The children of the Windrush: persistent inequalities across multiple life domains

Matthew Wallace¹ Ben Wilson¹² Fran Darlington-Pollock³

Department of Sociology, Stockholm University¹. Department of Methodology, London School of Economics². Department of Geography and Planning, University of Liverpool³.

Introduction

Between 1945 and 1971, the British government welcomed workers and their families from the Caribbean destined to help rebuild the country in the aftermath of the Second World War. Over half a century later these workers, and particularly their children, began to face serious problems with their immigration status. Despite being British citizens (albeit ones who had not formally naturalised or applied for a British passport), large numbers were detained, denied legal rights, benefits and medical care, and threatened with deportation. The *Windrush Scandal* – the name given to this particular cohort of immigrants, so called after one of the first boats to arrive with workers from Jamaica – broke in the British media in 2018. Yet despite the widespread public awareness and condemnation of their treatment, we still know very little about the children of the *Windrush* and their life experiences since arriving in the UK. Thus, our **aim** is to investigate (in)equality in the life outcomes of the children of the *Windrush* across five domains; education, employment, occupation, housing and health. The main **question** we want to answer is whether, through merit of having arrived in the UK as British citizens, the children of the *Windrush* went on to experience the same level of equality in their life opportunities as the White UK-born did.

Data and Methods

We make use of a 5% representative individual-level sample of the England and Wales resident population derived from the 2011 Census conducted by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). Specifically, we utilise the regional safeguarded microdata file downloaded from the UK Data Service. This cross-sectional data contains detailed information on a wide range of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics for around three million people, permitting the identification of our subpopulations of interest and the life outcomes we want to examine. Table 1 shows the variables used to identify our subpopulations. We first define our primary subgroup of interest: the children of the Windrush (G1.5). For additional comparison purposes, we also define the UK-born children of two Windrush parents (G2) and UK-born children of one Windrush parent (G2.5).

| Subgroup | Country of | Ethnic group | Birth | Year of | Arrival | Freq |
|---------------|------------|--------------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|
| | birth | | cohort | arrival | at age | |
| Reference | England | White | 1945-71 | N/A | | 680,000 |
| | and Wales | British | | | | |
| G1.5 Windrush | Caribbean | Black | 1945-71 | 1945-1971 | <18 | 2,000 |
| | countries | Caribbean | | | | |
| G2.0 Windrush | England | Black | 1945-71 | N/A | N/A | 6,000 |
| | and Wales | Caribbean | | | | |
| G2.5 Windrush | England | White Black | 1945-71 | N/A | N/A | 2,500 |
| | and Wales | Caribbean | | | | |

Table 1. Subpopulations of interest, identification criteria and frequencies

In all, we examine ten outcomes across five life domains (two outcomes per domain): education, employment, occupation, housing and health. Table 1 provides these domains alongside the two outcomes, the original variable used to define the outcomes and an accompanying description. These domains and outcomes cover the full range of inequalities that individuals can experience over the life course and should provide a complete overview for the children of the Windrush.

| Domain | Outcome | Description | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Education | Low educated | People with no academic or professional quals. | | |
| | High educated | People with degrees or high professional quals. | | |
| Employment | Active unemployed | People who are unemployed, seeking work and | | |
| | | ready to start, or waiting to start a new job. | | |
| | Economically inactive | People listed as inactive other, which excludes | | |
| | | students, retirees, people looking after home | | |
| | | and family and the long-term sick and disabled. | | |
| Occupation | Routine occupation | People in routine sales and service, production, | | |
| | | technical, operative and agricultural jobs. | | |
| | Highly skilled occupation | People in professional and managerial | | |
| | | occupations and higher technical occupations. | | |
| Housing Rents social housing | | People who renting from a Local Authority or a | | |
| | | registered social landlord. | | |
| | House overcrowded | People living in households that are over- | | |
| | | crowded and/or in shared dwellings with no | | |
| | | central heating. | | |
| Health | Limiting long-term illness | People with long-term health problems or | | |
| | | disabilities that limit their daily activities. | | |
| | Poor general health | People with bad or very bad general health. | | |

Table 2. Life domains and outcomes under investigation

We use logistic regression to estimate the odds of each outcome for our populations of interest as compared to the White British born in England and Wales. The model is specified as follows:

$$ln\frac{p(Y_i=1)}{1-p(Y_i=1)} = \propto + \sum_k \beta_k x_{ik}$$

Where $p(Y_i = 1)$ is the probability of experiencing one of the outcomes for individual i, \propto is a constant, and x_{ik} represents the values of independent variables for person i, with k variables. In our baseline model (Model 1), we only adjust for age (in 5-year groups from 40-44 to 60-44) and our subpopulations (White UK-born, G1.5 Windrush, G2 Windrush and G2.5 Windrush). In our final model (Model 2), we additionally adjust for region of residence (coded to London, North and Yorkshire, Midlands, East England, South England, and Wales) and for one variable from each of the other life domains. For example, if the outcome was poor health, in our final model we would adjust for variables representing education, economic activity, occupation and housing. Specifically, the variables that we use are highest level of education (no qualifications, primary, secondary, and tertiary), economic activity (a binary of active or inactive), occupation (higher, intermediate and lower occupations), housing tenure (owns outright or with mortgage, rents socially, rents privately, and lives rent free) and self-reported general health (coded to very good, good, fair, poor, and very poor). The purpose of these finals models is to standardise *within* and *across* outcomes in order to determine whether any initial inequalities observed in the life domains of the Windrush persist net of compositional differences in other life domains.

Results

For **education**, we find clear gender differences in the children of the Windrush. In the baseline model for men, the G1.5 and G2 are neither more nor less likely to have no qualifications as compared to the White UK-born The G2.5, however, are more likely to have no qualifications. Net of compositional differences in the other life domains, G1.5 and G2 men become less likely to have no qualifications; the G2.5 now reflect the White UK-born. At the opposite end of the educational distribution, all three generations of men have lower odds of being highly educated. For women, the picture is more positive. The G1.5 and G2 have lower odds of no qualifications and higher odds of having attained a degree in the baseline models, odds which are magnified in the final models. For G2.5 women, initially, this group has higher odds of no qualifications and lower odds of having a degree. For employment, we find pervasive inequality across generation and gender. In every case, the children of the Windrush have higher odds of being active unemployed or economically inactive as compared to the White UK-born. The odds are especially large for men. Net of compositional differences in the other four life domains, the size of the disadvantage attenuates somewhat, but remain different from the White UK-born. For **occupation**, like education, we see gender differences in the children of the Windrush. For men, the story is one in which all generations experience inequality in their occupation. All men have higher odds of being employed in a lower occupation and lower odds of being employed in a higher occupation. These patterns persist net of compositional differences in the other four life domains. For women, there is no such disadvantage. Indeed, the G2 have lower odds of being employed in a routine occupation and higher odds of being employed in a highly skilled occupation. The G1.5 are also initially less likely to be employed in a lower routine job, but this advantage is explained after adjusting for composition differences in the other life domains. For housing, like employment, the picture is consistent for children of the Windrush. Irrespective of gender or generation, they have much higher odds of renting social housing or living in an overcrowded house as compared to the reference group. The size of the inequality is attenuated by adjusting for differences in the remaining life domains, but these initial patterns persist. For health, there is no clear pattern across generation or gender. For men, initial disadvantages in limiting long-term illness (LLTI) and poorer general health for the G2 and G2.5 are explained away in the final model. Additionally, some advantages emerge in the final models in that G1.5 and G2 Windrush have lower odds of LLTI or bad to very bad general health. For women, some initial disadvantages in LLTI are also explained away in the final model. However, there are no instances of an advantage among women. Furthermore, a large initial disadvantage among G2.5 women in poor general health persists net of compositional differences in the other life domains.

Preliminary findings

We uncover persistent inequalities for employment and housing in the children of the Windrush. For men only, we also find persistent inequality in education (at least in being highly educated) and occupation (with men overrepresented in the lowest occupations and underrepresented in the highest occupations). Women, conversely, do not experience educational or occupational inequality; they are less likely to be employed in routine jobs, neither more nor less likely to be employed in a managerial or professional occupation and have higher odds of being highly educated. This is all the more impressive given that said advantages are usually visible before adjusting for compositional differences in other life domains in which they are disadvantaged. Simultaneously, it is also concerning, given that women are also still more likely to be actively unemployed or economically active than the White UK-born. Finally, while we find a relative consistency in the life outcomes of the G1.5 (children of the Windrush born in the UK), the situation for the G2.5 (children born to one Windrush parent) appears to be worse than the G1.5 and G2.

| · | | omen | Men | | |
|---------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Domains | Model 1 (baseline) Model 2 (final) | Model 1 (baseline) Model 2 (final) | Model 1 (baseline) Model 2 (final) | Model 1 (baseline) Model 2 (final) | |
| 1: Education | A: no academic or professional quals | B: highly qualified (degree level +) | A: no academic or professional quals | B: highly qualified (degree level +) | |
| | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | |
| White UK-born | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | |
| G1.5 Windrush | 0.48 ** 0.40 - 0.58 0.31 ** 0.26 - 0.39 | 1.33 ** 1.17 - 1.52 1.50 ** 1.28 - 1.75 | 1.12 0.96 - 1.31 0.72 ** 0.60 - 0.85 | 0.60 ** 0.51 - 0.70 0.79 ** 0.66 - 0.96 | |
| G2.0 Windrush | 0.52 ** 0.45 - 0.59 0.37 ** 0.31 - 0.43 | 1.47 ** 1.37 - 1.59 1.54 ** 1.41 - 1.68 | 1.02 0.92 - 1.13 0.63 ** 0.55 - 0.71 | 0.77 ** 0.71 - 0.84 0.87 ** 0.79 - 0.97 | |
| G2.5 Windrush | 1.92 ** 1.68 - 2.19 1.10 0.93 - 1.29 | 0.78 ** 0.68 - 0.89 1.09 0.93 - 1.28 | 2.01 ** 1.76 - 2.29 1.10 0.95 - 1.28 | 0.53 ** 0.46 - 0.62 0.83 * 0.70 - 0.98 | |
| 2: Employment | A: active unemployed | B: economically inactive | A: active unemployed | B : economically inactive | |
| | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | |
| White UK-born | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | |
| G1.5 Windrush | 2.24 ** 1.73 - 2.90 1.55 * 1.02 - 2.35 | 1.66 ** 1.21 - 2.30 1.47 * 1.06 - 2.05 | 3.24 ** 2.68 - 3.92 1.83 ** 1.32 - 2.54 | 1.78 ** 1.22 - 2.59 1.36 0.92 - 2.01 | |
| G2.0 Windrush | 2.26 ** 1.98 - 2.59 1.75 ** 1.42 - 2.16 | 1.36 ** 1.08 - 1.73 1.11 0.86 - 1.42 | 2.89 ** 2.56 - 3.25 2.12 ** 1.78 - 2.53 | 2.56 ** 2.09 - 3.12 1.66 ** 1.34 - 2.06 | |
| G2.5 Windrush | 1.64 ** 1.28 - 2.12 1.21 0.84 - 1.74 | 2.54 ** 1.92 - 3.35 1.56 ** 1.16 - 2.08 | 3.06 ** 2.57 - 3.65 2.21 ** 1.72 - 2.83 | 2.89 ** 2.19 - 3.83 1.73 ** 1.28 - 2.32 | |
| 3: Occupation | A: employed in routine occupation | B : employed in higher occupation | A: employed in routine occupation | B : employed in higher occupation | |
| | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | |
| White UK-born | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | |
| G1.5 Windrush | 0.70 ** 0.55 - 0.88 0.98 0.77 - 1.26 | 1.11 0.97 1.27 0.90 0.77 - 1.05 | 1.33 ** 1.13 - 1.57 1.33 ** 1.12 - 1.59 | 0.46 ** 0.39 - 0.54 0.49 ** 0.40 - 0.59 | |
| G2.0 Windrush | 0.46 ** 0.38 - 0.55 0.60 ** 0.50 - 0.72 | 1.41 ** 1.31 1.52 1.26 ** 1.15 - 1.37 | 1.17 ** 1.05 - 1.30 1.19 ** 1.06 - 1.33 | 0.75 ** 0.69 - 0.82 0.83 ** 0.75 - 0.92 | |
| G2.5 Windrush | 1.23 * 1.02 - 1.48 0.86 0.70 - 1.04 | 0.81 ** 0.71 0.92 1.08 0.93 - 1.26 | 1.43 ** 1.23 - 1.66 1.03 0.88 - 1.21 | 0.49 ** 0.43 - 0.57 0.73 ** 0.62 - 0.86 | |
| 4: Housing | A: rents social housing | B : house overcrowded | A: rents social housing | B : house overcrowded | |
| | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | |
| White UK-born | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | |
| G1.5 Windrush | 2.91 ** 2.55 - 3.32 2.50 ** 2.15 - 2.91 | 2.07 ** 1.70 - 2.52 1.39 ** 1.14 - 1.70 | 2.57 ** 2.22 - 2.98 1.71 ** 1.45 - 2.01 | 2.48 ** 2.07 - 2.96 1.50 ** 1.24 - 1.80 | |
| G2.0 Windrush | 3.40 ** 3.15 - 3.65 3.25 ** 2.98 - 3.54 | 2.69 ** 2.45 - 2.96 1.93 ** 1.75 - 2.13 | 2.68 ** 2.46 - 2.92 1.90 ** 1.72 - 2.10 | 2.21 ** 1.99 - 2.46 1.43 ** 1.28 - 1.60 | |
| G2.5 Windrush | 3.75 ** 3.34 - 4.22 2.78 ** 2.42 - 3.19 | 2.46 ** 2.10 - 2.88 1.82 ** 1.55 - 2.14 | 3.44 ** 3.04 - 3.89 2.24 ** 1.95 - 2.59 | 2.22 ** 1.89 - 2.60 1.55 ** 1.31 - 1.82 | |
| 5: Health | A: has limiting long-term illness | B: reports bad or very bad health | A: has limiting long-term illness | B: reports bad or very bad health | |
| | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | OR 95% CIs OR 95% CIs | |
| White UK-born | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | |
| | | | | | |
| G1.5 Windrush | 0.98 0.80 - 1.20 0.98 0.79 - 1.22 | 1.20 + 0.97 - 1.48 1.13 0.91 - 1.41 | 1.05 0.84 - 1.31 0.80 + 0.63 - 1.02 | 0.83 0.64 - 1.08 0.61 ** 0.47 - 0.80 | |
| | | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | 1.05 0.84 - 1.31 0.80 + 0.63 - 1.02 1.20 ** 1.04 - 1.30 0.83 * 0.71 - 0.97 | 0.83 0.64 - 1.08 0.61 ** 0.47 - 0.80 1.13 0.96 - 1.33 0.83 * 0.70 - 0.98 | |

Table 3. Summary table of odds ratios for ten life outcomes of the children of the Windrush relative to the White UK-born population

<u>Notes</u>: baseline models adjust age and subpopulation, final models adjust region of residence, education, activity status, occupation, housing tenure and health (minus the control relating to the specific domain (i.e. we do not adjust for education if our outcome is education); **p<0.01, *p<0.05, +p<0.10.