Unequal returns

Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Li, Y. (2018). Unequal returns: higher education and access to the salariat by ethnic groups in the UK. In *Unequal returns: higher education and access to the salariat by ethnic groups in the UK* (pp. 103-124)

Published in:

Unequal returns

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.

6

Unequal Returns: Higher Education and Access to the Salarial by Ethnic Groups in the UK

Yaojun Li

Introduction

This chapter seeks to provide a more comprehensive analysis than hitherto available of the ethnic differences in higher education and access to professional-managerial (salarial) positions in contemporary UK society by linking ethnicity with generational status, family class and gender. For this purpose, I draw on the most authoritative data from the Labour Force Survey (2014–2015). The large sample size of the dataset makes it possible to differentiate ethnic groups and generational statuses in a more refined way than usually found in ethnic research, and the availability of information on parental class, together with ethnicity, generation, gender and other characteristics, offers a unique opportunity to simultaneously analyse the social foundations of ethnic differences in higher education and access to the salariat in a thorough and systematic manner.

Y. Li (✉)

Manchester University, Manchester, UK

e-mail: Yaojun.Li@manchester.ac.uk

© The Author(s) 2018

J. Arday and H. S. Mirza (eds.), *Dismantling Race in Higher Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_6

The importance of higher education for career advancement is undisputed. Trying to obtain high levels of education by immigrants of ethnic minority heritages and their children in the 'receiving' society is a strategic investment in human capital to avoid discrimination and to ensure success in the labour market (Becker 1962). Social scientists have conducted a great deal of research on the sources and the consequences of ethnic differences in educational and occupational attainment, but such research has usually been conducted in separate manners. This chapter studies the linkage of higher education and access to the salariat whilst controlling for ethno-generational status, parental class and gender differences. It is this linkage which will make the present research a unique contribution to ethnic studies in the UK context.

It has often been observed that large-scale immigration since the Second World War has changed the socio-demographic landscapes of many developed societies. In the UK, for instance, the proportion of ethnic minorities in the population has increased nearly five-fold from less than 3% in the early 1950s to 15% in 2011 (Cheung and Heath 2007; ONS 2011). A substantial and increasing proportion of members of ethnic minority heritages belong to the second or higher generations. The continuing influx of migrants who came as adults or children, and the increasing numbers of ethnic minority heritages who were born in the country have created an on-going and imperative need to study the status, progress and obstacles of their integration into the socio-economic fabric of contemporary UK society in terms of acquiring human capital and gaining access to labour market position as commensurate with the human capital and as representing equal returns to the majority group.

Given the importance of social equality and ethnic integration, many studies have been carried out on educational and labour market attainment of the ethnic minorities in the UK. Yet due to the lack of key variables on some crucial domains such as parental class or generational status, few studies have managed to examine the link between higher education and access to the salariat whilst taking into account crucial influences exerted by parental class positions or generational changes. For instance, Lessard-Phillips and Li (2017) examined ethnic educational attainment at degree levels for multiple generations but

did not link it to occupational attainment. A large number of studies looked at the ethnic situation in the labour market and found marked ethnic disadvantages but were unable to examine parental class influences. People of ethnic minority origins, even the second generation, were found to have fewer chances in training (Bhattacharyya et al. 2003), and to face ‘hyper-cyclical unemployment’, namely, to experience much higher levels of unemployment during economic downturns when they were three or four times as likely to be unemployed as their white peers (Li and Heath 2008; Heath and Li 2008; Li 2010); they were also less likely to find themselves in professional-managerial positions (Li and Heath 2010), and tended to receive significantly lower pay than did their white peers (Li 2012; Breach and Li 2017). Similar findings are reported in Iganski and Payne (1999), Dustmann and Fabbri (2005), Berthoud and Blekesaune (2006). Employer bias and discrimination against members of ethnic minority origins is shown to underlie much of the ethnic disadvantage (Wood et al. 2009). Disadvantages in employment, occupation and earnings as faced by members of ethnic minority heritages who possess similar educational qualifications and who share similar personal characteristics to those of the majority group are termed ‘ethnic penalties’ by Heath and McMahon (1997: 91).

Ethnic penalties exhibit themselves most notably in unemployment but for those fortunate enough to be in employment, the disadvantages in career advancement are shown to be mitigated (Cheung and Heath 2007). Previous studies of ethnic minority disadvantage in the labour market tend to use the micro data from the Censuses of the Population or the Labour Force Survey. These data sources contain large sample sizes as needed for ethnic research but they do not have information on parental class. When more refined analysis is conducted, such as examining the ethnic situation by generational status, the sample sizes for the ethno-generational groupings become quite small, making it necessary to limit the analysis to only a few (usually three or four) groups per generation (Cheung and Heath 2007: 532–533). When information on family class is available, researchers turned to study ethnic social mobility. For instance, Heath and McMahon (2005) compared the mobility profiles between minority and majority groups. They found that Black Caribbean, Indian and Pakistani/Bangladeshi men

were well behind white men in gaining access to the most advantaged occupational positions. Yet the small samples used in the study meant that they had to confine the analysis to only a few groups. Li and Devine (2011, 2014) were unable to differentiate generational changes due to data limitations. Similarly, Platt (2005) confined her mobility analysis to Indians and Black Caribbeans. More recently, Li and Heath (2016) used datasets that contain large samples, parental class and generational status. They analysed parental effects on both unemployment risks and access to the salariat, and found that parental class played a highly important role in both respects. Similar to Cheung and Heath (2007), they found that first-generation Black Caribbean and Pakistani men were disadvantaged, being 10 and 15 percentage points behind white men in the salariat, but the second generation were generally doing well. Yet, they did not focus on higher education.

The foregoing discussion of the recent research on ethnic differences in Britain suggests two main features. Firstly, wherever data sources permit, researchers would take the advantage and include parental class, ethnicity and generational status as ascriptive factors (or as interrelated domains of social origin) which have been shown to have a powerful impact on education and, through this, on occupational attainment. The interrelationship between the expanded domains of origin, education and destination would, as shown in Fig. 6.1, constitute a reformulated OED specifically designed for research on ethnic integration, just as the classic model is for the general population (Goldthorpe 1996). The limited use of this framework is mainly due to data constraints. Secondly, a finer-grained distinction is needed on the concept of 'ethnic penalty'. Disadvantages in unemployment and low class positions as faced by the first generations certainly reflect but cannot be entirely attributed to racial discrimination, as other factors such as religion, poor human capital (overseas qualifications, poor English, unfamiliarity with the local labour market) and lack of social capital may all play a role (Heath and Martin 2012). First-generation disadvantages are thus at least partially attributable to 'migrant penalty' associated with the disruptive processes of migration. Yet, labour market disadvantages faced by the second generation who have British education

Fig. 6.1 A framework of analysis—ethno-generational status, class origin, and educational and occupational attainment (Note Double-headed arrows on dotted lines indicate associations and single-headed arrows on solid lines indicate causation. Ethnicity, generational status and family class are indicators of origin)

and who face no language difficulties cannot be due to the disruptive processes of migration, and can be properly termed as ‘ethnic penalty’. This is especially true amongst those who possess higher levels of education obtained in UK universities. The degree to which ethnic penalty persists is a litmus test of social equality of British society. The differentiation between migrant and ethnic penalties thus calls for analyses of ethnic differences by generation, between those who came as adults or who were born in the country. In between are those who came as children or young adults, such as those arriving between ages 6 and 16 who received partial education in Britain, a group of people called the 1.5th generation in the literature (Rumbaut 2004; Lessard-Phillips and Li 2017). If ethnic penalty declines, it would be more noticeable in the attenuation of penalties in obtaining higher education and in gaining access to more advantaged occupational positions from the 1.5th to the 2nd generation.

With these considerations in mind, this chapter seeks to address the following questions:

1. How much difference is there both between the minority and the majority and among the minority groups in terms of degree-level education?
2. Do ethnic minorities find the same returns to higher education as enjoyed by the majority in terms of gaining access to the professional-managerial salariat?
3. Is there evidence of progress for the ethnic minorities over generations in both higher education and salariat access?
4. What roles do parental class and gender play in attainment of higher education and privileged occupation over and above ethno-generational status?

Data and Methods

In order to address the research questions as outlined above, I will use the combined data from the third quarters of the labour force survey (LFS) of 2014 and 2015. The LFS is a longstanding government survey conducted since 1981 and has been much used by academic and government researchers. The reason for using this data source for the present study is that it has a large sample size and contains, for the first time in its history, information for parental class. As one of the most authoritative social surveys in the country, it also contains rich information on ethnicity, generation, educational qualification, employment status and occupational position, as well as many other demographic attributes, which makes it ideal for the present purposes. The response rates of the LFS are high, and the data files including technical reports are available at <http://ukdataservice.ac.uk/get-data/key-data.aspx#/tab-uk-surveys>.

The coding of the key variables (ethnicity, generational status, education, own and parental class) is adopted from standard practice (Cheung and Heath 2007; Li and Heath 2016; Lessard-Phillips and Li 2017). The analysis is confined to the working-age population, namely, age 16–65 for men and 16–63 for women excluding full-time students. Limiting the analysis to valid cases on education, ethnicity, generation, and parental class results in an analytical sample of 82,026, which is the best dataset currently available with all the crucial variables contained in

one single source permitting detailed and simultaneous analysis of the ethnic stratification in higher education and access to the salariat in the UK. As ethnic minorities are generally younger than the majority group (by five years of age in the sample used), I use age-adjusted weighted analysis in this chapter following the procedure designed by Li and Heath (2016, note 12).

Results

I will start the analysis with higher education (first and higher degrees) and then move to access to the professional-managerial salariat. In each respect, I will begin with descriptive analysis before moving to statistical modelling.

The data in Table 6.1 show the educational distributions by ethno-generational status, family class and gender. Before going into detailed discussion, I wish to point out that although the focus in this chapter is on higher education, it is important to have a detailed view of the educational distribution rather than just looking at higher education which would mask considerable ethnic disadvantages. Thus six educational categories are differentiated, from higher degree to the lowest level (primary education or no formal schooling). This more differentiated view provides a fairly comprehensive educational profile in the UK. Differentiating the higher from the first degree as shown in the table has the advantage of allowing us to see the marked ethnic differences. For instance, 9% of the majority group (white UK) have higher degrees, as compared with 8 and 5% for Black Caribbeans and Bangladeshis respectively. Yet most other ethnic minority groups are more likely than the white UK respondents to have higher degrees, with white Irish and Indians being twice, and Chinese three times, as likely (17, 18 and 29% respectively).

If we group higher and first degrees together as 'higher degree', as will be the practice for the later analyses in this chapter, it can be seen that 28% of the white UK have higher education, and 16% have the lowest level (primary education or no formal schooling). Ethnic minorities are, as a whole, much more likely than the white UK to have higher

Table 6.1 Educational distribution by ethnicity, generation, family class and sex (% by row)

	Higher degree	First degree	Sub-degree	Higher secondary	Lower secondary	Primary/none	N
Ethnicity							
White UK	9	19	10	13	33	16	70,768
Ethnic minority	14	28	8	10	14	25	11,258
White Irish	17	24	12	12	16	20	472
White Other	14	27	9	10	10	30	4145
Mixed	12	28	7	13	23	17	891
Black Caribbean	8	18	10	14	30	20	732
Black African	15	28	12	9	15	22	1016
Indian	18	38	6	7	12	19	1962
Pakistani	11	21	5	11	18	33	1242
Bangladeshi	5	24	5	12	18	34	438
Chinese	29	32	5	5	9	20	360
Generation							
1st Gen	15	27	9	8	10	31	8283
1.5th Gen	10	23	8	13	23	23	1211
2nd Gen	9	19	10	13	33	15	72,532
Parental class							
Higher salariat	18	33	10	12	20	6	8943
Lower salariat	18	32	11	12	20	6	14,674
Clerical	10	22	11	13	29	15	10,550
Own-account	8	17	10	13	35	18	9562
Foremen and tech	7	17	12	13	35	16	8156
Semi routine	5	13	10	12	37	23	12,414
Routine	5	10	8	11	37	29	12,999
Not employed	4	11	7	12	33	33	4728
Sex							
Male	10	20	9	11	32	18	39,743
Female	10	20	11	13	29	16	42,283
All	10	20	10	12	31	17	82,026

Note Weighted analyses and unweighted Ns (the same below for all analyses in this chapter)
Source The Labour Force Survey (2014, 2015 quarter 3 combined, the same below for all analyses in this chapter)

education but, at the same time, they are also more likely to have the lowest education: 42 and 25% as shown in the second row of the table.

Looking more closely at the data, we find clear evidence of both ethnic polarisation and ethnic stratification in education. With regard to the former, most ethnic groups are more likely to have higher education but all groups are more concentrated in the lowest level, with white Other, Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups being twice as likely. With regard to the latter, only Black Caribbeans (at 26%) are slightly behind the white UK in higher education. Chinese and Indians are, at 61 and 56%, well above the white UK; and even white Irish, white Other, Mixed and Black African groups are around 1.5 times as likely as the white UK to have higher education, at around 40–43% versus the 28% for the white UK. Given the evidence on both the polarisation and the stratification in educational distributions, any simple notions of ethnic disadvantage or advantage in education are likely to be incomplete.

Apart from ethnic differences, there are also notable generational changes. Over 42% of the first-generation and one third of the 1.5th generation 33% have higher education, both higher than the 28% by the majority group. Among the second generation, all ethnic minority groups are more likely to have higher education than the majority group, with 58% Black Africans and Indians, and 70% Chinese being in this category.

As would be expected from the large body of literature on the sociology of education (Breen et al. 2009; Devine and Li 2013), there are striking parental class effects on educational attainment, with 52% of the respondents from higher-grade professional-managerial salariat families having higher education, which stands in sharp contrast to the 15% from routine manual or non-employed families (the latter category referring to families where neither parent was in gainful employment when the respondent was in the adolescent years, at around age 14). The mirror image of this is the evidence on the lowest level of education, with only 6% of the respondents from higher salariat families versus 33% of those from non-employed families being thus found. Gender differences are small, with women being slightly less likely than men to have the lowest level of education, at 16 and 18% respectively.

The complex interplay of ethnicity, generation, parental class and gender in their effects on education requires more refined analysis to obtain net effects. Given this, I turn to multivariate analysis with logit regression focusing on higher education (first and higher degrees combined). For ease of exposition, the coefficients from the logit models are turned into percentages using average marginal effects (AMEs) models. The data (Table 6.2) thus represent percentage-point differences for each category relative to the reference group. Three models are conducted: model 1 on ethno-generational status, model 2 adding parental class, and model further including age, age squared and gender. Note that the effects of age squared are absorbed in the age effects in the AME calculation.

Table 6.2 Average marginal effects (AME) on degree-level education

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Ethnicity			
White Irish	0.127***	0.136***	0.135***
White Other	0.112***	0.135***	0.117***
Mixed	0.108***	0.104***	0.094***
Black Caribbean	−0.020	0.022	0.015
Black African	0.137***	0.144***	0.122***
Indian	0.282***	0.284***	0.267***
Pakistani	0.039**	0.103***	0.084***
Bangladeshi	0.019	0.085***	0.065**
Chinese	0.327***	0.316***	0.293***
Generation			
1st Gen	0.023**	−0.008	−0.018*
1.5th Gen	−0.048***	−0.053***	−0.036**
Parental class			
Higher salariat		0.365***	0.355***
Lower salariat		0.353***	0.342***
Clerical		0.168***	0.168***
Own-account		0.093***	0.089***
Foremen & tech		0.100***	0.100***
Semi routine		0.035***	0.037***
Not employed		−0.002	−0.005
Age			−0.001***
Female			0.009**
(N)	82,026	82,026	82,026

Note Reference groups are white UK, 2nd generation, parents in routine manual positions and male

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

The data in model 1 of Table 6.2 suggest that, net of generational status, all ethnic minority groups, with the sole exceptions of Black Caribbeans and Bangladeshis, are more likely to have higher education than the majority, with the Chinese, Indians and Black Africans being 33, 28, and 14 percentage points higher, white Irish, white Other and Mixed leading by 11–13 points, and Pakistanis by 4 points. Controlling for ethnicity, the 1st are slightly more likely than the majority group to have higher education, by 2 percentage points, but the 1.5th generation are less so, being around 5 points behind.

The parental class effects, net of ethnicity and generation, are strong and have clear gradients, as shown in model 2 of Table 6.2. People from higher salariat families have a lead of 36.5 percentage points over those from routine manual families in having higher education. As Pakistani/Bangladeshi groups tend to come from more disadvantaged family positions, controlling for parental class shows that the two groups would be even more likely than the white UK to have higher education if they had similar parental class positions: an increase of approximately 6 percentage points in both cases.

Model 3 further controls for personal characteristics of age, age squared and gender. Even with all these factors taken into account, women are still found to have a higher educational profile than men, by around 1 percentage point in having first or higher degrees. Older people are less likely than younger ones to have higher education, which is understandable given the rapid expansion of higher education in the last few decades in the UK and in some other parts in the world. With the other covariates in the model taken into account, the ethnic effects in model 3 declined somewhat as compared with model 2, by 1 or 2 percentage points for most ethnic groups. Yet the overwhelming evidence still points to an ethnic premia: apart from Black Caribbeans, all other groups are more likely to have higher education than the majority. It is also the case that, other things being equal, the 1st and the 1.5th generation are less likely to have higher education.

Although all three models in Table 6.2 control for ethnicity and generation, they do not show separate ethnic differences by generation. To see such effects, I present, in Fig. 6.2, predicted probabilities of higher education on the basis of model 3 of Table 6.2.

The data in Fig. 6.2 show that, among all three generational groups, the Black Caribbeans have no statistically significantly differences with the majority group in having higher education, nor do the 1st and the 1.5th generation Bangladeshis. Apart from these, all other ethno-generational groupings are significantly above the majority in having higher education. A closer scrutiny also reveals a three-tiered structure, with Chinese and Indians taking the lead, followed by white Irish, white Other, Mixed, and Black African groups, with white UK and Black Caribbean groups being the least likely to have higher education. Generational progress is also visible for Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups, other things being equal. The findings with regard to the 2nd generation are similar to those by Cutz (2014: 180) although she was only able to analyse the situation for the four Asian groups.

Fig. 6.2 Predictive margins with 95% confidence intervals on having degree-level education by ethnicity and generation (Note The predicted probabilities are based on Model 3 of Table 6.2. G1: 1st generation, G1.5: 1.5th generation, G2: 2nd generation. WB: white UK, WI: white Irish, WO: white Other, M: Mixed, BC: Black Caribbean, BA: Black African, I: Indian, P: Pakistani, B: Bangladeshi, Ch: Chinese)

Having discussed ethnic differences in higher education, I will now turn to ethnic differences in the labour market position. Previous research in this regard tends to focus on the economically active, in terms of unemployment rates (NEP 2007; Li and Heath 2008), occupational positions (Platt 2005; Li and Heath 2010), or access to the professional-managerial salariat among the active (Cheung and Heath 2007; Li and Heath 2016). Whilst such a focus is justifiable for the general population given the variegated reasons for inactivity, it is less desirable for the working-age and non-student population as used in the present study. It is reasonable to suggest that a sizeable portion of the economically inactive among this population, particularly those from ethnic minority backgrounds who tend to live in deprived areas with limited employment opportunities and elevated employer discrimination, may have involuntarily opted out of the labour market (Demireva and Heath 2017). Their cumulative experiences of job-seeking frustrations might have suggested to them that ‘there is no job for me’. Such people are called ‘disillusioned seekers’ or ‘discouraged workers’ in the literature (Gallie 1988). It may also be pertinent to say that there is no clear-cut distinction between job-seeking and home-making activities, particularly for female members from some ethnic minority communities who may decide to stay at home or look for a job intermittently, pending on the prevailing family circumstances including caring responsibilities (Dale et al. 2002). Seen from this perspective, worklessness (unemployment and inactivity) may be taken as a particular, and more useful, form of disadvantage for the working-age population, with special regard to women in some ethnic minority groups. There may, to be sure, be genuine reasons for some people to stay out of the labour market, such as those with limiting long-term illness or heavy household responsibilities. Given these considerations, the following analysis will firstly show a full picture of labour market position combining occupational and employment statuses and then focus on access to the professional-managerial salariat among the employed in the multivariate modelling.

Table 6.3 shows the gross ethnic differences in the labour market, with two major features. Firstly, most ethnic minority groups are under-represented in the salariat, with Pakistanis and Bangladeshis falling

behind the majority group by a big margin (13 and 14 percentage points), even though they were, as seen earlier, somewhat more likely to have higher education than the white UK respondents. Secondly, looking under the last column, one finds that broadly the same ethnic minority groups who are underrepresented in the salariat are overrepresented in the routine manual and the workless positions, such as Pakistani, Bangladeshi and the two Black groups. The workless rates are markedly high for the Pakistanis and Bangladeshis. Further analysis shows that around 60% of the women in the two groups are economically inactive. There is also clear generational change, with the workless rates precipitating from 85% for the first generation to 34% for the second generation of the Bangladeshi women.

Having looked at the gross differences between ethnic groups in the labour market position, let us move to the relative ones, focusing on access to the salariat. As Iganski and Payne (1996: 129) note, it is essential to analyse ethnic position in the labour market by examining gender effects separately. Furthermore, time commitment must also be taken into account as salariat jobs tend to require full-time commitment. Thus, in the modelling part, in addition to the covariates used for educational modelling, time commitment, educational qualification, health and marital status, and number of dependent children in the family will be controlled for, as these can be expected to have significant impacts on salariat access.

Table 6.3 Labour market position by ethnicity (percentage by row)

	Salariat	Intermediate	Working class	Non-employed
White UK	35	25	17	23
White Irish	52	17	9	22
White Other	33	24	26	17
Mixed	36	20	15	29
Black Caribbean	30	26	21	24
Black African	31	17	24	28
Indian	40	21	16	23
Pakistani	22	24	13	40
Bangladeshi	21	27	16	36
Chinese	45	17	11	26
All	35	25	17	23

The data in Table 6.4 show the relative probability of being in the salariat, for men and women separately, and each with three models. For men, model 1 shows that Black Caribbeans, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis are significantly less likely to be in the salariat than white UK men. Parental class has, as can be expected, highly influential impacts, with men from higher salariat families being 31 percentage points more likely to be in the salariat positions themselves than their counterparts from routine manual working-class families, as shown in model 2. Interestingly, those from non-employed families are even less likely than those from routine manual families to be in the salariat, by 4.5 points, which is significant at the 0.001 level, showing a clear scarring effect. Education and other attributes of personal/family circumstances all show effects in the expected directions as seen in model 3. Importantly, with all these important factors taken into account, men in most ethnic minority groups show a lower probability of having salariat jobs than do white UK men with similar levels of education, similar personal characteristics, and similar family circumstances. Amidst the overall disadvantage, men of Black African, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi origins are particularly disadvantaged, being behind their white UK peers by around 9 percentage points.

Ethnic minority women are found to face lesser disadvantage than do their male counterparts. The most salient cases of disadvantage are those faced by Pakistani and Bangladeshi women but the reasons behind the differences seem chiefly attributable to personal and family circumstances. When family circumstances are taken into consideration, as shown in model 3, their disadvantages sharply declined.

Since this chapter is focused on higher education, an interesting question is whether ethnic minorities with first or higher degrees would have equal access to the salariat as do their white UK counterparts. For this, model 3 of Table 6.4 was re-run with the same covariates included but confined to those with higher education. The predicted margins were then obtained for each ethno-generational groupings, and for men and women separately. The data are shown in Fig. 6.3.

Even at the higher end of educational distribution, ethnic disadvantages persist, as seen for all three generational groups for men. A closer look shows that first and second generation Black Africans, Pakistanis

Table 6.4 Average marginal effects (AME) on access to the salariat

	Men			Women		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Ethnicity						
White Irish	0.158***	0.171***	0.124***	0.237***	0.242***	0.143***
White Other	-0.016	0.007	-0.034*	0.067***	0.073***	-0.027*
Mixed	-0.010	-0.015	0.000	0.043	0.048*	0.011
Black Caribbean	-0.103***	-0.075**	-0.045	0.006	0.043	0.017
Black African	-0.050	-0.036	-0.090***	0.042	0.044	-0.004
Indian	0.085***	0.084***	-0.029	0.073***	0.076***	-0.039**
Pakistani	-0.086***	-0.037	-0.081***	-0.142***	-0.106***	-0.042*
Bangladeshi	-0.132***	-0.087*	-0.090**	-0.121***	-0.081*	-0.013
Chinese	0.193***	0.185***	0.063	0.117**	0.106**	-0.032
Generation						
1st Gen	-0.004	-0.031*	-0.079***	-0.087***	-0.103***	-0.089***
1.5th Gen	-0.058**	-0.062**	-0.020	-0.066**	-0.068***	-0.021
Parental class						
Higher salariat		0.311***	0.150***		0.268***	0.097***
Lower salariat		0.289***	0.134***		0.254***	0.094***
Clerical		0.151***	0.082***		0.138***	0.063***
Own-account		0.094***	0.043***		0.094***	0.043***
Foremen and tech		0.110***	0.063***		0.106***	0.047***
Semi routine		0.036***	0.026***		0.024**	0.010
Not employed		-0.045***	-0.011		-0.041***	-0.012
Degree+			0.362***			0.314***
Full-part time						
Part-time			-0.136***			-0.150***
Other			-0.386***			-0.409***
Age			-0.000			0.001***
Married			0.083***			0.035***
Having L-T illness			-0.137***			-0.101***
No. children under 16			-0.005*			-0.022***
(N)	39,591	39,591	39,591	42,144	42,144	42,144

Note Reference groups are white UK, 2nd generation, parents in routine manual positions, no-degree, full-time work, non-married, and no limiting long-term illness. The effects of age squared are absorbed in the age effects in the AME calculation
 * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

- **Fig. 6.3** Predictive margins with 95% confidence intervals on access to the salariat among degree-holders by ethno-generational status and sex (Note G1: 1st generation, G1.5: 1.5th generation, G2: 2nd generation. WB: white UK, WI: white Irish, WO: white Other, M: Mixed, BC: Black Caribbean, BA: Black African, I: Indian, P: Pakistani, B: Bangladeshi, Ch: Chinese)

and Bangladeshis, and 1.5th generation Pakistanis were significantly behind their white UK counterparts in the access rates to the salariat. Further analysis shows that, when all ethnic minorities are combined, second-generation men were around 6 percentage points less likely to have salariat jobs, which was statistically significant at the 0.001 level. Ethnic minority women faced fewer disadvantages than their male counterparts but, apart from white Irish women, all ethnic groups in all three generations were less likely to find themselves in the salariat positions than their white UK counterparts.

Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter provided an analysis of the ethnic differences in education and labour market, focusing on higher education and access to the professional-managerial salariat. Generational, gender and family class differences were also examined. The main findings can be summarised as follows:

- At the overall level, ethnic minorities were well educated but at the same time they were also highly polarised: they were more likely to have degrees, but were overrepresented in the lowest level of education. There were greater differences among the ethnic minority groups in higher education than between the minority and the majority groups, with Chinese, Indians and Black Africans being well above the majority in having degree-level education. And this picture was generally the same for all three generational groupings delineated in this chapter. Family class played a crucial role but gender differences were rather small.
- The ethnic educational premia were not translated into commensurate labour market position. Many groups, particularly Pakistanis, Bangladeshis and Black Africans, were notably behind the majority in

getting salariat jobs and were overrepresented in the workless positions. The ethnic penalties were more severe for men than for women. Family class effects were still marked even when education and a whole range of personal and household circumstances were taken into account. There was some evidence of generational improvement in access to the salariat for both men and women ethnic minorities.

- Even among those with higher education, ethnic minorities, particularly men, faced marked disadvantages. Second-generation Pakistani and Bangladeshi men with degrees were around 20 percentage points behind their majority counterparts in having salariat jobs.

Overall, the analysis in this chapter shows an encouraging story for higher education but a disappointing story for access to the salariat by the ethnic minorities in the UK. While the first story is most probably due to the aspiration and determination of the minorities, first and second generations alike, in performing well in gaining higher qualifications to avoid discrimination in the labour market, the second story is a more direct reflection of unfair treatment experienced by the ethnic minorities, even amongst the second-generation degree-holders. Attainment of higher education and access to privileged class positions were not in tune with each other for the ethnic minorities. A likely explanation for this is that whilst ethnic minorities believed that they could try hard to achieve educational excellence, which many of them did as clearly demonstrated by the remarkable educational success by the 2nd generation members of Chinese, Indian, and Black African origins, they would also find that, when stepping out of education and into the realm of labour market, fates were more beyond their own control. Employers' decisions, rather than their own efforts, may play a more important role in gaining paid employment and in career advancement. In this sense, the educational success by the 1.5th and the 2nd generations may be seen as a strategic effort to try to reduce possible future employer bias and discrimination. They would have fared worse with lesser success in higher education.

Finally, it is noted that the success story of higher education by ethnic minority groups as depicted in this chapter may be too rosy. It is possible that ethnic minorities are well represented in higher education at an overall level but underrepresented in elite institutions such as in Russell

Group universities in general or in Oxford/Cambridge universities in particular. Future work could try to address this question if and when appropriate data become available. In sum, ethnic minorities face greater barriers in the labour market than in the higher education sector. Unequal returns present a serious challenge to social justice and ethnic integration in Britain.

References

- Becker, G. (1962). Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 70(5), 9–49.
- Berthoud, R., & Blekesaune, M. (2006). *Persistent Employment Disadvantage, 1974 to 2003*. Working Chapter of Institute for Social and Economic Research, Chapter 2006–09. Colchester: University of Essex.
- Bhattacharyya, G., Ison, L., & Blair, M. (2003). *Minority Ethnic Attainment and Participation in Education and Training: The Evidence*. London: Department for Education and Skills. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RTP01-03MIG1734.pdf>.
- Breach, A., & Li, Y. (2017). *Gender Pay Gap by Ethnicity in Britain—Briefing*. London: Fawcett. <https://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=f31d6adc-9e0e-4bfe-a3df-3e85605ee4a9>.
- Breen, R., Luijkx, R., Müller, W., & Pollak, R. (2009). Non-persistent Inequality in Educational Attainment: Evidence from Eight European Countries. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(5), 1475–1521.
- Cheung, S., & Heath, A. (2007). Nice Work If You Can Get It: Ethnic Penalties in Great Britain. In A. Heath & S. Y. Cheung (Eds.), *Unequal Chances: Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets* (pp. 505–548). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cutz, A. (2014). University Completion Among the Children of Immigrants. In A. Heath & Y. Brinbaum (Eds.), *Unequal Attainments: Ethnic Educational Inequalities in Ten Western Countries* (pp. 167–191). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dale, A., Shaheen, N., Kalra, V., & Fieldhouse, E. (2002). Routes into Education and Employment for Young Pakistani and Bangladeshi Women in the UK. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25, 942–968.

- Demireva, N., & Heath, A. (2017). Minority Embeddedness and Economic Integration: Is Diversity or Homogeneity Associated with Better Employment Outcomes? *Social Inclusion*, 5(1), 20–31.
- Devine, F., & Li, Y. (2013). The Changing Relationship Between Origins, Education and Destinations in the 1990s and 2000s. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 34(5–6), 766–791.
- Dustmann, C., & Fabbri, F. (2005). Immigrants in the British Labour Market. *Fiscal Studies*, 26(4), 423–470.
- Gallie, D. (Ed.). (1988). *Employment in Britain*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goldthorpe, J. H. (1996). Problems of “Meritocracy”. In R. Erikson & J. O. Jonsson (Eds.), *Can Education Be Equalised? The Swedish Case in Comparative Perspective* (pp. 255–287). Oxford: Westview Press.
- Heath, A., & McMahon, D. (1997). Education and Occupational Attainments: The Impact of Ethnic Origins. In V. Karn (Ed.), *Ethnicity in the 1991 Census: Employment, Education and Housing Among the Ethnic Minority Populations of Britain* (pp. 97–113). London: The Stationery Office.
- Heath, A., & McMahon, D. (2005). Social Mobility of Ethnic Minorities. In G. Loury, T. Modood, & S. Teles (Eds.), *Ethnicity, Social Mobility and Public Policy: Comparing the US and UK* (pp. 393–413). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, A., & Li, Y. (2008). Period, Life-Cycle and Generational Effects on Ethnic Minority Success in the Labour Market. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 48, 277–306.
- Heath, A., & Martin, J. (2012). Can Religious Affiliation Explain ‘Ethnic’ Inequalities in the Labour Market? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(6), 1–23.
- Iganski, P., & Payne, G. (1996). Declining Racial Disadvantage in the British Labour Market. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 19(1), 113–134.
- Iganski, P., & Payne, G. (1999). Socio-Economic Re-structuring and Employment: The Case of Minority Ethnic Groups. *British Journal of Sociology*, 50(2), 195–216.
- Lessard-Phillips, L., & Li, Y. (2017). The Social Stratification of Education in the UK: A Study of Minority Ethnic Groups’ Educational Attainment Over Three Generations. *Social Inclusion*, 5(1), 45–54.
- Li, Y. (2010). The Labour Market Situation of Minority Ethnic Groups in Britain and the USA. *EurAmerica: A Journal of European and American Studies*, 40(2), 259–309.

- Li, Y. (2012). Ethnic Wage Gaps in Britain and the US. In P. Lambert, R. Connelly, R. Blackburn, & V. Gayle (Eds.), *Social Stratification: Trends and Processes* (pp. 167–179). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Li, Y., & Devine, F. (2011). Is Social Mobility Really Declining? Intergenerational Class Mobility in Britain in the 1990s and the 2000s. *Sociological Research Online*. <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/3/4.html>.
- Li, Y., & Devine, F. (2014). Social Mobility in Britain, 1991–2011. In L. Archer, A. Mann, & J. Stanley (Eds.), *Understanding Employer Engagement in Education: Theories and Evidence* (pp. 79–91). London: Routledge.
- Li, Y., & Heath, A. (2008). Ethnic Minority Men in British Labour Market (1972–2005). *International Journal of Sociology and Social policy*, 28(5/6), 231–244.
- Li, Y., & Heath, A. (2010). Struggling onto the Ladder, Climbing the Rungs: Employment Status and Class Position by Minority Ethnic Groups in Britain (1972–2005). In J. Stillwell, P. Norman, C. Thomas, & P. Surridge (Eds.), *Population, Employment, Health and Well-Being* (pp. 83–97). London: Springer.
- Li, Y., & Heath, A. (2016). Class Matters: A Study of Minority and Majority Social Mobility in Britain, 1982–2011. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122(1), 162–200.
- National Employment Panel in Association with the EMBF. (2007). 60/76: *The Business Commission on Race Equality in the Workplace*, NEP.
- Office for National Statistics. (2011, March). 2011 Census: Key Statistics for England and Wales. http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_290685.pdf.
- Platt, L. (2005). Intergenerational Social Mobility of Minority Ethnic Groups in Britain. *Sociology*, 39(3), 455–461.
- Rumbaut, R. (2004). Ages, Life Stages, and Generational Cohorts: Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 1160–1205.
- Wood, M., Hales, J., Purdon, S., Sejersen, T., & Hayllar, O. (2009). *A Test for Racial Discrimination in Recruitment Practice in British Cities*. DWP Research Report 607. Leeds: Corporate Document Services.