

This is a repository copy of *How has the Child Poverty Rate and Composition Changed?*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/73200/>

Version: Published Version

Monograph:

Bradshaw, J orcid.org/0000-0001-9395-6754 (2006) *How has the Child Poverty Rate and Composition Changed?* Research Report. Joseph Rowntree Foundation , York.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

Jonathan Bradshaw

The **Joseph Rowntree Foundation** has supported this project as part of its programme of research and innovative development projects, which it hopes will be of value to policy makers, practitioners and service users. The facts presented and views expressed in this report are, however, those of the author[s] and not necessarily those of the Foundation.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation
The Homestead
40 Water End
York YO30 6WP
Website: www.jrf.org.uk

© University of York 2006

First published 2006 by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation

All rights reserved. Reproduction of this report by photocopying or electronic means for non-commercial purposes is permitted. Otherwise, no part of this report may be reproduced, adapted, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

A pdf version of this publication is available from the JRF website (www.jrf.org.uk).

| |
|--|
| <p>This publication can be provided in alternative formats, such as large print, Braille, audiotape and on disk. Please contact: Communications Department, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, The Homestead, 40 Water End, York YO30 6WP. Tel: 01904 615905. Email: info@jrf.org.uk</p> |
|--|

Introduction

This note is designed to draw attention to how the pattern of child poverty has changed since the Labour Government started to take an interest in the issue with the Prime Minister's pledge in 1999. The analysis is entirely based on published data – the Households Below Average Incomes analysis by the Department for Work and Pensions. This analysis is based on data in the reports since 1999/00 because that is the first year that the DWP began to publish breakdowns of the poverty rates and characteristics of children in poverty. Even so the breakdowns employed in the analysis have changed over the years which make comparisons over time somewhat problematic. It could be possible to go back to the original data from each survey to undertake a similar analysis. However there are probably advantages in following the DWP statisticians' methodology and it is worth using the data to tell us something about what had been achieved and which groups have benefited most from the changes in demography, labour market and policy that have influenced trends in child poverty.

As well as increased employment rates and changes in the characteristics of families, changes in child poverty may have been influenced by any of the following factors:

- the introduction of the minimum wage in 1998 and its uprating, particularly in October 2002 and 2003, by more than the rate of inflation;
- the increases in Child Benefit, particularly the increase in child benefit in 2000 which much exceeded movements in prices;
- the replacement of Family Credit by Working Families Tax Credit from October 2001 with a premium for disabled children, a disregard of all Child Support payments from non-resident parents and childcare tax credit;
- the introduction of Child Tax Credit in 2002 and the large increases in 2003 and 2004;
- the new Child Support Scheme which began to operate from March 2003, introducing a £10 disregard for parents with care on Income Support.

So the questions this analysis seeks to answer are:

1. Which children have benefited from these changes and trends?
2. How have the policy changes and trends changed the composition of poor children?

The two are of course related but the latter is useful as a confirmation. If the composition of all families was changing, the poverty rate may

change upwards or downwards without any impact from other factors. Also policy could change the poverty rate for a group but it might make little impact on the overall rate because the group affected by the policy change was small. The analysis includes the picture both before and after housing costs.

The Family Resources Survey on which this analysis is based is a sample survey and therefore variations in rates and proportions could be expected due to sampling errors. The DWP estimates that changes in the proportion of children below 60 per cent of the median need to be in the order of 1.5 per cent to be statistically significant at the 95 per cent confidence level. However we are interested in changes in poverty rates of sub groups some of which are small and therefore subject to larger sampling errors. We have therefore only acknowledged changes in proportions in excess of 3 per cent and then only when there is a clear trend in the data rather than what might be year to year fluctuations.

Results

Table 1 compares the poverty rates over the period 1999/0 to 2004/5 after housing costs. Care needs to be taken because the classification of categories is not entirely consistent over time and there was less detail in the breakdowns in the earlier period. The 1999/2000 data is not strictly comparable because it excludes the self employed. However from the table we observe that there has been a significant change (reduction unless stated) in the poverty rate of children in the following households:

- lone parents
- lone parents not working
- four children or more
- one or more disabled adults¹
- one or more disabled children¹
- Tax Credit recipients (in 2003/4 because of the expansion in eligibility)
- under 25 and under 29
- youngest child under 5
- Outer London (up)
- South east
- Scotland
- Wales

¹ Disability benefits and tax credits including Disabled Living Allowance are treated as income though they are to meet extra costs

Table 1
Child poverty rate - % children living in households with income below 60 per cent of the median after housing costs

| | 1999-2000 | 2000-1 | 2001-2 | 2002-3 | 2003-4 | 2004-5 |
|---|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| All children | 32 | 31 | 30 | 28 | 28 | 27 |
| Economic status and family type | | | | | | |
| Lone parent: | 59 | 55 | 54 | 52 | 48 | 48 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| in full time work | | 12 | 12 | 15 | 9 | 13 |
| in part time work | | 32 | 38 | 33 | 27 | 27 |
| not working | | 77 | 75 | 76 | 74 | 72 |
| | | | | | | |
| Couple with children: | 22 | 23 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 20 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| self-employed | | 31 | 28 | 25 | 27 | 29 |
| both in full time work | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| one in full time work, one in part time work | | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| one in full time work, one not working | | 25 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| one or more in part time work | | 54 | 60 | 58 | 55 | 49 |
| both not in work | | 76 | 81 | 80 | 77 | 72 |
| | | | | | | |
| Economic status of household¹ | | | | | | |
| All adults in work | | | | 11 | 10 | 12 |
| At least one but not all in work | 19 | 19 | 19 | 32 | 32 | 31 |
| Workless households | 81 | 80 | 79 | 79 | 77 | 75 |
| | | | | | | |
| Number of children in family | | | | | | |
| One | 25 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 23 |
| Two | 26 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 23 |
| Three | 45 | 36 | 35 | 32 | 29 | 30 |
| Four or more | | 56 | 50 | 48 | 51 | 50 |
| | | | | | | |
| Disability | | | | | | |
| No disabled adults | 29 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 26 | 25 |
| 1 or more disabled adults | 45 | 43 | 43 | 39 | 38 | 40 |
| | | | | | | |
| No disabled children | 31 | 30 | 29 | 28 | 27 | 27 |
| 1 or more disabled children | 40 | 36 | 35 | 31 | 31 | 30 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| no disabled adults in family | 33 | 34 | 29 | 25 | 28 | 26 |
| 1 or more disabled adults in family | 50 | 39 | 46 | 40 | 36 | 37 |
| | | | | | | |
| Ethnic group | | | | | | |
| White | 29 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 25 |

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Mixed | | | 41 | 34 | 44 | 39 |
| Asian or Asian British | | | 47 | 55 | 53 | 47 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| Indian | 49 | 37 | 36 | 22 | 42 | 33 |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | 73 | 73 | 69 | 75 | 63 | 57 |
| Black or Black British | 49 | | 41 | 46 | 49 | 43 |
| Chinese or other ethnic group | | | | | 52 | 44 |
| | | | | | | |
| Benefit/tax credit receipt of family | | | | | | |
| Disability Living Allowance | | 24 | 24 | 23 | 19 | 23 |
| Jobseeker's Allowance | | 85 | 84 | 87 | 80 | 73 |
| Incapacity Benefit | | 48 | 47 | 42 | 40 | 46 |
| Tax Credits | | 37 | 36 | 36 | 18 | 22 |
| Income Support | | 76 | 75 | 75 | 74 | 71 |
| Housing Benefit | | 75 | 76 | 74 | 74 | 69 |
| Not in receipt of benefit/tax credit listed above | | 14 | 14 | 12 | 18 | 16 |
| | | | | | | |
| Age of mother in family¹ | | | | | | |
| under 25 | | | 62 | 53 | 52 | 41 |
| 25 to 29 | | 49 | 49 | 43 | 43 | 37 |
| 30 to 34 | | 41 | 39 | 33 | 31 | 31 |
| 35 to 39 | | 36 | 34 | 25 | 24 | 26 |
| 40 to 44 | | 27 | 27 | 21 | 22 | 22 |
| 45 to 49 | | 25 | 23 | 22 | 20 | 20 |
| 50 and over | | | 23 | 23 | 22 | 23 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Age of youngest child in family | | | | | | |
| under 5 | | 35 | 33 | 32 | 30 | 29 |
| 5 to 10 | | 31 | 30 | 29 | 29 | 28 |
| 11 to 15 | | 25 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 16 to 18 | | 17 | 17 | 20 | 16 | 15 |
| | | | | | | |
| Geographical disaggregation | | | | | | |
| England | | 30 | 30 | 29 | 28 | 28 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| North East | | 37 | 31 | 37 | 30 | 32 |
| North West and Merseyside | | 32 | 32 | 30 | 29 | 29 |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | | 29 | 32 | 30 | 29 | 29 |
| East Midlands | | 29 | 29 | 29 | 25 | 26 |
| West Midlands | | 37 | 32 | 29 | 32 | 30 |
| Eastern | | 22 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 22 |
| London | | 41 | 35 | 38 | 41 | 39 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| Inner | | | 48 | 54 | 51 | 52 |

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Outer | | | 26 | 30 | 34 | 33 |
| South East | | 22 | 24 | 20 | 19 | 21 |
| South West | | 27 | 28 | 25 | 26 | 25 |
| Scotland | | 30 | 30 | 27 | 25 | 25 |
| Wales | | 33 | 31 | 30 | 27 | 28 |
| | | | | | | |
| Tenure | | | | | | |
| Local authority | 63 | | 59 | | 56 | 56 |
| Housing association | 64 | | 62 | | 58 | 56 |
| Private rented | 62 | | 57 | | 53 | 49 |
| Owned with mortgage | 14 | | 14 | | 14 | 14 |
| Owned outright | 21 | | 25 | | 21 | 19 |
| Other | 12 | | 14 | | 28 | 34 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| No savings | | | 49 | | 49 | 45 |
| Less than £3,000 | | | 22 | | 19 | 21 |
| £3,000 - £7,999 | | | 11 | | 12 | 10 |
| £8,000- £20,000 | | | | | 8 | 10 |
| more than £20,000 | | | | | 9 | 9 |
| more than £20,000 | | | | | 9 | 11 |
| | | | | | 4 | 8 |

Table 2 compares the composition of child poverty over the period 1999/0 to 2004/5 after housing costs. Again care needs to be taken because the classification of categories is not entirely consistent over time and there was less detail in the breakdowns in the earlier period. From this we observe that there has been a significant change (reduction unless stated) in the proportion of poor children in the following households:

- lone parents
- all adults in work (up)
- three child families
- receiving tax credits (up)
- not in receipt of benefits
- local authority tenants
- housing association tenants(up)

Table 2

Composition of children in poverty – living in households with equivalent income less than 60% of the median after housing costs

| | 1999-2000 | 2000-1 | 2001-2 | 2002-3 | 2003-4 | 2004-5 |
|---|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Economic status and family type | | | | | | |
| Lone parent: | 45 | 44 | 45 | 45 | 42 | 43 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| in full time work | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| in part time work | | 5 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7 |
| not working | | 36 | 35 | 35 | 34 | 34 |
| | | | | | | |
| Couple with children: | 54 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 58 | 57 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| self-employed | | 11 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| both in full time work | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| one in full time work, one in part time work | | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| one in full time work, one not working | | 14 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| one or more in part time work | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 |
| both not in work | | 17 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 16 |
| | | | | | | |
| Economic status of household¹ | | | | | | |
| All adults in work | 45 | 51 | 52 | 22 | 21 | 24 |
| At least one in work, but not all | | | | 29 | 31 | 30 |
| Workless households | 55 | 49 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 46 |
| | | | | | | |
| Number of children in family | | | | | | |
| One | 18 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 21 |
| Two | 35 | 35 | 36 | 38 | 38 | 38 |
| Three | 48 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 23 | 23 |
| Four or more | | 20 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 19 |
| | | | | | | |
| Disability | | | | | | |
| No disabled adults | 74 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 76 |
| 1 or more disabled adults | 26 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 24 |
| | | | | | | |
| No disabled children | 86 | 86 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 |
| 1 or more disabled children | 14 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| no disabled adults in family | 7 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| 1 or more disabled adults in family | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| | | | | | | |
| Ethnic group | | | | | | |
| White | 81 | 81 | 80 | 79 | 78 | 80 |

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| Mixed | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Asian or Asian British | | | | 13 | 11 | 11 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| Indian | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 7 |
| Black or Black British | 4 | 3 | | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Chinese or other ethnic group | | | | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | | | | | | |
| Benefit/tax credit receipt of family | | | | | | |
| Disability Living Allowance | | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Jobseeker's Allowance | | 7 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Incapacity Benefit | | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| Tax Credits | | 18 | 19 | 22 | 31 | 45 |
| Income Support | | 40 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 40 |
| Housing Benefit | | 46 | 50 | 46 | 47 | 46 |
| Not in receipt of any benefit/tax credit listed above | | 29 | 28 | 26 | 21 | 17 |
| | | | | | | |
| Age of mother in family¹ | | | | | | |
| under 25 | | | | 8 | 10 | 8 |
| 25 to 29 | | 15 | 13 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| 30 to 34 | | 27 | 27 | 25 | 23 | 23 |
| 35 to 39 | | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 26 |
| 40 to 44 | | 16 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 45 to 49 | | 7 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| 50 and over | | 3 | | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| | | | | | | |
| Age of youngest child in family | | | | | | |
| under 5 | | 48 | 47 | 44 | 44 | 43 |
| 5 to 10 | | 34 | 36 | 35 | 36 | 36 |
| 11 to 15 | | 15 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| 16 to 18 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| | | | | | | |
| Geographical disaggregation | | | | | | |
| England | | 87 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 88 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| North East | | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| North West and Merseyside | | 14 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| East Midlands | | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| West Midlands | | 11 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 |
| Eastern | | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 |
| London | | 18 | 16 | 19 | 19 | 18 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| Inner | | | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Outer | | | 7 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|---|----|----|----|----|
| South East | | 9 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 10 |
| South West | | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| Scotland | | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| Wales | | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | | | | | | |
| Tenure | | | | | | |
| Local authority | 43 | | 35 | 35 | 27 | 26 |
| Housing association | 14 | | 16 | 16 | 18 | 21 |
| Private rented | 13 | | 14 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| Owned with mortgage | 28 | | 28 | 29 | 34 | 30 |
| Owned outright | 4 | | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| Other | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| No savings | | | 68 | 69 | 65 | 64 |
| Less than £3,000 | | | 24 | 24 | 23 | 26 |
| £3,000 - £7,999 | | | 4 | 3 | 7 | 4 |
| £8,000- £20,000 | | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| more than £20,000 | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| more than £20,000 | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | 0 | 1 |

Tables 3 and 4 provide the same data but before housing costs. The overall child poverty rates are lower. From Table 3 we observe that there has been a significant change (reduction unless stated) in the poverty rate of children in the following households:

- lone parents in part-time work and not in work
- three and Four children or more
- Tax credit recipients (in 2003/4 because of the expansion in eligibility)
- Outer London (up)
- Scotland

Table 3
Child poverty rate - % children living in households with income below 60% of the median before housing costs

| Economic status and family type | 1999-2000 | 2000-1 | 2001-2 | 2002-3 | 2003-4 | 2004-5 |
|---|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| All children | 23 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 19 |
| Lone parent: | 36 | 34 | 32 | 33 | 32 | 31 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| in full time work | 8 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 9 |
| in part time work | | 17 | 21 | 19 | 18 | 15 |
| not working | | 50 | 45 | 48 | 49 | 47 |
| | | | | | | |
| Couple with children: | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| self-employed | | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 25 |
| both in full time work | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| one in full time work, one in part time work | | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| one in full time work, one not working | | 18 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 14 |
| one or more in part time work | | 46 | 54 | 51 | 48 | 40 |
| both not in work | | 63 | 67 | 70 | 63 | 61 |
| | | | | | | |
| Economic status of household¹ | | | | | | |
| All adults in work | | | | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| At least one in work, but not all | 13 | 14 | 14 | 27 | 26 | 24 |
| Workless households | 55 | 55 | 52 | 55 | 55 | 52 |
| | | | | | | |
| Number of children in family | | | | | | |
| One | 15 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 15 |
| Two | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 16 |
| Three | 35 | 25 | 27 | 24 | 24 | 22 |
| Four or more | | 45 | 40 | 45 | 41 | 41 |
| | | | | | | |
| Disability | | | | | | |
| No disabled adults | 20 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 17 |
| 1 or more disabled adults | 33 | 32 | 33 | 31 | 30 | 31 |
| | | | | | | |
| No disabled children | 22 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 19 |
| 1 or more disabled children | 29 | 26 | 25 | 25 | 22 | 24 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| no disabled adults in family | 22 | 25 | 19 | 21 | 19 | 19 |
| 1 or more disabled adults in family | 40 | 28 | 35 | 32 | 29 | 31 |
| | | | | | | |
| Ethnic group | | | | | | |

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| White | 20 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Mixed | | | | 21 | 30 | 23 |
| Asian or Asian British | | | | 46 | 49 | 38 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| Indian | 43 | 32 | 29 | 19 | 36 | 28 |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | 67 | 64 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 47 |
| Black or Black British | 25 | | | 27 | 35 | 28 |
| Chinese or other ethnic group | | | | 28 | 35 | 34 |
| | | | | | | |
| Benefit/tax credit receipt of family | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Disability Living Allowance | | 17 | 16 | 20 | 13 | 18 |
| Jobseeker's Allowance | | 71 | 76 | 75 | 63 | 64 |
| Incapacity Benefit | | 38 | 36 | 33 | 30 | 36 |
| Tax Credits | | 27 | 26 | 26 | 13 | 15 |
| Income Support | | 49 | 45 | 48 | 49 | 46 |
| Housing Benefit | | 48 | 46 | 45 | 47 | 43 |
| Not in receipt of any benefit/tax credit listed above | | 10 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 12 |
| Age of mother in family¹ | | | | | | |
| under 20 | | 30 | 35 | | | |
| 20 to 24 | | 28 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 24 |
| 25 to 29 | | 24 | 23 | 25 | 28 | 21 |
| 30 to 34 | | 21 | 23 | 24 | 22 | 21 |
| 35 to 39 | | 18 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 20 |
| 40 to 44 | | 17 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 18 |
| 45 to 49 | | 18 | 18 | 19 | 15 | 16 |
| 50 and over | | | | 18 | 22 | 19 |
| | | | | | | |
| Age of youngest child in family | | | | | | |
| under 5 | | 23 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 19 |
| 5 to 10 | | 22 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 21 |
| 11 to 15 | | 19 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 19 |
| 16 to 18 | | 12 | 13 | 16 | 12 | 14 |
| | | | | | | |
| Geographical disaggregation | | | | | | |
| England | | 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| North East | | 32 | 24 | 32 | 25 | 28 |
| North West and Merseyside | | 22 | 24 | 22 | 23 | 22 |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | | 24 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 24 |
| East Midlands | | 25 | 22 | 23 | 20 | 21 |
| West Midlands | | 26 | 24 | 22 | 26 | 24 |
| Eastern | | 12 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 14 |

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| London | | 25 | 21 | 25 | 27 | 24 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| Inner | | | 30 | 37 | 36 | 35 |
| Outer | | | 15 | 18 | 22 | 19 |
| South East | | 11 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 12 |
| South West | | 16 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 16 |
| Scotland | | 25 | 25 | 23 | 22 | 21 |
| Wales | | 26 | 25 | 25 | 21 | 23 |
| | | | | | | |
| Tenure | | | | | | |
| Local authority | 48 | | 45 | 46 | 44 | 44 |
| Housing association | 33 | | 35 | 31 | 37 | 34 |
| Private rented | 25 | | 23 | 24 | 24 | 23 |
| Owned with mortgage | 10 | | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| Owned outright | 26 | | 30 | 29 | 25 | 23 |
| Other | 18 | | 23 | 24 | 34 | 33 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| No savings | | | 34 | 36 | 36 | 32 |
| Less than £3,000 | | | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 |
| £3,000 - £7,999 | | | 8 | 6 | 9 | 9 |
| £8,000- £20,000 | | | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| more than £20,000 | | | 7 | 7 | 6 | 8 |

Table 4 shows changes in the composition of poor children before housing costs. Groups that have reduced their share significantly are:

- three child families
- Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups
- receiving tax credits (up)
- not in receipt of benefits
- youngest child under five
- local authority tenants
- housing associations (up)
- owned with a mortgage (up)

Table 4
Composition of children in poverty – living in households with equivalent income less than 60% of the median before housing costs

| | 1999-2000 | 2000-1 | 2001-2 | 2002-3 | 2003-4 | 2004-5 |
|---|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Economic status and family type | | | | | | |
| Lone parent: | 43 | 39 | 38 | 39 | 38 | 39 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| in full time work | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| in part time work | | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| not working | | 33 | 30 | 30 | 31 | 31 |
| | | | | | | |
| Couple with children: | 57 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 62 | 61 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| self-employed | | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 15 |
| both in full time work | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| one in full time work, one in part time work | | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| one in full time work, one not working | | 15 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 13 |
| one or more in part time work | | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 9 |
| both not in work | | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 19 |
| | | | | | | |
| Economic status of household¹ | | | | | | |
| All adults in work | 46 | | | 20 | 20 | 23 |
| At least one in work, but not all | | 52 | 55 | 33 | 34 | 33 |
| Workless households | 54 | 48 | 45 | 47 | 46 | 45 |
| | | | | | | |
| Number of children in family | | | | | | |
| One | 15 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 19 | 19 |
| Two | 32 | 34 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 |
| Three | 53 | 27 | 28 | 26 | 25 | 23 |
| Four or more | | 24 | 22 | 22 | 20 | 22 |
| | | | | | | |
| Disability | | | | | | |
| No disabled adults | 72 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 74 |
| 1 or more disabled adults | 28 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 26 |
| | | | | | | |
| No disabled children | | 86 | 88 | 87 | 89 | 87 |
| 1 or more disabled children | 14 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| no disabled adults in family | 7 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 or more disabled adults in family | 7 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| | | | | | | |
| Ethnic group | | | | | | |

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| White | 80 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 76 | 79 |
| Mixed | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Asian or Asian British | | | | 15 | 14 | 12 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| Indian | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Pakistani/Bangladeshi | 11 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 8 |
| Black or Black British | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 |
| Chinese or other ethnic group | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | | | | | | |
| Benefit/tax credit receipt of family | | | | | | |
| Disability Living Allowance | | 5 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 6 |
| Jobseeker's Allowance | | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Incapacity Benefit | | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| Tax Credits | | 18 | 20 | 22 | 32 | 44 |
| Income Support | | 40 | 37 | 38 | 37 | 36 |
| Housing Benefit | | 46 | 43 | 39 | 40 | 40 |
| Not in receipt of any benefit/tax credit listed above | | 29 | 32 | 29 | 23 | 18 |
| | | | | | | |
| Age of mother in family¹ | | | | | | |
| under 25 | | 6 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 |
| 25 to 29 | | 13 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 11 |
| 30 to 34 | | 26 | 26 | 25 | 22 | 21 |
| 35 to 39 | | 27 | 27 | 26 | 28 | 28 |
| 40 to 44 | | 16 | 17 | 19 | 18 | 20 |
| 45 to 49 | | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 9 |
| 50 and over | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| | | | | | | |
| Age of youngest child in family | | | | | | |
| under 5 | | 44 | 42 | 41 | 40 | 38 |
| 5 to 10 | | 36 | 38 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| 11 to 15 | | 17 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 16 to 18 | | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| | | | | | | |
| Geographical disaggregation | | | | | | |
| England | | 85 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 86 |
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| North East | | 8 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| North West and Merseyside | | 14 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 13 |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| East Midlands | | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| West Midlands | | 11 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 11 |
| Eastern | | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 7 |
| London | | 16 | 14 | 17 | 17 | 15 |

How has the child poverty rate and composition changed?

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|---|----|----|----|----|
| <i>of which</i> | | | | | | |
| Inner | | | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Outer | | | 6 | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| South East | | 7 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| South West | | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| Scotland | | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Wales | | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| | | | | | | |
| Tenure | | | | | | |
| Local authority | 48 | | 37 | 37 | 30 | 29 |
| Housing association | 11 | | 13 | 12 | 16 | 18 |
| Private rented | 9 | | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 |
| Owned with mortgage | 26 | | 30 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Owned outright | 7 | | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| Other | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| No savings | | | 67 | 68 | 67 | 63 |
| Less than £3,000 | | | 23 | 23 | 21 | 26 |
| £3,000 - £7,999 | | | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 |
| £8,000- £20,000 | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| more than £20,000 | | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| more than £40,000 | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| more than £80,000 | | | | | 0 | 1 |

Conclusion

This paper has brought together data from successive HBAI publications and analysed how child poverty rates and composition have changed over time.