Ethnic Minority Women and Local Labour Market Disadvantage in England

Sue Yeandle
University of Leeds
Email s.m.yeandle@leeds.ac.uk

Presentation to
Department of Sociology
University of Bristol
November 2007
Outline of presentation

- Background to the investigation
- Key facts about ethnic minority women and the LM in England
- Method and research questions
- Results of our statistical investigation
- Conclusions

- Contribution of Dr Lisa Buckner, Senior Research Fellow in Social Statistics, University of Leeds
- GELLM Research Programme based on work of a team of 10 colleagues at Sheffield Hallam University 2003-6
- EOC was formal partner in GELLM and sponsored our research
Background

- **Gender and Employment in Local Labour Markets Research Programme** (2003-6) (Funded by ESF and 13 UK partners)


Gender and Employment in Local Labour Markets

Gender Profile of Sandwell’s Labour Market

7. Women, Men and Diversity

The Economic Circumstances of People from Black and Minority Ethnic Groups

There are marked differences in the way women and men from Black and Minority Ethnic groups in Sandwell experience the labour market.

As described in Chapter 1, Sandwell has a comparatively large population of residents from Black and Minority Ethnic groups. Figures 7.1 and 7.2 show the economic activity status of young men and women under 25 by ethnicity. The largest groups of young people are found among the Indian (3,390), Pakistani (1,865), Black Caribbean (562), and Bangladesh (713) groups, Mixed White and Black Caribbean (514), and White Other (266) ethnic groups.

Among minority people of working age (25–59 years for women, and 25–64 years for men), the figures for each population group are also significant. Index (12,249), Black Caribbean (5,163), Pakistani (2,085), White Irish (1,362), White Other (1,216), Bangladesh (1,175), and Other Asian (1,123).

The economic activity, occupations and industrial distribution of the above Black and Minority Ethnic groups are the focus of discussion in this section. Data for all Black and Minority Ethnic groups identified in the 2001 Census are shown in the figures presented.

Economic Activity

Economic Activity: 16–24 year olds

Figures 7.1 and 7.2 show that in Sandwell, among 16–24 year olds, young White Irish people were more likely to be employed full-time (57 percent of men and 50 percent of women), compared with 45 percent of men and 32 percent of women of the total young population, 54 percent of young White British men and 32 percent of young White British women in Sandwell. Young White Other people in Sandwell also had a comparatively higher full-time employment rate (31 percent for men and 25 percent for women). Followed by 26 percent of young men and 19 percent of young women from Mixed White and Caribbean backgrounds. Sandwell’s young Black Caribbean men had a lower full-time employment rate 21 percent for men and 14 percent for women.

Economic Activity: 25–64 years

Figure 7.3 shows that 50 percent of Black Caribbean men were employed full-time, followed by men from Mixed White and Black Caribbean, Indian and Other Mixed ethnic groups (57 percent respectively), compared with a higher proportion of the overall 25–64 male population (52 percent) and of White British men (64 percent) employed full-time in Sandwell.
Key facts about ethnic minority women in the labour market in England

- **15% of women of working age** belong to ethnic minority groups
- **Economic activity** (EA) and **unemployment** (UE) rates and **industrial/occupational distribution** of EM women are highly variable
- **Very uneven geographical distribution** of EM women in England/UK
# Employment status of women of working age: selected ethnic minority groups

**England & Wales 2001**

*thousands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Age</strong></td>
<td>13,522</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economically Active</strong></td>
<td>9,621</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In employment</strong></td>
<td>8,836</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployed</strong></td>
<td>363</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women aged 25 - 44 resident in England: % who are economically active, by place of birth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK born</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK born</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK born</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK born</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2001 and 1991 Census SARs. Census output is Crown copyright and is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland. This work is based on the SARs provided through the Centre for Census and Survey Research of the University of Manchester with the support of ESRC and JISC.
England: Women aged 25-44 who are unemployed as a proportion of those economically active, by place of birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1991</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK born</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK born</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women of working age by ethnicity, excl. White British women: selected localities and England

Women and girls born outside the UK:

selected localities and ethnicities

Examples from GELLM Gender Profiles

Source: 2001 Census Standard Tables, Crown Copyright 2003
Economic activity rates of women aged 16-59, selected ethnic groups England & Wales

Source: Buckner, Yeandle and Botcherby, 2007
Unemployment rates of women aged 16-59: selected ethnic groups

Source: Buckner, Yeandle and Botcherby, 2007
Headlines from the GELLM study of Ethnic Minority women

- **2.1m women** of working age in England are from EM groups
- FT and PT employment rates **varied by both locality and ethnicity**
- Unpaid **caring responsibilities** more common for women in some EM groups
- Some **LLMs operating in ways which seriously disadvantage women** in certain groups
Clustering in the labour market

Among women in employment, for example:

- 28% of Indian women in Leicester worked in *plant, process and machine operative* jobs;
- 40% of Bangladeshi women in Camden worked in *sales and customer service* jobs;
- 42% of Black African women in Birmingham worked in *health and social work* occupations;
- 33% of Pakistani women in Newcastle, and 49% of Chinese women in Sandwell, worked in the *wholesale, retail, restaurants and hotels* sector;
- 31% of Black Caribbean women in Southwark worked in *administrative and secretarial* jobs

In the *social care* sector, in all the districts studied (and in England as a whole),

- Black women were disproportionately concentrated in jobs as care workers/care assistants
- Asian women were under-represented in this segment of the labour market (Yeandle et al 2006b).

(see also GELLM Gender Profiles; Buckner et al 2004-06)
Employment in manufacturing: example of Leicester

- 34% Indian women worked in manufacturing (12% White British women).
- Within manufacturing, Indian women more strongly concentrated in lower level jobs than White British women or than Indian men.
- Only 4% of Indian women (18% of White British women, 12% of Indian men) held better paid jobs in the sector, as managers, professionals, or technicians.

Data from 2001 Census; Crown Copyright
Ethnic minority women and access to the labour market – GELLM study design

*Built on our Gender Profile chapters - “Women Men and Diversity”*

This study was carried out in Camden, Leicester, Newcastle, Somerset and Southwark

1) **Statistical analysis** - mapping and profiling district/ward level data on ethnic minority women and the labour market

2) **Documentary analysis** -
   1) Trawl for relevant local research and policy analysis
   2) Review of national and local level policy developments

3) **Views of local women** –
   1) Arts-based workshops to capture ‘voices rarely heard’ – locality/focus chosen by LA partners
Locality Reports of this study were produced for:

- Camden
- Leicester
- Newcastle
- Somerset
- Southwark
Research Questions for the EOC investigation in 2007

- Are EM women disadvantaged in the LM mainly because they are clustered in localities where LM opportunities are poor?
- Do different groups of EM women have consistently high/low levels of EA and UE, irrespective of where they live?
Moving on up?  
Ethnic minority women and work  

Ethnic Minority Women and  
Local Labour Markets  

Lisa Buckner,  
Sue Yeandle  
and Sue Botcherby
EOC Investigation Methodology (1)

- Examined **2001 Census** (100% sample): detailed question about ethnicity
  - Economic activity rates
  - Unemployment rates
- Identified **highest and lowest rates EA/UE** in 376 local authority districts (LADs)
- Mapped **geographical distribution** among selected groups of EM women
EOC Investigation Methodology (2)

- EA/UE in **major conurbations** with large EM populations
- ‘pairs’ of LADs where EA/UE rates for White British women similar
- EA/UE rates in **86 Neighbourhood Renewal** Areas, where high % of EM women live
Results of the EOC investigation: 5 aspects

- Mapping (areas where pop. of EM women 100+ only)
- Highest/lowest rates
- Major conurbations
- Pairs of LADs
- NR areas
Economic activity rates of White British women aged 16-59
Economic activity rates of Indian women aged 16-59
Economic activity rates of Pakistani women aged 16-59,
Economic activity rates of Black Caribbean women aged 16-59
Economic activity rates of Bangladeshi women aged 16-59
## Highest and lowest EA rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of women</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2001 Census Crown Copyright
### Highest and lowest UE rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of women</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2001 Census Crown Copyright
## Women’s EA rates in major conurbations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
<th>PAKISTANI</th>
<th>BANGLADESHI</th>
<th>BLACK CARIBBEAN</th>
<th>WHITE BRITISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>+ 66</td>
<td>++ 38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>-- 43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-- 24</td>
<td>-- 66</td>
<td>-- 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-- 23</td>
<td>-- 22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>-- 24</td>
<td>-- 22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-- 25</td>
<td>- 25</td>
<td>- 71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>-- 52</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>- 57</td>
<td>++ 38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>- 69</td>
<td>- 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td>-- 50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>- 25</td>
<td>- 71</td>
<td>-- 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>-- 52</td>
<td>++ 42</td>
<td>-- 23</td>
<td>- 68</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLAND</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Women’s UE Rates in major conurbations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
<th>PAKISTANI</th>
<th>BANGLADESHI</th>
<th>BLACK CARIBBEAN</th>
<th>WHITE BRITISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>London</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-- 12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manchester</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-- 14</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
<td>++ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birmingham</strong></td>
<td>+ 8</td>
<td>++ 22</td>
<td>++ 22</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bradford</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>++ 20</td>
<td>++ 21</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leeds</strong></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>++ 25</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheffield</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>++ 22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leicester</strong></td>
<td>+ 8</td>
<td>-- 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>++ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LB Newham</strong></td>
<td>++ 9</td>
<td>++ 18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
<td>++ 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LB Tower Hamlets</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>++ 21</td>
<td>++ 20</td>
<td>++ 11</td>
<td>++ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLAND</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis in ‘pairs’ of LA Districts

- Even where EA/UE rates for White British women are same, EM women have very different experiences, e.g.:
  - Blackburn (NW) and Gravesham (SE)
    - White British women EA is 71% in both areas
    - But Indian women’s EA 31% and 68%
  - Redbridge (SE) and Hyndburn (NW)
    - White British women UE is 4% in both areas
    - But Pakistani women 10% and 21%
  - Birmingham and Luton (large EM pops)
    - EA rates of Pakistani women 23% and 27%
      - (WB 69% and 75%)
    - UE rates of Pakistani women 22% and 15%
      - (WB 5% and 4%)
Neighbourhood Renewal Areas

- 75% of all Bangladeshi women and 71% of all Pakistani women of WA live in 47 of the 86 Neighbourhood Renewal Areas (compared with just 22% of White British women of WA).
- 76% of all unemployed Bangladeshi women of WA and 74% of all unemployed Pakistani women of WA live in these 47 areas.
## Women’s Economic Activity rates in Neighbourhood Renewal districts

Selected ethnic minority groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WHITE BRITISH</th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
<th>PAKISTANI</th>
<th>BANGLA-DESHI</th>
<th>BLACK CARIBBEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average EA (England)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average EA (NRU areas)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest EA in NR areas</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR areas Lowest EA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women’s unemployment rates in Neighbourhood Renewal districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WHITE BRITISH</th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
<th>PAKISTANI</th>
<th>BANGLA-DESHI</th>
<th>BLACK CARIBBEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average UE (England)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average UE (NRU areas)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest UE in NR areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest UE in NR areas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

selected ethnic minority groups
Conclusions of EOC Investigation

- The structure and extent of available employment opportunities do NOT fully explain differences in the LM experiences of ethnic minority women.
- The relationship between the residential clustering of population groups and women’s access to employment is complex.

Response to our Research Questions:

- Clustering in poorer districts only partly explains EM women’s disadvantage.
- Women in the same EM groups do NOT have consistently low/high UE and EA rates – cultural attitudes/preferences may be relevant - but they do NOT have the same effect everywhere; and attitudes and discriminatory practices CAN be changed.
- Local, tailored LM targets and policies are needed to address the LM inequality of EM women.
Policy Options

- 2001 Census data showed that...
- Unemployment rates for women aged 16-59 were:
  - White British women – 3.7% (of economically active women)
  - Pakistani women - 14.8% (of economically active women)
  - Bangladeshi women - 16.5% (of economically active women)

- To **reduce** unemployment rates to rate for White British women, we have to reduce the number of unemployed in England by:
  - 5,400 for Pakistani women
  - 2,100 for Bangladeshi women

- Targeted policy initiatives could make a major impact
Policy Options (2)

- Places where targeted effort would have greatest impact, e.g.:
  - In 2001, 50% of all Bangladeshi women aged 16-74 lived in just 6 local authority districts (Tower Hamlets, Newham, Birmingham, Camden, Oldham, Luton)
  - 30% of all Bangladeshi women aged 16-74 lived in just 20 wards (including 13 in Tower Hamlets and 4 in Birmingham)

- We know many women in these groups want to work
  - Over 37,000 Pakistani women of working age
  - And 12,000 Bangladeshi women of working age are unemployed or economically inactive but say they want paid work

(Source: APS Sep 2005- Oct 2006)
Policy Options indicated by the GELLM study

- **Socio-economic conditions** crucial factors
- **Special support is needed for EM women displaced from declining sectors**
- **Language skills** are a barrier for some – much better support needed
- **Tackle unemployment** among ethnic minority women – variations suggest discrimination still a factor
- **Improve support services/ local infrastructure**
- **Build on success** – examples of successful local projects
For more information about the GELLM Research Programme

- The *Gender and Employment in Local Labour Markets* research programme was directed by Professor Sue Yeandle and based at the Centre for Social Inclusion, Sheffield Hallam University, 2003-6.

- The full set of publications produced during the grant period are available from www.shu.ac.uk/research/csi or from the University of Leeds www.leeds.ac.uk/sociology/research

For more information / to contact Sue Yeandle
- s.m.yeandle@leeds.ac.uk
- Tel 0113 343 4442
- http://www.leeds.ac.uk/sociology/research