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www.equalityhumanrights.com/britain-fairer
‘Is England Fairer?’ is a tool to support local decision-makers to identify the significant inequalities in their areas and act to tackle them. The report follows on from ‘Is Britain Fairer? 2018’, our comprehensive review of how we, as a nation, are performing on equality and human rights.
The context in Britain is one of increasing devolution of responsibility for laws, policy and service delivery at the national, regional and local level. This devolution reflects the need to respond to differing situations and experiences across Britain. In ‘Is England Fairer?’, we examine differences in outcomes in four areas of life involving England-specific laws, policies and delivery mechanisms: education, health, work and living standards. Significant inequalities and disadvantages exist across England for people with certain protected characteristics in each of the domains we examine.

The inequalities faced by groups sharing some protected characteristics are replicated across many English regions. The differences between regions are summarised in the chapter titled ‘Regional Summary’. Overall, the most positive picture emerged in the South East region, where people with certain protected characteristics experience fewer negative outcomes and smaller disparities when compared with other groups than they did in other regions. On many measures, the regions with worse outcomes for people with certain protected characteristics were the North West, North East, and West Midlands.

Public bodies across England have responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to identify the action they could take to proactively advance equality, including by setting organisational equality objectives. In meeting their PSED, public bodies should use the evidence provided in this report to identify the inequalities facing the people affected by their functions, set equality objectives to tackle these inequalities and act to deliver improvements for their local populations.

1 Available at: https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/britain-fairer

2 The Equality Act 2010 prohibits discrimination against someone because of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation. These are called protected characteristics.
Education

- London and the South East had the highest attainment rates in English and Mathematics at school-leaving age. The North East had the lowest rate, despite having better attainment rates at Foundation Stage than several other regions.

- At primary and secondary school, some ethnic minority groups had lower attainment rates than others, and this was particularly acute for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children. Children with special educational needs (SEN) had significantly lower attainment than children without SEN. At early years foundation stage and at secondary school, boys had a lower rate of attainment than girls.

- Exclusions were particularly prevalent among certain groups: boys, children with special educational needs, and certain ethnic minority groups, such as Mixed, Black, and rates were highest for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller groups.

- Disabled people aged 16 to 18 were more likely not to be in education, employment or training than non-disabled people of the same age. This pattern was replicated in half of the regions.

- Disabled people were less likely than non-disabled people to hold degree-level qualifications. Ethnic minorities were more likely than White British people to hold a degree and to engage in learning activities later in life.

Health

- London and the South had the lowest rate of meeting waiting time targets for healthcare across England. The highest rate was in the North of England.

- Across England, fewer disabled people reported good health than non-disabled people.

- Across England, fewer women reported good health than men, although the gap between the rates for women and men were not statistically significant in any region apart from the East Midlands.

- Children from Asian and other ethnic minority groups reported good health less frequently than White British groups.

- Women, disabled people, lesbian, gay and bisexual people, and people reporting other sexual orientations were more likely to report poor mental health than (respectively) men, non-disabled people, heterosexual people, or than for the national average.
Living standards

- Ethnic minorities had high rates of poverty in the North West and North East.
- Certain ethnic minority groups (Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Black African, in particular) were more likely to live in poverty. Among these groups, half of children were living in poverty, as were half of White Irish, Chinese and other ethnicity children.
- Half of disabled people in the North East experienced severe material deprivation.
- Ethnic minorities were more likely to live in overcrowded accommodation than White households, and Black households were less likely to report that they were satisfied with their housing than White households.
- Disabled people were more likely to live in poverty and experience severe material deprivation than non-disabled people. People with mental health and behavioural or social impairments were consistently more likely to experience poverty than non-disabled people.

Work

- Employment rates were lowest in the North East.
- Women had lower rates of employment and lower median hourly earnings than men.
- Disabled people were significantly less likely to be employed, had lower earnings and were less likely to be in high-pay occupations than non-disabled people.
- Those regions with the lowest overall earnings had narrower pay gaps between disabled and non-disabled people and between men and women.
- Some ethnic minorities, particularly Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups, were less likely to be employed, more likely to be unemployed, and more likely to be in insecure employment. These groups had lower average earnings than White British groups and were less likely to be in high-pay occupations. In the South East, there were no significant differences between these rates for different ethnic groups.
- Across many regions, Muslims were less likely to be employed and more likely to be in insecure employment.
In October 2018, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) reported on the extent to which equality and human rights had improved for the whole of Britain since 2015, alongside reports for the devolved nations of Wales and Scotland.³
We recognise that many of the disparities and negative outcomes identified in our ‘Is Britain Fairer?’ report 2018, vary across regions and areas in England, and can be dependent on characteristics of the population, economy and history in those areas. Decision-makers at local levels are therefore instrumental in changing disparities and negative outcomes, and local decision-makers and public bodies must be fully informed and committed to tackling problems. ‘Is England Fairer?’ is a tool to support local decision-makers in identifying the significant inequalities in their areas, enabling them to develop plans to tackle them.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) places the duty on public bodies to set equality objectives to tackle discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and promote good relations. This report brings together the findings on the significant inequalities specific to England that public bodies in all areas should consider using as the basis of equality objectives. Wherever possible, we have provided a breakdown of statistical measures to draw out where regional differences are located to demonstrate how the picture in England can be applied regionally to inform public bodies of the issues that are pronounced in their area.

Local public authorities will have extensive and up-to-date data and information on their areas. Public bodies should use that data and information in conjunction with this report to identify the inequalities facing people who are affected by their functions, set equality objectives to tackle those inequalities and act to deliver improvements for their local populations. This report is a starting point for public bodies to set equality objectives and begin to tackle the disparities that exist in their areas.

How we reviewed the evidence

The evidence in this review is based on our Measurement Framework, which measures and monitors progress on equality and human rights across Britain in a systematic and consistent way. This analysis is achieved through a focus on specific domains representing the major areas of life which ensure individuals can access opportunities for a healthy and fulfilling life.

Due to the devolved nature of authorities within Britain, we have reported on four of the six domains which have England-specific policies, laws and responsibilities. We have identified key inequalities within the domains of education, health and living standards. We also include a chapter on work, which has a direct relationship with the economic underpinning of findings regarding living standards. Our analyses of justice and participation do not provide regional breakdowns, so the findings for Britain within ‘Is Britain Fairer?’ are relevant for identifying equality objectives in England. Within each domain, we analysed outcomes experienced by people to identify the inequalities prevalent in England. This analysis has mainly been performed using our own secondary statistical analysis of datasets, such as household surveys and administrative data (collected by government agencies such as schools and hospitals), but we have also included some desk-based research into existing published sources where there are gaps in the data relevant to our Measurement Framework.

---

We compared data from 2010/11, 2013/14 and 2016/17 when this was possible. Where data from some of the measures was not available for these years we used the latest data, with similar three-year gaps for consistency. We have only reported on statistically significant differences. For some measures, particularly at the level of regions, sample size breakdowns can be low or data unavailable for some protected characteristics or ‘at-risk’ groups, which has limited what we have been able to comment on. For some subsections (for example, school exclusions) we have no regional breakdown, so we have provided the England-level picture. The full data tables of our own analysis are available on the website.4

We recognise that source data and research may use terms referring to protected characteristics in slightly different ways. Protected characteristics are described consistently in this report unless a source uses a slightly different term, in which case we have replicated the term used in the source to avoid misrepresenting the findings. Similarly, we have retained source terminology relating to the medical model of disability, although the Commission uses the social model. A full explanation of our methodology is provided in the Appendix to ‘Is Britain Fairer?’.

---

1. Education

The pupil premium is slowly closing the attainment gap between poorer children and their peers, but the gap remains large (Education Policy Institute, 2016).
Despite additional support provided to children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), the attainment gap between children with and without SEND remains very large.

Unlike Scotland and Wales, there has not been progress in England to enable children to make a legal challenge against decisions made by education authorities regarding support needs and school exclusion. Children in need of SEND support are particularly at risk of formal and informal exclusion in mainstream secondary schools. Some parents of children with SEND have complained of unlawful exclusions (Ofsted, Care Quality Commission, 2017).

The UK Government has been urged to do more in England to support young people following their completion of compulsory schooling, with the goal of reducing the number of those aged 16 to 18 who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) to zero by 2022 (Social Mobility Commission, 2016).

Many people in England lack the skills required to succeed in the labour market. Older and low-skilled workers are at particular risk of disengagement from training and lifelong learning (HM Government, 2017).

In 2015, the UK Government has set a target of doubling the proportion of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds going to university by 2020 and increasing the proportion of students from ethnic minorities by 20% (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2015).

1.1 Educational attainment of children and young people

1.1.1 Early years education

England overview

In 2016/17, 70.7% of children achieved a ‘good level of development’ at age five, the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage (Table EDU. EAT.1). Figure 1 shows the percentage of children from main ethnic groups who achieved this level. While some ethnic groups had higher attainment than others, Gypsy and Irish Traveller children had particularly low attainment.

![Figure 1: Percentage of children by ethnic group who achieved a ‘good level of development’ at age five in 2016/17](image_url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy, Roma and Irish Traveller</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of other ethnicities</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All children</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Girls were more likely to have achieved a good level of development than boys (77.7% compared with 64.0%). Children with special educational needs (SEN) were much less likely to have achieved a good level of development than children with no SEN (23.4% compared with 75.9%). The increase in the proportion of children with SEN who achieved a good level of education since 2013/14 was smaller than the increase in proportion of children with no SEN (4.9 percentage points compared with 10.3 percentage points). Children eligible for free school meals (FSM) were less likely than their non-FSM peers to achieve this level of education (56.0% compared with 73.0%).

Regional findings

In 2016/17, the South East and London were the two regions with the highest proportion of five-year-olds who achieved a good level of education (74.0% and 73.0% respectively). The North West was the lowest achieving region (67.9%). The West Midlands (68.6%), Yorkshire and Humberside (68.8%) and the East Midlands (68.9%) all performed slightly below the national average of 70.7%.

The North East made the most progress in the period 2013/14 to 2016/17. The percentage of children who reached a good level of development climbed by 14.9 percentage points, from 55.8% to 70.7%, compared with an improvement of 10.3 percentage points for England as a whole. The East Midlands also saw progress, improving by 11.1 percentage points over the period. The South West saw the slowest improvement, of 8.1 percentage points, from 62.4% to 70.5%.

1.1.2 Attainment at school-leaving age

England overview

Overall, 63.9% of pupils in state-funded schools attained grades 9–4 in English and Mathematics at the end of Key Stage 4 in 2016/17 (Table EDU.EAT.2). This represents a small increase from 63.0% achieving A*–C grades in 2015/16, although there was also a change to ‘reformed’ GCSEs in 2016/17. On average, girls continue to attain higher grades than boys at school. In 2016/17, 67.6% of girls and 60.3% of boys attained grades 9–4 in English and Mathematics GCSE.

The difference in attainment of grades 9–4 was very large between pupils with special education needs (SEN) and those without SEN (25.0% compared with 70.4%). Among children with SEN, performance varied considerably depending on the type and severity of their disability:

- Those with a hearing impairment and those with a visual impairment performed relatively highly, with 46% and 48.9% respectively of those groups attaining the threshold of grades 9–4.
- Of children with physical disabilities, 38.6% attained the threshold.
- Of children with an autistic spectrum disorder, 32.5% attained the threshold.
- Of those with a moderate learning difficulty, only 11.5% reached the threshold.
In 2016/17, educational attainment differed across socio-economic statuses. Children eligible for free school meals (FSM) performed well below their non-FSM peers (40.3% compared with 67.4% attained the threshold). Less than half (48%) of pupils from the most deprived 10% of areas achieved grades 9–4 in English and Mathematics compared with over three quarters (81.6%) of pupils in the least deprived 10% of areas.

Very poor outcomes occurred for children with SEN and eligibility for FSM. Only 12.7% of boys with SEN who were also eligible for FSM achieved grades 9–4 in English and Mathematics. Only a slightly higher proportion of girls in this category (15.1%) achieved the same threshold.

Figure 2 below highlights the differences in attainment by ethnic group.

Children in the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller ethnic group had the lowest level of attainment, with only 11.8% attaining grades 9–4 in English and Mathematics. Chinese, Indian, White Irish and Bangladeshi pupils had higher attainment levels than their White British Peers.

Notable differences in attainment are evident when both sex and ethnicity are examined. For example, only 55.3% of Black boys, but 64.2% of Black girls, achieved grades 9–4. Similar differences between the percentage of boys and girls attaining grades 9–4 are evident in the other White group (56.9% compared with 65.4%), the other ethnic group (64.8 compared with 72.8%) and Chinese group (80.6% compared with 88.3%). There was very little difference in the attainment level of boys and girls within the Gypsy, Roma and Irish Traveller group; both had a very low level of attaining grades 9–4 (10.7% and 13% respectively).

Regional findings

As with attainment at Early Years Foundation Stage, London and the South East had the highest rates of attainment in English and Mathematics at school-leaving age (68.6% and 66.4% respectively). The East of England also had a high rate (65.4%). The West Midlands and Yorkshire and Humberside regions had lower rates (61.2% and 62.1%). The North East was the lowest achieving region (60.2%), which contrasts with the region’s improved position at Early Years Foundation Stage.

Due to changes in secondary school grade systems, comparisons with previous years are not possible.
1.2 School exclusions and NEET

1.2.1 Exclusions from school

England overview

The overall exclusion rate has risen. The rate of pupils receiving one or more fixed-period exclusion declined from 24.2 per 1,000 in 2009/10 to 19.2 per 1,000 in 2012/13, but then increased to 21.1 per 1,000 in 2015/16 (Table EDU.EBN.1).

In 2015/16, there were considerable differences in the exclusion rate of different groups:

- Boys were approximately three times as likely as girls (30.1 compared with 11.7 per 1,000) to be excluded from school.

- The exclusion rate of children eligible for FSM was three times that of non-FSM children (49.4 compared with 16.4 per 1,000).

- Between 2009/10 and 2015/16, the exclusion rate for pupils with SEN declined by 5.5 pupils per 1,000 (from 65.6 to 60.0), but the rate remains much higher than the average.

- Certain ethnicities were far more likely to be excluded from school than others, with Gypsy/Roma and Travellers of Irish heritage being the two groups with the most exclusions per 1,000 pupils (as Figure 3 shows).

By sex and ethnicity, exclusion rates were highest for Gypsy/Roma boys (120.4 per 1,000) and Traveller of Irish heritage boys (115.0 per 1,000), followed by Gypsy/Roma girls (54.8 per 1,000) and Black boys (52.7 per 1,000).

Exclusion rates were lowest for Chinese girls (1.3 per 1,000), followed by Indian girls (2.8 per 1,000). Figure 3 (right) highlights the difference in exclusion rates by ethnic group.
1.2.2 NEET (not in education, employment or training)

England overview

In 2016/17, 8.1% of young people aged 16 to 18 were not in education, employment or training (NEET) (Table EDU.EBN.2).

Based on 2016/17 data, men were more likely to be NEET than women (9.1% compared with 7.0%). Disabled people were twice as likely as non-disabled people to be NEET (16.4% compared with 7.0%). Indian people were less likely to be NEET than White British people (4.4% compared with 8.2%). People with no religion were more likely to be NEET than Christians and people from religious minorities (9.5% compared with 7.2% and 6.8% respectively).

Between 2010/11 and 2016/17 the overall NEET rate fell from 10.5% to 8.1%. However, the rate declined more rapidly for some groups than others. The NEET rate for non-disabled people declined by 3.0 percentage points but for disabled people did not change. There was also a large drop of 12.3 percentage points in the NEET rate for Pakistani people, whereas for other ethnic groups the changes were not statistically significant. The change in men and women’s NEET rate was fairly similar (a decline of 2.5 and 2.3 percentage points respectively).

Regional findings

The West Midlands had one of the highest NEET rates, along with the North East (10.3% and 10.1%). The South East and the South West had the lowest NEET rates of all the regions (6.3% and 6.6%).

In the period from 2010/11 to 2016/17, the North West’s NEET rate fell considerably – by five percentage points, from 12.2% to 7.2%. London’s rate dropped by 3.3 percentage points, to 7.7%, and the NEET rate in the South East fell by 2.6 percentages points, to 6.3%.

Overall, men were more likely than women to be NEET, but a statistically significant difference was only evident in the North West. There was no difference in the NEET rate between all ethnic minorities in England as a whole and young White British people. In the North West, people from ethnic minorities were less likely than White British people to be NEET.

As we have noted, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be NEET in England. The disparity was particularly large in the East Midlands (28.1% of disabled people were NEET compared with 7.3% of non-disabled people), Yorkshire and Humberside (21.6% compared with 7.3%), the West Midlands (29.9% compared with 8.5%) and the East of England (18.5% compared with 6.4%).
1.3 Higher education and lifelong learning

1.3.1 Higher education

England overview

In 2016/17, 33.0% of people aged 25 to 64 in England had a degree-level qualification, which represented an increase from 29.6% in 2013/14 (Table EDU.HLL.1). This rate was higher than in Scotland and Wales (30.9% and 28.2%). Of disabled people, 20.1% had a degree-level qualification, compared with 36.1% of non-disabled people. People from ethnic minorities were more likely to have a degree than White British people. In particular, Chinese people and Indian people were considerably more likely to hold degree-level qualifications than White British people (61.5% and 53.5% compared with 30.0%). Overall, women were slightly more likely than men to have a degree (33.6% compared with 32.3%).

Regional findings

London had the highest proportion of people with a degree by a large margin (49.7%). The South East also had a higher proportion than most other regions (36%). Yorkshire and Humber, the West Midlands, the North East and the East Midlands all had low proportions of people with degrees (26.0%, 25.6%, 25.3% and 25.0%).

The North East and London saw large increases in the proportion of people with degrees in the period from 2013/14 to 2016/17 (4.7 and 4.6 percentage points respectively).

1.3.2 Lifelong learning

England overview

In 2016/17, 28.4% of adults in England aged 16 to 64 had attended an education course or job-related training (described here as ‘lifelong learning’) in the previous three months, which represented a slight drop in the rate of 2010/11 (29.8%) (Table EDU.HLL.2). The rate in England was higher than in Scotland (27.4%) but lower than in Wales (30.4%). Non-disabled people were more likely than disabled people to have engaged in learning activities (30.2% compared with 20.3%). Those from ethnic minorities were generally more likely than White British people to have participated in learning activities (31.1%, including White minorities, compared with 27.5%). Chinese people, those of Mixed ethnicity and Black people had the highest levels of engagement in learning activities (41.2%, 40.7% and 38.1%). Pakistani people were less likely to have done so than White British people (24.7% compared with 27.5%).

Regional findings

People were most likely to have engaged in lifelong learning in the South West, followed by London (31.8% and 30.5%). The North East and the West Midlands had the lowest proportions of adults engaging in learning activities (24.7% and 24.4%). The East Midlands, North West, and Yorkshire and Humberside were in the middle (27.5%, 27.7% and 28.8%).

Most regions saw a fall in engagement from 2013/14 to 2016/17; most notably the North East, which saw a decline of 4.2 percentage points. The East Midlands, West Midlands, East of England and London saw drops of 2.3 to 2.7 percentage points. The South West, however, saw an increase in engagement of 1.5 percentage point.
Across England, the time between referral and treatment has increased. When combined with workforce shortages, this increase has had consequences for the quality of and timely access to health services.
Much of the responsibility for public health and inequalities has been transferred from the NHS to local authorities and Public Health England to ensure health matters are considered in all relevant policies. However, performance still varies between local authorities and there is still poor access to data and information (House of Commons Health Committee, 2016).

Investment in mental health services in England has continued to grow (NHS England, 2018). Funding for mental health is not ring-fenced in England, which has raised concerns that the money is being diverted to fund other services, thereby affecting proper provision of mental health services (see X (A Child) (No 3) 2017 EWRC 2036 (Fam); Public Accounts Committee, 2016; Kings Fund, 2015; NHS Providers, 2016).

2.1 Access to health

2.1.1 Waiting and referral times

England overview

In March 2017, nearly one in ten people (9.7%) who were waiting for health services in England had waited for more than 18 weeks (Table HLT. ACH.1). This rate was higher in 2011 at 10.6%, but lower in 2014 at 6.3%.

Regional findings

The rates of waiting times over 18 weeks were highest in the commissioning region of London, followed by the South (10.8% and 10.1%). Both of these rates were higher than the waiting time rates across England as a whole. The Midlands and Eastern Region performed in line with the England average (9.7%), while the lowest rate was for the commissioning region of the North of England (8.5%).
2.1.2 Access issues for at-risk groups

England overview

Most people with learning disabilities have poorer physical and mental health than the rest of the population, but their access to appropriate healthcare is often limited. Only an estimated 23% of people who have a learning disability in England are registered with their GP as having a learning disability (National Audit Office, 2017). The percentage of these patients receiving an annual learning disability health check had increased from 43% in 2014/15 to 50% in 2016/17 (NHS Digital, 2017). However, the quality or content of health checks is not analysed, so there is no way to measure their success (National Audit Office, 2017).

Homeless people in England face particular difficulties registering with a GP. Compared to 98% of the population in England who are registered with a GP, only 83.3% of single homeless people in accommodation, 89.0% of hidden homeless people, and 65.5% of rough sleepers were registered with a GP. The source study focus on people in contact with services; in reality, the number of homeless people not registered with a GP could be much higher (Elwell-Sutton et al., 2017).

There is very little available data on the experience and health outcomes of Gypsies, Roma and Travellers. These groups face numerous barriers in accessing health services in England, particularly across primary care. Barriers include not being able to register with a GP, which requires proof of identity and address; poor literacy skills; fear of discrimination; and over-reliance on Accident and Emergency services (Inclusion Health Board, 2016).

Evidence of the experience and health outcomes for differing migrant groups is also limited to small qualitative studies in England. These show that perceptions of health services can be negatively influenced by poor experiences with GPs, which is often migrants’ first experience with healthcare (University of Birmingham, 2016).

Confusion over entitlement to healthcare is experienced by those seeking asylum, those refused asylum and service providers as a result of poor understanding and misapplication of guidelines in England (both of which have a wider impact not confined just to England). Fear of detention or removal as a consequence of accessing health services led people to delay or avoid getting treatment (EHRC, 2018).

---

5 The Annual Health Check scheme is for adults and young people aged 14 or above with learning disabilities who need additional health support and may otherwise have health conditions that go undetected.

6 Hidden homeless people, such as those staying with family members or friends, living in squats or other insecure accommodation, are not evidenced in official figures.
2.2 Health outcomes

2.2.1 People’s current health status

England overview

In 2015, 75.8% of adults in England reported good health; that number declined as age increased from ages 16 to 24 to ages 75 and over (Table HLT.OCM.1A). Fewer women in England reported good health than men (74.6% compared with 77.1%). Significantly fewer disabled people reported good health than non-disabled people (32.8% compared with 88.8%). Those in higher managerial roles reported good health more frequently than those who had never worked or were long-term unemployed (87.7% compared with 63.3%).

Between 2010 and 2015, there was an increase in the percentage reporting good health of older people aged 70 to 74 and younger people aged 20 to 24 (7.8 and 8.4 percentage points respectively). Between 2013 and 2015, the percentage of people with social or behavioural impairments of all ages reporting good health increased by 12.7 percentage points.

In 2015, 94.4% of children in England (Table HLT.OCM.1C) reported their health as good, with no significant difference between boys and girls or across age groups. Disabled children reported good health less frequently than non-disabled children (65.0% compared with 96.9%). This discrepancy was most prominent for those with mobility or stamina impairments (51.9% and 50.7% respectively). Children from Asian or other ethnic backgrounds reported good health less frequently than White children (91.8% and 92.7% respectively compared with 95.3%).

Regional findings

The West Midlands and the North East had significantly lower rates of people reporting good health than most other regions. The West Midlands and South West saw decreases in the number of people reporting good health between 2013 and 2015, with the West Midlands seeing significant a decrease since 2010.

The difference between the rate for men and women was significant in the East Midlands, where fewer women reported good health than men (73.7% compared with 80.1%). In other regions there was no significant difference between the rates for men and women.

Significantly fewer disabled people reported good health in the West Midlands than the South East. Between 2010 and 2015, the rate of disabled people reporting good health in the West Midlands dropped significantly (by 11.5 percentage points).

There was little difference between regions in the rate of children reporting good health. In the North West, there was a 3.7 percentage point growth in children reporting good health between 2010 and 2015.

2.2.2 Health outcomes for other groups

Available research for other groups (homeless people; transgender people; Gypsies, Roma and Travellers; and migrants, refugees and those seeking asylum) is limited to smaller studies. The recent data that exist show that these groups often experience worse health outcomes than the rest of the population (see ‘Is Britain Fairer?’). For migrants, refugees and those seeking asylum, poorer health outcomes are a result of poor access to health services (Nair et al., 2015).
2.2.3 Suicide

England overview

In 2016, the overall suicide rate in England (for those aged 15 and over) was 10.1 per 100,000 (Table HLT.OCM.2). Men in England were three times more likely to die by suicide than women (15.6 compared with 4.8 per 100,000) and the suicide rate for those aged 45 to 54 was double the rate of those aged 15 to 24. Between 2011 and 2016, the suicide rate declined in England by 0.2 per 100,000. Over this period, the suicide rate in England showed little change by gender, with a small decline for men between 2013 and 2016 (1.4 per 100,000). Between 2013 and 2016, the rate increased for younger people aged 15 to 24 (0.9 per 100,000) but decreased for people aged 35 to 44 (1.9 per 100,000).

Regional findings

In 2017, the North East had the highest rate of suicide for those aged 10 or over and London had the lowest rate (10.8 compared with 7.7 per 100,000). The rate for London was significantly lower than that for the whole of England (9.2 per 100,000), and for each individual English region except for the East Midlands, East of England and South East. The rate for the North East was significantly higher than for the East Midlands and London. There were no significant changes between 2016 to 2017 for any of the regions of England (ONS, 2018c).

2.2.4 Life expectancy

England overview

In 2017, life expectancy at birth in England reached 79.6 years for men and 83.2 years for women (PHE, 2018). In 2017, 1.35 million people in England were aged 85 and over, almost half a million of whom were in their nineties (PHE, 2018). The average life expectancies of men and women with learning disabilities were 14 and 18 years shorter, respectively, than the averages for men and women in the general England population (NHS Digital, 2017). In 2017, the average age of death for people with a learning disability was 59 for men and 56 for women, and more than a quarter (28%) of these deaths were of people aged under 50 years (LeDeR, 2017).

Regional findings

In 2015/16, life expectancy varied across English regions and tended to be higher in the South than in the North and Midlands. Life expectancy was higher for women than men across all regions (ONS, 2018b).
2.2.5 Infant mortality

England overview

The infant mortality rate in England fell from 5.4 per 1,000 live births in 2001 to 2003, to 3.9 in 2014 to 2016 (PHE, 2018).

In England and Wales, the lowest infant mortality rate was for babies in the Other White ethnic group (2.2 deaths per 1,000 live births). Pakistani and Black African babies had the highest infant mortality rates of 5.9 and 5.3 deaths per 1,000 live births, respectively (ONS, 2018a).

Increased mortality risk is due partly to higher rates of obesity, diabetes and deprivation in ethnic minority groups (HoP POST, 2016). Other risk factors include poor access to maternity and postnatal care (HoP POST, 2016; MBRRACE-UK, 2015). The risk of stillbirth and infant mortality is higher when the parents are from the same family (that is, with at least one shared great-grandparent or more closely related), such as some British-born Pakistani people (HoP POST, 2016).

Regional findings

In 2016, the infant mortality rate remained highest in the West Midlands (6.0 deaths per 1,000 live births) and the North West (4.9 per 1,000) compared to 3.9 per 1,000 in England overall.
2.3 Mental health

2.3.1 Population reporting poor mental health and wellbeing

England overview

In 2014, 14.7% of adults in England reported poor mental health and wellbeing (Table HLT.MTL.1A). The rate was lowest among those aged 65 to 74 (11.0%). Over three times as many disabled people in England reported poor mental health and wellbeing than those with no disability (33.0% compared with 9.8%). More women than men reported poor mental health and wellbeing (17.0% compared with 12.3%). Heterosexual people were almost half as likely to report poor mental health than gay, lesbian, or bisexual people, and those reporting other sexual orientations (14.3% compared with 27.2%).

In 2014, 9.3% of all young people aged 13 to 15 in England had poor mental health and wellbeing. The rate for young people aged 15 was 17.3%, with rates of 22.6% for girls aged 15 and 2.0% for boys aged 14. Between 2010 and 2014, there was a decrease of 6.8 percentage points in the rate of those aged 14 reporting poor mental health and wellbeing. Most of this decline occurred between 2012 and 2014 (a decrease of 6.2 percentage points). Between 2012 and 2014, the percentage of those aged 15 in England with poor mental health and wellbeing increased by 9.8 percentage points.

Regional findings

In 2014, rates of children reporting poor mental health in the North West declined by 12.5 percentage points.

In the North East, those aged 45 to 54 reporting poor mental health decreased by 10.8 percentage points between 2010 and 2014. Between 2012 and 2014, those aged 65 to 74 reporting poor mental health increased by 10.4 percentage points.

London, the West Midlands, North East, South East and South West showed no significant difference between men and women reporting poor mental health. However, the North West, Yorkshire and Humberside, and East Midlands all shared the overall pattern in England of more women than men reporting poor mental health. Between 2010 and 2014, there was an increase in women reporting poor mental health in Yorkshire and Humber of 7.4 percentage points.

Between 2010 and 2014 the proportion reporting poor mental health increased for Muslim people in London by 11.9 percentage points.

Heterosexual people were almost half as likely to report poor mental health than gay, lesbian, or bisexual people, and those reporting other sexual orientations (14.3% compared with 27.2%).
During the period discussed in this report, spending on welfare and social security has reduced. All local authorities’ social care budgets have also been reduced. The UK Government has introduced measures to tackle homelessness and reform the housing market.
Pressure on public spending has been applied to social care budgets, which have been reduced in all local authorities across England. The UK Government has introduced multiple measures to tackle homelessness and reform the housing market and has changed the definition of ‘Gypsy’ and ‘Traveller’ for planning purposes.

3.1 Housing

In 2015/16, 3.0% of households in England were living in overcrowded accommodation that failed to meet the bedroom standard (Table LST.HSG.1A). Using the characteristics of the household reference person (the ‘householder’ in whose name the accommodation is owned or rented), this rate was highest for those aged 35 to 44 (5.8%). One in 10 (10.5%) ethnic minority households experienced overcrowding compared with one in 50 (2.0%) White households. Female householders were more likely to experience overcrowding than male householders (3.7% compared with 2.5%), and ethnic minority women were more likely to experience overcrowding than ethnic minority men (13.2% compared with 8.7%).

In 2015/16, 90.3% of adults in England lived in households that were satisfied with their house or flat, which represents a slight increase of 1.1 percentage points from 2013/14 (Table LST.HSG.2). The rate of satisfaction was higher for White households (91.3%) than for Pakistani or Bangladeshi households (84.3%), Black households (77.8%), and those of other ethnic minority households (82.5%), although the proportion of ethnic minority households reporting satisfaction increased by 3.0 percentage points between 2013/14 and 2015/16.

One in 10 (10.5%) ethnic minority households experienced overcrowding compared with one in 50 (2.0%) White households

3.2 Poverty outcomes

3.2.1 Relative poverty

England overview

Our analysis shows that, in 2015/16, a fifth (19.6%) of adults in England were living in relative poverty (Table LST.PVT.1A). This rate is almost the same as for Britain overall (19.8%). There was little change in the overall rate between 2010/11 and 2015/16, although there are differences among people with different protected characteristics.

Disabled people were more likely to be living in poverty than non-disabled people (25.1% compared with 17.8%).

Ethnic minorities (including white minorities) were also more likely to live in poverty (31.4% compared with 16.7% of White British people). The poverty rates were highest among Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Black African adults (44.4%, 48.6% and 45.6%). The poverty rate for Bangladeshi adults decreased by 15.6 percentage points between 2010/11 and 2015/16, compared with a reduction of 0.1 percentage points for White British adults.

---

7 The proportion of adults living in households below 60% of the contemporary median income after housing costs is known as relative poverty. In 2015/16, 60% of the contemporary median income after housing costs was £248 per week. See Table 2b, available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/households-below-average-income-199495-to-201516.
Women were slightly more likely than men to live in poverty (20.2% compared with 18.9%). The proportion of men living in poverty decreased by 0.3 percentage points over the period from 2010/11 to 2015/16, but the proportion of women living in poverty increased by 0.2 percentage points. Across different ethnic groups, the likelihood of living in relative poverty was high for Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Black African women and men (between 41% and 50%).

Regional findings
Poverty rates ranged from 16.0% in the South East to 23.3% in London.

The difference between poverty rates for White British adults and ethnic minority adults (including white minorities) was lower in the South East (a difference of 9.7 percentage points) compared to the North East (a difference of 23.3 percentage points). The poverty rates for ethnic minorities (including white minorities) in the South East (24.2%), South West (27.1%) and East (26.6%) were lower than in the North East (42.2%), North West (37.2%), Yorkshire and Humber (37%) and West Midlands (34.5%).

Between 2013/14 and 2015/16, the poverty rate for Black African adults in London increased by 13.4 percentage points to 51.0%, whereas the rate for Black African adults across England decreased by 0.8 percentage points in the same period. The decline in the poverty rate in London between 2010/11 and 2015/16 was greatest for Indian adults (a decrease of 11.2 percentage points to 12.3%), those of Mixed ethnic groups (a decrease of 13.9 percentage points to 25.7%), and Bangladeshi adults (a decrease of 18.5 percentage points to 52.5%).

In the North East, the poverty rate for ethnic minorities (including white minorities) increased between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 20.1 percentage points to 42.2%.

Poverty rates ranged from 16.0% in the South East to 23.3% in London

The poverty rate in Yorkshire and Humberside increased for all ethnic minorities (including white minorities) between 2013/14 and 2015/16 by 10.2 percentage points to 37%.

In the East Midlands, the poverty rate for ethnic minorities (including white minorities) increased between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 8.6 percentage points to 32.4%.

In the East, the poverty rate for the Other White group increased overall between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 14.1 percentage points to 29.7%. The rate of increase for this group was highest between 2013/14 and 2015/16 (14.2 percentage points).

In the South East, the poverty rate for the Other White group increased between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 8.7 percentage points to 23.9%; the poverty rate overall for ethnic minorities (including white minorities) increased by 6.0 percentage points to 24.2%.
### 3.2.2 Severe material deprivation

#### England overview

The proportion of adults experiencing severe material deprivation\(^8\) decreased over the period 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 3.0 percentage points to 17.8% of adults (Table LST.PVT.2). This hides an increase in the period from 2010/11 to 2013/14 followed by a decrease between 2013/14 and 2015/16. The pattern is very similar for Britain overall, with a rate of 17.6% of adults, including a decrease of 3.1 percentage points between 2010/11 and 2015/16, with a rise in the earlier period. This indicates that people’s ability to afford certain items up to the start of 2016 had not been detrimentally affected by increases in poverty, but there is a risk that this may have changed subsequently after 2016.

In England, disabled people were nearly three times as likely to experience severe material deprivation as non-disabled people (37.1% compared with 13.8%). Women were slightly more likely to experience deprivation than men (20.1% compared with 15.4%).

Experiences of deprivation varied by ethnic group in England. Many ethnic minority groups were more likely to experience severe material deprivation than White British groups, although Other White and Chinese groups were less likely to be severely deprived. Some groups were particularly at risk: Black Caribbean and Black African groups were twice as likely as the White British group to experience severe material deprivation. Within the Black African group, more women were deprived than men (45.6% compared with 31.3%).

---

\(^8\) An individual is defined as deprived if they cannot afford 4 or more from a list of 9 items, such as replacing worn out furniture or keeping their accommodation sufficiently warm.
In London, the rate of material deprivation was lower for White British people (10.5%) than in any other region except the East, whereas the rates for ethnic minorities were higher in London than the South East and lower in London than in the North West and Yorkshire and Humberside.

### 3.2.3 Social security and the benefit system
#### England overview

Our assessment of changes to tax, welfare, social security and public spending up to the tax year 2021/22 found that these changes had a greater negative impact in England for the bottom half of the income distribution scale than they did in Scotland or Wales. For example, by 2021/22, households in deciles 1 and 2 in England are forecast to lose an average of slightly under £1,300 per year and slightly over £2,200 per year respectively. In Scotland, the equivalent average losses are slightly under £900 for decile 1 and slightly over £1,650 for decile 2. In Wales, the equivalent losses are slightly under £500 for decile 1 and slightly under £1,700 for decile 2.

These differences partly reflect policies introduced by the Scottish and Welsh Governments to mitigate the impact of benefit and tax credit cuts on households introduced by the UK Government. Average rents are also higher in England (particularly in London and the South East) compared with Scotland and Wales; therefore the impact of restrictions on Housing Benefit has been more severe for claimants in England than for those in Scotland or Wales. Portes and Reed (2018) provide further detail on England findings.

Further assessment of changes to public spending up to the tax year 2021/2022 found public spending per head is forecast to fall by approximately 18% (slightly over £900) in England, 5.5% (just under £300) in Wales and just over 1% (around £100) in Scotland. By 2021/22, overall spending per head will be 36% higher in Scotland than in England, and 17% higher in Wales than in England. Cash losses for lower deciles are larger in England than in Wales or Scotland due to the far greater overall scale of cuts in spending in England.

Differences between spending trends in the three countries are due to faster population growth in England compared with Scotland and Wales; different Scottish and Welsh Government spending priorities; and more generous funding in Scotland due to Scotland-specific income tax rises (Reed and Portes, 2018).

### 3.2.4 Experiences of at-risk groups: child poverty and poverty of disabled people
#### Child poverty

Our analysis found that, in 2015/16, 29.9% of children were living in households in poverty. This proportion is higher than that of adults overall (19.6%). The child poverty rate had increased by 2.1 percentage points from 2010/11.

#### Regional findings

The North East and London had high child poverty rates at 34.3% and 34.1% respectively. The South East and East had low rates at 24.4% and 24.8% respectively.

In all regions where the data was available, the poverty rate was higher for ethnic minorities (both including and excluding White minorities) than for White British children. Data was not available for the North East.
In London, the poverty rate was higher for children in Pakistani and Black African households compared with White British households (64.1% and 52.8% compared with 20.2%).

In the North West, the poverty rate was higher for children in Black African and Bangladeshi households compared with White British households (75.3% and 66.1% compared with 26.7%).

In the West Midlands, around twice as many ethnic minority children were living in poverty as White British children (50.4% compared with 26.8%).

In the East, the poverty rate was higher for Pakistani children, at 42.4%, compared with White British children, at 22.3% (a breakdown was only given in the East for three groups). Girls were also more likely to be living in poverty than boys (27.8% compared with 21.9%).

In all regions where the data was available, the poverty rate was higher for ethnic minorities (both including and excluding White minorities) than for White British children. Data was not available for the North East.

Disabled people

England overview

Our analysis found that, in 2015/16, 25.1% of disabled adults in England were living in poverty. The rate for disabled people increased by 2.4 percentage points between 2010/11 and 2015/16. The poverty rate was high among people with social or behavioural, mental health, and learning or understanding or concentration impairments (37.6%, 34.5% and 31.0%).

Regional findings

In London, 40.8% of people with ‘other’ impairments (24.5% in England) and 35.9% of people with mental health impairments (34.5% in England) were living in poverty, compared with 22.3% of non-disabled people (17.8% in England).

In the North East, 44.1% of people with learning or understanding or concentration impairments (31.0% in England) and 40.7% of people with mental health impairments (34.5% in England) were living in poverty, compared with 17.3% of non-disabled people.

In the North West, 40.2% of people with learning or understanding or concentration impairments (31.0% in England) and 38.7% of people with mental health impairments (34.5% in England) were living in poverty, compared with 18.6% of non-disabled people.

In the East Midlands, 53.6% of people with social or behavioural impairments (37.6% in England) were living in poverty compared with 17.7% of non-disabled people.
In the West Midlands, 40.9% of people with mental health impairments (34.5% in England) and 39.5% of people with social or behavioural impairments (37.6% in England) were living in poverty, compared with 19.3% of non-disabled people.

In the South East, the findings were more positive for those with certain impairments: 29.2% of people with mental health (34.5% in England) and 27.8% of people with learning or understanding or concentration impairments (31.0% in England) were living in poverty, compared with 14.2% of non-disabled people. Between 2013/14 to 2015/16, the rate of those living in poverty declined for people with mental health impairments by 11.2 percentage points to 29.2%, and for those with memory impairments by 11.1 percentage points to 19.0%. However, the rate increased for those with vision impairments by 10.5 percentage points to 24.5%, while not changing for non-disabled people.

### 3.2.5 Food and fuel poverty

#### England overview

**Food poverty**

In 2017/18, the Trussell Trust’s network of 427 food banks across England provided three-day emergency food supplies to 1,031,544 people in crisis, an increase of 12.7% from 2016/17. There are estimated to be many more food banks in addition to this network (Church Urban Fund, 2016).

**Fuel poverty**

Approximately 2.5 million households in England were in fuel poverty in 2015 (an overall rate of 11%, which had changed little since 2003). The average fuel poverty gap (the amount needed to meet the fuel poverty threshold) decreased in real terms by 5.6% from 2014 to 2015, continuing a trend since 2013 (Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2017). In 2015, 16% of households from ethnic minorities (other than White ethnic minorities) were living in fuel poverty compared with 10% of White households. These figures have not changed between 2003 and 2015 (Cabinet Office, 2017).

#### 3.2.6 Wealth and income distribution

**England overview**

In the period July 2014 to June 2016, the South East had the highest aggregate household total wealth of all regions (£2.46 trillion), closely followed by London (£2.15 trillion). These two regions also have the largest and second largest number of households per region. The North East, which has the fewest number of households of all regions, had the lowest aggregate household total wealth (£0.37 trillion) (ONS, 2018).

---

9 In England, a household is considered to be fuel poor if they have required fuel costs that are above average (the national median level) and would be left with a residual income below the official poverty line were they to spend that amount.
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3.3 Social Care

3.3.1 Access to social care

England overview

In England, 15.1 adults per 1,000 were receiving long-term home care, residential care or nursing care as of 31 March 2016 (Table LST.SCR.2). This rate increased to 41.7 per 1,000 for those aged over 65. More women received care than men (17.7 compared with 12.5 per 1,000).

3.3.2 Dignity and respect in social care

England overview

In 2016/17, more than 3 in 5 (62.3%) social care service users in England reported that they were treated with dignity and respect (Table LST.SCR.1). This rate represented an increase by 5.3 percentage points from 2010/11. However, those aged 75 to 84 and over 85 were least likely to report that they were treated with dignity and respect (58.3% and 57.9% respectively). Increases in the rate reporting treatment with dignity and respect for these age groups were 3.3 and 2.0 percentage points respectively, lagging behind the improvement for younger age groups, such as the increase of 8.0 percentage points for ages 45 to 74.

Respondents with learning difficulties were more likely to say that they were treated with dignity and respect in 2016/17 than respondents with physical disability, frailty and sensory impairments (76.6% compared with 57.7%). The proportion of those with mental health conditions reporting that they were treated with dignity and respect increased by 6.5 percentage points over the period from 2010/11 to 2016/17, reaching 63.8%.

In 2016/17, 66.9% of Asian respondents reported being treated with dignity and respect, which was higher than the rate of White respondents (62.1%), and an increase of 8.0 percentage points from 2010/11.

Buddhist, Muslim and Hindu respondents were more likely to report being treated with dignity and respect than Christians (77.1%, 70.3% and 68.7% compared with 62.2%). Respondents with no religious affiliation were less likely to report being treated with dignity and respect than Christians (60.5% compared with 62.2%).

Regional findings

There was very little variation in the rate of reporting being treated with dignity and respect at a regional level. Yorkshire and Humberside had a relatively low proportion of social care service users reporting they were treated with dignity and respect, at 60.7%, but the difference in this rate when compared with other regions is marginal.

The proportion of those with mental health conditions reporting that they were treated with dignity and respect increased by 6.5 percentage points over the period from 2010/11 to 2016/17, reaching 63.8%
4. Work

The work domain is not a devolved area, and change over time and differences between those sharing protected characteristics closely mirror those findings in ‘Is Britain Fairer?’. However, our analysis has identified some regional differences which provide context to the findings in other domains.
4.1 Employment

4.1.1 Employment

England overview

The employment rate in England was 60.5% in 2016/17, which represented an increase of 2.4 percentage points since 2010/11 (Table WRK.EMP.1). The patterns across protected characteristics are similar to those in Britain because the England labour market represents the majority of the employees in Britain. Employment rates increased for many groups although gaps between groups with protected characteristics remained. The gap between women and men remains above 10 percentage points. The disability gap has decreased slightly since 2013/14, but the employment rate for disabled people in 2016/17 was less than half the rate for non-disabled people. The employment rates for some ethnic groups had improved, but remained low for Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Chinese people. Younger people and those approaching or over retirement age had lower employment rates.

Regional findings

Most regions had an employment rate near the England average, ranging from 62.4% in the South East to 57.6% in the West Midlands. London had a particularly high employment rate at 65.2%, and the North East had a particularly low rate at 55.4%. The wealth division that separates the Midlands and Northern regions from the South was evident in employment rates; employment was high in London, the South East and Eastern regions, while low in the North East, West Midlands and North West.

In London, employment increased by significantly more than all other regions between 2010/11 and 2016/17. Employment in most of the other regions increased at similar rates. In London, the difference between employment rates for men and women was larger than the English average. Similar to the picture in England as a whole, Pakistani and Bangladeshi people had low rates of employment; the same was true for Muslims. The difference between the employment rate for disabled people and non-disabled people was similar to the difference in England as a whole.

The employment rates for some ethnic groups had improved, but remained low for Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Chinese people.
In the North East, Chinese people had a low employment rate and people of Mixed/Multiple ethnicities had a high employment rate. In the North West, White Irish people had a low employment rate and Other White people a high employment rate. In both regions, however, Muslims had low rates of employment. The differences between employment rates for disabled people and non-disabled people were large in both regions.

Those ethnic groups that typically had low employment in England – Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups – also had low employment rates in Yorkshire and Humberside (47.8% and 35.0% respectively). The lower rates of employment in this region for women and disabled people compared with men and non-disabled people respectively mirrored the pattern in England as a whole.

In the South East and South West, the employment gap between non-disabled people and disabled people was narrower than in England. While, in the South East ethnic minorities (including white minorities) had an 8.0 percentage points higher employment rate than the White British population.

In London, employment increased by significantly more than all other regions between 2010/11 and 2016/17.
### 4.1.2 Unemployment

#### England overview

Our analysis shows that the unemployment rate of those economically active and aged 16 and over in England in 2016/17 was 4.8% (Table WRK.EMP.2). In a similar pattern to the rate for Britain, the unemployment rate had dropped by 2.8 percentage points since 2010/11. Young people aged 16 to 24 experienced a greater fall in unemployment than older age groups, but the unemployment rate in 2016/17 for the same group of young people was by far the highest of any group.

Some ethnic groups that had particularly high unemployment rates in 2010/11 (Mixed/Multiple, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Black ethnicities) experienced some of the largest decreases. The unemployment rate for disabled people fell further than the rate for non-disabled people between 2013/14 and 2016/17, while the disability unemployment rate remained high at 8.2%, compared with 4.2% for non-disabled people.

#### Regional findings

The regional pattern of unemployment mirrored the employment distribution across the regions, however while London had the highest employment rate, its unemployment rate was also relatively high compared with other regions. The North East had the highest unemployment rate, reflecting the lower levels of employment noted above, and was the only region with higher unemployment than London. While it was the South East, Eastern and South West regions that had some of the lowest levels of unemployment, in contrast to employment rates which were highest in London.
4.1.3 Insecure employment

England overview

Our analysis shows that, in 2016/17, 9.0% of employees and self-employed people aged 16 and over in England were in insecure employment (Table WRK.EMP.3). Insecure employment here refers to temporary employment, employment in agency work or low-paid self-employment (identified by self-employment in caring, leisure and other service occupations; process, plant and machine operative occupations; or elementary occupations, such as cleaners or kitchen and catering assistants)\(^\text{10}\). This pattern is very similar to that across Britain, and the rate had grown in England since 2010/11 by 0.8 percentage points.

The percentages of those in insecure employment were higher for women than men; the same as across Britain as a whole. Some groups were more likely to be in insecure employment than others, and those tended to be the same groups that had low employment rates, such as young people, disabled people, people in certain ethnic groups, and Muslims.

Regional findings

There was very little difference between the rate of insecure employment across regions, apart from London, which had a higher rate than the other regions, with 10.8% of people classed as in insecure employment. The other regions ranged from 8.2% to 9.3% of employees of those aged 16 and over in insecure employment.

A few regions had notable differences when compared with England as a whole; in the North East the levels of insecure employment for men were higher than for women.

London had a large difference between the percentages of disabled and non-disabled people in insecure employment: a far higher proportion of disabled people than non-disabled people were in insecure employment, at a rate of 14.9% compared with 10.3%. In the East Midlands, a small proportion of disabled people were in insecure employment, at a rate of 7.8%.

The North East and East Midlands had some of the highest percentages of ethnic minorities in insecure employment. Muslim workers experienced high rates of insecure employment in most regions.

Some groups were more likely to be in insecure employment than others, and those tended to be the same groups that had low employment rates, such as young people, disabled people, people in certain ethnic groups, and Muslims.

\(^{10}\) There is no standard definition of insecure employment and we recognise that other sources use different definitions. We also recognise that some self-employed people in these occupational groups may not consider their employment to be insecure.
4.2 Earnings

4.2.1 Pay gaps in median hourly earnings

England overview

Median hourly earnings allow us to compare the difference in earnings for those with different protected characteristics. Our analysis shows that, in 2016/17, median hourly earnings of employees aged 16 and over (Table WRK.ERN.1) were £11.63 (at 2017 prices). Median hourly earnings were higher in England than Scotland (£11.63 compared with £11.39) and higher in Scotland than Wales (£11.39 compared with £10.52). Median hourly earnings were higher for men than for women (£12.96 compared with £10.31), and higher for non-disabled people than disabled people (£11.78 compared with £10.26). White Irish and Chinese employees had the highest median hourly earnings (£16.49 and £14.89), both higher than White British employees (£11.74). Pakistani and Bangladeshi employees had low median hourly earnings (£9.91 and £9.28).

Regional findings

London had the highest median hourly earnings of all the regions, with a rate of £14.67. The South East and Eastern regions were the next highest, with rates of (£12.65 and £12.03). Most of the other regions were clustered below the England average: the East Midlands at £10.56, the North East at £10.46, Yorkshire and Humber at £10.34, the North West at £10.58 and the West Midlands at £10.81.

Those regions with high earnings had large gaps between the median hourly earnings for men and for women; for example, in the South East men earned over £3.00 per hour more than women. Yorkshire and Humberside, the North East and the North West had relatively small gaps with the median hourly earnings of men approximately £2.00 per hour more than women's earnings.

Disabled people experienced higher median hourly earnings in London than the rest of England (£12.37), but the gap between non-disabled people and disabled people was also large, with the rate for disabled people £2.48 less than for non-disabled people. Again, Yorkshire and Humber, the North East and the North West had smaller gaps in median hourly earnings between disabled and non-disabled people, but these regions also had relatively low earnings overall.

The overall gap between White British and Ethnic Minority employees’ median hourly earnings was largest in London, with the rate for White British employees £3.86 higher than for Ethnic Minority employees (including white minorities). White British employees earned more than Ethnic Minority employees in all other regions, except for the North East, where there was little difference in the rates. In London, all ethnic minorities except for White Irish and Chinese had lower median hourly earnings than White British. Earnings for Bangladeshi employees were particularly low in London, at £9.73.
4.3 Occupational segregation

England overview

Our analysis shows that, in 2016/17, 31.5% of people in employment aged 16 and over in England were employed in managerial or professional occupations (Table WRK.OCS.1). These tended to be high-pay occupations. A total of 27.1% of people were employed in caring, leisure and other service occupations; sales and customer service occupations; or elementary occupations, such as cleaners or kitchen and catering assistants (Table WRK.OCS.2). These tended to be low-pay occupations. Between 2010/11 and 2016/17, the number of people in high-pay occupations increased by 1.1 percentage points.

Men were more likely than women (33.3% compared with 29.4%) to work in high-pay occupations in England and the gap between these rates narrowed between 2010/11 and 2016/17. Women were far more likely to work in low-pay occupations than men (36.5% compared with 19%). Disabled people were less likely to work in high-pay occupations, and more likely to work in low-pay occupations, than non-disabled people. Certain ethnic groups, including White Irish, Indian and Chinese, were more likely to work in high-pay occupations than White British groups (48.6%, 41.9% and 43.9% compared with 31.7%). Those groups that were less likely to be employed and more likely to be in insecure employment were also less likely to be in high-pay occupations: namely, Pakistani (27.4% in high-pay occupations) and Bangladeshi (25.1%) workers. Black and Other White workers had low proportions in high-pay occupations (25.6% and 27.4%), although the Other White population also had the highest employment rate. Black workers had a high percentage in low-pay occupations compared with White British workers (41.3% compared with 25.9%). Other groups with higher percentages in low-pay occupations were: workers with Mixed/Multiple ethnicity (33.6%), Other White workers (31.3%), Bangladeshis workers (31.4%), Pakistani workers (30.0%) and workers in other ethnic groups (34.6%).

Regional findings

London and the South East had the highest proportions of those aged over 16 in high-pay occupations (37.9% and 34.8% respectively), and the lowest proportions in low-pay occupations. The Midlands and Northern regions all had relatively fewer workers in high-pay occupations and relatively more in low-pay occupations when compared with the other regions.
Regional summary

South East

The South East was in the top two regions with the highest rates of education attainment at early years and secondary level (in 2016/17), and had one of the lowest proportions of young people not in employment, education or training (NEET). The region had the second highest levels of employment and earnings, but also had one of the largest gaps in earnings between men and women, and between disabled and non-disabled people.

Life expectancy was higher in the South East, and the difference between life expectancy for men and women was narrower in this region than average. However, a higher proportion of patients waited more than 18 weeks for treatment in the South than they did in England as a whole.

The South East had one of the lowest rates of adult and child poverty of all the regions, indicative of the affluence in this region. The differences in rates of poverty between the White British and ethnic minorities in the South East were also relatively small. The low levels of poverty in the South East were reflected in the lowest rate of severe material deprivation in England. The material deprivation rate for disabled people in the South East was also relatively low.

South West

The South West had early years and secondary attainment rates similar to the England average, but saw the lowest improvement in early years attainment of all the regions. However, the region had one of the lowest rates of young people who were NEET in England and one of the highest rates of people taking up learning activities.

The employment measure for the South West replicated the England average, but with relatively low unemployment and also lower earnings. However, rates of poverty and deprivation in the South West were comparatively low against England as a whole.

The South had the poorest performance across England in meeting waiting time targets for healthcare. In the South West there was a decrease in people reporting good health between 2013 and 2015. In 2012 a smaller proportion of people reported poor mental health in the South West than for other regions.
London

Along with the South East, London was one of the two highest achieving regions in terms of early years and secondary attainment. The level of young people NEET was similar to the level in England as a whole. Half of people in London held degree-level qualifications, signifying the dominance of industries in London requiring this level of education. London also saw one of the largest increases in those holding degree-level qualifications across the English regions, and had one of the highest levels of learning activities engagement.

London had the highest level of employment of the English regions, but also the highest level of unemployment. The gap in employment between men and women was larger in London than in England overall, and there were more disabled people in insecure employment in London than in England overall. London had the highest earnings of any region.

London had the highest rate of waiting times being exceeded by 18 weeks of all the regions. London’s rate of adults reporting good health did not differ greatly from that in England overall. London had a lower suicide rate than England as a whole. The rate of poor mental health was the same as the rate in England as a whole.

London had one of the higher rates of poverty for adults and children in England. There was some evidence that ethnic minorities experienced greater disparity in levels of poverty and deprivation in London compared with the White British population. Pakistani and Black African children had particularly high rates of poverty. Material deprivation for the White British group was lower in London than in England as a whole, despite the rate for ethnic minorities in London remaining similar to that of England as a whole.

East of England

The East of England region had the third highest rate of educational attainment in England but performed better than other regions in indicators of health and living standards. The patterns of employment and earnings were similar in the East to the England average, replicating those inequalities experienced by most protected characteristic groups.

Rates of exceeding waiting times of 18 weeks in the Midlands and the East were in line with the England average. Differences between life expectancy for men and women were consistently smaller in the East of England than in other regions.

While poverty rates in East of England were not that different to England overall, adults in the Other White group experienced an increase in poverty over the period reviewed. Material deprivation in the East of England was at one of the lowest rates across England. A smaller proportion of disabled people experienced severe material deprivation in the East than in England.
East Midlands

In the East Midlands, children’s attainment was slightly lower than in England as a whole, and the region had one of the lowest proportions of people holding degrees in England.

The East Midlands largely replicated work inequalities seen in England as a whole. However, there was not a statistically significant difference in the proportion of disabled people and non-disabled people in insecure employment in the region.

The East Midlands, as part of the Midlands region of Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), was in line with the average rate of waiting times of 18 weeks being exceeded for England. Rates of people reporting good health were also in line with England. There was a significant difference between men and women reporting good health in the East Midlands that was not replicated in most other regions, with fewer women than men reporting good health. This disparity was replicated in mental health indicators, with more women than men reporting poor mental health.

Poverty rates and deprivation in the East Midlands were similar to England as a whole.

West Midlands

The West Midlands had one of the lowest rates of educational attainment and was one of two regions with the lowest rates of people taking part in learning activities (and had experienced a decline in the latter rate). The West Midlands was also among a range of regions with lower than average rates of people holding degree-level qualifications. Levels of employment and earnings in the West Midlands were marginally lower than the England average, while levels of unemployment and employment in low-pay occupations were higher. Patterns of inequality mirrored those seen in England as a whole.

The Midlands regions overall performed in line with the England average for the rate of waiting times exceeding 18 weeks, but in 2015 the West Midlands had a lower rate of people reporting good health than all other English regions, except the North East, after a decrease in this rate between 2013 and 2015. The number of disabled people reporting good health also decreased over the period 2010 to 2015.

The West Midlands had one of the highest adult poverty rates in England, and the region’s child poverty rates were exceptionally high for some ethnic minority groups. Material deprivation in the West Midlands was similar to the level in England overall.
Yorkshire and Humberside

Yorkshire and Humberside had a slightly lower rate educational attainment than England as a whole, and had one of the lowest rates of people holding degree-level qualifications.

While employment and earnings rates were lower than the rates for England overall, the gaps in earnings between women and men and between disabled people and non-disabled people were relatively narrow. However, Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups had low employment levels, and ethnic minorities collectively saw a bigger gap between their earnings and those of their White British peers than experienced in England overall.

Yorkshire and Humberside had one of the highest rates of poverty for ethnic minorities in English regions, and the rate had increased for all ethnic minorities between 2013/14 and 2015/16. While rates of material deprivation were not one of the highest in England, the rate of deprivation experienced by Pakistani people in Yorkshire and Humber exceeded that experienced by the same ethnic group in London and some other regions. Although differences were marginal, Yorkshire and Humber had one of the lowest proportions of care users reporting they were treated with dignity and respect.

Yorkshire and Humberside is in the Northern region of CCGs, which had the lowest rate of waiting times being exceeded by 18 weeks, and was among a group of regions where fewer disabled people reported that they were in good health.

North West

While the North West had the poorest performance regarding early years educational attainment, secondary attainment was only slightly below the England average, and the region’s rate of young people who were NEET had dropped over the period 2010/11 to 2016/17.

Employment rates were lower in the North East and North West than other regions. The gaps between employment rates for disabled people and non-disabled people were larger than in England, and Muslims also had a low employment rate. However, while earnings in the region overall were low, the gaps in earnings between disabled and non-disabled people, and between men and women, were narrower than in England as a whole.

The North West, as part of the Northern region of CCGs, had the lowest rate of waiting times being exceeded by 18 weeks. Rates of people reporting good health reflected the rates in England overall, and there had been a growth in the proportion of children reporting good health. The North West had one of the highest rates of infant mortality, and the region shared the pattern elsewhere of more women reporting poor mental health than men. However, the rate of children reporting poor mental health in the North West declined between 2010 and 2014.

Despite poverty rates overall being similar to those in England, rates of poverty experienced by ethnic minorities were higher than in England, and those rates were among the highest of the regions. For children, rates of poverty were high for both Black Africans and Bangladeshis. Rates of severe material deprivation were higher than seen in England but, for Pakistani adults, the rate was particularly high, and higher than seen for the same group in other regions (such as London), indicating the specific economic position of this demographic group in the region.
North East

The North East had an average rate of early years educational attainment, but had the largest growth in the rate of children achieving a good level of attainment in foundation stage between 2013/14 and 2016/17. The North East was, however, the region with the lowest level of attainment in secondary education and one of the regions with the lowest rates of people holding degree-level qualifications. It was also one of two regions with the lowest rate of adults undertaking learning activities, and saw a large decrease in engagement in these activities between 2013/14 and 2016/17.

Employment rates in the North East were the lowest in England overall, and the gap between employment rates for disabled people and for non-disabled people was larger than in England. As in the North West, the gap in earnings between men and women was narrower than in England as a whole, although earnings were one of the lowest overall.

As a northern region, the North East had the lowest rate of waiting times being exceeded by 18 weeks, but also had significantly lower rates of people reporting good health than other regions. The North East had the highest suicide rate. Between 2010 and 2014, the rate of those aged 45 to 54 reporting poor mental health decreased.

While the poverty rate for adults in the North East was similar to the rate in England, the region had one of the highest rates of poverty for children. The rate of material deprivation in the North East was one of the highest, with a quarter of adults, and half of disabled people, experiencing severe material deprivation: higher than the average for England and evidencing a large gap when compared with non-disabled people.
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