

E&D Applicant data analysis: Quarter 2: July – September 2011

Criminal convictions:

My Analysis: The data shows that there may be bias at each stage of the job application process for people with criminal convictions etc.

Possible Actions: I do not feel that we need to take any action on this as at this stage – I will look into what (if anything) other housing associations are doing on this and report back.

Ethnicity:

Analysis on incomplete applications: In regards to the incomplete applications, all I can do is make assumptions. Reasons may range from finding the application form to difficult to complete due to language barriers or just to not fully understanding the process. The 2 largest ethnic groups whom did not complete the application process were African & Indian Pakistani.

Possible Actions: We could hold workshops with the local BME groups (specifically the African or Pakistani communities) to teach them the sustainable skills of completing a satisfactory application form. This would also help with our agenda of closing the gap.

Analysis on applications for review: 93.16% of the total applications for review were White British, BME accounted for 6.83%. This is reflective of the community of Warrington. If I break down the BME groups further, the other largest groups of applicants reflect the community demographics i.e.; Indian, Pakistani, Asian. (Note; The 'other white background' may be the new Polish community which will be picked up on in the census 2011.)

Possible Actions: No action needed; due to no bias shown. Work does need to continue to be done to ensure we attract different BME groups through the E&D Officer.

Analysis on applications that failed screening: Only 1 person from a minority group made it through to the interview stage (and then they didn't make it through the interview stage). The number suggests bias if using the four fifths rule, although GGHT do not know what the names of the applicants are at this stage so there can be no name based discrimination.

Possible Actions: None.

Summing up:

Many ethnic groups log on and start the application process and then for some reason do not complete the application. This may be because of the projected culture of the organisation – in which case we need to carry out exercises to change public's perception of GGHT. Also, targeted work needs to be done with the different ethnic groups in application form completion and to explain what we expect and what support we offer. (<http://www.equalityscotland.com/newsandevents/press-020907.php>)

Gender:

My Analysis: The percentages of men & women who started the application process are nearly equal to the Warrington demographic. Fewer women actually completed the application process than men. From the 50.8% of women who started the application process, only 29.9% of those completed the application form compared with 70.1% of the males completing the form from the 48.9% who applied. Making an assumption on the reasons for this; maybe we are not publicizing the flexible working scheme enough or the benefits we offer to working mothers / maybe the roles are stereotypically male? A higher percentage of males continued through to the interview stage but it was a 50/50% split on the appointments, which shows no bias from GGHT.

Possible Actions:

- Targeted publicity to publicise the benefits of working for GGHT – especially for mothers / women
- Advertise stereotypically male roles in female press / women's organisations
- Have events in the community targeted at women to help them understand GGHT's support networks and to attract them into male dominated roles.
- Work with the local skill centre to raise the profile as GGHT as an employer so that any females studying bricklaying / plastering etc will want to work for us.

Religion:

My Analysis: The percentages of the different religions that started the application process are higher than the local demographic. This is also the case for the finished applications. Although not one person with a religion other than Christian got through the interview stage. This may show an unconscious bias from the interviewers?

Possible Actions:

- Give managers training on understanding personal bias or unconscious bias.

Sexual Orientation:

My Analysis: The percentage of people who were gay / lesbian or bisexual was nearly equal to the local demographic with only 3.7% of people preferring not to say – which should be seen as a positive compared with the 8% who preferred not to say in the local population. Unfortunately, only 0.9% of the total 2.9% of LGB applicants carried on to complete the application; the other 99.1% of completed applications came from heterosexual applicants. There were only heterosexual applicants that made it through to the interview stage also.

Possible Actions:

- Become a Stonewall diversity Champion or appear on the workplace equality index to raise our profile as a LGB friendly employer.
- Advertise roles in LGB Press
- Work with local LGB groups or the WTG to come up with ideas for raising the profile as an LGB friendly employer.
- LBG Month
- Attend an LGB recruitment fair to raise our profile

Gender Identity:

My Analysis: 0.3% of applications were from transgender people, 0.5% of people preferred not to say whilst 99.2% of applicants were not transgender. 0.2% of the transgender applications did not complete the application form and none got through to the interview stage. I can reasonably assume that some people who were transgender could have 'preferred not to say' but even so – none of these got through to the interview stage and only one was an application which was reviewed.

Possible Actions:

As there are no demographic figures regarding the transgender population it is very difficult to see if there is any bias.

No actions needed as of yet

Disability:

My Analysis: The disability data clearly shows that we are not attracting enough people who class themselves as having a disability. This maybe due to many reasons such as the language used in advertisements / not promoting our willingness to make adjustments enough / not having a strong brand to disabled people / people not admitting they have a disability who are applying. I think this because only 2.8% of the total applications were from people with disabilities compared to the 26% in the local population.

Of the disabled applicants, only 2 made it through to the interview stage – which they then failed. Of the two applicants that got through to the interview stage, both had a physical impairment. This may suggest that people who had learning difficulties did not progress as they didn't have the support needed to complete the application form or it wasn't in a format that was easy to understand / complete.

I also noticed that no one with ill mental health applied. This may be true or they may have felt that they should not say as; "40% of job seekers say that they were denied a job because of their history of psychiatric treatment and about 60% say they have been put off applying for a job as they expect to be dealt with unfairly" and "47% of people with mental health problems say they have experienced discrimination at work."

Possible Actions:

- Work with the local Job centre's Disability Employment advisor (DEA) to attract more disabled people to GGHT.
- Targeted recruitment advertising towards disabled people
- Linking in with the Warrington Disability partnership's employment team
- Raise GGHT's brand awareness as a disabled friendly employer
- Use disabled employee testimonials on recruitment website
- Look at the application form and take this to a group of people with learning difficulties for an accessibility audit.
- Communicate GGHT's willingness to make reasonable adjustments

Source used for research:

www.barrierfree-recruitment.com/recruit/messages.htm