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FOREWORD BY RANJANA BELL, CHAIR OF THE NORTH EAST EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP (NEEDP) BOARD

I am very pleased to introduce this report, which provides a very thorough statistical profile of equality and diversity in the region. I would like to thank Amy O'Donnell and her team at the Centre for Public Policy at Northumbria University for their hard work in researching and writing it.

This report is aimed at all employers, public, private and voluntary sector and those providing services to the population of the NE. It clearly shows there is no place for complacency and the success of future business will depend on engaging with all those people who are currently excluded from employment and services.

The report will greatly help the NEEDP Board in implementing the Equality and Diversity Action Plan. The Action Plan was launched in 2007, aiming to ensure that the needs of different communities are understood and pursued by those who provide services, and those who develop policy and strategy in the region. This research will benefit each of the priority areas identified in the Action Plan:

- Leadership
- Capacity building and voice
- Evidence
- Awareness and communication
- Mainstreaming equality
- Employment, skills and enterprise

This report makes clear that the population of North East England is becoming increasingly diverse. For example, we know that there are many more people from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups living in the region now than ever before. Ethnic diversity has significantly increased even over the past ten years. This increasing diversity provides challenges to the region, but it also provides opportunities which the NEEDP Board is keen to explore. Over the next year the Board wants to develop a 'business case' for equality and diversity, which will aim to demonstrate how much more economically successful North East England would be if employers and service providers utilised the wealth of talent currently not being tapped into. Such thinking should feed directly into the forthcoming Integrated Regional Strategy, currently being developed by a wide partnership of organisations in the public sector.

I would like to make a point about some of the language used in this report. Often, groups within the population are referred to by standard statistical categories: for example, BME groups are identified with categories used by the Office for National Statistics hence the use of the term 'non white'. This is not ideal but necessary and is not intended to cause any offence.

Ranjana Bell, July 2008
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One NorthEast commissioned the Centre for Public Policy at Northumbria University (CPP) to provide an up-to-date and comprehensive statistical baseline of equality and diversity issues in the North East region. Equality in the North East: a statistical profile was conducted between January and May 2008, in close partnership with NERIP (North East Regional Information Partnership) and the North East Equality and Diversity Partnership Board’s Evidence Base Task Group. It is a follow-up to the 2005 report by Jane Shewell and David Penn, Equality and diversity in the North East region of England: a baseline study and represents a significant contribution to the evidence requirements of the North East Equality and Diversity Partnership Board. A summary of the research and its findings is provided below.

Background

At both the national and regional level there is an increasing understanding of the need for a robust evidence base in order to inform policies aimed at tackling inequality in today’s Britain. The final report from the government’s Equalities Review, Fairness and Freedom (2007) identified the need for accurate, coordinated and timely data in order to present a complete picture of inequality across all the relevant strands of equality. More recently, within the North East itself, the evidence and business case has been identified as one of six priority areas for action in the region’s Equality and Diversity Board Action Plan, Working Together for a Welcoming, Inclusive and Fair North East. The North East Regional Information Partnership (NERIP) is leading on this work and will work with key partners around the region including One NorthEast and the Equality and Human Rights Commission in order to map the existing evidence base, address any identified gaps and disseminate key findings. As part of this work, the overall aim of this research project was therefore to provide a more comprehensive understanding of equality and diversity issues in the North East, and in particular to establish a updated baseline of statistical data based on the previous report by Shewell and Penn, Equality and diversity in the North East region of England: a baseline study (2005).

Method

The research was undertaken between 22nd January and 9th May 2008 in four interlinked phases, as described below:

- **Phase 1: Updating the existing evidence base** took place from late Jan. to mid Feb., during which the research team conducted desk-based statistical research in order to update Shewell & Penn for the identified target population groups.  

---

1 Namely Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Disability, Mental Health, LGBT, Worklessness, Faith & Religion, Refugees & Asylum seekers, Gypsies and Travellers, Lone parents, Carers, Offenders.
Phase 2: Addressing the knowledge gaps focussed on the areas identified in Shewell & Penn’s report and was carried out from mid to the end of February.

Phase 3: Reviewing the findings took place during March, and involved a thorough review of the evidence base generated in order to highlight key knowledge gaps and thus suggest possible additional areas for research.

Phase 4: Production of the final report during April, was carried out in conjunction with partners at One North East, NERIP and the Evidence Base Task Group.

Statistical Profile of the North East

The North East is the smallest of the English regions in both area size and population (2.6 million). Although two thirds of the region is rural, the majority of the population live in urban settlements, with the highest population density in Middlesbrough. Following a number of years of downturn, the regional population is now experiencing growth but this is still at a slower rate than in England as a whole. Further, there is considerable variation at sub-regional level, with the south of the region in particular predicted to experience a population decline in the following decades. Finally, in comparison to the rest of the UK, the region’s population is less qualified, commands the lowest gross weekly earnings and experiences lower employment rates and higher unemployment rates than most other regions. Indeed looking across a range of equality indicators, recent data tells us that parts of the North East experience some of the highest levels of multiple deprivation of any region in England.

Target Population Groups

Age: In line with national trends, the North East population is ageing, and now has one of the highest proportions of over 60s in England. Within the region, however, there is considerable variation, with the rural north displaying a generally older, and the south and urban parts of the region, a comparatively younger age profile. At both ends of the scale, large numbers of the youngest and oldest people in the North East live in poverty. Gross pensioner incomes are well below the UK average, and almost 1 in 4 children under 16 live in households dependent on workless benefits.

Gender: Women play an increasingly active role in the North East labour market however significant gender divisions persist, particularly in terms of the nature of the work the majority of women currently perform in the region, and also in relation to the burden of caring responsibilities that they continue to shoulder. Women earn less than their male counterparts, continue to be under-represented at professional and managerial levels, and are more likely to be concentrated at the lower skilled end of the market, particularly in the service industries. As at national level, there are also marked differences in the educational performance of boys and girls in the region. Although achievement for all North East pupils is low in comparison with the rest of England, boys in the North East perform particularly badly, with fewer boys achieving good grades at GCSE / A/AS level, and a higher proportion of boys reported as “not settled” at the end of compulsory education.

Ethnicity: According to recently released experimental ONS statistics, the ethnic diversity of the North East has changed significantly since the 2001 Census. In particular, the region’s non-White population has grown dramatically; there have been marked increases in the Black African, Black Caribbean, Chinese, Mixed heritage, Other Ethnic population groups, as well as in the Other White category. At
the same time, the North East remains one of the least diverse regions of the UK; the top five districts with the highest proportion of White British people (99%) are all in this region. In terms of employment and ethnicity, there are some notable trends. In particular, White and mixed race people are the most likely to be employed in routine and manual jobs, whilst Pakistani / Bangladeshi people have the lowest employment rates in the region, and are most likely to be classed as having never worked or long-term unemployed.

- **Migrant Workers:** The expansion of the European Union in recent years has had a marked impact on the significant growth in the North East migrant worker population since the turn of the century. Almost 40% of National Insurance Number allocations in the past year have been to migrants from the EU accession states, with Poland supplying the vast majority of these workers. At a sub-regional level, looking at Worker Registration Scheme data, Tyne and Wear had the largest number of registered workers (45% of the regional total), and these predominantly settled in Newcastle. Alternatively, Northumberland had the lowest number of registrations, at only 15% of the regional total influx. However, in comparison to other emerging communities (such as refugees and asylum seekers), there are significant numbers of migrant workers in rural parts of the region as well as urban areas.

- **Refugees and Asylum Seekers:** The Newcastle’s ethnic minority population has grown and changed considerably since the 2001 Census, due in particular to the recent expansion of the EU, but also as a result of government’s dispersal policy for asylum seekers and refugees. The majority of asylum seekers are located in ten local authorities in the North East, with Newcastle receiving the largest numbers at present (37% of the regional total). The main nationalities of the region’s asylum seekers are Iranian, Iraqi and Zimbabwean, with increasing numbers from some African counties including Eritrea, Angola and the Congo. However, less is known about numbers of failed asylum seekers in the region, particularly those not in receipt of any formal means of support, or in terms of current numbers of resident refugees. Local research has shown that refugees and asylum seekers are a diverse group, with varied educational levels, employment experiences, aspirations, health, abilities, family arrangements and training and support needs. In terms of health needs, however, health providers in the region have found particularly high prevalence of mental health issues amongst this group.

- **Gypsies and Travellers:** A lack of reliable, comprehensive data on Gypsy and Traveller communities makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the region’s population or the particular issues they face. According to the latest Caravan Count, there were 530 caravans in the region, the majority of which were located in County Durham on authorised sites. However, Caravan Count data only provides the *minimum* number of caravans at anyone time and importantly, tells us little about the Gypsy and Traveller population itself. In terms of the health, education and accommodation status of the North East’s Gypsies and Travellers, studies carried out at the national, regional and local level point toward a number of issues for concern. For instance, research indicates that Gypsies and Travellers have significantly poorer health status than other ethnic groups in the UK; levels of educational attainment are extremely low and a number of people, particular those living in unauthorised encampments live with poor basic facilities and experience harassment and abuse from the local community on a fairly regular basis.

- **Faith and Religion:** Christianity remains the dominant religion in both the North East and the wider UK, with just over half of all adults claiming affiliation, while other faiths account for just 6% of the population (notably, the Muslim, Hindu and Sikh faiths).
However this is not reflected in actual attendance levels; only one in four adults attend a place of worship at least once a year (less than one in five in this region, many for only weddings, christenings etc), and two thirds have no connection with places of worship at all. There is some ethnic variation in this respect; nationally almost half of adults of black ethnic origin are regular attenders at places of worship and in contrast with attendance patterns in the White majority, non-White attendance at places of worship has increased significantly in recent years.

- **Disability and Mental Health:** The North East region has the highest proportion of disabled people in England, representing a quarter of the working age population. In comparison with the non-disabled population, employment & economic activity rates and earnings are lower, despite the fact that many inactive disabled people would like to work. Looking at trends in relation to Disability Living Allowance, regional statistics show that most claimants are over 60, and that the vast majority have been claiming for 5 years or more (this is particularly the case in some local authority areas, such as Easington). Further, a number of health indicators show that the North East has higher rates of mental illness compared with other English regions.

- **Sexual Orientation:** Government estimates put the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) population at between 5-7% of the population, although much less is known about numbers of transgender people in the UK. Due to the lack of comprehensive data on the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) population, particularly at regional level, observed trends are therefore likely to represent only a “snapshot” profile of the North East. At national level, the Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles indicates that either same sex sexual behaviour is increasing, or that people are more willing to report it. At the same time, research shows that homophobic bullying is particularly prevalent in schools, and there is concern about homophobic and discriminatory practices in the NHS and the workplace more generally. At the regional level, a recent Stonewall survey (Serves you right, Stonewall 2008) implies that LGB people in the region have slightly more positive expectations about treatment in the political arena, but more likely to feel negatively about treatment in health and social care, and by the police and justice system.

- **Carers:** According to the 2001 Census, a higher proportion of people in North East are carers compared with the national picture, and the region’s women in particular have a higher likelihood of providing care than nationally. At sub-regional level, County Durham and Tyne and Wear are two of the areas with the largest numbers of carers relative to the population. Research conducted at the national level has found links between deprivation and caring, with people from less advantaged backgrounds more likely to provide unpaid care than those from more advantaged groups. Caring also appears to have a further negative impact on earnings and many carers are in poor health, with caregiving itself leading to further health deterioration. The North East itself displays a particularly high prevalence of carers in poor health: more than one in four carers providing over 50 hours of care per week in Gateshead and Sedgefield reported ill-health in the last Census.

- **Lone Parents:** There is limited regional or local data on lone parents that provides a more recent profile than the 2001 Census. Data that is available via the Department for Work and Pensions offers only a partial picture as by its very nature, it only includes lone parents currently in receipt of benefits. Based on this data, however, it is clear that as at national level, lone parent claimants in the North East are overwhelmingly female and have comparatively younger dependent children. The main variant compared with England as a whole is in relation to lone parents and
disability, where proportionately more of the region’s lone parent claimants are disabled than in other parts of the country.

- **Offenders:** A third of the region’s offenders are aged between 17 and 24, and the vast majority are White British and male. These trends are also reflected in the North East prison population. Two thirds of the regional prison population is from the North East, with the majority of the remainder from the North of England generally. There is limited regional data on the impact of having a criminal record on an individual’s life chances however, although national qualitative research indicates far higher prevalence of social disadvantage and unemployment amongst this group.

**Key Equality Indicators**

- **Employment and Worklessness:** Despite a recent upward trend in economic activity rates, the North East still lags behind the average performance in England, particularly in comparison to the South East. However, within the region, there is considerable variation in terms of economic performance, with distinct economic “hot-spots” and high employment rates in some areas, with other parts of the region experiencing significantly lower employment rates (such as South Tyneside, Hartlepool and Middlesbrough), alongside high levels unemployment in comparison to the national picture. Further, the region as a whole exhibits high levels of worklessness and economic inactivity, with the highest percentage of workless households in comparison to other parts of England. In particular, a significant number of working age adults claim incapacity benefits, particularly in key localities (almost 1 in 5 adults of working age in Easington). Finally, taking a broader measure of unemployment (defined by Sheffield Hallam University), there is a marked North / South divide at national level. In particular, Easington, Middlesbrough and South Tyneside all feature amongst the top 20 districts in England showing high rates of “real unemployment”.

- **Crime and Safety:** Crime rates in the North East are slightly below the overall level for England & Wales, although in general rates for most offence groups are fairly similar. People in the region appear to worry less about burglary and violent crime than the national average rate, but have relatively equal concerns about car crime along with perceptions of anti-social behaviour. Further, confidence levels in the Criminal Justice System compare well with the national situation. There is limited regional data on hate crime, but national research indicates many ethnic minorities, LGBT and disabled people have experienced varying levels of harassment, including verbal abuse and violent attacks.

- **Education and Skills:** In educational terms, the North East compares poorly with England on a range of indicators. In terms of examinations, whilst female pupils outperform their male counterparts at GCSE level in line with national trends, achievement levels in the region are generally lower than the national picture. In 2006/2007, only 41.5% of North East pupils achieved five or more grades A*- C including English and Mathematics at GCSE (or equivalent), compared with 46.5% for England as a whole. Further, although an increased number of 16/17 year olds are now working towards a qualification in the North East, participation rates in full-time education for that group are below the national average and the region has the highest percentage of young people classified as NEET (not in education, employment or training) in the country. Looking at the working age population, North East residents are also, on the whole, less well-qualified than the national average (particularly at degree level) and the region has one of the highest percentage of people with no qualifications at all.
Social Capital: Whilst people in the North East appear to have very slightly lower civic participation rates than most other regions, other indicators show more positive levels of social capital in the region. For example, in terms of social networks, there appears to be a clear North / South divide, with people in the North East more likely to have regular telephone contact with relatives than people living in the South East and London and more likely to talk to their neighbours on a regular basis, indicating higher levels of social cohesion than other parts of England. However the key indicator in terms of social capital is clearly age, with older people more likely to feel able to influence local decisions, be satisfied with their local area, and to trust and have regular contact with their neighbours than in most English regions.

Health and Social Care: Health is a key dimension of equality but outcomes continue to be shaped by an individual’s socio-economic status and class. In this respect, the North East performs poorly on a range of health indicators, with high prevalence of smoking, high rates of male alcohol consumption, one of the lowest rates of "5 a day" consumption and overall, low life expectancies. Further, in terms of birth and fertility, although the North East has the joint lowest total fertility rate in England, it has the highest teenage birth rate in England.

Housing: Although the North East has some of the lowest priced housing stock in the UK, there is significant variation in both the quality, cost and availability of dwelling stock at a sub-regional level. The region has a high proportion of terraced housing, particularly around major conurbations and former coalfield communities, where there is also a concentration of lower socio-economic groups. However in terms of housing aspirations, there is a shortage of detached housing and flats in many parts of the region. In relation to cost, whilst parts of the region (Tees Valley in particular) have house prices that are considerably lower than the national average, this masks sub-regional property hotspots at the other end of the scale. Northumberland and other notable patches within or around the region’s conurbations are relatively unaffordable, with average house prices 7-9 times average household income. Even in other parts of the region, house prices have become increasingly hard to afford for first time buyers.

Transport: The transport profile of the North East in most areas is similar to the rest of England (with the exception of London), with the majority of the population reliant on the car as the main means of transport. However, a significant proportion (22%) of commuters to key employment centres in the region use public transport, particularly where Metro access is available. A number of studies have found evidence of link between transport access and deprivation: higher socio-economic groups tend to commute longer distances, with the poorest households least likely to have access to a car or van. People living in rural parts of the region are particularly dependant on the car as a means of transport and a number of studies have linked rural transport deprivation to difficulties in accessing key services, in addition to education, training and employment opportunities

Findings and recommendations
The investigation carried out as part of this project suggests that the evidence base would particularly benefit from further research and / or improved data collection on the following target groups:

Refugees and Asylum Seekers: available data is basic and there is a particular need for more information on failed and / destitute asylum seekers and on resident numbers of refugees in the region.
Data on **Gypsies and Travellers** continues to provide an incomplete picture of the regional community. More information on the health needs, education and employment patterns of this group. Along with trends in terms of the gender and ethnicity of the region’s Gypsies and Travellers would be particularly valuable.

**Faith and Religion** would benefit from more data on the various Christian and Muslim faith denominations, in addition attitudinal data on the large section of the population with no religious affiliation.

Standardisation of **Disability and Mental Health** definitions would improve the available evidence base, and there is a need for more information in terms of ethnicity and mental health, plus data to illustrate the educational and employment experiences of people with physical, sensory and mental impairments.

There is minimal data available on the region’s **Lone Parents** and **Carers** since Census 2001, except in terms of numbers and characteristics of relevant benefit claimants. The 2011 Census should address this need however.

**Sexual Orientation** data is extremely limited at all geographic levels, and as other studies have noted, there is particularly little data available on people with transgender status.

Data on the region’s **Offenders** is relatively limited and one-dimensional. More information on their health, education and employment status would be of value.

More broadly:

There is currently a paucity of detailed data at the sub-regional level other than in Newcastle upon Tyne. The research carried out by Sheffield Hallam University exploring local labour markets in this area offers an excellent example of the value of conducting additional analysis of available data sets in illustrating equality issues at the sub-regional level. Disaggregation of existing data to regional and sub-regional level in key areas of interest would also therefore add value.

Increased harmonisation of data to allow greater understanding of the impact and prevalence of multiple-deprivation factors at local authority district level. In particular, improved consistency of data gathering and publication formats at sub-regional level by relevant agencies (local government, healthcare and education providers in particular) would further support this aim.

Further, there is no comprehensive source of regional data on attitudes to equality and diversity in the North East, particularly in terms of attitudes towards the key societal groups that have formed the focus of this research.

Finally, due both to the time limited nature of this research and the scope defined by the original objectives, a selective approach to data collection was essential. In particular, whilst Section C includes some data on key equality indicators, this area would benefit from additional research. This would reflect the work currently ongoing at national level by the Equality and Human Rights Commission to develop the data sets by which to measure progress in relation to the ten dimensions of equality². Further areas for future research in order to support the region’s equality and diversity evidence base could focus in particular on the domains of **standards of living** and **participation, influence and voice**.

---

Conclusion and way forward

Despite some concerns that ongoing developments in the UK statistical evidence base will still fall short of addressing all the above issues, it is clear that over the next few years significant improvements will nevertheless be made. For policy makers using the data, *The Equalities Review* also provides a valuable framework via the ten dimensions of equality that can be used as basis by which to measure progress. In addition, there continue to be opportunities for regional stakeholders to further influence ongoing improvements in the evidence base:

**In the immediate term:**

- NERIP, One NorthEast and other members of the Equality and Diversity Evidence Base Task Group need to ensure that the findings from this research are publicised and disseminated effectively. This may mean provision of key findings in a variety of formats that will be accessible to the community at large.
- At the practical level, providers of equality data in the region can also play a valuable role in terms of working to ensure data collection is carried out consistently in their own organisations, in addition to communicating the value of data being collected to those involved in the process.
- Further, the North East Equality and Diversity Board should consider the implications of this research for future policy and practice at the earliest opportunity and take action as appropriate.

**In terms of future research:**

- Some of the knowledge gaps highlighted above will take action at national level to address. However there may be value in commissioning further research at the regional and local level. For example:
  - Further analysis of existing data, to disaggregate statistics at the regional and sub-regional level (for example, such as Sheffield Hallam’s work on local labour markets).
  - More qualitative research to investigate experiences of and attitudes towards equality and diversity issues, for example in the fields of sexual orientation, disability and refugee and asylum seekers.
  - Future reviews of statistical data for the region should focus on collecting information to illustrate the ten dimensions of equality highlighted in *The Equalities Review*.

**In relation to the potential policy impact of this research:**

- Nationally, Government is working on the production of a series of indicators by which they can measure progress in relation to the ten dimensions of equality. Based on the priority data gaps identified in this study, and the work of the Equality and Diversity Board’s Evidence Base Task Group in general, policy makers in the region must ensure they participate actively in that process where possible.
- Finally, whilst to date there are no plans by ONS to include questions on sexual orientation in Census 2011, there is widespread concern that alternative proposals will fail to address this major gap in the evidence base. Policy makers, service providers and other interested parties in the North East are therefore urged to monitor developments closely in this area, and where possible, maintain pressure at the national level for a more acceptable solution.
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SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

This introductory section summarises the background and context to the project in the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1 – Introduction** outlines the background to the research, including the national and regional policy context and details the project aims and objectives.

- **Chapter 2 - Research Method** describes the research methods employed during the course of the study, and outlines the project schedule through four broad phases. It concludes with a note of the interpretation of data provided in the report.
1. Introduction

This report outlines the findings of research undertaken by the Centre for Public Policy at Northumbria University to provide an up-to-date and comprehensive statistical baseline of equality and diversity issues in the North East region. The Evidence Base Review was funded by One NorthEast, and conducted in close partnership with NERIP (North East Regional Information Partnership). It is a follow-up to the 2005 report by Jane Shewell and David Penn, *Equality and diversity in the North East region of England: a baseline study* and represents a significant contribution to the evidence requirements of the North East Equality and Diversity Partnership Board.

Background to the research

*A new agenda for equality*

“An equal society protects and promotes equal, real freedom and substantive opportunity to live in the ways people value and would choose, so that everyone can flourish. An equal society recognises people’s different needs, situations and goals and removes the barriers that limit what people can do and can be.”

*Source: Fairness and Freedom (The Equalities Review 2007)*

The publication of the report from the government’s Equalities Review, *Fairness and Freedom*, in 2007 marked the beginning of a new chapter in equality and diversity policy-making for the UK. In addition to providing an updated, capability-based definition of equality, the report helped to draw attention to the long term and underlying causes of disadvantage that exist today. Crucially, it also provided a practical approach for measuring inequality based on ten key dimensions of equality, derived from international human rights principles and consultation with the general public, including groups at high risk of disadvantage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ten dimensions of equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Longevity</strong>, including avoiding premature mortality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Physical security</strong>, including freedom from violence and physical and sexual abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Health</strong>, including both well-being and access to high quality healthcare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Education</strong>, including both being able to be creative, to acquire skills and qualifications and having access to training and life-long learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Standard of living</strong>, including being able to live with independence and security; and covering nutrition, clothing, housing, warmth, utilities, social services and transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Productive and valued activities</strong>, such as access to employment, a positive experience in the workplace, work/life balance, and being able to care for others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Individual, family and social life</strong>, including self-development, having independence and equality in relationships and marriage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation, influence and voice, including participation in decision-making and democratic life.

Identity, expression and self-respect, including freedom of belief and religion.

Legal security, including equality and non-discrimination before the law and equal treatment within the criminal justice system.

Combined with the recent launch of the Equality and Human Rights Commission nationally, and the regional Equality and Diversity Board, this provides us with an enhanced governance and policy framework to support those seeking to promote equality and diversity in the North East and nationally.

**Barriers to progress**

At the same time, *Fairness and Freedom* highlighted a series of key barriers to progress:

- First, it focussed on the persistence of prejudice in today’s society, despite a strong public value of fairness and equality.
- Lack of awareness and understanding about what equality means, how it relates to what organisations do, what is required or permitted under the law, and who is responsible for delivering on this, was also seen as a factor.
- Further, it drew attention to the inadequacy of the tools available to help achieve equality in today’s Britain. For example, limitations and inconsistencies in the law.

Importantly, the Review also identified the need for accurate, coordinated and timely data in order to present a complete picture of inequality across all the relevant strands of equality (Age, Disability, Gender, Race, Religion or Belief and Sexual Orientation, alongside Human Rights). Indeed, lack of robust evidence was seen to be at the heart of why inequalities still persist in Britain today:

> "Poor measurement and a lack of transparency have contributed to society and governments being unable to tackle persistent inequalities and their causes. The data available on inequality are utterly inadequate in many ways, limiting people’s ability to understand problems and their causes, set priorities and track progress. And even where data do exist, they are not consistently used well or published in a way that makes sense."

*Fairness and Freedom, 2007*

**Value of evidence-based policy making**

The important link identified here between evidence and effective policy making is a not new one. Indeed, in recent years there has been a renewed interest in defining and strengthening the relationship between research evidence and policy-making. This development has been attributed to a number of factors; in particular the growth of an increasingly well-educated and well-informed public; the explosion in the availability of data of all types; the growth in size and capabilities of the research community; and an
increasing emphasis on scrutiny and accountability within Government. As a result, evidence is now seen as central to effective policy making:

"Good quality policy making depends on high quality information, derived from a number of sources – expert knowledge; existing domestic and international research; existing statistics; stakeholder consultation; evaluation of previous policies; new research, if appropriate; or secondary resources, including the internet".

(Strategic Policy Making Team (SPMT) 1999)

In the North East region itself, there is acknowledgement of the valuable contribution that evidence-based policy can make to the ongoing development of the region (NEA Scrutiny and Policy Board 2007).

In this context, the North East Equality and Diversity Board has produced an Action Plan entitled Working Together for a Welcoming, Inclusive and Fair North East, which details a number of priority themes to ensure that the needs of diverse communities are promoted, and the opportunities from greater equality are maximised. These include: awareness; leadership; capacity-building; employment & enterprise; mainstreaming; and the evidence and business case. This final theme relates to the need to improve the regional evidence base on equality and diversity in order to provide an essential shared understanding of the baseline position and address any knowledge gaps. The North East Regional Information Partnership (NERIP) is leading on this work and will work with key partners around the region including One North East and the Equality and Human Rights Commission in order to map the existing evidence base, address any identified gaps and disseminate key findings.

**Aims and objectives**

As part of the Equality and Diversity Board’s work under the theme of the evidence and business case, the overall aim of this research project was therefore to provide a more comprehensive baseline understanding of equality and diversity issues in the North East. The key objective was to establish an updated baseline of statistical data relating to Equality and Diversity in the North East. In particular, the project was intended to expand and update, where possible, the previous report Equality and diversity in the North East region of England: a baseline study (Shewell and Penn 2005). The project comprised of three broad focus areas for the research:

1. Update the statistical data contained within the 2005 report by David Penn and Jane Shewell using available public data sources.
2. Address any identified statistical gaps within this report where this can be done from available public data sources.
3. Highlight, in consultation with partners from the North East E&D Board and the Evidence Base Task Group, key gaps in the evidence base that would require
further research or analysis to address, preparing a report for the Evidence Base Task Group to enable them to prioritise further research needed to improve the evidence base.

The findings from this research are presented in the following report.

**Structure of the report**

The report is divided into four sections:

- **Section B**: presents a statistical profile of the North East region, including a chapter summarising highlight statistics for the region and chapters breaking down data by identified target population groups, namely: age; gender; ethnicity; migrant workers; refugees and asylum seekers; Gypsies and Travellers; faith and religion; disability and mental health; sexual orientation; carers; lone parents and offenders.

- **Section C**: provides further statistical information on the region in a series of key cross-cutting policy themes that offer a range of key indicators of equality in the North East, namely: employment and worklessness; crime and safety; education and skills; social capital; health and social care; housing and transport.

- **Section D**: examines the national policy context to the development of the equality and diversity evidence base, and reviews and analyses the evidence base generated during the research, highlighting key gaps in the available data.

- **Section E**: provides a comprehensive bibliography of references and data sources used in the study.

---

3 Note that unlike Penn & Shewell's 2005 study, this report does not include a chapter on lone parents as the researchers were unable to find any updated data since Census 2001.
2. Research method

The research was undertaken between 22nd January and 9th May 2008. The project was almost exclusively desk-based, and employed predominantly quantitative methods in order to conduct secondary data analysis in pre-identified equality data categories, in addition to a number of cross-cutting policy themes.

Research approach

The project was undertaken in four interlinked phases, as described below.

**Phase 1: Updating the existing evidence base**

From late January to mid February, the research team conducted desk-based statistical research in order to update Penn & Shewell figures for the identified target population groups.4 The majority of this information was located via the interrogation of a range of key publicly available data sources using three broad approaches:

- First, a systematic review of the data sources listed in Shewell & Penn was carried out in order to determine focus areas for which updated statistics were available and/or where no new data had been published since 2005 (particularly in the case of Census 2001 data)
- A second data trawl then took place, using the audit conducted as part of the ONS Review of equality data, in order to locate additional information sources.
- These approaches were further supplemented through online searches of specialist electronic databases (e.g. NORA; Ingenta Select); alongside more generic Internet based search engines (e.g. Google Scholar, Yahoo).

As data and literature was located and collected, it was catalogued and organised chronologically and by key equality or cross-cutting policy category using Endnote. A systematic review and analysis of the literature then took place, during which the research team highlighted broad themes emerging in the data, as well as discarding documents/reports that were not of relevance to the research project (for example, where sources contained little or no regional data or did not add to the existing body of research generated by Penn & Shewell).

**Phase 2: Addressing the knowledge gaps**

From mid to the end of February, further desk-based statistical research was carried out in additional areas with the aim of addressing any identified gaps within Penn & Shewell’s report. In addition to exploring publicly available sources (as detailed above), this research phase also employed a ‘snowballing’ technique, working with colleagues at

---

4 Namely Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Disability, Mental Health, LGBT, Worklessness, Faith & Religion, Refugees & Asylum seekers, Gypsies and Travellers, Lone parents, Carers, Offenders
NERIP, ONE NorthEast and members of the Evidence Base Task Group, in order to access additional local data not yet in the public domain. In addition, the research team reviewed a range of sources submitted to NERIP by delegates and invitees to their seminar on the evidence base, held jointly with Equality North East, in November, 2007.

This phase focused in particular on interrogating the latest sources for more data in the following areas:

- sexual orientation
- disability and mental health
- faith and religion
- Gypsies and Irish travellers

These areas were research gaps identified in the report by Penn & Shewell (2005). In addition, it also reviewed available data in relation to recent economic migrants to the region from the 2004 European Union accession states.

In total, over 190 articles, reports and other relevant documents were identified during Phases 1 and 2 of the research. A full reference list of the literature referred to in the research is provided at the end of the report.

Phase 3: Reviewing the findings

The final research phase took place during March, when the research team conducted a thorough review of the evidence base generated in order to highlight key knowledge gaps and thus suggest possible additional areas for research.

Phase 4: Production of the final report

In April, the research team worked with partners at ONE North East, NERIP and the Evidence Base Task Group in order to negotiate and produce the final report from the research and executive summary.

Interpretation of findings

This study has sought to conduct a systematic review of quantitative evidence relating to equality and diversity issues in the North East region. In interpreting the results, however, a couple of notes of caution.

First, it is important to stress the time restricted nature of this project. Whilst the research team have endeavoured to carry out a comprehensive search and analysis of

---

5 Note that the majority of the evidence reviewed from this event comprised of either qualitative data or the research team could only locate partial local statistics, therefore was not appropriate for inclusion in this research.
publicly available data sources, in addition to accessing additional information via relevant networks, a study of this size and scope can only present a limited statistical profile. In order to gain a more in-depth understanding of a particular issue or theme, readers are therefore strongly encouraged to refer to the primary data source before drawing firm conclusions.

Second, the focus of this particular study was on collating and interrogating quantitative data only. A key benefit of quantitative evidence is that it can give policy makers fairly reliable information about the prevalence of certain characteristics amongst the target population. Quantitative research that is conducted on a periodic basis also can track trends and developments in the population or in terms of changing attitudes, and/or behaviours. At the same time, to facilitate data entry and analysis, the structure of most surveys limits the number of questions that can be asked, the variety of responses that respondents can provide and any type of interactive process with or among respondents. Thus the data are limited in the amount and richness of information that can be gathered. In order to further explore the trends and issues highlighted in this report, it is advisable therefore to consult authoritative qualitative research studies in the appropriate areas of interest.
SECTION B: STATISTICAL PROFILE OF THE NORTH EAST

This section presents a statistical profile of the North East region and includes an opening chapter (3) summarising highlight statistics for the region, followed by chapters breaking down data by identified target population groups, namely:

- **Chapter 4 - Age** looks at the current age profile of the North East; the prevalence of poverty in both children and the elderly population; and trends in relation to older people’s health in the region.

- **Chapter 5 – Gender** looks at regional trends in terms of education and skills, and employment issues, and concludes with a summary of the findings of research into the impact of caring responsibilities on women in the North East labour market.

- **Chapter 6 – Ethnicity** examines the ethnic categories employed in most standard data sources, before going on to look at the ethnic profile of England and the North East itself, including recent trends in the regional ethnic minority population.

- **Chapter 7 - Migrant Workers** summarises current data on the migrant worker population, focusing in particular on the EU accession states, using National Insurance Number Registration and Worker Registration Scheme statistics.

- **Chapter 8 - Refugees and Asylum Seekers** explores trends in the refugee and asylum seeker population (including information on both supported and failed asylum seekers) and includes sections on the health and housing needs of this group, looking in particular at the issue of destitute asylum seekers.

- **Chapter 9 - Gypsies and Travellers** summarises North East data from the latest Caravan Count, looks at the accommodation needs of this group, focussing on County Durham, and explores issues relating to health and education.

- **Chapter 10 - Faith and Religion** explores post-Census data on religion in England and the North East, focussing in particular on issues around attendance, recent trends in religion, and the link between faith and social action in the region.

- **Chapter 11 - Disability and Mental Health** summarises key data on the region’s disabled population, using recent Labour Force & Family Resources Survey statistics, relevant claimant counts and APHO’s Indications of Public Health in the English Regions.

- **Chapter 12 - Sexual Orientation** reviews various statistical sources on the LGBT population (including the National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles and registered Civil Partnerships), before concluding with a summary of recent research.

- **Chapter 13 - Carers** explores the current profile of carers in the North East, based mainly on 2001 Census data, before going on to look at poverty and health.

- **Chapter 14 - Lone Parents** reviews Labour Force Survey Household Datasets and New Deal for Lone Parent claimant data in order to examine differences in terms of the gender, ethnicity and disability status of the region’s lone parents.

- **Chapter 15 – Offenders** draws on National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and Home Office data this information in order to examine the region’s offender and prison population.
3. Profile of the North East

The North East is a mixed urban and rural region extending from the Scottish border to Yorkshire; and from the Pennine Hills to the North Sea. It is the smallest of the English regions in both area (8,592 square km) and population (2.6 million). It has four sub-regions: Northumberland, County Durham, Tyne and Wear and the Tees Valley. Two thirds of the region is rural, a large proportion of which is protected landscape such as National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. However the majority of the population live in urban settlements along the three commercial rivers of the Tyne, the Wear and the Tees. The following chapter provides some summary statistics on the overall profile of the region’s population, including population density, recent population trends and data derived from the 2007 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation published by the Department for Communities and Local Government.

North East population

As the chart below illustrates, 68% of the North East population (1.75 million people) lived in the Tyne and Wear and Tees Valley sub-regions in 2006.

Figure 3-1 North East population by Local Authority: 2006

Population Density

The following graph shows the density of the population on a local authority basis in the North East. It further underlines the fact that the majority of the region’s population live in
the southern and eastern part of the region along the coast; i.e. where the region’s major urban areas are located (Smith 2007).

**Figure 3-2 Population Density in the North East by Local Authority 2005**

**Trends in population**

Following a number of years of population downturn (coinciding with major economic change in the region, such as the decline of traditional industries like coal mining and ship-building), population change in recent years in the North East has been characterised by growth, driven in the main by in-migration. Trends across the sub-region have been further influenced by new build housing and subsequent migration patterns. The overall patterns of population change are shown in the graph below.
However, despite this trend, recent projections suggest that population growth in the region will continue to be significantly slower than in England –indeed, population growth in the North East is projected to be slower than in any other region in England. The North East population is projected to increase by 1.4 % between 2004 and 2014, compared with growth of 5.3 % in England. In the longer term, the region’s population is projected to grow by 3.7 % between 2004 and 2029, compared with growth nationally of 12.7 % (LSC 2007).

There are notable variations in historical and predicted population trends at the sub-regional level. The main population trends of recent years are summarised below (NLP 2006):

- Northumberland has experienced population growth since 1996, which has continued at a more significant rate since 2001
- Tees Valley has experienced population decline since 2004, and this population change is fuelled by natural change (caused by difference between births and deaths).
- Population change in County Durham and Northumberland is fuelled by net migration.
- Tyne and Wear has in the last two years experienced positive net migration preceded by a number of years of negative net migration.

---

6 In 2007 ONS revised the mid year population estimates from 2002 to take better account of international migration. These revised figures show a continuation of the growth trends albeit less substantial in recent years than previously reported.
Looking to the future however:

- Growth to 2014 projected to be above the regional average in Northumberland (3.5%), Newcastle (4.7%), North Tyneside (4.6%), Darlington (4.7%) and Stockton-on-Tees (4.7%).
- This compares with predicted population decline in Sunderland (–1.3%), Redcar and Cleveland (–1.5%), South Tyneside (–2.4%) and Middlesbrough (–6.1%).

Statistical snapshot of the region

- In 2005, the North East had a population of 2.6 million. This was 13,200 more compared with mid-2004 and a decrease of 3% since 1981. The largest percentage change was an 11.5% increase in Alnwick.
- Middlesbrough had the highest population density with 2,554 people per square kilometre in 2005. The local authority districts of Tynedale and Berwick-upon-Tweed had the lowest population densities each with 27 people per square kilometre.
- The proportion of people of working age qualified to GCE A level/ equivalent or higher was around 47% in 2006, compared with a UK average of 51% (see Chapter 18 for more statistics on Education and Skills).
- In the second quarter of 2006 the employment rate (for people of working age) in the North East was 71.7%, one of the lowest in the UK (see Chapter 16 for more data on employment and worklessness in the region).
- The unemployment rate in the region was 6.1% in 2006; the second highest in the UK. However, there was a reduction of 0.7% between 2005 and 2006.
- In April 2007, the average (median) gross weekly earnings for full-time employees on adult rates in the North East were £439.20 for males and £344.50 for females. This was 12 and 13% respectively below the average UK levels (Chapter 5 provides more detail on the gender pay gap in the region).
- Across the region, earnings are amongst the lowest in the UK. Residents of Berwick-upon-Tweed and Blyth Valley are in the bottom ten lowest median weekly full-time earnings at £349.60 and £350.90 respectively.

Taken from the 2007 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, the table overleaf details average (median) gross weekly full-time earnings for the region at local authority level and in comparison to the UK and England as a whole.
Table 3:1 Weekly pay - Gross (£) - For full-time employee jobs by country / region and local authority district of residence: 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of jobs (thousand)</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Annual % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>456.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>14,415</td>
<td>462.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>400.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington UA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>404.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool UA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>440.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough UA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>387.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland UA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>405.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees UA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>453.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Durham</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>400.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>470.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>367.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>419.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>376.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>393.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>399.9</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>407.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>421.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>443.9</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick-upon-Tweed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>349.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>350.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>508.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>510.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>426.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear MC</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>387.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>380.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>394.0</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>387.8</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>388.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>387.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, ONS

- The average price for dwellings in the North East was £121,000 in 2007, which remains the lowest in England and Wales and £52,000 below the national average (more housing data is available in Chapter 21).
- Manufacturing accounted for 19% of GVA (gross value added) in 2004, compared to 14% for the UK as a whole. Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing accounted for 0.6% of GVA compared with 1.0% in the UK overall.
- GVA per head in the North East in 2006 was the second lowest in the UK and 81% of the UK average. The following table provides these figures in full.

**Table 3:2 North East region: selected key statistics**

|                                | North East | UK  
|--------------------------------|------------|------
| Population, 2005 (thousands)   | 2,558      | 60,210 |
| - Percentage aged under 16     | 18.6       | 19.3 |
| - Percentage pension age and over | 19.5       | 18.7 |
| Standardised Mortality Ratio (UK=100), 2005 | 113 | 100 |
| Infant mortality rate, 2005    | 4.5        | 5.1  |
| Percentage of pupils achieving 5 or more grades A*-C at GCSE level or equivalent, 2005/06 | 57.4 | 59.0 |
| Economic activity rate, second quarter 2006 (percentages) | 76.5 | 79.0 |
| - Employment rate, second quarter 2006 (percentages) | 71.7 | 74.6 |
| - Unemployment rate, second quarter 2006 (percentages) | 6.1 | 5.5 |
| - Median gross weekly earnings: males in full-time employment, April 2007 (£) | 439.20 | 498.30 |
| - Median gross weekly earnings: females in full-time employment, April 2007 (£) | 344.50 | 394.00 |
| Average gross weekly household income, 2003/04 - 2005/06 (£) | 455 | 596 |
| Average weekly household expenditure, 2003/04 - 2005/06 (£) | 352.30 | 432.00 |
| Gross value added, 2006 (£ billion) | 38.8 | 1,129 |
| Gross value added per head index, 2006 (UK=100) | 81 | 100 |
| Total business sites, March 2004 (thousands) | 76.7 | 2,573.1 |
| Average dwelling price, 2005 (£ thousands) | 121 | 173 |
| Motor cars currently licensed, 2005 (thousands) | 1,006 | 27,520 |
| Fatal and serious accidents on roads, 2004 (rates per 100,000 population) | 41.1 | 51.1 |
| Recorded crime rate, 2005/06 (recorded offences per 100,000 population) | 10,100 | 10,331 |


**Deprivation in the North East: a regional comparison**

The English Indices of Deprivation 2007 (ID 2007) provides a relative ranking of areas across England according to their level of deprivation. The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007 (IMD 2007) which forms part of the ID 2007 brings together 37 different indicators which cover specific aspects or dimensions of deprivation: Income, Employment, Health

---

7 Figures relate to the United Kingdom except for average dwelling prices (covering England); currently licensed motor cars and fatal and serious accidents (Great Britain); and recorded crime rate (England and Wales).
8 Population figures for 2005 are mid-year population estimates. Pension age is men aged 65 or over and women aged 60 or over.
9 Deaths of infants under one year of age per 1,000 live births.
10 Seasonally adjusted data for people of working age, men aged 16 to 64 and women aged 16 to 59.
11 Data combined from the 2003/04, 2004/05 and 2005/06 Expenditure and Food Surveys.
12 Registered for VAT and/or PAYE local unit basis, e.g. an individual factory or shop.
13 Totals for the United Kingdom include vehicles where the country of the registered vehicle is unknown, that are under disposal or from countries unknown within Great Britain.
and Disability, Education, Skills and Training, Barriers to Housing and Services, Living Environment and Crime. These are weighted and combined to create the overall IMD 2007. The IMD is based on the small area geography known as Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs). There are 32,482 LSOAs in England. The LSOA ranked 1 by the IMD 2007 is the most deprived and that ranked 32,482 is the least deprived.

The map below shows the geographic concentration of deprivation in the North East and is taken from The English Indices of Deprivation (DCLG 2007).

Figure 3-4 North East GOR: Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007

![Map showing the geographic concentration of deprivation in the North East](Source: The English Indices of Deprivation 2007, DCLG)

---

14 LSOAs have between 1000 and 3000 people living in them with an average population of 1500 people. In most cases, these are smaller than wards, thus allowing the identification of small pockets of deprivation.
In terms of how the North East compares with the rest of the country, 2007 data tells us that 294 of the 10% most deprived LSOAs on the IMD in England are located in this region. The North East has 1656 LSOAs in total so nearly 18% of all its LSOAs are amongst the 10% most deprived in England. Just under half of all its LSOAs (784) are in the 30% most deprived LSOAs in England and there are only 53 LSOAs in this region which are within the least deprived 10%. The pattern of severe multiple deprivation remains similar to previous findings (ID 2000 and ID 2004), with the former steel, shipbuilding and mining areas such as Easington, Middlesbrough, Hartlepool, Redcar and Cleveland, and Stockton-on-Tees containing many of the most deprived LSOAs. There are also concentrations of very deprived LSOAs in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, South Tyneside, Sunderland and Gateshead.

The final chart shows the minimum, maximum and population weighted mean rank of LSOAs in each GO Region, for the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007. A rank of 1 is assigned to the most deprived LSOA and 32482 to the least deprived LSOA. This chart shows that in all regions there is a wide range of LSOA ranks. However the region with LSOAs with the highest levels of multiple deprivation on average is the North East Region with a mean LSOA rank of 12,480, followed by London with a mean LSOA rank of 12,650 and the North West with a mean rank of 13,446. The least multiply deprived regions are the South East, with a mean LSOA rank of 21,390, followed by the East Region with a mean LSOA rank of 20,008.

Figure 3-5 Range of IMD 2007 ranks by region

![Range of IMD 2007 ranks by region](Chart 3.21)

*Source: The English Indices of Deprivation 2007, DCLG*
Summary

The North East is the smallest of the English regions in both area size and population (2.6 million). Although two thirds of the region is rural, the majority of the population live in urban settlements, with the highest population density in Middlesbrough. Following a number of years of downturn, the regional population is now experiencing growth (driven in the main by in-migration) but still at a slower rate than in England as a whole. There is considerable variation at sub-regional level with the south of the region in particular predicted to experience a population decline in the following decades. Finally, in comparison to the rest of the UK, the region’s population is less qualified and commands the lowest gross weekly earnings. Employment rates are lower and unemployment rates higher than most other regions. Indeed looking across a range of equality indicators, recent data tells us that parts of the North East experience some of the highest levels of multiple deprivation of any region in England.
4. Age

Older people make up an increasing proportion of our population. Since the early 1930s, the number of people aged over 65 in the UK has more than doubled and is continuing to rise (Joint Health Surveys Unit 2007); indeed, an ageing population is a trend seen across the developed world (Deloitte & Touche and Business Strategies 1999). Nationally, the North East has one of the highest proportions of over 60s in England, exceeded only by the South West. This chapter first explores the current age profile of the North East; next examines the prevalence of poverty in both children and the elderly population; and finally looks at trends in relation to older people’s health in the region.

Current age profile of the North East

The chart below illustrates the region’s population breakdown by age, broken down by local authority area and compared with both the region and England as a whole15.

Figure 4-1 North East district and unitary authority areas: population breakdown by age

In comparison to England, whilst the overall age profile for the North East is relatively similar, there are some notable differences, particularly on a sub-regional level:

- 21% of the region’s population is aged between 45 and 59; compared with 19% for England.
- While the same proportion of the population (5%) is aged between 60 and 64, there are more people aged 65-79 living in the North East.

15 Chapter 6 provides breakdown by age and ethnicity for the region.
A number of areas in the south of the region have a comparatively large population aged under sixteen: in Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, Darlington, Easington, Redcar & Cleveland and Sedgefield, this age group comprises over 20% of the population. This compares with the regional lows of Berwick at just over 16% and Durham at just over 15%.

Some rural districts (particularly in the north of the region) have a larger population aged 60 and over: Berwick-upon-Tweed (30%); Alnwick (26%); and Castle Morpeth and Teesdale (both at 24%). These districts also have some of the smallest populations aged 0 to 16.

Finally, the university cities of Newcastle and Durham, along with the town of Middlesbrough, have particularly large populations aged between 16 and 24. In Durham, this represents 24% of the population, compared with the regional low of Alnwick, at just 9%.

This information is presented in table form below.

Table 4:1 North East district and unitary authority areas: population breakdown by age (rounded to nearest whole %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Region / Local Authority</th>
<th>0 to 4</th>
<th>5 to 15</th>
<th>16 to 19</th>
<th>20 to 24</th>
<th>25 to 44</th>
<th>45 to 59</th>
<th>60 to 64</th>
<th>65 to 79</th>
<th>80 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington UA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool UA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough UA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland UA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees UA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentdale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick-upon-Tweed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Valley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear (Met.County)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office for National Statistics midyear population estimates 2006

Indicators of ageing

As already emphasised, the UK’s population is ageing. According to ONS figures (http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?ID=949, based on midyear population estimates for 2006), although the population grew by 8% in the last thirty-five years, from

---

16 Population ageing is defined as the process by which older individuals make up a proportionally larger share of the total population over a period of time.
55.9 million in 1971 to 60.6 million in mid-2006, this change has not occurred evenly across all age groups. The population aged over 65 grew by 31%, from 7.4 to 9.7 million, whilst the population aged under 16 declined by 19 %, from 14.2 to 11.5 million. Further, the largest percentage growth in population in the year to mid-2006 was at ages 85 and over (5.9 %). Indeed, the number of people aged 85 and over grew by 69,000 in the year to 2006, reaching a record 1.2 million. This large increase reflects improving survival rates and the post World War One baby boomers now reaching this age group.

Another indicator of an ageing population is the level of dependency of the old (and young) on the population of working-age\textsuperscript{17}. In 1971 there were 43.8 children per hundred people of working age; by 2006 this number had fallen to 30.5. This fall reflects both the smaller number of children in 2006 relative to 1971 and the increase in the working-age population, which was due to the 1960s baby boomers who joined the working-age population from the late 1970s. It is because of this increase in the population of working age that the old-age dependency ratio only increased slightly between 1971 and 2006, reaching 30.0 per hundred working-age people. However, the ageing index, the ratio of older people to children, rose sharply from 64.0 in 1971 to 97.8 in 2006.

**Figure 4-2 Age structure indicators. United Kingdom**

![Age structure indicators](image)

*Source: Mid-year population estimates: Office for National Statistics*

### Age and poverty

**Pensioners' income**

Despite a nationally recognised overall upward trend in pensioners' income (ONS 2007), there are substantial variations within all groups of pensioners. Indeed, according the

\textsuperscript{17} The working-age population refers to men aged 16 to 64 and women aged 16 to 59.
figures from the Pensions Commission, around 1.8 million older people still live in poverty (Pensions Commission 2005). Further, research commissioned by Age Concern suggests that current benefit levels may not be sufficient to enable some older people to afford the minimum requirements for a healthy lifestyle (Opinion Leader Research 2005).

The following bar chart is taken from The Pensioners’ Income Series 2005/6 (Revised) (ONS 2007) and illustrates the regional variation in income in the UK. In comparison to other regions, the pensioners living in the North East have gross incomes below the UK average. Estimates put average pensioner couple incomes in this region at £405 per week. This compares with the UK average of £480 per week and a high of £607 per week in the South East of England.

Table 4:2: Average gross income for pensioner couples by region, 2003-6

![Graph showing regional variation in pensioner income](image)


The latest English Indices of Deprivation report (2007) also looks at income deprivation affecting older people as part of a range of equality indicators. As the following chart shows, the North East has the highest percentage of older people affected by income deprivation.

---

18 The Pensioners’ Income Series contains estimates of the levels and trends of pensioners’ incomes based on two household surveys: information on the last eleven years is based on the Family Resources Survey (FRS), while historical trends are examined using the Family Expenditure Survey (FES).
Further, in addition to such regional disparities, there are notable differences in income between single and pensioner couples, between older and younger pensioners and by gender. Not all statistics are available disaggregated by region, but across the UK:

- Pensioner couples on average have over twice the level of occupational pensions and investments as single pensioners, and over seven times the level of earnings.
- On average older pensioners have lower incomes. In 2005/6 pensioner couples where the head was aged 75 or over received £330 net income per week, compared with £425 for those aged under 75, and £449 per week for recently retired pensioner couples (those within five years of state pension age).
- On average male pensioners have higher incomes than female pensioners within all age groups. Single male pensioners had an average net income of £221 per week in 2005/6 compared with £200 for single female pensioners.

**Children and poverty**

At the other end of the age spectrum, recent research carried out by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation found that child poverty in the United Kingdom remains worse than in most other European countries. Despite falling rates of child poverty since the 1990s, a child in the UK still has nearly twice as much chance of living in a household with relatively low income than a generation ago. Across Great Britain, almost 21% of children under 16 live in families dependent on worklessness benefits. The rate for the North East as a whole is higher at 23.21% but as the table below shows, there is significant variation at local authority level. The percentage of children dependent on worklessness benefits ranges from 36.2% in Easington to 10% in Tynedale.19

19 A more comprehensive exploration of worklessness in the North East is given in Chapter 16.
Table 4:3 Children in families receiving workless benefits by Country / Region / Local Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Region / Local Authority</th>
<th>Children 0-15 dependent on workless benefits</th>
<th>Children 0-15 on Child Benefit</th>
<th>% 0-15 dependent on workless benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>2.34 million</td>
<td>11.2 million</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>122,730</td>
<td>477,695</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>5595</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick-upon-Tweed</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>4325</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Valley</td>
<td>3515</td>
<td>15595</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>8405</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>9970</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>19925</td>
<td>21.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside</td>
<td>3795</td>
<td>16110</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>13660</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>6750</td>
<td>18850</td>
<td>36.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>9140</td>
<td>35305</td>
<td>25.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>5850</td>
<td>18995</td>
<td>30.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>9725</td>
<td>29060</td>
<td>33.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-upon-Tyne</td>
<td>14305</td>
<td>45890</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>7760</td>
<td>35935</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>26915</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>4395</td>
<td>17260</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>27760</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>8360</td>
<td>36745</td>
<td>22.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>14315</td>
<td>53460</td>
<td>26.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>10455</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>11770</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>11810</td>
<td>28.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Local child poverty statistics: 2004/05, from JRF website

Older peoples’ health

The 2005 Health Survey for England (Joint Health Surveys Unit 2007) focused on the health of older people (i.e. those aged 65 and over) and key findings included:

- Prevalence of self-reported longstanding illness varied across the regions for both men and women. The prevalence of self-reported longstanding illness showed a decrease from north to south in both sexes and there was a particularly marked north / south gradient in relation to women, with prevalence reaching 59% in the North East but homogeneity across the south (40%- 43%).

- There was significant variation by Government Office Region in informants reporting problems with mobility. For women, those in the North East had the highest prevalence of mobility problems (57%), compared with the national picture.

- There was marked regional variation in the prevalence of ‘good’ or ‘very good’ self-reported health, longstanding and limiting longstanding illness, and mobility
problems. Regional variation was seen in many of the regression models for men. Men outside London were less likely to have below median grip strength or walking impairment. Men in the north (North East, North West and Yorkshire and the Humber), East Midlands and East of England, were significantly more likely to have limiting longstanding illness than those in London.

Additional health indicators for the region, including life expectancy data, are available in Chapter 20.

**Summary**

In line with national trends, the North East population is ageing, and the region now has one of the highest proportions of over 60s in England. Within the region, however, there is considerable variation, with the rural north displaying a generally older, and the south and urban parts of the region, a comparatively younger age profile. At both ends of the scale, large numbers of the youngest and oldest people in the North East live in poverty. Gross pensioner incomes in the region are well below the UK average, and almost 1 in 4 children under 16 live in households dependent on workless benefits.
5. Gender

The North East labour market has changed fundamentally over the last five decades, with women playing an increasingly key role in the workforce. At the same time, recent years have also seen changes in the composition of the regional labour force which has contributed to this trend. Since 1991, for example, there has been a significant and continued decline in the jobs for men in the manufacturing industry (Buckner, Tang et al. 2003). However significant gender divisions persist, particularly in terms of the nature of the work the majority of women currently perform in the region, and also in relation to the burden of caring responsibilities that they continue to shoulder. This chapter presents a statistical review of the status of men and women in the region, drawing in particular on current Labour Market statistics, alongside the findings of recent research into women in the North East. The chapter starts with analysis of gender trends in education and skills in the region, before examining gender employment issues (including two local labour market case studies). It concludes with a summary of the findings of research into the impact of caring responsibilities on women in the North East labour market.

Education and skills

Reflecting the national picture, there are marked gender differences in educational attainment in the North East region. The following statistics are taken from the Sheffield Hallam University report, *Gender Profile of Newcastle’s Labour Market* (Buckner, Tang et al. 2003):

- At Key Stages 1 and 2 (ages 7 & 11) a high proportion of pupils have Special Educational Needs (SEN) in the North East when compared with England as a whole, with more boys having a SEN than girls.
- Achievement among pupils is low in comparison with England as a whole in tests at ages 7, 11 and 14. Additionally, as the following table shows, proportionally fewer girls and boys achieve 5 or more passes at GCSE/GNVQ level in the North East. In particular, the region’s boys are the most likely to achieve no passes at this level when compared with England as a whole\(^2^0\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage of pupils achieving at GCSE/GNVQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5+ A-C grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: DfES, Crown Copyright 2004*

\(^2^0\) See later Chapter 18 on *Education and Skills* for more recent regional examination data.
This trend continues at A level, where fewer boys in the region achieve good grades. The table below shows that the average point score per candidate achieving A/AS levels or their equivalent is lower in the North East than in England.

Table 5:2 Average GCE/VCE A/AS point scores of 16-18 year old candidates by gender in 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Average point score by candidates achieving A/AS levels</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per candidate</td>
<td>Per entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>220.9</td>
<td>240.4</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>230.1</td>
<td>256.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources, DfES, Crown Copyright 2004

In terms of the destinations of boys and girls at the end of compulsory education, Buckner et al (2003) found that compared to England as a whole, fewer pupils in the North East stayed on into education at age 16 and a higher proportion of boys in particular, were reported to be ‘not settled’. This was particularly the case for Newcastle, where 17% of boys were reported as ‘not settled’ compared with 9% nationally, see below.

Figure 5-1 Destination of pupils at the end of compulsory education in 2003
Gender and employment

Economic activity levels

In January 2008 there were 743,900 women of working age in the North East region compared with 788,600 men. There was a higher rate of economic activity for men in the region (80.2% compared to 72.3% for women), along with a higher rate of unemployment (7.9% for men compared with 5.3% for women).

Table 5:3: Economic activity in the North East by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic activity in the North East (January 2008)</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People aged 16 –59/64</td>
<td>778,600</td>
<td>743,900</td>
<td>1,522,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total economically active</td>
<td>624,600</td>
<td>537,800</td>
<td>1,162,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in employment</td>
<td>575,600</td>
<td>509,100</td>
<td>1,084,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>28,700</td>
<td>77,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive</td>
<td>153,900</td>
<td>206,100</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above demonstrates, overall, both men and women in the North East have lower economic activity and employment rates than nationally. However there is marked variation between the north and the south of the region in this respect. Looking at economic activity and employment rates on a sub-regional level, therefore:

- Women in Sedgefield have the lowest economic activity rates (58.3) in the region; but this compares to men in Berwick-upon-Tweed who have the highest rate (92.4).
- Within the region, districts in Durham demonstrate the lowest employment rates. For example, men in Teesdale have an employment rate of 61.8%, which compares with the national rate for men of 78.8%; women in Sedgefield have the lowest rate of 54.2%, compared to the national rate for women of 69.7%.

---

21 Please see Chapter 16 for a more comprehensive exploration of the issues around worklessness in the region.
Men and women in Northumberland, however, have overall a higher employment rate than the national picture: 79.9% for men (compared with 78.8% in England) and 70.8% for women (compared with 69.7% in England).

The following table provides a detailed sub-regional breakdown of economic activity and employment rates by gender in 2005/06.

Table 5:4 Sub-regional labour market, 2005/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY/GOVERNMENT OFFICE REGION / COUNTY / UNITARY AUTHORITY/LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISTRICT</th>
<th>Economic activity rates</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Numbers (thousands)</th>
<th>Rates (percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>12,689</td>
<td>10,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH EAST</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington UA</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool UA</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough UA</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland UA</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees UA</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick-upon-Tweed</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Valley</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey, ONS (Taken from Regional Trends 39)
Full-time, part-time and temporary work

Women in the region are more likely to be employed on a part-time basis (73.8% compared to 21.6% in the case of men) and are also more likely to have a second job (1.5% of women compared to 1.0% of men).

Table 5:5: Full-time, part-time and temporary work by gender in the North East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment category</th>
<th>Full-time, part-time and temporary work undertaken in the North East (September – November 2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker with second job</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employees</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Variations can also be observed in terms of the level of part-time vs full-time working in different ethnic groups in the region. For example, for those aged 25+, 45% of White Other and Indian men, and 38% of White Other women and 34% of Indian women are employed full-time, whereas the rate is just 16% for Bangladeshi men and 5% for Bangladeshi women. This compares with 56% and 38% of White British men and women, and 55% and 37% of all Newcastle men and women (Buckner, Tang et al. 2003).

Segregation in the region’s workforce

Horizontal segregation

The economic restructuring which has taken place in the region has seen the replacement of a highly skilled predominantly manual labour market with more diverse and multi-segmented labour markets in which less skilled, non manual groups and women are more heavily represented (Cumbers 1996). However, gender segregation persists across and within industries, despite anti-discrimination laws. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that women are over represented in certain service industries (in education, health, public admin and other services at a rate of 50% compared to 22% of men in the North East); whilst under-represented in other industries (construction at a rate of 1.5% compared with 12% for men).

Table 5:6: Industrial composition of employee jobs by gender in the North East and UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>North East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Hunting, Forestry &amp; Fishing</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Energy &amp; Water Supplies</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, Transport, Finance &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>43.34</td>
<td>51.21</td>
<td>42.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Health, Public Admin &amp; Other Services</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>50.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vertical segregation**

There is also extensive evidence of vertical segregation as women in the North East account for only 17.6% of management at higher and professional levels compared to 24.2% of men. At the associate professional and technical level women are roughly equal to men at 12.4% compared to 12.6% of men. Women are also more likely to be concentrated in the lower skilled and lower paid end of the market, in administrative and secretarial work (21.3%), personal service occupations (13.4%) and elementary occupations (14.3%). This suggests that although there have been improvements and more women are reaching positions of seniority there is still evidence that the glass ceiling remains in the upper echelons.

**Table 5.7: Occupational structure by gender in the England and North East**

![Graph showing occupational structure by gender in England and North East](source: Census 2001, NOMIS)

**Earnings in the North East**

A comparison between men and women in the North East based on full-time earnings shows that women’s wages have risen at a faster rate than men’s in the period from 2006 to 2007 (and indeed faster than women in the UK as a whole). This trend is historical. As the following charts show, female full-time earnings in the North East have risen at a faster rate than their male counterparts since 2000.
Figure 5-2 Median earnings for full-time workers 2000-2007: North East and UK

Source: Annual Survey of Hours and Earning
However salaries in the North East still lag behind the UK average, and there continues to be a marked gender pay gap. As the table below shows, in 2007 women’s median gross weekly earnings stood at £350.30 compared to £440.00 for men. Further, figures from 2003 (Table 5:9) show that 31.6% of women are earning under £250.00 compared to 16.5% of men.

### Table 5:8: Earnings for full-time workers in the North East: 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median gross annual salary</td>
<td>£22,961 (£26,300)</td>
<td>£18,274 (£20,500)</td>
<td>£21,034 (£24,002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median gross weekly pay</td>
<td>£440 (£498.3)</td>
<td>£350.30 (£394)</td>
<td>£402.9 (£456.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in median gross weekly pay 2006-07</td>
<td>-0.2% (2.9%)</td>
<td>3.3% (2.8%)</td>
<td>2% (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median hourly earnings</td>
<td>£10.62 (£11.96)</td>
<td>£9.36 (£10.46)</td>
<td>£10.14 (£11.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2007 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, ONS*

### Table 5:9 Breakdown of earnings for full-time workers in the North East by gender: 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% earning under £250</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% earning under £350</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% earning under £460</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: New Earnings Survey 2003 (ONS 2003)*

Further, looking at earnings by gender and industry, it can be seen that at both the national and regional level, women earn less than their male counterparts in all industrial sectors. Contrasting with England as a whole (where men working in financial intermediation are the highest earners), men working in the North East energy sector, on average, command the highest median weekly earnings, at approaching £600. In the education and health and social work sectors, men also have comparatively higher earnings, at just over and just under £500 per week respectively. Women working in hotels and restaurants, however, have the lowest median weekly earnings at just £242 (less than half that of the region’s highest male earners).
Figure 5-3 Median and average weekly earnings by industry and sex, April 2006

Local labour market profiles

**Case Study 1: Women’s poverty in East Newcastle**

A recent report by Sheffield Hallam University (Escott, Price et al. 2006) focused on the scale and experience of women’s economic disadvantage in East Newcastle, looking at the wards of Byker, Monkchester and Walker. The study found that compared with women in Newcastle and England as a whole, women in the three wards were:

- Less likely to be in full-time but more likely to be in part-time employment.
- More likely to work in unskilled and semiskilled jobs and less likely to be in professional or managerial occupations.
- If they had caring responsibilities, less likely to work either full-time or part-time.
- More likely to be unemployed and more likely to be economically inactive.
- Much more likely to work closer to home (within 5 km).

---

22 Median values are less affected by extremes of earnings at either ends of the scale with half the workers earning above the stated amount and half below
23 Median and average gross weekly earnings are workplace based. Data relate to full-time employees on adult rates whose pay for the survey pay-period was not affected by absence
24 Data missing / invalid for Agriculture, hunting and forestry, Mining and Quarrying and Hotel and restaurants
The report also emphasised the impact of low qualification levels and limited job opportunities on women’s employment prospects in the wards: 40% of women of working age living in the neighbourhood have no educational qualifications and only 8% have degree level qualifications.

**Case Study 2: Ethnic Minority women and employment in West Newcastle**

Further research conducted by Sheffield Hallam University explored the situation of ethnic minority women and labour market access in the West End of Newcastle (Stiell and Tang 2006). Their detailed analysis of the 2001 Census revealed that:

- The Pakistani community make up the largest ethnic group in Wingrove, while the Bangladeshi group is the largest in Elswick. These communities have a much younger age profile. For example, women under age 24 make up almost two thirds of the local Bangladeshi population. Only 7% of Pakistani women in Newcastle are over state pension age, compared with 35% of all women in England.

- These wards have a higher proportion of households with dependent children. 58% of Bangladeshi households consist of couples with dependent children, compared with just 17% of all Newcastle households. This reflects other national studies showing that a higher percentage of ethnic minority families than white families have dependent children. For example, 4 out of 5 Bangladeshi families have dependent children compared with just over 2 out of 5 white families (EOC 2007).

- Women in Elswick and Wingrove are less likely to be employed. In Elswick, only 4% of Bangladeshi women were employed full-time, compared with 38% of all local women. A much higher proportion of Bangladeshi and Pakistani women were looking after their home and family full-time (also reflecting other studies in this respect, e.g. EOC, 2007), and women in these groups were also more likely to be students.

- There were very high rates of unemployment among economically active Bangladeshi women in Elswick: 25% compared with just 5% of all economically active women in the city. Thus many are actively seeking, but unsuccessful in securing, employment.

- Pakistani and Bangladeshi women in Newcastle are more likely to work in sales and customer service occupations and in the wholesale, retail, restaurants and hotel sectors, and are less likely to be employed as managers, senior officials and professionals.25

**Impact of caring responsibilities**

*Maternity leave and career breaks*

Increasing numbers of women take maternity leave in order to return to employment after the birth of their children, and many others take career breaks to allow them to care

---

25 Furthermore, nationally, one study found that of those mothers who did not work during pregnancy, 68% of Bangladeshi and 58% of Pakistani mothers had never had a paid job (EOC, 2007).
for small children or elderly relatives. 66.0% of women return to exactly the same job after maternity leave yet only 20.0% return to the same job after a career break. Interestingly, women often return to a job with less hours (25.0% of those taking maternity leave and 46.0% after a career break), and less money (12.0% of those taking maternity leave and 27.0% after a career break).

Table 5:10: Women’s experience of returning to work in the North East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s experience of returning to work in the North East 2001</th>
<th>After maternity leave (%)</th>
<th>After a career break (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exactly the same job</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A job with less hours</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A job with more hours</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A job with less responsibility</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A job with more responsibility</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A job with less money</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A job with more money</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Women at Work: Gender Inequality in the North East Labour Market (TUC 2002)

Sharing responsibilities

Although more and more women are undertaking paid work, women in the region still carry most of the burden of family care. This has huge consequences for women’s labour market position and their subsequent life experiences, and it is particularly important for single parents and for those looking after elderly relatives. Further, research by Sheffield Hallam University (Buckner, Tang et al. 2003) found that women in certain ethnic groups were particularly likely to have caring responsibilities: 63 % of Bangladeshi women and 43 % of Pakistani women look after their home or family full-time, a much higher proportion than among women from all other ethnic groups in Newcastle.

Table 5:11: Share of family responsibilities performed by workers in the North East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of family responsibilities</th>
<th>Share of family responsibilities performed by workers in the North East 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-20%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%-40%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%-60%</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%-80%</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%-100%</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Women at Work: Gender Inequality in the North East Labour Market (TUC 2002)
**Summary**

Women play an increasingly active role in the North East labour market however significant gender divisions persist, particularly in terms of the nature of the work the majority of women currently perform in the region, and also in relation to the burden of caring responsibilities that they continue to shoulder. Women earn less than their male counterparts, continue to be under-represented at professional and managerial levels, and are more likely to be concentrated at the lower skilled end of the market, particularly in the service industries. As at national level, there are also marked differences in the educational performance of boys and girls in the region. Although achievement for all North East pupils is low in comparison with the rest of England, boys in the North East perform particularly badly, with fewer boys achieving good grades at GCSE / A/AS level, and a higher proportion of boys reported as “not settled” at the end of compulsory education.
6. Ethnicity

The ethnic diversity of the North East has changed significantly in recent years. Experimental statistics published by the Office for National Statistics in January 2008 indicate the scale of change since the 2001 Census. Whilst it remains statistically less diverse than the UK as a whole, the region’s non-White population (non-White being a standard statistical term for a category of the population) has grown dramatically since the turn of the century; with particularly marked increases in the Other White, Mixed heritage, Black African and Black Caribbean and Chinese and Other Ethnic population. The following chapter starts with an examination of the ethnic categories employed in most standard data sources, before going onto to look at the ethnic profile of England and the North East itself, including recent trends in the regional ethnic minority population. The chapter then examines trends in employment and education by ethnic group. Later chapters explore the impact of economic migration on the region and the position of refugees and asylum seekers, and Gypsies and Travellers in North East society.

Terminology for Ethnic Background Categories

Everyone has an ethnicity and this ethnicity is self defined. This could be based on common ancestry, memories of a shared past, a shared cultural identity which might include kinship, religion, language, shared territory, nationality or physical appearance. In the 2001 Census respondents were asked to which ethnic group they considered themselves to belong. Responses were grouped as follows for England and Wales²⁶:

WHITE
- British
- Irish
- Other White background

MIXED
- White and Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White and Asian
- Other Mixed background

ASIAN or ASIAN BRITISH
- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Other Asian background

²⁶ For further information, the ONS publication “Ethnic Group Statistics: a guide for the collection and classification of ethnicity data” is available as a download from the ONS website.
Data on England’s ethnic population

Currently the 2001 Census offers the only publicly available data source providing statistically valid information on the ethnicity of the region’s population. However in January 2008, ONS published "experimental" ethnicity statistics for each Local Authority in England. These statistics give a more up-to-date picture than the 2001 Census however it is important to note they are in the testing phase and are not fully developed\(^{27}\). The experimental statistics estimating population by ethnic group are available for mid-2001 to mid-2005 for England and its constituent administrative areas, and are consistent with the mid-year population estimates for each year current in October 2007. The following section therefore draws on these latest experimental figures in addition to the 2001 Census, in order to provide a more current picture of the region’s ethnic profile.

Ethnic diversity in England: a comparative picture

In 2001, there were 50.4 million White British people living in Great Britain; 88 % of the population. In most local authority areas of Great Britain the White British made up a large proportion (over 94 %) of the population, but each region contained some local authorities with a lower proportion of White British people, typically in cities and urban areas. The local authority areas containing the highest proportion of White British people relative to other ethnic groups were Easington, Sedgefield, Derwentside, Berwick-upon-Tweed, and Wear Valley, all in the North East region. In these local authority areas almost all (99 %) people were White British. In contrast, in 9 of the 32 London boroughs less than half were White British, of which the lowest proportions were in Newham (34 %) and Brent (29 %) (ONS 2006).

Most local authority areas in England and Wales were not particularly ethnically diverse. Some 223 local authorities (59 %) had diversity scores of 0.11 or less, representing a lower than 11 % chance in most areas that two people drawn at random would be from

\(^{27}\) Experimental statistic have not yet been shown to meet the quality criteria for National Statistics, but are being published to involve users in the development of the methodology and to help build quality at an early stage. More information on Experimental Statistics and National Statistics is provided in the National Statistics Code of Practice: Protocol on Data Presentation, Dissemination and Pricing available at http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/national_statistics/cop/protocols_published.asp.
different ethnic groups. Of these, 80 (21%) were particularly homogeneous, with diversity scores of 0.05 or lower. Easington in the North East had the lowest ethnic diversity score of all areas (0.02), representing a 2% chance that two people chosen at random would belong to different ethnic groups (ONS 2006). The figure below illustrates the geographic concentration of ethnic diversity in England as at 2001.

**Figure 6-1: Ethnic diversity: by local authority area, April 2001**

The experimental figures published in 2008 (based on 2005 population estimates) show a number of interesting trends since the 2001 Census.

At a national level, for example, these updated figures show that while the White British and White Irish groups decrease in size over the period (due both to net international emigration and, for the relatively old White Irish population, more deaths than births), this is more than offset by the increase in other ethnic groups, with the rises in the Other White, Asian Indian and Black African groups making the largest contributions to growth. Nearly three quarters of the total growth of the non-‘White British’ groups is attributable to net migration into England.

At a sub-national level, although London retains great concentrations of the non-‘White British’ ethnic groups, the pattern of faster growth of non-‘White British’ populations in areas with smaller starting populations is also clear in the results for individual local authorities. In the North East for example, Berwick upon Tweed has one of the highest growth rates for non-‘White-British’ groups (ONS 2008).
Ethnic profile of the region

The following chart shows that, as in 2001, the largest three non-White ethnic groups in the North East are Pakistani, Indian and Chinese.

Figure 6-2 Percentage (%) breakdown of England and North East population by ethnicity, excluding White British

However whilst the overall pattern of the region’s population by ethnicity has remained essentially the same as in 2001, the latest experimental statistics from ONS show some relatively dramatic increases in particular ethnic groups. For example:

- As with the rest of England, there has been a small decrease in the North East White British population of 0.4%;
- There has been a 40% increase in the region’s Other White population, from 22,000 to almost 31,000. This compares with the situation elsewhere in England and is largely contributable to net migration, from the new European Union states for example.
- The North East's mixed heritage ethnic population has also increased, by between 32% (White and Asian) and 47% (White and Black African). This is thought to have mainly been driven by high natural growth unlike the increases in other ethnic groups which are due to net migration (ONS 2008).

- The Black Caribbean and Black African regional population appears to have increased significantly since the Census, from 1000 to 2500, and from 2900 to over 9,000 respectively. At a national level, net inflows of asylum seekers with Zimbabwean and Somali nationality have made a particular contribution to the increase in the Black African population (ONS 2008).

- As with the rest of England, both the region’s Chinese and Other Ethnic population has increased sharply over this period (an increase of 57% and 76% respectively). At a national level, the increase in the Other Ethnic population is attributable to net migration, particularly in-migration from the Philippines (ONS 2008).

The figure below illustrates the percentage change by ethnic group between mid-2001 and mid-2005 for the North East and England using the ‘experimental’ ONS population estimates,

**Figure 6-3 Population change by ethnic group, mid 2001 to mid 2005 for England and the North East (in %)**

The table overleaf details the estimated resident population by ethnic group in full, including national and regional level figures and broken down by local authority.
| ENGLAND | 50,465.6 | 42,752.6 | 592.0 | 1,623.2 | 266.3 | 101.4 | 233.1 | 190.6 | 1,215.4 | 825.5 | 324.3 | 309.7 | 590.4 | 658.5 | 110.4 | 347.0 | 325.2 |
| NORTH EAST | 2,549.7 | 2,412.4 | 9.7 | 30.9 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 6.6 | 4.3 | 16.2 | 17.9 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 2.5 | 9.1 | 0.9 | 9.7 | 8.1 |
| Darlington UA | 98.8 | 94.3 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Hartlepool UA | 90.9 | 88.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Middlesbrough UA | 138.5 | 125.0 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Redcar and Cleveland UA | 139.6 | 134.2 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Stockton-on-Tees UA | 187.7 | 177.4 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Durham | 498.4 | 482.0 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| Chester-le-Street | 53.1 | 51.6 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Derwentside | 86.2 | 84.1 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Durham | 90.4 | 83.9 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| Easington | 93.8 | 91.9 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Sedgefield | 88.0 | 86.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Teesdale | 24.7 | 24.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Wear Valley | 62.2 | 60.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Northumberland | 309.8 | 300.1 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Alnwick | 32.0 | 31.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Berwick-upon-Tweed | 26.0 | 25.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Blyth Valley | 81.5 | 79.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Castle Morpeth | 49.6 | 47.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Tyne | 59.3 | 57.4 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Wansbeck | 61.6 | 60.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Tyne and Wear | 1,085.9 | 1,011.4 | 4.5 | 16.3 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 9.9 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 5.4 | 0.4 | 6.0 | 4.6 |
| Gateshead | 190.4 | 180.8 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Newcastle upon Tyne | 269.6 | 235.3 | 1.8 | 6.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 2.3 |
| North Tyneside | 193.8 | 184.2 | 0.7 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| South Tyneside | 151.2 | 142.8 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Sunderland | 281.0 | 268.2 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 |

Source ONS: Population Estimates by Ethnic Group (experimental)
The above chart shows the region’s main ethnic groups by gender. Most groups follow the general population pattern of approaching an equal split between male and female. However, there are a greater proportion of males in the Other Asian, Black African and Other Black regional populations.

As the following chart shows however, there is a greater degree of age diversity within the region’s different ethnic groups. In particular:

- The Irish resident population is comparatively older, with over a quarter (27.8%) at retirement age and only 6.2% aged under 16.
- Mixed heritage population (White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian and Other Mixed) have the youngest age profile: overall, around 40% are aged under 16. Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities also have a relatively younger population, with 30.7% and 35.1% respectively aged 0-15.
Ethnicity and employment

**Occupation**

Across the region, there are a number of categories of occupations in which ethnic minorities are employed in relatively high numbers. Previous research has focussed on the high representation of BME groups in both Middlesbrough and Newcastle, in the following occupations: health professionals, managers and proprietors in agriculture and services, and skilled trades of printing, textiles and other trades (Conway, Coombs et al. 2006). Looking at the regional ethnic profile in terms of socio-economic classifications, LFS statistics show that:

- Fewer people in the North East are employed at a managerial and professional level when compared with England as a whole but there are some interesting ethnic variations. For example, Indian people are more likely and White people less likely to be employed at this level than the national average. Pakistani / Bangladeshi people have the lowest employment rates at this level, which reflects the situation at a national level (Fitzpatrick, Jacobson et al. 2005).
- White and mixed race people are more likely to be employed in routine and manual jobs than the rest of the region’s population.

---

28 Estimate categories are 16-64 for males and 16-59 for females and 65 and over for males, 60 and over for females.
- Significantly more Pakistani / Bangladeshi, Black\(^{29}\) and Other ethnic people are classed as having never worked or long-term unemployed in the region.

The full details by ethnic group are provided to follow.

**Table 6.2 Percentage of working-age people by NS-SEC class\(^{30}\) and ethnic group, 2002/03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>ETHNIC GROUP %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Annual Labour Force Survey 2002/03*

The research conducted by Sheffield Hallam University into local labour markets (Buckner, Tang et al. 2003) also revealed some crucial differences. In Newcastle, for example:

- The Chinese population contains very large numbers of students, 91\% of young men and 85\% of young women under 25, and 21\% of men and 24\% of women aged over 25.

- 36\% of White Other men and 39\% of White Other women, and 38\% of Indian men and 28\% of Indian women are in professional jobs, compared with 9\% of Bangladeshi men and 11\% of Bangladeshi women, and with 16\% of White British men and 13\% of White British women. 36\% of Bangladeshi men and 29\% of Chinese men work in skilled trades, compared with only 4\% of Indian men, and 18\% of White British men in Newcastle.

- Newcastle’s Bangladeshi, Chinese and Pakistani residents of both sexes are heavily concentrated in the wholesale, retail, restaurant and hotel sectors, while the city’s Indian population is more concentrated in both the health and social work and the wholesale, retail, restaurant and hotel sectors.

---

\(^{29}\) Potentially as a result of the high proportion of students from Black groups in the region and the high rates of inactivity evident in Pakistani / Bangladeshi women.

\(^{30}\) The National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NSSEC) is an occupationally based classification using 3 classes: managerial and professional occupations; intermediate occupations; routine and manual occupations; and additionally never worked and long-term unemployed. Due to differences in definition, the number of adults who are categorised as never worked and long-term unemployed are not consistent with the number of economically inactive adults. For example, an inactive female adult with dependent children who expects to be employed in the future or an inactive retired working aged adult are classed under NS-SEC according to their last main job rather than never worked and long-term unemployed.
The White Other population in Newcastle is more likely to work in the education and finance sectors, and less likely to work in public administration and transport industries.

The previous chapter on Gender also includes a local labour market profile examining ethnic minority women and employment in West Newcastle.

**Worklessness**

Both Census and Labour Force Survey data detailing economic activity in the region show that a high percentage of non-White ethnic minorities are not in employment. This is particularly the case in Middlesbrough, where 56.3% of the non-White population is classed as inactive.

Table 6.3 Working-age inactivity rate by ethnic group, 2002/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>All Non-white</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.30</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REST OF NORTH EAST</strong></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington UA</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepoo UA</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough UA</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland UA</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees UA</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northumberland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick-upon-Tweed</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Valley</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Labour Force Survey 2002/03

---

31. .. estimate and confidence interval not available since the group sample size is zero or disclosive (sample size 0,1,2).
Ethnicity in the region’s schools

The statistics referenced in the following section are drawn from the Department for Children, School and Families’ *Schools and Pupils in England*, published in January 2007. This publication provides information collected via the School Census and reports national trends on the number of schools and pupils in England. It gives findings for the number of pupils by age, gender, free school meal eligibility, ethnicity and first language together with a range of class size information.

**Ethnic profile of primary and secondary school pupils**

The following two charts exclude pupils classed as White British in order to illustrate the ethnicity of the region’s primary and secondary school population. Pupils categorised as White British make up the overwhelming majority of the school population in the North East (almost 94% of primary school pupils and 95% of secondary school pupils are White British in the region; compared with the national level rates of just under 91% and 83% respectively). As shown in the following chart, at both primary and secondary school level, there are higher percentages of children from Pakistani, Other White, Black African and Indian backgrounds than any other non-White British group.

Eligibility for free school meals (FSM)

Eligibility for free school meals (FSM) has frequently been used as a proxy measure of poverty, disadvantage and social exclusion, as information on adult’s
income is not collected. Based on data collected by the Association of Public Health Observatories (Fitzpatrick, Jacobson et al. 2005), in the North East, as nationally:

- The groups with the highest proportions eligible for FSM are Travellers of Irish Heritage, Gypsy / Roma and Black Africans.
- The groups with the lowest proportions eligible for FSM are Chinese, Indian, and White British.

**North East pupils and language**

A further indicator of the region’s ethnic diversity is the variation in proportions of pupils whose first language is English around the North East. As demonstrated in the following two charts, both Newcastle upon Tyne and Middlesbrough have significantly larger proportions of pupils whose first language is not English at both primary and secondary level, although relatively small in national terms. Alternatively, Durham, Northumberland and Redcar & Cleveland have overwhelming school populations with English as their first language.

**Figure 6-8 Maintained Primary Schools, % of Pupils by First Language**

*Source: DCSF: Schools and Pupils in England: January 2007*
Additional education data

The later chapter on *Education and Skills* includes detailed attainment data by ethnicity (and in some cases gender) at local authority level for Key Stage 1,2,3 and GCSE level. National level data by ethnic group for pupil exclusions is provided in Chapter 9, *Gypsies and Travellers*.

Summary

According to recently released experimental ONS statistics, the ethnic diversity of the North East has changed significantly since the 2001 Census. In particular, the region’s non-White population has grown dramatically, with marked increases in the Other White, Mixed heritage, Black African and Black Caribbean, and Chinese and Other Ethnic population. At the same time, the North East remains one of the least diverse regions of the UK; the top five districts with the highest proportion of White British people (99%) are all in this region. In terms of employment and ethnicity, there are some notable trends. In particular, White and mixed race people are the most likely to be employed in routine and manual jobs, whilst Pakistani / Bangladeshi people have the lowest employment rates in the region, and are most likely to be classed as having never worked or long-term unemployed.
7. Migrant Workers

Between 1991 and 2001, the “North East experienced one of the most dramatic proportional increases in its foreign-born population” (Pillai 2006). Further, developments since 2001 (most crucially the accession of a further ten member states to the European Union since 2004\(^\text{\textsuperscript{33}}\)) are likely to have further contributed to this trend. By way of illustration, the proportion of international migrants registering for National Insurance in the region almost doubled between 2001 and 2005 (NERIP 2007). While the proportion of people in the region who were born outside of the British Isles still remains small, the relative increase during this period was second only to London (Kyambi 2005). However it should noted that between May 2004 and September 2007, the North East still received by far the lowest number of registered A8 workers of any UK region\(^\text{\textsuperscript{34}}\). This chapter summarises current data on the migrant worker population, focusing in particular on the EU accession states. The chapter starts by reviewing available data on migrant workers in the UK, before exploring regional National Insurance Number Registration and Worker Registration Scheme data, and finally signposting additional research in this area.

Data on Migrant Workers

Data challenges
International migration is one of the most difficult components of population change to measure accurately. Large numbers of people travel into and out of the UK every year although migration numbers can be very different between one part of the country and another. There is no single, comprehensive source which can provide the information, at national and local levels, that is required for statistical purposes. Further, the definition of migrants differs between the various published statistical sources available. The National Insurance Recording System (NIRS) defines a migrant as an overseas national allocated a National Insurance Number, whereas the Labour Force Survey defines a foreign worker as someone who works but has foreign citizenship, and a foreign-born worker as anyone born outside of the UK, including British citizens. Whilst ONS has been undertaking a substantial and long-term programme of work to improve the population statistics it produces (see [http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase) for further information),

\(^{33}\) Ten countries joined the EU with effect from 1\(^\text{st}\) May 2004 – Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Malta and Cyprus - with Bulgaria and Romania joining on 1 January 2007.

regionally disaggregated statistics detailing international migration figures are yet to become available.

**International migration data sources**

An international migrant is defined as someone who changes his or her country of usual residence for a period of at least a year, so that the country of destination effectively becomes the country of usual residence. Presently, estimates of international migration can be derived from several data sources:

- 2001 Census
- Labour Force Survey
- Home Office’s Worker Registration Scheme
- National Insurance Number Allocations to Overseas Nationals
- Migration data from the International Passenger Survey (IPS\(^{35}\)).
- Estimates of migration between the UK and the Irish Republic based on data provided by the Irish Central Statistics Office (CSO\(^{36}\)).

This chapter primarily draws on National Insurance Number Registration and Home Office Worker Registration Scheme data in order to illustrate the changing nature of the region’s migrant worker population.

**National Insurance Number Registrations (NINO) for the North East**

In 2006/7, there were a total of 13,270 National Insurance Numbers allocated to foreign nationals starting work in the North East. As shown in the table below, Poland was the country that supplied the most workers to the region accounting for 31% of all international migrant workers in the North East in 2006/7 (Skills North East 2007).

**Table 7:1 Top 10 origin countries for new NINO registrations in the North East 2006/7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Number of NINO registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>4,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Peoples Republic</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{35}\) The IPS is a continuous voluntary sample survey that provides information on passengers entering and leaving the UK by the principal air, sea and tunnel routes.

\(^{36}\) The Irish CSO makes estimates of outflows from the UK to the Irish Republic using data from the Irish Quarterly National Household Survey (QNHS) each April.
Of these, almost 40% (5,270) were from the new EU Accession States. The table below provides the most recent National Insurance Scheme registration data for the North East region by local authority.

Table 7.2 National Insurance Number Registrations in respect of EU Accession State Nationals in 2006/07 by Local Authority and country of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Slovakia</th>
<th>Lithuania</th>
<th>Czech Republic</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Estonia</th>
<th>Slovenia</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>Bulgaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastington</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick-upon-Tweed</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Valley</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Insurance Recording System (NIRS), Office for National Statistics

Looking at the top four EU states, the following chart shows the distribution by nationality of National Insurance registrations in the region:
Worker Registration Scheme

The Worker Registration Scheme (WRS) began in May 2004 when the A8 countries joined the EU. Prior to this date, workers from the A8 countries were required to obtain permission to work, generally through one of the legal employ-related routes such as the work permits scheme. Those A8 nationals already working legally in the UK were not required to register on the WRS when the A8 countries joined the EU, if they remained in the same employment or if they had been working legally without interruption for 12 months or longer. The Home Office does not keep records of the number of A8 nationals who register on the WRS but who then leave the UK. The following section draws together regional WRS data and draws extensively on the analysis of the North East Worker Registration Scheme data conducted by Ian Fitzgerald at Northumbria University (Fitzgerland 2008).

In total, between May 2004 and September 2007, 7,765 A8 workers registered by nationality to the WRS in the North East. Of these, the majority (74%) were Polish, with the only other notable group regionally being Lithuanians (9%). These proportions were slightly higher and lower than the UK levels of 66% and 10%
respectively, however Fitzgerald notes that registrations in the region are seemingly starting to slow down: "When comparing the April-June 2006 period to the April-June 2007 period, registrations showed a 6% decline, although this amounted only to 35 people". However "when comparing the July-September 2006 period to the July-September 2007 period, this decline was more marked, rising to 14% (120 A8 registered workers)". Looking at the general profile of the region’s migrant worker, the male: female ratio of registered workers was 64:36 (again, slightly differing from the national level where the ratio was 55:45.) and the vast majority of registered workers (74%) were aged 18-34\textsuperscript{37}. Further, most registered A8 workers (89%) were employed as process, plant and machine operatives or in elementary occupations, as demonstrated in the table below.

Table 7:3 WRS top ten occupations mapped to SOC200\textsuperscript{38} classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOC2000 classification</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>Tyne &amp; Wear</th>
<th>County Durham</th>
<th>Northumberland</th>
<th>Tees Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrative</td>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skilled trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer/mason</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care assistants &amp; home carers</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and retail assistants</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Process, plant and machine operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process operative (factory)</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process operative (fruit &amp; veg)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>3,145</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Elementary occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner/domestic staff</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen &amp; catering assistants</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packer</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building labourer</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter/waitress</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse operative</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maid/room attendant (hotel)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fitzgerald, 2008

\textsuperscript{37} However there appears to be an introduction of an older A8 workforce into the region. In the April-June 2006 period compared to the April-June 2007 period the ratio of 18-34 year old to 35-64 year old A8 workers went down from 77:23 to 70:30 with a significant rise in the 35-44 year old category from 70 registered workers to 130 (86% rise). This was again the case in the July-September 2006 period compared to the July-September 2007 period with the ratio of 18-34 year old to 35-64 year old A8 workers registering going down from 83:17 to 77:23 (Fitzgerald, 2008)

\textsuperscript{38} The SOC2000 consists of the following major groupings: 1. Managers and senior officials; 2. Professional occupations; 3. Associate professional and technical occupations; 4. Administrative and secretarial occupations; 5. Skilled trades occupations; 6. Personal service occupations; 7. Sales and customer service occupations; 8. Process, plant and machine operatives; and 9. Elementary occupations.
At a sub-regional level, the location and nationality of A8 workers is explored in more detail below (all data taken from Fitzgerald, 2008).

**Tyne and Wear**

- **Tyne and Wear** had by far the largest numbers of A8 registered workers (45% of the regional total). Of these workers 74% were Polish.

- At the local level, **Newcastle** accounted for the highest proportion of A8 and Polish workers (51% of Polish registered workers in Tyne and Wear). It also had the highest single regional groupings of Czechs (32% of regional Czechs), Estonians (33% of regional Estonians), Hungarians (58% of regional Hungarians), and Slovaks (35% of regional Slovaks). The Poles accounted for 72% of Newcastle A8 workers.

- The second highest number of A8 registered workers both in Tyne and Wear and regionally were working for **Gateshead** employers (19% of Tyne and Wear A8 workers), where 78% of A8 workers were Polish.

- Gateshead was closely followed by **Sunderland** (17% of Tyne and Wear A8 workers), which had the third highest number of A8 registered workers regionally. Of these 78% were Polish. The two other main groupings were Slovaks (7% of Sunderland A8 workers) and Latvians (6% of Sunderland A8 workers).

- **North Tyneside** had 8% of Tyne and Wear A8 workers of which 78% were Polish. It, along with Newcastle, had the equal highest grouping of Estonians in the region.

- Finally, **South Tyneside** (2%) had by far the lowest numbers of Tyne and Wear A8 registered workers and the lowest number of Poles.

**County Durham**

- **County Durham** had the second highest number of A8 registered workers (20% of the regional total) of which 80% were Polish.

- At a local level by far the highest number of registered A8 workers were in **Derwentside** (38% of County Durham A8 registered workers), and this was also the highest proportion of A8 registered workers outside of Tyne and Wear. Poles (35% of County Durham Poles) again dominated, accounting for 74% of Derwentside A8 workers, with Lithuanians (14% of Derwentside A8 workers) the other noticeable group.

- The second highest number of registered A8 workers in County Durham were working for **Durham** employers (17% of County Durham A8 workers), with the Poles again dominating (92%). There were also forty-five Slovaks registered here.

- This was followed by **Wear Valley** which had 13% of County Durham A8 registered workers, of which 77% were Polish and 21% Slovaks.

- **Easington** had 13% of County Durham A8 registered workers with Poles again the largest proportion of A8 workers (67%). The other main groups in Easington were Slovaks (21% of Easington A8 workers) and Czechs (12% of Easington A8 workers). Durham, Easington and Wear Valley had the
second highest numbers of Slovaks in the region, second only to Newcastle.

- **Sedgefield** had 12% of County Durham A8 registered workers and 95% were Polish.

- Finally, **Teesdale** and **Chester-le-Street** (4% and 2% respectively of County Durham A8 registered workers) had the lowest numbers of County Durham A8 registered workers and the lowest numbers of Poles (50 and 35 respectively).

**Tees Valley**

- **Tees Valley** followed County Durham with their number of A8 registered workers (19% of the regional total) of which 80% were Polish.

- At a local level the highest number of A8 workers were in **Darlington** (39% of Tees Valley registered workers), which also had the highest number of Poles (41% of Tees Valley Poles and 84% of Darlington’s A8 registered workers).

- The second highest number of A8 registered workers were working for **Stockton-on-Tees** employers (27% of Tees Valley registered A8 workers) and again Poles were dominant (85% of Stockton-on-Tees registered A8 workers).

- This was followed by **Middlesbrough** (18% of Tees Valley A8 registered workers), where Poles again made up the largest proportion of A8 registered workers (57% of A8 registered workers in Middlesbrough). Middlesbrough also had two other main national groupings, Czechs (18% of Middlesbrough A8 registered workers) and Latvians (15% of Middlesbrough A8 registered workers).

- Finally, **Hartlepool** (8% of Tees Valley A8 registered workers) and **Redcar and Cleveland** (7% of Tees Valley A8 registered workers) had the lowest numbers of Tees Valley A8 registered workers and the lowest numbers of registered Polish workers (105 and 95 respectively). The Poles again accounted for the vast majority of their registered workers (87% and 86% respectively).

**Northumberland**

- Finally, **Northumberland** had the lowest number of A8 registered workers in the region (15% of the regional total), and the highest proportion of these workers were again the Poles (55% of Northumberland A8 registered workers). Interestingly, though, Lithuanians (38% of Northumberland A8 registered workers) were also prominent. These groups accounted for 93% of Northumberland A8 registered workers.

- At the local level the highest number of registered workers were working for **Castle Morpeth** employers (32% of Northumberland A8 registered workers), which also had the second highest number of any single A8 national grouping in the Region (340 Lithuanians – second only to Newcastle’s 1,330 Poles). This was by far the largest proportion of Lithuanians in the region (46% of Lithuanians) and they accounted for 88% of A8 registered workers in Castle Morpeth.
The second highest proportion of A8 registered workers in Northumberland were working for **Berwick-upon-Tweed** (20% of Northumberland A8 registered workers) employers. Here again Poles were in the majority constituting 84% of Berwick-upon-Tweed A8 registered workers.

Registrations in **Blyth Valley** (18% of Northumberland A8 registered workers) followed next and again the Poles were in the majority constituting 66% of Blyth Valley A8 registered workers. Although, in Blyth Valley Lithuanians (29% of Blyth valley A8 registered workers) held a notable presence.

**Tynedale** had 14% of Northumberland A8 registered workers and 79% were Polish.

**Alnwick** followed with 12% of Northumberland A8 registered workers of which 86% were Polish.

Finally, **Wansbeck** had by far the lowest number and proportion of Northumberland A8 registered workers (3% of Northumberland A8 registered workers), of which 71% were Lithuanian. It also had the lowest number of registered Poles anywhere in the region (10).

The table overleaf provides full data for the North East WRS from 2004.

### Further research

For additional information, including qualitative data on migrant workers in the region, the overview of research into migration in North East England carried out by NERIP is of note. In particular this includes summary findings from:

- **Assessing the Local and Regional Impacts of International Migration** (Stenning, Champion et al. 2006)
- **Destination North East? Harnessing the regional potential of migration** (Pillai 2006)
- **I am a Migrant Worker** (Stella and Strasenburgh 2007)
- **International Migrant Workers in Northumberland** (Bates 2006)
### Table 7:4 WRS North East A8 registrations from May 2006 to September 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2004 – 06</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Grand totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Durham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tees Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The expansion of the European Union in recent years has had a marked impact on the significant growth in the North East migrant worker population since the turn of the century. Almost 40% of National Insurance Number allocations in the past year have been to migrants from the EU accession states, with Poland supplying the vast majority of these workers. At a sub-regional level, looking at Worker Registration Scheme data, Tyne and Wear had the largest number of registered workers (45% of the regional total), and these predominantly settled in Newcastle. Alternatively, Northumberland had the lowest number of registrations, at only 15% of the regional total influx. However, in comparison to other emerging communities (such as refugees and asylum seekers), there are significant numbers of migrant workers in rural parts of the region as well as urban areas.
8. Refugees and Asylum Seekers

The North East’s ethnic minority population has grown and changed considerably since the 2001 Census, due in part to the government’s dispersal policy for asylum seekers and refugees. Although asylum seekers are not permitted to work until they are granted refugee status, they nonetheless make up an important element of Newcastle’s ethnic minority population. This chapter explores trends in the refugee and asylum seeker population, at both national and regional level. It begins with a review of available data sources on refugees and asylum seekers, then examines recent trends in the North East asylum seeker population (including information on both supported and failed asylum seekers). It concludes with sections on the health and housing needs of this group, looking in particular at the issue of destitute asylum seekers.

Data on Refugees and Asylum Seekers

Home Office data sources

The Home Office is the main source of data on the asylum process and flows of individuals through it. Throughout the asylum process, administrative data is entered into a number of computerised databases, which are supported by a small number of manual systems. The Case Information Database (CID) records information on applications, decisions, appeals, removals (including voluntary assisted returns), persons held in detention and persons leaving detention. The ASYS database records details of asylum seekers applying and receiving support.

In April 2004, the National Audit Office was asked by the Home Office to examine the reliability of its quarterly asylum statistics and a detailed report, Asylum and migration: a review of Home Office statistics was published in May 2004. Whilst concluding that the asylum data and statistics are ‘in most respects reliable’, the report identified ‘several weaknesses in the process of compiling statistics and in their presentation, some of which impact on other items in the published statistics.’ Following this report, in March 2005, the Home Office initiated a quality review of its immigration statistics publications. The review identified three shortcomings in the basic data: an individual’s progress through all the various control processes cannot readily be tracked; particular elements of data often need extensive quality assurance before they can be used to produce National

Statistics; and the categories used to classify some variables are not always ideally suited to the needs of users of the statistics.

In 2007 the new Border and Immigration Agency (BIA) was created. In July a review of BIA statistics was announced, following a National Statistics Quality Review (NSQR) on the control of immigration. As well as taking forward the NSQR’s recommendations, the review aims to take account of new structural and policy changes such as the remit of the BIA. A key stated aim is to improve the breadth as opposed to the depth of statistical information with the expectation that this might make for a “more balanced perspective on the control of immigration”. The consultation period ended in February 2008. The Refugee Council and Immigration Law Practitioners Association are among those who have already published their responses.

**Cohort data**

**Definitions**

- **Asylum Seeker** is someone who has fled their home country, possibly because of war and/or human rights abuses, and makes an application for asylum in another country.

- **Refugee** is someone who is recognised by the Government of that country as having met the definition of a refugee under the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees as having a well founded fear of being persecuted.

It is important to recognise that asylum figures usually relate to the number of events of a given type (for example, asylum applications and the granting or refusal of asylum) occurring within a particular time period (e.g. a calendar year or a calendar quarter) or at a particular point in time. These events do not necessarily relate to the same group of individuals (i.e. an individual may apply for asylum in one calendar year and then be granted asylum, or have their application refused, in another). However, the Home Office has published some figures relating to applications and outcomes for the same group, or ‘cohort’, of people. For example, the text and table on pages 17-18 of the 2005 asylum statistics summarises the estimated outcomes of applications made in 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005, including outcomes of appeals at the Immigration Appellate Authorities (IAA)/Asylum and Immigration Tribunal (AIT) and the numbers of unsuccessful cases and corresponding removals.

Nationally, the Home Office (HO) provides data on the numbers of applications, refusals, withdrawals, appeals allowed and removals of asylum seekers and their dependants. These data are used to estimate the migration of asylum seekers and their dependants that is not captured by the International Passenger Survey. The Home Office also provides data on the numbers of asylum seekers and their dependants who are removed from the UK within a year of their application.
These data are used to make adjustments to exclude those who were in the UK for less than a year as they do not meet the definition of a migrant.

At a regional level, the primary data source on asylum seekers via NASS (National Asylum Seeker Support) statistics. As acknowledged elsewhere, however, “very little is known on the numbers of refused asylum seekers without support” (NEPHO 2008). In addition, there is very little information on refugee numbers as once the right to remain is granted there is no recording system.

**Trends in the North East refugee and asylum seeker population**

**Supported asylum seekers**

In 2003, the North East was ranked 4th out of 10 regions in terms of numbers of recipients, hosting approximately 12% of all dispersals. The largest refugee groups were from Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Central African countries and the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. (LSC 2003). By 2007, the North East had fallen to 5th place, with almost 10% of the UK’s asylum seekers (Home Office Asylum Statistics, Q4 2007). At national level, there had also been a fall in the total number of asylum seekers in receipt of asylum support (10% lower in Q4 2007 than in the same period 2006). At the end of December 2007, there were a total of 3380 asylum seekers in the North East, receiving either subsistence only support (45) or in NASS (National Asylum Seeker Support) accommodation (3,335).

**Dispersal by Local Authority**

In the North East, the majority of asylum seekers are accommodated in ten different Local Authorities. The following chart illustrates the regional dispersal by local authority and shows that Newcastle receives the largest numbers of asylum seekers at present; 37% of the regional total:
In addition, there were 20 asylum seekers in Newcastle in receipt of subsistence only support and 25 in other areas of the region in this period, representing 1% of the national total group.

**Nationalities of North East asylum seekers**

Overall, at the end of June 2007, there were 79 different known nationalities in the North East. The main nationalities of asylum seekers in the North East are Iranian (10.37%), Iraqi (8.08%) and Zimbabwean (6.66%). The chart below illustrates the ten most prominent nationalities of supported asylum seekers in the region:
Nationally, however, there have been increasing numbers of asylum applications from Afghanistan and the Peoples Republic of China, as the following table shows.

**Table 8:1 Top 10 applicant nationalities Q4 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No of applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Nationalities</td>
<td>1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,910</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Home Office Asylum statistics*
Profile of the region’s refugee and asylum seekers

In terms of the profile of the region’s refugees and asylum seekers, a survey by the Tyne and Wear LSC (2003) indicated that:

- The majority of refugees and asylum seekers arriving in Newcastle between 2000 and 2003 were young (20-35 years), single (two-thirds) and male (70%).
- Most had been in the UK and the North East for less than a year, and 80% did not have permission to work.
- Overall, refugees and asylum seekers were a highly diverse group, with varied educational levels, employment experiences, aspirations, health\(^{40}\) (Fay 2007), abilities, family arrangements and training and support needs.
- Over half could speak some English, a quarter had qualifications at Level 3 or above and most (60%) had previously been employed/self-employed.

Failed and destitute asylum seekers

Asylum application initial decisions

As the following chart shows, nationally 5,935 initial decisions were made in Q2 2007; 1.17% lower than the previous quarter. The number of cases (excluding dependants) awaiting an initial decision was 4,500 at the end of June 2007 (4,900 at the end of March 2007; 5,000 at the end of June 2006). Of this total, 3,900 cases were work in progress, i.e. the application had been outstanding for six months or less. Slightly fewer positive decisions were made: 14% of initial decisions in Q2 2007 were to grant asylum compared with 15% for Q1 2007. The Chart below demonstrates the number of decisions made for the past 6 quarters:

\(^{40}\) See “Asylum seekers and Refugees in Newcastle upon Tyne – an overview of Mental Health Service Needs, Provision and Pathways” (Fay, 2007) for more qualitative information.
Failed asylum seekers

Numbers of failed asylum seekers are far less available, as highlighted earlier in this chapter, although this is a particularly vulnerable group. Nationally, at the end of Q2 (June 2007), 9,365 failed asylum seekers (excluding dependents) were in receipt of Section 4 (‘Hard Case’) support\(^{41}\). Of these, nationals of Iraq accounted for the vast majority (3,460). Accurate regional data is unavailable. In the North East, for example, despite being required to continue to report fortnightly to Immigration Control in North Shields “many do not for fear of arrest and removal and therefore they go 'underground' with no official monitoring” (Prior 2006).

Numbers of destitute failed asylum seekers (i.e. not in receipt of section 4 support) are even harder to estimate. The following statistics are taken from the recent Open Door report, Destitute and Desperate (Prior, 2006):

- **Nationally**: The Home Office estimates that there are between 155,000 and 280,000 asylum seekers who have been refused the right to remain yet are still in the UK.
- **Regionally**: 500 are estimated to be destitute in the North East.
- **Newcastle**: A survey was carried out between Oct and December ’05 with all members of the Newcastle Citywide Asylum Seekers Support Group that

---

\(^{41}\) Section 55 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 enables the Home Office to deny support to asylum seekers who receive a negative decision on their asylum claim. Failed asylum seekers who are then destitute but unable to leave the UK immediately due to circumstances entirely beyond their control, can seek limited support under Section 4 (‘Hard Case’) of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 in the form of accommodation and food. After this, refused asylum seekers that remain in the UK are without statutory support or the legal right to work, and lack the means to meet their basic needs: meaning they are destitute.
asked how many asylum seekers their organisation saw every month that had been refused the right to remain:

- 93 people left their NASS accommodation in Newcastle over a 3 month period who had not been successful in the asylum claim. 11 had their support re-instated at a later date. Source - NASS Accommodation providers
- 50+ receiving financial support each month - WERS - Nov '05
- 50+ individuals supported financially every month - EAASSG Nov '05
- 519 'Hard Case' advice sessions, Jun-Nov '05 – NERS
- 428 different individuals receiving advice on homelessness, Jun-Nov '05 – NERS
- 312 helped with applying for Section 4 support - NERS Oct-Dec 05

The figures above will have some degree of duplication and it is not known how many leave Newcastle either by their own choice or by Home Office removal. Together they provide only an indicator therefore of numbers of destitute asylum seekers in Newcastle as at 2005. If anything, however, recent estimates suggest these numbers have increased. For example, the West End Refugee Service (WERS) based in Newcastle saw an 87% rise in the number of clients living with no means of support between April 2005 until March 2006. More recently, analysis of the 120 clients currently being supported by WERS revealed:

- 1% destitute since 2002
- 2.5% destitute since 2003
- 7.5% destitute since 2004
- 18% destitute since 2005
- 11% destitute since 2006
- 32.5% destitute since 2007
- 27.5% made destitute in 2008

In terms of the impact of destitution on failed asylum seekers, research conducted as part of the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust Inquiry into Destitution among Refused Asylum Seekers looked at experiences in Leeds and found that:

- People whose asylum cases have been refused form the main group experiencing destitution. Despite government expectations that the fast-track New Asylum Model (NAM) will improve the asylum process, the research found that some destitute people in Leeds had been processed through the NAM pilot since April 2006.

42 WERS Newsletter, April 2008, [www.wers.org.uk/docs/newsletter/Issue%2033%20April%202008.pdf](http://www.wers.org.uk/docs/newsletter/Issue%2033%20April%202008.pdf)
Destitute asylum seekers rely upon friends and charity from voluntary organisations and churches to try to meet their basic needs of shelter, food, health, income and safety. Others are forced to find undocumented work to survive. All sources of support are highly precarious.

People remain in this vulnerable position for protracted periods during which time they experience differing degrees of destitution that have an acute impact on their wellbeing, and can lead to self-harm and suicidal thoughts. Periods of rough sleeping are common for some.

Source: All above taken from Destitution in Leeds, (Lewis 2007).

Health Issues

A survey of Primary Care Trusts in the region carried out as part of the North East Public Health Observatory’s research into Migrant Health in North East England identified the following key health issues:

- Mental Health issues, including post traumatic stress disorder, the consequences of trauma and rape, and isolation. Almost all responders mentioned these issues.
- Sexual Health issues, including Sexually Transmitted Infections, HIV and unwanted pregnancies.
- Lack of, or incomplete, screening and immunisations – covering a wide variety of checks from communicable disease, cervical smears, breast screening, hearing, eye checks.
- Dental Health – poor dental health and accessing dental care was an issue noted directly in at least four responses. It is a known problem for other migrants as well as asylum seekers.
- Poor nutrition and consequences such as vitamin deficiencies.
- Skin diseases and parasitic diseases.
- Musculoskeletal problems, particularly of the feet – sometimes from travelling.
- Behavioural health problems – opium use, domestic violence, alcohol use, tobacco and smoking.
- Hypertension, H. pylori and diabetes (work carried out as part of Sunderland’s Health Needs Assessment has found higher frequencies and earlier onset of these conditions).

Respondents in the region’s Mental Health Trusts further confirmed the particular problems of asylum seekers, refugees and to lesser extent migrants as including anxiety, depression, suicidal thoughts and actions, survivor’s guilt and post traumatic stress (flashbacks and nightmares). They also identified that these problems are exacerbated by social isolation, racism, asylum seeker processes, language barriers, lack of access to ESOL classes, and lack of access to religious and cultural support.
Asylum seekers and housing

Conventional homelessness agencies are unable to help 'failed' asylum seekers as they are not entitled to Housing Benefit. The following section (taken from Prior, 2006) outlines the main options available to a failed asylum seeker who is unable to qualify for Section 21 support and/or cannot or does not want to access Section 4 support.

- **‘Sofa surfing’**: If evicted with no other possible statutory support most asylum seekers search out their fellow countrymen or a Refugee Community Organisation (RCO) to ask for help/advice. They will often end up sleeping on the couch of a friend who has either been given refugee status or more likely someone who is in NASS supported accommodation awaiting their decision on their asylum claim. This is strictly forbidden by NASS and if caught the asylum seeker who is permitted to stay in the accommodation would be evicted also with no possible way of accessing any further support from NASS. Therefore, when staying over-night with a fellow asylum seeker it is very important that they are not caught by NASS inspection teams and therefore they would not enter the property until late at night and would be required to leave early in the morning to go in search of somewhere else to stay for the following night. Most asylum seekers who are destitute in Newcastle adopt this nomadic lifestyle, moving from house to house, enduring little sleep and having to carry all their possessions with them searching out warm, dry places to occupy their time during the day.

- **Charitable help**: If unable to find somewhere to stay as described above many seek out charities, faith groups, communities and voluntary groups. However, whilst there are a number of places that offer a warm, friendly and dry place to go during the day that may or may not be able to offer some food, there is very little available in the way of providing over-night accommodation. A number of individuals do take asylum seekers into their homes, however, there is very little specifically set up or organised in Newcastle to house destitute asylum seekers for any length of time. Open Door are the only charity in the North East that are housing any significant number of people in this situation.

- **Rough sleeping**: If all of the above are not an option the last resort is to sleep rough in bus shelters or doorways in the city. It is estimated by one organisation that works with 'failed' asylum seekers that there are approximately 20 - 30 people that sleep outside in any one night. The health implications of this are only too obvious.

- **Night Stop**: Night Stop provides safe accommodation for vulnerable young people in private homes one night at a time, offering a breathing space until longer term accommodation can be found. The West End Refugee Service have occasionally used Night Stop to house some of their clients temporarily.

- **Hosting with families/faith groups etc**: Numerous individuals have taken asylum seekers into their own homes to stay for short a period of time in a spare room. There is no specifically organised system for this hosting, unlike in some other cities (such as the ASSIST project in Sheffield) where a hosting scheme has been set up to help facilitate this method of informal housing.
Summary

Newcastle's ethnic minority population has grown and changed considerably since the 2001 Census, due in particular to the recent expansion of the EU, but also as a result of government’s dispersal policy for asylum seekers and refugees. The majority of asylum seekers are located in ten local authorities in the North East, with Newcastle receiving the largest numbers at present (37% of the regional total). The main nationalities of the region’s asylum seekers are Iranian, Iraqi and Zimbabwean, with increasing numbers from some African counties including Eritrea, Angola and the Congo. However less is known about numbers of failed asylum seekers in the region, particularly those not in receipt of any formal means of support, or in terms of current numbers of resident refugees. Local research has shown that refugees and asylum seekers are a diverse group, with varied educational levels, employment experiences, aspirations, health, abilities, family arrangements and training and support needs. In terms of health needs, however, health providers in the region have found particularly high prevalence of mental health issues amongst this group.
9. Gypsies and Travellers

Gypsies and Travellers have been a part of British society for centuries; Gypsies since the 1500s and Irish Travellers since the 1800s. Today it is estimated that between 90,000 and 120,000 live in caravans in England with a further 2000 in Wales, and up to three times as many live in conventional housing (CRE 2006). However trends and fluctuations in the population are notoriously difficult to measure due to the lack of reliable, comprehensive data on local communities. Within this context, the following chapter explains the choice of language and definitions employed in this report, before moving on to a summary of the policy and legislative context. It moves on to the background to the primary data source for the Gypsy and Irish Traveller community at present, summarises North East data from the latest Caravan Count, and looks at the accommodation needs of this group, focussing on County Durham. Finally, the chapter looks at trends in relation to the health and educational performance of Gypsies and Travellers.

Language and definitions: the legislative context

The term Gypsy and Traveller is used in recognition that first, travellers are not a homogenous group and that second, ethnic identity itself is established by both personal ascription and social acceptance by the broader group. Within different communities, therefore, individuals may describe themselves as a "Gypsy", "English Traveller" or "Irish Traveller". Further, many, but not all Gypsy and Traveller communities maintain a nomadic or transient occupational or traditional lifestyle. For the purposes of this report, particularly given the lack of detailed data in this respect, the term Gypsies and Travellers is therefore used as an all-encompassing term to describe the varied sub-groups within the travelling community. This reflects the approach taken by the Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Race Relations Act

In official terms, there are two different uses of the term ‘Gypsy’. The first is as a distinct racial group as defined by the Race Relations Act. The term ‘racial group’ refers to groups defined by race, colour, nationality or ethnic or national origins. In 1983, in a landmark ruling in the case of Mandla (Sewa Singh) v Dowell Lee, the House of Lords identified two essential criteria for recognising an ‘ethnic group’ under the Race Relations Act:

- a long shared history, of which the group is conscious as distinguishing it from other groups, and the memory of which it keeps alive; and
- a cultural tradition of its own, including family and social customs and manners, often but not necessarily associated with religious observance.
Applying this definition, the courts have held that both Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers are ethnic groups for the purposes of the Race Relations Act (CRE, 2006).

In 2000, the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (RRA) marked a further important development in British race relations law, by enforcing a duty on public authorities to ensure that race equality and good race relations are built into the way all major public services are planned and provided. The amended RRA covers all the functions of all public authorities. It also gives over 40,000 listed public bodies (including local authorities, parish councils, community councils and police forces) a statutory general duty to ‘pay due regard’ to the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity, and to promote good relations between different racial groups.

As legally recognised ethnic groups, Gypsies and Irish Travellers are protected by the RRA, and included in the scope of the duty to promote race equality and good race relations. This means it is unlawful for any individual or organisation to treat Gypsies or Irish Travellers less favourably than other racial groups, or to discriminate against them indirectly. Segregation on racial grounds is also a form of direct discrimination. The RRA covers all locally and nationally provided services, including planning (section 19A of the RRA), housing and management of housing (including Gypsy sites) (section 21 of the RRA), education (sections 17 and 18 of the RRA), and the provision of other goods and services, such as health services, to unauthorised encampments (section 20 of the RRA).

Any policy or practice aimed at people who have a nomadic way of life, whether they are protected racial groups or not, will, in practice, disproportionately affect Gypsies and Irish Travellers, who do have protection under the RRA, and will therefore have implications for race equality and race relations.

**Planning Law**

This is also true for planning policy and practice in relation to ‘gipsy’ sites, where ‘gipsy’, as defined by the Caravan Sites Act 1968, refers to people who are ‘of nomadic habit of life, whatever their race or origin’. This piece of legislation was set in place as an attempt to solve the disparate problems faced by traditional Travellers at the time. This definition, based around the concept of those who had a nomadic habit of life, was later amended by a high court, and later an appeal court decision, to people who had a nomadic habit of life in which their wanderings were purposeful, for example in search of work. Many traditional Gypsies who continue to travel, Irish and Scots Travellers and increasing numbers of new Travellers, qualify in planning terms as ‘gipsies’. This has been born out at a large number of local planning inquiries and confirmed by the
Inspectors involved. Therefore, anyone who pursues a nomadic habit of life for economic purposes can argue that they are a ‘gipsy’ in planning terms.

**Human Rights**

Before turning to the detailed terms of reference of the inquiry, we look at recent cases brought under the Human Rights Act 1998, and cases heard in Strasbourg under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), that have important implications for Gypsies and Travellers living on sites. The courts have confirmed that, for many Gypsies and Irish Travellers, living in a caravan is not a ‘lifestyle choice’ but a reflection of their social and cultural heritage, and an essential part of their ethnic identity. This is so, whether they are nomadic or settle for long periods in one place. In recognition of this, the European Court of Human Rights has ruled that, to comply with Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (which protects the right to private and family life), local authorities need to take active steps, through their planning systems, to ‘facilitate the Gypsy way of life’. It requires them to take health and educational needs into account before making a decision to evict. It has also been accepted that some Gypsies and Irish Travellers may have a psychological aversion to conventional ‘bricks and mortar’ housing, and that this should be taken into account when assessing applications for accommodation from homeless people.

It has been made clear under human rights law that local authorities can exercise discretion about Gypsy sites. While it would continue to be unlawful to give preferential treatment to Gypsies and Irish Travellers over other racial groups in deciding what is needed to ‘facilitate the Gypsy way of life’, these and other court judgments unequivocally state that local authorities must take active steps to recognise the particular cultural needs of Gypsies and Irish Travellers, and to meet those needs as best they can. This echoes the UK’s responsibility under Article 5 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (Council of Europe, 1995) to ‘promote the conditions necessary for persons belonging to national minorities to maintain and develop their culture, and to preserve the essential elements of their identity’.

**Data on Gypsy and Irish Travellers**

**History of the Caravan Count**

Despite consistent efforts to expand the number and range of ethnic categories used in the National Census of Population, to date, Gypsies and Travellers have been omitted. It should be noted that in preparation for the 2011 Census, the Office for National Statistics is reviewing the questions on ethnicity, national identity, language and religion, and whether separate categories for Gypsies and Irish Travellers should be included. However at present, the primary source of data on the UK Gypsy and Irish Traveller population remains the Caravan Count.
This system of twice-yearly counts of Gypsy caravans and families was first introduced in England in 1979. Local authorities carry out the count and return figures to the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG). At the time the count was introduced county councils, metropolitan districts and London Boroughs were under a statutory duty to provide adequate accommodation for Gypsies residing in and resorting to their areas (Caravan Sites Act 1968 Part II). The count was intended to estimate the size of the Gypsy population for whom provision was to be made and to monitor progress towards meeting the provisions of the 1968 Act.

Part II of the 1968 Act, and thus the duty to provide, was repealed in 1994 by the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act. However following a successful challenge in the European Court, the Housing Act of 2004, placed extended duties on local authorities to undertake regular assessments of the accommodation needs of 'gypsies and travellers' either living in, or resorting to their area, under the Local Housing Needs Assessment process set out in Section 8 of the Housing Act 1985. The Act also requires local housing authorities to include the needs of 'gypsies and travellers' in any housing strategy they produce in line with section 87 of the Local Government Act 2003 and to take any such strategy into account in exercising their functions.

Review of the Caravan Count

Between 1989 and 1991 the (then) Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS) carried out extensive research into the count system following various criticisms from official agencies and Gypsy representative groups as to the system’s adequacy and accuracy. In the course of the research, OPCS examined how local authorities carried out the count and how the count information was used. Researchers developed and tested an alternative series of count forms designed to collect fuller and more consistent information. The report Counting Gypsies was published in 1991 (Green 1991), but the recommendations have not yet been implemented.

More recently, the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies at the University of Birmingham was commissioned by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) to review the Gypsy Caravan Count system in 2003 (ODPM 2003). The purpose of the review was to examine the adequacy and accuracy of the Gypsy count; to ascertain the current uses of count information; to identify other useful data which could be collected at the same time; and to propose several options which would produce a more useful and accurate count of Gypsies and Travellers without the burden on local authorities increasing to an unacceptable level.

Key findings included that the policy context has changed since the Gypsy count was introduced in 1979 and the current purpose of the count is not clearly
understood. Further, counts are not completely accurate; accuracy varies between local authorities and items of information. One reason for lack of accuracy is the non-involvement of Gypsies/Travellers themselves in the count process, which contributes to mistrust. However, despite fears about accuracy, the study concluded that the count is valuable because it effectively provides the only source of information on the numbers and distribution of Gypsy caravans/families. The consensus was therefore that the count should continue but that every effort should be made to reduce the weaknesses identified and to create information which is as useful as possible.

Accommodation needs and provision

Data from latest Caravan Count

Table 9.1 Gypsy sites provided by Local Authorities and Registered Social Landlords in the North East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of pitches</th>
<th>of which are: Residential</th>
<th>Caravan capacity</th>
<th>Date site opened</th>
<th>Date of last site changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total for North East</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham CC</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street (Drum Lane Travellers Site)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside (Tower Road Travellers Site)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham (Adventure Lane)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield (East Howie Travellers Site)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley (Green Lane Travellers Site)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley (St. Phillips Park)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough UA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough UA (Metz Bridge Gypsy and travellers Site)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland CC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth (Lynemouth Gypsy site)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck (Hartford Caravan Site)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar &amp; Cleveland UA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gypsy&amp;Traveller Residential Site</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees UA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees UA (Mount Pleasant Grange)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne &amp; Wear</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead (Baltic Road Site Gypsy Caravan Site)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caravan Count, DCLG 2007
Lack of authorised sites

Limitations of the Caravan Count aside, as acknowledged in the recent North East Assembly report on Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment, there is a shortfall of authorised sites for Gypsies and Travellers (White Young Green 2007) at both a national and regional level. The study found that in the North East:

“...the January 2006 ODPM count identified 530 caravans in the region. This accounts for approximately 3% of the total number of caravans in the UK. Of the 530 caravans identified, 48 were on unauthorised sites, 447 on socially rented sites and 35 on private sites.”

The following table compares the proportions of caravans on authorised and unauthorised sites in the North East with those in England over the period January 2004 to July 2007.

Table 9.2 Proportions of authorised and unauthorised sites in the North East (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan-04</th>
<th>Jul-04</th>
<th>Jan-05</th>
<th>Jul-05</th>
<th>Jan-06</th>
<th>Jul-06</th>
<th>Jan-07</th>
<th>Jul-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caravan Count, DCLG

As this shows, the proportion tends to fluctuate depending on the time of the count, with winter counts in particular tending to show a marginally lower level of unauthorised caravans. There is also a marked impact due to seasonal community events. However the report authors comment that regionally, since 2005, the proportion of unauthorised caravans has dropped sharply with recorded levels ranging between 8% and 10% (although there is no apparent explanation for this sharp change in level of unauthorised caravans which is considerably below the national average).

Gypsy and Traveller Local Accommodation Needs Assessments

Measures in the 2004 Housing required local authorities to include Gypsies and Travellers in the Accommodation Needs Assessment process, and to have a strategy in place which sets out how any identified needs will be met as part of their wider housing strategies, came into force on 2\textsuperscript{nd} January 2007. Initially, all local housing authorities were expected to have completed a Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessment by the end of 2007. However this was subsequently extended to March 2008 but to date, only Durham County Council's report is available. The following section therefore provides a summary of some of the key findings from the Durham report as a “snapshot indicator” of the situation in the region as a whole.
**Focus on County Durham**

Over half of the region’s authorised sites are located in County Durham and overall, the area provides some 39% of all Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the North East. The County Council recently commissioned David Cumberland Housing Regeneration Ltd to carry out research into accommodation and support needs of the local Gypsies and Irish Traveller population (DCHR 2006).

Key findings from that study are summarised here:

- For Gypsies and Travellers living in unauthorised encampments, abuse and harassment, lack of facilities (toilets, water etc) and police / enforcement officer behaviour were cited as key problems. On authorised sites, 80% indicated that improvements were need to the sites, with particular focus on the need for new or improved sheds with more space for laundry facilities as well as toilets, showers and sinks.

- Whilst survey returns from Councillors and Parishes indicated a low awareness of any hate incidents against Gypsies and Travellers in Durham, this contrasted with interview responses from the local Gypsy and Traveller community. For people living on unauthorised encampments in particular, there was significant experience of harassment (37%).

- In terms of health issues, the study found the majority of interviewees had experienced stress in their daily lives (including 64% of those living on authorised sites). Key causes cited by people living on unauthorised sites included no stopping places and being forced to move on, homelessness, various forms of harassment from both the police and the local community and domestic violence. For Gypsies and Travellers on Local Authority sites, key causes were predominantly the conditions and facilities on site, lack of privacy, rent and money, family and personal reasons.

- The majority of respondents saw education of their children as very important, particularly in terms of its role in accessing employment opportunities and because of its benefits to overall quality of life. However the one key criticism was concern from parents that schools were unable to deal effectively and fairly with racist incidents against Gypsy and Traveller children.

**Health issues**

The University of Sheffield recently conducted research into the health status of Gypsies and Travellers in England on behalf of the Department of Health (Parry, Van Cleemput et al. 2004). Results from the quantitative survey carried out as part of the study show that Gypsies and Travellers have significantly poorer health status and significantly more self-reported symptoms of ill-health than other UK-resident, English-speaking ethnic minorities and economically disadvantaged white UK residents. Health problems amongst Gypsies and Travellers are between two and five times more common than the settled community. Specifically, Gypsies and Travellers are more likely to be anxious, have breathing problems (including asthma and bronchitis) and chest pain. They are also more
likely to suffer from miscarriages, still births, the death of young babies and older children. Further, Gypsies and Irish Traveller women are twice as likely to be anxious than Gypsies and Irish Traveller men.

The report also looks at the use of health services and Gypsy and Travellers’ attitudes, beliefs and experiences of health and the health service. In it, Gypsies and Travellers talk about their experience of:

- Discrimination and bad communication with, and ignorance about, Gypsies and Travellers within the healthcare system. The report recognises the value of doctors and health workers who understand Gypsy and Traveller culture.
- Traveller attitudes to health, including a traditional belief in relying on yourself or family, suspicion of health services, and the belief that treatment will not be effective.
- The effect that the lack of access to education and decent accommodation has on Gypsy and Traveller Health (Parry, Van Cleemput et al. 2004)

Education and attainment trends

At a national level, in England, there were about 1,100 Irish Travellers and 2,300 Gypsy/Roma students in secondary schools, fewer than half the number registered in primary schools in 2006 (Foley 2006). In terms of attendance, “The average attendance rate for Traveller pupils is around 75%. This figure is well below the national average and is the worst attendance profile of any minority ethnic group.” (Ofsted 2003) Further, Ofsted considers that about 12,000 Traveller children are not registered with a school and that at Key Stage 4 this represents about 53% of these pupils.

In terms of attainment, other research has found that both Gypsy and Irish Traveller groups have extremely low levels of academic achievement. Although it is estimated that many children from these groups are not recorded in the Annual School Census, are not present during key stage assessments and/or do not continue in education up until Key Stage 4, for those that have a recorded result, attainment is very low. For example, at Key Stage 1, 28% of Travellers of Irish Heritage and 42% of Gypsy/Roma pupils achieved Level 2 or above in Reading compared to 84% of all pupils (from DfES, 2005).

As shown by the following table, achievement at GCSE level is also significantly lower than for any other ethnic group.
### Table 9:3 Achievements at GCSE 2007 by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>% Achieving 5 A* to C including E&amp;M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller of Irish Heritage</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy/Romany</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other White background</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other mixed background</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black background</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified¹</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Pupils</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In terms of exclusion from school, as the following table shows, Travellers of Irish Heritage and Gypsy / Roma pupils were by far the most likely to be permanently excluded in 2005/06. Data is only available at national level, but it shows that boys from these groups in particular were most likely to be permanently excluded at secondary school level (almost half the total school population in each case).

Research carried out by the Department for Education and Skills in 2005 confirmed this trend and highlighted the need for improved monitoring of data by ethnicity alongside a number of other measures in order to support further action (DfES 2005).
Table 9.4 Maintained Secondary Schools: Number of Fixed Period Exclusions by Ethnic Group and Gender: England, 2005/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group and Background</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of school population</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Period Exclusions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>170,650</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>65,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>165,600</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>63,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller of Irish heritage</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>45.47</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy/Roma</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>46.59</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other White background</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>7,790</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>3,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>2,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Mixed background</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8,810</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>1,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10,790</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>4,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>2,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black background</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified (4)</td>
<td>49,350</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>18,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Ethnic Pupils</td>
<td>33,990</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>12,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils (3)</td>
<td>248,940</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>94,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: School Census*
Summary

A lack of reliable, comprehensive data on Gypsy and Traveller communities makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the region’s population or the particular issues they face. According to the latest Caravan Count, there were 530 caravans in the region, the majority of which were located in County Durham on authorised sites. However, Caravan Count data only provides the minimum number of caravans at any time and importantly, tells us little about the Gypsy and Traveller population itself. In terms of the health, education and accommodation status of the North East’s Gypsies and Travellers, studies carried out at the national, regional and local level point toward a number of issues for concern. For instance, research indicates that Gypsies and Travellers have significantly poorer health status than other ethnic groups in the UK; levels of educational attainment are extremely low and a number of people, particularly those living in unauthorised encampments live with poor basic facilities and experience harassment and abuse from the local community on a fairly regular basis.
10. Faith and Religion

Measuring religious affiliation in the population presents researchers with some considerable challenges. For example, whilst the 2001 Census represents the most recent, extensive survey of religion in England, it only gathers data on people by broad faith denomination, i.e. Christian, Muslim and so forth. Further, the way in which people answer questions on religion is very sensitive to the exact question wording. This is particularly true for people who have a loose affiliation with a religion. In particular, slight differences in question wording can produce large differences in the proportion of people who say they are Christians or have no religion, although the proportion of people from other religions tends to be more stable. These issues notwithstanding, the following chapter explores more recent data on religion in England and the North East, focussing in particular on issues around attendance, recent trends in religion, and the link between faith and social action in the region.

Religion in Great Britain

As detailed below, Census 2001 provides a broad overview of the population by faith group.\(^{43}\)

Table 10:1 Religion: by country and Government Office Region, April 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Britain</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Buddhist</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Sikh</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Religion</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
<th>All people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and The Humber</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All people (100%)</td>
<td>41,014,811</td>
<td>148,157</td>
<td>558,342</td>
<td>267,373</td>
<td>1,588,890</td>
<td>336,179</td>
<td>159,167</td>
<td>8,596,488</td>
<td>4,433,520</td>
<td>57,103,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001, Office for National Statistics, Census 2001, General Register Office for Scotland

Source: ONS Focus on Ethnicity and Religion

\(^{43}\) See Shewell and Penn (2005) for full 2001 Census data on faith and religion.
As is clear from the above, Christianity was the dominant religion in the UK in 2001. In the last Census, just over 4 out of 5 people (81%) in the region claimed affiliation to the Christian faith, with the next sizeable group being people of Muslim faith, at 1.0%. Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Sikh and Other religion were all at 0.2% of the population, with 11% having no religion and a further 6.1% religion not stated. This finding is upheld in more recent studies such as the 2007 Tearfund report on *Churchgoing in the UK*. This found that Christianity is still the predominant faith in the UK with over half (53%) or 26.2 million adults claiming to be Christian; while other faiths account for just 6% (notably, Muslim, Hindu and Sikh faiths). Overall, therefore, three out of five people in the population are affiliated with faith, with the remainder claiming to have no religion (39%) (Ashworth and Farthing 2007). Other key findings from that report included:

- 7.6 million UK adults (15%) attend at least monthly. The majority of these, 4.9 million (10% of UK adults) attend at least weekly. Adding in fringe and occasional churchgoers (5 million) means that one in four UK adults (26%) or 12.6 million attend a place of worship at least once a year.
- Two thirds of UK adults (66%) or 32.2 million people have no connection with church at present (nor with another religion). These people are evenly divided between those who have been in the past but have since left (16 million) and those who have never been in their lives (16.2 million).
- Nearly 1 million adults attend ethnic majority places of worship. This is composed of 9% black majority, 1% Asian majority and 2% Chinese or other ethnic majority. The largest denomination groupings among ethnic majority churches overall are Pentecostal (23%), Roman Catholic (23%) and Church of England/Anglican (19%). Regular churchgoing is particularly high among adults of black ethnic origin at 48% - over three times the proportion among white adults (15%).
- The following are all more likely than average to be regular churchgoers: women (19% attend at least monthly); Social Class ABs (21%); over 55 year olds (22%); and those of black ethnic origin (48%).

**Variation by region**

At a regional level, the Tearfund report found significant variations in patterns of church attendance and experience within the UK. All statistics below are taken from *Churchgoing in the UK* and summarise some key patterns that emerged (Ashworth and Farthing 2007):

- London has the highest proportion of regular churchgoers (22%) of any English province and the most religiously diverse population with 20% belonging to religions other than Christianity – much higher than elsewhere in the UK.
- In comparison, the North East and Yorkshire & Humberside have the lowest proportion of churchgoers (18% and 20% attending at least once a year respectively compared to 24% in England as a whole).
Attendance rates in North East

As the figure below shows, a small proportion of people in the region attend religious services on a regular basis, other than for weddings, funerals and christenings. Overall, over a third (38%) never attend a place of worship for events other than these.

Figure 10-1 Q.7 - Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, how often do you attend religious services these days? (% of respondents: UK rate in brackets)

However, there does appear to be evidence that people use churches / places of worship to engage in a wider range of community activities. For example, 33% of respondents to the 2007 Church of England Omnibus Survey in the North East had attended church or a place or worship for social or community events. In terms of attitudes towards places of worship, it also appears that people in general see them as making a positive contribution to the local community. A survey published by Opinion Research Business in 2006 into *Attitudes Towards the Church* found that people in Northern England were particularly likely to agree that places of worship make the neighbourhood a better place to live (62% compared with the British average of 58%) and the vast majority (73%) feel they
provide valuable social and community facilities. People in the North of England would also like to see them more actively involved in the local community (69% compared to GB average rate of 64%) and would like to see places of worship more accessible to the community (75% compared to GB average of 69%).

Recent trends in religion

Ethnic growth

The 2005 English Church Census shows that there has been considerable growth in church attendance among those coming from a non-white ethnic background. Black church attendance is at least three times their proportion in the population, and Chinese more than double. On the other hand, Indian church attendance as a percentage of Indians in England is only about a third of their numbers. Other groups (Other Asian and Other Non-White) are above the national proportions but closer to them.

Table 10:2 Church attendance by ethnicity, 1998 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,274,600</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>2,640,600</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>268,600</td>
<td>+23%</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>54,300</td>
<td>+ 9%</td>
<td>59,400</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>+ 3%</td>
<td>56,400</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>36,300</td>
<td>+24%</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-White</td>
<td>26,200</td>
<td>+27%</td>
<td>33,400</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,714,700</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>3,166,200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>47m</td>
<td>49m</td>
<td>50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-White</td>
<td>440,100</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>525,600</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pulling out of the nosedive (Brierley 2006)

Non-White attendance at places of worship has increased by a fifth, +19%, in the period 1998 to 2005, a total of over 85,000 people, or an increase of more than 12,000 per year. The White community meanwhile has dropped by almost a fifth, -19%, or a loss of over 630,000 people, equivalent to 90,000 people per year.

Faith and social action

Research carried out on behalf of the Churches Regional Commission, emphasised the important role that faith communities play in social action activities in the region. The following is taken from that report (Smith 2004):

- Faith communities in the North East are making a significant contribution to the life of the region through service and social action. 88% of the worshipping communities in this survey are drawn from the local neighbourhood in which the worship building is located. They therefore form a very real presence in every local area within the region.
- Buildings belonging to faith groups in the North East are an important resource for local communities in both urban and rural contexts and are
accessible to the wider community. The survey showed that 13.9% of buildings were purpose built for shared communal use and 56.7% had rooms used by community groups.

- The survey has identified a pool of 855 paid staff (some included their ministers, others did not) and 10,085 volunteers involved directly with local faith communities. The majority of activity undertaken by faith communities is dependent on volunteers.

- Respondents indicated they were involved in 4,262 separate activities based on the lists provided in the survey form. An additional 500 specific projects and activities were mentioned in more detail.

- Faith communities in the North East are an important part of the community and voluntary sector, with the potential to play a strong support role. They stimulate significant amounts of volunteering. In addition to their identifiably faith-based work, it is possible to extrapolate, from the information provided by respondents that faith community members across the region spend approximately 161,268 hours per week of their time working in the wider community.

- Faith communities in the North East consistently engage people and groups, often at times of crisis, who are not part of the worshipping community and who are among the most vulnerable social groups. Faith communities appear to be in direct contact with groups that agencies identify as ‘hard to reach’.

- Faith communities in the North East could be more involved in Local Strategic Partnerships. The survey findings suggest that accurate knowledge of the role of faith communities in LSPs is limited. Significantly, faith communities with the least awareness of the potential for working with LSPs, also have little knowledge about accessing new funding streams that might benefit their activities.

**Summary**

Christianity remains the dominant religion in both the North East and the wider UK, with just over half of all adults claiming affiliation, while other faiths account for just 6% of the population (notably, the Muslim, Hindu and Sikh faiths). However this is not reflected in actual attendance levels; only one in four adults attend church at least once a year (less than one in five in this region, many for only weddings, christenings etc), and two thirds have no connection with the church at all. There is some ethnic variation in this respect; nationally almost half of adults of black ethnic origin are regular church goers and in contrast with attendance patterns in the White majority, non-White attendance at places of worship has increased significantly in recent years.
11. Disability and Mental Health

The concept of “disability” is complex and difficult to measure: in part because disability itself can take many different forms, but also because subjective ideas and standards of what constitutes “disability” vary. This can be particularly the case for people with mental impairments, despite the fact that a range of mental health problems are now considered to constitute a disability in the same way as a physical or sensory impairment[44]. As a result, whilst there are a range of sources available to help gain an understanding of disability in the North East today, they nevertheless provide a somewhat “patchy” picture (as reported in the previous report by Penn and Shewell, 2005). With such limitations in mind, the following chapter starts off by examining the evidence base currently available for measuring disability, then goes on to summarise key data on the region’s disabled population, using recent Labour Force and Family Resources Survey statistics, along with relevant benefit claimant counts. The section on Mental Health, drawing in particular on APHO’s Indications of Public Health in the English Regions (2007), to explore overall regional mental health needs, rates of incapacity benefit claimants with mental health issues, and hospital statistics on the prevalence of suicide and depression and anxiety admissions in the North East.

Data and definitions

Currently, the primary data sources for information on disability in the North East are:

- Disabled people’s participation in the labour market using April-June 2006 Labour Force Survey (LFS) data.
- Estimates on the disabled population in Britain from the Family Resources Survey (FRS).
- Claimant data from the Department for Work and Pensions

However, as acknowledged above, these vary in their definitions of disability and therefore the data they collect. Taken from the Disability Rights Commission’s most recent Disability Briefing (2007), the following section provides information on the various definitions employed.

Definitions of disability used in the LFS

Since spring 1998, the LFS has provided information about disability using the following range of definitions:

---

[44] For the purposes of the 2005 Disability Discrimination Act, a disabled person is someone who has a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his or her ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. Importantly, the DDA 2005 amended the definition of disability by removing the requirement that a mental illness should be 'clinically well-recognised'.
- **Current DDA disabled**: Includes people who have a long term health problem or disability which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day to day activities.

- **Work limiting disabled**: Includes people who have a long-term health problem or disability which affects the kind or amount of paid work which a person might do.

- **Long term disabled**: Includes people who meet the criteria for either current DDA or work-limiting definitions of disability (or both – as is often the case) are defined as having a current long-term disability.

Clearly, estimates for the different definitions may vary, and it should be noted that the difference between the DDA definition estimates and those based on work-limiting disabilities may be exaggerated due to people not being able to assess the extent to which their work limiting disability would also affect their ability to carry out normal day to day activities. It follows that including all those with current long term disabilities improves the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the estimates.

### Definition of disability used in the Family Resources Survey (FRS)

The Family Resources Survey (FRS) disability estimates are based on "the number of people with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity, and who have a significant difficulty with day-to-day activities'.

### Disability in Britain

The Family Resources Survey (FRS) provides prevalence estimates for disabled adults and disabled children\(^{45}\), including breakdowns by region, age group, gender and ethnicity, based on the definition of disabled provided above. According to the most recent Family Resources Survey (2005/6) there were 10.8 million disabled people in Britain in 2005/6 (including people with limiting long standing illness); of which 0.5 million lived in the North East. This number is slightly less than that recorded in the previous two years, as detailed in the table below\(^{46}\).

\(^{45}\) The FRS also provides a regional breakdown of numbers of disabled children in Britain, but as estimates are rounded to the nearest 100,000, there is no current data for the North East. In total, there were 0.7 million disabled children in Britain in 2005/6. See *Children with long-term disability in the North East* (NEPHO, 2003) for regional estimates.

\(^{46}\) Note that the figures are estimates based on a sample survey and are therefore subject to sampling variation. Caution should therefore be exercised in the interpretation of small year-on-year fluctuations and identification of trends should be based on several years of data.
Table 11.1: Disabled people in Britain by Region, 2003/4 to 2005/6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2003/4</th>
<th>2004/5</th>
<th>2005/6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West and Merseyside</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Family Resources Survey, Great Britain (taken Disability Rights Commission, 2007)

Disability and employment

The following analysis is taken from the Disability Rights Commissions latest briefing on disability (Disability Rights Commission 2007) and is based on April to June 2006 Labour Force Survey data.

This indicated that overall, there were 6.9 million disabled people of working age in Britain in 2006, one fifth of the total working age population. This represents a gradual increase in the size of the working age disabled population over time, from 6.4 million in 1999 to 6.9 million in 2006; a growth of 8% over a seven year period. By way of comparison, over the same period, the non disabled population increased by only 2%. Other key findings from the 2007 briefing show that:

- Across Britain, there are regional variations in the prevalence of disability. The North East of England and Wales have the highest proportions of disabled people, with one quarter of the local working age population in these regions disabled – 25% and 24% respectively. London, the South East and East of England have lower than average proportions of disabled people at 17%.
- Disability rates increase with age; whilst 9% of adults aged 16-24 are disabled, this increased to 44% in the 50 to retirement age category.
- Many disabled people work or want to work. Half of disabled people of working age, 3.5 million people, are in work and 1.3 million disabled people without a job, want to work.
Since 1999, disabled people’s overall employment rate has increased steadily by 4 percentage points, from 47% to 50%. Despite this, inequalities in the proportions of disabled and non disabled people in work persists, with only half of disabled people in work, compared with over four fifths of the non disabled population in work.

Employment rates vary greatly according to the type of impairment a person has. Disabled people with mental health problems have the lowest employment rates of all impairment categories, at only 21%.

Disabled people in employment are more likely to work in manual and lower occupations, and less likely to work in managerial, professional and high-skilled occupations.

At £10.28 per hour, the average gross hourly pay of disabled employees is about 10% less than that of non disabled employees (£11.3 per hour).

Disabled people are still only half as likely as non-disabled people to be qualified to degree level and are twice as likely as non-disabled people to have no qualification at all. This pattern of inequality has not changed over time.

Disabled people continue to experience high rates of unemployment: the unemployment rate for disabled people in 2006 was 9%, compared with 5% for non disabled people.

Nearly half of the disabled population of working age in Britain are economically inactive. However, one third of inactive disabled people would like to work, compared with just under one quarter of non disabled people.

According to the LFS, there are 2.4 million disabled people out of work and on state benefits: over one third of the total disabled population by working age.

The following table and charts explore some dimensions of the above findings in more detail.

**Table 11:2 Disabled population of working age in North East and Great Britain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GB</strong></td>
<td>6,359</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>6,537</td>
<td>6,671</td>
<td>6,692</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>6,786</td>
<td>6,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North East</strong></td>
<td>361</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Labour Force Survey*
Table 11:3: Employment and unemployment rates of disabled people by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total number of disabled (000s) and as a % of local population</th>
<th>In employment (000s) and employment rate (%)</th>
<th>ILO unemployed and unemployment rate</th>
<th>On state benefits and not in work (000s and as % of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All long-term disabled</td>
<td>6,871 (19.3)</td>
<td>3,465 (50.4)</td>
<td>336 (8.8)</td>
<td>2,443 (35.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>383 (25.1)</td>
<td>172 (45.0)</td>
<td>15 (7.8)</td>
<td>161 (42.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West &amp; Merseyside</td>
<td>873 (21.3)</td>
<td>391 (45)</td>
<td>31 (7.4)</td>
<td>368 (42.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>609 (19.9)</td>
<td>308 (50.6)</td>
<td>33 (9.7)</td>
<td>222 (36.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>503 (19.4)</td>
<td>281 (55.8)</td>
<td>25 (8.1)</td>
<td>156 (31.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>633 (19.8)</td>
<td>318 (50.2)</td>
<td>28 (8.2)</td>
<td>222 (35.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>550 (16.5)</td>
<td>312 (56.7)</td>
<td>25 (7.3)</td>
<td>156 (28.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>821 (16.9)</td>
<td>357 (44.9)</td>
<td>63 (15)</td>
<td>330 (40.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>853 (17.1)</td>
<td>510 (59.8)</td>
<td>47 (8.4)</td>
<td>221 (25.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>571 (19.1)</td>
<td>329 (57.6)</td>
<td>20 (5.9)</td>
<td>162 (28.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Labour Force Survey

Table 11:4 Employment rates for disabled and non-disabled people by region and Great Britain: 1999-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GB</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All not disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GB</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Labour Force Survey
Claimant rates

The Department for Work and Pensions provides a further data source on the region’s disabled population via Disability Living Allowance claimant data. The following charts therefore illustrate sub-regional patterns of Disability Living Allowance claimants in the region, including trends by age and duration of claim.

**Figure 11-1 Disability Living Allowance claimant in the North East by Local Authority of claimant and gender at May 2007**

As the above chart shows:

- There is a roughly even split between male and female claimants in the region, with slightly more male claimants in all authorities with the exception of North Tyneside. This is similar to the gender split at the national level (49.7% female; 50.3% male). Castle Morpeth has the highest proportion of male to female claimants, at 56.0%:44.0%.
- Sunderland has the highest prevalence of DLA claimants for both genders, with 11,020 male and 10,250 female claimants at May 2007 (21,270 in total).

---

47 Disability Living Allowance is a benefit that is paid to people who are severely disabled and who, as a result, need help with either personal care and with getting around or both. The benefit is intended to help meet the extra costs of people with severe disability and entitlement is based on how much help is needed with care and/or mobility. In terms of eligibility, DLA cannot be claimed on or after the 65th birthday and is only payable after a person has needed help for 3 months and is expected to need help for a further 6 months.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne has the second highest prevalence with 7,950 male and 7,410 female claimants at May 2007 (15,360 in total).

At the other end of the scale, Teesdale, Alnwick and Berwick upon Tweed have the lowest numbers, with 1195, 1280 and 1270 total claimants respectively.

In terms of the age of the region’s claimants:

- A minority of claimants are aged under 16, ranging from just over 6% in Easington to almost 13% in Berwick upon Tweed. An even smaller number are aged between 16 and 24, ranging from just under 3% in Teesdale to 6.3% in Castle Morpeth. This reflects the age profile at national level, where 5.5% of claimants are 16 or under.

- Between 40% and 47% are aged between 25 and 59, with the highest level in Newcastle upon Tyne and lowest in Sedgefield. Again, this compares with the situation in England, with 46% of claimants in this age range.

- However the vast majority of the region’s claimants are 60 plus, ranging from just under 38% in Newcastle upon Tyne to a high of 48.7% in Easington. In many districts of the region, this proportion is higher than the national rate (38%), meaning that DLA claimants in the North East generally have an older age profile.

Figure 11-2 Disability Living Allowance claimant in the North East by Local Authority of claimant and age at May 2007

Source: DWP Information Directorate
Finally, the following chart illustrates sub-regional trends in relation to the duration of DLA claim and shows that the vast majority of claimants in the North East have been claiming for 5 years or more. In all authorities except Berwick upon Tweed this accounted for over 70% of claimants, with the highest level of long term claimants in Easington. This is slightly higher than the national rate, where 68% of claimants have been claiming for 5 years or more.

Figure 11-3 Disability Living Allowance claimant in the North East by Local Authority of claimant and duration of claim at May 2007

Mental Health

The following section draws primarily on the seventh series report *Indications of Public Health in the English Regions*, focusing on mental health (APHO, 2007). In terms of data presentation, in Figures 11:5 to 11:9, bar charts are used to display regional indicator values and most include 95% confidence intervals to identify whether regional values differ significantly from the national average. They use one of two colour schemes as follows:
Traffic light colours

Better than / worse than average are used when making a judgement about the performance of a region against the national average based on whether and how the regional value statistically significantly differs from the national average.

Alternative colours

Lower than average are used when it is felt that a judgement about desirability can’t be made. These indicate whether the regional value is statistically significantly low, consistent, or statistically significantly high compared with the national average.

National target or recommended levels, where these have been clearly stated, are highlighted using a vertical red line.

**Overall Regional Mental Health Needs**

**Figure 11-4 Mental Health ‘Needs’ Indices by Region**

As widely acknowledged, “the association between rates of mental illness and certain population characteristics, notably poverty, unemployment and social isolation is well established” (APHO 2007). The above chart therefore measures mental health needs by region using the following data sources:

- The Mental Illness Needs Index (MINI) is calculated by predicting electoral ward level psychiatric admission prevalences from Census small area statistics.
The Mental Illness Needs Index (MINI2000) is calculated by predicting electoral ward level psychiatric admission rates from index of multiple deprivation component scores and ONS area classification.

National Psychiatric Morbidity Survey index is calculated by predicting postcode sector level prevalence of Revised Clinical Interview Schedule (CIS-R) scores of 12 or more from Census small area statistics, England and Wales data, psychiatric morbidity survey 1993/4 and Census 1991.

AREA mental health services model hybrid index calculated from admission statistics and General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) scores, a range of predictor variables, England data 1998.

As the chart illustrates, while the various indices employed show broadly similar patterns, there is some variation by region. In particular, London and the North of England are estimated as having higher rates of mental illness while the rest of southern England and the East Midlands have lower rates.

**Incapacity benefits**

The chart below shows the rate per 100,000 population aged 16 to 59 years claiming incapacity benefit or severe disablement allowance with a diagnosis in the mental and behavioural disorders category (irrespective of whether they receive payments). As it shows, numbers claiming Incapacity Benefits are substantially higher than average in the North East and North West regions and lower in the South East, Eastern and London regions.

**Figure 11-5 Mental and behavioural disorders incapacity benefit claimant rate per 100,000 population aged 16 to 59 years, 2004/05**

---

*Source: Department for Work and Pensions*
Psychiatric disorders

The proportion of adults with a score of four or more on the 12-item General Health Questionnaire (GHQ 12). A GHQ score of 4 or more indicates a possible psychiatric disorder. This method has been found to be a reliable indicator of both the current state of mental health in the country and the future demand for mental health care services.

As the chart below shows, rates of a GHQ 12 score of four or more vary little across regions, with the exception of the North East, where the proportion is significantly higher. Applying the findings of the Health Survey for England to the general population of England indicates that 13.2% of England’s population received a point score of 4 or more. The lowest region is the East of England at 11.1%, whilst the highest is the North East at 17.5%, a proportion 4.3% greater than the national average.

Figure 11-6 Percentage of adults with a GHQ12 score of four or more, 2003

Suicide

The following chart uses age-standardised rates for suicide and injury undetermined, pooled for the 3 years 2003-2005 in people aged 15 years and over. Suicide is defined by Coroners in England and has to be proven ‘beyond reasonable doubt’. However since there is some variation in practice it is generally considered that the addition of open verdicts (cause of injury undetermined) provides a more reliable guide to trends in suicide.

As the chart shows, rates of suicide are highest in the North East and North West regions:
Admissions for depression and anxiety

The next tables look at hospital admissions for depression and anxiety disorders. Note that Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) are based on consultant episodes (a period of care under one consultant within one provider) and not admissions, hence some over-counting may occur and does not include data from the independent sector. It is also worth noting that “depression and anxiety disorders are predominantly treated in the community and in primary care so hospital admissions give only limited information about ‘the tip of the iceberg’” (APHO, 2007). Limitations notwithstanding, the data tells us that the North West, North East and South West regions have higher rates of admission for both depression and anxiety.
Figure 11-8 Directly age standardised hospital admission rates for depression per 100,000 population aged 15 to 74 years, 2001/02

Source: Hospital Episode Statistics

Figure 11-9 Directly age standardised hospital admission rates for anxiety disorders per 100,000 population aged 15 to 74 years, 2001/02

Source: Hospital Episode Statistics
Mental health and ethnicity

There appears to be little regional data on mental health and ethnicity but nationally, the recent Count Me In (Commission for Healthcare Audit and Inspection 2007) report found that:

- In terms of ethnicity, of the 99% of inpatients for whom data was available:
  - 78% were White British
  - 9% were from Black or White/Black Mixed groups
  - 5% were from Other White groups
  - 3% were from South Asian (Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi) groups
  - 2% were White Irish
  - 3% were from other ethnic groups (including Chinese)

- Overall, 22% of inpatients were from minority ethnic groups, compared with 21% in the 2006 census and 20% in the 2005 census. The increase was largely attributable to the increased proportion of the Other White group.

- Rates of admission were lower than the national average among the White British, Indian and Chinese groups, and were average for the Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups.

- However they were higher than average among other minority ethnic groups for both genders: particularly in the Black Caribbean, Black African, Other Black, White/Black Caribbean Mixed and White/Black African Mixed groups, with rates of over three times higher than average, and over 10 times higher in the Other Black group. These patterns are very similar to those observed in 2006 and 2005.

- Although rates of admission remain fairly consistent for most ethnic groups across 2005, 2006 and 2007, an exception is the Other White group, for whom both the admission ratio and the underlying numbers of patients have risen consistently across the three years.

Summary

The North East region has the highest proportion of disabled people in England, representing a quarter of the working age population. In comparison with the non-disabled population, employment and economic activity rates and earnings are lower, despite the fact that many inactive disabled people would like to work. Looking at trends in relation to Disability Living Allowance, regional statistics show that most claimants are over 60, and that the vast majority have been claiming for 5 years or more (this is particularly the case in some local authority areas, such as Easington). Further, a number of health indicators show that the North East has the highest rate of mental illness in comparison to other English regions.
12. Sexual Orientation

As recognised by the authors of the previous review of equality and diversity evidence in the region, “…there is a striking lack of information about this diverse population group. The authors have been unable to find any regional statistical information” (Penn & Shewell 2005). This knowledge gap is acknowledged at a national level (The Equalities Review 2007), although at present, there are no plans to include questions on sexual orientation in the 2011 Census. Drawing on national research conducted by Stonewall, in addition to recent data on Civil Partnerships and NATSAL statistics, the following chapter therefore attempts to construct a “snapshot” profile of sexual orientation in the region, whilst accepting the likely limitations of such figures. The chapter begins with a summary of data limitations on this group and looks at future possible developments in National Statistics to address this issue. It goes on to review various statistical sources on the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) population (including the National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles and numbers of registered Civil Partnerships), before concluding with a summary of recent research, particularly Stonewall’s 2008 Serves you Right report.

Data limitations

The Cabinet Office-commissioned Equalities Review highlighted data on sexual orientation and transgender status as a key knowledge gap, commenting on ‘lack of robust data on inequality within certain groups, most notably sexual orientation and transgender’ (The Equalities Review 2007). At present, there are no information sources that collect reliable and comprehensive information about the LGBT community. A number of small scale surveys have been conducted, but these only represent the visible LGBT population in a specific geographical area, so often cannot be used by organisations in other areas. A further possible alternative is to use data on civil partnerships but this provides an unrepresentative figure as it excludes single people and couples who choose not to register their partnership. The National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles collects some information on sexual orientation, however limited participants make it difficult to draw conclusions around their geographic distribution, household structure or occupation (as would be measured by the Census)

Future developments

In May 2005 ONS published a consultation document The 2011 Census: Initial view on content for England and Wales. Responses were received from nearly 500 users, presenting arguments for the inclusion of around 70 topics. On the basis of this consultation, the topic of sexual orientation was placed in category 3, meaning that ONS believed that there was insufficient evidence of user demand
to justify inclusion in the 2011 Census (ONS 2006). This was particularly as a result of ONS’s significant concerns surrounding the issues of privacy, acceptability, accuracy, conceptual definitions and the effect that such a question could have on the overall response to the Census.

At the same time, a number of central government departments, local authorities, health service providers, education services and police authorities agree that collecting information on sexual orientation would allow effective and targeted allocation of resources. In order to investigate alternative ways of meeting this data need, the Office for National Statistics established the Sexual Identity Project in 2006 to meet user requirements for information on sexual identity. The project has three main objectives:

1. Question development

It aims to develop a question (or set of questions) that can be used on social surveys and for equality monitoring purposes. Question development will be achieved by:

- exploratory work to gain an understanding of the concept of sexual identity and issues relating to acceptability and survey administration. The exploratory work includes focus groups, and
- a review of other surveys that have included a question on sexual identity, both in the UK and internationally

2. Question testing and implementation

It also aims to develop a question (or set of questions) that can be used on social surveys and for equality monitoring purposes. It is important that questioning is developed where possible to meet user requirements, is acceptable to respondents and can be administered on a social survey. Once an acceptable question is developed it will be added to the Integrated Household Survey (IHS), which combines most ONS household surveys into one. This will allow for experimental estimates of the size and characteristics of the lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) populations to be produced and evaluated.

3. Guidance

User guidance will collect all the evidence from the previous stages of the project into one with the aim of providing guidance to both users of statistics and those organisations collecting data on sexual orientation. It is envisaged that a draft report will be produced in early 2009 and published here after a peer review by the expert research and the user/stakeholder groups.

ONS has identified this project as a high priority and is consulting widely both within and outside government, including academics, non-governmental
organisations and lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) groups. The project aims to report in 2009.

**LGBT population**

Government estimates put the gay, lesbian and bisexual population at between 5% and 7% of the population in England and Wales (DTI, Final Regulatory Impact Assessment: Civil Partnership, 2004). In a report by the National Association for the Care and Rehabilitation of Offenders (NACRO, Without Prejudice, April, 2002) estimates vary from 5% of the population in rural areas, to 25% in parts of London and Brighton. In terms of the number of transgender and transsexual people within the UK population, Press for Change and Manchester Metropolitan University published a report into the people’s experiences as part of *The Equalities Review*. This reports that in 2000, after informal consultations with the Passport Section of the Home Office, Press for Change estimated there were around 5,000 transsexual people in the UK (Whittle, Turner et al. 2007), based upon numbers of those who had changed their passports (Home Office 2000). Further, as of November 2006, 1,660 people had already been awarded a Gender Recognition Certificate (GRC)\(^{48}\). However as the report’s authors acknowledge, ‘there is no substantive knowledge of how many people in the UK identify as transgender or transvestite, or use any other gender identity descriptor, but estimates vary considerably, with a quick internet search suggesting figures from about 1 in 100 to as many as 1 in 20 in the male population’ (Whittle, Turner et al. 2007).

**National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles**

Between 1989-1990, a National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (NATSAL) of nearly 19,000 people was undertaken in Britain (Wellings, Field et al. 1994). The survey examined a cross section of people throughout the country, and looked at their sexual attitudes and behaviour, including people’s same sex sexual experiences. The NATSAL survey was repeated between 1999-2001; this time the subject group involved less people, at just over 11,000 (Johnson, Fenton et al. 2003). The following tables compare findings from the two surveys and provide one possible indicator of changes in attitudes and behaviours around sexuality in recent years.

\(^{48}\) Based on information gained via correspondence between Press for Change and the Gender Recognition Panel Secretariat, November 2006.
**Table 12:1 Sexual orientation in 1990 and 2000, question responses (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NATSAL I (%) 1990</td>
<td>NATSAL II (%) 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever had a sexual experience, not necessarily including genital contact, with a partner of the same sex?</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever had sex with a same sex partner, including genital contact?</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you had a same sex partner in the last five years?</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NATSAL 1 & 11*

The differences in the two NATSAL surveys clearly indicate the changes that have been occurring in people's same sex sexual attitudes and behaviours. The greatest change is highlighted in the increase in women who have indicated that they have had a same sex sexual experience, not necessarily including genital contact, as this increased from 2.8% in 1990 to 9.7% in 2000. More men said that they had had a same sex sexual experience too, up from 5.3% in 1990 to 8.4% in 2000, thus showing that either same sex sexual behaviour is either on the increase or that people are more willing to report it.

When looking at same sex sexual attraction, and not necessarily sexual experience, the figures have also changed over the ten-year period, with women showing the most significant difference. In 1990, 93.3% of men said they had only ever had sexual attraction towards the opposite sex, whilst by 2000 this had fallen to 91.9%. 93.6% of women in 1990 said they had only ever been attracted to men, but by 2000 this had dropped to 88.3%. From this we can therefore deduce that 11.7% of women and 8.1% of men have felt a sexual attraction towards the same sex at least once in their lives.

**Civil Partnerships**

A further indication of the gay, lesbian and bisexual population within the UK can be given by the number of civil partnerships. It is important to remember that these figures are only a guide as they exclude single people and couples who choose not to register their partnership. Also, note that figures relate only to civil partnerships taking place in the constituent countries of the UK. They do not include civil partnerships of UK residents taking place abroad but will include non UK residents who form a partnership in the UK.
Table 12:2 Civil Partnerships (numbers): by area of formation, year and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Partners</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITED KINGDOM</strong></td>
<td>3,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLAND</strong></td>
<td>3,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humb.</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **UNITED KINGDOM** | 32,212 | 19,296 | 12,916 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| **ENGLAND** | 28,766 | 17,436 | 11,330 | 89 | 90 | 88 |
| North East | 896 | 464 | 432 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| North West | 3,130 | 1,676 | 1,454 | 10 | 9 | 11 |
| Yorkshire & Humb. | 2,222 | 1,062 | 1,160 | 7 | 6 | 9 |
| East Midlands | 1,754 | 858 | 896 | 5 | 4 | 7 |
| West Midlands | 1,914 | 1,052 | 862 | 6 | 5 | 7 |
| East | 2,382 | 1,300 | 1,082 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| London | 8,038 | 6,116 | 1,922 | 25 | 32 | 15 |
| South East | 5,416 | 3,204 | 2,212 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| South West | 3,014 | 1,704 | 1,310 | 9 | 9 | 10 |

Source: Office for National Statistics (ONS 2007)

- There were 18,059 civil partnerships formed in the UK between December 2005 and the end of 2006. A total of 16,173 took place in England with 1,131 in Scotland, 627 in Wales and 128 in Northern Ireland. Almost 2,000 partnerships were formed in December 2005. On average, 1,600 partnerships were formed each month between January and March 2006, falling to 1,500 between April and September and 800 between October and December.

- More men than women formed civil partnerships. In 2006, 60% of all civil partners were male compared with 66% in December 2005. In England, 9,913 male and 6,260 female partnerships were formed up to the end of 2006. The corresponding figures were 633 and 498 in Scotland, 318 and 309 in Wales and 71 and 57 in Northern Ireland.

- Male civil partners tended to be older than female civil partners. The average age at formation in the UK in 2006 was 47 for men and 44 for women.

49 Data are based on area of formation and not area of residence.
compared with 54 and 46 in December 2005. The average age of all partners in 2006 was highest in England (46) and lowest in Northern Ireland (41). The average age was 45 in Wales and 44 in Scotland.

- London had the highest proportion of male civil partnerships with more than three times as many male partnerships (3,429) formed as female (1,059) up to the end of 2006. Yorkshire and The Humber and the East Midlands were the only regions where more women than men registered a partnership. In the North East however, there was a fairly even gender split, with 232 male and 216 female civil partnerships registered in 2006.

- London was the most popular region within the UK in which to register a partnership between December 2005 and the end of 2006. A quarter of all civil partnerships took place in London, whereas the region accounts for only 12% of the UK adult population. In contrast, of all the regions in the UK, the North East saw the fewest number of civil partnerships registered (less than half of the number registered in the next lowest region).

- Up to the end of 2006, 10% of men and 24% of women forming a civil partnership in the UK had been in a previous marriage. In 2006, 21% of people entering a partnership in Wales had previously been married compared with 16% in Scotland, 15% in England & 12% in Northern Ireland.

**National research on Sexual Orientation**

Whilst local level data on the issues that affect lesbian and gay people is limited in terms of the North East region, as mentioned above, some smaller scale surveys have been conducted that help provide a useful reference point for considering their needs. As part of the government’s Equalities Review, Stonewall carried out a research review on sexual orientation and some of the key findings are provided here (Stonewall 2007):

**Citizenship and democracy**

- Research and policy development works on the assumption that lesbian and gay people belong to a community who can be involved in the development of equality policy, democracy and citizenship. That is, they identify as a minority. Generally, however, lesbian and gay people are removed from the general provisions of society, are unserved by public policy and assume that public policy is not applicable to them, or do not identify as a minority. Where a local area makes a concerted effort to engage lesbian and gay citizens, they are actively involved. In Brighton, 81% of gay people are registered to vote (91% of the general population is registered to vote).

**Public attitudes and involvement**

- The greatest barrier to citizenship and democracy amongst lesbian and gay people is homophobia and the prevalent assumption in the development of policies, that everyone is heterosexual. Stonewall’s *Profiles of Prejudice* (published 2003) commissioned MORI to measure manifestations of prejudice among the UK population. It found that 35% of people knew someone who was homophobic.
Education

- Homophobic bullying is particularly prevalent in schools because schools have not developed mechanisms for tackling it. There is also some entirely unfounded anxiety that if children are taught about gay people, they will become gay. In a recent survey, 82% of lesbian and gay adult respondents stated that they had been subject to name-calling at school, 71% had been ridiculed in front of others, and 60% had reported being hit or kicked. In another survey, 82% of secondary school teachers were aware of verbal homophobic abuse in schools but only 6% of schools have anti-homophobia policies.

Health and social care

- It is assumed that gay men’s unique health care needs are solely preoccupied with sexual health, and HIV in particular. Half of gay men do not reveal their sexuality to their GP. It is also assumed that lesbians do not have any unique health needs, and are generally told they do not need to have cervical cancer screening. However, 69% of women who identify as lesbian have had sex with men in the past. Homophobia and discriminatory practices are widespread in the NHS, but this is rarely acknowledged or addressed. 20% of health care professionals admit to being homophobic.

Economy and Business

- Homophobia in the work place has a massive impact on lesbian and gay people. It leads to secrecy at work, and employees consequently underperform. Bullying and harassment on the grounds of sexual orientation has only recently been made illegal in the workplace. There are no statutory duties to help prevent homophobia. 36% of gay people would change jobs if they experienced homophobia. 55% of those who had experienced homophobia at work stated that it had a negative impact on their work.

Crime and hate crime

- Homophobic hate crime is widely under-reported. It can include verbal abuse and physical abuse. It can be very violent or constitute nuisance and harassment. Gay people can also experience domestic violence and other forms of crime not necessarily prompted by, or associated with their sexual orientation. 41% of the general population report violent crime. Only 10% of the lesbian and gay population report such crime. Research has found that 48% of East London gay people had experienced homophobic crime. Three times as many homophobic hate crimes were reported in 2004 as in 2003.

Serves you Right

More recently, Stonewall have published the findings of a survey of 1,658 lesbian, gay and bisexual people across Britain. As the report comments, “This is the first time a national polling organisation has been able to conduct a survey exclusively with gay people.” (Hunt and Dick 2008) The survey focussed on lesbian and gay people’s expectations and experiences of:

- politics and political engagement
Key findings are reproduced below, including regional statistics where available.

In politics:

- Nearly nine in ten lesbian and gay people think they would face barriers from the Conservative Party if they wanted to be selected to run for parliament. Seven in ten supporters of the Conservative Party would expect to face barriers. Regionally, this ranged from 94% in the East Midlands to the lowest level of 85% here in the North East.
- Three in five lesbian and gay people think they would face barriers to selection by the Labour Party. Two thirds of lesbians would expect to face barriers. Again, people surveyed in the North East appeared less likely to expect discrimination in comparison to other parts of the UK, 58% compared with 77% in the East Midlands.
- Half of lesbian and gay people think they would face barriers to selection by the Liberal Democrats. The North East reflected this average at 52%, but again the East Midlands were most likely to expect barriers at 71%.

In education and families:

- Three in ten think they would be treated worse than heterosexuals if they wanted to enrol their child into a primary school or secondary school.
- Nine in ten would expect to face barriers to becoming foster parents because they are lesbian or gay.
- Eight in ten think they would face barriers to becoming a school governor because of their sexual orientation. This includes 83% in the North East region.

Police and the justice system:

- One in five lesbian and gay people expect to be treated worse by police than a heterosexual if they report a crime, while a quarter think they would be treated worse than other victims of crime if they reported a homophobic hate crime.
- More than a third of lesbian and gay people, including half of those over the age of 50, think they would be treated worse than a heterosexual if they were suspected of committing a crime. The North East was slightly above the average response rate at 39%, with people in Yorkshire and Humber most likely at 44%.
Nearly a third think they would be more likely than heterosexuals to be asked for their identity cards, should these be introduced, if police suspected they were gay.

One in six think they would be treated worse by a magistrate for a minor offence because they are lesbian or gay, while three fifths think they would face barriers to becoming a magistrate because of their sexual orientation.

In health and social care:

- One in five lesbian and gay people expect to be treated worse than heterosexuals when applying for social housing, however at 17%, North East respondents were least likely to have negative expectations of treatment.
- One in fourteen lesbian and gay people expect to be treated worse than heterosexuals when accessing healthcare for a routine procedure or an emergency procedure, while eight % have the same expectations about general practice. In terms of the North East in comparison to other regions:
  - 8% expected to be treated worse than heterosexuals in terms of emergency procedures (slightly above the national average).
  - 6% expected to be treated worse than heterosexuals in terms of routine procedures.
  - 6% expected to be treated worse than heterosexuals by their GP, which was below the national rate.
- Gay women, who have received fewer targeted healthcare messages than gay men, are twice as likely to expect to be treated worse.

In the workplace:

- Nearly one in five lesbian and gay people have experienced homophobic bullying in the workplace during the last five years.
- A third think that lesbian and gay people who are open about their sexual orientation are more productive in the workplace.

In education:

- Homophobic bullying in schools is getting worse. Almost three in ten lesbian and gay people aged over 55 say they experienced homophobic bullying compared to more than half of those aged 25-34 and over six in ten lesbian and gay students at school in 2007, according to Stonewall’s School Report.
- More than eight in ten lesbian and gay people would not have felt able to be open about their sexual orientation in school.

All findings and quotes given above are taken directly from Stonewall’s, Serves You Right report (2008).
Summary

Government estimates put the LGB population at between 5-7% of the population, although much less is known about numbers of transgender people in the UK. Due to the lack of comprehensive data on the LGBT population, particularly at regional level, observed trends are therefore likely to represent only a “snapshot” profile of the North East. At national level, the National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles indicates that either same sex sexual behaviour is increasing, or that people are more willing to report it. At the same time, research shows that homophobic bullying is particularly prevalent in schools, and there is concern about homophobic and discriminatory practices in the NHS and the workplace more generally. At the regional level, a recent survey by Stonewall implies that LGB people in the region have slightly more positive expectations about treatment in the political arena, but more likely to feel negatively about treatment in health and social care, and by the police and justice system.
13. Carers

As explored in the earlier chapter on Age, future demographic trends, most notably increases in the size of the very old population, mean that the number and proportion of people in Britain needing assistance with everyday activities is projected to increase considerably in coming decades. Most of this help is likely to be provided by informal unpaid caregivers, predominantly close relatives. Indeed, as has been noted, “All types of people, in all social situations are likely to provide care for someone at some time in their lives” (Maher and Green 2002). The following chapter explores the current profile of carers in the North East, based mainly on 2001 Census data, before going on to look at the issues of poverty and health in relation to caring.

What is a “carer”?*

In terms of identifying the nation’s carers, the 2001 Census defines a carer as a provider of unpaid care but of course, as indicated above, this refers to a broad, heterogeneous group in society. Census data is further limited by the fact that people are required to define themselves as carers or not which fails to take account of the number of “hidden carers” in the population. For example, recent research has found that a significant proportion (65%) of people with a caring responsibility did not identify themselves as a carer in the first year of caring. For a third of them (32%) it took over 5 years before they recognised they were a carer (Carers UK 2006).

For the purposes of the General Household Survey, a carer is defined as someone who gives support, looks after or gives special help to family members, friends, neighbours or others because of long-term physical or mental health or disability, or problems related to old age. More recently, following consultation with various carers’ groups and business organisations, the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) has announced a revised definition of a carer that will be used as the basis for the right to request flexible working as part of the Work and Families Act 2006. For these purposes, the DTI has opted for a wide definition, to include an employee who is or expects to be caring for an adult who:

- is married to, or is the partner or civil partner of, the employee; or
- is a ‘near relative’\(^{50}\) of the employee; or
- falls into neither category but lives at the same address as the employee.

---

\(^{50}\) The ‘near relative’ definition includes parents, parent-in-law, adult child, adopted adult child, siblings (including those who are in-laws), uncles, aunts or grandparents and step-relatives.
Carers in the North East

Data from the 2001 Census

Census 2001 provides the most recent, comprehensive data on carers in the region, and detailed analysis by gender, hours spent caring and economic activity can be found in Penn and Shewell’s 2005 report, “Equality and Diversity in the North East region of England: a baseline study”. The following section therefore presents a summary of key statistics illustrating the profile of carers in the North East.

According to the Census, there were 275,813 carers in the North East in 2001, 11 percent of the population, 9 percent of males and 13 percent of females. This compares with 10 percent, 9 percent and 11 percent respectively in England as a whole, indicating that overall, a higher likelihood of providing care in the region than nationally, particularly for women. This is reflected in part of the number of carers allowance claimants by gender, as illustrated below.

Figure 13-1 Allowances by local authority and gender, quarter ending 30th November 2004

Source: Carers Allowance Quarterly Statistics, November 2004, Office for National Statistics
The proportion of the population of England and Wales providing informal care for 20 hours or more per week in each LA is shown in the figure below.

**Figure 13-2 Proportion of the population aged 16 and over providing care for 20 hours of more per week by local authority, 2001**

Analysis carried out by Young, Grundy et al using 2001 Census data alongside information from the ONS Longitudinal Study in 2005, showed that in comparison to England and Wales as a whole, Durham and Tyne and Wear were two of the areas with the largest proportions of the population providing care.

*Source: 2001 Census, Office for National Statistics*
The following figure illustrates the number of carers in the region in 2001, by local authority, in addition to the numbers of new carers each year.

**Figure 13-3 Turnover of carers by local authority based in 2001 Census data**

![Bar chart showing turnover of carers by local authority.](chart.png)

**Source:** 2001 Census, Office for National Statistics

**Caring and ethnicity**

There appear to be large variations both between minority ethnic groups and by region in prevalence of caregiving. For example:

- Of ethnic minority caregivers, nearly half lived in London (indeed, in 2001, 30.3% of caregivers in London (57,090 individuals) were from minority ethnic groups).
- Overall, both male and female Bangladeshis and Pakistanis are more likely to provide care than those from other ethnic groups. However, Pakistani and Bangladeshis have the highest ratio of female to male care providers. While in most ethnic groups, females are 40% more likely to provide care, among Bangladeshis and Pakistanis women are twice as likely as men to be caregivers. This may be related to spousal age differences and differences in gender roles.
However, whilst nationally, the Pakistani and Bangladeshi population have a higher likelihood of caregiving, in the North East (as in Wales); Whites are nearly as likely to provide care as these ethnic groups.

All above statistics taken from (Young, Grundy et al. 2005).

**Carers and poverty**

*Deprivation and caring*

Research has shown that people from less advantaged backgrounds, such as those from manual occupational groups, are more likely to provide unpaid care than those from more advantaged groups, particularly to a spouse. For example, one study estimated that 23% of those about to start caregiving were in poverty compared with 15% of non-carers. (Hutton 1998). Reasons for this association include the fact that higher levels of poor health and disability are found in manual groups, who consequently have a higher likelihood of needing care. Additionally, individuals of higher socioeconomic status may be more able to purchase and negotiate support from outside (Glaser and Grundy 2002).

*Impact on earnings*

However, being a caregiver may itself influence socioeconomic status. Caregiving has been shown to have negative financial implications, resulting in decreased income, reduced likelihood of remaining in paid employment for long-term carers and less opportunity to contribute to pension schemes which in turn influences future financial well-being (Young, Grundy et al. 2005). Research carried out by Carers UK found that the average loss of earnings from a sample survey of careers was £11,050 in the last year. However there were notable variations within this average. For example those caring for the largest number of hours (more than 50 hours per week) had lost the most in terms of earnings; one in five had lost more than £20,000. Further those caring for a parent and partners or approaching retirement, reported higher earnings than average (Carers UK 2007).

*Benefits and carers*

In addition to loss of earnings, there is also the concern that many carers fail to receive the benefits support to which they are entitled. Research carried out by Carers UK in 2005 demonstrated that an estimated £740 million a year in carers’ benefits alone could be going unclaimed every year. Further, the survey carried out as part of “In The Know: The importance of information for carers” found that although 50% of respondents felt that they had not missed out on benefits, many did. Of those who did, a staggering 58% had missed out for over 3 years. A similar proportion of carers felt they missed out on practical support. Of those who felt they had missed out, 68% had missed out for over 3 years. The report commented that “Carers who had missed out on benefits felt this had an impact
on their pension entitlements, quality of life, health and well-being” (Carers UK 2006).

**Carers and health**

National research conducted by Carers UK (Carers UK 2004) found considerable evidence that unpaid caregiving is associated with poor health, and furthermore that caregiving itself can lead to deteriorating health. This is especially the case for those providing more intensive care and those who have provided care for a longer duration. There is stronger evidence for the influence of caregiving on mental health than physical health, although some studies have cited an association between caregiving and specific health problems including back-pain and chronic illness. As the Carers UK report comments:

“If intensive caregivers are more likely to come from manual households, then it may be hypothesised that in addition to having relatives in poor health, the carers themselves are also more likely to be in poor health. In addition to being more likely to provide care, intensive care providers from manual households may experience deteriorating health as a result of caregiving, further compounding disadvantage and potentially leading to increased poverty levels.”

Carers UK, 2004

As at the national level, the proportion of informal caregivers with poor self-rated health in these parts of the North East is also high. One fifth to a quarter of carers in Tyne and Wear and Durham have poor self-rated health, and male carers are more likely than females to report this. However, in both national and regional terms, the greatest proportion of full-time carers suffering ill-health, are to be found in Gateshead and Sedgefield. In these areas, more than one in four (around 26%) of those providing over 50 hours of care per week reported ill-health. Many of these areas which have high levels of carers in poor health are also areas with high levels of disability and illness. This suggests that carers may already have poor health before they start caring (Carers UK 2004). The following table illustrates the number and percentages of carers in poor health in the region broken down by local authority and compared with England and the North East region as a whole.
Table 13:1 Number and percentages of carers aged 16+ in poor health by number of hours cared, compared with non-carers in poor health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total no. of carers</th>
<th>Total no. of carers not in good health</th>
<th>% of all carers not in good health</th>
<th>No. of carers providing 50+ hrs of care per week</th>
<th>% of carers providing 50+ hrs of care per week</th>
<th>% non-carer population in poor health</th>
<th>Difference in likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>4764300</td>
<td>663885</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>2035258</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>270914</td>
<td>39259</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>16379</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington UA</td>
<td>9649</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool UA</td>
<td>9650</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough UA</td>
<td>14321</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland UA</td>
<td>15813</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees UA</td>
<td>18566</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham County</td>
<td>55858</td>
<td>8662</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>6034</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside</td>
<td>9717</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>24.94</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>8854</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>11702</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>27.99</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>10009</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>2659</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>6574</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>32985</td>
<td>4105</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>2975</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick-upon- Tweed</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Valley</td>
<td>8712</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
<td>5549</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale</td>
<td>6015</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck</td>
<td>7097</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear  (Met County)</td>
<td>113769</td>
<td>17007</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>7158</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>20764</td>
<td>3203</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>25689</td>
<td>3865</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>20608</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>23.34</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>2328</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>3114</td>
<td>4710</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tees Valley</td>
<td>58444</td>
<td>8168</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>3474</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Darlington</td>
<td>65717</td>
<td>9969</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>4187</td>
<td>25.09</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001, taken from In Poor Health: The impact of caring on health (Carers UK 2004)

---

51 Final column shows the difference in health between non-carers and those providing over 50 hours care per week
Summary

According to the 2001 Census, a higher proportion of people in North East are carers compared with the national picture, and the region’s women in particular have a higher likelihood of providing care than nationally. At sub-regional level, County Durham and Tyne & Wear are two of the areas with the largest numbers of carers relative to the population. Research conducted at the national level has found links between deprivation and caring, with people from less advantaged backgrounds more likely to provide unpaid care than those from more advantaged groups. Caring also appears to have a further negative impact on earnings and many carers are in poor health, with caregiving itself leading to further health deterioration. The North East itself displays a particularly high prevalence of carers in poor health: more than one in four carers providing over 50 hours of care per week in Gateshead and Sedgefield reported ill-health in the last Census.
14. Lone Parents

In terms of evidence on the key characteristics of the region’s lone parents, the richest data is provided via the 2001 Census results\footnote{52}. Limited comparable updated data is publicly available on this group at present. Primary sources include the Labour Force Survey Household Datasets and New Deal for Lone Parent claimant data. Using this data, the following section explores some of the main emerging trends, focusing on differences in relation to gender, ethnicity, age of dependent children and disability status of the region’s lone parents.

**Claimants by gender and ethnicity**

Across England, New Deal for Lone Parent claimants are overwhelmingly female. As the following chart shows, this is the same in all regions, including the North East.

**Figure 14-1 New Deal for Lone Parents - Participants: Gender by Jobcentre Plus Region (May 2007)**

![Chart showing New Deal for Lone Parents participants by gender and Jobcentre Plus region]

In terms of the ethnicity of lone parent claimants, there is very little diversity: in the North East as nationally, the vast majority are White British.

\footnote{52 For a full exploration of Census data on lone parents, please see the previous report by Shewell and Penn (2005)}
Age of claimants’ children

DWP data shows that most claimants have comparatively young dependent children: in the North East over half have children aged 5 or under and this is typical of the situation in other regions. However as the following chart demonstrates, there is some variation at the sub-regional level. Whilst data for some areas in Northumberland must be treated with caution due to the small sample size, the chart shows that Chester-le-Street in particular has a younger age profile of dependent children.

Figure 14-2 New Deal for Lone Parents - Participants (thousands) : Age group of youngest child (age at entry to New Deal) by Local Authority

Disability and Lone Parents

In terms of disability and lone parent claimants, in both Yorkshire and Humber and the North East, slightly more lone parent claimants are disabled (almost 8%) compared with the national picture (6.4%). However there is further variation at local authority level. Again, whilst data for some areas in Northumberland must be treated with caution due to the small sample size, as the following chart shows, a number of districts in County Durham (Chester-le-Street, Durham City and Easington), have particularly high levels of disabled lone parent claimants.
Summary

There is limited regional or local data on lone parents that provides a more recent profile than the 2001 Census. Data that is available via the Department for Work and Pensions offers only a partial picture as by its very nature, it only includes lone parents currently in receipt of benefits. Based on this data, however, it is clear that as at national level, lone parent claimants in the North East are overwhelmingly female and have comparatively younger dependent children. The main variant compared with England as a whole is in relation to lone parents and disability, where proportionately more of the region’s lone parent claimants are disabled than in other parts of the country.

Source: DWP New Deal for Lone Parent Claimant Statistics
15. Offenders

People with a criminal record face an increased risk of being socially disadvantaged, either immediately or later in life. In particular, unemployment amongst some groups of people with a criminal record is known to be high. Previous research has highlighted the multiple barriers to employment that exist to people with a criminal record (Metcalf, Anderson et al. 2001). It also drew attention to the need for more data on the offender population in order to be able to understand the scale and nature of such exclusion. Currently, the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and the Home Office provide the most extensive source of statistics on UK offenders and current prison population. The following section draws on this information in order to explore the situation in the North East. The chapter starts by reviewing data on the North East’s offender population using recent NOMS data, including trends by age, gender and ethnicity. It continues on to look at the regional prison population, drawing on Home Office statistics, focusing in particular on ethnicity.

North East Offender Population

The total current probation caseload for the North East is 14,379. Analysis of this data shows that:

- The caseload breakdown across the region is:
  - County Durham: 3,031
  - Northumbria: 7,442
  - Teesside: 4,266
- 35% of offenders under supervision within the region are aged between 17 and 24 years of age and 65% are aged 25 and over (this compares well with the national picture: 32% aged 17-24 and 68% aged 25 and over). The age profiles show there is some variation between the areas. County Durham caseload has 40% of offenders below the age of 25 whereas Northumbria has 32%.
- 95.5% of the area caseload are white offenders. The highest other identified category is Asian or Asian British at 1.4%. Teesside has a marginally higher percentage of offenders from other ethnic groups at 7.7% but no one group is predominant. This is notably less diverse than at national level. During 2005, 14% of those starting supervision were from a minority ethnic group, with the largest minority ethnic group being Black or Black British, accounting for 6% of offenders.\(^{53}\)

88% of offenders are male and 12% are female. The profiles by gender show little variation between the three areas. This is similar to the gender divide at national level in 2005 of 87% male and 13% female⁴².

The following tables illustrate the current offender population in the region and are drawn from data in the latest National Offender Management Service Regional Commissioning Plan for the North East (NOMS 2007).

**Table 15:1 Offender population by age and probation area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17-25</th>
<th>25+</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Durham</td>
<td>1232 (40%)</td>
<td>1799 (60%)</td>
<td>3031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>2341 (32%)</td>
<td>5088 (68%)</td>
<td>7442 (includes 13 under 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesside</td>
<td>1578 (37%)</td>
<td>2688 (63%)</td>
<td>4266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area total</td>
<td>5151 (35%)</td>
<td>9575 (65%)</td>
<td>14739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NOMS

**Table 15:2 Offender population by gender and probation area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Durham</td>
<td>2670 (88%)</td>
<td>365 (12%)</td>
<td>3031 (plus 4 under 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>6631 (89%)</td>
<td>811 (11%)</td>
<td>7442 (includes 67 with no info)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesside</td>
<td>3650 (85%)</td>
<td>622 (15%)</td>
<td>4266 (plus 6 under 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area total</td>
<td>12,951 (88%)</td>
<td>1798 (12%)</td>
<td>14,739 (plus 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NOMS

**Table 15:3 Offenders by race and ethnicity and probation area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Durham</th>
<th>Northumbria</th>
<th>Teesside</th>
<th>Area total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Asian or Asian British</em></td>
<td>23 (0.7%)</td>
<td>88 (1.2%)</td>
<td>93 (2.2%)</td>
<td>204 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Black or Black British</em></td>
<td>8 (0.2%)</td>
<td>54 (0.8%)</td>
<td>51 (1.2%)</td>
<td>113 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mixed</em></td>
<td>10 (0.3%)</td>
<td>35 (0.5%)</td>
<td>47 (1.1%)</td>
<td>92 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Not stated / missing</em></td>
<td>60 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (0.1%)</td>
<td>118 (2.8%)</td>
<td>185 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chinese of other Ethnic Group</em></td>
<td>8 (0.2%)</td>
<td>35 (0.5%)</td>
<td>21 (0.5%)</td>
<td>64 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>White</em></td>
<td>2926 (96.4%)</td>
<td>7156 (97%)</td>
<td>3942 (92.3%)</td>
<td>14024 (95.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3035</td>
<td>7375</td>
<td>4272</td>
<td>14682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NOMS

**Regional Prison Population**

All seven establishments within the North East Area are operated by the public sector Prison Service. According to the latest Home Office data:
• 78% of the North East prison population are male adults and 13% are male young offenders; 4.9% are Female adults and 0.6% Female young offenders. Overall, therefore, 94.6% of the prison population is male and 5.4% is female, which reflects latest national custody figures from the Ministry of Justice.

• 66% of the prison population is from the North East. Of the remainder of the population the most significant contributing areas are the North West where 13.9% of the NE prisons population come from. 13.3% are from the Yorkshire and Humberside areas. The lowest proportion is from the South West with 0.29%.

• There are 161 foreign national prisoners in the North East and 14 others of unknown nationality

• Over 90% of the Prison Population is White British. The highest proportion of offenders from other ethnic groups is Black or Black British Caribbean at 1.17% and Other Asian at 1.12%. The percentages from other groups range from Mixed White and Asian at 0.14%, to 0.67% Black or Black British Other. It should be noted that these proportions are significantly higher than in the region’s population as a whole.

The following table provide details of the North East prison population in terms of gender by establishment.

**Table 15:4 CNA and population by sex and establishment in North East: January 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment / Gender</th>
<th>In use CNA</th>
<th>Population Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acklington</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castington</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerbolt</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankland</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme House</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklevington</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,566</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Newton</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
<td><strong>301</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Home Office, 2008*

The table overleaf provides a breakdown by ethnicity per North East establishment at April 2007.

---

54 In Use CNA - Certified Normal Accommodation that is available for immediate use, excludes damaged cells, cells affected by building works and cells taken out of use due to staff shortages.
Table 15.5 Ethnicity of North East prison establishments at end June 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic classification</th>
<th>Acklington</th>
<th>Castington</th>
<th>Deerbolt</th>
<th>Durham</th>
<th>Holme House</th>
<th>Kirkelevington</th>
<th>Low Newton</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pakistani</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other Asian background</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British Caribbean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British African</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British Other background</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed White and Black African</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed White and Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other Mixed background</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3636</td>
<td>90.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other White background</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of 4023</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>4023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NOMS, 2007
Summary

A third of the region’s offenders are aged between 17 and 24, and the vast majority are White British (95.5%) and male (88%). These trends are also reflected in the North East prison population. Two thirds of the regional prison population is from the North East, with the majority of the remainder from the North of England generally. There is limited regional data on the impact of having a criminal record on an individual’s life chances however, although national qualitative research indicates far higher prevalence of social disadvantage and unemployment amongst this group.
SECTION C: EQUALITY INDICATORS

This section provides further statistical information on the region in a series of key cross-cutting policy:

- **Chapter 16 - Employment and Worklessness** explores the employment issues in the region, starting with a profile of the North East workforce, examining employment and economic activity rates, before moving on to the issue of worklessness, including concepts / definitions, and relevant data sources.

- **Chapter 17 - Crime and Safety** looks at crime in the North East, drawing in particular on recent data published in the British Crime Survey to look at recorded crime in the region, before moving on to a section on perceptions, and confidence levels in those agencies responsible for tackling crime. Finally, it explores recent evidence on the prevalence of hate crime in the UK.

- **Chapter 18 - Education and Skills** explores some available statistics on attainment levels in the North East (at Key Stages 1,2,3), examination achievement data at GCSE level, as well as data on pupil participation and engagement levels in both compulsory and post-compulsory education and overall skills levels in the region.

- **Chapter 19 - Social Capital** explores various dimensions of social capital in the region, including data indicators of civic participation, social support, networking and neighbourliness.

- **Chapter 20 - Health and Social Care** summarises some of the health data available for the region, focussing on key health indicators such as smoking, along with issues in relation to social care provision in the North East.

- **Chapter 21 – Housing** explores some of the key trends in relation to the region’s housing situation. Starting with review of data of the North East housing stock, it goes on to look at sub-regional house prices trends. The chapter concludes with a section on social housing, focusing in particular on the quality of social housing, ethnicity and worklessness.

- **Chapter 22 – Transport** focuses on transport as a conduit to economic and social inclusion, summarising data on the transport profile of the North East focussing on regional commuting patterns in particular, as well as national studies into the link between transport access and social inclusion.
16. Employment and Worklessness

Despite an overall upward trend in employment rates over the past decade or so, improvements have not been evenly distributed among the population. There are individuals who remain long-term unemployed, despite living in a period of relatively high employment, and a rising number of individuals who are economically inactive and claiming inactive benefits. In addition, “the changing geography of employment has…led to concentrations of worklessness as some areas that experienced de-industrialisation have not benefited from new economic growth.” (Institute for Employment Studies 2005). Within this context, the North East in particular continues to have comparatively lower rates of economic activity amongst its population, alongside lower employment rates. This chapter explores the employment issues in the region, starting with a profile of the North East workforce, examining employment and economic activity rates, before moving on to the issue of worklessness, including concepts / definitions, and relevant data sources. Trends in terms of gender and ethnicity are generally covered in more detail in the earlier focus chapters.

Employment and economic activity in the region

North East Workforce

The region’s workforce is defined as by the Labour Force Survey (LFS) as the population of working age, 16 to 64 for men, and 16 to 59 for women. Based on the most recent data, in 2006/2007, there were 1,586,000 people of working age in the North East. The following chart illustrates the percentage of working age population across the region, by local authority and compared with the rate for the region and the UK as a whole.

As it clearly shows, there are wide variations in working age population in the North East, particularly at the sub-county level. For example, whilst the average rate of 76% at working age compares well with the national rate of 77%, within the region, it ranges from a high of 80% in Durham to 67% in Berwick upon Tweed (mainly reflecting the age profile of this local population – see previous chapter on Age).
Employment rate

Of this working age population, the following chart illustrates the employment rate across the region. As it shows, by place of residence:

- Durham City has the highest employment rate in the region, at 79.7%. This is closely followed by Darlington (77.2%), Berwick-upon-Tweed (76.7%) and North Tyneside (76%). All these are higher than the UK average rate of 74.2%.
- At the other end of the scale, the lowest employment rates can be found in South Tyneside at 65%. Hartlepool (65.8%), Middlesbrough (66.7%) and Sedgefield (66.8%) are all considerably lower than the average UK employment rate.
**Employment trends and the region’s economy**

Recent research has shown that the North East’s economy has performed well in recent years relative to the UK. This has resulted in a 5.8% increase in jobs, a decline in unemployment by around one third and an overall improvement in business survival rates in the North East. However there was little change in each sub-region’s actual share of employment (i.e. where most employment is based) between 1998 and 2003. For example, there was a reduction of approximately only 1% in the share of Northumberland and Tyne and Wear, and a subsequent increase of 1% in the other two sub-regions’ share during this time period.

Further, the current employment structures of the sub-region’s highlight that there is a high proportion of employment in public service/administration and distribution/restaurants compared with the national picture. However again, there are variations at sub-regional level. For example, the two main urban sub-regions within the Tees Valley and Tyne and Wear have a higher proportion of jobs in banking/finance compared to higher proportions of manufacturing employment in Durham/Northumberland, which is predicted to decline further (NLP 2006).
Strategy Integration: Aligning the Regional Evidence Base (NLP 2006) identified the main employment sites as the central Newcastle area (spanning to the north to Regent Centre and Longbenton, the south to Gateshead centre and down to the Team Valley Trading Estate and the Metro Centre), the area surrounding the river at Sunderland, Durham City and Washington. It found these employment centres had a number of key characteristics including a younger workforce in Tyne and Wear and an older workforce in Tees Valley in the main employment centres, along with an overall higher socio-economic make up compared to the North East average. Taken from the NLP report (2006), the map below provides a visual depiction of these economic trends. It combines data to highlight the areas (in red) with high job densities, net in commuting, and past employment land supply take up in the North East as a whole.

Figure 16-3 Regional economic trends

The map highlights the importance of the main employment centres in the region: Newcastle, Gateshead, Stockton-on-Tees and to a lesser extent Sunderland,
North Tyneside, Middlesbrough and Darlington. The current dominant economic centres in the North East are located within Tees Valley and Tyne and Wear.

**Economic activity**

Despite a recent upward trend in economic activity rates, the region still lags between the average performance in England. The following chart illustrates the historical trends in economic activity rates for the region, against the average rate in England and other comparable regions. So, despite an increase from an economic activity rate of 68.4% in 2000/01 to 70.2% in 2004/05, this is still lower than all other regions and the national rate of 75.1%.

![Economic Activity Rate Chart](chart.png)

**Unemployment in the North East**

**Data sources on the unemployed**

Currently, there are two main official measures of unemployment in the UK, the claimant count and ILO unemployment.

- The claimant count is the number of people claiming unemployment-related benefits, mainly Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) but also a few who do not qualify for JSA and instead only receive National Insurance credits for unemployment. Whilst there are advantages to the claimant count, particularly in relation to the frequency of its publication and its reliability, it fails to take account of an increasingly number of people claiming other benefits available to support jobless individuals (such as Incapacity Benefit & Income Support).
The alternative official measure of unemployment is the International Labour Organisation (ILO) measure. This counts anyone who is out of work, and is available to start work in the next two weeks, and has looked for work in the last four weeks. Less frequent than the claimant count, the ILO unemployment figures are derived from the Labour Force Survey, which is a large sample survey of households across the country and thus more subject to error. The number of ILO unemployed is consistently higher than the claimant count, as it includes many people who are ineligible to receive Jobseeker’s Allowance for various reasons, including large numbers of women.

The following section draws primarily on the latter data source due to its more comprehensive nature in order to examine unemployment trends in the region.

**Unemployment-related benefit claimants**

**Gender**

As the following chart shows, due to eligibility, the majority of claimants in the region are male. Overall, this reflects the national trend but the claimant rate for women in the North East is, in general, lower than at a national level (27% of claimants in England are women; compared with 24% in the North East). At a sub-regional level, however, there are some interesting trends. In Northumberland as a whole, for example, women’s claimant rate is far closer to the national level, at 26.9%. However this masks significant variations within the county: 4 out of 6 districts actually have a higher rate (Berwick upon Tweed is highest at 32.3%); only Blyth and Wansbeck have lower rates.

**Figure 16-4 Claimants by gender, 2006**

![Claimants by gender, 2006 chart](Source: Labour Force Survey, 2nd Quarter 2006, Office for National Statistics)
Length of unemployment

A key factor in differentiating the unemployed from the workless, is the length of unemployment. As discussed earlier, people experiencing long term unemployment are likely to feel significantly more detached from the labour market and require very different policy responses than those out of work for only short periods of time. The following charts explore claimant rates for young adults (18-24) and older adults (50 or over) who have claimed for longer than six months, in addition to claimants over 12 months, by local authority area. As the following three charts show:

- For people aged 18-24, the claimant rate in a number of North East areas is significantly above both the national and regional average, particularly in Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland.
- At the other end of the age spectrum, there appears to be a higher proportion of claimants aged 50 plus in Castle Morpeth and Tynedale, potentially reflecting the older age profile of Northumberland as a whole.
- Finally, looking at people who have claimed for over 12 months, the proportion of claimants in Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland is again, significantly higher than the national and regional average.

Figure 16-5 Percentage of claimants age 18-24 years claiming over 6 months

Source: Labour Force Survey, 2nd Quarter 2006, Office for National Statistics
Figure 16-6 Percentage of claimants aged 50 or over claiming over 6 months

Source: Labour Force Survey, 2nd Quarter 2006, Office for National Statistics

Figure 16-7 Percentage of claimants claiming for over 12 months

Source: Labour Force Survey, 2nd Quarter 2006, Office for National Statistics
Towards more accurate measurement of unemployment

As highlighted earlier, currently, there are two main official measures of unemployment in the UK, the claimant count and ILO unemployment. However, previous research has highlighted failings of both sources; in particular, a study carried out by the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research at Sheffield Hallam University explored this issue in more depth (Beatty, Fothergill et al. 2007).

A key concern with relying on these sources to measure the true extent of unemployment is that they fail to account for the so-called “diversion” of people onto incapacity benefits. Incapacity benefits are paid to non-employed men and women who are deemed too ill or disabled to be required to look for work and in total, claimants account for 2.7 million non-employed adults of working age (three times more than the number of claimant unemployed). As the CRES study identified:

“Across Britain as a whole, incapacity claimants are by some margin the largest group of working-age benefit claimants. Moreover, their numbers are nearly four times greater than a generation ago and it seems impossible to explain the increase in health terms alone, especially at a time when general standards of health have slowly been improving, albeit with the smallest improvements among the most disadvantaged groups.”

The study goes on to argue that:

“…..the very large numbers claiming incapacity benefits hides unemployment. We are not suggesting that a substantial proportion of incapacity claims are somehow fraudulent. Rather, the point is that ill health or disability is not always an insuperable obstacle to employment, and that at least a proportion of the present-day 2.7m incapacity claimants could reasonably be expected to have been in work in a genuinely fully employed economy.”

Beatty, Fothergill et al, 2007

Britain’s coalfields are cited as a key example of this possible trend. Although such areas have always had above average levels of incapacity, partly reflecting the impact on health of the coal industry itself, numbers have increased significantly since the closures in the 1980s. CRES research conducted in 1996 and subsequently in 2005 found that claimant unemployment was no higher in the coalfields than before the closures but that that the principal labour market adjustment in response to job loss had been a large withdrawal of men into ‘economic inactivity’, which in turn reflected a huge surge in incapacity numbers.
The following table illustrates this finding. It lists the top 20 districts in terms of the share of working age adults claiming incapacity benefits and includes many former industrial areas of Britain; as can be seen, Easington in County Durham is close to top of the list.

**Table 16:1 Incapacity claimant rate, top 20 GB districts, August 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>% of working age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taff</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Barrow in Furness</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bursley</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source DWP, ONS*

For the North East, this is a crucial distinction in terms of estimating the true level of regional unemployment or “worklessness”. As one report commented, “combining figures for unemployment, sickness and disability benefits reveals that 18% of the adult workforce is primarily dependent on benefits for their income” (ODPM 2003). Currently, for example, the proportion of people in receipt of incapacity benefit and / or severe disablement allowance as a percentage of the population of working age was 11.2 % in the North East compared to the national rate in England of 7.2%. With this in mind, the following section explores the concept of worklessness as a means of providing a more accurate picture of unemployment in the region,

---

55 Based on DWP claimant data for May 2007
56 Using population data for 2nd quarter 2006 provided in Regional Trends No. 39, Office for National Statistics
Regional worklessness

Definitions and concepts

The term ‘worklessness’ is increasingly being used to describe those individuals and places that continue to experience low levels of economic activity despite the overall upward trend. Broader than the narrow concept of unemployment, it is often defined as people of working age who are not in formal employment but who are looking for a job (the unemployed), together with people of working age who are neither formally employed nor looking for formal employment (the economically inactive). This approach has recently been used by the Social Exclusion Unit: ‘Worklessness refers to people who are unemployed or economically inactive, and who are in receipt of working age benefits.’ (SEU 2004). A recent report produced as part of the national evaluation of the New Deal for Communities also defines worklessness as including those who are unemployed or economically inactive and are in receipt of benefits. Crucially, the definition rests on the necessity of “evidence from the benefit system that they are involuntarily out of work.” (CRES 2004).

Whilst there are benefits to using these types of concepts of worklessness in their ability to broaden the traditional definitions of unemployment that focus on those actively seeking work to include people are economically inactive and claiming inactive benefits. However, these definitions have a few key disadvantages, highlighted in the DWP commissioned study, Understanding workless people and communities: A literature review (Institute for Employment Studies 2005). The findings are summarised below:

- The first disadvantage is that such definitions excludes people who are receiving Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA) but who, in reality, have not been actively seeking work over the past four weeks.

- Secondly, by including all those who are unemployed and actively seeking work, it includes individuals who are only briefly in unemployment. This group are in contrast to long-term unemployed and economically inactive individuals, who experience entrenched detachment from the labour market and are, therefore, the focus of policy attention.

- Finally, through the focus on benefit claimants, these definitions of worklessness exclude individuals who may be economically inactive but are not claiming inactive benefits. This excludes those who are eligible for working age benefits but are not claiming them. For example, some disadvantaged groups may not access the working-age benefits that they are entitled to, dependent partners may have a claim made on their behalf rather than claiming themselves, and some lone parents who are workless may not be claiming benefits.
In order to address these issues, the report (Institute of Employment Studies, 2005) advised the adoption of a refined concept of worklessness as:

“….detachment from the formal labour market in particular areas, and among particular groups. Workless individuals include individuals who are unemployed and claiming unemployment benefits, individuals who are economically inactive and eligible for inactive benefits (who may or may not be claiming them), and individuals who are working exclusively in the informal economy (who may or may not be also claiming benefits).”

**Measuring worklessness**

Using this broader definition, worklessness is, therefore, made up of very diverse groups. Workless individuals may:

- be unemployed for a short-time only;
- have been unemployed for many years;
- be ‘cycling’ between employment and benefits;
- have had little or no experience of formal employment;
- see no prospect of participating in the labour market because of the barriers they face;
- have chosen not to work (for example, those approaching retirement or with family responsibilities);
- actually be working, but in the informal economy.

Furthermore, individuals may fall in to one or more of these categories. These groups may have very different motivations, attitudes, and norms of employment. Being defined as workless does not necessarily mean that individuals are not undertaking forms of unpaid work or activity such as caring for relatives, looking after children and voluntary work.

**Worklessness across England**

Recent research examined the characteristics of those living in more than 16,000 areas in England defined as being ‘concentrations of worklessness’ (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004) and found certain groups and characteristics disproportionately represented within them. For example:

- Almost half the working-age population in such areas have no qualifications.
- The proportion of black residents is twice the national average.
- Half of all households have at least 1 person with a limiting long-term illness.
- One-fifth of workless households have dependent children.
- One-third of people providing unpaid adult care do so for over 50 hrs a week.
- Rates of self-employment are half those in the rest of England.
In geographic terms, the report also found high levels of employment polarisation in the British population. Whilst concentrations of worklessness occurred in almost all parts of the country, 6 out of 10 were in the North East, North West, and Yorkshire and the Humber and they were disproportionately found in local authorities classed as either ‘mining/manufacturing’ or ‘cities/services’.

**Workless Households**

The Labour Force Survey publication *Work and worklessness amongst households* provides an indication of levels of worklessness at household level across the UK. As the following chart demonstrates, in comparison to other regions and England as a whole, the North East has a higher percentage of workless households. 19.4% (almost one in five) of all the region’s households are classed as workless. This compares with the 16% for England as a whole and the national low of 11.5% in the South East.

**Figure 16-8 Working-age households by region and combined economic activity status of household: April-June 2007**

![Graph showing workless households by region](image)

*Source: ONS Labour Force Survey*

**‘Real unemployment’**

The Sheffield Study represents one recent attempt to measure what it terms ‘real unemployment’ based on “all those who could reasonably be expected to have been in employment in a genuinely fully employed economy” (Beatty, Fothergill et al, 2007). This uses data from three main sources in order to calculate the true level: the claimant unemployed; the additional ILO unemployed; and the hidden
unemployed among incapacity claimants. The sum of these components generates a benchmark figure for each district that represents the ‘full employment IB claimant rate’. Excesses over this benchmark are deemed to be a form of hidden unemployment. In terms of how the North East pictures in this revised approach to calculating unemployment, the following table shows districts such as Easington in particular, along with Middlesbrough and South Tyneside, feature high in the list of GB hotspots.

Table 16:2 GB districts with the highest and lowest “real unemployment” January 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of working age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGHEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Easington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Blaenau Gwent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Merthyr Tydfil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hartlepool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Middlesbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Neath Port Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Barrow in Furness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Inverclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Caerphilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. West Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Blackpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Great Yarmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Stoke on Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Halton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. South Tyneside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402. Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403. Cotswold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404. Eden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405. Littleford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406. South Cambidgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407. East Dorset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408. Kennet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Beatty, Fothergill et al, 2007

Further, the table below shows the estimated real level of unemployment by region and compares the figures with the claimant count. As it shows, on both measures the North East has the highest rates of unemployment, but taking the ‘real unemployment’ rate, the difference between the lowest (South East) and the highest in this region, is particularly marked. The subsequent table explores data at a sub-regional level, and details estimates of real unemployment by district.
Table 16:3 Claimant versus “real unemployment” by region, January 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Claimant Count (%)</th>
<th>Real Unemployment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT BRITAIN</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Beatty, Fothergill et al, 2007

Table 16:4 Claimant versus “real unemployment” by North East local authority, January 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CVL</th>
<th>Claimant Count (%)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Real Unemployment (%)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton on Tees</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester le Street</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwentside</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesdale</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear Valley</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick upon Tweed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Valley</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Morpeth</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynedale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wansbeck</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>10,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Beatty, Fothergill et al, 2007
Based on this data, the charts below illustrate the difference between claimant and ‘real’ unemployment rates by gender in the region. As is clearly evident, ‘real unemployment’ rates for women in particular, are considerably higher than rates based on claimant data.

**Figure 16-9 NE male claimant v ‘real unemployment’ by local authority, Jan. 2007**

**Figure 16-10 NE female claimant v ‘real unemployment’ by local authority, Jan. 2007**

*Source: Beatty, Fothergill et al, 2007*
Summary

Despite a recent upward trend in economic activity rates, the North East still lags behind the average performance in England, particularly in comparison to the South East. However, within the region, there is considerable variation in terms of economic performance, with distinct economic “hot-spots” and high employment rates in some areas, with other parts of the region experiencing significantly lower employment rates (such as South Tyneside, Hartlepool and Middlesbrough), alongside high levels unemployment in comparison to the national picture. Further, the region as a whole exhibits high levels of worklessness and economic inactivity, with the highest percentage of workless households in comparison to other parts of England. In particular, a significant number of working age adults claiming incapacity benefits, particularly in key localities: for example, almost one in five adults of working age in Easington claim incapacity benefits. Finally, taking a broader measure of unemployment, there is a marked North / South divide at national level. In particular, Easington, Middlesbrough and South Tyneside all feature amongst the top 20 districts in England showing high rates of “real unemployment”.
17. Crime and Safety

Concerns about crime and safety can limit a person’s opportunity to take part in all aspects of life and have a major impact upon the quality of a person’s life. In this sense, levels of crime, alongside perceptions of safety and confidence in key agencies of the criminal justice system, are important indicators of equality. In this context, the following chapter explores crime in the North East, drawing in particular from recent data published in the British Crime Survey. It first looks at figures of recorded crime in the region before moving on to a section on perceptions, along with confidence levels in those agencies responsible for tackling crime. Next, it explores recent evidence on the prevalence of hate crime in the UK, focusing on homophobic and disability hate crime. Finally it looks at the issue of violence against women and in particular, trends in service provision around the UK.

Levels of crime in the North East

Police recorded crime

In 2006/07 the total recorded crime rate in the North East region (at 98 offences per 1,000 population) was just below the overall rate for England and Wales (at 100 offences per 1,000 population). The recorded crime rates in the North East region were similar to the England and Wales rate for most offence groups, apart from criminal damage which was higher.

Table 17:1 Recorded crime by region and Wales, 2006/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded crime rates per 1,000 population</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>Yorkshire &amp; the Humber</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>East of England</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total recorded crime (No.)</td>
<td>5,093,395</td>
<td>250,695</td>
<td>751,262</td>
<td>576,444</td>
<td>432,129</td>
<td>510,345</td>
<td>458,728</td>
<td>929,752</td>
<td>748,031</td>
<td>258,473</td>
<td>5,351,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded crime rates</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences against vehicles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other theft offences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS comparator</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crime in England and Wales 2006/07: North East Region (Kirwan, Wood et al. 2007)

The total number of crimes recorded by the police in this region in 2006/07 decreased by two%, when compared with 2005/06. The number of burglaries...
recorded decreased by four % and offences against vehicles decreased by 12 % (the greatest reduction in offences against vehicles in English regions and Wales) between 2005/06 and 2006/07. Over the same period there was a four % increase in violence against the person offences in the North East region.

Table 17:2 Percentage change in recorded crime by region and Wales, 2005/06 to 2006/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% change since 05/06 to 06/07</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>Yorkshire and the Humber</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>East of England</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total recorded crime (rates)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences against vehicles</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other theft offences</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS comparator</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crime in England and Wales 2006/07: North East Region (Kirwan, Wood et al. 2007)

Perceptions of crime

The proportion of people with high levels of worry about burglary and violent crime was lower in the North East compared with the England and Wales average. However, worry about car crime in the North East was similar to the national average.

Table 17:3 BCS worry about crime by region and Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>Yorkshire and the Humber</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>East of England</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of worry about burglary (%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of worry about car crime (%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of worry about violent crime (%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crime in England and Wales 2006/07: North East Region (Kirwan, Wood et al. 2007)
The proportion of people perceiving high levels of anti-social behaviour in the North East was not significantly different from the England and Wales average. Perceptions of anti-social behaviour in the region did not change significantly between the 2005/06 and 2006/07 BCS. The proportion of people perceiving high levels of drug use or dealing in the North East was similar to the national average and remained stable in this region between the 2005/06 and 2006/07 BCS.

Table 17:4 BCS perceptions of anti-social behaviour, drug use or dealing and confidence in the criminal justice system (CJS) by region and Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High level of perceived anti-social behaviour</th>
<th>High level of perceived drug use or dealing</th>
<th>CJS effective in bringing people to justice</th>
<th>Confidence in the local policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crime in England and Wales 2006/07: North East Region (Kirwan, Wood et al. 2007)

Confidence in the Criminal Justice System

National trends

Fuelled by the media, public interest in crime and the Criminal Justice System is at an all time high. In contrast to this, public knowledge of the Criminal Justice System and how it functions continues to be low (Cole et al, 2005a) Indeed, public perceptions of crime are often at odds with reported statistical data. For example, although rates of both violent and property crimes in Britain declined from 2000 to 2002, almost three quarters of the British public believed that crime had increased over this two year period (Finney, 2004). A review of the findings of various public surveys, most notably in this context the British Crime Surveys (Allen, Komy et al. 2005; Allen, Edmonds et al. 2006) helps to provide some indication of how confident or satisfied certain societal groups tend to be about particular organisations or professions.

- In relation to ethnicity, the picture of public confidence is varied. There are lower levels of confidence at the local level in the Criminal Justice System from black and minority ethnic communities but at the national level, the majority feel “fairly confident”. This trend is particularly true in relation to the way that crime is dealt with on a national, rather than local, level (Page et al, 2004). In fact the only area where white people display higher confidence
levels is in relation to whether the Criminal Justice System respects the rights of people accused of committing a crime and treated them fairly (Allen, Edmonds et al. 2006). This is in contrast to the general level of public confidence in the Criminal Justice System, where people are generally more positive about their local situation than across the country as a whole (Page, Wake et al. 2004). However, when it comes to the question of trust, loss of trust appears to be most pronounced among young Black/Black British people and there are some deep rooted negative attitudes towards the Criminal Justice System amongst this group, most particularly in relation to issues of discrimination and inequality (as opposed to concerns around service delivery expressed more frequently by White people) (Duffy, Downing et al. 2002). The British Crime Survey also collects data about victims from minority ethnic communities. In 2004/05, 79% of victims from BME groups were satisfied with the way that the Criminal Justice System handled the matter (compared to 75% of all victims).

- With regard to gender, women display higher confidence levels than their male counterparts in almost all Criminal Justice System functions (Allen, Edmonds et al. 2006).

- However the impact of income on confidence levels is less clear cut. For example, whilst those on lower household incomes (less than £10,000) appear to be more confident than those on higher incomes (£30,000 or more) that the Criminal Justice System is effective in reducing crime, dealing with cases promptly, meeting the needs of victims and dealing with young offenders, the opposite is true for confidence that the Criminal Justice System treats victims well and respects the rights of the accused (Allen, Edmonds et al. 2006). In terms of age, at the local and national level, young people appear to be more confident than old people, as are people classified as in good health (Duffy 2004; Page, Wake et al. 2004; Allen, Edmonds et al. 2006). In fact, age is one of the factors highlighted as most predictive of general confidence (Allen, Edmonds et al. 2006). This also appears to be the case in relation to satisfaction levels in the Criminal Justice System, but in this respect, young people are actually less satisfied with the police etc than older people (Duffy and Skinner 2003).

**Confidence at the regional level**

As shown in the previous table, the proportion of people in the North East who were confident that the CJS was effective in bringing people who commit crimes to justice was similar to the England and Wales average. A similar proportion of people felt that the local police did a good or excellent job in the North East compared with the national average. Within Northumbria, the 2004/05 data reported 39% of people confident in the Criminal Justice System’s ability to bring offenders to justice. This represents an improvement from the 2003/04 position (38%) but levels of confidence have been higher in previous years (peaking at 43% during 2003/04). This places Northumbria 4 percentage points below the national average. Out of the 42 Local Criminal Justice Board areas:

- 32 have confidence levels exceeding 39% (the highest being 52% in Cumbria)
4 have confidence levels equalling 39%
6 have confidence levels below 39% (the lowest being 31% in Humberside)

**Hate crime**

Hatred is a strong term that goes beyond simply causing offence or hostility. Hate crime is any criminal offence committed against a person or property that is motivated by an offender's hatred of someone because of their:

- race, colour, ethnic origin, nationality or national origins
- religion
- gender or gender identity
- sexual orientation
- disability

Hate crime can take many forms including:

- physical attacks – such as physical assault, damage to property, offensive graffiti, neighbour disputes and arson
- threat of attack – including offensive letters, abusive or obscene telephone calls, groups hanging around to intimidate and unfounded, malicious complaints
- verbal abuse or insults - offensive leaflets and posters, abusive gestures, dumping of rubbish outside homes or through letterboxes, and bullying at school or in the workplace

Whilst regional / local data is difficult to access on the extent of hate crime in the North East, the following statistics provide an indication of the situation in the UK as a whole.

**National data**

Key facts and figures from the Home Office:

- Nationally, in 2006-07, police reported 5,619 hate crimes in which someone was injured, 4,350 hate crimes without injury, and 28,485 cases of racially or religiously motivated harassment.
- There were also 3,565 cases of criminal damage related to hate crimes.
- The typical hate offender is a young white male (most homophobic offenders are aged 16-20, and most race hate offenders under 30).
- The majority of hate crimes happen near to the victim's home while they are going about their daily business, and an offence is most likely to be committed between 3pm and midnight.

---

- Most hate criminals live in the same neighbourhood as their victims.

**Homophobic hate crime**

*Queer Bashing*, Stonewall's (Stonewall 1995) study of violence against lesbians and gay men in Britain, found that one in three gay men and one in four lesbians had experienced at least one violent attack during 1990-1995. Because of fear of becoming the victim of homophobic violence, 65% of respondents always or sometimes avoided telling people they were gay, and 59% of respondents always or sometimes tried to avoid looking obviously gay. The problem is even worse for young lesbians, gay men and bisexuals. For those aged under 18, 48% of respondents had experienced violence, 61% had been harassed and an astonishing 90% had experienced verbal abuse because of their sexuality.

Breaking the Chain of Hate, the National Advisory Group's national survey (Stonewall 1999) examining levels of homophobic crime and community confidence towards the police service, confirmed these statistics. 66% of 2,500 respondents stated that they had been a victim of a homophobic incident only 18% of all homophobic incidents were reported 70% were fearful of reporting future homophobic incidents.

Reasons for not reporting included

- Lack of confidence in the police
- Anticipated negative reaction
- Fear of being charged with gay offence
- Fear of beingouted
- Fear of retribution
- Acceptance of violence and abuse

A more recent study from the London Gay and Lesbian Policing Group (GALOP 2001) found similarly high levels of violence and abuse against lesbian and gay black and minority ethnic groups. 68% experienced homophobic abuse and 81% experienced racist abuse. 10% experienced homophobic violence and 24% experienced racist violence.

**Disability hate crime**

- An Attitudes and Awareness Survey (Disability Rights Commission 2003) revealed that 22% of disabled respondents had experienced harassment in public because of their impairment. Incidents of harassment were more acute among 15-34 year olds with 33% of this group of disabled people experiencing harassment.

- Eight % of disabled people in London suffered a violent attack during 2001-02 compared with four % of non-disabled people. Research by Greater London Action on Disability (GLAD 2002) found that, "The attacks have a major impact
on disabled people. Around a third have had to avoid specific places and change their usual routine. One in four has moved home as a result of the attack. Many disabled people are not confident that the police can help to stop the incidents.”

- Research by Mencap (MENCAP 2000) demonstrated that 90% of people with a learning disability had experienced bullying and harassment. Sixty-six % of people with a learning disability have been bullied regularly with 32% stating that bullying was taking place on a daily or weekly basis.

Violence against Women

It is estimated that across the UK, three million women experience violence each year, and almost half these incidents will be serious and/or repeated. In addition, there are many more women who have suffered violence in the past as children or adults and who need support to deal with the legacies of victimisation. A recent report drew attention to the gaps in provision for victims of domestic violence in the UK (Coy, Kelly et al. 2007). It found that:

- A third of local authorities across the UK have no specialised VAW (Violence against Women) support service.
- Most women in the UK have no access to a Rape Crisis Centre and fewer than one quarter of local authorities have any sexual violence service at all.
- A very small proportion of the UK is covered by existing Sexual Assault Referral Centres.
- Fewer than 1 in 10 of local authorities have specialised services for BME women which would address forced marriage, female genital mutilation and crimes in the name of honour, as well as other forms of violence.
- Almost one third of local authorities have no domestic violence services.
- Fewer than 1 in 10 local authorities have services for women in prostitution.

Five areas are highlighted as particularly underserved: the East of England; London; Northern Ireland; the North West; and the South East.

Summary

Crime rates in the North East are slightly below the overall level for England and Wales, although in general rates for most offence groups are fairly similar. People in the region appear to worry less about burglary and violent crime than the national average rate, but have relatively equal concerns about car crime along with perceptions of anti-social behaviour. Further, confidence levels in the Criminal Justice System compare well with the national situation. There is limited regional data on hate crime, but national research indicate many ethnic minorities, LGBT and disabled people have experienced varying levels of harassment, including verbal abuse and violent attacks.
18. Education and Skills

Early years and education was identified in The Equalities Review (2007) as one of four of key areas in which equality gaps are most likely to cause further inequalities. Access to education and levels of educational achievement impact on an individual’s income level and overall employment opportunities. More broadly, evidence suggests that it reduces risk of poverty, improves health and increases the likelihood of political participation. However despite an overall increase in attainment levels, some marked inequities persist in education and training in today’s Britain. The underachievement of boys is one well-documented trend in this respect, but it is also clear that children from poorer backgrounds do less well at school than other children alongside continued regional variations in attainment at all levels. This chapter explores available statistics on attainment and achievement levels in the North East, as well as data on pupil participation and engagement levels in both compulsory and post-compulsory education, and overall skills levels in the region. The earlier chapters focusing on Gender and Ethnicity provide further educational trend indicators in those categories.

Early years and schools in the North East

Early years education

Reflecting the wider trend for England, nearly all three- and four-year-olds in the North East region were receiving early year’s education in January 2005. Within the United Kingdom 65 % of 3 and 4 year-old children were taught in schools and 35 % by private and voluntary providers. The highest rate of education in schools, 86 %, was in the North East (ONS 2006).

Table 18:1 Participation rates of 3 and 4 year olds in early education: Jan 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>All schools</th>
<th>Private and voluntary providers</th>
<th>All providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department for Children, School and Families, 2007
**Free school meals**

Nearly one in six children (17.7% of pupils) in the UK maintained nursery and primary schools were known to be eligible for free school meals. However there is considerable regional variation, and in the North East, eligibility exceeded 20% of pupils (along with Scotland, Northern Ireland and the North West). This compares with the highest rate in London (26.6%) but below rates in the South East, South West, East and East Midlands below the UK average, ranging from 10.6 to 13%. In maintained secondary schools, 14.8% of the pupils in the UK were known to be eligible for free school meals. The distribution of eligibility was similar to that for nursery and primary schools.

**Key Stage Assessments**

Pupils are assessed formally at the ages of 7, 11 and 14 by a mixture of teacher assessments and by national tests in the core subjects of English, mathematics and science. Nationally, at Key Stage 1 (age 7) in 2004, the proportion of pupils reaching or exceeding the expected standard in English, mathematics and science showed little variation (from 82 to 91%) in the English regions. Key stage 2 (age 11) results for England, Wales and Northern Ireland showed a similar pattern but at a lower level; 71 to 86%. The following table details performance by region, and shows that broadly speaking, the North East performs in line with the national average at all Key Stages, with the exception of Science and Mathematics at Key Stage 3 level.

**Table 18:2 Pupils reaching or exceeding expected standards: by Key Stage Teacher Assessment, summer 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Key Stage 1</th>
<th>Key Stage 2</th>
<th>Key Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Department for Education and Skills*

**Attainment, ethnicity and gender**

Attainment rates by ethnicity and gender are available at Local Authority level for Key Stage 1 & 2, and by ethnicity for Key Stage 3 from the Department for
Education and Skills. The following section explores some of the main trends emerging from this data with full tables for each Key Stage provided overleaf.

**Key Stage 1**
- There is a particularly large difference between attainment rates for Black boys and girls in Reading (68:82 compared with 75:84 for England as a whole), and in Writing (64:79 compared with 75:84). Asian boys also have significantly lower attainment rates in Writing at Key Stage 1 than girls in the region (67:81 compared with 73:83 for England)
- Chinese pupils outperform other ethnic groups in all areas except Science (where White and Mixed ethnic groups do best). However interestingly, Chinese boys achieve higher attainment rates than Chinese girls in Reading, Writing and Science; a trend not seen in any other group.

**Key Stage 2**
- In English, across the region, girls do better than boys in all ethnic groups apart from Chinese, where attainment rates are equal between genders. Mixed ethnic groups achieve the highest attainment rates, again with girls outperforming boys.
- Again, there is a noticeable large gender difference for Black pupil attainment rates in all areas but particularly English (51:80 in region compared with 67:79 in England) and Science (65:83 compared with 78:82 in England). At sub-regional level, this difference is in some areas even more extreme. For example in Middlesbrough (Black boys in Science: 40 compared with 86 for Black girls). Indeed Black boys in Middlesbrough achieve the lowest attainment rates of all groups.
- Chinese pupils achieve highest attainment rates in Mathematics, with Chinese boys outperforming girls in this area (94:81).
- Mixed race and Chinese pupils achieve the highest attainment rates in Science.

**Key Stage 3**
- Chinese pupils achieve highest attainment rates in all areas, with particularly marked differential in Mathematics (91 compared with average rate of 75 for region).
- The lowest attainment rates are for Black pupils, particularly for English (58 compared with 71 for North East as a whole), but Asian pupils also perform relatively poorly in England (66) and Science 63).
- There are also some marked sub-regional differences, with Black pupils in the south of the region (see Middlesbrough, Darlington, Stockton-on-Tees and Redcar and Cleveland) achieving the lowest attainment rates in the North East.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Science

Mathematics

English

Table 18:4: Key Stage 2 Attainment Rates by Ethnicity and Gender (% achieving)

England
North East
Gateshead
Newcastle upon
North Tyneside
South Tyneside
Sunderland
Hartlepool
Middlesbrough
Redcar and
Stockton-on-Tees
Durham
Darlington
Northumberland
England
North East
Gateshead
Newcastle upon
North Tyneside
South Tyneside
Sunderland
Hartlepool
Middlesbrough
Redcar and
Stockton-on-Tees
Durham
Darlington
Northumberland
England
North East
Gateshead
Newcastle upon
North Tyneside
South Tyneside
Sunderland
Hartlepool
Middlesbrough
Redcar and
Stockton-on-Tees
Durham
Darlington
Northumberland

Boys
77
76
78
71
82
77
75
77
76
78
77
76
75
74
79
78
79
76
81
79
78
80
77
81
81
79
79
74
88
88
89
86
89
87
88
87
87
87
90
88
92
88

White
Girls
85
84
83
79
88
86
83
88
83
86
86
85
83
85
77
77
77
72
75
77
76
82
77
81
82
79
80
73
89
89
89
85
89
87
88
94
87
89
91
89
88
89

Total
81
80
81
75
85
81
79
82
79
82
81
80
79
79
78
78
78
74
78
78
77
81
77
81
81
79
80
73
88
88
89
85
89
87
88
91
87
88
90
89
90

Boys
77
81
73
73
67
100
71
x
81
x
93
81
91
83
78
81
82
87
78
90
86
x
73
x
100
71
82
75
88
91
91
93
89
100
93
x
88
x
100
90
100

88

83

Mixed
Girls Total
87
82
90
85
86
78
94
84
92
81
100
100
77
74
x
83
82
81
x
82
92
93
95
88
90
90
100
90
76
77
83
82
100
89
71
78
92
86
100
93
69
78
x
83
73
73
x
82
100
100
86
79
90
86
78
76
89
88
92
92
100
94
83
88
100
95
100
100
85
89
x
83
82
85
x
82
100
100
100
95
90
95
100

90

Boys
73
70
77
69
100
59
66
88
74
80
64
58
75
80
75
75
77
73
91
64
73
75
79
80
79
83
75
73
82
83
77
86
91
77
82
100
82
80
82
75
88
80

Asian
Girls
82
79
75
80
56
75
79
100
75
88
81
87
79
95
72
70
58
67
61
75
67
86
67
75
79
73
64
84
84
81
67
82
56
88
76
100
77
88
88
87
86
95

Total
77
75
76
74
72
67
71
93
74
85
73
74
77
88
74
73
68
70
72
70
70
80
72
77
79
78
68
79
83
82
72
84
69
83
79
100
79
85
85
81
86

Boys
67
51
x
50
x
x
50
.
40
x
50
x
.
.
66
53
x
50
x
x
50
.
40
x
50
x
.
.
78
65
x
67
x
x
83
.
40
x
67
x
.

88

.

Black
Girls
79
80
x
67
x
x
100
.
57
x
100
x
.
x
66
63
x
50
x
x
67
.
57
x
100
x
.
x
82
83
x
69
x
x
100
.
86
x
100
x
.
x

Total
73
66
86
58
57
100
67
.
50
100
67
100
.
x
66
58
57
50
71
100
56
.
50
75
67
67
.
x
80
74
71
68
57
100
89
.
67
100
78
100
.

Boys
82
77
x
75
33
.
.
x
.
x
100
71
x
x
92
94
x
78
100
.
.
x
.
x
100
100
x
x
91
91
x
89
100
.
.
x
.
x
100
71
x

x

x

Chinese
Girls
89
77
x
75
75
.
x
x
.
x
.
83
x
x
92
81
x
88
75
.
x
x
.
x
.
83
x
x
92
92
x
100
100
.
x
x
.
x
.
83
x
x

Total
85
77
67
75
57
.
x
x
.
x
100
77
100
100
92
88
100
82
86
.
x
x
.
x
100
92
100
67
92
91
100
94
100
.
x
x
.
x
100
77
100

Boys
76
76
77
70
82
77
75
77
75
77
77
76
75
74
78
78
79
75
81
78
77
80
77
81
81
79
79
74
87
88
88
85
89
87
88
87
86
87
90
88
92

100

88

All pupils
Girls Total
84
80
84
80
83
80
79
74
87
84
85
81
83
79
87
82
81
78
86
82
86
81
85
80
83
79
85
79
76
77
77
77
77
78
71
73
75
78
77
78
76
76
82
81
75
76
80
81
82
81
79
79
80
80
73
73
88
87
88
88
88
88
84
85
88
89
88
88
87
88
94
91
85
86
89
88
91
90
89
89
88
90
89

88



Table 18:5 Key Stage 3 Attainment Rates by Ethnicity (% achieving - provisional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>All Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North East</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North East</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North East</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination achievements

Gender differences

On the whole girls continue to outperform boys at all levels of education in the UK from Key Stage 1 to higher education. In 2005/06, 64% of girls in their last year of compulsory education achieved five or more GCSE grades A* to C, compared with 54% of boys. This was an increase for both sexes since 2004/05, when the figures were 62% and 52% for girls and boys respectively. The following charts illustrate pupil achievement at GCSE level nationally and in the North East. As shown in 2005/06:

- Male pupils in the North East performed less well than the average rate for England in all subjects.
- Female pupils in the North East only performed better than the average in England in Single Award Science and Craft, Design and Technology.
- Within the region, as is the trend at national level, female pupils outperformed male pupils in all areas.

Figure 18-1 Male Pupils achieving GCSE grades A*-C by selected subjects 2005/06

Source: Department for Education and Skills, 2007
More recently, in 2006/2007, only 41.5% of North East pupils achieved five or more grades A*- C including English and mathematics at GCSE (or equivalent),
compared with 46.5% for England as a whole. The national target is 53% by 2011. At a sub-regional level:

- Only North Tyneside managed to achieve at above the England average (47%), which was due to its strong performance in boys’ results (which are poorer than girls’ results across the board).
- Middlesbrough is noticeably adrift of the rest of the Local Authorities with only 31.7% achieving five or more grades A*-C including English and mathematics at GCSE.

Table 18:6 Achievement of 5 GCSEs A*-C (including maths and English) at end of KS4 (2006/7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Office Region/Local Authority</th>
<th>5+ A*-C inc. English &amp; mathematics GCSEs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Boys/girls achievement index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHEAST</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar &amp; Cleveland</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton on Tees</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department for Education and Skills

Exam achievement and ethnicity

The following table details GCSE achievements for the region by ethnicity and Local Authority, with analysis of the data to follow.
Table 18.7 Achievements at GCSE and Equivalents for pupils at the end of Key Stage 4, in maintained schools, by Local Authority and ethnicity in 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>All pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 A* to C</td>
<td>5 A* to C including E&amp;M</td>
<td>Any Passes</td>
<td>5 A* to C</td>
<td>5 A* to C including E&amp;M</td>
<td>Any Passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar and Cleveland</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DCSF: GCSE and Equivalent Attainment by Pupil Characteristics, in England 2006/07
As the previous table shows:

- At regional level (as in England as a whole), a higher percentage of Chinese pupils achieve 5 GCSEs at grades A-C including English and Maths than any other ethnic group.

- Black pupils in the region are least likely to achieve this, at only 35%, and again this reflects the national picture. Asian pupils achieve only marginally higher levels of 5 GCSEs at grades A-C inc. E&M at 36.3% but this is significantly lower than the percentage in England (48.1%).

- At the sub-regional level, Middlesbrough performs worst in terms of 5 A to C inc. E&M (31.6 compared with 41.5 for North East and 45.5 for England). However it is important to note that all non-White groups other than Chinese perform under this rate (Mixed at 24.2%, Asian at 29.1%, Black at 10%).

- There are also notable differences between LAD areas in terms of ethnic achievement rates for non-White pupils in particular. For example, Mixed ethnic pupil achievement rate for 5 A-C inc E&M ranges from 75% in Northumberland to 24.2% in Middlesbrough, Black pupil achievement rates range from 66.7% in Darlington and South Tyneside to 10% in Middlesbrough, Chinese pupil achievement rates range from 100% in Northumberland to 33.3% in North Tyneside.

Looking in more detail at the examination achievement rates of different ethnic groups, there are some further trends of interest. Due to small or invalid sample sizes for some ethnic groups (particularly in certain districts in the North East), data is not readily available at LAD level. However DfES statistics on GCSE attainment by ethnic group at regional level show marked variation in achievement rates between the various sub-groups that comprise White, Mixed and Asian pupils, in addition to noticeable differences between North East and England as a whole.

For example, in terms of the achievement of 5 GCSEs at grades A-C including English and Maths:

- Although there is relatively small variation between White sub-groups (White British highest at 40.5% compared with Other White at 39.3%) performance of all sub-groups is lower than at national level.

- In Mixed ethnicity sub-groups, pupils of White and Black African descent perform particularly poorly in comparison to other sub-groups (22.2% compared with the group high of 54.4% for White and Asian pupils). This rate is also significantly lower than national performance levels (almost half), although caution is urged in attaching undue weight to this trend due to the small sample size.

- As at national level, there is also variation between Asian sub-groups in the North East, with Indian pupils performing noticeably better (46.2%) than Pakistani (35.9%) or Bangladeshi (28.9%) pupils in the region. However, when looking at the national picture, both Indian and Bangladeshi pupils in North East perform significantly worse than in England as a whole.

The following table provides full data by ethnic sub-group for the North East and England.
Table 18:8 Achievement of 5 GCSEs A*-C (including Maths and English) at end of KS4 (2006/7) by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>(no. of NE eligible pupils)</th>
<th>North East (%)</th>
<th>England (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>29,488</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White Background</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian (57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other mixed Background (75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian (78)</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani (248)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi (142)</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background (58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African (71)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black background (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese (73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group (83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils (31,705)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: DCSF: GCSE and Equivalent Attainment by Pupil Characteristics, in England 2006/07*

**Participation in education**

The following section looks at a range of indicators to illustrate levels of participation in education in the region.

**School participation data**

**Pupil absences**

In terms of pupil absence, while the North East appears to have relatively low levels of unauthorised absences, it had by far the highest rate of authorised absences at both primary and secondary school level.
### Table 18:9 Pupil absence from maintained primary and secondary schools 2005/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary schools</th>
<th>Secondary schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorised</td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Department for Education and Skills, 2007*

### Pupil exclusions

Overall, the North East had slightly fewer average numbers of exclusions per pupil when compared with England as a whole, but on average, more sessions lost per pupil. However at a sub-regional level, there was significant variation, with pupil exclusions particularly high in Darlington, but Middlesbrough and Gateshead also demonstrating high average numbers of sessions lost per pupil.

### Table 18:10 Maintained Secondary Schools: Number of Fixed Period Exclusions in 2005/06, by Local Authority area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Number of fixed period exclusions</th>
<th>Number of fixed period exclusions expressed as a percentage of the school population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>343,840</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>14,910</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>24.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyneside</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar &amp; Cleveland</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: School Census*
**Further education**

Recent statistics from the North East Learning and Skills Council (LSC 2008) have shown a marked increase in participation and success both for young people and adults in Further Education (FE) and Work Based Learning. Headline figures for LSC funded provision in the region for 2006/07 show:

- The number of young people studying for a full Level 2 qualification (the equivalent of five good GCSE’s) is higher than ever before at 9,833, an increase of 7.7% on the previous year.
- A 2.6% increase in the number of young people studying for a full Level 3 (equivalent to 3 A Levels) - 15,194.
- An increase of 6.1% in the number of adults studying for full Level 2 qualifications in FE and an increase of 7.6% in the number of adults studying for a full Level 3.
- More than 10,000 individuals started an Apprenticeship and the number of individuals completing their Apprenticeship is higher than ever before at 6,106, an increase of 7.5% on the previous year. This gives the North East an achievement rate of 59.6%.

Labour Force Survey data confirms this increase (although due to the dramatic upward trend in the population, this figure should be treated with caution). Figures are particularly positive for the percentage of residents aged 16-19 working towards a qualification, as detailed below.

**Table 18:11 Percentage of residents aged 16-19 year olds working towards a qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4, 2006</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4, 2005</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4, 2004</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4, 2003</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4, 2002</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Labour Force Survey*

The region also performs comparatively well in relation to participation of 16 and 17 years olds in some form of education or work-based learning, with rates consistently at or above the England average (DfES, 2005). However, in terms of the participation of 16-19 year olds in full-time education, despite an improvement in recent years, the North East still lags behind the national average.
Table 18.12 Percentage of 16 and 17 year olds participating in full time education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfES First Release statistics, 2005

Young People Not in Employment Education or Training

The gap with the UK at age 17 in participation in full-time education actually widened between 2002 and 2004 from 5 to 7 percentage points (as the North East participation rate remained at 53% while the national rate improved). At post-compulsory education level, levels of young people classified as Not in Employment Education or Training (NEET) is higher than England in all parts of the North East. In March 2006, some 10.7% of the North East cohort aged 16–18 years old –over 8,200 young people –were not in education, employment or training, compared with 7.9% of the national cohort. The activities of a further 6.6% of the regional cohort –almost 5,500 young people –were not known, compared with 5.5% of the national cohort. It is likely that some (though not all) young people whose activities were not known were actually NEET (LSC, 2007).

In terms of trends at the sub-regional level, as a proportion of the total cohort, the size of the NEET group is particularly significant in South Tyneside, Sunderland and Gateshead. In numerical terms, a particularly large number of young people in Durham are NEET. Sunderland also appears to account for a disproportionate number of the region’s NEET young people.
Table 18:13 16-18 year olds who are not in education, employment or training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Area</th>
<th>March 2005</th>
<th>March 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar &amp; Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>8,263</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>7,862</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>103,987</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>105,529</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ConneXions, LSC*

**Participation in Higher Education**

In terms of regional trends at the Higher Education level:

- The number of people from the region participating in higher education in 2005/06 was 70,680; up from 68,650 in 2004/05. In the same year, the same proportion of people from the North East were studying at University as the average for other regions (3.9%).

- There is a marked gender difference however in terms of participation rates in the region. The female participation rate of 29% is significantly higher than male participation (21%).
There has been an increase in the percentage of students at University coming from the region’s more deprived areas. 14% of applicants in 2007 were from the nationally most deprived 10% IMD areas, with 12% from the (next most deprived) 10-20%.

Both the percentage of applicants and percentage of accepted applicants coming from the lower socio-economic groups continues to rise, with the greatest long term change apparent in the "semi-routine occupations" group. In 2006, for example, there were 38.5% more applicants coming from the semi-routine occupations group compared to 1999.

At the regional level, the percentage of applicants with a disability is at 4.8%, the highest level recorded since records began in 1999. The success rate amongst applicants with a disability, which fell below 80% in 2006, has risen to 82.1% (same as NE average).

Over the period 1999-2006, there has been a 17.4% increase in the number of applicants from a comprehensive school. All sub-regions have reported increases ranging from 2.8% (Northumberland), 4.1% (Durham), 21.4% (Tyne and Wear) and 80.9% (Tees Valley).

7.2% of applicants and 6.6% of accepted applicants were from non-white backgrounds. The success rate for Black, Asian and Mixed Race applicants is at its lowest since 1999 (pre 1999 picture not available).

Proportion of women enrolled onto STEM courses has risen from 43.2% to 47.3% as female enrolments have grown significantly (+20%) while males only up slightly (+1.5%). However women are still heavily underrepresented in engineering (9.8% of students), maths and computer science (16.9%) and technologies (21.0%) and the numbers accepted to all three is deteriorating. Growth in enrolments has generally been in traditionally ‘female populated’ STEM disciplines (subjects allied to Medicine and biological sciences)

Source: AimHigher (UCAS data for entry to HEIs in 2007)

Skills and qualifications

This section looks at the overall skill and qualification level of the region’s resident population. As the table below shows, in 2006, London had the highest proportion of any working population, 28%, with a highest qualification at degree level or equivalent, compared with just under 19% for England as a whole. In comparison, the North East had the lowest proportion of its working age population qualified to degree level or equivalent at 13.6%. In 2006, 14.5% of the region’s population still had no qualifications, higher than the national rate of 13.1% but less than a number of other English regions including West Midlands, North West, and Yorkshire and Humber.
Table 18:14 Population of working age: by highest qualification, spring 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degree or equivalent</th>
<th>Higher education qualifications*</th>
<th>GCE A level or equivalent*</th>
<th>GCSE grades A*-C or equivalent</th>
<th>Other Qualifications</th>
<th>No qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department for Education and Skills, from the Labour Force Survey, 2007

The following chart details skills levels in the region in comparison with England.

Figure 18-4 Qualification level in North East and England: Jan-Dec 2006

As it shows, the North East has comparatively fewer people qualified to NVQ Level 4 or above in comparison to England as a whole (22.7% v 27.1%), but more people of working age who have no qualifications (14.3% as opposed to 13.6%).

Further, in 2003 more than one in four work age residents of the North East did not possess functional ability in numeracy, and more than one in five did not possess functional ability in literacy (Skills North East 2007). Indeed, a significant
proportion of the working age population in the North East have literacy skills below Level 2 (63 %, compared with 56 % in England). The following table illustrates the variation in basic literacy and numeracy at sub-regional level.

Table 18:15 Working age adults with poor literacy and numeracy skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Area</th>
<th>Working age adults with Literacy below Level 2</th>
<th>Working age adults with Numeracy below Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point estimate</td>
<td>Credible range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%–59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%–77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%–65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58%–72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%–77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%–74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%–69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%–71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>64%–78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%–77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar &amp; Cleveland</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>64%–77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%–68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East region</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%–65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%–57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfES Skills for Life Survey 2003 (taken from LSC, 2007)

The table and chart overleaf illustrate the skills level by occupation group within the region. As shown, there is a clear link between skill level and occupation:

- More people in professional occupations are qualified to degree level (Level 4/5) than any other class (77.4% compared to the slightly lower rate of 76.7% in England as a whole)
- Almost two thirds of those classed as never having worked have no qualifications (63.6% - higher than the England rate of 57%); and 44.5% of those elementary occupations also have no qualifications (compared with 42.2% in England)
- Overall, in comparison to the national picture, more of the North East workforce has no qualifications (34.7% to 28.9% in England), with fewer qualified at Level 2, 3 and 4/5.

58 The Skills for Life Survey provides sound estimates of literacy and numeracy skills at regional and national levels, direct from the survey results. Below regional level, estimates are modelled from the socio-economic information collected during the survey, and are subject to wider margins of error. The table shows, firstly, the figures regarded as the most likely rates of literacy and numeracy skills (the ‘point estimate’), and secondly, taking margins of error into account, the ‘credible range’ within which the actual rates of literacy and numeracy skills lie.
### Table 18:16 Highest Level of Qualification Group by Occupation: North East and England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No Qualifications</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4/5</th>
<th>Other Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Senior Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professional &amp; Technical Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Secretarial Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Customer Service Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process, Plant and Machine Operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked or occupation not coded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NOMIS, Census 200
Work and training

Overall, females of working age in the United Kingdom received more job-related training than males of working age in 2005 (19 % and 14 % respectively). However, the North East had the highest proportion of males receiving job-related training at 16 %. Further, in relation to comparable regions, the proportion of employees that receive job-related training is higher in the North East, as demonstrated in the table below.

Table 18: 17 % of people in employment that undertook job-related training in the last 3 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2005-Sep 2006</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2005-Jun 2006</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2005-Mar 2006</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2005-Dec 2005</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2004-Sep 2005</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2004-Mar 2005</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2004-Dec 2004</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey

However in other respects, the region compares less favourably with England as a whole. For example, according to the National Employers Skills Survey, 21% of employers in the North East had staff with skills gaps in 2005 (compared to 16% in England). Further, as the figure below shows, the number of people in work-based learning (WBL) programmes in the region has been falling year on year:

Figure 18-5 People in work-based learning by year in the North East

Source: LSC ILR data
Learning difficulties and / or disabilities

As recent study by the North East Learning and Skills Council examined the position of people with learning difficulties and / or disabilities in education in the region, The following data is taken from the report of that study, Meeting Need Raising Aspiration (LSC 2007) and shows that:

- The North East has a higher proportion of 14–19 year old students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) than the national average (15.4% in 2004/05, compared with 14.7% in England). In contrast, the proportion of adult learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities is slightly lower in the region than in England.

- Around twice as many young male learners than female learners in the North East are identified as having SEN. The gender ratio is not so pronounced in Further Education (FE) as it is in schools or Work Based Learning (WBL), though males continue to predominate.

- There are very few learners from black and minority ethnic groups with learning difficulties and/or disabilities in the North East region.

- Dyslexia is the most commonly recorded learning difficulty or disability in FE, with moderate learning difficulties and ‘other’ coming second and third. In WBL, moderate learning difficulty is the most common learning difficulty or disability recorded.

- Adult and Community Learning provision does not currently appear to make a significant contribution to provision for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities.

- In the North East, demand is greatest from young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities who consider that help with obtaining employment is the most important reason for continuing in post-16 learning. However, there is concern that there is a lack of learning provision, particularly in E2E, to meet the demand. Moreover, there are insufficient progression opportunities available to meet the demand from young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities once they have completed college courses. Where there is demand outside the local area, there are problems with transport to permit learners to access the learning of their choice.

- 42% of North East learners with a learning difficulty and/or disability achieved a full Level 2 at 19 in 2005, compared with 71% of those without. Nationally, 51% of learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities and 73% of those without achieved a Level 2\(^59\). As with ethnicity, however, there are a number of learners for whom information on learning difficulties and/or disabilities is not available, and it is therefore difficult to draw firm conclusions.

---

Summary

In educational terms, the North East compares poorly with England on a range of indicators. In terms of examinations, whilst female pupils outperform their male counterparts at GCSE level in line with national trends, achievement levels in the region are generally lower than the national picture. In 2006/2007, only 41.5% of North East pupils achieved five or more grades A*-C including English and Mathematics at GCSE (or equivalent), compared with 46.5% for England as a whole. Further, although an increased number of 16/17 year olds are now working towards a qualification in the North East, participation rates in full-time education for that age group are below the national average and the region has the highest percentage of young people classified as NEET in the country. Looking at the working age population, North East residents are also, on the whole, less well-qualified than the national average (particularly at degree level) and the region has one of the highest percentage of people with no qualifications at all.
19. Social Capital

Social capital describes the pattern and intensity of networks among people and shared values which arise from these networks. In some ways, it can be seen as the ‘social glue’ that makes communities work (North East Social Capital Forum 2007). There are a number of definitions of social capital, but the main aspects that it includes are citizenship, neighbourliness, social networks and participation. The Office for National Statistics uses a definition from the Office for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) which is “networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within and among groups”. In equality and diversity terms, social capital is important as research has shown that higher social capital is associated with better levels of health, better educational attainment, better chances of employment and lower crime rates. This chapter explores these different aspects of social capital in the region, including data indicators of civic participation, social support, networking and neighbourliness.

Measuring social capital

The multifaceted and imprecisely defined nature of social capital makes measurement a challenge. Various social surveys provide useful indicators of the nature and scope of social capital, often through asking questions about proxy measures for social capital. In order to gain an insight into social capital trends in the North East, this section examines national data from the latest Citizenship Survey in addition to drawing substantially on recent research carried out by IPPR North that disaggregated key data sets (General Household Survey 2004/05 and 2005 Citizenship Survey) at the regional level.

Civic participation

National trends

At a national level, the Citizenship Survey provides data on patterns of civic participation, including some regional level statistics. The latest survey (DCLG 2008) found that:

- In April-September 2007, 73% of all adults had volunteered (formally or informally) at least once in the last 12 months, with 48% having volunteered at least once a month.
- Overall levels of volunteering have not changed since 2001. However, levels of formal volunteering have risen over this period, whilst informal volunteering has declined.
- 41% of people from groups at risk of social exclusion participated in voluntary activities at least once a month. This is unchanged from 2001 (41%).
39% of people engaged in civic participation at least once in the past year, and 3% engaged in civic participation at least once a month.

Women were more likely to volunteer regularly than men, with 51% of women volunteering at least once a month compared to 44% of men.

In terms of influencing decisions:

- 38% of people felt they could influence decisions in their local area and one-fifth (20%) of people felt they could influence decisions affecting Great Britain. These proportions remain unchanged since 2005 and 2003, although they have fallen since 2001.
- White people are less likely than people from minority ethnic groups to feel they can influence decisions at the local level (37% compared with 47%). White people are also less likely to feel they can influence decisions affecting Great Britain (19% compared with 33%).

A further data source is the Health Survey for England, which asks questions about involvement in civic society in the past 12 months (Joint Health Surveys Unit 2007). The most recent survey found that:

- 50% of people felt that they were well informed about local affairs
- 56% felt that communities could influence decisions, although a much smaller number (26%) felt that they could personally influence decisions in their area.
- Only 18% felt civicly engaged.

In terms of regional differences, Yorkshire and Humber and North East regions had the lowest participation rates, and the South West the highest.

Figure 19-1 % of adults participating in any civic activity in the previous 12 months

![Graph showing percentage of adults participating in any civic activity in the previous 12 months by region.](Source: Health Survey for England, 2007)
Civic participation in the North East

More recently, IPPR North (Schmueckar 2008) carried out research into social capital in the North East, focusing on breaking down national statistics to the regional level (in particular the General Household Survey 2004/05 and the Citizenship Survey 2005). In terms of civic participation, key findings included:

- Apart from the South West region (where more people agreed that they felt able to influence decisions affecting their local areas, particularly when ‘working together’ than any other part of Great Britain), a similar proportion of North East residents responded positively to questions on civic participation to other parts of the country.

- Within the region itself, as the following table shows, those individuals that felt most able to influence decisions belonged to the 65-74 year age group, although there was little variation by occupational group.

Table 19:1 North East Respondents at least “agree” to being able to influence decisions affecting the local area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age Group</th>
<th>By Occupation</th>
<th>Source: Schmuekar, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-44 years</td>
<td>18% Managerial &amp; Professional</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>22% Intermediate</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>30% Small Enterprise etc</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>21% Lower Supervisory</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22% Semi and Routine</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in Great Britain, these proportions more than doubled in response to the question of whether people felt able to influence decisions when they “work together”. Again, the perception of greatest influence is again in the 65-74 years age group in the North East, with 50% of respondents feeling able to influence decisions about their local area when working with others. The members of the higher occupational classes also felt more empowered than the other groups, with between 53% and 59% agreeing that they are able to influence decisions whilst working with other people.

North East Respondents at least "agree" that by working together people can influence decisions affecting the local area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age Group</th>
<th>By Occupation</th>
<th>Source: Schmuekar, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-44 years</td>
<td>44% Managerial &amp; Professional</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>48% Intermediate</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>50% Small Enterprise etc</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>44% Lower Supervisory</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46% Semi and Routine</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- A slightly higher proportion of North East respondents stated that no action had been taken when asked about the actions taken in the last 12 months in response to a local issue (71% compared to 66% of respondents nationally.

**Table 19:2 Action taken to address a local issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>Great Britain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Local radio or TV or Newspaper</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact an Appropriate organisation</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact a Councillor or MP</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Public meeting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Tenants residents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Protest meeting</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Organise a Petition</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problems</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of above</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Schmuekar, 2008*

- When asked about actions taken to show concern over a national issue, over 90% of respondents from the North East stated they had taken no action in the last 12 months, marginally more than the national average.

**Table 19:3 Action taken over a national issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>Great Britain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Local radio or TV or Newspaper</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact an Appropriate organisation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact an MP</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Public meeting</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Protest meeting</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Organise a Petition</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of above</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Schmuekar, 2008*

**Local data**

Finally, at a more local level, in Newcastle, young peoples’ response to the Department for Education and Skills Green Paper ‘Youth Matters’ indicated that:

- 52% of young people would like to be involved in helping decide how local councils spend money on providing services and activities for young people.
- 29% thought being involved in the inspection of how good local activities are would be a good idea.
- Young people want to be involved in decision making and want to be involved through a range of interesting ways. 27% thought questionnaires would be a good method to use, 19% said to do it through schools and colleges with 16% wanting it to happen through websites, emails and text messages.
- The responses collated in Newcastle give a very strong message that young people want to engage in making changes to their communities and to be influential in the decision making processes that affect them.

Source: The Newcastle Children and Young People’s Engagement Strategy, Newcastle City Council

Neighbourhoods and Cohesion

Social Cohesion Indicators

Using further data from the recent 2007 Citizenship Survey, at a national level:

- 82% of people agreed that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together, an increase from 80% in 2005.
- Perceptions of cohesion are most positive among those aged 75 and over (91%) and least positive among those aged 25-34 years (77%).
- 84% of people feel they belong strongly to Britain with a slightly lower percentage (75%) feeling they belong strongly to their neighbourhood.
- The percentage of people who feel they belong strongly to their neighbourhood (75%) has increased since 2003 (71%).
- 47% of people feel that many people in their neighbourhood can be trusted, an increase from 40% in 2001.
- ‘Respect for the law’ (57%), and ‘tolerance and politeness towards others’ (56%) are the two most commonly cited values that people thought most important for living in Britain today. With the exception of Black Caribbean and Mixed Race people, ‘respect for the law’ is the most important value across all the minority ethnic groups (for Pakistani people, ‘respect for all faiths’ is equally important). For Black Caribbean and Mixed Race people, equality of opportunity is the most important value.
- In terms of meaningful interaction with people from different backgrounds, overall, 80% of people mixed socially with people from different ethnic or religious groups at least once a month either at work, at a place of education, through a leisure activity, at a place of worship, at the shops or through volunteering.

Social cohesion: levels of trust in the North East

- 82% of respondents in the region are “fairly satisfied” with their local areas, which is comparable to most other parts of Great Britain (overall rate of 81%) apart from London. Levels of satisfaction in the North East were greatest in the over 75s age group at 92%, while only three-quarters of the 16-44 years reported being at least “fairly satisfied with their local area as a place to live”.

Source: The Newcastle Children and Young People’s Engagement Strategy, Newcastle City Council
The occupational class of respondents with the lowest levels of satisfaction with their local areas were found to have Routine and Semi-routine occupations, with only 79% of respondents from the North East being “fairly satisfied”.

- In terms of trust in other people in their neighbourhood, as in Great Britain, levels of trust in the region increase with age. As the following table shows, the proportion of over 75s that felt “most of the people in their neighbourhood can be trusted” was twice the proportion of the youngest age group.

Table 19:4 North East Respondents Trust of Others by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Most Trusted</th>
<th>Some Trusted</th>
<th>A Few Trusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-44 years</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Schmuekar, 2008

- In terms of perceptions of racism in neighbourhoods, respondents over 45 years old in the North East are less likely to think there is a problem in their neighbourhood with “racially” motivated attacks or harassment, with around 88% responding that there was “no problem”. However, among the 16-44 years age group only 74% of respondents believed there was “not a problem”. There were also some variations by occupation, as the following table shows.

Table 19:5 North East Respondents: People being Attacked or Harassed because of their Skin Colour, Ethnic Origin or Religion is "Not A Problem"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age Group</th>
<th>By Occupation</th>
<th>By Occupation</th>
<th>By Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-44 years</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Managerial and Profession</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Small Enterprise etc</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Lower Supervisory</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Semi and Routine</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Schmuekar, 2008

- When asked more broadly whether people could be trusted in general, around 29% of respondents in the region felt that “most people could be trusted”, while nearly twice the proportion of individuals in North East stated that one “can’t be too careful in dealing with people”. This was similar to the national average. Again, respondents from the over 75s age group were the most trusting in the region, with 46%.
Looking at trust in public institutions, in terms of differences by age: older respondents were more likely to have “a fair amount” of trust in government (Parliament and the Local Council), with 16-44 year olds most trusting of the Courts and 65-74 year olds most trusting of the Police. In terms of variation by occupation, Managerial and Professional respondents displayed higher rates of trust in almost all areas in comparison with other classes.

**Table 19:6 North East Respondents: At least “a fair amount” of trust in police / courts / Parliament / local council by age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Courts</th>
<th>Parliament</th>
<th>Local Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-44 years</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ years</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19:7 North East Respondents: At least “a fair amount” of trust in police / courts / Parliament / local council by occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Courts</th>
<th>Parliament</th>
<th>Local Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and Professional</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Enterprise etc</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Supervisory</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi and Routine</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Schmuekar, 2008*

**Social support**

Social support is a feature of and derived from a person’s social network which can include family as well as friends and work colleagues. There are a range of possible indicators to demonstrate social support which were used in the Social Capital Module of the 2000 General Household Survey (Joint Health Surveys Unit, 2007):

- Could get a lift somewhere if needed;
- Has at least three sources of informal help for a lift;
- Could get help in bed;
- Has at least three sources of informal help if ill;
- Could borrow £100 if in financial difficulties;
- Has at least three sources of informal help if needed £100;
- Number of people to turn to in a crisis;
- Number of these people living nearby.

The following graph illustrated shows the reported ability of people to get a lift if needed and shows minimal difference at regional level, although there is a noticeable difference in the figures for London and this may be due to the availability of public transport and low car ownership.

**Figure 19-2 Percentage of adults who could get a lift somewhere if needed, 2000**

Social networks

Social networks are quantified as the number of contacts, frequency and density, and are to be considered separately from social support which is more a measure of direct help and assistance. The indicator below shows the variation in frequency with which adults speak to relatives by telephone. It shows a clear North / South divide. People living in London and the South East had lower levels of networks than people living in the North East (Joint Health Surveys Unit, 2007).
The recent IPPR North research confirms this trend in terms of the frequency of meeting up with relatives. Again, a clear north / south divide emerged in the frequency of “meeting-up”, with all the regions (and countries) of Great Britain not in the north of England having significantly higher levels of “face-to-face” interaction with relatives than those in the south of England, and the North East being the region with the largest proportion of respondents that meet up with relatives at least once a week (62% in North East compared with national rate of 49%, Schmueckar, 2008).

**Neighbourliness**

Neighbourliness is seen as an important component of social capital and can be measured in a number of possible ways. The Joint Health Surveys Unit illustrates one which is the percentage of adults speaking to their neighbours (2007). Other indicators which are available include the number known to neighbours, the number of people trusted in the neighbourhood and whether people have received a favour from their neighbours in the past week. Some of these alternative indicators can be found on the National Statistics website.

Overall one in four people spoke to their neighbours at least daily. On the other hand, 19% of the population spoke to their neighbours less than once per week. In general, people in England were less likely than those in Wales or Scotland to speak to, know or trust their neighbours (although figures for the North East were higher than the national average and most other English regions). People living in Wales spoke to their neighbours more regularly than those living in either England or Scotland. 38% of people in Wales spoke to their neighbours daily compared...
with 27% in England and 29% in Scotland. There were no statistical differences between the countries in the reciprocity measures (i.e., where neighbours look out for and do favours for each other).

The IPPR North research found noticeable trends by age in this respect. Nearly all of the respondents from the North East in the 65-74 year age group reported that they spoke to their neighbours at least once a week. The age group with the least contact with neighbours was the 16-44 year olds, where 75% were in contact at least weekly.

**Figure 19-4 Percentage of adults speaking to neighbours**

![Figure 19-4 Percentage of adults speaking to neighbours](image)

**Source:** General Household Survey 2000 (Social Capital Mode)

**Summary**

Whilst people in the North East appear to have very slightly lower civic participation rates than most other regions, other indicators show more positive levels of social capital in the region. For example, in terms of social networks, there appears to be a clear North / South divide, with people in the North East more likely to have regular telephone contact with relatives than people living in the South East and London and more likely to talk to their neighbours on a regular basis, indicating higher levels of social cohesion than other parts of England. However the key indicator in terms of social capital is clearly age, with older people more likely to feel able to influence local decisions, be satisfied with their local area, and to trust and have regular contact with their neighbours than in other English regions.
20. Health and Social Care

Health, including both well-being and access to high quality healthcare, is seen as one of the ten dimensions of equality highlighted in the recent Equality Review (2007). Today however, as with educational attainment, health outcomes are still shaped strongly by socio-economic status and social class. Again, there are issues in relation to the evidence base for health: “...while data exist on health inequalities by gender and age (and geography); there are no systematic data available for health inequalities by ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, transgender, and religion or belief. In some of these areas no data at all is available.” (The Equalities Review, 2007). Bearing in mind such limitations, this chapter summarises some of the health data available for the region, focussing on key health indicators, such as smoking, along with issues in relation to social care provision in the North East.

Key Health Indicators

The latest Indications of Public Health in the English Regions (2005) shows that the North East performs badly on a range of health indicators. The section to follow looks at smoking and alcohol consumption in detail, along with a range of other indicators to illustrate this fact.

Smoking

In relation to smoking, along with Yorkshire and Humber, the North East has one of the lowest success rates for quitting smoking at 4 weeks (53.1% compared with the national average of 57% and high level of 64.% in the South East). Further, smoking prevalence in the region is higher for both males and females: for women, at 32%, this is by far the highest rate nationally.

**Table 20:1 Cigarette smoking among people aged 16 or over by sex, 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current cigarette smoked per day</td>
<td>Ex-regular cigarette smokers</td>
<td>Current cigarette smoked per day</td>
<td>Ex-regular cigarette smokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than 10</td>
<td>10, less than 20</td>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>All current smokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol

As the table below shows, male alcohol consumption in the North East is one of the highest rates in regional terms, and above the national average. Female alcohol consumption rates are more comparable with the national average.

Table 20:2 Alcohol consumption among people aged 16 or over: by sex, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average weekly consumption</td>
<td>Drank on 5 or more days last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(units of alcohol)</td>
<td>Drank up to 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>17.6 20 31 21 21</td>
<td>6.6 11.0 32.0 16.0 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>18.0 22 34 18 24</td>
<td>7.4 12.0 34.0 15.0 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and</td>
<td>18.4 22 37 17 25</td>
<td>7.6 13.0 36.0 14.0 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Humber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>14.8 20 36 17 19</td>
<td>6.0 12.0 38.0 12.0 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>14.6 22 40 15 16</td>
<td>6.7 14.0 36.0 11.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>17.3 21 39 16 17</td>
<td>6.0 12.0 41.0 11.0 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>13.6 20 36 14 12</td>
<td>4.9 10.0 34.0 8.0 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>14.2 25 44 16 15</td>
<td>6.7 17.0 43.0 12.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>15.9 26 42 14 19</td>
<td>7.1 15.0 41.0 14.0 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>15.8 22 39 16 18</td>
<td>6.5 13.0 38.0 12.0 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>15.8 22 39 16 18</td>
<td>6.5 13.0 38.0 12.0 8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further:

- In terms of obesity, whilst female levels compare with the national average (at 22.2%), men in the North East have the highest rate at 24.7% (compared with national average of 20.8%)
- The North East has by far the lowest prevalence of 5 a day consumption in England: 16.6% compared with the national average of 23.6%

**Births, deaths and fertility**

According to recent ONS population trend statistics (ONS 2007):

- The North East has the joint lowest Total Fertility Rate of any English Region (1.80 compared with the England average of 1.86)
- The North East has by far the highest fertility rate of teenage mothers (34.9 compared with the England average of 26.3)
- In eight out of nine Government Office Regions, the birth rate to women aged 40 and over increased between 2005 and 2006. The only exception to this trend was in the North East. In 2006, the North East had the highest teenage birth rate and the South East the lowest, with 34.9 and 20.9 live births per 1,000 women aged 15 to 19 respectively.
- In 2006, the North East had the greatest percentage of births registered outside of marriage of any UK nation or region with (55% compared with the England average of 43%)
- There were 146,956 births in England and Wales in 2006 to mothers born outside the United Kingdom, accounting for 22 per cent of all live births in England and Wales. 15 per cent of births had both parents born outside the United Kingdom. These two proportions indicate that for one-third of foreign-born mothers, the child’s father was born in the United Kingdom. The majority of the increase over the last ten years in the proportion of live births to mothers born outside the United Kingdom is among women in their twenties and early thirties.
- North East is the region with the lowest percentage of births to foreign born mothers (9% compared with the England average of 23% - London = 53%)
- Finally, the people in the North East have some of the lowest life expectancies at birth in comparison to the national picture, as the chart below demonstrates:
Personal and social care

In terms of personal social services expenditure in England in 2006-07 (ONS, Personal Social Services expenditure) recent data shows that:

- In 2006-07, gross current expenditure by Councils with Social Services Responsibilities in England on Personal Social Services was £20.2 billion. Over the 10 years from 1996-97, this represents an increase of around 70% in real terms.
- In 2006-07, expenditure on services for children and families accounted for 25% of total gross current expenditure, whilst expenditure on services for older people accounted for 43%.

Domiciliary care

There is limited regional and / or local data in this area, however a recent Sheffield Hallam study on Newcastle (Yeandle, Shipton et al. 2006), showed challenges faced by key agencies in responding to changes in supply and demand for domiciliary care in Newcastle. In terms of demand for domiciliary care, Newcastle’s ageing population, and continuing high levels of poor health and deprivation in parts of the city, mean that demand for domiciliary care is growing. For example:
39% of households in Newcastle contain a person with a limiting long-term illness, including 8,000 households where the sick person is aged 75 or older. Further, there is no co-resident carer in 88% of these households.

Newcastle’s population of very aged (85+) residents is expected to rise by 7,700 people by 2028, with a particularly strong increase for males.

In Newcastle, 87% of very aged men, and 78% of very aged women, live in their own homes.

39% of very aged men in the city, and 58% of very aged women, live alone.

Looking at employment in the care sector, domiciliary care remains a strongly female-dominated segment of the labour market, and continues to be an important source of paid work for women in Newcastle:

1 in 22 of all employed women in Newcastle is a care worker.

In Newcastle, 46% of female care workers, and 25% of male care workers, work part-time. Most are White British men and women, although Newcastle’s small population of Black/Black British residents, especially men, are more strongly concentrated in care work than people of other ethnicities.

A large minority of Newcastle’s care workers had no formal qualifications in 2001 – two thirds of women care workers aged 50-59, and almost a fifth of women care workers aged under 25 years.

**Summary**

Health is a key dimension of equality but outcomes continue to be shaped by an individual’s socio-economic status and class. In this respect, the North East performs poorly on a range of health indicators, with high prevalence of smoking (particularly for women), high rates of male alcohol consumption, one of the lowest rates of “5 a day” consumption and overall, low life expectancies. Further, in terms of birth and fertility, although the North East has the joint lowest total fertility rate in England, it has the highest teenage birth rate in England.
21. Housing

Historically, housing in the North East has followed the pattern of its industrial heritage: terraces for shipyard workers along its rivers, houses built for miners and social housing built to house workers in the newer manufacturing and chemical industries. This combines with a sparsely populated rural hinterland of market towns and smaller settlements. Today however, the region faces a complex set of housing issues, with areas that are in need of regeneration and market renewal alongside areas of soaring house prices with many households unable to participate in the housing market. This chapter explores some of the key trends in relation to the region’s housing situation. Starting with review of data of the North East housing stock (particularly in relation to aspirations), it goes on to look at sub-regional house prices trends. The chapter concludes with a section on social housing, focusing in particular on the quality of social housing, ethnicity and worklessness.

Regional Housing Stock

A number of studies (NLP 2005); (Smith 2007) have shown the balance of housing stock in the region.

Figure 21-1 Dwelling Stock by Type in the English Regions (March 2006)

As the above and below graphs show, at both the regional and sub-regional level, the North East dwelling stock is dominated by terraces and semi-detached housing to a greater extent than the England average. Across the region, NLPs Regional Housing Aspirations Study (2005) identified four key trends:

Source DCLG Housing Statistics

As the above and below graphs show, at both the regional and sub-regional level, the North East dwelling stock is dominated by terraces and semi-detached housing to a greater extent than the England average. Across the region, NLPs Regional Housing Aspirations Study (2005) identified four key trends:
- Tyne and Wear has by far the largest proportion of flats in the region, which is even higher than the English average.
- Tyne and Wear has the largest proportion of semi-detached houses in the region, which is again higher than the English average.
- Northumberland has by far the largest proportion of detached housing in the region, which is greater than the English average.
- County Durham has the largest share of terraced housing in the region by a considerable degree and has the largest make-up of semi-detached and terraces, which is larger than the English average.

Figure 21-2 Dwelling stock by type for North East sub-regions (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Semi-detached</th>
<th>Terraced</th>
<th>Flats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyne &amp; Wear</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Durham</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tees Valley</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The English Indices of Deprivation (Revised) (ODPM 2004)

The Aspirations study used 2001 census data to illustrate that the North East has the highest proportions of semi-detached, one of the highest proportions of terraced stock and the lowest proportion of detached housing as a percentage of total dwellings compared to all other regions. The following graph, taken from the later NLP report “Aligning the Regional Evidence Base” further highlights the imbalanced housing supply in the North East compared to other regions:

Figure 21-3 Comparative balance of housing stock: by region and type of dwelling

Source: (NLP 2006)
The other trends identified in relation to the housing stock in the North East by the *Aspirations* study were:

- Terraced and semi-detached housing is concentrated in and around major conurbations and former coalfield communities.
- The highest proportion of detached housing is found in rural areas, especially Northumberland, with the lowest within urban areas - this has influenced migration patterns to rural areas.
- The uneven distribution of dwelling types in the region has impacted upon and influenced migration and commuting patterns and the socio-economic make up of the region.

The study compared the proportion of detached and terraced houses in each Local Authority area with its socio-economic make up. This showed a clear correlation between the proportions of terraced housing and lower socio-economic groupings. There was also a concentration of lower socio-economic groups in urban areas and former coalfield communities, again areas with concentrations of terraced houses. However, in areas where there has been past high build rates, such as Darlington and Stockton-on-Tees, these areas have a more balanced socio-economic profile.

The graph below highlights the imbalance between current housing supply and household aspirations.

**Figure 21-4 North East regional housing aspirations relative to supply**

![Graph showing housing aspirations relative to supply](image)

*Source: (NLP 2005)*
House Prices

Analysis of house price data across the North East highlights the uneven housing stock distribution in the North East creating hotspots in areas with a high concentration of detached properties alongside relatively consistent prices for semi-detached properties across the region.

- The lowest house prices found in urban areas of the North East, with particular concentrations in the Tees Valley. A large proportion of the Tees Valley has house prices considerably lower than the average. Overall, however, there has been a reduction between 2000 and 2004 in the proportion of house prices significantly lower than the North East average, mirroring general housing market trends. The choice of house type and environment in rural locations are resulting in higher prices in these locations.

- In Tyne and Wear prices have increased between 2000 and 2004 and there are a number of property ‘hotspots’ primarily Newcastle Great Park, Jesmond and Gosforth. Higher than average house prices are also found around the coast, both in North and South Tyneside and outer areas of Gateshead.

- However, Northumberland has areas that exhibit house price extremes. The areas with the highest house prices are in Castle Morpeth and Alnwick. This is likely to be influenced by the environment, accessibility to Newcastle/Gateshead area, the choice of housing and possibly the number of second homes. More remote areas of Northumberland are not in such high demand and there are pockets of extremely low house prices.

- In County Durham, Durham City is an area of concentrated high house prices. This is in contrast to the rest of Durham where house prices are lower compared to the North East average. This is linked to the quality of environment in Durham City, relatively high number of new build completions and the concentration of attractive housing in this area.

The following graph illustrates regional variation in house prices:
It shows that median average house prices in Alnwick, Castle Morpeth and Tynedale are more expensive than the median average English house price. Berwick, Newcastle and Teesdale are the next highest median average prices but they represent only around 80% of the median average house price in England. The lowest median average house prices were recorded in Easington, Hartlepool, Sedgefield, Wansbeck and Wear Valley and all are below £100,000.

In terms of assessing the relative affordability of housing, one approach is to look at the ration between average house prices and average household incomes. As the following graph demonstrates:
Figure 21-6 Ratio of average house prices (2006) to average household income (2004/05) by North East MSOA

The most unaffordable areas at 7 to 9 times average income are southern Berwick, northern and eastern Alnwick, western Castle Morpeth and southern Tynedale. There are also significant patches within or surrounding the conurbations notably the broad areas of Gosforth, Cleadon, Yarm, Whickham and Neville’s Cross. The rural west of Teesdale, Tynedale and the Wear Valley are around 6 times average income.

Rentals and social housing

Whilst owner-occupation is the dominant trend for both the North East and England as a whole, the region has the lowest proportion outside of London. Like
London, the North East has one of the highest proportions of local authority rented housing.

**Figure 21.7 Proportion of dwelling tenure in the English regions in 2006**

![Figure 21.7 Proportion of dwelling tenure in the English regions in 2006](image)

Source: DCLG Housing Statistics

However overall, the trend in recent years has been towards increasing levels of owner occupation and decreased rentals, with factors such as ‘Right to buy’ and the end of Council building programmes thought to have impacted on the rise in private ownership. More recently, the rise in owner-occupation however has slowed and there has been and there has been a rise in both RSL and private renting. It has been suggested that “the recent ‘housing boom’ has contributed to this in some way; more people buy-to-let, fewer people can afford to buy and so rent. As a consequence the balance of the rented market has changed with significant reductions in local authority renting and increases.” (Smith 2007)

CORE (COntinuous REcording) is a system for recording information about Registered Social Landlords’ (RSL) lettings and sales in England; it is funded jointly by the Housing Corporation and Communities & Local Government. Each year, the Centre for Housing Research at the University of St Andrews publishes an Annual Digest of CORE data.

Some key recent statistics include (Centre for Housing Research 2007):

- The percentage of lone adult households continued to increase, up from 33% in 2002/03 to 37% in 2006/07.
- The percentage of lettings made to Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) tenants increased by 3 percentage points over the figure reported during 2005/06,
partly influenced by the reclassification of ‘White: Other’ from a non-BME category to a BME category.

- The percentage of tenants categorised as being statutorily homeless at the time of letting continues to rise each year, increasing from 12.9% in 2002/03 to 17.9% in 2006/07.

**Housing quality**
The North East Assembly’s Compendium of Housing & Population Data (2007) also examines the quality of housing in the RSL and Local Authority sectors. While the majority of this housing meets decent homes standards:

- The largest numbers of non-decent homes are located in Hartlepool, Middlesbrough and Redcar & Cleveland
- Both Darlington and Alnwick have no local authority sector homes that are non-decent, whereas in Tyne and Wear, only Gateshead has a higher proportion of decent homes compared with non-decent.

Looking at housing that is classified as ‘unfit’, the report shows that while unfitness represents a minority of the total dwelling stock in all local authorities:

- The majority is recorded in Newcastle, Middleborough and Easington.
- Owner occupied and private rented properties represent the majority of unfitness in most local authorities.

**Ethnicity and social housing**
The following data draws on CORE analysis (Joint Centre for Scottish Housing Research 2003). This paper examines the contribution of housing associations in meeting the housing needs of BME households and charts the changes over time and the regional variability in provision. The paper is based on analysis of CORE data on housing association lettings and the 2001 Census.

- 6.7% of all households and 10.2% of BME households live in the housing association social rented sector.
- BME households were more likely to have been living in overcrowded housing, in temporary housing or with family and friends prior to being allocated a housing association dwelling compared to White households.
- Single adult households account for the majority of lettings among all ethnic groups except Asian households. Among Asian households, 2+ adult households with children comprise the largest category (33%, rising to 50% among Bangladeshi households).
- Lone parent households are the second largest category among white, mixed and black households.
- When income is adjusted to take account of family size and composition, a higher proportion of Asian households pay more than 25% of their income on rent and have lower incomes remaining after rent payments.
- One-fifth of supported accommodation is let to BME households.
More than half of supported lettings to Black Caribbean and African households were to single homeless people.

A third of supported lettings to Indian and Bangladeshi households and half to Pakistani households were to women experiencing domestic abuse.

One-third of general needs lettings to BME households were made in London and a further third in the South-East, West Midlands and North-West regions – broadly reflecting the distribution of BME households in England.

---

The geography of housing association lettings to BME households broadly reflects their distribution in the population (Figure 1). Almost half (47%) of all BME households in England live in London and a further 30% live in the three regions of the South-East, the West Midlands and the North West. More than one-third of all general needs lettings to BME households are found in the London region (36%), and a further 35% are made to households in the South East (7.1%), the West Midlands (15.6%) and the North West regions (11.7%).

**Worklessness and social housing**

When compared to all households in England, Housing Association households (General Needs and Supported Housing) are more than three times as likely to be workless. This partly reflects Housing Association allocation policies which target
needy households among which are many unemployed. Across all regions Supported Housing has 10% to 15% higher levels of worklessness than General Needs. In part this reflects the high number of single households in Supported Housing. Excluding London, the national Labour Force Survey demonstrates a North/South divide with southern regions (East, South-East and South-West) recording lower levels of worklessness than northern (North East and North West) and midland (East Midland and West Midland) regions. A similar North/South divide is apparent for both General Needs and for Supported Housing. The highest percentage of worklessness is recorded for Supported Housing households in the East Midlands, closely followed by London. London has the highest levels of worklessness among both the national population and among General Needs households. The Labour Force Survey records a North/South divide in the distribution of working households with the highest percentages recorded in the southern regions, all of which exceed the national average. In contrast, the proportions of working households in northern and midland regions (with the exception of the East Midlands) are below the national average. The regional distribution of working households among General Needs and Supported Housing are rather more complex.
Although the North East has some of the lowest priced housing stock in the UK, there is significant variation in both the quality, cost and availability of dwelling stock at a sub-regional level. The region has a high proportion of terraced housing, particularly around major conurbations and former coalfield communities, where there is also a concentration of lower socio-economic groups. However in terms of housing aspirations, there is a shortage of detached housing and flats in many parts of the region. In relation to cost, whilst parts of the North East (Tees Valley in particular) have house prices that are considerably lower than the national average, this masks sub-regional property hotspots at the other end of the scale. Northumberland and other notable patches within or around the region’s conurbations are relatively unaffordable, with average house prices 7-9 times average household income.
22. Transport

Effective transport provision plays an important role in supporting the economic development of the region and in tackling social exclusion. As the North East Assembly’s recent report “Making Transport Work for the Region” (NEA 2007) states “Transport is important in all our daily lives. Getting transport right in North East England is important to the economy, the environment and people’s quality of life.” The following chapter therefore focuses on transport as a conduit to economic and social inclusion, summarising data on the transport profile of the North East focussing on regional commuting patterns in particular, as well as national studies into the link between transport access and social inclusion.

Transport profile of the North East

The transport profile of the North East in most areas is similar to the rest of England, with the exception of London. As is the case in most other regions, the people in the region are heavily reliant on the car as the main means of transport (NLP 2006).

Transport and employment: regional commuting trends

In terms of commuting patterns two main research projects have been undertaken in the region; by NERIP and by the Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies (CURDS). Both pieces of research have looked to understand changes in commuting and current commuting patterns in the North East, between the 1991 and 2001 census period.

The key findings are:

- The trend towards the decoupling of workplace and place of residence
- Longer commuting distances
- The influence employment centres have on commuting patterns
- The difference between the distance travelled and the volume of manual and non-manual commuter patterns – higher socio economic groups tend to commute longer distances
- Characteristics of commuters – the biggest commuter age groups are between the ages of 35 to 49 and 60 to 64
- Dominance of the car as the most common mode of transport of commuting
- 22% of workforce travelling to employment centres use public transport – even higher for employment centres in city centre location especially where there is access to the Metro
- The highest proportion of commuters over 35 in the whole region are from Alnwick, Tynedale and Castle Morpeth
County Durham has the greatest proportion of younger commuters, perhaps linking to recent graduates and student population

Tyne and Wear and Tees Valley average commuting distance is between 2 and 5 kilometres

Shorter commuting distances are particularly evident within Easington, the northern parts of Northumberland towards Berwick-upon-Tweed and Alnwick, Darlington and Hartlepool.

Longer commuting distances are found in Northumberland

Transport corridors and public transport provision have influenced past commuting patterns. Public transport provision should be considered in relationship to further jobs growth and employment sites to promote accessibility of employment within the City Regions, particularly in Tees Valley.

Based on Labour Force Survey data, the following chart illustrates the dependence on the car as the dominant form of commuting in the North East.

Figure 22-1 Main mode of transport to work by Government Office Region and country of workplace (October to December 2006)

Source Transport Statistics Great Britain 2007

Transport and social exclusion

Currently, the cost of the certain forms of transport puts them out of reach of the poorest groups in society. For example, analysis of the UK Family Resources Survey carried out by the Institute for Public Policy Research North (Reed 2008)
shows that 62% of the poorest fifth of households in the North East do not own a car or van (excluding households where all household members are aged over 75), compared with 36% of the poorest fifth of households in the South East and 29% in the East of England. As the report authors observe “while some households may not own a car simply because they prefer to use other means of transport to get around (particularly in urban areas), there is certainly some element of affordability driving these differentials in car ownership.” Further, given the high dependence on the car as a means of transport at a national and regional level, it is perhaps unsurprising that National Travel Survey statistics tell us “people in households without a car make fewer than half the number of journeys as those with a car” (The Poverty Site).

The accessibility of transport can also differ according to social group. There is limited data to illustrate trends at the local and / or regional level, but the following points are nevertheless broadly applicable:

- In spatial terms, where different localities are better or worse served by buses, trains or the road network, this can worsen or reduce inequalities. In general, rural households rely more on the car, own more cars, make more journeys over longer distances and spend more per week on motoring than those from more densely populated localities (Gray 2001). Gray also ‘cautiously’ estimates “that around a quarter of rural car journeys are entirely dependent on the car”. A number of reports have linked transport deprivation to difficulties for rural people accessing services alongside education, training and employment opportunities (Burgess 2008). The recent NEA report also “People commute very long distances from where they can afford to live to places where there is work and many of these people are dependent on a carefully orchestrated web of connecting services. When any operator changes the frequency, coverage or charges for that service, it can make it impossible for people to get to work. This is a particular problem for people living in rural areas and travelling to urban areas for work.” (NEA 2007)

- On an individual basis, some members of the population are less mobile than others and therefore may experience disadvantage in terms of the accessibility of transport. For example, the Social Exclusion Unit reported in 2003 that only around 10% or trains and 29% of buses then met the requirements of the 1995 Disability Discrimination Act.

- There is also a gender dimension to transport access. In 2006, 20% of women and 15% of men lived in households that did not have car. Thirty years ago, both these proportions were about twice as high. While the gap between men and women in terms household car ownership is only 5 percentage points, the gap in terms of who can drive the car is much larger, with 25% of men but 40% of women either lacking a car in their household or not having a driving license. These proportions, too, have both halved over the last thirty years. (2006 National Travel Survey, DfT, updated August 2007). Other regional reports have also explored the link between transport access and gender and have emphasised the important role it plays in opening up education and employment opportunities for women in the North East (Dobbs, Moore et al. 2004) and (O'Donnell, Biddle et al. 2007).
Summary

The transport profile of the North East in most areas is similar to the rest of England (with the exception of London), with the majority of the population reliant on the car as the main means of transport. However, a significant proportion (22%) of commuters to key employment centres in the region use public transport, particularly where Metro access is available. A number of studies have found evidence of link between transport access and deprivation: higher socio-economic groups tend to commute longer distances, with the poorest households least likely to have access to a car or van. People living in rural parts of the region are particularly dependant on the car as a means of transport and a number of studies have linked rural transport deprivation to difficulties in accessing key services, in addition to education, training and employment opportunities.
SECTION D: REVIEWING THE EQUALITY & DIVERSITY EVIDENCE BASE

In addition to providing a more comprehensive baseline understanding of equality and diversity issues in the North East, this research has also sought to highlight key gaps in the evidence base that would benefit from further research. In this final section, therefore, the following chapters:

- First, review findings from other studies that have focussed on the quality of the equality and diversity evidence base.
- Second, summarise and draw overall conclusions in relation to the knowledge gaps uncovered in this study.
- Third, examine planned improvements in the future that could address some of the issues raised.
- Fourth and finally, draw these findings together to summarise priority areas for action for the region in order to improve the equality and diversity evidence base in the future.
23. The Evidence Base in Context

In addition to providing a more comprehensive baseline understanding of equality and diversity issues in the North East, this research has also sought to highlight key gaps in the evidence base that would benefit from further research. This chapter explores the context to the research, focusing on the findings of previous reviews of the equality and diversity evidence base including the 2005 Shewell and Penn report and the findings of the 2007 Equalities Review.

Regional context

The inadequacy of the equality and diversity evidence base as both a measurement and policy tool is widely acknowledged. At a regional level, the previous review conducted by Shewell and Penn (2005) focused on this issue and identified the following areas as key knowledge gaps:

- Disability, where current information, such as benefit claimants and limiting long-term illness, only provide partial and tangential information.
- Mental health, where we have not found any regional information other than that inferred from national data.
- Refugees and asylum seekers: current information is very basic and more is needed on demographics.
- Travellers: the caravan count is extremely limited and exists to meet the needs of local authorities in managing official and unofficial camp sites, rather than to assist in meeting the needs of Travellers.
- Faith groups: the Census does not ask about Christian denominations.
- Offenders: more demographic information is needed.
- LGBT: minimal data, mostly inferred from national, international or other studies.

Their report also highlighted the limitations of the information currently gathered by the Census, commenting that:

“The following groups and characteristics are at present only measured in the region using Census information: ethnicity, religion, same sex couples and limiting long-term illness. Annual population estimates, which include age and gender, are based on the last Census. Because Census information is by nature self defined, its reliability is questionable in some areas. In particular, the number of carers and same-sex couples, and the extent of limiting long-term illness are likely to be understated. This would be a fruitful area for further research.”
Findings of The Equalities Review

More recently, at the national level, The Equalities Review (2007) also highlighted a number of deficiencies in UK equality data at present. In particular, it drew attention to the negative impact this has on effective policy making:

“Poor measurement and a lack of transparency have contributed to society and governments being unable to tackle persistent inequalities and their causes. The data available on inequality are utterly inadequate in many ways, limiting people’s ability to understand problems and their causes, set priorities and track progress. And even where data do exist, they are not consistently used well or published in a way that makes sense.”

Source: Fairness and Freedom (The Equalities Review 2007)

The final report of the Review, Fairness and Freedom, identified data quality issues across the measurement framework, in particular data coverage (including coverage across the UK and coverage of non-household groups within countries) and data quality (including inconsistencies in classification and use of proxy measures). Further, it emphasised the importance of data that would allow us to better understand and measure the ‘cascade’ effect, where disadvantage in one area of life sets off inequality in others. For example, low educational attainment, employment and health are all linked. In addition, the Equalities Review made a strong case for improvement to accessibility and presentation of equality data. Some of these points are covered in more detail below.

Gaps in data on equality groups

Whilst there are many official data sources that contain information to support evidence-based policy making, the Review found that significant gaps remain. In particular, many large-scale national surveys and administrative data sources do not collect and publish national statistics on key equality groups. It highlights the following examples:

- Data on education attainment and disability: At present, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) does not collect disability data, although it is committed to doing so. In addition, there is also a need for more detailed data, for example in the category of Special Educational Needs (SEN), and data by disability are also needed for the 16-19 age group.

- Data on education and socio-economic status. The use of ‘free school meals’ (FSM) as a proxy measure of pupils' socio-economic status is highlighted as problematic. It excludes children who may have this entitlement but who do not take it up and fails to reflect important ethnic differences in deprivation: for example, a Bangladeshi pupil not eligible for FSM is far more likely to be living in a poor household than a White British pupil who is not eligible for FSM.

- Data for the 16-19 age group. The quality of ethnicity data for the 16-19 age group is in stark contrast to the quality of data for school pupils. This is true of
young people engaged in further education as well as those who are not in education, employment and training. Likewise, there is a need for detailed data on disability, by type of disability, for this age group.

- **Data by sexual orientation are particularly poor.** There is no reliable source of data on this strand in Britain at the moment and it has been decided that the 2011 census will not include a question about sexual orientation. The Citizenship Survey is piloting questions on sexual orientation and it is expected that other surveys will soon incorporate civil partnerships as an option within questions about marital status. However, these will still cover only a small minority of lesbian, gay and bisexual people and will not tell us anything about transgender status.

- **In the case of healthcare,** investigation focuses on clinical purposes and socio-economic factors. Health inequality data are not collected in order to understand the impact on group inequalities. There is no continuous and systematic recording or analysis of ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation or religion or belief. An audit of primary care trust (PCT) race equality schemes found that only 13% of those with published schemes had evidence of efforts to monitor uptake of GP services, and 35% of primary care trusts offered no evidence of monitoring service use by various groups at all.

- **In the criminal justice system,** there are longstanding concerns about the disproportionate manner in which some ethnic groups are treated. Yet despite the requirements of the race relations legislation, the Review found that only 6 of the 42 Court areas had data on ethnicity which were even up to 80% complete. More than half produce no ethnicity data at all on important outcomes such as bail decisions and sentencing, which it is vital to monitor in order to determine whether criminal justice processes are fair or not.

In addition, the Review highlighted the need for more robust data on:

- People’s attitudes to equality, as well as about the creation and prevalence of stereotypes.
- Relationship between attitudes and behaviours, that is to say the disparities between what people think and what they actually do, is called for.
- Discrimination in the workplace and in other settings.
- Homophobic hate crime and hate crime against disabled people.

It also stressed the two significant gaps that exist in relation to the coverage of the data sources. Since all of these are based on household surveys, they exclude groups that are at high risk of inequality, such as homeless people, children in care and people living in communal establishments, such as residential care.
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homes, prisons or barracks. It highlighted the fact that a special data collection effort will be needed to cover such groups. The other gap relates to data on attitudes and autonomy and the Review makes the case for more work to investigate the best way of measuring socially conditioned expectations and free choice among key equality groups.

Lack of trend data and time inconsistencies in measurement was also a concern, along with the need for better local data and improved responsiveness to change. Dispersed data collection and poor information sharing also needed to be addressed, to combat the issue that official data collection can often be narrowly focused on individual outcome areas and on topics which are of recent policy interest. Governance structures can also work against effective sharing and collection of data. For example, devolved and different arrangements for collecting data can make it difficult to compare data between different departments and between England, Scotland and Wales. Improvements in data publication and dissemination are also called for.

**Concerns about improve data quality**

In terms of the quality of current data collection processes, the report focussed on:

- The need for better information on appropriate data categorisation. For example existing categories for collecting data on religion and belief do not include an adequate way of recording non-religious belief.

- The use of proxy measures and their accuracy in measuring inequality must be assessed. Examples are the use of country of birth as a proxy for ethnicity in health data and the use of eligibility for free school meals as a proxy for socio-economic status in education data.

- The collection of data on equality data is often characterised by poor response to questions on characteristics such as ethnicity, age and sexual orientation.

- Publication of equalities data is often done in a way that is difficult to understand, and in formats which are difficult to access.

**Review of equality data**

Following the publication of *Fairness and Freedom* (2007), an ONS-led review of equality data took place from June to September 2007. It was guided by a cross-Government task force with diversity and equality stakeholders drawn from eight Whitehall departments and the three devolved administrations. The starting point was a measurement framework proposed in the Cabinet Office-commissioned Equalities Review (February 2007) which included the following equality characteristics:

- gender
- transgender
- ethnicity
- disability
- age
- sexual orientation
- religion/belief
- socio-economic status

Overall, whilst the review of Equalities Data found that there is more equality information available than reported in the *Equalities Review*, in addition to a number of data developments already underway which will improve the evidence base further. However, it supported *Fairness and Freedom’s* assertion that there remain a number of significant gaps in equality information. In particular, the data review argued that the current lack of strategic coordination across stakeholders and data providers, particularly at a UK level, in building an equality evidence base has contributed to the current data gaps and inconsistencies.

Key issues identified included that where data is available it generally does not contain information on transgender, sexual orientation and religion/belief. Data for disability is also an issue for many sources. There was also concern expressed that the type of data collected currently is predominantly about outcomes. There is therefore insufficient data on processes and autonomy to fill the needs of a capability approach.
24. Review of the Regional Evidence Base

Based on thorough analysis of the evidence base generated during the course of this research project, the following chapter summarises the quality of regional data by individual target equality group. Note that this evidence base has been developed via a systematic approach to data interrogation as detailed in the introductory section on research methodology and is therefore, on the whole, a comprehensive profile of the region. However, due to the time limited nature of the study, the summary of regional equality data may represent a “snapshot” picture in some areas. First, this chapter summarises the quality of the evidence base uncovered during this research by the corresponding target population group. Second, the chapter highlights the broader data issues that have emerged during the research.

Target Population Group

Age
- Comprehensive demographic data is available to illustrate the region’s population breakdown by age via ONS. ONS has also done a series of future trend estimates at national and regional level which are readily available. Child and old age dependence ratios however are further useful indicators of the age structure, and the researchers could only find data at a national level in this respect.
- In relation to income, *The Pensioner’s Income Series* provides regional level statistics and the *2007 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation* offer additional data at local and SOA level.
- The *Health Survey for England*’s recent focus report on the health of older people provides a wide range of health indicators by age, some of which are available at regional level.
- At the other end of the age spectrum, there is limited data available on the issues facing the region’s young people, other than in relation to education and skills and to a limited extent, worklessness and income.

Gender
- In comparison to some categories, there is a wide range of data on gender at national, regional and local authority district level.
- This appears to be particularly the case in terms of educational attainment figures by gender (DfES), and economic activity levels, employment rates and earnings (Labour Force Survey and Annual Population Survey).
- However, recent studies carried out by Sheffield Hallam University exploring local labour markets illustrate the depth and quality of data that can be gained from further interrogation of public data sources. This is particularly useful in exploring sub-regional variations and trends in relation to women and the labour market.
**Ethnicity**

- ONS have recently released ‘experimental’ ethnicity statistics for each local authority in England, which whilst still in the testing phase, nevertheless are of significant value in helping to illustrate the scale of change since the Census figures were published.
- In terms of ethnicity and the labour market, the Annual Labour Force Survey provide good indicators of employment rates by broad ethnic group (although once again, further interrogation as carried out by SHU illustrates trends at sub-regional level).
- DFES School and Pupils data show diversity in region’s schools and is particularly useful as it measure the Gypsy / Roma pupil population, albeit at a regional as opposed to sub-regional level. Provision of comparable historical data (which the researchers were unable to locate) would further help to illustrate regional trends.
- Further DFES data illustrate variation in attainment levels by both ethnicity and gender, particularly at Key Stages 1, 2 and 3. Local Education Authorities also gather exclusion data by ethnic group but the researchers were only able to locate national level statistics in this area.

**Migrant Workers**

- The primary data sources providing information on the region's migrant worker population are the 2001 Census, Labour Force Survey, Worker Registration Scheme, National Insurance Number Allocations and International Passenger Survey statistics (the latter being less useful, particularly in the context of the North East). Taken together, these sources provide relatively rich data on the predominant nationalities of migrant workers in the North East.
- Ongoing analysis of Worker Registration Scheme data by Ian Fitzgerald at Northumbria University ensures availability of up to date, comprehensive statistics for the region and at sub-regional level.

**Refugees and Asylum Seekers**

- The majority of the data used in this report has been derived from reports published by the North of England Refugee Service and North East Consortium of Asylum Seekers and Refugee Service along with more recent Home Office statistics on numbers of asylum seekers in the region.
- Although this provides an overall picture of trends in terms of the nationality and dispersal patterns of the region’s refugee / asylum seeker population, as Shewell and Penn highlight, there is a need for more detailed information on these groups.
- In particular, a number of local mainly qualitative studies have examined the issue of the health needs of refugees / asylum seekers, so more data on health status at both regional and sub-regional level would be of value.
- Further, there is limited accurate data on failed and / or destitute asylum seekers, despite the fact this is a particularly vulnerable group. Numbers of resident refugees in the region are also difficult to estimate as once refugee status is granted, there is no recording system.
Gypsies and Travellers

- There continues to be a lack of reliable and comprehensive data on this group. Despite continued criticism of the Caravan Count, it remains the primary statistics source for measuring numbers in the UK and at local / regional level.

- The region’s local authorities are currently conducting Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments which once completed should address some of the data needs on this group. To date, however, only Durham County Council’s report was available to the research team.

- In terms of key focus areas for further research, based on the findings of other studies, more data on the health needs, education and employment patterns of this group would be particularly valuable. DfES statistics on a range of education and skills indicators are available at national level on this group but at present, regional / local data is only broken down as far as the “White Other” category (which includes Gypsy / Roma etc respondents but also includes any other White respondent who does not come under White British or White Irish).

Faith and Religion

- As highlighted in the report, measuring religious affiliation in the population remains a research challenge.

- Whilst the Census continues to provide the most valid, comprehensive source of data on faith, figures are currently 7 years out of date. Further, its focus on broad denominational groups, mean that trends within faiths go relatively unrecorded. More data on the various Christian and Muslim faith denominations would be particularly useful, in addition to the large section of the population with no religious affiliation.

- Using Tearfund and Church Census data, the researchers have been able to explore recent patterns in attendance along with attitudes to religion in more detail. But again, more disaggregation by denomination group and at sub-regional level would be useful.

Disability and Mental Health

- Measuring disability and mental health is complicated by their potentially subjective nature. Further, different standards of measurement are employed by different data sources which makes comparison of statistics on the disabled population difficult.

- Currently, the primary data sources are the Labour Force Survey, Family Resources Survey along with claimant data from the Department for Work and Pensions. However as above, these vary in their definitions of disability and therefore the data that they collect.

- In terms of mental health, whilst the Association of Public Health Observatories provides a range of data indicating prevalence at the regional level, this is based solely on the proportion of the population that has interacted with healthcare providers.
There is particularly little data on mental health and ethnicity at the regional level.

Finally, data to illustrate the educational and employment experiences of people with physical, sensory and mental impairments is a further noticeable gap in the knowledge base at present.

**Sexual Orientation**
- Data on the LBGT population is extremely limited at all geographic levels.
- This report draws on the findings of notable local studies, in particular by Stonewall, to illustrate some of the key issues faced by this community. However none of these are North East based.
- In terms of data, the report could only find national level statistics (primarily from the National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles) to indicate broad trends in sexual attitudes and behaviours.
- Some regional data is drawn from ONS statistics on Civil Partnerships in the North East, but of course this does not provide a full picture of the LGBT community as single people and couples who choose not to register are not included. The recent Stonewall report, Serves You Right (2008) offers enhanced data on the experiences of Britain’s LGB population but is based on a limited sample and not all data was available disaggregated by region.
- In summary, data on sexual orientation stands out as one of the main knowledge gaps at present. Whilst there are currently no plans to include questions in future Census questionnaires, the ONS Sexual Identity Project was established in 2006 to address user requirements for information on sexual identity and will hopefully address some of these issues.

**Carers**
- The main data sources for carers are the Census alongside Carers Allowance statistics and recent research studies have conducted further interrogation of this data.
- However, whilst general information is available at a regional and sub-regional level, particularly in terms of the health of carers, more local information on carers’ ethnicity and experiences of deprivation would be of value, particularly in the context of the region’s ageing population.

**Lone Parents**
- There is minimal updated data available since the 2001 Census on this group. For the purposes of this report therefore, the researchers focussed on analysis of claimant data to explore trends in terms of gender, ethnicity and so forth (which appreciably, gives only a partial picture of lone parents as a whole.)
- On this basis, further research that could yield more up to date data on this group would be beneficial.

**Offenders**
- Data on the region’s offenders is relatively limited and uni-dimensional.
At present, NOMS statistics detailing probation caseloads by policy force area and regional prison population by establishment, provide an indication of North East offenders in terms of numbers but offer limited insight into their health, education and employment status, or in terms of the longer-term impacts of having a criminal record. More research in these areas would be of value.

General Data Trends

In addition to concerns about the quality and availability of statistical evidence on individual target groups, there are some broader data issues worthy of mention:

- First, a number of mainstream data sources provide limited disaggregation at either a regional or sub-regional level. This makes it difficult to either gain an accurate picture of the situation here in the North East, or to make useful comparisons with the experience of other parts of England and/or the UK as a whole. Key examples where further geographic disaggregation would be of benefit include: health of older people; attainment and exclusion data (by gender and ethnicity); religious affiliation and attendance trends; prevalence/type of disability (including mental health).

- Second, whilst there is increasing understanding that multiple factors of deprivation impact disproportionately on some geographical areas and societal groups, much of the data available provides a uni-dimensional picture limited to one particular equality group or policy theme. Whilst a series of separate data sets can offer an indication of the prevalence of certain domains of deprivation in particular groups or areas (essentially the approach employed in this research project), meaningful comparison is complicated by the fact that they may be based on different sample groups or use different standards of measurement. In order to address this issue, provision could be improved by standardising data collection to include information broken down by ethnicity, age, gender and disability. In addition, improved consistency of data gathering and publication formats at sub-regional level by relevant agencies (local government, healthcare and education providers in particular) would further support this aim.

- Third, in terms of tracking the developments in equality and diversity since the previous review was carried out in 2005, many data sources have proved difficult to locate and/or access. Whether due to changes in the ownership of data at department or agency level, or changes in the type/definition or output styles of data collected, this makes it difficult for researchers or policy makers to identify equality trends over a defined period in time. Further, as highlighted in the Equalities Review, publication of equalities data is often done in a way that is difficult to understand, and in formats which are difficult to access.

Focus for future research

As emphasised at the start of this chapter, due both to the time limited nature of this research and the scope defined by the original objectives, a selective approach to data collection was essential. In particular, whilst Section C includes
some data on key equality indicators, this area would benefit from additional research. In particular, this would reflect the work currently ongoing at national level to develop data sets by which to measure progress in relation to the ten dimensions of equality. Appendix C represents an initial attempt to map the data provided in this report against these ten equality domains but there are some notable gaps in the knowledge base. Further areas for future research in order to support the region’s equality and diversity evidence base could focus on:

- **In terms of regional standards of living**, in addition to income and lifestyle data, this could include additional housing data, for example to measure geographical barriers to housing such as proximity to key services (GP surgery, supermarket, school and Post Office). It was also be valuable to look at available data on homeless people, children in care and people living in communal establishments, not picked up in traditional household surveys. Further, in terms of the overall living environment, the chapter on *Housing* covers some indicators of the quality of the ‘indoors’ living environment in the North East, such as condition of social and private housing, but future research could focus in the quality of the outdoors’ living environment.

- **In relation to participation, influence and voice**, this research has focused on indicators of social capital in the region as opposed to electoral participation. Additional research would be of value in order to interrogate data on voting trends in the region in addition to engagement in political parties and other forms of political participation.
25. Developing the UK Evidence Base: a look to the future

Whilst the concerns about the equality and diversity evidence base are well-documented, it must also be noted that there are a number of ongoing developments that will hopefully address some of the issues raised. This chapter looks at the future of the UK evidence base; examining developments to the 2011 Census questionnaire, then continues to consider planned improvements in the harmonisation and expansion of some key national level population surveys, plus newly emerging commercial data sources that may prove of value. It concludes with a summary of the work currently being undertaken by the Equality and Human Rights Commission to develop the Equality Measurement Framework.

Launch of UK Statistics Authority

In terms of improving the accessibility of statistics, the launch of the new UK Statistics Authority on 1st April 2008 is an important step. This is an independent body, with powers and the obligation to promote, improve, and safeguard official statistics across the UK. It also aims to rebuild public trust in Government statistics. The new Publication Hub (www.statistics.gov.uk) will be a one-stop shop providing statistics which are accessible, clear, and free from political commentary.

Census 2011

Following user consultation in 2005, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) launched a programme of question development and testing, to ensure that the 2011 Census meets as many user requirements as possible. New questions have been developed for topics where there is a new demand for information, and existing questions have been redeveloped to account for increasing or changing user requirements.

A series of four open meetings in England and Wales took place in March 2007 to share current thinking on the likely content of the 2011 Census questionnaire with a focus on ethnicity and identity questions in particular. The first major milestone in this development programme was the 2007 Census Test, where the newly developed questions were used on a large scale for the first time. The Census Test in England and Wales was held on 13 May 2007, and the questionnaires used were published in October 2006.

New questions being tested include:

- National identity - to allow respondents to record their English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish, Irish or other identity.
Income - to collect level and sources of income.

Language - to collect information on proficiency in English, Welsh, British Sign Language and other languages. In Wales, people will be asked about the frequency of their use of the Welsh language.

Second address - to identify the number of people with a regular second address and the purpose and frequency of its use.

Month and year of entry into the UK - to collect extra information about international migration.

Redeveloped questions being tested include:

- Illness and Disability - expanded to collect information on the nature of illness and disability.
- Marital or civil partnership status - expanded to include civil partnership equivalent for each marital status.

Each question included in the 2007 Census Test will be evaluated to assess the quality of information that can be collected and the public acceptability of the topic. The final questionnaire for the 2011 Census will include a selection of questions from the questionnaires used in the 2007 Census Test, some from the 2001 Census excluded from the Test and others developed through a programme of small-scale testing. The analysis of the 2007 Census Test will be used to inform this selection. Following the Test there will be a census Rehearsal in 2009, before the proposed questions are put forward to Parliament in 2009.

**Harmonisation programme**

The United Kingdom has a wide range of Government surveys that provide sources of social and economic information. The Census of Population is the largest and best known, but there are many others covering topics, such as economic activity, income, expenditure, food, health, education, housing and transport. Most of these are continuous household surveys. Others, covering topics such as crime, dental health and house condition, are repeated regularly. The Government also commissions single surveys from time to time on subjects of national importance, such as the prevalence of disability and mental ill health.

These surveys were designed at different times, to meet different needs, and have been commissioned by a range of departments. Consequently, the surveys were developed mostly in isolation from each other and this has resulted in a lack of cohesion. There are noticeable differences in terms of concepts, definitions, design, fieldwork and processing practices, or 'inputs', and also in the way results are released, or 'outputs'. In order to address these concerns, a cross-governmental programme of work is looking into standardising inputs and outputs, know as harmonisation. For several years, the ONS has led this programme of work and its long term aim is to make it easier for users to draw clearer and more
robust comparisons between data sources. Some key outputs from this programme are explored in more detail below.

**Integrated Household Survey**

During 2008, ONS will launch the new Integrated Household Survey (IHS) covering in the region of 220,000 households in total. The IHS brings together ONS-led continuous Government household surveys into one modular survey. This includes the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and its associated boosts, the General Household Survey (Longitudinal) (GSL), the Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS) and the Omnibus Survey (OMN). It will also incorporate the new English Housing Survey (EHS) formed from a merger of the English House Conditions Survey (EHCS) and the Survey of English Housing (SEH) collected on behalf of Communities and Local Government.

Once fully established, the IHS will collect a common set of Census type information and other key socio-demographic and labour market indicators via a core questionnaire module addressed to the whole sample. The core module will then be followed by one of five interview types containing different modules in combination which provide the detailed information collected by the existing surveys. The following equality domains will be covered in part sample modules of the IHS:

- **Health**: Long term health problems/disabilities (effects, characteristics and intensity); Past health problems/disabilities (characteristics and intensity) – (GLF interview);
- **Education**: current qualifications (type, level, number); current study (qualifications studied for, type of course, institution attended); Apprenticeships (and Modern Apprenticeships); Job-related training (in last 13 weeks, last four weeks, and last week); Characteristics of job-related training (on/off job, site, fees, reason for training, pay whilst training, time spent training, qualifications from training); Adult learning (taught or non-taught learning carried out in the last 3 years) - (WRK module, some also covered by GLF module);
- **Standard of Living**: gross earnings (main and second job), net earnings (main and second job) - (WRK module); equivalised income (LCF module); gross household income (GLF module);
- **Productive and Valued Activities**: employment characteristics and conditions (employed/self-employed, Government training scheme, manager, number of staff, full/part time, permanent/temporary, holiday entitlement, union representation, working from home, travel to work, sickness absence, working times and patterns, when started current job and how it was found) – (WRK module).

The following equality characteristics will be collected in the core module: age, gender, religion, ethnicity and socio-economic status (education level, income level, and occupational group) as well as marital status.
There are a number of issues and developments which are relevant for equality:

- **Income**: the size and complexity of the differences between the income modules on the LCF and GLF modules lend themselves to a longer-term development programme to consider harmonisation of income across these modules, which would also help the analysis of socio-economic data;

- **Non-private households**: there is increasing demand to expand survey coverage to include people in non-private households. One of the drivers for this comes from an interest in short-term migrants and others who could be contributing to the labour market. ONS will be taking forward work to look at communal establishments as part of its longer-term development of survey and population coverage, for planned delivery in 2009;

- **Census 2011 (England and Wales)**: the IHS core content is likely to be fixed for a 3-year period leading up to the 2011 Census (England and Wales), when some changes will be required to bring the two data sources in line with each other. ONS is also looking at linkage issues between the IHS and Census (England and Wales).

- In addition, the ONS sexual orientation development work is developing a line of questioning which can be used on existing ONS household surveys. This is a high priority project for ONS. Currently developmental work is underway to ensure that the questions are acceptable, reliable and provide information of reasonable quality/accuracy. Subject to the evaluation of the quantitative and qualitative tests, ONS would expect to include sexual orientation questioning on all modules of the IHS, phasing it in during 2008 starting with the Omnibus and one of the interview types which interviews more than one household member.

**The Disability Survey**

This new household survey is commissioned by the Office for Disability Issues (ODI) and will be developed and carried out by ONS. The survey will track people from the general population in Great Britain and chart their experiences of disability over time, collecting information to explore relationships between disability and a range of areas including work, education, income, transport, independent living, social participation and attitudes. Information from the survey will be used to inform work across and beyond Government. A significant amount of development work will take place to determine the survey design and content and the development will draw on input from disability organisations and disabled people.

The survey will aim to provide an insight into a number of disability issues, and a range of areas may be covered, including:

- Experiences of health and disability over time/disability dynamics and transitions;
- Different experiences of disability by sub-group;
- Disability prevalence rates;
The relationship between disability and work and incapacity;
- The relationship between disability and education;
- Income and the direct and indirect costs of disability;
- Benefit receipt and take-up (with a particular emphasis on the take-up rates for Disability Living Allowance (DLA) and Attendance Allowance (AA));
- Social participation and access;
- Attitudes towards disability;
- Issues around independent living, support and care.

The development and testing of the survey design will be undertaken during 2007/08 and 2008/09, with the survey fieldwork starting in April 2009.

**Newly emerging sources of data**

In addition to the standard social surveys mainly used in this report, there are a growing number of data sources generated as a result of social interactions or commercial transactions. Census data has been combined with other information, for example from the Electoral Register and the Land Registry, to provide profiles for small geographical areas that are increasingly being used in the commercial and public sector as powerful tool for understanding more about populations living in those areas.

Mosaic Public Sector, from Experian, classifies all households and postcodes in the United Kingdom into 61 types aggregated into 11 groups. So, for example, the tool can be used to complements the Indices of Deprivation by providing postcode level estimates of deprivation, identifying smaller areas of deprivation not captured by the Indices. In relation to ethnicity, Mosaic offers a classification tool that enables organisations to better understand the cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds of their citizens and customers, right down to postcode level. Further, in the future, analysis of new sources of data could yield further insights into the region. For example, commercial Loyalty Cards allow purchasing data to be linked to the customer profile information supplied on issue. Mobile phone records potentially provide a large about of data on social interactions.

**The Equality Measurement Framework**

As already mentioned, the final report of the Equalities Review was published in February 2007. This independent review was commissioned by the then Prime Minister to explore the causes of persistent discrimination and inequality in Britain. Following a programme of research and consultation, the Review proposed adopting an Equality Measurement Framework (EMF). This was underpinned by the international human rights framework, the theoretical capabilities approach developed by Sen (Sen 1985) and others,
Review, 2007) and extensive consultation with the general public and groups at particular risk of disadvantage and discrimination.

Three aspects of substantive freedom are identified by the EMF:

- the central and valuable things in life that people actually achieve (outcome measures);
- the degree of choice and control an individual has in achieving a desired activity (autonomy measures); and
- whether discrimination or some other barrier causes or contributes to inequality (process measures).

The EMF captures these aspects of equality among ten spheres of life, such as health or engaging in productive and valued activities, and disaggregates them by, at least, the six equality characteristics of: age; disability; ethnicity; gender; religion or faith; and sexual orientation.

One of the Equality and Human Rights Commission's (EHRC) duties under the Equality Act 2006 is to map the equalities landscape; identify changes in society that affect it and monitor progress in the areas of equality, human rights and good relations. A major tool to help with this is the EMF which the EHRC is developing further by refining the original capability list, which was for adults, and producing a new list for children. An audit of available data sources at national, regional and local levels is underway plus development of, and consultation over, a final list of 'spotlight' outcome and process indicators. These should be finalised by early 2009 and it is these spotlight indicators which will be populated with data in the first instance. They will form an integral part of the EHRC's first triennial report in 2010.

In addition, the Government Equalities Office (GEO) is conducting initial conceptual work on the development of autonomy and choice within the context of the measurement framework, with a view to defining practical measures of choice and autonomy in relation to relevant spotlight indicators. The EHRC is also exploring with its regional offices and with IDEA, the relationship between the EMF and other indicators and data that are available and used at regional and local level.
26. Summary

As the findings from this and previous studies have found, there continue to be significant gaps in the equality and diversity evidence base. Whilst the UK Statistics Authority appears to be working towards addressing some of the issues raised in this respect, there is concern that certain societal groups will continue to be unrepresented. This final chapter therefore summarises the priority areas for action in order to improve the equality and diversity evidence base, and suggests further issues for consideration at regional policy level.

Priority data gaps

The investigation carried out as part of this project suggests that the evidence base would particularly benefit from further research and/or improved data collection on the following target groups:

- **Refugees and Asylum Seekers**: available data is basic and there is a particular need for more information on failed and/or destitute asylum seekers and on numbers of resident refugees in the region.
- Data on **Gypsies and Travellers** continues to provide an incomplete picture of the regional community. More information on the health needs, education and employment patterns of this group. Along with trends in terms of the gender and ethnicity of the region’s Gypsies and Travellers would be particularly valuable.
- **Faith and Religion** would benefit from more data on the various Christian and Muslim faith denominations, in addition attitudinal data on the large section of the population with no religious affiliation.
- Standardisation of **Disability and Mental Health** definitions would improve the available evidence base, and there is a need for more information in terms of ethnicity and mental health, plus data to illustrate the educational and employment experiences of people with physical, sensory and mental impairments.
- There is minimal data available on the region’s **Lone Parents** and **Carers** since Census 2001, except in terms of numbers and characteristics of relevant benefit claimants. The 2011 Census should address this need however.
- **Sexual Orientation** data is extremely limited at all geographic levels, and as other studies have noted, there is particularly little data available on people with transgender status.
- Data on the region’s **offenders** is relatively limited and one-dimensional. More information on their health, education and employment status would be of value.

More broadly:

- There is currently a paucity of detailed data at the sub-regional level other than in Newcastle upon Tyne. The research carried out by Sheffield Hallam
University exploring local labour markets in this area offers an excellent example of the value of conducting additional analysis of available data sets in illustrating equality issues at the sub-regional level. Disaggregation of existing data to regional and sub-regional level in key areas of interest would also therefore add value.

- Increased harmonisation of data to allow greater understanding of the impact and prevalence of multiple-deprivation factors at local authority district level. In particular, improved consistency of data gathering and publication formats at sub-regional level by relevant agencies (local government, healthcare and education providers in particular) would further support this aim.

- Finally, there is no comprehensive source of regional data on attitudes to equality and diversity in the North East, particularly in terms of attitudes towards the key societal groups that have formed the focus of this research.

**Conclusion and way forward**

Despite some concerns that ongoing developments in the UK statistical evidence base will still fall short of addressing all the above issues, it is clear that over the next few years significant improvements will nevertheless be made. For policy makers using the data, *The Equalities Review* also provides a valuable framework via the ten dimensions of equality that can be used as basis by which to measure progress. In addition, there continue to be opportunities for regional stakeholders to further influence ongoing improvements in the evidence base:

**In the immediate term:**

- NERIP, One NorthEast and other members of the Equality and Diversity Evidence Base Task Group need to ensure that the findings from this research are publicised and disseminated effectively. This may mean provision of key findings in a variety of formats that will be accessible to the community at large.

- At the practical level, providers of equality data in the region can also play a valuable role in terms of working to ensure data collection is carried out consistently in their own organisations, in addition to communicating the value of data being collected to those involved in the process.

- Further, the North East Equality and Diversity Board should consider the implications of this research for future policy and practice at the earliest opportunity and take action as appropriate.

**In terms of future research:**

- Some of the knowledge gaps highlighted above will take action at national level to address. However there may be value in commissioning further research at the regional and local level. For example:
  - Further analysis of existing data, to disaggregate statistics at the regional and sub-regional level (for example, such as Sheffield Hallam’s work on local labour markets).
- More qualitative research to investigate experiences of and attitudes towards equality and diversity issues, for example in the fields of sexual orientation, disability and refugee and asylum seekers.

- Future reviews of statistical data for the region should focus on collecting information to illustrate the ten dimensions of equality highlighted in *The Equalities Review*.

**In relation to the potential policy impact of this research:**

- Nationally, Government is working on the production of a series of indicators by which they can measure progress in relation to the ten dimensions of equality. Based on the priority data gaps identified in this study, and the work of the Equality and Diversity Board’s Evidence Base Task Group in general, policy makers in the region must ensure they participate actively in that process where possible.

- Finally, whilst to date there are no plans by ONS to include questions on sexual orientation in Census 2011, there is widespread concern that alternative proposals will fail to address this major gap in the evidence base. Policy makers, service providers and other interested parties in the North East are therefore urged to monitor developments closely in this area, and where possible, maintain pressure at the national level for a more acceptable solution.
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