322	0.154	0.900	1.944	GCSE D-E or equivalent	0.350	0.010*	0.158	0.774
Ethnicity					Foreign or other qualifications	0.495	0.192	0.171	1.428
Reference group = white					No qualifications	0.226	0.000*	0.126	0.406
Asian	0.974	0.948	0.442	2.145	**Social class (HRP nssec7) (p<0.05)**				
Black	2.150	0.01*	1.198	3.859	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Mixed	0.735	0.445	0.333	1.623	Intermediate occupations / small employer	0.652	0.091	0.397	1.072
Chinese / other	1.781	0.117	0.865	3.667	Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	0.516	0.012*	0.307	0.865
Age					Routine occupations	0.404	0.001*	0.242	0.673
Reference group = 16-19					Never worked / longterm unemployed	0.463	0.021*	0.241	0.890
20-24	0.618	0.278	0.258	1.478	Full time students	0.453	0.199	0.135	1.520
25-34	0.556	0.117	0.267	1.158	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)**				
35-49	0.606	0.202	0.280	1.309	Reference group=not social housing				
50-64	0.599	0.169	0.288	1.244	Social housing	1.026	0.896	0.700	1.505
65-70	0.607	0.237	0.265	1.390	**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.147	1.000	0.000
Religion / belief					**IMD (quintile groups) (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = Christian					Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Buddhist	2.706	0.134	0.736	9.950	IMD Second Quintile	1.241	0.481	0.679	2.268
Hindu	0.851	0.754	0.308	2.351	IMD Third Quintile	2.051	0.026*	1.090	3.860
Jewish	2.769	0.359	0.313	24.512	IMD Fourth Quintile	0.973	0.930	0.523	1.807
Muslim	0.963	0.933	0.398	2.326	IMD Fifth Quintile	1.258	0.507	0.639	2.477
Sikh	0.956	0.936	0.317	2.881	**Government Office Region (p<0.05)**				
Any other religion	1.641	0.358	0.569	4.732	Reference group = London				
No religion	0.723	0.136	0.472	1.108	North East	1.256	0.513	0.634	2.487
Country of birth (p<0.05)					North West	1.076	0.802	0.605	1.914
Reference group = UK					Yorkshire and the Humber	0.969	0.943	0.414	2.269
Irish Republic	1.157	0.837	0.287	4.668	East Midlands	1.710	0.104	0.895	3.269
India	0.577	0.128	0.284	1.173	West Midlands	2.134	0.013*	1.175	3.877
Pakistan	0.689	0.283	0.349	1.362	East of England	2.547	0.008*	1.280	5.068
Bangladesh	0.711	0.391	0.326	1.553	South East	2.394	0.009*	1.250	4.584
Jamaica	0.899	0.836	0.330	2.452	South West	1.856	0.074	0.942	3.657
East African New Commonwealth	1.872	0.120	0.849	4.126					
Rest of New Commonwealth	0.412	0.018*	0.198	0.859					
Other	0.395	0.000*	0.235	0.664					svygof: 0.875

Table A6: Variations in support for right to access to free education for children by population subgroup[xxvii]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval	
Gender					**Highest educ. Qual. (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	1.151	0.200	0.928	1.429	Higher education below degree	0.721	0.110	0.483	1.077
Disability					A level or equivalent	0.715	0.071	0.496	1.029
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	0.779	0.167	0.547	1.111
LLID	0.827	0.150	0.639	1.071	GCSE D-E or equivalent	0.447	0.002*	0.272	0.735
Ethnicity (p<0.05)					Foreign or other qualifications	0.577	0.095	0.303	1.101
Reference group = white					No qualifications	0.342	0*	0.245	0.479
Asian	0.441	0.001*	0.268	0.726	**Social class (HRP nssec7) (p<0.05)**				
Black	0.740	0.271	0.433	1.266	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Mixed	1.077	0.808	0.592	1.961	Intermediate occupations / small employer	0.663	0.006*	0.496	0.886
Chinese / other	0.578	0.130	0.284	1.176	Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	0.795	0.109	0.601	1.053
Age (p<0.05)					Routine occupations	0.711	0.041*	0.512	0.987
Reference group = 16-19					Never worked / longterm unemployed	1.008	0.974	0.612	1.662
20-24	1.683	0.056	0.986	2.873	Full time students	0.344	0.04*	0.125	0.951
25-34	1.740	0.014*	1.121	2.700	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)**				
35-49	1.889	0.006*	1.203	2.966	Reference group=not social housing				
50-64	1.618	0.033*	1.040	2.517	Social housing	0.785	0.082	0.597	1.031
65-70	1.196	0.463	0.741	1.932	**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.481	1.000	1.000
Religion / belief (p<0.05)					**IMD (quintile groups)**				
Reference group = Christian					Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Buddhist	2.903	0.072	0.909	9.267	IMD Second Quintile	0.982	0.925	0.674	1.431
Hindu	0.924	0.788	0.521	1.641	IMD Third Quintile	0.777	0.139	0.555	1.086
Jewish	0.968	0.961	0.267	3.509	IMD Fourth Quintile	0.655	0.03*	0.447	0.961
Muslim	1.830	0.004*	1.210	2.767	IMD Fifth Quintile	0.795	0.279	0.525	1.205
Sikh	1.366	0.313	0.744	2.509	**Government Office Region**				
Any other religion	1.206	0.496	0.703	2.071	Reference group = London				
No religion	1.041	0.819	0.738	1.468	North East	0.942	0.821	0.559	1.588
Country of birth (p<0.05)					North West	0.803	0.364	0.500	1.290
Reference group = UK					Yorkshire and the Humber	0.816	0.403	0.506	1.316
Irish Republic	0.428	0.024*	0.205	0.892	East Midlands	0.940	0.794	0.588	1.501
India	0.926	0.768	0.556	1.542	West Midlands	0.637	0.061	0.397	1.022
Pakistan	1.255	0.492	0.655	2.402	East of England	0.935	0.772	0.594	1.472
Bangladesh	1.864	0.208	0.706	4.924	South East	0.869	0.531	0.561	1.349
Jamaica	0.846	0.682	0.379	1.889	South West	0.721	0.168	0.452	1.149
East African New Commonwealth	1.803	0.024*	1.083	3.001					
Rest of New Commonwealth	0.581	0.108	0.299	1.128					
Other	0.614	0.103	0.341	1.104					

svygof: 0.230

Table A7: Variations in support for the right to be looked after by the State if you can not look after yourself by population subgroup[xxviii]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval	
Gender					**Highest educ. Qual. (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	0.969	0.679	0.836	1.124	Higher education below degree	0.695	0.010*	0.526	0.917
Disability					A level or equivalent	0.722	0.023*	0.546	0.956
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	0.589	0.000*	0.462	0.750
LLID	1.087	0.445	0.877	1.348	GCSE D-E or equivalent	0.582	0.005*	0.401	0.845
Ethnicity (p<0.05)					Foreign or other qualifications	0.479	0.003*	0.296	0.775
Reference group = white					No qualifications	0.614	0.001*	0.466	0.810
Asian	0.594	0.009*	0.401	0.880	**Social class (HRP nssec7) (marg.)**				
Black	0.608	0.006*	0.428	0.865	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Mixed	0.588	0.007*	0.398	0.867	Intermediate occupations / small employer	0.739	0.006*	0.597	0.914
Chinese / other	0.707	0.107	0.464	1.078	Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	0.784	0.016*	0.644	0.955
Age (p<0.05)					Routine occupations	0.676	0.005*	0.514	0.889
Reference group = 16-19					Never worked / longterm unemployed	0.800	0.327	0.512	1.251
20-24	1.439	0.064	0.979	2.115	Full time students	0.445	0.023*	0.221	0.896
25-34	1.429	0.033*	1.030	1.983	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)**				
35-49	1.842	0.000*	1.332	2.546	Reference group=not social housing				
50-64	1.817	0.001*	1.297	2.547	Social housing	0.948	0.647	0.755	1.191
65-70	2.647	0.000*	1.732	4.047	**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.956	1.000	1.000
Religion / belief (p<0.05)					**IMD (quintile groups)**				
Reference group = Christian					Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Buddhist	1.505	0.341	0.648	3.497	IMD Second Quintile	1.301	0.026*	1.032	1.641
Hindu	1.018	0.938	0.648	1.600	IMD Third Quintile	1.256	0.073	0.979	1.612
Jewish	2.334	0.142	0.752	7.240	IMD Fourth Quintile	1.280	0.073	0.977	1.677
Muslim	1.446	0.061	0.984	2.125	IMD Fifth Quintile	1.349	0.056	0.993	1.835
Sikh	2.211	0.007*	1.240	3.943	**Government Office Region**				
Any other religion	1.060	0.813	0.656	1.712	Reference group = London				
No religion	1.255	0.072	0.980	1.607	North East	0.746	0.188	0.482	1.155
Country of birth (p<0.05)					North West	0.928	0.686	0.647	1.332
Reference group = UK					Yorkshire and the Humber	0.857	0.416	0.590	1.244
Irish Republic	0.393	0.01*	0.193	0.797	East Midlands	0.679	0.058	0.454	1.014
India	0.596	0.008*	0.406	0.873	West Midlands	0.827	0.354	0.553	1.236
Pakistan	1.040	0.878	0.629	1.722	East of England	1.075	0.697	0.746	1.551
Bangladesh	0.768	0.259	0.484	1.216	South East	0.923	0.664	0.642	1.326
Jamaica	0.603	0.078	0.344	1.059	South West	0.945	0.774	0.640	1.393
East African New Commonwealth	1.566	0.151	0.849	2.889					
Rest of New Commonwealth	0.936	0.733	0.641	1.368					
Other	0.612	0.002*	0.450	0.831					svygof: 0.990

Table A8: Variations in support for the right to free health-care if you need it by population subgroup[xxix]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf Interval	
Gender (p<0.05)					**Highest educ. Qual. (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	1.289	0.014*	1.054	1.578	Higher education below degree	0.835	0.343	0.575	1.213
Disability					A level or equivalent	0.818	0.285	0.565	1.183
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	0.767	0.125	0.546	1.077
LLID	1.115	0.475	0.826	1.505	GCSE D-E or equivalent	0.496	0.003*	0.314	0.785
Ethnicity					Foreign or other qualifications	0.874	0.725	0.413	1.853
Reference group = white					No qualifications	0.564	0.001*	0.403	0.789
Asian	0.605	0.022*	0.394	0.930	**Social class (HRP nssec7)**				
Black	0.699	0.121	0.445	1.099	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Mixed	0.867	0.583	0.520	1.445	Intermediate occupations / small employer	0.748	0.049*	0.560	0.998
Chinese / other	0.807	0.434	0.470	1.384	Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	0.792	0.107	0.596	1.052
Age (p<0.05)					Routine occupations	0.933	0.708	0.647	1.344
Reference group = 16-19					Never worked / longterm unemployed	1.032	0.918	0.563	1.893
20-24	1.564	0.100	0.918	2.666	Full time students	0.441	0.038*	0.203	0.955
25-34	1.377	0.175	0.867	2.185	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)**				
35-49	1.677	0.028*	1.058	2.660	Reference group=not social housing				
50-64	1.616	0.034*	1.037	2.518	Social housing	0.979	0.889	0.729	1.315
65-70	3.145	0.00*	1.672	5.915	**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.008*	1.000	1.000
Religion / belief					**IMD (quintile groups)**				
Reference group = Christian					Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Buddhist	1.407	0.447	0.583	3.401	IMD Second Quintile	1.115	0.551	0.779	1.595
Hindu	0.971	0.913	0.571	1.650	IMD Third Quintile	0.966	0.837	0.692	1.348
Jewish	0.722	0.616	0.202	2.585	IMD Fourth Quintile	0.972	0.871	0.689	1.371
Muslim	1.056	0.835	0.632	1.765	IMD Fifth Quintile	0.804	0.302	0.530	1.218
Sikh	1.179	0.622	0.612	2.269	**Government Office Region**				
Any other religion	0.809	0.494	0.440	1.488	Reference group = London				
No religion	1.168	0.309	0.865	1.578	North East	0.955	0.879	0.528	1.727
Country of birth (p<0.05)					North West	0.856	0.433	0.580	1.264
Reference group = UK					Yorkshire and the Humber	0.729	0.255	0.422	1.258
Irish Republic	0.471	0.120	0.183	1.216	East Midlands	0.659	0.091	0.406	1.069
India	0.765	0.283	0.469	1.248	West Midlands	0.758	0.189	0.501	1.147
Pakistan	1.046	0.860	0.636	1.719	East of England	0.980	0.917	0.664	1.445
Bangladesh	0.891	0.720	0.472	1.680	South East	1.017	0.937	0.677	1.528
Jamaica	0.563	0.059	0.310	1.021	South West	0.968	0.897	0.594	1.579
East African New Commonwealth	1.276	0.532	0.592	2.752					
Rest of New Commonwealth	0.782	0.335	0.473	1.291					
Other	0.421	0.00*	0.284	0.624					svygof: 0.376

Table A9: Variations in support for the right to have a job by population subgroup[xxx]

	Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf. Interval			Odds ratio	p-value	95% Conf. Interval	
Gender (p<0.05)					**Highest educ. Qual. (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = male					Reference group = Degree or equivalent				
Female	1.408	0.00*	1.250	1.587	Higher education below degree	1.215	0.083	0.975	1.515
Disability					A level or equivalent	1.309	0.016*	1.052	1.629
Reference group = no LLID					GCSE A-C or equivalent	1.845	0*	1.478	2.303
LLID	1.015	0.864	0.853	1.209	GCSE D-E or equivalent	1.589	0.007*	1.136	2.223
Ethnicity (p<0.05)					Foreign or other qualifications	1.444	0.137	0.889	2.345
Reference group = white					No qualifications	1.450	0.002*	1.148	1.832
Asian	0.828	0.261	0.595	1.151	**Social class (HRP nssec7)**				
Black	1.620	0.012*	1.111	2.362	Reference group = Higher, lower managerial and professions				
Mixed	1.242	0.244	0.862	1.788	Intermediate occupations / small employer	0.980	0.830	0.816	1.177
Chinese / other	1.426	0.140	0.889	2.287	Lower supervisory & technical / semi-routine	1.187	0.062	0.992	1.420
Age (p<0.05)					Routine occupations	1.197	0.199	0.909	1.575
Reference group = 16-19					Never worked / longterm unemployed	0.788	0.212	0.541	1.146
20-24	1.790	0.008*	1.164	2.752	Full time students	0.977	0.949	0.484	1.974
25-34	1.459	0.031*	1.036	2.055	**Social housing (renting, landlord is LA, HA etc)**				
35-49	1.388	0.051	0.998	1.929	Reference group=not social housing				
50-64	1.444	0.032*	1.032	2.020	Social housing	0.982	0.861	0.799	1.206
65-70	1.025	0.895	0.708	1.484	**Equivalent household income**	1.000	0.00*	1.000	1.000
Religion / belief					**IMD (decile groups) (p<0.05)**				
Reference group = Christian					Reference group = IMD First Quintile (least deprived)				
Buddhist	1.155	0.773	0.433	3.077	IMD Second Quintile	1.197	0.064	0.990	1.448
Hindu	1.638	0.027*	1.058	2.537	IMD Third Quintile	1.397	0.001*	1.149	1.699
Jewish	0.630	0.308	0.258	1.536	IMD Fourth Quintile	1.403	0.001*	1.142	1.725
Muslim	1.475	0.04*	1.018	2.136	IMD Fifth Quintile	1.483	0.002*	1.152	1.910
Sikh	1.915	0.023*	1.096	3.346	**Government Office Region (p<0.05)**				
Any other religion	1.157	0.495	0.760	1.763	Reference group = London				
No religion	0.911	0.268	0.772	1.075	North East	1.213	0.274	0.858	1.714
Country of birth					North West	1.036	0.802	0.788	1.361
Reference group = UK					Yorkshire and the Humber	0.800	0.111	0.607	1.053
Irish Republic	0.827	0.605	0.401	1.702	East Midlands	0.864	0.379	0.623	1.198
India	1.178	0.402	0.803	1.729	West Midlands	0.873	0.286	0.679	1.121
Pakistan	1.171	0.498	0.741	1.853	East of England	1.117	0.398	0.864	1.444
Bangladesh	0.913	0.749	0.521	1.599	South East	1.220	0.108	0.957	1.554
Jamaica	1.097	0.746	0.627	1.918	South West	1.141	0.402	0.838	1.554
East African New Commonwealth	1.041	0.898	0.567	1.910					
Rest of New Commonwealth	1.026	0.932	0.567	1.856					
Other	0.865	0.434	0.602	1.244					svy gof: 0.091

Table A10: Standardised logistic regression model[xxxi]

	standardised odds ratio	p value		standardised odds ratio	p value
Freedom of expression					
Female	0.860	0.00	**Crime**		
Non-White	0.831	0.002	Age >24	1.127	0.007
Non-UK country of birth	0.891	0.02	Non-Christian	0.902	0.054
No educational qualifications	0.823	0.00	No educational qualifications	0.782	0.000
Social Class	0.900	0.015	IMD quintile 4/5	0.903	0.078
Freedom of thought, conscience and religion			Equivalent household income	1.170	0.024
Age > 24	1.115	0.001	Social class	0.873	0.014
No educational qualifications	0.723	0.00	GOR not London	1.142	0.012
Equivalent household income	1.294	0.00	**Treated fairly and equally**		
Social class	0.805	0.00	No educational qualifications	0.716	0
Free elections			IMD quintile 4/5	0.828	0.003
Female	0.876	0.00	Equivalent household income	1.291	0.002
Non-White	0.845	0.00	Social class	0.772	0
Age > 24	1.247	0.00	GOR not London	1.213	0.001
No educational qualifications	0.723	0.00	**Health**		
Equivalent household income	1.294	0.00	Female	1.07`	0.059
Social class	0.960	0.00	LLID	1.121	0.005
Education			Non-White	0.864	0.007
LLID	0.923	0.021	Age > 24	1.117	0.001
Age > 24	1.132	0.00	No educational qualifications	0.898	0.036
No educational qualifications	0.766	0.00	IMD quintiles 4/5	0.886	0.004
IMD quintile 4/5	0.925	0.071	Social class	1.002	0.053
Equivalent household income	1.156	0.004	**Employment**		
Social class	0.933	0.094	Female	1.162	0.000
GOR not London	1.104	0.018	Non-White	1.139	0.001
State support			Non-Christian	0.910	0.001
LLID	1.083	0.006	Non-UK country of birth	1.082	0.025
Non-White	0.868	0.00	No educational qualifications	0.926	0.005
Age > 24	1.122	0.00	IMD quintile 4/5	1.079	0.008
Non-Christian	1.097	0.002	Equivalent household income	0.849	0.00
Non-UK country of birth	0.914	0.01	Social class	1.146	0.00

Table A11: Interactive logistic regression models[xxxii]

Freedom of expression		
Interactions ns-sec3 (focal) and IMD quintile (moderator)		
Reference: household 1, imd1		
IMD quintile 2, ns-sec3=1	0.928	0.790
IMD quintile 3, ns-sec3=1	0.796	0.396
IMD quintile 4, ns-sec3=1	1.334	0.309
IMD quintile 5, ns-sec3=1	0.982	0.954
IMD quintile 1, ns-sec3=2	1.801	0.126
IMD quintile 1, ns-sec3=3	0.952	0.936
IMD quintile 2: odds for ns-sec3=2 compared to odds for ns-sec3=1	0.548	0.268
IMD quintile 2: odds for ns-sec3=3 compared to odds for ns-sec3=1	0.222	0.004
IMD quintile 3: odds for ns-sec3=2 compared to odds for ns-sec3=1	0.320	0.026
IMD quintile 3: odds for ns-sec3=3 compared to odds for ns-sec3=1	0.511	0.016
IMD quintile 4: odds for ns-sec3=2 compared to odds for ns-sec3=1	2.342	0.064
IMD quintile 4: odds for ns-sec3=3 compared to odds for ns-sec3=1	1.238	0.576
IMD quintile 5: odds for ns-sec3=2 compared to odds for ns-sec3=1	1.088	0.821
IMD quintile 5: odds for ns-sec3=3 compared to odds for ns-sec3=1	1.757	0.172
Adjusted wald test (omnibus test)		**0.005**
Right to health		
Interactions LLID (focal), ethnicity (moderator)		
No LLID: Asian relative to white	0.587	0.02
No LLID: Black relative to white	0.663	0.071
No LLID: Mixed relative to white	0.946	0.844
No LLID: Other relative to white	0.898	0.71
White: odds for LLID compared to odds for no LLID	1.060	0.721
Asian: odds for LLID compared to odds for no LLID	3.534	0.003
Black: odds for LLID compared to odds for no LLID	2.388	0.024
Mixed: odds for LLID compared to odds for no LLID	0.510	0.233
Other: odds for LLID compared to odds for no LLID	0.619	0.518
Adjusted wald test (omnibus test)		**0.004**

Appendix 2: Further Information on Methodological Framework

Further details of the data and the methodological framework and data are provided in Vizard (2010).

The data

The Survey has a multi-stage complex survey design involving (1) stratification; (2) cluster sampling; and (3) ethnic boost sampling. The 'Rights and Responsibilities' Module was fielded in 2001, 2003 and 2005. The questions on rights and responsibilities included in the module have not been held constant. A key difference is that in 2001, respondents were asked for their unprompted answers to the following question: "what do you think your rights are, as someone living in the UK?" In contrast, in 2003 and 2005, the questions were *prompted*. Respondents were asked about the rights they feel they (1) actually have, and (2) think they should have, as someone living in the UK today, from a long list of options. This list covered civil and political rights, and economic and social rights. Support for multiple items was possible as there were no restrictions on the maximum number of rights that respondents could value as 'important'. As a result, respondents were not required to 'de-select' rights that are recognized in domestic and international law because of an artificial 'cut-off' imposed by the questionnaire.

The core dataset is generally recommended as a basis for data analysis using the Citizenship Survey. This is because of the over-sampling relative to the population of minority ethnic respondents for the boost sample. However, where analysis is based on ethnicity or on subgroups such as religion and belief and country of birth, the use of the combined sample is recommended. In the logistic regression research exercise, the combined Citizenship Sample has been used as a basis for the analysis because of the central role that disaggregation by these characteristics plays in the analysis. The effective sample size reduces to 10,500 because the data for Wales was not included. This is because the Index of Multiple Deprivation is included as an independent variable in all of the logistic regression equations and these are non-comparable for England and Wales. In addition, the over 70 years old sub-group was dropped from the analysis because the Citizenship Survey does not provide information on the highest level of educational qualification for this sub-group.[xxxiii]

Construction of the income variable

The research findings are reported on the basis of a continuous household income variable that was constructed by generating an equivalent household income variable using the information on respondent and partner income and family size available from the data sets.

Information on respondent income and partner income was provided with the data set and both of these are categorical variables. However, a household income variable was not provided with the 2005 data set. There was therefore a methodological choice as to whether to rely on the respondent income variable or whether to construct a household income variable on the basis of the information about respondent income variable and the partner income that was provided with the dataset. An important limitation of an analysis based on respondent income only is the failure to take into account partner households, where non-working adults might contribute zero to respondent income whilst having a significant share of household income. A decision was therefore made to construct a household income variable based on the categorical respondent and partner income information that was available. An equivalent household income variable was then derived using the modified OECD equivalence scale.

A continuous household income was generated for single households and couple households as follows:

Household income = respondent income where the respondent said they were neither married nor cohabiting)

Household income = couples income (where the respondent said they were either married or cohabiting)

Couples income was defined as: rowtotal (respondent income, partner income), where the respondent said they were either married or cohabiting):

- since there was no continuous respondent or partner income variable included in the data set, the new variables were generated using the midpoints from reported the income bands; and
- for the upper band (>£100,000), income was set to £100,000.

Ideally, rather than individuals being assigned income levels based on the midpoints of the range of the corresponding categorical variables, they would have been assigned income levels that are randomly generated within each income range. However, information about mean income would be required for this procedure and this was not available in the current research project. The method of assigning the midpoint has been used elsewhere (e.g. Smith, 2004:19).

Decisions also had to be made about how to deal with answers rincome / pincome =15, 98 or 99. The following actions were taken:

- Don't knows – set to missing.
- Refusals – set to missing.
- If either a respondent or partner said 'no income' this was interpreted as zero income and included within the household income variable (rather than being treated as 'missing').

- Additional adults in the household who are not part of a couple (i.e. who are not married to or cohabiting with the respondent) are not accounted for in the construction of the household income variable in the sense that:
    - information about the income of additional income earners within the household (who are neither the respondent nor the respondent's partner, for example, a working grandparent) was not provided with the dataset and is not reflected in the analysis; and
    - the equivalisation procedure covers singles with no children, couples with no children, singles with 1-8 children, and couples with 1-8 children.

Alternative model specification

An alternative specification of the logistic regression equation (Model B) applies a categorical version of the equivalent household income variable for the purposes of robustness testing and further exploratory analysis. The continuous equivalent household income discussed above was split into four bands.

Under model A, equivalent household income was found to be significant and positive in relation to support for the right to elections. Under model B (with the categorical equivalent household income variable), significant increases in the odds ratio were established in relation to income band 2 (lower-middle equivalent household income) and band 4 (high equivalent household income) relative to income band 1 (low equivalent household income).

Under model A, equivalent household income was found to be significant and positive in relation to support for the right to thought, conscience and religion. Under model B (with the categorical equivalent household income variable), significant increases in the odds ratio were established in relation to income band 3 (upper-middle equivalent household income) relative to income band 1 (low equivalent household income).

Under model A, equivalent household income was found to be significant and negative in relation to support for the right to health. Under model B (with the categorical equivalent household income variable), significant decreases in the odds ratio were established in relation to income band 4 (high equivalent household income) relative to income band 1 (low equivalent household income).

Under model A, equivalent household income was found to be significant and negative in relation to support for the right to a job. Under model B (with the categorical equivalent household income variable), significant decreases in the odds ratio were established in relation to income band 3 (upper-middle equivalent household income) and income band 4 (high equivalent household income) relative to income band 1 (low equivalent household income).

Under model A, equivalent household income was *not* found to have a significant impact of the right to state support. Under model B (with the categorical equivalent

household income variable), significant increases in the odds ratio were established in relation to income band 2 (lower-middle equivalent household income) relative to income band 1 (low equivalent household income).

Under model A, equivalent household income was *not* found to have a significant impact of the right to state support. Under model B (with the categorical equivalent household income variable), significant increases in the odds ratio were established in relation to income band 2 (lower-middle equivalent household income) relative to income band 1 (low equivalent household income).

Under model A, equivalent household income was *not* found to have a significant impact on support for the right to be treated fairly and equally. Under model B (with the categorical equivalent household income variable), significant increases in the odds ratio were established in relation to income band 2 (lower-middle equivalent household income) and income band 3 (upper-middle equivalent household income) relative to income band 1 (low equivalent household income).

Changing the model specification, and including equivalent income specified as a categorical rather than a continuous variable, has a limited impact on other findings. In relation to most of the results reported in the sub-sections above, the evaluation of the significance of the effects of the independent variables is unchanged (although the values of the odds ratios, *p*-values and confidence intervals are marginally different). However, the evaluation of the significance of the effects of a limited number of the indicator-level age bands is different

A number of issues around missing values arose in the construction of the household income variable, and a third model (Model C) was specified in order to explore the impact of different methodological choices with respect to the treatment of the missing values. A third specification (Model C) was also run, with "complex" cases dropped. No major divergences in findings were identified through the robustness analysis.

Further details of the robustness analysis are provided in Table A12 and Vizard (2010: Appendix 1).

Table A12: Comparison of findings under alternative specification of the logistic regression model (Model A, continuous equivalent household income variable; Model B, categorical equivalent household income variable)

	Model A	Model B			Model C
	Sig of the continuous variable	**Sig. of equiv. hld inc. indicator variables**	**Joint sig. of equiv. hld. inc. indicator variables**	**Impact of alternative model specification on significance of non-equivalent household income variables**	**Impact of alternative model specification on significance of non-equivalent household income variables**
Health	***-ve**	band 4* (decreased odds ratio)	ns	50-64 age band not significant under model B. Otherwise, no changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B, but in addition 35-49 and 50-64 age band not significant under model B. Otherwise, no changes in the significance of anything, but ma
Job	***-ve**	band 3* (decreased odds ratio) band 4* (decreased odds ratio)	*	25-34 & 50-64 age band not significant under model B. Otherwise, no changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B
Elections	***+ve**	band 2* (increased odds ratio) band 4* (increased odds ratio)	ns	No changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B
Conscience	***+ve**	band 3* (increased odds ratio)	ns	No changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B
Education	ns	ns	ns	50-64 age band and routine occupations not significant under model B. Otherwise, no changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B
Speech	ns	ns	ns	No changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B
State support	ns	band 2* (increased odds ratio)	ns	25-34 age band not significant under model B. Muslim group is significant under Model B (with an increased odds ratio). Otherwise, no changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B
Be protected from crime	ns	ns	ns	No changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B
Fairly and equally	ns	band 2* (increased odds ratio) band 3* (increased odds ratio)	*	25-34 age band significant under Model B (with a decreased odds ratio). Otherwise, no changes in the significance of anything, but marginal changes in the odds ratios, p-value and cis	As under Model B

References

Anand, P., Hunter, P., Carter I., Dowding K., Guala F., Van Hees (2005) *The Development of Capabilities and their Relation to Life Satisfaction*, version dated September 4th 2005, personal communication.

Anand, P., Hunger, G., Carter, I., Dowding, K. and van Hees, M. (2009) 'The Development of Capability Indicators', *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 10, pp. 125-52.

Anand, P, Santos, C and Smith R (2009b) 'The Measurement of Capabilities' in K. Basu and R. Kanbur (Eds.) *Arguments for a Better World: Essays in Honour of Amartya Sen*, OUP, Oxford.

Alkire, S. (2002) *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Alkire S. (2007) 'Choosing dimensions: The Capability Approach and Multidimensional Poverty' http://www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication_files/WP88_Alkire.pdf.

Alkire, S., Bastagli, F., Burchardt, T., Clark, D., Holder, H., Ibrahim, S., Munoz, M., Terazzas, P., Tsang, T., and Vizard, P. (2009) *Developing the Equality Measurement Framework: Selecting the Indicators*, Equality and Human Rights Commission, Manchester. Available from http://www.equalityhumanrights.com [accessed 22nd February 2010].

Archer K and Lemeshow S (2006), 'Goodness-of-fit test for a logistic progression model fitted using survey sample data' *Stata Journal* 6 (1), pp. 97-105.

Attwood, C. Singh, G. Prime D. Creasey R and others (2003), *2001 Home Office Citizenship Survey: people, families and Communities, Home Office Research Study 270* (London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate). Available at: http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/hors270.pdf. Last accessed 3 September 2010.

Biggeri, M., Libanora, R., Mariani, S., Menchini, L. (2006) 'Children Conceptualizing their Capabilities: Results of a Survey Conducted during the First children's World Congress on Child Labour', *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities: A Multi-Disciplinary Journal for People-Centered Development*, 7(1), pp. 59-83.

Burchardt, T., and Vizard, P. (2007a) *Definition of Equality and Framework for Measurement: Final Recommendations of the Equalities Review Steering Group on Measurement*, available from http://www.theequalitiesreview.org.uk/publications.aspx [accessed 22nd February 2010]

Burchardt, T and Vizard, P. (2007b) *Developing a capability list: Final Recommendations of the Equalities Review Steering Group on Measurement,* CASEpaper 121, London, available from

http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cp/CASEpaper121.pdf, [accessed 2nd August 2010].

Burchardt, T., and Vizard, P. (2008) *Developing an equality measurement framework: A list of substantive freedoms for adults and children*, Research report 18, EHRC, London, available from http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/research/18_substantive-freedoms-for-adults-and-children.pdf [accessed 2nd August 2010].

Burchardt, T., and Vizard, P. (forthcoming) Operationalising' the capability approach as a basis for equality and human rights monitoring in 21st century Britain, Journal of Human Development and Capabilities, Forthcoming February 2011.

Crocker, D. A. (2008) Ethics of Global Development: Agency, Capability, and Deliberative Democracy, Cambridge: CUP

Department for Communities and Local Government [DCLG] (2006), *2005 Citizenship Survey: Community cohesion topic report* (London: DCLG). Available at: http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/452571.pdf. Last accessed 3 September 2010.

Department for Communities and Local Government [DCLG] (2009), *2007-2008 Citizenship Survey: Identity and Values Topic Report* (London: DCLG). Available at http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/statistics/pdf/1319805.pdf. Last accessed 3 September 2010.

de-Shalit A., and Woolf (2008), *Disadvantage*, Oxford: OUP

Equalities Review (2007) *Fairness and Freedom: The Final Report of the Equalities Review*, Communities and Local Government, London. Available from http://www.theequalitiesreview.org.uk/publications.aspx [accessed 2nd August 2010].

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010) *How Fair is Britain? Equality, human rights and good relations in 2010. The first Triennial Review.* Available from

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/key-projects/triennial-review/full-report-and-evidence-downloads/#How_fair_is_Britain_Equality_Human_Rights_and_Good_Relations_in_2010_The_First_Triennial_Review, accessed 18th October 2010.

Green H. and. Farmer C (2004), *2003 Home Office Citizenship Survey: People, family and communities, Technical Report* (London: Office for National Statistics). Available at: http://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/5087/mrdoc/pdf/5087userguide.pdf. Last accessed 3 September 2010.

Holder, H., Tsang, T and Vizard, P. (forthcoming) *The Equality Measurement Framework: Selecting the Indicators for Children and Young People*", EHRC Research Report, EHRC, London.

Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate (2004), *2003 Home Office Citizenship Survey: people, families and communities, Home Office Research Study 289* (London: Home Office RDS). Available at: http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors289.pdf. Last accessed 3 September 2010.

Hosmer D. and Lemeshow S. (2000), *Applied Logistic Regression,* Second edition, *(*New York: John Wiley).

Ipsos-MORI (2007) *Consulting for a capability list,* Ipsos MORI, London, available from http://www.theequalitiesreview.org.uk/publications.aspx [accessed 2nd August 2010].

Long J. and Freese J. (2006), *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata,* Second edition (College Station TX: Stata Press).

Menard S. (2002), *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis,* Second edition (London: Sage).

Michaelson J., Pickering K., Wood N.and Scholes S (2006), *2005 Home Office Citizenship Survey: Technical Report* (London: The Home Office).

Nussbaum, M.C. (2003) 'Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Global Justice', *Feminist Economics,* 9(2-3), pp. 33-59.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1995) 'Human Capabilities, Female Human Beings, in M. Nussbaum and J. Glover (Eds.) *Women, Culture and Development: A Study Of Human Capabilities,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997) 'Capabilities and Human Rights', *Fordham Law Review*, 66, pp. 273-300.

Nussbaum, M.C. (2000) *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Nussbaum, M.C. (2003) 'Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Global Justice', *Feminist Economics,* 9(2-3), pp. 33-59.

Nussbaum M.C. (2006) *Frontiers of Justice*

Office of National Statistics [ONS] (2005), *The National Statistics Socio-economic Classification User Manual* (London: ONS). Available at: http://www.statistics.gov.uk/methods_quality/ns_sec/downloads/NS-SEC_User_2005.pdf. Last accessed 10 May 2010.

Robeyns, I. (2003) 'Sen's Capability Approach and Gender Inequality: Selecting Relevant Capabilities', *Feminist Economics,* 9 (2-3), pp. 61-92.

Robeyns, I. (2005) 'Selecting Capabilities for Quality of life Measurement', in P. Anand (Ed.) *Social Indicators Research: The Quality of Life and the Capability Approach,* 74 (1).

Scholes, S. D'Souza J. and Prescott A. (2007), *Applying logistic regression techniques to Welsh Health Survey Data, NatCen Research Report prepared for the Welsh Assembly Government* (Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government).

Sen, A. K. (2000) 'Consequential Evaluation and Practical Reason', *The Journal of Philosophy*, 97 (9), pp. 477-502.

Sen, A. K. (2004a) 'Capabilities, Lists and Public Reason: Continuing the Conversation', *Feminist Economics,* 10 (3), pp. 77-80.

Sen, A. K. (2004b) **'**Elements of a Theory of Human Rights'**,** *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 32 (4), pp. 315-356.

Sen, A. K. (2005) 'Human Rights and Capabilities', *Journal of Human Development*, 6 (2), pp. 151-66.

Sen, A.K., (2009) *The Idea of Justice*, Penguin: London.

Smith P. and Wands S. (2003), *Home Office Citizenship Survey 2001: Technical Report* (London: The Home Office).

Smith S. (2004), *Can the Retirement Consumption Puzzle Be Resolved? Evidence from UK panel data* (London: Institute for Fiscal Studies). Available at: http://www.ifs.org.uk/wps/wp0407.pdf. Last accessed 3 September 2010.

StataCorp (1985-2007a), *Stata Survey Data Reference Manual, Release 10* (College Station, TX: Stata Press).

Tonkin R. and Rutherford R. (2007), *Citizenship Survey 2007/08* (London: DCLG).

Taylor, C. (1985) Atomism, in Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical

Vizard P. (2006) Poverty and Human Rights: Sen's Capability Perspective Examined OUP: Oxford

Vizard P. (2007), Selecting And Justifying A Basic Capability Set: Should The International Human Rights Framework Be Given A More Direct Role? Oxford Development Studies 35(3): 225-250.

Vizard P (2010) *What do the public think about economic and social rights? Research Report to Inform the Debate about a Bill of Rights and a Written Constitution* (London: LSE/CASE, 2010). Available at: http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cr/CASEreport61.pdf. Last accessed 3 September 2010.

Wiggins, D. (1998) Claims of Need' in Needs, Values, Truth, Third Edition (Oxford, Clarendon)

Williams, B. (1987) The Standard of Living: Interests and Capabilities, in: G. Hawthorn (Ed) The Standard of Living (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

[i] An important also reflects the tradition in moral philosophy that views the surface grammar of moral claims as elliptical on the grounds that some parameter or other that is essential to understanding the moral claim is left inexplicit (Sayre-McCord). The proposition has been

extensively analysed in the philosophical literature on *needs*. It has been argued, for example, that moral claims of the form "A needs X" are always elliptical (e.g. Wiggins 1998).

[ii] Williams went on to challenge the primacy of the concept of rights over that of capability. "The notion of a basic human right seems to me obscure …. I would rather come at it from the perspective of basic human capabilities. I would prefer capabilities to do the work, and if we are going to have a language or rhetoric of rights, to have it delivered from them, rather than the other way round. But I think that there remains an unsolved problem: how we should see the relations between these concepts ..." (Williams, 1987: 100).

[iii] Full details of the changes to the list arising from the deliberative consultation in round are given in Burchardt and Vizard 2007b, section (2.3). For details of the changes arising from round 2, see Burchardt and Vizard (2008).

[iv] This table is indicative and does not provide a complete mapping of the relevant articles in the ICCPR and the ICESCR. A number of articles can be mapped to more than one domain. The table is based on the final EMF domain headings.

[v] Analysis of findings are provided in DCLG, Attwood *et al* (2003: 9-20), Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate (2004: 9-24), DCLG (2006: 23-27) and DCLG (2009: 10-15). Technical details are provided in Smith and Wands (2003) Green and Farmer (2004); Michaelson *et al* (2006) and Tonkin and Rutherford (2007).

[vi] Details of the construction of the equivalent household income variable are given in Vizard (2010: Appendix 1 Section 6.11.2).

[vii] Social class is based on the NS_SEC scheme. This is derived from detailed occupational groups and classifies individuals by their labor market situation and work conditions. The categories in the scheme can be mapped to social class. Full details of the NS-SEC classification scheme and of the ways occupational categories can be related to social class are given in ONS (2005).

[viii] Social housing has been included in the analysis because it was considered, a priori, to be of interest to examine whether living in a social housing cluster might have an impact on support for rights, after controlling for other factors. However, it should be noted that some researchers are sceptical about social housing being included as an independent variable in regression analysis. The reason for concern here is that individuals that are living in social housing might be thought a priori to have certain characteristics in common that might be systematically linked to the dependent variable.

[ix] The broad distinction between 'social identity' characteristics, socio-economic variables and geographical variables is intended as an aid to the analysis. However, as discussed in Burchardt and Vizard (2007a: 23), there is a danger of "essentialism" in relation to the term 'social identity' characteristic. This term should not be taken to imply that these characteristics are the only, or necessarily even the most important, aspects of a person's identity. It would also be possible to classify social class as a 'social identify characteristic' since social class is arguably inherited at birth.

[x] The departure from a simple random sampling assumption has implications for statistical tests of survey estimates and the calculation of standard errors of regression estimates (which are based on a random sample assumption). See Vizard (2010) and more generally Scholes *et al (*2007), Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000: 211) and the Napier / ESRC Research methods website.

[xi] The significance tests established the same variations. At the individual indicator level, 'Other' religion was also significant.

[xii] The primary purpose of the research exercise has been to establish the significance of odds ratios rather than to develop a fully specified logistic regression model. However, the research exercise has been driven by theory in the sense that the focus has been on a set of predictor variables that were thought, a priori, to be of interest from the human rights perspective.

Further, the research exercise will be useful in the future in developing a fully specified logistic regression model. The methodology adopted draws heavily on the framework for logistic regression analysis set out in Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000), Menard (2002) and Long and Frese (2006) and STATACorp (1985-2007a).

[xiii] See Appendix 2 for further details.

[xiv] See Appendix 2 for further details.

[xv] Note that significant variations for the Foreign and other qualifications subgroup were not identified.

[xvi] See Appendix 2 for further details.

[xvii] See Appendix 2 for further details.

[xviii] The methodology for evaluating testing relative importance outlined in this section is not accepted by some researchers. The methodology applied to generate the results in this table departs from that underlying other data tables in two key respects. First, categorical independent variables with more than two categories have been recoded using the coding system discussed in Vizard (2010: Appendix 1, section 6.8). Second, the results are not run with the STATA svy suite of commands (that correct for complex survey design).

[xix] See note ix.

[xx] The findings here should be regarded as suggestive rather than as definitive and should be interpreted with caution. See Long and Frese (2006:178), Menard (2002:56) and Vizard (2010) for further discussion.

[xxi] This table is indicative and does not provide a complete mapping of the relevant articles in the ICCPR and the ICESCR. A number of articles can be mapped to more than one domain. The table is based on the final EMF domain headings. Some of the rights in the research exercise using the Citizenship Survey are taken to map to more than one domain.

[xxii] The data in this table is for England only. It represents the combined sample, corrected for complex survey design. The findings are accurate to three decimal places.

[xxiii] See endnote xxii. Without rounding up, the confidence interval for the p-value for the equivalent household income significance test is 1.000001-1.000018 (which does not contain 1).

[xxiv] See endnote xxii. Without rounding up, the confidence interval for the p-value for the equivalent household income significance test is 1.000001-1.000019 (which does not contain 1).

[xxv] See endnote xxii.

[xxvi] See endnote xxii.

[xxvii] See endnote xxii.

[xxviii] See endnote xxii.

[xxix] See endnote xxii. Without rounding up, the confidence interval for the p-value for the equivalent household income significance test is 0.9998- 0.99999 (which does not contain 1).

[xxx] See endnote xxii. Without rounding up, the confidence interval for the p-value for the equivalent household income significance test is 0.9999869 - 0.9999953 (which does not contain 1).

[xxxi] See endnote xxii. The underlying categorical variables have been recoded as binary variables.

[xxxii] See endnote xxii.

[xxxiii] An alternative strategy that might have made it possible to retain the Welsh data would have been to interact the 'living in Wales' variable with the other characteristics being tested. This approach will be followed up in subsequent analysis.