Video 5:

Now I want to talk a little bit about data analysis using the short set of questions. We need data so that we can measure disability prevalence rates. We want to make comparisons, not only between countries (which is what the WG is interested in), but within a country – it’s important to be able to know disability prevalence by gender, by age, by different cultural groups. So you’re able to do that but you need good data to do that. I’ve talked a lot about the disability continuum – that there’s no real set cut off on disability, there’s no gold standard – that’s why we have these questions. What the WG questions allow is the creation of several different cut offs. You can look at moderate and severe disability if you look at only those people who answered that they have ‘a lot of difficulty’ or ‘cannot do at all’ to any of those 6 questions. By including people who have ‘some difficulty’ in that group, you’re including people who have lesser disability – mild forms of disability – you can create any number of different cut offs based on the answer categories – that’s important depending on what your purpose is. Our purpose is to generate comparable data around the world so we recommend a standard and that standard is anybody who says ‘a lot of difficulty’ or ‘cannot do at all’ to any of those 6 questions. The world report on disability mentions that the prevalence rate of disability internationally is about 15%. Without going into how they came up with that number, what we’re finding is when we’re analysing data that’s coming in now is that were able to replicate that within a certain limit of reliability depending on what the cut off is. If we look at data from the USA or from Zambia (where we have information) when we include people who have milder forms of disability were approaching 15%. We find that at more severe levels it’s more like 8-10% - that’s what we’re finding. But it’s important to remember that we can look at different levels of severity, composite for those 6 domains of functioning and we can also look at individual domains of functioning. If you were interested in sensory difficulties you could look at just vision and hearing; if you were interested in mobility difficulties you could look at that question and capture information in the population of those people who have that difficulty. One of the things that we’ve found is that it’s important to look at disability not only in the population but in sub-groups of the population - by age group, by gender, by culture diversity. We talked a little bit earlier about how people identify as disabled - If you go to an elderly person and ask them if they have a disability they may say no - they don’t have a disability really they’re just getting old - but if you ask them if they have difficulty walking they may say yes. They don’t equate the difficulty doing something that’s natural to them as necessarily having a disability – it’s important to capture those concepts in these questions. So we’re looking at functional activities where not looking at impairment - you have to remember that. We’re not identifying diagnoses or conditions but general levels of functioning. I can’t tell you at the end of the data collection how many people have rheumatoid arthritis or cerebral palsy or anything like that but I can tell you levels of functioning in the population that may be the result of those conditions. So what were able to do with these questions is we can disaggregate on levels of functioning but not on impairments. We can’t look at specific impairments and make a disaggregation; we can look at different levels of functioning, we can look at different levels of severity and disaggregate that way. So the population can be divided into those with moderate and severe difficulties compared to those who have less than that, or people who any kind of difficulty including those with some difficulty compared to those with less than that. We can create those kinds of dichotomies based on levels of functioning. The other important disaggregation is looking at outcomes – that’s what’s really important when looking at the UN CRPD or these post-2015 SGDs. And in that case what we want to look at are different outcomes like employment or education. And the same way you want to know do boys and girls have the same access to education, do younger and older people have the same access to employment, we want to know do people with disabilities have the same access to those activities –employment and education – as people without disabilities. By creating these dichotomies – these different groups based on functioning – we can look at outcomes. And meet the goals of the UN Convention and the SGDs – those targets and indicators by disability status.