Civil Service

Diversity & Inclusion

Measuring Socio-economic Background in your Workforce: recommended measures for use by employers

May 2018

Acknowledgements

Foreword

We want to create opportunities for all: a society in which everyone has the chance to go as far as their talent and hard work will take them, regardless of background. We want the Civil Service to be a role model for other employers, giving talented individuals the opportunity to succeed in public service and acting to ensure our policies and services better reflect the needs of communities of this country. Broadening access to opportunities available in the workplace is crucial if we are to break down barriers to employment and improve social mobility. There is already much the Civil Service has achieved, and we expect that continuing to implement the recommendations made by the Bridge Group Report in February 2016 will help increase in the number of talented people from disadvantaged backgrounds participating in our flagship Fast Stream graduate programme.

Our progress on increasing diversity in our workforce is something we should rightly be proud of. But as one of the biggest employers in the country, the Civil Service recognises that we have more to do to attract people from less privileged backgrounds and ensure they can thrive in our organisations. We will achieve this by building an inclusive culture, embracing diversity and attracting individuals based on merit and potential – yet we can only target action where it is most needed and be sure of progress made if we can accurately measure socio-economic diversity.

That is why we commenced groundbreaking work with a range of employers, industry partners and experts, leading the development of a commonly agreed set of socio-economic background measures. The results of that collaborative endeavour are published in this report. This forms a major part of our overall efforts to increase social mobility in the Civil Service and other sectors in the economy. In October 2017 we published our Civil Service Diversity and Inclusion Strategy, which confirms our commitment for the Civil Service to be the most inclusive employer in the UK by 2020, sets out a plan of action across the twin priorities of greater representation and inclusion that are essential to achieving our ambition, and builds on the significant advances we have already made. In the strategy, we committed to establishing - by 2020 - a baseline of data on socio-economic background in the Civil Service.

This report will be a breakthrough not only for the Civil Service, but also for other employers. It will standardise the way we understand socio-economic diversity in our workforces. and help indicate where we should prioritise improvement.

Answering questions about socio-economic background is not easy. We are grateful to all those who have shaped this work: from organisations who have shared insights from the data they have been collecting over the years, to those who responded to our more recent calls for evidence. Use of these measures by employers is entirely voluntary but we expect that the measures we are

recommending in this report will be used in a similar fashion to the data employers gather on other characteristics of their employees, with the data used anonymously and never to form the basis of individual recruitment decisions. The data these measures will enable us to gather will be of crucial importance, helping us to measure the impact of our policies and actions to increase social diversity in the Civil Service and beyond.

This Government is committed to breaking down any existing barriers to a successful and enjoyable career – while increasing social mobility and increasing diversity and inclusion. Only by doing so will we successfully build a country, economy and society that truly works for everyone.

We look forward to seeing the data collected using these measures shape our efforts to increase social mobility, helping to make the Civil Service and other employers more inclusive and diverse, more closely reflecting and better serving the diverse communities of our nation.

Oliver Dowden MP,
Parliamentary Secretary at Cabinet Office

Sir Jeremy Heywood,
Cabinet Secretary and Head of the Civil Service

Contents

Introduction

1.1 Establishing common measures of socio-economic background is a core component of the Government's efforts to understand and address barriers to social mobility in the Civil Service and elsewhere. That is why we have been collaborating with a group of employers, academics and other experts who are recognised champions of the social mobility agenda and who are interested in enabling a consistent approach to gathering evidence on socio-economic background, enabling benchmarking across sectors.

1.2 The top 50 employers in the Social Mobility Employer Index was published for the first time in June 2016. The Index, which is a joint initiative between the Social Mobility Foundation and the Social Mobility Commission, ranks Britain's employers on the actions they are taking to ensure they are open to accessing and progressing talent from all backgrounds and it showcases progress on improving social mobility. One of the key findings from the Index is that employers are now increasingly asking both new and current employees about their socio-economic background, using measures such as parental occupation, parental qualification and eligibility for free school meals. This work, to establish common, industry standard measures for social mobility, is therefore a major element of our work on inclusion and diversity overall.

1.3 The clear conclusion from our early discussions with employers, experts and academics was that there was a need for well-understood measures of socio-economic background for use by employers: without these, employers' ability to identify barriers to social mobility is limited, as is the scope for measuring and benchmarking progress.

Background

1.4 With a view to developing a set of socio-economic background measures that could be used by both the Civil Service and other employers, we undertook a public engagement exercise in summer 2016 .[1] As part of this, we gathered the views of over 40 employers and other experts in social mobility on a long list of 26 potential measures of socio-economic background. This feedback enabled us to refine the set of potential measures, arriving at a short list of 12 measures.

1.5 We then piloted a series of test questions for these 12 measures across the Senior Civil Service (SCS), with the aim of arriving at a set of three to five measures of socio-economic background. Other employers also piloted the same 12 measures or shared insights with us from the socio-economic background data they were already collecting. These insights and pilots

---

[1] www.gov.uk/government/consultations/establishing-common-measures-of-socio-economic-background

enabled us to identify a small number of measures which leading employers and experts could agree should be commonly used across sectors.

1.6 In summer 2017 we invited views on our analysis of the survey findings and preliminary recommendations on common measures, from our partner employers and experts. We have taken on board their constructive views in determining the measures which we think should be used in the Civil Service and by other employers.

Summary: recommendations on measures and their use

1.7 We are recommending four measures to be commonly used by employers, including the Civil Service. These are measures of: **parental qualifications**; **parental occupation**; **type of school attended** and **eligibility for free school meals**. Some employers may well wish to use other measures in addition to the ones which we are recommending. In the Civil Service we will also use a fifth measure: self-assessment of socio-economic background. The recommended wording for these measures is set out in Chapter 4.

1.8 In adopting a set of common measures, our engagement work and pilots indicate that employers will need to ensure, and make clear to their workforce that:

- Data are collected on a voluntary basis;
- Data are analysed at an aggregate level, so individuals' responses cannot be identified.
- Data derived from the measures do not influence individual recruitment and promotion decisions - these should always be on merit.

 Guidance on ensuring engagement with and high response rates to SEB measurement is set out in Chapter 4.

1.9 In the Civil Service we will use the measures to identify areas for improvement and assess the impact of our policies and other actions to increase diversity in the Civil Service. We anticipate that other employers will want to use their data for similar purposes, and we know there is a high degree of interest in benchmarking.

Chapter 1: Methodology and key findings

1.1 We have arrived at our final list of measures through open online engagement which sought views on 26 potential measures, followed by piloting of twelve measures in the Civil Service through a survey of Senior Civil Servants, and building in insights from other employers and experts with a keen interest in social mobility.

Online engagement

1.2 We undertook a public engagement exercise in summer 2016, gathering the views of over 40 employers and other experts on a long list of 26 potential measures of socio-economic background (see Annex A). Participants were invited to score each measure for its suitability - on a scale of one to five, with one indicating not at all suitable and five indicating highly suitable - with a view to further testing of the most suitable measures.

1.3 As well as considering the measures themselves, respondents to the engagement exercise were asked to set out their thoughts on the most important criteria for assessing suitability of socio-economic background measures. This resulted in the following ranking of criteria (based on scores of one to five):

- *Accurate measure of disadvantage* (Average score 4.3).
  Does the metric reflect what it purports to measure, i.e. socio-economic background, such that lower status can be reasonably assumed to have the potential to adversely affect educational progression and access or progression in the workplace?

- *Likely to elicit a response* (Average score 4.3).
  Is the measure considered so sensitive or intrusive that it leads to a low response rate, or the information may be hard to recall? Answers to questions on the measures could easily be recalled or obtained.

- *Clarity of the measure* (Average score 4.2).
  Is the measure easily understandable, allowing consistent application by employers and consistent interpretation by employees?

- *Comparability* (Average score 3.9)
  Measures can be compared across employers, by an employer over time, and against eligible candidate populations.

- ***Accessibility*** (Average score 3.7);
  Businesses, including those small in size, are able to collect and analyse measures for themselves, at reasonable cost.

- ***Longevity*** (Average score 3.5);
  The measure will be available and relevant in the foreseeable future.

- ***Verifiability*** (Average score 3.1).
  It is possible to verify the measure through appropriate and proportionate analytical assessment.

1.4 With the exception of verifiability, which was considered least important, these criteria were applied when determining the most appropriate measures to test further. Following feedback from the engagement exercise, "accurate measure of disadvantage" was changed to "accurate measure of advantage / disadvantage".

1.5 Participants were also asked for views on the following issues:

- Should the same measures be used for new entry level hires (e.g. graduate/apprenticeship), experienced hires and the existing workforce;
- Applicability of measures to those who grew up overseas;
- The importance or otherwise of collating numerous measures into a single output measure; and
- The main barriers to organisations collecting socio-economic background data in the future and what would make organisations more likely to adopt a socio-economic background measure.

1.6 Employers and other experts also highlighted the following areas as important in determining the final set of measures:

- How subjective/objective the measures should be; and
- The international nature of the UK workforce and therefore the relevance of measures to those brought up outside of the UK.

1.7 Finally, respondents to the online engagement exercise were asked:

- Do you believe that the collection of socio-economic background information would be beneficial to your organisation and the wider social mobility agenda?
- Would you be willing to publish anonymised data on the socio-economic background of your workforce, or to deposit your data in a secure database that academics and researchers could access?

Of those that responded to the engagement, around 90% agreed that it would be beneficial to their organisation and the wider social mobility agenda. In addition, around 80% agreed they would be willing to publish data on their workforce.

1.8 In the course of the engagement exercise we received 43 written responses and approximately 40 employers attended roundtable events to share their views. In selecting the 12 measures from the list of 26, we gave particular weight to a response to the engagement exercise, sent in on behalf of a group of economists and educational researchers (including academics from the University of Cambridge, University of Bath, UCL, and the University of Warwick) who had researched extensively the relationship between socio-economic background and a range of other social outcomes.

1.9 On the basis of the input received, we selected the 12 highest scoring measures for further testing. The shortlisted measures were:

- Whether the individual had spent time in care
- Whether they ever had refugee or asylum status
- Whether they were a registered as a carer as a child
- Type of secondary school attended
- Name of secondary school attended
- Whether their parent/ guardian/ carer had completed a degree
- The highest qualification of their parent/ guardian/ carer
- Their home postcode at age 14
- Whether they were eligible for free school meals
- The occupation of their parent/guardian/carer
- The tenure of accommodation they lived in as a child
- Self-assessment of their socio economic background

Pilot of 12 potential measures

1.10　In August and September 2016 we piloted a series of test questions for the 12 measures across the Senior Civil Service (SCS), with the aim of arriving at a set of three to five measures of socio-economic background. Approximately two thirds of Senior Civil Servants completed the survey - 2,896 staff, from 89 different Civil Service organisations. They were also asked

how difficult they found each question and how comfortable they felt responding to the survey. Other employers also piloted some of the measures or shared insights with us from the socio-economic background data they were already collecting.

1.11   In analysing the SCS pilot survey data, we took the following approach:

- We examined completion rates and the proportion of respondents who had difficulty with the question - including how willingness and ability to respond varied for each question - by assessing the number of 'prefer not to say' and 'don't know' responses and the number of people who skipped the question entirely;
- We tested the difficulty of data linking where relevant - for example linking home postcode with indices of deprivation - determining whether:
    - It is feasible for us to do so on a larger scale and consequently whether it would also be feasible for other employers; and
    - Whether it generates valuable insight that would justify the additional effort that collecting this data would entail.
- We conducted quantitative and qualitative analysis: including how measures vary by other characteristics; and an analysis of open text comments to the survey exercise.
- We used a statistical technique called factor analysis to ascertain whether questions could be grouped into themes and to understand the structural relationship between questions. This allowed us to determine which questions were most associated with each theme.

1.12   Key findings from the analysis of the pilot survey of Senior Civil Servants were:

- Response rates for individual questions were generally high – ranging from 85.7% for the question asking for home postcode at the age of age 14, to 99.3% for the question on whether a respondent lived in care prior to the age of 18.
- 82% of respondents had no difficulty answering any of the questions. Three caused difficulty for over 5% of respondents: self-assessed socio-economic background, parental occupation type and home postcode at age 14.
- Most respondents were comfortable providing responses to the survey, with 53% being 'completely comfortable' and 23% being 'quite comfortable'. Only 3% of respondents were 'very uncomfortable'. Reasons for feeling uncomfortable included feeling that the questions were intrusive, that they did not allow a comprehensive assessment of their personal circumstances, concerns regarding anonymity and privacy, and in a small number of cases a feeling that the questions were   judgmental.

1.13   The survey highlighted potential issues with some of the measures, some of which are highlighted below and set out in more detail at Annex A. These include:

- Changes in policy affect the usability of some measures over time. For example, around two thirds of the Senior Civil Servants who completed the survey attended school prior to 1980, when free school meals became a means tested entitlement, and therefore eligibility for free school means would not have been applicable as a measure of socio-economic background.
- Some measures will apply only to a very small proportion of people – notably questions relating to whether a person was in care as a child, has ever had refugee or asylum status, or was a registered carer prior to the age of 18.
- Analysis of the parental occupation measure suggests a relationship between this and age. It is hard to determine the extent to which this is driven by socio-economic changes in the wider population, or changes that are specific to the Senior Civil Service. This is indicative of the various complexities of understanding socio-economic trends over time and therefore the importance of ensuring that any measures withstand the test of time.

1.14   The pilot of the SCS found that, of those who responded (excluding "don't know", or "prefer not to say"):

- 59% of SCS had parents who were educated to below degree level, or who had no qualifications.
- 21% of SCS had parents with a "routine, manual or not working" occupation, whereas 66% had a "higher" occupation.
- 23% of SCS attended an independent secondary school, though 42% of these were on bursaries. Only 47% attended a non-selective state school.
- 12% of SCS said that they were eligible for Free School Meals, excluding those whose education finished before 1980 or who were educated overseas.
- 28% of SCS self-assessed as being from a lower socio-economic background.

More detail on the survey results is given in Annex A.

Chapter 2: Recommendations on measures

2.1 In order to arrive at our recommendations we have considered:

- Evidence from the engagement exercise;
- Evidence from the pilot survey of Senior Civil Servants;
- Analysis from other collection exercises that included socio-economic data over the last few years in the Civil Service;
- Insight shared by other organisations that have undertaken similar pilots and/or were undertaking related studies into how best to measure socio-economic background; and
- Responses from partner employers and experts to our thinking - based on analysis of the pilot survey results - on a potential list of final measures.

2.2 We recommend that employers use the following four measures to examine the socio-economic diversity of their workforces:

- The occupation of an individual's parent/guardian/carer, using the four questions making up the Office for National Statistics' National Statistics Socio-economic classification (NS-SEC)[2].
- The highest qualification of their parent/ guardian/ carer
- Type of secondary school the individual attended
- Whether they were eligible for free school meals, if a large enough proportion of staff were at school after 1980.

    Recommended wording is given in Chapter 4.

2.3 Partner employers agree that these are the best measures for use by employers. There is consensus that parental occupation and highest qualification of the individual's parent/guardian/carer are the strongest measures. A high proportion of employers also consider that the type of secondary school an individual attended and their eligibility for free school meals are strong measures, as they are easy to understand, receive good response rates, and provide historical trends to enable them to assess the impact of their social mobility strategies.

2.4 Details on the rationale behind the inclusion of each measure, along with the rationale for not including other measures, is set out at Annex A.

---

[2] www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/methodologies/standardoccupationalclassificationsoc2000and nsseconthelabourforcesurvey

Using additional measures

2.5 In the Civil Service we will also use a measure of self-assessed socio-economic background, asking: "Compared to people in general, would you describe yourself as coming from a lower socio-economic background?" We are not recommending this as an indicator that should be commonly used by employers as there is less support from it from other employers and experts. While some employers feel this measure it too subjective, outcomes of our pilot survey of the SCS and discussions with departments show that this is a measure which Civil Servants want to use.

Chapter 3: How we will collect and use the data in the Civil Service

3.1 In the Civil Service Diversity and Inclusion Strategy, which we published in October 2017, we committed to beginning the roll-out of new socio-economic background measures using HR systems in 2018.

3.2 This collection will complement data on socio-economic background that is already collected by the Civil Service Executive Recruitment service and for our centrally run accelerated development schemes, the Fast Stream and apprenticeship schemes. This includes parental occupation, parental qualification, type of school attended and eligibility for free school meals measures.

3.3 In addition, during 2018, we will use a survey to create a Civil Service-wide baseline for socio-economic background. In line with our approach to other personal characteristics, we will build the new measures into our recruitment gateways and, if possible, our annual People Survey. Provision of information on socio-economic background will be voluntary; the data will only be used anonymously, at an aggregate level, so that individuals' responses to the questions cannot be identified. The data will never form the basis of any individual recruitment decisions.

3.4 Having the data means that we are able to respond to evidence to ensure we widen our reach and attract Civil Servants from a broader social background. Case study one shows how we are using data to increase socio-economic diversity in the Fast Stream.

Case study 1: The benefits of a data-driven approach - Civil Service Fast Stream social mobility research

In the Civil Service, socio-economic diversity data are already collected within our centrally run accelerated development schemes, Fast Stream and apprenticeship schemes. For the Fast Stream itself, the data from 2015 painted a stark picture, with only 4% of entrants from the routine/manual background; and only 9% reporting they were eligible for free school meals. The data showed that we needed to do more to reach out to a wider pool of talent to ensure that the Fast Stream is more reflective of society as a whole. We have implemented recommendations of an independent report by the Bridge Group and:

- increased our outreach into a broader range of universities to recruit from the widest pool of talent;
- streamlined and shortened the application process;
- opened an additional assessment centre in Newcastle; and
- provided an offer for people on the Summer Diversity Internship Programmes to be fast passed to the final stage of the fast stream assessment process on the basis of good performance on the internship.

The data driven interventions have significantly increased the socio-economic diversity of the Fast Stream programme, with double the proportion of entrants in 2017, compared to 2016, coming from lower socio-economic background, based on the parental occupation metric.

Chapter 4: Guidance for employers

Collecting data: wider considerations

4.1 Discussions with and input from employers and other experts during the engagement exercise demonstrated that following points should be considered when introducing and collecting any measures of socio-economic background:

- The need to ensure that description of measures aren't overly arduous, but equally are not open to interpretation;
- The importance of effective communications, including use of individual role models willing to talk about their personal career journeys;
- The need for sufficient time to introduce data collection mechanisms; and
- The need to ensure, and make clear to employees that:
  - Data are collected on a voluntary basis;
  - Data are analysed at an aggregate level, so individuals' responses cannot be identified;
  - Data derived from the measures do not influence individual recruitment and promotion decisions - these should always be on merit.

Encouraging high workforce engagement and response rates

4.2 Employers will wish to take their own view on the best channels and processes for collecting the data, depending on the nature and size of their business. However, from our experience of conducting the pilot survey of Senior Civil Servants and a further survey conducted by HMRC on a wider sample of their workforce, we have identified some good practices which employers could adopt which will help to ensure positive outcomes. These fall into the following categories:

- Effective communication with staff, before, during and after any data collection exercise, including engagement with staff networks and trade unions (as relevant);
- Messaging to include a clear articulation of how the data will be used and benefit the organisation going forward; assurances on data security and anonymity; and
- Senior leader buy-in.

4.3 Case study two is from HMRC, who carried out a socio-economic background survey of 12,000 randomly selected staff, with positive results, both in terms of the percentage of people responding and the quality of the engagement from staff, which was achieved by promoting a good understanding of the rationale for collecting the data.

Case study 2: Success factors for data collection - HMRC Social mobility survey case study

We want to ensure all staff can realise their full potential by creating an inclusive workplace, where encouraging social mobility is part of everything we do. A key starting point was to establish a baseline of our employees' socio-economic background.

We set up a social mobility working group, headed by one of our Executive Committee (ExCom) members, to progress the social mobility agenda. The group commissioned the staff survey using a number of the measures used in the 2016 pilot survey of senior civil servants, plus some questions of specific interest to HMRC. We aimed for a representative sample of all staff and different grades within HMRC. In order to get a statistically reliable final set of results, we planned for a potential response rate of 35% and issued the survey questionnaire to around 12,000 staff, with a three week period for completion.

Success Factors

We felt It was essential to explain to staff why this was important and how we were going to use the results, as part of the overall social mobility programme. We worked closely with businesses leads, unions and senior leaders to ensure that we had their agreement and support to issue the survey. We also staggered the issuing of the survey to avoid hitting peak work times.

Key communication messages were issued to all managers and a news article was added to the intranet, to ensure maximum publicity for the survey. Our ExCom member penned an invitation to issue to all sampled staff, personalising the request to complete the survey.

We provided assurances to staff that their responses would be completely anonymous and requested that they did not identify people or teams within any free text responses. Once the survey was completed, the data were stored in a restricted folder, which could only be accessed by the analysts working on this.

Results and Next Steps

We achieved a response rate of 42%, well above our original aim. The survey findings have been shared with staff on the intranet, along with personal social mobility stories of members of staff. The results and personal stories inspired a lot of conversations and led to a rise in staff volunteering to become members of staff networks promoting progress on social mobility and inclusion within HMRC.

We are keeping the discussions going through focus groups looking at what staff see as the enablers of and barriers to social mobility in the workplace. We are now looking to collect data, using the agreed measures, in our diversity data collection from new recruits to see if we are attracting people from all   backgrounds

Guidance on questions to use in relation to the recommended measures

4.4 The questions used in our pilot survey for each of the recommended measures proved effective, and our recommendation is that other employers adopt the same questions, as set out below. Also set out below is a refined question on self-assessed socio-economic background, which we intend to use in the Civil Service, in addition to the other four measures.

TYPE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED

1. What type of school did you mainly attend between the ages of 11 and 16?
- State-run or state-funded school - selective on academic, faith or other grounds
- State-run or state-funded school - non-selective
- Independent or fee-paying school - bursary
- Independent or fee-paying school - no bursary
- Attended school outside the UK
- Don't know
- Prefer not to say
- Other (please specify):

PARENTAL QUALIFICATION

2. What is the highest level of qualifications achieved by either of your parent(s) or guardian(s) by the time you were 18?
- At least one has a degree level qualification
- Qualifications below degree level
- No formal qualifications
- Don't know
- Not applicable
- Prefer not to say
- Other (please specify):

PARENTAL OCCUPATION

3a. Thinking back to when you were aged about 14, which best describes the sort of work the main/ highest income earner in your household did in their main job?
- Modern professional occupations such as: teacher/lecturer, nurse, physiotherapist, social worker, welfare officer, artist, musician, police officer (sergeant or above), software designer
- Clerical and intermediate occupations such as: secretary, personal assistant, clerical worker, office clerk, call centre agent, nursing auxiliary, nursery nurse
- Senior managers and administrators usually responsible for planning, organising and co-ordinating work and for finance such as: finance manager, chief executive
- Technical and craft occupations such as: motor mechanic, fitter, inspector, plumber, printer, tool maker, electrician, gardener, train driver
- Semi-routine manual and service occupations such as: postal worker, machine operative, security guard, caretaker, farm worker, catering assistant, receptionist, sales assistant
- Routine manual and service occupations such as: HGV driver, van driver, cleaner, porter, packer, sewing machinist, messenger, labourer, waiter / waitress, bar staff
- Middle or junior managers such as: office manager, retail manager, bank manager, restaurant manager, warehouse manager, publican
- Traditional professional occupations such as: accountant, solicitor, medical practitioner, scientist, civil/mechanical engineer
- Long term unemployed (claimed Jobseeker's Allowance or earlier unemployment benefit for more than a year)
- Retired
- Not applicable
- Don't know
- Prefer not to say

3b.Thinking back to when you were aged about 14, did the main/highest income earner in your household work as an employee or self-employed?
- Employee
- Self-employed with employees
- Self-employed/freelancer without employees
- Not working

- Don't know
- Not applicable
- Prefer not to say

3c. If the highest income earner in your household was employed when you were aged 14, how many people worked for their employer? If they were self-employed and employed other people, how many people did they employ?
- 1-24
- 25 or more
- Don't know
- Not applicable
- Prefer not to say

3d. If the highest income earner in your household was employed when you were aged 14, did they supervise any other employees? A supervisor is responsible for overseeing the work of other employees on a day-to-day basis.
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Not applicable
- Prefer not to say

FREE SCHOOL MEALS

4. If you finished school after 1980, were you eligible for Free School Meals at any point during your school years? Free School Meals are a statutory benefit available to school-aged children from families who receive other qualifying benefits and who have been through the relevant registration process. It does not include those who receive meals at school through other means (e.g. boarding school).
- Yes
- No
- Not applicable (finished school before 1980 or went to school overseas)
- Don't know
- Prefer not to say

SELF-ASSESSMENT OF SEB STATUS

5. Compared to people in general, would you describe yourself as coming from a lower socio-economic background?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Prefer not to say

Analysis of the measures

4.5 The Office for National Statistics' guidance on the derivation of NS-SEC from the four questions on parental occupation is available here. We recommend that responses to the five measures are analysed separately, rather than a composite measures being used. Further details on issues that may arise when analysing the measures are available in the annex.