

Counting the 21st century children of Britain: the extent of advantage and disadvantage

Danny Dorling^a, Ben Wheeler^b, Mary Shaw^c and Richard Mitchell^d

^a *University of Sheffield, UK*; ^b *University of Bristol, UK*; ^c *South West Public Health Observatory, University of Bristol, UK*; ^d *University of Edinburgh Medical School, UK*

The individual Sample of Anonymised Records (SAR) was used from the 2001 Census to investigate the life circumstances of children in turn-of-the-millennium Britain. The numbers of children in the SAR, and by inference, the country, living in conditions of relative disadvantage or social exclusion are calculated, described and debated. The study also considers those children living in conditions of relative advantage, circumstances that are not often measured but are equally important if we want to understand how the first new populations of the 21st century are growing up. It was found that in 2001, approximately one-third of all children were experiencing two or more markers of disadvantage, such as overcrowded housing, long-term illness or living in a household with no adults in paid employment. Conversely, around 15 per cent of children experienced two or more indicators of advantage, such as living with adults in high-status, well-paid jobs, or in households with access to two or more cars. In relating these measures of advantage and disadvantage to children's ethnicity and religion (the latter collected for the first time in the 2001 Census), some startling variations were found. For example, half of Muslim children (compared to 29 per cent of all children) scored two or more on the indicator of multiple disadvantages, as did 59 per cent of children of African/Black African ethnicity. Similarly, while 15 per cent of all children scored two or more on the indicator of multiple advantage, only 8 per cent of Muslim and 6 per cent of African/Black African children did so. Other findings included that: children living on the 5th floor or above of a building, compared to those living on the 4th floor or below, were eight times as likely to live in overcrowded conditions, four times as likely to live in a household with no paid employment, three times as likely to be a lone-parent household, and seven times as likely to be of black or minority ethnic group.

Introduction

Children have long been used to promote the need for social science. For whom otherwise do social sciences and in particular the UK Academy of Social Sciences 'strive to build a better world' (David & Glasner, 2006, p. 1)? Who else will constitute almost all of 21st century society? Before looking at issues of great theoretical complexity, or to society as a whole, or abroad, perhaps now is a good time for UK social sciences to look again at children in Britain and to ask just how much we know of their lives, life chances, opportunities and inequalities.

This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Twenty-First Century Society: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences* (doi: 10.1080/17450140701325873). This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not contain final published proof-corrections or journal pagination.

The year in which we write this is the 10th anniversary year of the declaration of the Children's Bill of Rights:

Children are the future of our species. How a society treats its children is a direct reflection of how that society looks at its future. (Preamble: The Children's Bill of Rights (1996) (available at <http://www.newciv.org/ncn/cbor.html>)

The government's laudable, and widely supported, targets of halving child poverty by 2010, and eliminating it altogether by 2020, demonstrate that targeted policies aimed at improving the lives of our children are recognised as necessary. However, these targets are now unlikely to be met (Evans & Scarborough, 2006), and it has been estimated that in order to meet them an additional £28 billion would have to be added to planned annual spending (Hirsch, 2006).

Despite this attention being given to child poverty, there has been little quantification of the characteristics - good and bad - of the lives of children in the UK. For example, a recent study of social exclusion conducted for the government using the British Household Panel Survey excluded children from consideration (Taylor, 2005). The most recent comprehensive report on children produced by the Social Exclusion Unit was in March 2000 (NSRN, 2000).

Article 18 of the Children's Bill of Rights suggests that adults have the obligation to provide children with information from several different sources and that those children have the right to have reality presented to them in a balanced and accurately representative fashion. In the UK, although a cohort of babies born at the start of the new millennium is being followed up, to date they are very young and we are just beginning to learn from them about the contemporary lives of children in this country (CLS, 2006).

The largest social survey of children in Britain is the national census, carried out every 10 years. In Britain and internationally children are actively included in the census at school project (NTU, 2006). However, the last major official report focusing on children was released prior to the latest census data becoming available (National Statistics, 2002). This report (The Social Focus on Children) highlighted very simple, mostly univariate, summary statistics and did not have census data available to look in more detail at what happens most to which children, where and when in their lives and thus with what possible implications.

Despite these limitations, the social focus on children did collate some interesting and useful information from various sources about children in Britain around the year 2000 (National Statistics, 2002). It found, for example, that nationally one in eight children belong to a minority ethnic group, but in London this figure is one in three. Approximately one in five children lived in one-parent families, nearly double the rate 20 years previously. One in four lived in social rented housing, and one in 10 were living in overcrowded conditions. An advantage of a report such as the social focus is that in using data from a variety of sources, it is able to comment on a wide range of issues. For example, the report found that one in five children were in low-income households; since income data are not collected by the census, we are unable to look at this important issue.

Even greater detailed information about children is available from the large-scale cohort studies, the most significant of which in recent years are the Millennium Cohort Study mentioned above (CLS, 2006) and the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC), or 'Children of the 90s' as it is commonly known (ALSPAC, 2006). These cohort studies collect and provide massive quantities of information about relatively small

samples of children, much of which is used for epidemiological and developmental research.

However, the intention of this study is different and given that smaller sample surveys and cohort analysis is not most appropriate here. We are interested in the extents of advantage of disadvantage across the lives of all children in Britain and how those extents have been recorded. To address this aim we have conducted a relatively simple analysis of the 2001 Census to gain a detailed understanding of a snapshot of the circumstances in which children live in contemporary Britain. The census is the most comprehensive social record available to us, and very nearly achieves its goal of counting every single person in the UK. In a world of social science where increasingly complex and innovative methods are valued, there is still a valuable role played by simple descriptive statistics. This is especially the case with analysis of census data, which, due to its massive coverage, is necessarily simple in the issues it addresses, compared to other social surveys.

Method

Children were not encouraged to fill in the 2001 Census form although a few forms will have been completed by them. Thus the census is a record of households that contains information on children almost exclusively completed by proxy, in most cases completed by one of their parents or parent. Nevertheless, along with a small number of other official documents (birth certificates, health records) the census form is one of the few consistently recorded pieces of information completed for all children in Britain.

In order to understand the multi-dimensional life circumstances of children in 2001, we have used the Sample of Anonymised Records (SARs) from the census, rather than 100 per cent aggregated statistics. The SARs are a series of samples of records from the decennial UK census. These samples provide detailed information from a small percentage of census returns for individuals, households and small areas, allowing more detailed, multivariate analysis than that which is possible using aggregated tabulations of all census returns (CCSR, 2004; Li, 2004). This study uses the individual SAR from 2001, an approximately random sample of around 3 per cent of the individuals enumerated in that year's census. This is a relatively small sample, but still equates to around 1.76 million people, far larger than any sample survey.

The confidentiality of information provided to the census by individuals is critical, and is also legally mandated. The SARs are made possible through removal of all identifying information (address, date of birth and so on) for each individual, grouping of certain data items (such as age), and careful procedures to ensure that no individual for whom data is available in the SAR could be identified. These procedures include a degree of perturbation, with some values changed deliberately, introducing a certain amount of error into the data. However, these changes are unlikely to have any substantive effects on findings (CCSR, 2004). A recent analysis indicates some slight differences in proportions found using the SAR compared to 100 per cent census counts, but these are unlikely to affect findings in this paper. For example, the study found that ethnic group proportions in the SAR vary slightly from the 100 per cent counts, but no values were more than 0.2 per cent out, with most differences less than 0.05 per cent (CCSR, 2005).

For the analyses presented below, the individual SAR data for children aged under 16 at the time of the census (29 April 2001) were used. In order to set the analyses in the context of the entire population, some values were grossed up using the appropriate sampling proportion for each country (these vary very slightly from 3 per cent). For each child in the sample, indicators were created based on standard census variables.

This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Twenty-First Century Society: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences* (doi: 10.1080/17450140701325873). This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not contain final published proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Indicators of disadvantage/social exclusion:

1. 5th Floor: Child lives in a dwelling where the lowest floor is the building's 5th floor or above
2. Overcrowded (occupancy): Child lives in a household where the occupancy rating (bedroom standard) indicates that number of rooms is less than that required
3. Overcrowded (density): Child lives in a household with 1 or more persons per room
4. Limiting long-term illness (LLTI): Child has an LLTI
5. Poor health: Child's general health over the previous 12 months rated as 'not good'
6. Young carer: Child provides care for relative or friend for 1 or more hours per week (because they are elderly or suffer from ill health or a disability)
7. No employed adults in household
8. Low social grade household: Household reference person is in social grade E (unemployed, receiving benefits)
9. Household carers: Household includes one or more people providing informal care
10. Shared amenities: Household does not have exclusive use of bath/shower/toilet
11. Shared dwelling: Household shares dwelling
12. No car: Household has no access to a car or van
13. Low qualifications: Household measure indicating low or no qualifications held by any member of the household
14. Lone parent family: Child is part of a lone parent family

Indicators of advantage:

1. 2+ cars: Child lives in a household with access to 2 or more cars
2. Under-occupied: Household has less than 0.5 persons per room living in 5 or more rooms
3. Owned home: Home is owned outright (not mortgaged)
4. High social class: Family reference person is in National Statistics Socio-economic Classification 1 or 2 (managers and higher professionals)

Additionally, the relationship between ethnicity and religion, and some of these measures was investigated.

Just as with other academic studies we tend to focus on the negative and what is possibly not going well in children's lives. One reason for this is that the census does not ask many questions about positive aspects of life, for example, holidays, friends, happiness or hope. It is not inconceivable that such questions will be asked in future decades or in other ways but at present the census is largely a tool used for measuring what appears to be lacking and so highlights the same in the lives in Britain's children.

Results

Table 1 supports the assertion that the SAR is a good representation of the entire census population. For selected variables, percentages and grossed counts from the SAR are compared with those available from aggregate census output, which is comparing the 3 per cent sample with the 100 per cent census from which it is taken. For example, the proportion of children living in a household without access to a car is 17.43 per cent based on the SAR, and 17.44 per cent based on the 100 per cent census count.

Table 1. Comparison of selected statistics for children aged under 16 from the individual Sample of Anonymised Records and 100% census counts, UK, 2001

| Indicator | Number in UK from grossing up SAR | Number in UK from census aggregate output | % [95% CI] from SAR | % from aggregate output |
|-----------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| All children aged under 16 | 11,729,998 | 11,807,189 | | |
| Lives on 5th floor or above | 43,425 | 44,420 | 0.37 [0.35, 0.39] | 0.38 |
| Limiting long-term illness | 502,355 | 514,331 | 4.30 [4.24, 4.37] | 4.36 |
| Overcrowded (occupancy) | 1,449,488 | 1,462,368 | 12.37 [12.27, 12.48] | 12.39 |
| No car | 2,043,231 | 2,059,181 | 17.43 [17.31, 17.56] | 17.44 |
| Lone parent family | 2,700,684 | 2,730,715 | 23.13 [22.99, 23.27] | 23.13 |

Table 2 gives the numbers and percentages of children in the SAR for each indicator of disadvantage/social exclusion. While some of the indicators are very similar (e.g. the two overcrowding measures), these figures illustrate that they are measuring slightly different things. The percentages cover a wide range, from less than 1 per cent to over 30 per cent, indicating that some aspects of disadvantage are only experienced by a small (but still significant) proportion of children, whilst others are relatively common.

In order to obtain an indication of children experiencing multiple aspects of deprivation or social exclusion, a number of the indicators were selected and summed for each child (with each indicator counting as 'one'). To avoid double-counting where indicators are closely related, only one was selected, for example, overcrowding based on occupancy not density was used. The count of children by multiple indicator score is presented in Table 3.

Table 3 concerns multiple deprivation and social exclusion, rather than an indicator of child poverty that is uni-dimensional. To interpret Table 3 it should be considered how the distribution it shows compares with official figures and estimates on child poverty. There are a range of methods by which 'child poverty' can be measured; one commonly accepted method is the percentage of children living in households with less than 60 per cent of median household income.

Table 2. Numbers and percentages of children in the Sample of Anonymised Records across various indicators of disadvantage or social exclusion, UK census 2001

| Indicator | Number in SAR | % [95% CI] of all under 16s in SAR | Number in UK from grossing up SAR |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| All children aged under 16 | 367,781 | | 11,729,998 |
| Demographic | | | |
| Child lives in a lone parent family | 84,702 | 23.13 [22.99, 23.27] | 2,700,684 |
| Socioeconomic | | | |
| Low social grade household | 26,712 | 7.28 [7.19, 7.36] | 849,969 |
| No car | 64,118 | 17.43 [17.31, 17.56] | 2,043,231 |
| No employed adults in household | 67,592 | 18.38 [18.25, 18.50] | 2,155,358 |
| Low/no qualified household | 118,837 | 32.31 [32.16, 32.46] | 3,796,918 |
| Housing | | | |
| Shared dwelling | 619 | 0.17 [0.16, 0.18] | 19,607 |
| Shared amenities | 826 | 0.22 [0.21, 0.24] | 26,372 |
| Lives on 5th floor or above | 1,365 | 0.37 [0.35, 0.39] | 43,425 |
| Overcrowded (density) | 34,223 | 9.31 [9.21, 9.40] | 1,091,168 |
| Overcrowded (occupancy) | 45,507 | 12.37 [12.27, 12.48] | 1,449,488 |
| Health & Care | | | |
| Provides care 1+ hours per week | 3,416 | 0.93 [0.90, 0.96] | 108,863 |
| General health 'Not good' | 4,186 | 1.14 [1.11, 1.18] | 133,471 |
| Limiting long-term illness | 15,756 | 4.30 [4.24, 4.37] | 502,355 |
| Household includes 1+ carers | 65,710 | 17.87 [17.74, 17.99] | 2,095,246 |

Table 3 Distribution of children in the SAR by multiple indicator of disadvantage score (see text)

| Number of indicators of disadvantage | Number of children in SAR | % of children in SAR | of children in SAR | Cumulative % of children in SAR | Number in UK (from grossed up SAR) |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 0 | 166,254 | 45.2 | 100 | 5,300,134 | |
| 1 | 95,107 | 25.9 | 54.8 | 3,035,711 | |
| 2 | 45,533 | 12.4 | 28.9 | 1,452,576 | |
| 3 | 31,235 | 8.5 | 16.5 | 996,096 | |
| 4 | 22,792 | 6.2 | 8 | 726,941 | |
| 5 | 5,997 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 191,050 | |
| 6 | 771 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 24,563 | |
| 7 | 88 | 0.0 | 0 | 2,802 | |
| 8 | 4 | 0.0 | 0 | 127 | |
| 9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | |

Note: Indicators summed (each counting as '1'); Lives on 5th floor or above; overcrowded (occupancy); limiting long-term illness; general health 'not good'; provides care 1þ hours per week; no employed adults in household; shared amenities; no car; low/no qualified household; lone-parent family.

This figure for 2000/1, as used in the Department of Work and Pensions' 2005 report on Households Below Average Income, which in turn was derived from the Family Resources Survey, was 30 per cent (DWP, 2005). Note that this differs from the figure of 21 per cent in the social focus on children report mentioned in the introduction; this was derived from an earlier DWP report. Although this income-based measure poverty is conceptually different to the indicator of multiple deprivation above, the proportion is about the same as that of children scoring at least 2 in Table 3 (29 per cent).

Contrasting with the figures presented above are those for children living in relatively advantaged circumstances. Table 4 details the numbers and percentages of children across the indicators of advantage as described above. A 'multiple advantage' score analogous to the multiple disadvantage score above was calculated, and the distribution of under-16 year olds across this measure is presented in Table 5.

Table 4. Indicators of advantage: children aged under 16 in the Sample of Anonymised Records, UK census 2001

| Indicator of advantage | Number in SAR | % [95% CI] of all under 16s in SAR | Number in UK from grossing up SAR |
|--|----------------------|---|--|
| Lives in home owned outright | 31,850 | 8.66 [8.57, 8.75] | 1,016,191 |
| Family reference person in NS-SeC 1 or 2 | 50,043 | 13.78 [13.67, 13.89] | 1,596,893 |
| Lives in under-occupied household | 71,020 | 19.31 [19.18, 19.44] | 2,267,064 |
| Lives in household with 2+ cars | 146,728 | 39.90 [39.74, 40.05] | 4,682,055 |

Table 5. Distribution of children across the multiple advantage score

| Number of indicators | Number of children in SAR | % of children in SAR | Number in UK from grossing up SAR |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 0 | 166,596 | 45.3 | 5,310,028 |
| 1 | 125,168 | 34.0 | 3,993,854 |
| 2 | 55,717 | 15.2 | 1,778,266 |
| 3 | 18,161 | 4.9 | 579,588 |
| 4 | 2,139 | 0.6 | 68,264 |

These Tables show that, for example, about 2000 children in the SAR score positively on all four advantage indicators, equating to approximately 70,000 children across the UK. Similarly, Table 5 shows that around 580 000 children across the UK are estimated to enjoy three of the advantageous circumstances listed in Table 4.

Table 6 shows the distribution of the advantage and disadvantage indicators by age group amongst under-16 year olds. This shows that there is little added protection, as we might expect, for the youngest (and most vulnerable) children, and no escape from multiple deprivation with ageing. It is possible that social protection mechanisms for the very young are responsible for the decline from 50 per cent of 0–1 year olds scoring zero on disadvantage to 43 per cent for 10–15 year olds. However, it is also possible that a disproportionate number of children aged 0–1 live in single child households, and hence are less likely to be overcrowded.

Table 6. Multiple indicators of advantage and disadvantage by age group

| Number of indicators | Babies (age 0-1) | | Toddlers (age 2-3) | | Aged 4-9 | | Aged 10-15 | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % | Number | % | Number | % |
| Indicators of Disadvantage | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 20,967 | 50.4 | 21,134 | 48.2 | 62,171 | 44.7 | 61,982 | 43.3 |
| 1 | 9,214 | 22.2 | 10,222 | 23.3 | 36,205 | 26.0 | 39,466 | 27.6 |
| 2 | 4,411 | 10.6 | 4,747 | 10.8 | 17,061 | 12.3 | 19,314 | 13.5 |
| 3 | 3,300 | 7.9 | 3,767 | 8.6 | 11,993 | 8.6 | 12,175 | 8.5 |
| 4 | 2,840 | 6.8 | 3,066 | 7.0 | 9,046 | 6.5 | 7,840 | 5.5 |
| 5+ | 846 | 2.0 | 886 | 2.0 | 2694 | 1.9 | 2434 | 1.7 |
| Indicators of Advantage | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 19,023 | 45.8 | 20,367 | 46.5 | 64,891 | 46.6 | 62,315 | 43.5 |
| 1 | 13,551 | 32.6 | 14,463 | 33.0 | 47,029 | 33.8 | 50,125 | 35.0 |
| 2 | 6,600 | 15.9 | 6,686 | 15.3 | 20,215 | 14.5 | 22,216 | 15.5 |
| 3 | 2,197 | 5.3 | 2,086 | 4.8 | 6,309 | 4.5 | 7,569 | 5.3 |
| 4 | 207 | 0.5 | 220 | 0.5 | 726 | 0.5 | 986 | 0.7 |

The census asked people to allocate themselves to an ethnic group; approximately 43,000 children in the SAR are from black and minority ethnic groups (that is, allocated ethnicity other than white/white British), equating to around 12 per cent of all children under 16. The 2001 Census also asked, for the first time, for each person's religion. Tables 7 and 8 demonstrate the distribution of children from two selected religious/ethnic groups across the indicators of disadvantage and advantage. More detailed Tables considering other ethnic and religious groups are presented in Tables A1 and A2 in the appendix.

Based on these figures, 50 per cent of Muslim children in Britain are subject to two or more of the aspects of disadvantage, compared with the figure of 29 per cent for all children. Similarly, 55 per cent of all children enjoy one or more of the aspects of advantage considered here, whilst this figure for Muslim children is 37 per cent. The differentials between all children and those of African/Black African ethnicity for the disadvantage/advantage indicators are even greater: 59 per cent and 28 per cent respectively.

Both the children of families of Muslim religion and of African/Black African ethnicity are much more likely to be the children of relatively recent immigrants, and hence to grow up in a poorer housing situation. However, immigration itself does not necessarily imply that - the largest group of children aged 0-15 by immigration status in Britain were born in Germany, followed by the United States. There are more immigrant children from those two countries combined than from all three countries of the Indian subcontinent and South Africa combined (Thomas & Dorling, 2007).

Logistic regression analysis of the data was used to calculate bivariate odds ratios for the indicators of disadvantage and social exclusion. These enable comments to be made about relationships between the indicators for particular groups of interest, and full results are presented in Table A3 in the appendices. The figures show that, for example, children who are carers are: 24 per cent more likely to live in overcrowded households; more than twice as likely to have an LLTI and/or poor general health themselves; nearly twice as likely to live in a household where nobody is in employment and 32 per cent more likely to live in a lone-parent household, than children who are not carers.

Children who live on the 5th floor or above are: 6.7 times as likely to be of black or minority ethnic group (compared to white/white British); 8.4 times as likely to live in an overcrowded household (based on the occupancy rating measure); 4 times as likely to live in a household where nobody is in employment; 6 times as likely to live in a household with no access to a car; 2.9 times as likely to live in a lone-parent household; and 8.6 times as likely to share their dwelling with one or more other households, compared to children living below the 5th floor.

Conclusion

Many of the children counted by the census in 2001 are those who will be the subjects of targets to reduce child poverty by 2010 and to eradicate it altogether by 2020.

Table 7. Comparison of the multiple disadvantage indicator score for all children in Great Britain, those with religion stated as Muslim and those with ethnicity stated as Black African (England and Wales) or African (Scotland)

| Number of disadvantage indicators | All children in GB | | % of children with religion stated as Muslim | | % of children with ethnicity stated as African/Black African | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | Number of children | % of children in GB | Number of children with religion stated as Muslim | % of children with religion stated as Muslim | Number of children with ethnicity stated as African/Black African | % of children with ethnicity stated as African/Black African |
| 0 | 161,150 | 45.3 | 3,529 | 21.4 | 773 | 17.2 |
| 1 | 91,808 | 25.8 | 4,775 | 29.0 | 1,077 | 24.0 |
| 2 | 44,035 | 12.4 | 3,738 | 22.7 | 922 | 20.6 |
| 3 | 30,148 | 8.5 | 2,402 | 14.6 | 782 | 17.4 |
| 4 | 21,859 | 6.2 | 1,427 | 8.7 | 583 | 13.0 |
| 5 | 5,717 | 1.6 | 522 | 3.2 | 291 | 6.5 |
| 6 | 731 | 0.2 | 76 | 0.5 | 51 | 1.1 |
| 7 | 79 | 0.0 | 7 | 0.0 | 5 | 0.1 |
| 8 | 4 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |

Note: Northern Ireland is excluded here as questions on ethnicity and religion were different and do not allow these groups to be investigated.

Table 8. Comparison of the multiple advantage indicator score for all children in Great Britain, those with religion stated as Muslim and those with ethnicity stated as Black African (England and Wales) or African (Scotland)

| Number of advantage indicators | All children in GB | | % of children with religion stated as Muslim | | % of children with ethnicity stated as African/Black African | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | Number of children | % of children in GB | Number of children with religion stated as Muslim | % of children with religion stated as Muslim | Number of children with ethnicity stated as African/Black African | % of children with ethnicity stated as African/Black African |
| 0 | 161,019 | 45.3 | 10,335 | 62.7 | 3,225 | 71.9 |
| 1 | 121,198 | 34.1 | 4,616 | 28.0 | 970 | 21.6 |
| 2 | 53,639 | 15.1 | 1,308 | 7.9 | 251 | 5.6 |
| 3 | 17,606 | 5.0 | 194 | 1.2 | 37 | 0.8 |
| 4 | 2,069 | 0.6 | 24 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.0 |

Note: Northern Ireland is excluded here as questions on ethnicity and religion were different and do not allow these groups to be investigated.

Taking poverty in its widest sense - that of exclusion from the norms of society and experiencing material deprivation and hardship - the figures presented in this report show that the disparities amongst children living in 21st century Britain are stark. Given

such levels of inequality, it is perhaps unsurprising that under current policies the 2020 target is generally regarded as not likely to be met.

The differences between children of different ethnic and religious groups, both in terms of indicators of advantage and disadvantage, are profound. In a time when British society is desperately trying to establish and understand the meanings and impacts of ethnic and religious diversity, institutional racism and mass religious prejudice, the magnitude and nature of disparities in advantage and disadvantage between different groups is crucial to understand and acknowledge.

The children of 21st century Britain will be the most measured and surveyed children of all time. Cohorts of them are being traced forward in time. Scores of administrative records concerning their welfare are being scanned to detect the slightest rise or fall in a plethora of equality measures of outcome and opportunity. This is the CCTV generation who will grow up under the glare of social analysis as much as in the lens of the authorities' cameras. This is the generation for whom the targets of 2010, 2015 and 2020 have been set. The 2001 Census shows clearly that the playing field is so skewed, their starting positions so differentiated, that we should not express surprise when report after report in the near future fails to show even the most imaginative of policy interventions breaking the general trend. It is also certainly the case that without such policy interventions inequalities in advantage and disadvantage between the 21st century children of Britain would grow even wider. However, if we cannot reduce those inequalities here, it is hard to express optimism more widely.

Of course, all we have done here is show a snap shot. This snapshot can only be reliably compared over time when the 2011 Census is released. In the years until then a plethora of other sources will be useful. Cohorts are invaluable but are by definition stuck in time - the millennium cohort will only really tell us about millennium children: those born shortly after the turn of the century. Administrative records will only capture those children whom they administer. Annual censuses of state school pupils exclude the more advantaged who are privately educated and so do not allow us to compare the lives of all children living in this country. The census provides only a snapshot, but it is the most valuable snapshot we have. If you like, it is a school, nursery and toddler group photograph of the class of April 2001. The next snapshot is scheduled to be taken in less than five years from now. When we compare that with this, what do you think we will find?

Acknowledgements

This work is based on the SARs provided through the Centre for Census and Survey Research of the University of Manchester with the support of ESRC and JISC.

References

- ALSPAC (2006) The Avon longitudinal study of parents and children. Available online at: <http://www.alspac.bristol.ac.uk/welcome/index.shtml> (accessed 12 July 2006).
- CCSR (2004) User guide to the SARs. Version 3, 9 November (Manchester, Cathie Marsh Centre for Census and Survey Research). Available online at: <http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/sars>.
- CCSR (2005) Comparisons between proportions in the 2001 Individual Licensed SAR and the 2001 aggregate tables. Available online at: <http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/sars/2001/quality/confidence/index.html> (accessed 30 September 2005).
- CLS (2006) The millennium cohort study (The Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education). Available online at: <http://www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/studies.asp?section?000100020001> (accessed 12 July 2006).
- David, M. E. & Glasner, P.E. (2006) Editorial introduction, *21st Century Society*, 1(1), 1–4.
- DWP (2005) Households Below Average Income (HBAI) 1994/5–2003/4 (London, Department of Work and Pensions). Available online at: <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/hbai.asp> (accessed 30 September 2005).
- Evans, M. & Scarborough, J. (2006) Can current policy end child poverty in Britain by 2020? (York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation).
- Hirsch, D. (2006) What will it take to end child poverty? Firing on all cylinders (York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation).
- Li, Y. (2004) Samples of Anonymized Records (SARs) from the UK Censuses, *Sociology*, 38(3), 553–572.
- National Statistics (2002) Social focus in brief - children. Available online at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/Product.asp?vlnk?9274> (accessed 12 July 2006).
- NSNR (2000) Report of Policy Action Team 12: young people. National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal. Available online at: <http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/page.asp?id=47> (accessed 12 July 2006).
- NTU (2006) Census at school (Nottingham, Nottingham Trent University). Available online at: <http://www.censusatschool.ntu.ac.uk> (accessed 12 July 2006).
- Taylor, M. (2005) Multiple disadvantage in Britain: analysis of the British Household Panel Survey (1997–2003). Available online at: <http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/trackdoc.asp?id=795&pld=658> (accessed 12 July 2006).
- Thomas, B. & Dorling, D. (2007) *People, places and identity* (Bristol, Policy Press).

Appendix

Table A1. Comparison of the multiple disadvantage and advantage indicator scores for all children in Great Britain*, and by ethnic group**

| | All children in SAR in GB | | African/Black African | | Bangladeshi | | Caribbean/Black Caribbean | | Chinese | | Indian | | Pakistani | |
|--|---------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|------|---------------------------|------|---------|------|--------|------|-----------|------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Number of disadvantage indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 161,150 | 45.3 | 773 | 17.2 | 341 | 10.2 | 654 | 18.6 | 487 | 38.0 | 3,412 | 46.0 | 1,922 | 24.0 |
| 1 | 91,808 | 25.8 | 1,077 | 24.0 | 894 | 26.8 | 793 | 22.6 | 413 | 32.2 | 2,346 | 31.6 | 2,595 | 32.4 |
| 2 | 44,035 | 12.4 | 922 | 20.6 | 946 | 28.4 | 762 | 21.7 | 225 | 17.6 | 1,019 | 13.7 | 1,819 | 22.7 |
| 3 | 30,148 | 8.5 | 782 | 17.4 | 677 | 20.3 | 650 | 18.5 | 87 | 6.8 | 412 | 5.6 | 986 | 12.3 |
| 4 | 21,859 | 6.2 | 583 | 13.0 | 355 | 10.7 | 501 | 14.3 | 51 | 4.0 | 191 | 2.6 | 518 | 6.5 |
| 5 | 5,717 | 1.6 | 291 | 6.5 | 105 | 3.2 | 135 | 3.9 | 16 | 1.3 | 36 | 0.5 | 140 | 1.8 |
| 6 | 731 | 0.2 | 51 | 1.1 | 12 | 0.4 | 12 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.1 | 19 | 0.2 |
| 7 | 79 | 0.0 | 5 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 |
| 8 | 4 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 355,531 | 100 | 4,484 | 100 | 3,331 | 100 | 3,511 | 100 | 1,282 | 100 | 7,421 | 100 | 8,002 | 100 |
| Number of advantage indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 161,019 | 45.3 | 3,225 | 71.9 | 2,674 | 80.3 | 2,338 | 66.6 | 500 | 39.0 | 2,894 | 39.0 | 4,432 | 55.4 |
| 1 | 121,198 | 34.1 | 970 | 21.6 | 565 | 17.0 | 927 | 26.4 | 495 | 38.6 | 2,871 | 38.7 | 2,729 | 34.1 |
| 2 | 53,639 | 15.1 | 251 | 5.6 | 81 | 2.4 | 216 | 6.2 | 220 | 17.2 | 1,281 | 17.3 | 756 | 9.5 |
| 3 | 17,606 | 5.0 | 37 | 0.8 | 11 | 0.3 | 30 | 0.9 | 61 | 4.8 | 331 | 4.5 | 75 | 0.9 |
| 4 | 2,069 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 0.5 | 44 | 0.6 | 10 | 0.1 |
| Total | 355,531 | 100 | 4,484 | 100.0 | 3,331 | 100 | 3,511 | 100 | 1,282 | 100 | 7,421 | 100 | 8,002 | 100 |

Notes: *Northern Ireland is excluded here as the ethnic group question was different and does not allow comparable groups to be investigated.

**Ethnic groups were collected/recorded slightly differently in Scotland, as compared to England and Wales, so the groups here have been combined where possible for Great Britain as a whole (e.g. 'Black Caribbean' (England and Wales) combined with 'Caribbean' (Scotland)).

Table A2. Comparison of the multiple disadvantage and advantage indicator scores for all children in Great Britain*, and by religion**

| | All children in SAR in GB | | Buddhist | | Christian | | Hindu | | Jewish | | Muslim | | Sikh | |
|--|---------------------------|------|----------|------|-----------|------|-------|------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Number of disadvantage indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 161,150 | 45.3 | 175 | 32.5 | 113,351 | 50.0 | 1,729 | 48.6 | 937 | 67.6 | 3,529 | 21.4 | 1,172 | 45.3 |
| 1 | 91,808 | 25.8 | 160 | 29.7 | 59,379 | 26.2 | 1,107 | 31.1 | 277 | 20.0 | 4,775 | 29.0 | 827 | 31.9 |
| 2 | 44,035 | 12.4 | 85 | 15.8 | 24,844 | 11.0 | 463 | 13.0 | 102 | 7.4 | 3,738 | 22.7 | 352 | 13.6 |
| 3 | 30,148 | 8.5 | 58 | 10.8 | 15,649 | 6.9 | 179 | 5.0 | 46 | 3.3 | 2,402 | 14.6 | 138 | 5.3 |
| 4 | 21,859 | 6.2 | 39 | 7.3 | 10,518 | 4.6 | 61 | 1.7 | 21 | 1.5 | 1,427 | 8.7 | 79 | 3.1 |
| 5 | 5,717 | 1.6 | 17 | 3.2 | 2,669 | 1.2 | 15 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.1 | 522 | 3.2 | 20 | 0.8 |
| 6 | 731 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.6 | 333 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 76 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.1 |
| 7 | 79 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.2 | 38 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 8 | 4 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 355,531 | 100 | 538 | 100 | 226,783 | 100 | 3,557 | 100 | 1,386 | 100 | 16,447 | 100 | 2,590 | 100 |
| Number of advantage indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 161,019 | 45.3 | 262 | 48.7 | 93,480 | 41.2 | 1,385 | 38.9 | 312 | 22.5 | 10,335 | 62.7 | 973 | 37.6 |
| 1 | 121,198 | 34.1 | 169 | 31.4 | 81,273 | 35.8 | 1,340 | 37.7 | 458 | 33.0 | 4,616 | 28.0 | 1,056 | 40.8 |
| 2 | 53,639 | 15.1 | 79 | 14.7 | 37,908 | 16.7 | 624 | 17.5 | 392 | 28.3 | 1,308 | 7.9 | 457 | 17.6 |
| 3 | 17,606 | 5.0 | 25 | 4.7 | 12,675 | 5.6 | 182 | 5.1 | 184 | 13.3 | 194 | 1.2 | 95 | 3.7 |
| 4 | 2,069 | 0.6 | 3 | 0.6 | 1,447 | 0.6 | 26 | 0.7 | 40 | 2.9 | 24 | 0.2 | 9 | 0.4 |
| Total | 355,531 | 100 | 538 | 100 | 226,783 | 100 | 3,557 | 100 | 1,386 | 100 | 16,447 | 100 | 2,590 | 100 |

Notes: *Northern Ireland is excluded here as the religion question was different and does not allow comparable groups to be investigated.

**Religion was collected/recorded slightly differently in Scotland, as compared to England and Wales, so the groups here have been combined where possible for Great Britain as a whole (e.g. 'Christian' (England and Wales) combined with 'Church of Scotland', 'Roman Catholic' and 'Other Christian' (Scotland)).

Table A3. Bivariate odds ratios from logistic regression models between pairs of disadvantage indicators, along with the 'not white/white British' ethnic group indicator.

| | floor5 | overcrow | ppr_1up | lltill | poorhlth | carer | notwb |
|----------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| floor5 | | | | | | | |
| overcrow | 8.43 (7.58-9.38) | | | | | | |
| ppr_1up | 4.88 (4.35-5.46) | 65.03 (63.11-67.01) | | | | | |
| lltill | 0.98 (0.75-1.27) | 1.28 (1.22-1.34) | 1.19 (1.13-1.25) | | | | |
| poorhlth | 1.50 (0.99-2.26) | 1.35 (1.25-1.47) | 1.29 (1.17-1.42) | 49.28 (46.14-52.63) | | | |
| carer | 0.71 (0.37-1.37) | 1.24 (1.12-1.36) | 0.94 (0.84-1.06) | 2.14 (1.90-2.41) | 2.23 (1.80-2.77) | | |
| notwb | 6.72 (6.04-7.48) | 4.29 (4.19-4.40) | 5.00 (4.88-5.13) | 1.04 (0.99-1.10) | 1.30 (1.19-1.42) | 1.24 (1.12-1.37) | |
| hhnowork | 4.03 (3.62-4.48) | 2.50 (2.45-2.56) | 1.97 (1.92-2.02) | 2.21 (2.13-2.29) | 2.88 (2.70-3.06) | 1.98 (1.84-2.13) | 1.92 (1.88-1.96) |
| hhsocgrd | 4.02 (3.54-4.55) | 3.15 (3.06-3.25) | 2.35 (2.27-2.43) | 1.87 (1.78-1.96) | 2.23 (2.04-2.43) | 1.27 (1.13-1.43) | 2.34 (2.27-2.41) |
| hhcarers | 0.76 (0.65-0.88) | 1.29 (1.26-1.32) | 1.46 (1.42-1.50) | 4.83 (4.68-4.99) | 5.25 (4.94-5.58) | n/a | 1.10 (1.07-1.13) |
| hhshrame | 3.31 (1.77-6.18) | 7.53 (6.57-8.63) | 7.02 (6.11-8.06) | 0.96 (0.68-1.35) | 1.61 (0.97-2.69) | 1.71 (0.99-2.96) | 4.24 (3.68-4.89) |
| hhshrdwe | 8.61 (5.43-13.63) | 8.52 (7.27-9.98) | 6.47 (5.50-7.60) | 0.94 (0.63-1.40) | 1.42 (0.76-2.66) | 1.22 (0.58-2.57) | 4.62 (3.93-5.44) |
| hhnocar | 5.97 (5.37-6.65) | 3.03 (2.97-3.10) | 1.98 (1.93-2.03) | 1.64 (1.58-1.71) | 1.95 (1.83-2.09) | 1.08 (0.99-1.17) | 1.87 (1.83-1.91) |
| hhnoqual | 1.50 (1.35-1.68) | 1.26 (1.24-1.29) | 1.42 (1.39-1.46) | 1.42 (1.38-1.47) | 1.47 (1.38-1.56) | 0.96 (0.89-1.03) | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) |
| hhlonpar | 2.87 (2.58-3.20) | 2.15 (2.10-2.19) | 0.64 (0.62-0.66) | 1.63 (1.58-1.69) | 1.86 (1.74-1.98) | 1.32 (1.23-1.42) | 1.35 (1.32-1.39) |

| | hhnowork | hhsocgrd | hhcarers | hhshrame | hhshrdwe | hhnocar | hhnoqual |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------|----------|
| floor5 | | | | | | | |
| overcrow | | | | | | | |
| ppr_1up | | | | | | | |
| lltill | | | | | | | |
| poorhlth | | | | | | | |
| carer | | | | | | | |
| notwb | | | | | | | |
| hhnowork | | | | | | | |
| hhsocgrd | 91.41 (87.16-95.86) | | | | | | |
| hhcarers | 1.57 (1.54-1.60) | 1.19 (1.16-1.23) | | | | | |
| hhshrame | 3.48 (3.03-3.99) | 3.66 (3.11-4.32) | 1.11 (0.94-1.32) | | | | |
| hhshrdwe | 4.90 (4.18-5.73) | 5.12 (4.30-6.11) | 0.99 (0.81-1.22) | 195.66 (161.04-237.72) | | | |
| hhnocar | 12.34 (12.10-12.58) | 11.34 (11.03-11.65) | 0.90 (0.88-0.92) | 3.66 (3.18-4.20) | 5.57 (4.76-6.53) | | |

This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Twenty-First Century Society: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences* (doi: 10.1080/17450140701325873). This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not contain final published proof-corrections or journal pagination.

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| | 12.59) | 11.64) | | | | | |
| hhnoqual | 4.31 (4.23-4.38) | 4.28 (4.17-4.39) | 0.97 (0.95-0.99) | 1.93 (1.69-2.22) | 2.00 (1.71-2.34) | 3.56 (3.50-3.62) | |
| hhlonpar | 12.09 (11.86-12.32) | 9.43 (9.18-9.69) | 0.81 (0.79-0.82) | 1.92 (1.66-2.21) | 2.78 (2.37-3.25) | 10.46 (10.26-10.66) | 2.94 (2.89-2.98) |

Notes:

floor5: Lives on 5th floor or above; *overcrow*: Overcrowded (occupancy rating: number of rooms < required); *ppr_1up*: Overcrowded (1+ persons per room in hh); *ltil*: Limiting long-term illness; *poorhth*: General health 'Not good'; *carer*: Provides care 1+ hours per week; *notwb*: Not white or white British ethnic group; *hhnowork*: No employed adults in household; *hhsocgrd*: Low social grade of household reference person (unemployed/benefits); *hhcarers*: Household includes 1+ carers *hshrame*: Household does not have exclusive use of bath/shower/toilet; *hshrdwe*: Household shares dwelling; *hhnocar*: No car available to household; *hhnoqual*: Low/no qualified household; *hhlonpar*: Child lives in a lone-parent family.

Variables: