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Summary

Fawcett Society research has shown that the gender pay gap in Britain is shaped by racial inequality\(^1\). Women from different ethnic groups face different gender pay gaps. This briefing looks at pay data from the 1990s until the 2010s. Over that time most ethnic minority women have seen their incomes rise, both on their own terms and in comparison to men’s incomes. While gender and racial inequality remain major problems in the British economy we have made progress, though large ethnic gender pay gaps remain. Women from almost every minority ethnic group experience a pay gap with White British men. That full-time pay gap can range from a reversed gender pay gap of -5.6% for Chinese women in Great Britain to 19.6% for Black African women.

As well as this gender pay gap with White British men, pay by gender within the same ethnic group can vary widely. Women of most ethnic minority groups experience a gender pay gap when compared with men of the same ethnicity. Indian women experience the widest full-time gender pay gap of this type with Indian men of 16.1%, compared to 5.5% for the equivalent gender pay gap between Pakistani and Bangladeshi men and women. The exception is Black Caribbean women’s reversed gender pay gap with Black Caribbean men of -8.8%.

Chinese women in Britain have closed their gender pay gap with White British men to -5.6% but their gender pay gap with Chinese men has widened over the past decade from 4.6% to 11.5%. Pakistani and Bangladeshi women have the largest gender pay gap of all. Their aggregate (full and part-time) gender pay gap with White British men today stands at 26.2%.


Fig. 1 - Full-Time Gender Pay Gap with White British Men by Ethnicity (2010s)
Only White Irish women in Great Britain (not Northern Ireland) enjoy a pay premium over White British men in both respects, probably because the White Irish population in Britain is older and occupies a more senior position in the labour force.
The pay gap is narrowing but at very different rates.

Progress on closing the gender pay gap varies significantly by ethnic group with White Irish women seeing the most significant progress over the last thirty years, with their full-time gender pay gap with White British men narrowing by over 25 percentage points and Black African women the smallest narrowing of fewer than two percentage points. White women who aren’t British or Irish are the only group who have seen their gender pay gap with White British men widen since the 1990s from 3.5% to 14% today. This is largely because the composition of this group has changed over time but today it is mostly comprised of Central and Eastern European migrant women.
The Government has stated that closing the gender pay gap is a policy priority. But it is important to consider how that gender inequality is experienced by different ethnic groups to ensure that all women in Britain see their gender pay gap closed. It is a complex picture and requires action to address a number of issues, and we provide a number of recommendations in the report;

collecting the data, increasing low pay, ensuring care is valued, tackling multiple discrimination, and making sure all women can experience career progression.

Introduction

Britain is not just a country that experiences gender inequality but also racial and ethnic inequality. Discrimination and disadvantage on the basis of these identities, and others, cross over or ‘intersect’ with one another to create complex inequalities for women in different socio-economic-cultural situations. Considerable research has been conducted to analyse how these intersectional inequalities are expressed in terms of women’s economic status, including through pay. Research published by Fawcett has also explored the underlying experiences that drive these inequalities.

However, up-to-date quantitative evidence on the economic disadvantage of ethnic minority women as expressed by differences in income from pay is not currently available. This lack of new data often means that ethnic minority women and their disadvantage are invisible in debate about the gender pay gap.

For this reason, Fawcett together with Professor Yaojun Li at the University of Manchester conducted an analysis of Labour Force Survey data from the 1990s to the present. This briefing is a summary of that analysis.

What is the Ethnic Gender Pay Gap?

The gender pay gap is the average difference in hourly pay between men and women and is the headline statistic for representing women’s economic inequality. The gap can be measured by either the median or the mean average. Fawcett calculates it using mean average hourly earnings excluding overtime.

The mean gap for all full-time men and women in 2016 is 13.9%, according to the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings. The figure for all men and women – also known as the aggregate and including the 42% of working women in part-time work, which is lower paid by the hour – is 18.1%.

---


4 Others methods include the median equivalents for both figures – Fawcett prefers the mean gap as it captures the fact that the highest end of the pay scale is dominated by men, which is part of the economic reality of inequality.

5 11% of men in work are working part-time according to the Annual Population Survey 2016

6 Office for National Statistics, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2016, Provisional Results, (2016). This data refers to mean hourly pay gaps excluding overtime. Fawcett uses the same comparison throughout this briefing.
The equivalent earnings gap in 2015 for full-time men and women from the Labour Force Survey, which is the basis for this report, is 13.2%, and the aggregate gap is 17.7%. This is in line with other studies which have found a slightly smaller pay gap when using the Labour Force Survey. This report uses the Labour Force Survey data.

The overall gender pay gap is caused by a combination of factors: the unequal impact of caring roles and a lack of support for mothers’ career progression; a divided labour market in terms of skills and occupational segregation of women into more low-paid work; outright discrimination against women; and the over-representation of men at the top of the pay scale and women at the bottom. All of these factors, due to varying kinds and degrees of direct and indirect discrimination, alongside cultural norms, in turn shape the different ethnic gender pay gaps for different groups. This report highlights the gaps for different groups and the context surrounding them, but it does not attempt to explain them entirely.

The pay gap is complex and there are many different factors which influence it. For example, the parents of 73% of Black children, 72% of Pakistani children and 64% of Bangladeshi children take up the Government’s free 3-4-year-old childcare places in contrast to the parents of 89% of white children. The same report also indicated only 23% of ethnic minority parents had used informal/family childcare over a six-month period compared to 36% of white parents, indicating ethnic minority mothers are doing the lion’s share of their childcare. We would therefore expect these groups to experience different gender pay gaps, but neither this nor any single factor alone is the sole cause of different levels of pay for ethnic minority women.

Unlike the gender pay gap, there is no one single figure for the gender pay gap of all BME groups. Rather than having a generic “ethnic minority pay penalty” from being a member of an ethnic minority in Britain, we need to look at the individual characteristics of each group in order to better understand pay inequality.

This study focuses on two ethnic gender pay gaps – the gender pay gap relative to men of the same ethnicity, and the gender pay gap relative to White British men. We refer to the former as the internal ethnic gender pay gap, and the latter as the external ethnic gender pay gap. Each measure considers a different aspect of multiple disadvantages. The internal pay gap focuses on the impact of gender on pay within an ethnic group. The external pay gap tells us how women of different ethnic groups are disadvantaged relative to White British men, who are often thought of as the default group in British society and the labour market, that is, who are the most highly represented group at the top of business and public life, and who are the largest of all groups in work discussed in this briefing. Both numbers are needed for a complete picture of the gender pay gap for each group.

The role played by low pay is significant here for some groups in particular. Pakistani and Bangladeshi women experience some of the lowest pay so their gender pay gap with White British men is very large at 26.2%. But the gap between Pakistani and Bangladeshi women and men is just 5.5%, indicating that Pakistani and Bangladeshi men are trapped in low paid work as well.

Conversely, and although this lies outside the scope of this briefing, just because a group enjoys high average pay does not mean that pay equality has been achieved. Highly qualified and skilled groups such as Chinese
men might still be being underpaid relative to their skills even if they are highly paid, if they are experiencing discrimination or occupational segregation.

The Government’s McGregor-Smith Review recently observed that ending ethnic minority inequality at work in Britain would boost the economy by £24 billion a year. The Review concludes that the difficulties ethnic minority women in particular experience from progressing in work are a waste of their talent, and drain their skills and full participation in British life as equal citizens.

**Methodology**

The Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) survey is the Government’s preferred source of earnings data. However, as that dataset is based on a sample of PAYE tax records, it does not record the ethnicity of earners: in terms of demographics it records only their gender and age.

This report uses data from the Office for National Statistics’ Labour Force Survey (LFS). All data reported is for Great Britain only. Data is reported for men aged 16-65 and women aged 16-63, the working age population for most of the period, and excludes full-time students. In order to ensure consistency data is reported from 1992 onwards, when the LFS assumed its current quarterly form with income weights applied, through to 2015. This analysis treats individuals working over 30 hours per week as working full time. The part time gap has not been included as many sample sizes are too small to be significant, especially the number of ethnic minority men in part-time work.

Income data is GDP deflated to a base year of 2015, so hourly income figures are in real terms compared with overall domestic production, rather than indexed to the price level in any specific year.

That the data is divided by calendar decade from 1992-2015 means it is only possible to draw conclusions about the relative rates of growth between groups, not the absolute rate of growth. For example, it is possible to say that Indian women’s pay growth has been higher than White British women’s since the 2000s but not that White British pay stagnated from the 2000s to the 2010s.

The ethnic groups included here are: White British; White Irish; White Other; Black Caribbean; Black African; Indian; Pakistani/Bangladeshi; and Chinese. Other ethnic groups recorded in the Labour Force Survey data such as people of mixed ethnic backgrounds and Arab people either do not have a large enough sample size, or are too heterogeneous, to draw reliable estimates or conclusions.

For some of these groups, there are not enough survey respondents to carry out year-by-year analyses of ethnic gender pay gaps, so this briefing presents pay gaps using average pay for the 1990s, for the 2000s, and for the 2010s, for both the internal and external pay gaps. Graphs of hourly pay by decade are presented in the text, and the raw hourly pay data is set out in the appendix.

Furthermore, these figures are all averages, and each group will include high and low income individuals whose experiences will vary, potentially dramatically, from the representative and average figure this briefing captures. Additionally, not everyone will necessarily remain attached to one given identity, and in some cases the ethnicity individuals identify with may change across any given timeframe.13

---

While all pay gaps are for Great Britain, employment rates, which are used to provide context, are from the 2011 Census on England and Wales unless otherwise stated. These figures pertaining to economic status can be found in graph form in the appendix. Scotland has a small ethnic minority population of 8%14 so we do not expect its omission to significantly change the picture presented by the evidence included here. White British is presented first as the comparator, followed by the different ethnic groups in alphabetical order.

---

14 From the Scottish Census 2011, sum of all non-Scottish and non-Other British ethnicities [http://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/documents/censusresults/release2a/rel2asbfigure2.xls](http://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/documents/censusresults/release2a/rel2asbfigure2.xls); the equivalent figure for England and Wales (all non-White British) is 19.5%, and Scottish ethnic minorities make up 4% of the national total of ethnic minorities via Census 2011 chart DC2101EW
The different pay inequalities women in Britain face are immediately clear. Some groups such as Chinese and White Irish women have narrow or even reversed gender pay gaps compared with White British men, while Pakistani and Bangladeshi women still face yawning economic inequality relative to White British men. Although most groups see a narrowing in their gender pay gaps over time, some groups such as Black African women and White Other women have seen the gap widen since the 2000s.
Both White British men and women saw significant growth in their hourly pay from the 1990s to the 2000s, followed by a slower rate of growth in the 2010s. White British women have narrowed the aggregate and full time gender pay gaps over the entire period, but they still face substantial pay inequality relative to White British men.

White British is the largest ethnic group in the UK at 81.9% of the population in 2011, 15 and changes to white British contribute substantially to changes in overall statistics on the labour market and the gender pay gap. For example, 54% of all women are in work or looking for work, and 54% of White British women are; likewise, 38% of all women economically active (defined as all those in work or looking for work) are working part time, similar to the 40% of White British women; and 7% of all women are unemployed compared to 6% of White British women. The internal and external gender pay gaps for White British people are of course identical.

Black African men and women continue to face substantial pay inequality in Britain, and this experience has worsened over the past decade. Black African women have seen low pay growth in both full and part-time work.

Black African women experience a number of labour market disadvantages. 13% of Black African women have never worked, compared to 4% of White British women. 9% of Black African women are unemployed, compared to 3% of White British women. While 8% of Black African women are engaged in unpaid care work at home, similar to White British women at 6%, unpaid caring is why 25% of all economically inactive Black African women are economically inactive, compared to 14% of White British women. Separate evidence indicates this might be a particular issue in the Somali community, as only 10% of British Somali women are in work.\(^\text{16}\) Only 10% of Black African women are in intermediate occupations (e.g. paramedics, police officers, bank staff) compared to 20% of White British women, and they are under-represented at higher occupational levels too. However, 23% of all Black African women are students, the second highest of any group of women in this paper, suggesting grounds for optimism for the longer term prospects of Black African women.

---

The picture for Black Caribbean men and women is complex. Unlike the pay gap for Black African people in Britain, the Black Caribbean internal pay gap has disappeared as black Caribbean women have overtaken Black Caribbean men, and turned into a significant reverse gender pay gap for those in full time work in the 2010s. Likewise, even though progress on narrowing the aggregate gender pay gap with White British men has stagnated over the past decade, despite the full-time gap continuing to close, both pay gaps Black Caribbean women have with White British men are smaller than the equivalent figures for White British or Black African women.

Looking solely at hourly pay obscures the inequalities Black Caribbean people face, however. Although Black Caribbean women have high rates of working full time (55% of those economically active work full time compared to 51% of White British women compared to 27% of White British women) and have the second highest representation in well-paid lower managerial and professional occupations (25%, compared to 22% of White British), they face difficulties outside of paid work. Unemployment amongst Black Caribbean women is 6%, compared to White British women’s unemployment rate of 3%. Black Caribbean women are on average in a strong position when in work, but they are more likely than average to be excluded from the labour market.
Additionally, the external gender pay gap is in part driven by a generational cohort effect. The Black Caribbean population is older than average, so they are all else being equal more likely to hold more senior and well paid positions. For example, while 7% of White British women were aged 40-44 and another 7% were aged 45-49 in 2011, 10% of Black Caribbean women were aged 40-44 and 12% were aged 45-49 in the same year. This means they might still be experiencing discrimination or low pay as black women once you control for their seniority and skills, but it is not possible to prove or disprove this with this data.

The reasons for the low and reversed internal gender pay gap become clear when considering the labour market disadvantages faced by Black Caribbean men. 11% of Black Caribbean men are unemployed, the highest of men of any ethnicity and compared to 5% of White British men. Black Caribbean men are also under-represented in better paid occupations (7% and 15% are in higher and lower managerial and professional positions, compared to 14% and 20% of White British men) and over-represented in poorly-paid routine occupations (16% compared to 13% of White British men and 8% of Black Caribbean women).
In contrast, Chinese women face a narrow external gender pay gap and a much wider internal pay gap, though the rate of change over the past twenty-five years differs. Full-time Chinese women now earn more than their White British counterparts as well as having a smaller internal pay gap. Chinese incomes for both men and women also continued to grow quickly from the 2000s through to the 2010s, unlike some other groups.

Chinese women are likely to work full-time (59% of those economically active compared to 51% of White British women), and have a small economic activity gap with Chinese men (5 percentage points compared to 9 for White British men and women). Slightly low levels of activity for Chinese men and women appear to be driven by the high numbers of those in higher education – 36% of all Chinese men and 32% of all Chinese women are in higher education. However, the internal pay gap has risen quickly since the 2000s, suggesting that Chinese women are being left behind by high income growth of Chinese men (both aggregate and full time) in Chinese households.
Indian women in Britain have a similar pattern to Chinese women – a small gender pay gap with White British men, and a much larger internal gender pay gap. Indian men and women have seen slightly faster growth in incomes than White British men and women over the last three decades. In the 2010s, Indian men in Britain on average earn more than White British men, and Indian women earn more than White British women.

The small external gap is driven largely by an above average representation of Indian people in higher paying professional occupations – 11% of Indian women are in top professions like medicine and law, compared to 6% of White British women. Additionally, 58% of economically active Indian women are in full-time work, compared to 51% of White British women.

However, Indian women have a comparatively high gap in economic activity with Indian men (14%, compared to the White British gap of 11%, meaning a very high 76% of Indian men are economically active), and 27% of Indian women who aren’t economically active are engaged in unpaid care at home, high relative to the White British figure of 14% (10% of all Indian women, compared to 6% of all White British women). This and the high internal gender pay gap suggests that despite their high average hourly pay Indian families may face different challenges balancing care and work equitably than other groups in the UK.
The economic inequality experienced by Pakistani and Bangladeshi women can clearly be seen. Although the internal pay gap is very narrow, averaging around 4-5% from the 1990s onwards, the external pay gap, especially the aggregate external gap, remains very large despite consistent but slow narrowing.

This is a reflection of the low incomes for both Pakistani and Bangladeshi women and men. Men from these groups are by far the most likely to be working part-time, with of the economically active population 27% of Pakistani men and 37% of Bangladeshi men working part-time, compared to 11% of White British men. Part-time work is still predominately low paid, and one in four low paid men works part-time in 2017, far more than was the case twenty years ago. Pakistani and Bangladeshi male unemployment is also high, at 7% and 8% compared to 5% of White British men. Both of these indicate high underemployment alongside low hourly wages of Pakistani and Bangladeshi men.

37% of Pakistani and 35% of Bangladeshi economically active women work part-time. This figure is similar to the figure for White British women at 44%. Unemployment is however much higher, with 6% of Pakistani and Bangladeshi women unemployed, compared to 3% of White British women, and only 4% and 3% of both groups who are in employment are in top managerial positions compared to 6% of White British women. Most importantly, though, far fewer Pakistani and Bangladeshi women are in the labour market. Only 37% from both groups are economically active, compared to 57% of White British women, and while only 6% of

---

White British women are doing unpaid care work in the home, 30% and 31% of the entire populations of Pakistani and Bangladeshi women in Britain are.

Despite their large size, the ethnic gender pay gap figures for Pakistani and Bangladeshi women understate the economic inequality they face, as they miss that a very high proportion of women from these groups are working unpaid in the home. There are signs that this is changing and more women from these groups are entering the labour market at a faster rate, but in the near future it is likely that the economic gender inequality they experience will remain substantial due to a complex mix of class, cultural and religious factors. More broadly, Pakistani and Bangladeshi people should not be used as a proxy for Muslim inequality, as only 53% of Britain’s Muslims are Pakistani or Bangladeshi.

18 Fawcett Society Evidence to the Women and Equalities Committee Employment opportunities for Muslims in the UK inquiry March 2016
20 Census 2011; For more analysis by Fawcett on Muslim women’s economic inequality in Britain, see: Evidence from the Fawcett Society, Women and Equalities Select Committee inquiry into Employment Opportunities for Muslims in the UK 2016
White Irish women in Great Britain (data for Northern Ireland was not included in the LFS ethnic gender pay gap figures) were the only group that saw all of their gender pay gaps effectively close, and three out of the four of them reversed. Unlike White British women, White Irish women’s pay growth has remained strong and has outpaced White British and White Irish men’s pay since the 2000s.

White Irish women are much more likely to work full-time than White British women, at 59% of those economically active compared to 51%, and they have the lowest unemployment rate of any of the groups of women surveyed, at 2%, and the lowest percentage of those economically inactive doing unpaid care work at home, at 4%. White Irish women in Great Britain are disproportionately likely to be in higher paid managerial and professional jobs (9% compared to 6% for White British women) and lower managerial roles (29% compared to 22% for White British Women and 21% of White Irish men). This is perhaps partly driven by a generational shift as like Black Caribbean women Irish people in Britain are much older than the rest of the population – 24% of White Irish women are aged 50-65 compared to 18% for the rest of the population, while 15% of are aged 20-35 compared to 20% of the population. Career progression could therefore play a role in Irish women’s higher pay. Separate research shows that Northern Ireland also has a small full time gender pay gap, with a gap of 4.3%, but with much lower average hourly earnings. While mean hourly pay for White Irish men in Great Britain is £17.40 and for women it is £18.04, in Northern Ireland male mean hourly pay is £14.82 and mean female hourly pay is £14.19.  

The White Other group includes all people in Britain who identify as white but not as British or as Irish. This category therefore includes a range of experiences. The White Other internal gender pay gap narrowed since the 1990s, the gender pay gap with White British men has widened significantly, especially in full time work. This is because White Other people’s pay overall has fallen relative to White British pay, and White Other men’s pay has fallen faster than White Other women’s pay. Rather than individual women seeing their pay fall, this is more likely to be due to changes in the composition of White Other over the course of the three decades, including increased migration from the European Union, especially Eastern Europe, from 2004 onwards.

Women in the White Other group were the most likely group to be economically active (71%, compared to 57% of White British women), though a relatively large proportion of those inactive are at home doing unpaid care work (30% of those inactive, compared to 14% of White British women). White Other women though are the most likely group to be in full time work (62% of those economically active are, compared to 51% for White British women). They are also more likely to be in better paid higher managerial and professional jobs than White British women (10% vs 6%), and less likely to be engaged in intermediate jobs such as clerical and secretarial roles (12% vs 20%), but more likely to be engaged in routine occupations (13% vs. 10%). This fits with what we know about the economic of migration in Britain, that we see a polarisation of migrant labour into very high and very low skill jobs.22

---

Recommendations and Conclusion

On the basis of the diversity of experiences and inequalities shown in this report, we recommend a rethink of women’s economic inequality in Britain. The different ethnic gender pay gaps that women in Britain experience are complex and are a reflection of racial as well as gender inequality.

Although this report does not aim to explain how all the ethnic gender pay gaps should be closed, we have some initial recommendations informed by our wider work. We also echo and support the conclusions of the McGregor-Smith review.

Collect the data
The Government should aspire to close not just the headline gender pay gap of 13.9%, but the gender pay gaps experienced by women of different ethnicities, accounting for age. The ONS should calculate and release these figures on a regular basis alongside the gender pay gap data released in ASHE.

Increase pay for the lowest paid
Many of those women experiencing the largest ethnic gender pay gaps are working in some of the lowest paid jobs. Raising pay levels for the lowest paid is vital if we are to make any significant progress on closing the gap for those women. The National Living Wage should be set at Real Living Wage levels and replace the National Minimum Wage as the legal minimum rate of pay in the UK.

Address the unequal impact of caring roles
The unequal impact of caring roles is a major cause of the gender pay gap regardless of ethnicity. Enabling more fathers to spend time caring for children, increasing the availability of flexible working and supporting mothers to return to work are key steps that we have to take in order to close the pay gap for all women. However, some women are particularly likely to be out of the labour market because they are caring. Black African women and Pakistani and Bangladeshi women in particular are carrying out a significant amount of unpaid care work. Take up of formal childcare amongst Pakistani and Bangladeshi women is particularly low. This affects their ability to participate in the labour market and is a contributing factor to the large gender pay gap that they experience. Together with improving pay levels, increasing the take up of formal childcare amongst this group is key to enabling Pakistani and Bangladeshi women to enter the labour market.

Tackle multiple discrimination
Section 14 of the Equality Act 2010 addresses dual discrimination, i.e. that experienced on the basis of someone’s combined or dual identity. However, this section has not been commenced. For example, it is not possible for a Pakistani woman to claim that they have been discriminated against on the basis of their true identity, just one element of it (i.e. sex or race discrimination, not both combined). The law does not respond to the reality of people’s lives and identities and this gap in our legal protection must be addressed.

Ensure progression for a diversity of women
The lack of minority ethnic women in management or leadership roles is another major contributor to the gender pay gap. Diversity of leadership and decision-making is key and good for organisational performance. Identifying and enabling a pipeline of a diverse range of women to the top of organisations should form part of any strategy to close the gender pay gap.

## Appendix

### Fig. 15 – Gender Pay Gaps by type:

#### Internal Ethnic Gender Pay Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani/Bangladeshi</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### External Ethnic Gender Pay Gap (White British Men)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani/Bangladeshi</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fig. 16 – Hourly pay by ethnic group

#### Men’s Hourly Pay Excl. Overtime (£)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>14.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>17.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>14.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>16.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani/Bangladeshi</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>11.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>17.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Women’s Hourly Pay Excl. Overtime (£)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>16.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>12.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>11.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani/Bangladeshi</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Full-time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>15.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>13.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>17.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani/Bangladeshi</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>18.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>18.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>12.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>14.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani/Bangladeshi</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>16.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 17 - Economic Activity of 16+ Men by Ethnic Group England and Wales 2011
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[Bar chart showing economic activity by ethnic group for 16+ men in England and Wales 2011.]
Fig. 18 - Economic Activity of 16+ Women by Ethnic Group England and Wales 2011
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Fig. 19 - Occupational Group of 16+ Men by Ethnic Group England and Wales 2011
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Note these Census figures are for age sixteen onwards – explaining why student representation is so high.
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