

Hull Adult Health and Wellbeing Survey: Report

January 2020

1. Key Points

- SURVEY: Overall, 4,137 adults (16+ years) participated in the survey between March and June 2019. The survey responders are broadly representativeness of survey population to Hull's population. The response rate was high at 76%.
- ♦ HEALTH STATUS: Overall, 8.4% stated their usual health was excellent, 27% as very good, 34% as good, 21% as fair and 9.6% as poor. Unsurprisingly, there was a strong association with age. Around one in five stated their health was fair or poor among those aged 16-34 years, but this was 54% among those aged 75+ years. There was also a strong association with deprivation with around four in ten stating their health was fair or poor among those living in the most deprived fifth of areas compared to just under one-quarter of those living in the least deprived fifth of areas of Hull. Furthermore, 35% of those who were unemployed stated they had fair or poor health and not surprisingly 85% of those who were not working due to longterm illness or disability. People who lived alone (and were aged under 65 years) also had high levels of fair and poor health (39%). It is estimated that 20,050 people in Hull have poor health and a further 43,100 have fair health. Overall, three in ten had a long-term illness or disability that limited their activities equating to 62,350 adults aged 16+ years across Hull. Over time, the percentage reporting excellent or very good health has fallen slightly with a slight increase in the percentage in fair or poor health and with long-term illness or disability that limits daily activities.
- MENTAL HEALTH: Overall, 14% of people had low levels of satisfaction with life (equating to 28,850 people across all of Hull), 12% had low levels of feeling their life was worthwhile (equating to 25,050 people across Hull), 16% had low levels of happiness the previous day (equating to 33,150 people across Hull), and 31% had high levels of anxiety the previous day (equating to 64,700 people across Hull). Low levels of satisfaction with life, feeling life was worthwhile and feelings of happiness were highest among people living in the most deprived areas of Hull, people aged 16-24 and 45-64 years, who were unemployed or not working due to long-term illness or disability and people who lived alone (aged under 65 years). Women, people aged 16-24 years, people living in the most deprived areas of Hull, students and people not working due to unemployment or long-term illness or disability, and people who lived alone (aged under 65 years) and lone parents with one or two children (but not those with three or more children) had the highest levels of anxiety as did people living in households with three or more adults with three or more children). The wellbeing measures were collected for the first time in the 2014 survey so it is not possible to examine long-term trends, but the percentages with low levels of satisfaction, feeling life was worthwhile and happiness, and high levels of anxiety all increased between 2014 and 2019.



- SOCIAL ISOLATION: Overall, 9.6% often lacked companionship, 9.1% often felt left out, 9.9% often felt isolated from others, and 11.3% often felt lonely. Furthermore. 3.8% stated 'often' for all four of these questions and a further 14.3% stated 'often' for 1-3 of these questions so 18.1% stated 'often' for at least one of these four questions. Survey responders were also asked how frequently they felt lonely or isolated from others and 2.4% stated all of the time, 8.1% stated most of the time, and 25.8% stated some of the time. This equates to 4,950 people feeling lonely or isolating from others all of the time, and an additional 17,000 people feeling lonely or isolating from others most of the time. People aged 16-24 years were much likely to state they felt lonely or isolated from others all or most of the time, as were people living in more deprived areas of Hull, people who were unemployed or not working due to long-term illness or disability, people who lived alone (and aged under 65 years) and lone parents with three or more children. People aged 65+ years were the least likely to state they felt lonely or isolated from others all or most of the time compared to other age groups.
- SOCIAL SUPPORT: One in six people had only fewer than three people to turn to for comfort and support if they had a serious crisis, including 2.9% who had no-one and a further 4.9% who had only one person. This equates to 6,050 people in Hull having no-one to turn to for comfort and support in a serious crisis and a further 10,300 people having only one person to turn to. People aged 16-44 years were the most likely to have no-one to turn to as were people living in the most deprived areas of Hull, people who lived alone (aged <65 years), lone parents, and people who were working-age but not working particularly among those who were unemployed or were had long-term illness or disability. A similar pattern was evident for those who had 0-2 people to turn to with the exception of age. The percentage having 0-2 people to turn to was highest among those aged 35-44 and 75+ years. Overall, 10.8% could not ask anyone if they were ill in bed and needed help at home (including asking people who lived with them) or they stated they didn't know if they had anyone they could ask. Similarly, people living in the most deprived areas of Hull, who were working-age but not working, lone parents had the highest percentage not having anyone to help. People aged 16-24 and 75+ years were the most likely to state they did not have anyone to help if ill in bed. Since 2009, levels of social support appear to have reduced slightly.
- SMOKING: One quarter (24.9%) of people smoked having decreased considerably since the 2014 survey from 31.7%. Smoking prevalence was highest among those aged 25-54 years, and there was a very strong association with deprivation. People who were working-age but not working had the highest prevalence of smoking (with the exception of students) particularly among people unemployed and not working due to long-term illness and disability. Lone parents also had a high prevalence of smoking. Smoking prevalence was highest in St Andrew's & Docklands, and Newington & Gipsyville wards. The prevalence of smoking in Hull is considerably higher than England where 14.4% smoke. This equates to around 52,050 people in Hull who currently smoke. However, among the most and second most deprived fifths of geographical areas across England, 28.2% and 17.8% currently smoke respectively compared to 32.7% and 21.1% in Hull respectively. Whilst it is higher in Hull, the comparison is more comparing like-with-like and closer to the national average. Across all of Hull's population, it is estimated that 10.6%, 8.7% and 4.5% smoke 0-<10, 10-<20 and 20+ cigarettes per day (compared to 7.7%, 6.0% and 3.0% respectively for England).



- E-CIGARETTES: Overall, 13.4% use e-cigarettes daily or occasionally, which equates to around 27,950 adults across Hull. Usage was much higher among daily (21.8%) and occasional (34.9%) tobacco smokers, and among those who were exsmokers (23.3%). Only 15 (0.9%) of people who had never smoked tobacco currently used e-cigarettes. The majority of people who did use them were using e-cigarettes to cut down or quit tobacco smoking or to prevent them re-starting smoking tobacco after they had quit.
- DIET: Just over six in ten (63%) stated they ate a healthy diet, but 10% did not know what a healthy diet was or if they ate a healthy diet, and only 21% ate 5-A-DAY. It is estimated that 165,400 people in Hull do not eat 5-A-DAY including 83,100 who eat 0-2 portions of fruit and vegetables each day, and including 13,950 eating no portions. Diet was worst among men, younger people, people living in the most deprived areas of Hull, and people who were not working due to unemployment or long-term illness and disability. The percentage eating 5-A-DAY in Hull is lower than England (27.5%). The percentage reporting that they eat a healthy diet has decreased in Hull (from over 70% in 2007, 2009 and 2011). Whilst the percentage eating 5-A-DAY has been relatively constant in Hull between 2011 and 2019, the percentage eating no or one portion, and two portions has increased, so the average portions of fruit and vegetables has decreased.
- PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: Overall, 41% were active, fulfilling the national physical activity guidelines of 150 minutes of moderate intensity physical activity per week, and 44% were inactive (fewer than 30 such minutes per week). Unsurprisingly, older people were much more likely to be inactive, as were women, people living in more deprived areas of Hull, people who were unemployed and people with long-term illnesses or disabilities. This is equates to over 92,300 residents of Hull aged 16+ years who are inactive with 84,950 residents active. Activity levels are much lower in Hull compared to England where 66% are active and 22% are inactive (Active Lives Survey). The percentage who are physically active fell between 2014 and 2019 for both men (from 50% to 47% in men, and from 40% to 36% for women), but there were relatively small differences in the percentages who are inactive.
- OVERWEIGHT AND OBESITY: Overall, 70% of survey responders were overweight or obese (including 31% who were obese, and including 3.7% who were morbidly obese). This equates to 145,500 adults in Hull who are overweight or obese (including 64,850 who were obese and including 7,650 people who were morbidly obese). The prevalence of overweight and obesity increased with age and then reduced after retirement. The prevalence of overweight and obesity was slightly higher among people living in the least deprived areas of Hull, but in contrast, people living in the most deprived areas of Hull had a higher prevalence of obesity and morbidly obesity. The prevalence of obesity was also highest among those aged 45-54 years, and among those who were not working due to looking after the home or family, or due to long-term illness and disability. One in eight of those who were no working due to long-term illness and disability were morbidly obese which was considerably higher than any other group. The prevalence of overweight and obesity is higher in Hull compared to England (62%). The prevalence of overweight and obesity, obesity, and morbidly obese have all increased between 2003 and 2019 (morbidly obese increasing from 2.3% to 3.6%, obesity including morbidly obese increasing from 22% to 31%, and overweight and obesity combined increasing from 62% to 70%).



- FINANCIAL RESILIENCE: Six in ten would use their savings or money from their current account to fund a £200 household emergency, including 36% who would only use their savings or money from their current account. However, 26% would never use their savings or money from their current account or stated this option was not applicable to them (this equates to 54,100 adults in Hull). Unsurprisingly, people living in the most deprived areas of Hull, people who were working age but not working with the exception of students (i.e. looking after family or home, unemployed and long-term illness and disability) were the most likely to never use their savings or money from their current account or state this option was not applicable, as were lone parents, and other households with children particularly those with three or more children. National comparison data is not available, but in North East Lincolnshire where they undertook a financial inclusion survey in 2017, 66% would use their savings or current account to fund a £200 household emergency, although in North East Lincolnshire higher percentages would use each of the other stated methods.
- PROBLEM GAMBLING: Few individuals in the survey had regularly lied to people important to them about how much they had gambled, felt the need to bet more and more money, or bet more than they could afford to lose. The Lie/Bet Screening Tool uses the first two questions, and if examining both of these questions together, then 0.9% had lied to people important to them and/or felt the need to bet more and more money 'weekly', a further 0.5% do this 'monthly' and a further 1.4% do this 'a few times a year'. Overall, this equates to 1.4% doing this monthly and in total 4.0% doing this in the last year. This equates to around 1,900 adults lying to people important to them about how much they had gambled and/or feeling they need to bet more and more and more money weekly, and a further 1,100 doing this monthly (in total 8,300 doing this in the last year).
- WORRY ABOUT FINANCES: Overall, 4.4% worried most days and a further 4.3% worried about once a week about not having enough food due to lack of money or other resources (this equates to around 18,200 adults worrying weekly about lack of food). Slightly more people worried about not being able to eat healthy and nutritious food because of lack of money or other resources (10.6% worrying weekly). Overall, 7.0% worried weekly and a further 3.4% worried about once a week about paying their rent or mortgage and other essential bills like utilities (this equates to 21,750 adults across Hull). Fewer people worried about paying back money on loans, overdrafts or credit cards (9.1% worrying weekly). Unsurprisingly, the people who were more likely to worry most days or about once a week were the same group of individuals who would never use their savings or money from their current account to fund a £200 household emergency.
- CARING RESPONSIBILITIES: Overall, 17.9% are responsible for the long-term care of another person. This equates to 37,300 adults across Hull caring for someone. Women, people aged 45-64 years, people living in the most deprived areas of Hull, people not working as they are looking after the family or home and lone parents with three or more children are the most likely to care for someone. People are most likely to be caring for parents (6.3%), a sick or disabled partner (5.3%), sick or disabled children (4.4%) and for elderly relatives who are not sick (4.2%). People aged 65+ years are the most likely to care for a sick or disabled partner (over 10%) as are people who are not working as they are looking after the family or home are also the most likely to care for sick or disabled children (17%) as are people living in



households with 3+ children (over 10% and highest among lone parents at 19%). More than 10% of survey responders help with housework or gardening, preparing meals, and shopping. Overall, 7.7% undertake caring activities for 20+ hours per week, including 6.4% who undertake caring activities 35+ hours per week. This equates to 16,000 adults caring for someone for at least 20 hours per week including 13,350 people who care for someone for at least 35 hours per week.

- VOLUNTEERING: Overall, 7.9% volunteering about once a week or more frequently, a further 2.1% volunteer about once a month, 3.7% a few times a year, 2.8% about once a year and 29.7% have volunteered in the past but not in the last year. People aged 16-24 and 65-74 years, and people who are unemployed are the most likely to volunteer weekly. This equates to 16,500 people volunteering about once a week or more frequently (a total of 34,400 people have volunteered in the last year and a total of 96,400 people have done so at some point previously).
- COMMUNITY COHESION: Just over half (55%) of survey responders feel neighbours look out for one another in their neighbourhood, although a sizeable percentage (22%) did not know if this was the case or not. Just under one-fifth (19%) trusted most people in their neighbourhood, 18% trusted many people, 44% people trusted a few people, 10% did not trust people in their neighbourhood and 10% didn't know. The majority agreed that people from different backgrounds tended to get on well in their local area (8.7% definitely agreed and 46% tended to agree), although 28% stated they didn't know. Just over one-quarter (27%) were very satisfied with their local area as a place to live with a further 46% fairly satisfied; 17% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 7.1% were fairly dissatisfied, and 3.0% were very dissatisfied. Older people and people living in the least deprived areas of Hull were the most likely to feel neighbours looked out for one another, most likely to trust people in their neighbourhood, and feel satisfied with their local area as a place to live. This was also the case for agreeing that people from different backgrounds got on well in their area, but there was not such a strong association with age. Some of the surveys that included questions on 'social capital' were conducted by interview rather than self-completion forms, and this could have influenced the results as there is considerably year-on-year variability. However, the levels of trust of neighbours and feelings that neighbours look out for one another has tended to decrease with time. Unsurprisingly then that satisfaction with the local area as a place to live has tended to decrease over time.





Contents

1.	Key Po	oints	1
2.	Aims		7
3	Backo	round	7
U. З		rvev	7
3	2 Dei	nrivation in Hull	7
Δ	Summ	arv of Findings	Q
т. Л		nresentativeness of Survey Responders	۵
	2 Pro	ovalence Estimates	
	421	Physical Health and Emotional Wellbeing	13
	4.2.2	I oneliness and Isolation	
	4.2.3.	Social Support	
	4.2.4.	Lifestyle and Behavioural Risk Factors for Poor Health	
	4.2.5.	Financial Resilience	21
	4.2.6.	Problem Gambling	22
	4.2.7.	Financial Worries.	25
	4.2.8.	Caring Responsibilities	27
	4.2.9.	Volunteering	
	4.2.10.	Your Local Area	31
4	.3. Dif	ferences Across the Wards	32
	4.3.1.	Physical Health and Emotional Wellbeing	
	4.3.2.	Loneliness and Isolation	
	4.3.3.	Social Support	
	4.3.4.	Lifestyle and Behavioural Risk Factors for Poor Health	
	4.3.5.		
	4.3.6.	Problem Gambling	
	4.3.7.	Financial Worries	
	4.3.8.		
	4.3.9.	Volunteering	
٨	4.3.10.	mbors of Poonlo Affected in Hull	00 13
4.	.4. Nu 5 Ho	w Does Hull Compare to England?	
4	.5. 110 6 Ch	anges Over Time in Hull	
5		DOES THIS MEAN FOR HULL?	71
6. 6			
0.		E GAN I FIND WORE INFORMATION ADOUT THE 30	
	(Z		



2. Aims

- To provide information on the health status, and behavioural and lifestyle risk factors in a representative sample of Hull's adult population, and compare trends over time (from previous adults surveys completed in Hull from 2003).
- We need to know who to target to improve health and reduce inequalities, and find out which individuals or groups have improved their health or behaviours over time.

3. Background

3.1. Survey

- Overall, 4,137 adults (16+ years) participated in the survey between March and June 2019. Fieldwork undertaken by research company IbyD in Hull.
- Around 2% of the adult population of Hull participated in the survey.
- Quota sampling used (a 'target' number to people to survey was provided for each gender, age group and ward).
- Mainly used a 'Knock and drop' approach (interviewer calls at residents own homes and sought agreement then collected the completed form at an agreed later date). This ensured a very high response rate (76%).
- The survey responders are broadly representativeness of survey population to Hull's population. Compared to Hull's overall population, in the survey there were slightly fewer men aged 25-34 years, and people living in the less deprived areas of the survey. However, differences were relatively small and the survey is representative of Hull's overall population.

3.2. Deprivation in Hull

The Index of Multiple Deprivation is used to measure deprivation at a geographical level (lower layer super output area (LLSOA) geographical area). The IMD 2019 is the latest having been updated in October 2019 from the IMD 2015. These geographical areas have a minimum population size of 1,000 and a mean population size of 1,500, having been revised after the 2011 Census. The IMD 2019 is based on seven domains which are weighted according to their relative importance in relation to the overall score (weights in brackets): (i) income deprivation (22.5%); (ii) employment deprivation (22.5%); (iii) health deprivation and disability (13.5%); (iv) education, skills and training deprivation (13.5%); (v) barriers to housing and services (9.3%); (vi) living environment deprivation (9.3%); and (vii) crime (9.3%). The IMD 2019 score measures deprivation, but is not such a good measure of affluence. As it is applied to a geographical area, it relates to average levels of deprivation within an area. Therefore, there may be some residents of the area who are very much more deprived than the average and some very much better-off relative to the average. Across England each of the 32,844 LLSOAs are assigned a deprivation score based on 39 separate indicators across these seven domains. The higher the score, the more deprived the area. Hull is ranked as the 4th most deprived local authority out of 317 local authorities. It is possible to divide the 32,844 LLSOAs in England into five groups containing approximately





6,569 LLSOAs each into the most deprived fifth in England to the least deprived fifth in England. **Figure 1** presents the map showing Hull's deprivation levels in relation to England and these 'national fifths' for Hull's 166 LLSOAs. More than half of all Hull's LLSOAs are in the most deprived fifth (bottom 20%) nationally. As there are so few of Hull's LLSOAs in the least deprived fifth, it is not possible to look at national fifths in order to examine the effect of deprivation as the small numbers in the least deprived fifth will make the estimates unreliable. However, it is possible to divide Hull's 166 LLSOAs into five approximately equal groups (around 33 LLSOAs in each group) from most deprived fifth locally to least deprived fifth locally. **Figure 2** presents the map showing the most and least deprived areas within Hull.













4. Summary of Findings

4.1. Representativeness of Survey Responders

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) estimates the number of people living in each local authority. Its estimates for mid-year 2018 are compared with the distribution of survey responders in **Figure 3**. Due to the quota sampling, the survey responders are broadly similar to the age and gender distribution of Hull's population. Men aged 16-24 and 65-74 years are slightly over-represented in the survey whereas men aged 25-64 years are under-represented in the survey and this is particularly the case for men aged 25-34 years. Women aged 25-74 years are slightly over-represented in the survey, but women aged 16-24 years are slightly under-represented in the survey.









ONS also produce resident population estimates at ward level so it is possible to examine the representativeness of survey responders in relation to where they live (Figure 4).

Proportionately to the resident population, there are slightly more survey responders in Kingswood, University, Avenue and Bricknell wards (survey percentage is more than 10% higher than ONS percentage), and slightly fewer survey responders in Pickering and Central wards (survey percentage is more than 10% lower than ONS percentage).







It is also possible to combine the wards into the local area committee areas, and the survey representativeness is illustrated in **Figure 5**. There are slightly more survey responders in Northern and Wyke (survey percentage is more than 5% higher than ONS percentage), and slightly fewer in West (survey percentage is more than 5% lower than ONS percentage), but the proportions living in each area are very similar between the survey and ONS's population estimates.



Figure 5: Area comparison of survey responders with ONS 2018 population estimates





It is also possible to combine the local deprivation fifths to assess representativeness in relation to deprivation as illustrated in **Figure 6**. There are slightly fewer survey responders living in the most and second most deprived fifths of Hull compared to expected (that is 20% in each local fifth), and slightly higher percentages among the second least and least deprived fifths of Hull.





There are no recent estimates of the number of people living in Hull by ethnicity. The numbers of survey responders by ethnicity is similar to the 2011 Census (**Table 1**), but the numbers in Hull could have changed considerably over the last eight years. The number of school children from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups has increased considerably in Hull (from 9.1% in 2010 to 17.3% in 2016), and it is possible that the numbers overall have also increased. It is likely that different BME groups are underrepresented in the survey, as people from BME backgrounds are less likely to participate in surveys and this has been found to be the case in previous local surveys. However, as there are no recent population estimates for BME in Hull, the extent of this is unknown.



Ethnicity	Percentage							
Lunnerty	Survey	Census 2011						
White British	89.0	89.7						
Other White	5.4	4.4						
Mixed	1.1	1.3						
Asian or Asian British	2.2	2.5						
Black or Black British	1.4	1.2						
Arab / Other Ethnic Group	0.9	0.8						

Table 1: Comparison of survey ethnicity with 2011 Census

4.2. Prevalence Estimates

4.2.1. Physical Health and Emotional Wellbeing

Table 2 gives the percentages with differing levels of physical health and emotional wellbeing. Survey responders were asked how they rated their usual health: 'excellent', 'very good', 'good', 'fair' or 'poor'. They were also asked if they had any illnesses or disabilities which had lasted for longer than a month, and then for people who stated they did have such a condition, they were asked if this limited their activities in any way. For the four wellbeing questions, survey responders were asked the levels of satisfaction with life, feeling life was worthwhile, happiness yesterday and anxiety yesterday on a scale of 0 to10 with 0 representing "not at all" and 10 representing "completely". Low levels were scored as 0-4 for satisfaction with life, feeling life was worthwhile and happiness, and high levels of anxiety were scored as 6-10.



Table 2: Prevalence estimates of health status and emotional wellbeing, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

			Percent	ages from	n survey		
Group	In excellent or very good health	In fair or poor health	Long-term illness or disability that limits activities	Low levels of satisfaction with life	Low levels of feeling life is worthwhile	Low levels of happiness yesterday	High levels of anxiety yesterday
Overall	35.7	30.2	29.9	13.8	12.0	15.9	31.0
Men	37.0	28.7	27.1	13.2	11.9	14.9	27.6
Women	34.7	31.5	32.4	14.2	11.9	16.5	33.8
Aged 16-24	43.5	22.4	16.9	15.4	15.6	21.7	36.5
Aged 25-34	47.3	18.3	14.9	9.6	9.7	11.5	31.0
Aged 35-44	40.1	26.4	22.4	12.7	11.5	16.2	32.9
Aged 45-54	30.5	32.7	37.0	16.5	13.8	17.0	31.7
Aged 55-64	32.3	36.7	39.4	17.6	14.6	20.0	26.5
Aged 65-74	25.5	38.5	42.0	11.1	6.6	9.8	28.4
Aged 75+	16.4	54.1	58.2	14.6	11.2	13.9	27.6
Most deprived	26.4	37.4	34.0	19.2	16.3	20.1	32.2
Second most deprived	29.7	39.5	39.3	18.9	17.0	21.5	34.6
Middle fifth	34.9	28.5	28.8	12.4	12.9	15.4	32.6
Second least deprived	40.0	25.0	25.8	11.0	9.2	13.6	27.7
Least deprived	44.9	23.3	23.7	9.0	6.4	10.5	28.9
Working	45.6	17.8	16.4	7.8	7.1	10.6	28.7
Student	45.1	22.5	15.4	13.2	14.6	21.4	39.8
Retired	22.5	43.3	48.5	12.6	8.4	11.2	26.7
Looking after family/home	32.2	28.1	26.7	13.1	10.9	17.2	30.6
Unemployed	23.4	34.7	25.6	22.4	20.7	24.7	37.9
Long-term sick/disabled	4.4	85.4	93.8	50.2	45.6	49.3	40.7
1 adult 0 children (<65)	31.6	38.9	40.9	24.4	23.1	27.6	38.7
1 adult 0 children (65+)	19.9	47.0	51.7	12.2	9.9	11.8	26.1
1 adult 1-2 children	35.0	32.5	23.5	15.0	10.0	19.6	43.8
1 adult 3+ children	38.5	29.2	20.6	20.0	10.8	15.4	26.2
2 adults 0 children (<65)	38.0	28.6	29.8	12.7	12.4	15.2	26.5
2 adults 0 children (65+)	24.5	41.1	45.8	11.2	6.2	10.2	29.3
2 adults 1-2 children	44.5	19.8	17.2	9.3	8.5	12.6	29.7
2 adults 3+ children	43.4	18.9	20.3	8.6	9.2	13.2	26.4
3+ adults 0 children	35.9	27.0	26.5	13.6	11.6	14.6	31.7
3+ adults 1-2 children	43.7	25.7	20.3	14.3	15.5	19.2	31.8
3+ adults 3+ children	34.5	27.6	15.5	13.8	17.2	27.6	41.4





4.2.2. Loneliness and Isolation

Table 3 gives the equivalent information for social isolation. People were asked four questions relating to frequency of feeling they lacked companionship, felt left out, isolated from other and lonely (with responses 'never', 'rarely', 'sometimes' and 'often'). These four questions were combined to present the percentages who stated often for at least one of the four questions, and the subset who stated often for all four questions. Another question asked about frequency of feeling lonely or isolated from others with responses all, most, some or not much of the time, and 'rarely or never'.

Table 3: Prevalence estimates in relation to loneliness and isolation, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

			P	ercenta	ges fro	m surve	ey		
Group	Often lacks companionship	Often feels left out	Often feels isolated from others	Often feels lonely	Often for all of these four questions	Often for at least one of these questions	Feels lonely or isolated from others all of the time	Feels lonely or isolated from others most of the time	Feels lonely or isolated from others some of the time
Overall	9.6	9.1	9.9	11.3	3.8	18.1	2.4	8.1	25.8
Men	8.9	7.4	8.9	9.9	3.3	16.3	2.2	7.8	22.7
Women	10.0	10.3	10.5	12.3	4.1	19.5	2.4	8.3	28.6
Aged 16-24	11.4	12.7	15.3	18.9	4.1	28.5	3.6	14.5	32.7
Aged 25-34	8.5	7.5	8.6	9.0	3.1	16.3	2.0	8.4	26.0
Aged 35-44	7.7	9.3	9.3	9.8	3.4	16.5	2.2	7.8	24.8
Aged 45-54	10.2	9.3	10.7	11.6	4.5	17.4	2.9	8.4	23.7
Aged 55-64	10.8	9.2	9.2	11.2	5.0	16.8	1.9	6.7	22.6
Aged 65-74	8.7	6.5	6.5	8.4	3.5	12.4	1.4	3.7	23.0
Aged 75+	9.8	9.5	8.1	9.2	3.6	17.8	2.0	4.9	27.8
Most deprived	11.1	12.5	13.7	15.0	5.2	21.9	3.6	11.1	28.4
Second most deprived	12.8	12.4	13.2	14.8	5.4	23.5	3.2	11.8	29.4
Middle fifth	9.5	8.9	10.2	11.5	3.3	18.9	2.9	8.5	24.6
Second least deprived	8.9	6.9	7.3	9.3	3.6	14.9	1.4	6.3	24.4
Least deprived	6.5	6.0	6.4	7.2	2.2	13.2	1.2	4.2	23.2
Working	6.6	6.2	6.5	7.6	2.2	13.0	1.5	5.6	21.3
Student	11.0	9.3	11.0	17.2	3.8	23.7	1.4	12.0	34.4
Retired	9.3	6.9	6.6	8.7	3.1	14.6	1.7	3.8	25.0
Looking after family/home	6.9	7.6	9.4	8.3	3.0	16.7	1.9	9.1	33.3
Unemployed	19.2	17.5	19.2	22.3	8.4	32.3	6.6	15.0	32.9
Long-term sick/disabled	27.5	31.8	34.2	34.4	14.3	52.2	8.2	27.6	39.5
1 adult 0 children (<65)	22.4	18.0	19.8	22.3	11.1	31.4	5.7	15.2	32.5
1 adult 0 children (65+)	14.3	10.7	9.3	13.1	5.8	21.2	2.4	4.1	38.7
1 adult 1-2 children	13.0	9.7	10.9	15.1	4.6	23.1	2.5	11.7	38.1



			P	ercenta	ges fro	m surve	ey		
Group	Often lacks companionship	Often feels left out	Often feels isolated from others	Often feels lonely	Often for all of these four questions	Often for at least one of these questions	Feels lonely or isolated from others all of the time	Feels lonely or isolated from others most of the time	Feels lonely or isolated from others some of the time
1 adult 3+ children	10.8	13.8	16.9	15.4	7.7	21.5	3.1	15.4	21.5
2 adults 0 children (<65)	6.9	7.4	8.3	9.9	2.8	15.4	1.2	8.2	21.3
2 adults 0 children (65+)	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9	1.8	8.5	0.8	3.6	14.9
2 adults 1-2 children	5.2	6.5	6.9	8.2	1.4	13.1	2.3	6.1	22.8
2 adults 3+ children	3.7	8.4	7.8	5.8	1.6	15.8	0.5	7.4	27.5
3+ adults 0 children	10.2	8.9	9.4	11.8	4.2	18.7	3.4	6.9	25.7
3+ adults 1-2 children	7.9	9.1	11.7	12.0	2.5	19.9	2.1	10.7	24.7
3+ adults 3+ children	8.6	10.3	12.1	10.3	1.7	20.7	1.7	10.3	31.0

4.2.3. Social Support

Table 4 gives the same information for measures of social support. People were asked if they were ill in bed and needed help at home if they could ask someone to help (including those who lived with them), and how many people they felt they could turn to for comfort and support if they had a serious crisis.

	Per	rcentages from surv	/ey
Group	No-one to help if ill in bed (or do not know if they would be anyone)	No-one to turn for comfort and support in a crisis	0-2 people to turn for comfort and support in a crisis
Overall	10.8	2.9	16.6
Men	11.7	3.1	17.5
Women	9.9	2.6	15.6
Aged 16-24	14.2	4.4	17.6
Aged 25-34	10.4	3.5	16.2
Aged 35-44	9.4	4.3	18.6
Aged 45-54	11.2	2.3	16.5
Aged 55-64	9.9	1.8	14.4
Aged 65-74	8.6	0.8	14.7
Aged 75+	12.5	2.1	18.3

Table 4: Prevalence estimates in relation to social support, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition





	Pei	rcentages from surv	/ey
Group	No-one to help if ill in bed (or do not know if they would be anyone)	No-one to turn for comfort and support in a crisis	0-2 people to turn for comfort and support in a crisis
Most deprived	15.4	5.4	25.5
Second most deprived	14.5	4.3	22.1
Middle fifth	10.1	2.8	16.0
Second least deprived	7.6	1.9	11.7
Least deprived	7.9	0.9	10.3
Working	7.1	1.4	11.3
Student	13.6	3.9	20.4
Retired	9.9	1.4	15.2
Looking after family/home	14.3	4.6	20.6
Unemployed	25.5	11.1	29.6
Long-term sick/disabled	20.8	8.2	39.4
1 adult 0 children (<65)	24.3	6.5	27.3
1 adult 0 children (65+)	16.6	2.1	20.0
1 adult 1-2 children	18.1	5.6	27.6
1 adult 3+ children	33.3	8.1	30.6
2 adults 0 children (<65)	7.0	1.7	12.3
2 adults 0 children (65+)	5.1	0.5	12.9
2 adults 1-2 children	7.2	2.3	13.4
2 adults 3+ children	8.7	3.1	20.0
3+ adults 0 children	6.6	2.0	11.0
3+ adults 1-2 children	9.1	4.2	16.7
3+ adults 3+ children	6.9	3.8	15.1

4.2.4. Lifestyle and Behavioural Risk Factors for Poor Health

Table 5 gives the prevalence estimates overall, as well as by gender, age group, local deprivation fifth (based on Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019), employment status and household composition for specified behavioural and lifestyle risk factors for poor health related to smoking and alcohol, and **Table 6** gives the same for diet, physical activity and obesity. Current smokers / e-cigarette users are defined as daily and occasional smokers / e-cigarette users. Heavy smokers is given out of the total population (rather than the percentage of heavy smokers out of all smokers). Harmful drinking behaviour is defined as drinking more than 14 units during the previous week or usually binge drinking at least once a week (drinking 6+ units on a single occasion) or having a Fast Alcohol Screening Test of three or more¹. Survey responders were asked they frequency with which they used drugs other than those required for medical reasons.

¹ FAST consists of four questions (questions relating to the frequency of: binge drinking, failing to do what was expected because of drinking, and being unable to remember what happened the night before, and one question asking if a relative, friend or health professional had ever asked them to cut down their drinking. The FAST questionnaire was developed for use in an emergency setting such as A&E.



Physical activity levels were defined on the basis of the weekly minute of moderateintensity physical activity, with active people fulfilling the national guidelines of 150 such minutes per week, and inactive people undertaking fewer than 30 such minutes of physical activity per week. Heights and weights were adjusted slightly to try to compensate for people over-reporting their height and under-reporting their weight. Body mass index (BMI)² was used to define overweight and obesity with a BMI 25+ used to define overweight, 30+ for obesity and 40+ for morbidly obese.

In terms of combinations of behavioural and lifestyle factors, 24.4% of current tobacco smokers used e-cigarettes as did 23.3% of former tobacco smokers. Only 15 individuals (0.9%) used e-cigarettes among those who had never smoked tobacco. The majority were young men (nine of them were men aged 16-34 years) or young women (two of them were women aged 16-24 years), although the oldest was aged 65-74 years. Eight of them worked and three were students, and they were equally from the most deprived and least deprived areas of Hull (five from most deprived fifth, five from least deprived fifth, three from second least deprived fifth, and one each from other fifths of areas of Hull).

Table 5: Prevalence estimates of lifestyle and behavioural risk factors for poor
health, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and
household composition

		Percentages from survey												
Group	Current smokers	Smokes 20+ cigarettes per day	Former smokers	E-cigarette users	Never drinks alcohol	Exceeded 14 units of alcohol	Exceeded 28 units of alcohol	Binge drinks weekly	FAST score 3+	Harmful drinking behaviour	Use drugs monthly			
Overall	24.9	4.5	28.6	13.4	21.8	12.1	4.6	18.9	25.9	30.1	4.5			
Men	26.2	4.9	28.2	13.8	18.8	15.8	6.4	25.2	33.0	39.6	6.6			
Women	23.5	4.0	29.0	13.0	24.5	8.6	3.0	13.1	19.2	21.3	2.4			
Aged 16-24	26.5	2.7	13.4	12.0	21.4	10.3	3.4	16.4	33.5	36.0	10.3			
Aged 25-34	30.5	5.2	21.9	16.4	19.8	11.7	4.9	14.7	25.1	28.3	5.2			
Aged 35-44	28.5	4.7	28.9	13.8	19.4	13.3	5.2	19.9	27.8	33.4	4.1			
Aged 45-54	28.5	6.4	27.9	16.1	19.5	14.8	5.1	25.6	30.3	35.4	3.4			
Aged 55-64	23.3	5.8	34.1	13.3	22.2	13.4	4.1	21.5	23.7	29.1	3.2			
Aged 65-74	16.7	3.7	41.0	10.6	21.5	12.3	6.8	21.8	22.0	26.5	0.8			
Aged 75+	9.0	1.3	47.1	5.6	35.9	6.3	1.4	11.0	11.6	14.3	1.7			
Most deprived	35.7	6.9	27.5	14.9	30.5	8.3	3.5	17.2	23.8	25.9	5.3			
Second most deprived	32.1	7.3	30.1	15.9	27.4	9.1	2.8	14.3	19.8	22.7	6.9			
Middle fifth	26.1	3.9	28.6	14.2	23.2	13.2	5.6	18.3	26.0	31.3	4.8			
Second least deprived	20.8	3.2	29.1	11.9	16.2	13.2	5.4	20.2	29.2	34.3	3.7			
Least deprived	13.2	1.8	27.8	10.7	14.2	15.6	5.4	23.2	29.2	34.6	2.4			
Working	23.4	3.6	26.8	13.9	14.1	15.0	5.9	22.3	30.6	36.1	4.0			
Student	17.7	1.0	12.6	11.2	25.3	9.8	2.9	12.2	29.9	32.7	6.5			

² Weight in kilograms divided by the square of height in metres.





				Per	rcentag	ges fro	m sur\	/ey			
Group	Current smokers	Smokes 20+ cigarettes per day	Former smokers	E-cigarette users	Never drinks alcohol	Exceeded 14 units of alcohol	Exceeded 28 units of alcohol	Binge drinks weekly	FAST score 3+	Harmful drinking behaviour	Use drugs monthly
Retired	14.0	3.3	42.1	8.8	26.4	10.2	4.0	16.6	17.2	22.4	1.3
Looking after family/home	31.1	4.5	32.2	16.1	30.5	6.7	1.6	10.7	13.3	14.7	1.5
Unemployed	45.0	10.2	14.8	12.4	29.9	8.6	3.7	16.2	25.9	28.9	12.7
Long-term sick/disabled	48.1	13.6	30.2	17.7	40.3	7.5	1.4	16.6	22.9	23.8	9.4
1 adult 0 children (<65)	38.0	6.0	21.8	15.7	21.7	12.1	4.0	23.2	32.7	37.4	10.0
1 adult 0 children (65+)	15.9	3.1	42.6	10.3	32.6	5.5	2.2	12.4	11.6	15.8	0.7
1 adult 1-2 children	38.6	6.3	22.8	14.5	18.7	10.6	5.3	14.7	24.4	27.4	2.1
1 adult 3+ children	39.7	9.7	30.2	10.7	18.5	11.7	3.3	12.5	21.5	25.0	0.0
2 adults 0 children (<65)	24.3	4.2	29.6	12.6	16.8	13.5	5.2	22.3	29.0	33.7	5.2
2 adults 0 children (65+)	11.5	1.5	47.1	7.4	21.5	14.2	7.3	21.7	22.7	27.0	1.6
2 adults 1-2 children	22.6	4.4	26.3	15.9	21.1	10.8	5.2	16.7	24.3	27.8	3.3
2 adults 3+ children	24.9	5.2	29.9	22.1	32.5	7.4	1.6	8.8	14.4	17.7	3.1
3+ adults 0 children	24.0	4.5	21.7	10.1	17.1	16.0	4.1	23.2	33.9	40.2	4.9
3+ adults 1-2 children	23.0	4.2	23.0	14.9	21.6	12.7	3.1	18.8	29.5	32.1	6.2
3+ adults 3+ children	29.3	1.8	12.1	5.6	35.1	8.9	1.8	12.1	25.9	26.8	3.6



Table 6: Prevalence estimates of lifestyle and behavioural risk factors for poor health, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

		_		Perce	ntages	from s	survey	_	_	
Group	State they do not have a healthy diet	Lack of knowledge about what constitutes a healthy	Eats no portions of fruit and vegetables each day	Eats 0-2 portions of fruit and vegetables each day	Does not eat 5-A-DAY	Physically active	Physically inactive	Overweight or obese	Obese including morbidly obese	Morbidly obese
Overall	27.0	9.6	6.7	20.6	79.2	40.7	44.2	69.7	31.1	3.7
Men	29.8	11.2	8.3	24.9	82.1	45.6	41.5	72.7	30.8	3.0
Women	24.2	7.9	5.0	16.4	76.4	36.3	46.5	67.0	31.3	4.2
Aged 16-24	39.4	16.1	9.9	30.5	88.1	50.9	31.7	48.7	22.0	3.0
Aged 25-34	35.4	8.9	6.4	25.2	83.8	51.1	30.8	66.0	28.0	2.7
Aged 35-44	30.3	7.8	6.9	21.2	79.7	49.2	35.2	73.5	34.7	5.1
Aged 45-54	26.6	8.3	6.6	20.1	78.1	39.1	47.7	76.4	41.8	5.4
Aged 55-64	21.5	8.0	6.5	16.0	75.1	36.9	48.0	76.8	32.1	5.2
Aged 65-74	13.1	7.4	2.9	11.5	71.2	25.3	60.2	75.0	29.5	2.4
Aged 75+	8.2	9.2	6.4	12.1	73.8	13.0	79.4	71.6	27.0	0.4
Most deprived	34.2	12.7	9.2	25.6	83.5	50.1	32.6	67.9	35.3	6.2
Second most deprived	30.7	11.8	11.4	27.7	83.1	51.2	32.3	66.9	32.8	4.3
Middle fifth	26.4	9.4	5.6	19.9	77.8	23.3	64.7	70.4	31.5	3.3
Second least deprived	25.4	8.6	5.2	19.2	77.7	44.1	40.2	70.1	28.6	2.8
Least deprived	20.3	6.3	3.2	13.1	75.3	41.1	44.5	72.0	28.6	2.5
Working	28.1	8.0	5.3	19.8	80.3	15.8	76.1	70.6	31.4	2.9
Student	38.8	18.2	7.9	28.2	83.2	41.4	47.0	45.7	19.0	4.1
Retired	11.3	7.5	4.0	10.4	70.5	15.8	74.1	73.9	29.6	2.0
Looking after family/home	26.4	9.8	5.1	16.9	78.4	45.9	38.6	72.4	38.9	5.9
Unemployed	43.0	13.9	14.6	36.1	91.1	46.9	40.8	66.7	29.6	5.9
Long-term sick/disabled	41.2	12.4	17.6	35.5	85.3	42.2	41.1	73.2	39.4	12.2
1 adult 0 children (<65)	33.7	8.4	11.9	29.1	81.4	25.7	61.0	70.9	35.2	4.1
1 adult 0 children (65+)	12.8	9.4	6.0	13.5	76.9	51.8	30.8	68.0	25.1	0.7
1 adult 1-2 children	32.9	9.7	3.9	22.3	83.0	45.7	35.4	63.4	27.7	4.0
1 adult 3+ children	26.6	14.1	0.8	20.3	83.1	44.9	31.1	70.9	30.9	3.6
2 adults 0 children (<65)	26.7	7.1	7.1	18.8	80.0	38.8	45.0	74.0	32.5	4.9
2 adults 0 children (65+)	9.0	0.9	2.3	9.9	00.1	51.0	20.9	60.2	30.0	1.0
2 adults 1-2 children	31.5	0.0	0.4	21.0	80.7	15.7	30.0	70.7	35.4	4.0
3 adults 0 children	30.1	10.1	9.4 ∕\2	23.0	81.0	43.7	37.7	66.3	30.4	1.0
3+ adults 1-2 childron	35.8	15.2	+. <u></u>	20.0	83.5	38.8	45.0	60.3	20.0	3.0
3+ adults 3+ children	21.1	19.2	10.7	23.2	76.8	55.6	38.9	56.5	26.1	4.3
	<u> </u>	10.0	10.7	20.2	10.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	20.1	1.0





4.2.5. Financial Resilience

Table 7 gives the prevalence estimates overall, as well as by gender, age group, local deprivation fifth (based on Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019), employment status and household composition for financial measures asked within the survey. Survey responders were asked what they would do if their household needed £200 in an emergency. They had the option to response 'I would', 'I might', 'I'd never' or 'Not applicable' in relation to: (i) using savings or money from current account; (ii) work additional hours; (iii) arranged overdraft; (iv) unarranged overdraft; (v) short term loan (over 1-5 years); (vi) pay day loan (1-30 days); (vii) credit card; (viii) ask family or friends; (ix) Credit Union; and (x) Other. As having good financial resilience is having access to funds for such a household emergency, the information below presents the percentage who would only use their savings or money from their current account (and did not state 'would' or 'might' for any other of the financial options), and who stated they would use their savings or money from their current account but may have also stated they 'would' or 'might' use other financial options as well. The 'would' use savings or money from their current account includes the subgroup who would only use their savings or money from their current account.

Overall, in relation to the numbers who would use the specified financial option (perhaps in conjunction to using other financial options as well), 60.1% would use their savings or money from their current account, 25.9% would work additional hours, 10.3% would use an arranged overdraft, 2.4% would use an unarranged overdraft, 3.1% would use a loan, 2.1% would use a pay day loan, 10.2% would use a credit card, 24.2% would ask family or friends, and 2.2% would use a Credit Union. Whilst around one-quarter of people would work additional hours, the majority of these would or might use other financial options too, with only 4.0% only using this option of working additional hours. Just under one-quarter would ask family and friends, and more of these survey responders would only ask family and friends, so this information has been included in the summary table below as well as the percentage who would ask family and friends perhaps in conjunction with other options.



Percentages from survey												
Group	Would only use savings or current account	Would use savings or current account*	Would never use savings or current	Would only ask family or friends	Would ask family or friends*	Would work additional hours*	Would use an arranged overdraft*	Would use an unarranged overdraft*	Would use a short term loan*	Would use a pay day Ioan*	Would use a credit card*	Would use a Credit Union*
Overall	33.8	60.1	25.9	8.2	24.2	25.7	10.3	2.4	3.1	2.1	10.2	2.2
Men	37.2	64.0	21.9	6.4	20.9	23.3	10.0	2.7	2.6	2.1	11.3	2.1
Women	31.0	56.8	29.3	9.8	27.2	28.1	10.6	2.1	3.5	2.1	9.2	2.0
Aged 16-24	12.2	55.1	24.0	6.8	35.8	47.0	17.1	4.6	5.1	3.6	13.4	2.8
Aged 25-34	18.3	57.6	27.8	10.8	37.4	41.0	15.4	3.9	5.7	3.7	15.1	2.5
Aged 35-44	25.7	56.0	31.1	9.8	29.6	32.5	14.3	2.8	2.9	2.6	12.0	2.8
Aged 45-54	32.1	55.4	28.7	9.0	19.9	22.8	9.5	1.6	2.7	2.3	7.9	2.6
Aged 55-64	51.1	65.6	24.5	8.7	15.7	10.0	4.0	1.3	1.5	0.7	6.2	1.6
Aged 65-74	62.8	71.4	18.7	4.7	8.0	2.5	2.5	0.2	0.4	0.0	6.0	0.8
Aged 75+	60.1	68.4	20.6	3.5	5.6	0.7	2.1	0.0	0.7	0.0	7.0	0.7
Most deprived	22.1	44.2	39.6	12.7	30.5	25.1	9.5	3.8	5.5	3.4	7.8	3.9
Second most deprived	24.8	48.4	36.0	11.2	28.3	26.8	9.2	2.0	3.8	3.2	7.8	2.5
Middle fifth	29.6	58.0	28.2	8.1	25.2	28.5	11.2	2.4	2.4	2.3	10.6	2.4
Second least deprived	41.1	69.2	18.2	6.9	22.9	26.1	11.6	2.2	2.3	1.1	10.0	1.0
Least deprived	46.9	75.1	12.3	3.6	16.1	22.9	9.9	1.8	1.9	1.1	13.8	1.3
Working	30.9	66.4	19.2	5.4	25.4	38.9	13.9	3.0	2.9	1.6	12.5	1.9
Student	18.1	58.2	20.6	6.6	32.8	32.4	15.0	3.1	5.9	5.2	15.7	1.7
Retired	63.3	71.5	18.4	4.2	7.0	1.4	2.4	0.1	0.5	0.1	6.0	0.9
Looking after family/home	22.2	41.4	45.5	21.1	36.6	14.7	7.9	3.4	6.4	4.5	7.5	4.5
Unemployed	14.3	34.2	49.1	15.5	37.9	22.5	8.7	1.9	3.7	5.6	6.8	5.6
Long-term sick/disabled	16.9	26.8	59.9	23.1	34.9	6.0	5.0	1.4	4.3	2.5	3.2	2.5
1 adult 0 children (<65)	32.1	54.3	32.1	9.8	28.4	21.3	8.2	1.1	2.2	1.9	7.7	2.5
1 adult 0 children (65+)	58.9	67.7	19.6	6.0	8.9	1.1	1.8	0.0	0.7	0.0	4.6	1.8
1 adult 1-2 children	16.6	41.3	42.1	15.3	33.6	25.1	10.6	4.3	7.7	4.7	11.9	5.1
1 adult 3+ children	10.9	28.1	62.5	19.0	41.3	23.4	6.3	1.6	6.3	7.8	10.9	6.3
2 adults 0 children (<65)	40.2	66.8	20.7	6.8	21.6	24.5	10.7	1.7	2.3	1.3	9.3	1.7
2 adults 0 children (65+)	66.7	74.3	16.8	2.6	5.0	1.6	1.8	0.3	0.5	0.0	6.6	0.3
2 adults 1-2 children	25.6	61.2	22.3	8.5	31.1	39.3	14.8	3.3	3.9	3.0	13.5	1.4
2 adults 3+ children	15.0	46.6	42.5	15.5	35.8	38.3	10.9	4.7	5.7	3.6	10.4	4.1
3+ adults 0 children	27.7	61.9	21.9	6.6	24.3	34.1	13.7	2.6	2.4	2.0	11.1	1.1
3+ adults 1-2 children	20.4	57.1	22.9	6.7	29.2	35.4	11.7	3.3	4.2	2.5	14.6	3.8
3+ adults 3+ children	107	58 9	33.0	73	36.4	518	23.2	107	71	71	12 5	54

Table 7: Prevalence estimates of financial measures, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

*Perhaps in conjunction with other methods (the 'would only' is a subset of this group).

4.2.6. Problem Gambling

Table 8 gives the prevalence estimates among all survey responders for the individual three measures relating to problem gambling overall, as well as by gender, age group, local deprivation fifth (based on Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019), employment status and household composition. People were asked how frequently they had gambled using seven different types of gambling such as scratch cards, lottery, sports or race





betting, casino or card games for money, fruit machines, fixed odds betting terminals, and bingo. Among those who did gamble, they were asked if this was online, at licensed premises or a mixture of both, and they were also asked how frequently they had lied to people important to them about how much they had gambled, felt the need to bet more and more money, and bet more than they could afford to lose. **Table 8** gives the prevalence of these latter measures among all survey responders. People who answered 'never' to each of the seven frequency of gambling questions were assume to have never displayed any of these problem gambling behaviours and this was assumed to be 'never' for all three questions.

Table 9 gives the combined responses to the first two questions (which were part of the Lie/Bet Screening Tool) and all three questions.

Table 8: Prevalence estimates of problem gambling (individual questions), overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

	Percentages from survey										
Group	Lied about how much you had gambled – monthly	Lied about how much you had gambled – in last year*	Felt need to bet more and more money – monthly	Felt need to bet more and more money – in last year*	Bet more than you could afford to lose – monthly	Bet more than you could afford to lose – in last year*					
Overall	0.9	2.5	1.2	3.2	1.0	2.5					
Men	1.4	3.7	2.0	4.8	1.5	3.9					
Women	0.5	1.3	0.5	1.8	0.5	1.3					
Aged 16-24	1.5	4.6	2.0	5.8	1.9	4.6					
Aged 25-34	1.3	3.1	1.8	5.2	1.3	3.6					
Aged 35-44	1.5	2.6	1.6	3.3	1.5	3.3					
Aged 45-54	0.9	2.4	1.3	3.3	1.1	2.2					
Aged 55-64	0.2	1.5	0.6	1.3	0.4	1.3					
Aged 65-74	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.2					
Aged 75+	0.4	1.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0					
Most deprived	1.4	4.2	1.6	4.8	1.5	4.1					
Second most deprived	1.2	3.0	1.1	3.3	1.2	3.2					
Middle fifth	0.7	1.6	1.2	2.8	0.7	2.1					
Second least deprived	0.8	2.0	1.3	2.9	0.8	1.9					
Least deprived	0.6	1.6	1.0	2.5	0.9	1.6					
Working	0.8	2.6	1.2	3.5	0.8	2.6					
Student	1.5	3.4	1.9	4.1	1.9	3.4					
Retired	0.5	0.9	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.5					
Looking after family/home	0.4	0.8	0.4	2.1	0.4	0.8					
Unemployed	1.3	4.0	2.6	5.3	2.6	4.6					
Long-term sick/disabled	1.5	3.3	2.6	4.8	3.0	5.5					
1 adult 0 children (<65)	1.9	3.7	2.5	4.3	2.2	4.3					
1 adult 0 children (65+)	0.8	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4					
1 adult 1-2 children	0.9	2.8	0.9	5.1	0.5	3.7					
1 adult 3+ children	3.3	4.9	3.3	6.7	3.3	6.7					



	Percentages from survey									
Group	Lied about how much you had gambled – monthly	Lied about how much you had gambled – in last year*	Felt need to bet more and more money – monthly	Felt need to bet more and more money – in last year*	Bet more than you could afford to lose – monthly	Bet more than you could afford to lose – in last year*				
2 adults 0 children (<65)	0.4	2.3	0.9	2.6	0.3	1.9				
2 adults 0 children (65+)	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0				
2 adults 1-2 children	0.3	1.6	0.5	1.9	0.3	1.4				
2 adults 3+ children	2.3	3.5	1.8	2.3	2.3	2.9				
3+ adults 0 children	0.6	1.6	1.6	4.2	1.0	3.0				
3+ adults 1-2 children	1.9	4.3	2.4	6.6	3.3	4.3				
3+ adults 3+ children	1.8	5.5	1.8	7.3	1.8	5.5				

*This includes the percentage stating they do this monthly. So for example, overall 0.9% have lied about how much they have gambled weekly or monthly, and a further 1.3% have lied a few times a year, or once or twice in last year. Thus in total, 2.2% have lied about how much they have gambled in the last year.

Tabl	e 9:	Prevale	nce e	stimat	es of proble	m gan	nbling (questi	ons cor	nbine	ed), overall,
and	by	gender,	age,	local	deprivation	fifth,	employment	status	and	household
com	pos	sition								

	Percentages from survey								
	Com que Sc	bination of stions (Lie/	two ′Bet ol)	Combination of all three gambling questions					
Group	Lie to people important to them and/or felt the need to bet more and more money – weekly	Lie to people important to them and/or felt the need to bet more and more money – monthly*	Lie to people important to them and/or felt the need to bet more and more money – in the last	Lied, felt need to bet more and more and/or bet more than you could afford to lose – weekly	Lied, felt need to bet more and more and/or bet more than you could afford to lose – monthly*	Lied, felt need to bet more and more and/or bet more than you could afford to lose – in last			
Overall	0.9	1.4	4.0	0.9	1.5	4.2			
Men	1.4	2.2	5.8	1.4	2.3	6.0			
Women	0.4	0.7	2.3	0.5	0.8	2.6			
Aged 16-24	1.9	2.5	6.6	1.9	2.9	7.1			
Aged 25-34	1.0	1.8	5.7	1.0	1.8	5.9			
Aged 35-44	1.6	2.0	4.2	1.6	2.0	4.7			
Aged 45-54	0.7	1.5	4.0	0.9	1.6	4.0			
Aged 55-64	0.2	0.6	2.1	0.2	0.6	2.3			
Aged 65-74	0.0	0.2	0.9	0.0	0.2	1.2			
Aged 75+	0.4	0.4	1.4	0.4	0.4	1.4			





	Percentages from survey											
	Com que Sc	bination of stions (Lie/ reening To	two ′Bet ol)	Combination of all three gambling questions								
Group	Lie to people important to them and/or felt the need to bet more and more money – weekly	Lie to people important to them and/or felt the need to bet more and more money – monthly*	Lie to people important to them and/or felt the need to bet more and more money – in the last	Lied, felt need to bet more and more and/or bet more than you could afford to lose – weekly	Lied, felt need to bet more and more and/or bet more than you could afford to lose – monthly*	Lied, felt need to bet more and more and/or bet more than you could afford to lose – in last						
Most deprived	1.4	2.2	6.2	1.4	2.3	6.5						
Second most deprived	0.9	1.4	4.5	0.9	1.4	5.1						
Middle fifth	0.9	1.3	3.4	1.0	1.5	3.8						
Second least deprived	0.8	1.3	3.3	0.8	1.3	3.3						
Least deprived	0.6	1.1	2.7	0.6	1.2	2.7						
Working	0.8	1.3	4.3	0.8	1.3	4.5						
Student	2.3	2.3	4.9	2.3	2.6	5.3						
Retired	0.2	0.5	1.4	0.2	0.5	1.5						
Looking after family/home	0.4	0.4	2.1	0.4	0.4	2.1						
Unemployed	0.7	2.6	5.9	0.7	2.6	5.9						
Long-term sick/disabled	1.8	3.0	5.5	2.2	3.7	6.6						
1 adult 0 children (<65)	1.2	2.8	5.5	1.2	2.8	5.8						
1 adult 0 children (65+)	0.4	0.8	1.6	0.4	0.8	1.9						
1 adult 1-2 children	0.9	0.9	5.6	0.9	0.9	5.6						
1 adult 3+ children	3.3	3.3	6.6	3.3	3.3	8.2						
2 adults 0 children (<65)	0.3	1.0	3.6	0.3	1.0	3.8						
2 adults 0 children (65+)	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6						
2 adults 1-2 children	0.5	0.5	2.5	0.5	0.5	2.7						
2 adults 3+ children	1.7	2.3	4.1	1.7	2.9	4.1						
3+ adults 0 children	1.2	1.6	4.4	1.4	1.8	4.6						
3+ adults 1-2 children	2.4	3.3	6.6	2.4	3.8	6.6						
3+ adults 3+ children	1.8	1.8	7.3	1.8	1.8	9.1						

*'Monthly' figure includes 'weekly', and 'in last year' includes 'weekly' and 'monthly'.

4.2.7. Financial Worries

Table 10 gives the prevalence estimates in relation to financial worries overall, as well as by gender, age group, local deprivation fifth (based on Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019), employment status and household composition. Survey responders were asked how frequently they worried about not having enough food to eat because of a lack of money or other resources, being unable to eat healthy and nutritious food because of a lack of a lack of money or other resources, about paying rent or mortgage and other essential bills like for water, gas, electricity and Council tax, and about being about to pay back money on loans, overdrafts and credit cards.





Table 10: Prevalence estimates of frequency of worrying about finances, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

		Percentages worrying from survey									
Group	Not having enough food to eat – most days	Not having enough food to eat – weekly*	Not having enough food to eat – monthly*	Not being about to eat healthy and nutritious food – most	Not being about to eat healthy and nutritious food – weekly*	Paying essential bills – most days	Paying essential bills – weekly*	Paying essential bills – monthly*	Paying back money – most days	Paying back money – weekly*	
Overall	4.4	8.7	15.9	5.6	10.6	7.0	10.4	19.2	5.9	9.1	
Men	3.5	7.5	13.3	4.6	9.4	5.4	8.9	15.9	4.4	7.8	
Women	5.1	9.5	18.0	6.5	11.6	8.2	11.6	21.9	7.2	10.2	
Aged 16-24	6.4	13.0	24.3	8.0	16.4	7.5	13.1	24.4	6.3	10.5	
Aged 25-34	6.0	11.0	21.3	6.4	12.2	8.6	13.7	25.6	8.1	12.1	
Aged 35-44	6.7	13.1	21.6	8.1	15.0	10.2	14.9	28.6	9.0	13.8	
Aged 45-54	5.3	9.6	18.4	7.3	12.6	9.9	13.1	21.2	7.5	11.3	
Aged 55-64	2.5	6.0	9.6	4.3	7.8	5.9	7.8	13.9	4.1	6.8	
Aged 65-74	0.4	1.0	2.8	1.4	2.2	1.0	1.4	4.1	1.2	1.6	
Aged 75+	0.0	0.7	1.6	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.3	2.6	0.3	0.7	
Most deprived	7.8	14.8	25.0	10.6	16.9	11.2	17.3	29.6	7.7	12.9	
Second most deprived	7.2	12.3	22.5	9.5	16.2	10.5	14.8	26.9	8.7	12.4	
Middle fifth	3.8	7.4	14.3	5.3	9.1	6.8	9.2	19.1	6.8	9.3	
Second least deprived	2.8	6.6	13.4	2.9	7.9	5.2	8.2	15.2	4.6	7.9	
Least deprived	1.4	3.9	6.9	1.3	4.9	2.6	4.5	8.5	2.5	4.4	
Working	2.9	6.1	12.5	4.0	7.9	4.4	7.9	16.2	4.2	7.3	
Student	5.2	9.0	17.6	5.9	12.8	5.2	8.0	15.6	4.2	8.0	
Retired	0.3	0.8	2.2	0.9	1.3	0.9	1.1	3.4	0.8	0.9	
Looking after family/home	5.6	14.9	27.9	7.4	17.1	11.5	19.0	37.9	9.3	15.7	
Unemployed	15.8	29.1	44.2	18.8	33.9	22.8	30.9	45.7	17.9	25.3	
Long-term sick/disabled	16.4	28.1	44.5	20.8	31.4	27.6	32.3	49.0	19.9	25.1	
1 adult 0 children (<65)	10.5	17.2	25.5	12.1	18.6	14.6	18.6	29.9	10.0	14.1	
1 adult 0 children (65+)	0.7	1.7	3.4	1.4	2.4	1.4	2.0	4.1	0.7	1.4	
1 adult 1-2 children	12.3	19.6	37.4	12.7	19.1	17.0	24.3	40.9	13.7	19.2	
1 adult 3+ children	12.5	20.3	37.5	14.1	25.0	18.8	20.3	51.6	15.6	23.4	
2 adults 0 children (<65)	3.1	6.9	13.1	5.1	9.3	5.9	9.0	16.3	3.9	7.1	
2 adults 0 children (65+)	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.8	0.5	0.5	2.1	0.3	0.3	
2 adults 1-2 children	3.7	8.0	15.2	4.4	9.3	6.2	10.6	18.8	6.2	9.8	
2 adults 3+ children	6.2	12.3	23.6	8.7	15.9	10.3	14.4	30.3	11.9	14.9	
3+ adults 0 children	2.9	6.9	14.4	4.0	10.0	4.7	7.6	15.6	4.9	7.2	
3+ adults 1-2 children	4.2	8.8	17.2	5.9	12.7	5.9	8.9	19.4	5.1	11.4	
3+ adults 3+ children	5.3	10.5	17.5	7.0	15.8	5.3	10.5	24.6	5.3	7.0	

*Weekly figures includes 'most days' and 'about once a week'. Monthly figures includes 'most days', 'about once a week' and 'about once a month'.





4.2.8. Caring Responsibilities

Table 11 gives the prevalence estimates in relation to caring responsibilities overall, as well as by gender, age group, local deprivation fifth (based on Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019), employment status and household composition. Survey responders were asked if they were responsible for the long-term care of any of the following: (i) sick or disabled partner; (ii) sick or disabled children; (iii) other sick or disabled relatives; (iv) elderly relatives (not sick); (v) sick or disabled friends; (vi) parents; or (vii) someone else.

If they did care for someone, they were asked how frequently they performed various activities for them: (i) helping the person wash, dress or feed themselves, etc; (ii) giving them medication; (iii) doing housework (cleaning and clothes washing, etc) or gardening for them; (iv) helping with finances (paying bills, etc); (v) preparing meals for them; (vi) going shopping for them (food, medication); (vii) giving them lifts (do doctor's or hospital appointments, etc); and (ix) other caring activity (to be specified). They were then asked how many hours they spend in caring for that person(s). **Table 12** summarises the percentages undertaking these caring activities daily or weekly and the percentage caring for 20+ and 35+ hours per week.

		Pe	ercenta	ges car	ing for	specifie	d perso	on	
Group	Sick or disabled partner	Sick or disabled children	Other sick or disabled relatives	Elderly relatives (not sick)	Sick or disabled friends	Parents	Someone else	At least one specified person/group	More than two specified people/groups
Overall	5.3	4.4	3.1	4.2	1.0	6.3	2.6	17.9	4.7
Men	6.1	3.1	3.0	4.0	0.9	5.1	2.1	16.0	4.0
Women	4.4	5.6	3.2	4.3	1.2	7.2	3.0	19.5	5.4
Aged 16-24	1.3	1.8	3.6	3.9	1.5	6.9	2.9	13.0	4.0
Aged 25-34	2.3	4.2	2.9	2.9	1.2	5.1	3.0	13.3	3.9
Aged 35-44	3.7	8.4	3.2	3.4	0.5	5.9	2.3	18.8	4.4
Aged 45-54	4.4	6.2	4.1	6.2	1.3	10.2	3.0	23.8	7.4
Aged 55-64	7.7	4.1	3.4	6.2	1.1	8.8	2.4	22.6	6.4
Aged 65-74	10.5	2.9	2.0	4.2	0.9	2.4	1.7	18.1	4.0
Aged 75+	13.8	0.4	1.1	1.1	0.4	1.1	1.1	15.9	0.6
Most deprived	6.5	7.3	4.2	3.2	2.0	5.7	2.8	22.5	3.9
Second most deprived	7.3	4.6	4.7	4.3	1.0	8.0	3.3	20.7	6.2

Table 11: Prevalence estimates of caring responsibilities, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition





	Percentages caring for specified person										
Group	Sick or disabled partner	Sick or disabled children	Other sick or disabled relatives	Elderly relatives (not sick)	Sick or disabled friends	Parents	Someone else	At least one specified person/group	More than two specified people/groups		
Middle fifth	5.6	4.1	3.0	4.0	1.0	7.3	3.3	17.7	5.6		
Second least deprived	3.8	3.7	2.7	4.1	1.0	4.5	1.8	14.3	3.8		
Least deprived	3.7	2.9	1.5	5.2	0.4	6.2	2.0	15.4	4.3		
Working	2.0	3.8	2.6	4.3	0.8	6.5	2.1	14.8	4.4		
Student	1.8	2.5	4.3	4.7	2.5	9.1	4.0	14.2	5.7		
Retired	11.2	2.1	1.8	3.8	0.3	3.1	2.0	17.7	3.6		
Looking after family/home	14.6	16.5	6.9	5.0	1.6	11.2	3.5	43.0	10.4		
Unemployed	0.6	1.9	3.2	1.3	0.7	5.3	1.3	9.4	2.9		
Long-term sick/disabled	8.7	6.5	5.8	3.6	2.5	6.1	4.0	23.8	5.4		
1 adult 0 children (<65)	1.1	0.8	2.8	3.1	1.1	6.6	1.1	11.1	3.2		
1 adult 0 children (65+)	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4	2.7	0.3		
1 adult 1-2 children	1.8	6.3	2.2	2.7	0.5	5.9	6.8	17.4	5.4		
1 adult 3+ children	1.6	19.0	3.2	0.0	1.6	9.5	4.8	35.4	3.1		
2 adults 0 children (<65)	5.9	1.4	3.7	4.7	1.5	7.8	2.1	18.2	4.5		
2 adults 0 children (65+)	19.0	1.1	2.2	4.6	0.5	3.0	1.1	25.8	3.3		
2 adults 1-2 children	1.6	6.0	3.2	3.2	0.4	4.9	2.8	15.0	4.1		
2 adults 3+ children	6.4	11.8	3.7	2.7	0.5	8.0	3.2	23.2	6.6		
3+ adults 0 children	5.0	4.3	4.1	6.1	1.1	8.0	1.3	19.0	6.7		
3+ adults 1-2 children	6.0	8.2	3.9	7.8	2.6	9.9	4.8	24.8	8.5		
3+ adults 3+ children	1.8	14.3	5.3	5.5	3.6	7.1	8.9	25.9	12.1		



Table 12: Prevalence estimates of caring activities and time spent caring, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

	Percentages undertaking caring activity daily or weekly / total caring hours									
Group	Helping person wash, dress or feed themselves (daily/weekly)	Giving them medication (daily/weekly)	Doing housework or gardening (daily/weekly)	Helping with finances (daily/weekly)	Preparing meals for them (daily/weekly)	Going shopping for them (daily/weekly)	Giving them lifts (daily/weekly)	Cares for others 20+ hours per week	Cares for others 35+ hours per week	
Overall	8.4	7.6	11.7	6.8	11.1	11.6	6.6	7.7	6.4	
Men	6.9	6.5	9.9	6.2	9.2	9.7	5.7	5.9	4.8	
Women	9.6	8.5	13.3	7.4	12.9	13.2	7.4	9.2	7.8	
Aged 16-24	3.9	3.9	8.6	3.5	6.6	6.8	2.3	3.1	2.3	
Aged 25-34	6.5	5.6	8.8	4.8	8.5	1.8	4.7	6.7	5.8	
Aged 35-44	9.9	7.8	13.1	0.1	12.5	12.5	8.0	0.0 8.6	8.U	
Aged 45-54	10.7	9.0	15.0	0.2	13.0	15.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	
Aged 65-74	9.3	8.1	11.9	8.9	11.5	12.7	7.3	79	69	
Aged 75+	8.6	8.8	11.3	7.6	11.7	11.1	5.2	8.0	7.0	
Most deprived	11.8	11.4	17.1	9.6	15.3	16.0	9.4	11.2	9.3	
Second most deprived	10.6	9.8	14.4	8.8	13.9	13.8	8.4	10.7	9.3	
Middle fifth	7.0	6.3	10.5	5.9	9.7	10.5	5.4	6.6	6.0	
Second least deprived	6.3	6.0	8.3	5.8	8.0	8.6	5.0	5.1	4.0	
Least deprived	6.9	5.4	9.4	4.8	9.7	10.1	5.5	5.8	4.5	
Working	5.7	4.8	8.5	4.4	7.9	8.9	4.4	4.7	3.6	
Student	5.4	5.8	11.5	5.4	9.5	8.8	4.1	2.8	2.4	
Retired	9.8	8.7	11.7	9.0	11.1	11.7	6.7	8.8	7.9	
Looking after family/nome	26.6	25.9	35.2	21.2	35.7	36.0	24.2	30.4	28.8	
Unemployed	4.7	4.1	0.5 16.5	4.1	0.5	5.9	3.6	4.8	2.4	
1 adult 0 children (<65)	12.0	10.7	10.0 5.8	0.7	14.3	13.3	9.4	12.1	9.9	
1 adult 0 children (<05)	13	4.3 0.7	17	<u>+.0</u> 1 3	1.0	17	1.0	1.0	1.0	
1 adult 1-2 children	7.3	6.0	10.3	3.9	10.5	9.1	3.0	6.9	6.5	
1 adult 3+ children	25.4	14.5	28.6	13.1	29.7	29.7	20.3	26.6	25.0	
2 adults 0 children (<65)	7.6	8.2	12.5	7.5	11.4	13.1	7.1	8.1	6.5	
2 adults 0 children (65+)	14.8	13.9	18.9	13.4	18.6	18.7	10.0	12.5	10.6	
2 adults 1-2 children	6.2	4.8	8.6	3.4	8.7	8.5	5.5	6.4	5.0	
2 adults 3+ children	12.7	11.2	18.9	9.2	16.8	17.7	9.1	12.0	10.4	
3+ adults 0 children	8.1	8.3	11.9	8.6	11.2	12.1	8.1	7.3	5.8	
3+ adults 1-2 children	9.8	9.5	15.3	7.4	14.7	16.0	7.8	7.1	6.7	
3+ adults 3+ children	13.8	10.3	20.7	8.6	19.0	15.8	8.8	14.8	14.8	





4.2.9. Volunteering

Table 13 gives the prevalence estimates in relation to the current time spent volunteering overall, as well as by gender, age group, local deprivation fifth (based on Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019), employment status and household composition.

Table 13: Prevalence estimates for volunteering, overall, and by gender, age, local
deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

	Frequency of volunteering (%)										
Group	About once a week or more	About once a month	A few times a year	About once a year	Have done in the past but not in the last year	Have never volunteered					
Overall	7.9	2.1	3.7	2.8	29.7	53.9					
Men	7.3	2.4	4.1	3.2	26.2	56.9					
Women	8.3	1.9	3.3	2.4	32.7	51.3					
Aged 16-24	10.7	3.5	7.2	5.1	34.7	38.7					
Aged 25-34	5.4	2.0	2.9	3.4	36.4	49.9					
Aged 35-44	7.9	2.4	4.3	3.7	26.7	54.9					
Aged 45-54	6.9	1.6	2.6	2.4	31.3	55.3					
Aged 55-64	7.6	1.1	3.1	1.4	25.3	61.5					
Aged 65-74	10.2	2.6	2.0	0.8	21.1	63.2					
Aged 75+	6.3	1.3	3.7	0.7	25.9	62.1					
Most deprived	7.8	1.9	2.4	1.7	26.9	59.3					
Second most deprived	8.1	2.6	4.0	3.0	27.0	55.3					
Middle fifth	6.4	1.7	4.2	2.6	31.4	53.6					
Second least deprived	8.5	1.9	4.3	3.2	32.1	49.9					
Least deprived	8.6	2.5	3.4	3.1	30.3	52.2					
Working	7.0	2.2	3.8	3.5	31.3	52.2					
Student	11.0	3.5	9.5	4.9	35.0	36.0					
Retired	9.1	2.2	2.6	0.8	23.7	61.6					
Looking after family/home	4.5	1.1	2.6	1.9	28.8	61.0					
Unemployed	16.6	3.1	3.1	3.1	30.1	44.2					
Long-term sick/disabled	6.5	0.7	0.3	1.4	33.0	58.1					
1 adult 0 children (<65)	8.5	1.9	3.8	4.1	29.9	51.6					
1 adult 0 children (65+)	7.6	1.4	2.7	0.7	24.7	62.9					
1 adult 1-2 children	6.4	2.1	2.6	3.0	32.1	53.8					
1 adult 3+ children	4.8	3.2	3.2	1.6	28.6	58.7					
2 adults 0 children (<65)	7.5	2.0	2.9	3.0	30.5	54.1					
2 adults 0 children (65+)	9.9	2.3	2.9	0.5	22.6	61.8					
2 adults 1-2 children	5.6	2.4	4.5	2.8	31.6	53.0					
2 adults 3+ children	11.3	3.1	3.6	2.6	23.6	55.9					
3+ adults 0 children	9.2	2.2	4.6	2.9	34.4	46.7					
3+ adults 1-2 children	6.3	2.1	5.9	4.2	31.2	50.2					
3+ adults 3+ children	8.8	3.5	5.3	3.5	29.8	49.1					



4.2.10. Your Local Area

Table 14 gives the prevalence estimates in relation to some measures about people's local area overall, as well as by gender, age group, local deprivation fifth (based on Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019), employment status and household composition. People were asked if they felt their neighbourhood is a place where people look out for one another (yes, no or don't know), if they trust people in their neighbourhood (most, many or a few people or none, or don't know), feelings of safety, use of local parks, if they felt their local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together, problems in their area and overall satisfaction of their neighbourhood.

Table 14: Prevalence estimates for aspects of their local area, overall, and by gender, age, local deprivation fifth, employment status and household composition

		Percentages										
Group	Neighbours look out for one another	Do not know if neighbours look out for one another	Trust most or many people in neighbourhood	Trust a few people or do not trust people in neighbourhood	Definitely or tend to agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together	Definitely or tend to disagree that people from different backgrounds get on well together	Do not know if people from different backgrounds get on well together	Satisfied with area as a place to live	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with area as a place to live	Dissatisfied with area as a place to live		
Overall	54.8	22.4	36.4	54.0	54.3	17.9	27.8	72.9	16.9	10.1		
Men	53.1	22.4	37.7	52.6	56.6	20.1	23.3	72.6	17.0	10.3		
Women	56.5	22.3	35.5	55.0	52.5	15.7	31.8	73.5	16.7	9.8		
Aged 16-24	37.1	29.8	22.2	64.8	47.9	28.6	23.5	56.0	29.8	14.2		
Aged 25-34	50.1	26.1	29.0	57.9	55.2	19.3	25.6	71.4	17.7	10.9		
Aged 35-44	54.4	23.2	30.3	58.5	55.8	18.8	25.4	69.5	18.1	12.4		
Aged 45-54	57.8	20.5	38.0	54.0	55.7	17.8	26.5	75.1	15.7	9.3		
Aged 55-64	62.2	19.9	43.5	50.2	53.6	17.7	28.7	78.2	12.5	9.3		
Aged 65-74	68.3	14.3	50.6	44.2	58.6	8.4	33.1	82.9	11.1	6.0		
Aged 75+	62.8	16.4	57.4	35.3	54.8	6.0	39.1	88.7	6.5	4.9		
Most deprived	45.6	23.1	21.1	68.4	43.9	26.7	29.4	56.2	24.8	19.0		
Second most deprived	45.1	25.6	24.3	67.4	46.9	23.1	30.0	60.9	24.2	15.0		
Middle fifth	49.5	23.5	32.7	55.6	52.5	18.2	29.3	70.9	19.3	9.8		
Second least deprived	59.5	22.6	43.1	46.8	59.4	13.6	27.0	81.9	12.7	5.4		
Least deprived	70.1	17.9	55.4	36.9	65.5	10.3	24.2	89.4	6.8	3.8		
Working	55.7	23.4	36.3	53.4	57.5	17.2	25.3	75.2	16.6	8.3		
Student	36.4	30.9	20.5	66.1	49.8	26.1	24.0	56.3	26.3	17.4		



	Percentages									
Group	Neighbours look out for one another	Do not know if neighbours look out for one another	Trust most or many people in neighbourhood	Trust a few people or do not trust people in neighbourhood	Definitely or tend to agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together	Definitely or tend to disagree that people from different backgrounds get on well together	Do not know if people from different backgrounds get on well together	Satisfied with area as a place to live	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with area as a place to live	Dissatisfied with area as a place to live
Retired	65.5	15.9	52.8	40.9	56.7	8.7	34.6	84.0	10.1	5.9
Looking after family/home	58.0	21.6	30.1	62.0	48.8	20.8	30.4	67.8	20.1	12.1
Unemployed	32.3	22.8	20.4	66.5	46.0	32.5	21.5	55.0	20.7	24.3
Long-term sick/disabled	49.7	19.3	22.8	67.8	42.3	25.1	32.6	59.7	21.0	19.3
1 adult 0 children (<65)	49.1	23.2	29.9	59.3	49.2	21.8	29.0	68.3	17.9	13.9
1 adult 0 children (65+)	67.7	15.0	54.6	36.9	58.2	4.6	37.1	89.3	8.3	2.4
1 adult 1-2 children	51.5	25.7	25.4	59.7	53.1	20.6	26.3	68.8	21.9	9.3
1 adult 3+ children	56.9	10.8	26.2	70.8	59.7	27.4	12.9	61.9	22.2	15.9
2 adults 0 children (<65)	55.9	23.4	36.4	54.7	53.9	17.8	28.3	76.3	15.2	8.4
2 adults 0 children (65+)	66.2	15.1	55.8	40.2	59.0	7.3	33.7	84.1	9.0	6.9
2 adults 1-2 children	58.1	23.4	34.7	55.6	58.9	17.0	24.1	73.0	16.7	10.3
2 adults 3+ children	50.0	26.5	28.4	58.4	54.2	20.8	25.0	65.6	20.5	13.8
3+ adults 0 children	47.2	23.9	33.0	56.5	51.5	21.7	26.8	66.5	21.6	12.0
3+ adults 1-2 children	45.2	25.3	28.1	62.0	50.6	27.4	21.9	63.6	21.8	14.6
3+ adults 3+ children	52.6	17.5	31.6	57 9	564	25.5	18.2	517	36.2	121

4.3. Differences Across the Wards

4.3.1. Physical Health and Emotional Wellbeing

The following figures give the prevalence estimates for each ward and Area Committee Area and for Hull overall. The wards are shown within their Area Committee Areas with the prevalence estimates given for each Area Committee Area shown by the coloured line and the coloured value label. The solid line across the whole figure gives the prevalence for Hull overall together with a value label giving the overall prevalence. The figures give prevalence estimates of people in fair or poor health (**Figure 7**), long-term illness or disability that limits activities (**Figure 8**), low levels of satisfaction with life (**Figure 9**), low levels of feeling life is worthwhile (**Figure 10**), low levels of happiness yesterday (**Figure 11**), and high levels of anxiety yesterday (**Figure 12**).









Figure 8: Percentage with long-term illness or disability that limits activities by ward and area







Figure 9: Percentage with low levels of satisfaction with life by ward and area

Figure 10: Percentage with low levels of feeling life is worthwhile by ward and area

















4.3.2. Loneliness and Isolation

The following figures give prevalence estimates by ward for people who often lack companionship (Figure 13), often feel left out (Figure 14), often feel isolated from others (Figure 15), often feel lonely (Figure 16) and feel lonely or isolated from others all or most of the time (Figure 17).










Figure 15: Percentage who often feels isolated from others by ward and area











Figure 17: Percentage who feel lonely or isolated from others all or most of the time by ward and area



4.3.3. Social Support

Figure 18, **Figure 19** and **Figure 20** give the percentages by ward who have no-one to ask for help (or don't know if they have anyone to ask) if they were ill in bed and needed help at home, the percentages having no-one and 0-2 people to turn to for comfort and support in a serious crisis.



Figure 18: Percentage who have no-one to help (or don't know) if they were ill in bed and needed help at home (and could ask people they lived with) by ward and area



Figure 19: Percentage who have no-one to turn to for comfort and support if they had a serious crisis by ward and area





Figure 20: Percentage who have 0-2 people to turn to for comfort and support if they had a serious crisis by ward and area

4.3.4. Lifestyle and Behavioural Risk Factors for Poor Health

The following figures give prevalence estimates by ward for current smokers (Figure 21), those who smoke 20+ cigarettes per day (Figure 22), those who smoke 15+ cigarettes per day (Figure 23), those who smoke 15+ cigarettes per day (Figure 24), current e-cigarette users (Figure 25), those who never drink alcohol (Figure 26), drink alcohol at least once a week (Figure 27), display harmful alcohol behaviour (Figure 28), weekly use of drugs other than those required for medical reasons (Figure 30), use of drugs other than those required for medical reasons (Figure 30), use of drugs other than those required for medical reasons (Figure 31), eating fewer than five portions of fruit and vegetables each day (Figure 32), physical inactivity (Figure 33), physically active (Figure 34), overweight and obesity (Figure 35), obesity including morbidly obesity (Figure 36) and morbidly obesity (Figure 37).

Note that the smoking prevalence for North Carr was fourth highest across the 21 wards in the 2014 survey at 41.5%. It is unlikely to have changed so dramatically in five years, and it is possible that the underlying prevalence is higher. Examining the information at a local geographical level (LLSOAs), it appears that there has not been even coverage across the ward, and a relatively high percentage of the least deprived areas of the ward have been surveyed. In 2014, the most deprived six wards (St Andrew's & Docklands, Orchard Park, Central, Marfleet, North Carr, and Newington & Gipsyville) had the six highest smoking prevalence ranging from 37.0% to 46.1%. However, in 2019, five of these wards excluding North Carr also had the highest

Council



prevalence estimates ranging from 31.1% to 41.7% with North Carr only having a prevalence of 21.4% (ranked 14th out of the 21 wards). Thus is it likely that the prevalence is North Carr is higher than 21.4%, but the actual figure is unknown.



Figure 21: Percentage of smokers by ward and area

Figure 22: Percentage of people who smoke 20+ cigarettes per day by ward and area





Figure 23: Percentage of people who smoke 15+ cigarettes per day by ward and area



Figure 24: Percentage of people who smoke 10+ cigarettes per day by ward and area



Figure 25: Percentage of current e-cigarette users by ward and area









Figure 26: Percentage who never drink alcohol by ward and area

















Figure 30: Percentage of people who use drugs other than those required for medical reasons at least monthly by ward and area





Figure 31: Percentage of people who use drugs other than those required for medical reasons within the last year by ward and area































Figure 37: Percentage of people who are morbidly obese by ward and area

4.3.5. Financial Resilience

Figure 38 gives the percentages by ward for those who would use their savings or money from their current account to fund a £200 household emergency (perhaps in conjunction with other options they said they would or might use too), and **Figure 39** gives the percentages by ward who would never do this or stated this option was not applicable to them (the remaining 'might' use their savings or money from their current account). **Figure 40** gives the percentages by ward for those who would ask family or friends to fund a £200 household emergency (perhaps in conjunction with other options they said they would or might use too).







Figure 39: Percentage of people who would never use savings or money from current account to fund a £200 household emergency or stated this option was not applicable by ward and area







Figure 40: Percentage of people who would ask family or friends to fund a £200 household emergency by ward and area



4.3.6. Problem Gambling

The following figures give percentages by ward for those who have lied to people important to them about how much they have gambled and/or have felt the need to bet more and more money either weekly or monthly (Figure 41) or in the last year (Figure 42).







Figure 42: Percentage of people who have lied to people important to them about how much they have gambled and/or felt the need to bet more and more in the last year by ward and area







4.3.7. Financial Worries

The following figures give percentages by ward for those who have worried most days or weekly about not having enough to eat because of lack of money or other resources (**Figure 43**), or have worried most days or weekly about paying rent or mortgage, and other essential bills (**Figure 44**).

Figure 43: Percentage of people worry most days or about once a week about not having enough food to eat due to lack of money or other resources by ward and area





Figure 44: Percentage of people worry most days or about once a week about paying their rent or mortgage and other essential bills by ward and area

Hull

JSNA

4.3.8. Caring Responsibilities

The following figures give percentages by ward of the people who have caring responsibilities for someone (Figure 45), and the percentages out of all survey responders who are carers for 20+ hours per week (Figure 46) and 35+ hours per week (Figure 47).

Council





Figure 45: Percentage of people who care for someone by ward and area

Figure 46: Percentage of people who care for someone for 20+ hours per week by ward and area







Figure 47: Percentage of people who care for someone for 35+ hours per week by ward and area

4.3.9. Volunteering

Figure 48 gives the percentage of people by ward who volunteer about once a week or more frequently, and **Figure 49** gives the percentage volunteering monthly or more frequently.





Hull

JSNA

Figure 49: Percentage of people who volunteer about once a month or more frequently by ward and area











4.3.10. Your Local Area

Figure 50 gives the percentages by ward who feel their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours look out for one another. **Figure 51** gives the percentage who trust most or many of the people in their neighbourhood, and **Figure 52** gives the percentages who feel that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together. **Figure 53** gives the percentages that feel satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live.



Figure 50: Percentage of people who feel their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours look out for one another by ward and area







Figure 52: Percentage of people who agree that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together by ward and area













4.4. Numbers of People Affected in Hull

From the prevalence estimates in **Table 2** and **Table 3**, it is possible to estimate the number of people in Hull aged 16+ years. There was an estimated 208,867 people aged 16+ years living in Hull (Office for National Statistics mid-year 2018 resident population estimates). **Table 15** gives the estimated numbers in relation to health and wellbeing, and measures of isolation, and social support. **Table 16** gives the numbers in relation to the specified behavioural and lifestyle risk factors for poor health. **Table 17** gives the estimates for gambling and the financial measures from the survey, and **Table 18** presents the information in relation to caring responsibilities and volunteering. **Table 19** gives the numbers in relation to people's opinion of their neighbourhood.

All numbers have been rounded to the nearest 50 individuals, and cannot be considered to be an exact number with the characteristic, but will give an estimate and are a guide to the numbers in Hull.

Health and wellbeing status	Estimated number of residents in Hull
In excellent health	17,550
In very good health	57,050
In good health	71,100
In fair health	43,100
In poor health	20,050
Has limiting long-term illness or disability	62,350
Low levels of satisfaction with life	28,850
Low levels of feeling life worthwhile	25,050
Low levels of happiness yesterday	33,150
High levels of anxiety yesterday	64,700
Often lacks companionship	20,050
Sometimes lacks companionship	56,250
Often feels left out	19,050
Sometimes feels left out	55,950
Often feels isolated from others	20,650
Sometimes feels isolated from others	51,650
Often feels lonely	23,550
Sometimes feels lonely	53,950
Often for all four questions*	8,050
Often for 1-4 of four questions*	37,850
Feel lonely or isolated from others all of the time	4,950
Feel lonely or isolated from others most of the time	17,000
Feel lonely or isolated from others some of the time	53,900

Table 15: Estimated number of people in Hull with differing levels of health and wellbeing, and social support



Health and wellbeing status	Estimated number of residents in Hull
No-one to help if ill in bed	11,350
Don't know if there is anyone to help if ill in bed	11,250
No-one to help if ill in bed (or don't know)	22,600
No-one to offer comfort and support in serious crisis	6,050
1-2 people to offer comfort and support in serious crisis	28,650
0-2 people to offer comfort and support in serious crisis	34,650

*Lacking companionship, feeling left out, feeling isolated from others and feeling lonely.

Table 16: Estimated number of people in Hull with lifestyle and behavioural risk factors for poor health

Risk factor for poor health ³	Estimated number of residents in Hull
Daily smoker	41,700
Occasional smoker	10,300
Current smokers	52,050
Former smoker	59,750
Usually smokes 0-5 cigarettes (or equivalent) per week	16,100
Usually smokes >5-10 cigarettes (or equivalent) per week	15,050
Usually smokes >10-15 cigarettes (or equivalent) per week	8,200
Usually smokes >15-20 cigarettes (or equivalent) per week	8,050
Usually smokes >20-30 cigarettes (or equivalent) per week	1,650
Usually smokes >30 cigarettes (or equivalent) per week	750
E-cigarette daily user	17,800
E-cigarette occasional user	10,100
E-cigarette user	27,950
Never drinks alcohol	45,450
Drinks alcohol weekly	71,750
Excessive weekly units (>14)	42,800
Excessive weekly units (>28)	17,500
Excessive weekly units (>50)	7,000
Weekly binge drinking (6+)	39,450
Excessive and/or weekly binge	53,300

³ Current smokers are defined as daily and occasional smokers. Harmful drinking behaviour is defined as drinking more than 14 units during the previous week or usually binge drinking at least once a week (drinking 6+ units on a single occasion) or having a Fast Alcohol Screening Test of three or more (see **footnote 1**). Physical activity levels were defined on the basis of the weekly minute of moderate-intensity physical activity, with active people fulfilling the national guidelines of 150 such minutes per week, and inactive people undertaking fewer than 30 such minutes of physical activity per week. Heights and weights were adjusted slightly to try to compensate for people over-reporting their height and under-reporting their weight. Body mass index (BMI; see **footnote 2**) was used to define overweight and obesity with a BMI 25+ used to define overweight, 30+ for obesity and 40+ for morbidly obese.



Risk factor for poor health ³	Estimated number of residents in Hull
Fail to do what was expected due to drinking (at least weekly)	2,000
Unable to remember night before due to drinking (at least weekly)	3,300
Someone concerned or suggested cut down but no in last year	6,700
Someone concerned or suggested cut down in last year	6,950
FAST score 3-16	54,050
FAST score 8-16	6,450
Harmful alcohol behaviour	66,250
Use drugs daily/weekly	7,600
Use drugs daily/weekly/monthly	9,300
Used drugs in last year	17,350
Not used drugs in last year	4,300
Not used drugs in last 5 years	9,600
Never used drugs	177,650
Have a healthy diet	132,500
Do not have a healthy diet	56,400
Don't know what a healthy diet is or if they have a healthy diet	19,950
Usually no portions of fruit/vegetables every day	13,950
Usually one portion of fruit/vegetables every day	29,150
Usually two portions of fruit/vegetables every day	40,000
Usually three portions of fruit/vegetables every day	49,150
Usually four portions of fruit/vegetables every day	33,150
Usually five or more portions of fruit/vegetables every day (5-A-DAY)	43,500
Not 5-A-DAY	165,400
Physically active (150+ moderate-intensity physical activity per week)	84,950
Physically inactive (<30 moderate-intensity physical activity per week)	92,300
Underweight	9,750
Healthy weight	53,600
Overweight or obese	145,500
Obese or morbidly obese	64,850
Morbidly obese	7,650



Table 17: Estimated number of people in Hull in relation to financial and gambling measures from survey

Financial and gambling measures from survey	Estimated number of residents in Hull
Would only use savings/current account for £200 emergency	70,600
Would use savings/current account for £200 emergency*	125,500
Would never use savings/current account for £200 emergency	54,100
Would only ask family/friends for £200 emergency	17,150
Would ask family/friends for £200 emergency*	50,450
Would never ask family/friends for £200 emergency	88,650
Lied about how much had gambled weekly	1,350
Lied about how much had gambled weekly/monthly	1,950
Lied about how much had gambled in last year	5,150
Felt the need to bet more and more money weekly	1,450
Felt the need to bet more and more money weekly/monthly	2,550
Felt the need to bet more and more money in last year	6,750
Bet more than could afford to lose weekly	1,000
Bet more than could afford to lose weekly/monthly	2,100
Bet more than could afford to lose in last year	5,250
Lied to those important to them and/or felt need to bet more money weekly	1,900
Lied to those important to them and/or felt need to bet more weekly/monthly	3,000
Lied to those important to them and/or felt need to bet more in last year	8,300
Worry about not having enough food most days	9,200
Worry about not having enough food most days/weekly	18,200
Worry about not having enough food most days/weekly/monthly	33,250
Never worry about not having enough food	151,850
Worry about not being about to eat healthily most days	11,800
Worry about not being about to eat healthily most days/weekly	22,200
Worry about not being about to eat healthily most days/weekly/monthly	36,100
Never worry about not being about to eat healthily	148,350
Worry about paying essential bills most days	14,600
Worry about paying essential bills most days/weekly	21,750
Worry about paying essential bills most days/weekly/monthly	40,150
Never worry about paying essential bills	136,700
Worry about paying back loans most days	12,250
Worry about paying back loans most days/weekly	19,000
Worry about paying back loans most days/weekly/monthly	33,000
Never worry about paying back loans	148,950

*Perhaps in conjunction with other methods (the 'would only' is a subset of this group).



 Table 18: Estimated number of people in Hull in relation to caring responsibilities

 and volunteering

Caring responsibilities and volunteering	Estimated number of residents in Hull
Cares for sick or disabled partner	10,950
Cares for sick or disabled children	9,200
Cares for other sick or disabled relatives	6,500
Cares for elderly relatives (not sick)	8,750
Cares for sick or disabled friends	2,150
Cares for parents	13,050
Cares for someone else	5,350
Does not care for anyone listed above	171,550
Cares for at least one person/group of people listed above	37,300
Cares for two or more people/groups of people listed above	9,850
Cares for three or more people/groups of people listed above	3,000
Helps someone wash, dress or feed themselves daily	13,150
Helps someone wash, dress or feed themselves daily/weekly	17,500
Helps someone wash, dress or feed themselves daily/weekly/monthly	18,750
Gives someone medication daily	12,900
Gives someone medication daily/weekly	15,800
Gives someone medication daily/weekly/monthly	17,550
Helps with housework or gardening daily	17,100
Helps with housework or gardening daily/weekly	24,500
Helps with housework or gardening daily/weekly/monthly	27,300
Helps with finances daily	9,900
Helps with finances daily/weekly	14,250
Helps with finances daily/weekly/monthly	17,500
Prepares meals for them daily	18,200
Prepares meals for them daily/weekly	23,250
Prepares meals for them daily/weekly/monthly	25,200
Shops for them daily	14,650
Shops for them daily/weekly	24,200
Shops for them daily/weekly/monthly	27,500
Gives them lifts daily	9,100
Gives them lifts daily/weekly	13,750
Gives them lifts daily/weekly/monthly	20,100
Cares for person(s) for less than an hour per week	5,650
Cares for person(s) for 1-4 hours per week	3,850
Cares for person(s) for 5-9 hours per week	3,250
Cares for person(s) for 10-19 hours per week	2,500



Caring responsibilities and volunteering	Estimated number of residents in Hull
Cares for person(s) for 20-34 hours per week	2,650
Cares for person(s) for 35-49 hours per week	3,650
Cares for person(s) for 50-99 hours per week	1,700
Cares for person(s) for 100+ hours per week	8,050
Cares for person(s) for variable of hours per week (but under 20)	1,450
Overall cares for person(s) for 20+ hours per week	16,000
Overall cares for person(s) for 35+ hours per week	13,350
Volunteers about once a week or more	16,500
Volunteers about once a month	4,450
Volunteers a few times a year	7,700
Volunteers about once a year	5,750
Has volunteered in the past but not in last year	61,950
Has never volunteered	112,500
Volunteers monthly or more frequently	20,950
Volunteers annually or more frequently	34,400
Currently volunteers or has previously volunteered	96,400

Table 19: Estimated num	er of people ir	Hull in relation	to measures	collected to
examine perception of ne	ghbourhood			

Measures in relation to neighbourhood	Estimated number of residents in Hull
Neighbourhood is a place where neighbours look out for one another	114,450
Neighbours do not look out for one another	47,700
Don't know if neighbours look out for one another	46,700
Trust most people in neighbourhood	39,450
Trust many people in neighbourhood	36,600
Trust a few people in neighbourhood	91,200
Do not trust people in neighbourhood	21,500
Don't know about trusting people in neighbourhood	20,100
Definitely agree people from different backgrounds get on well	18,100
Tend to agree people from different backgrounds get on well	95,400
Tend to disagree people from different backgrounds get on well	25,300
Definitely disagree people from different backgrounds get on well	12,000
Don't know if people from different backgrounds get on well	58,100
Very satisfied with neighbourhood as a place to live	56,200
Fairly satisfied with neighbourhood as a place to live	96,100
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with neighbourhood as a place to live	35,400
Fairly dissatisfied with neighbourhood as a place to live	14,900
Very dissatisfied with neighbourhood as a place to live	6,250





4.5. How Does Hull Compare to England?

Table 20 compares the prevalence in Hull with England in relation to lifestyle and behavioural risk factors for poor health.

Table 20: Prevalence estimates of lifestyle and behavioural risk factors for poor health for Hull compared to England

Pick factor for peer backh Percentage		England data course (wear		
Risk factor for poor fleatth	Hull	England	England data source / year	
Current smokers	24.9	14.4	Annual Population Survey, 2018	
Current smokers	24.9	16.8	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Former smoker	28.6	25.4	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Never smoked	46.5	57.8	Health Survey for England, 2018	
0-<10 cigarettes per day	10.6	7.7	Health Survey for England, 2018	
10-<20 cigarettes per day	8.7	6.0	Health Survey for England, 2018	
20+ cigarettes per day	4.5	3.0	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Smoker (most deprived national fifth*)	32.7	28.2	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Smoker (second most deprived fifth*)	21.1	17.8	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Smoker (middle deprived fifth*)	16.8	16.4	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Smoker (second least deprived fifth*)	10.3	12.8	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Smoker (least deprived national fifth*)	9.9	10.1	Health Survey for England, 2018	
E-cigarette user	13.4	6.3	Office for National Statistics, 2018	
E-cigarette user	13.4	6.5	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Never drinks alcohol**	21.8	17.8	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Drinks alcohol weekly	34.3	49.1	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Excessive weekly units (>14)**	18.2	21.2	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Excessive weekly units (>21)**	10.8	13.1	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Excessive weekly units (>35)**	4.7	6.0	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Excessive weekly units (>50)**	2.5	3.0	Health Survey for England, 2018	
No portions of fruit/veg***	6.6	8.1	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Less than one portion of fruit/veg***	0.0	3.4	Health Survey for England, 2018	
One portion of fruit/veg	13.9	15.3	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Two portions of fruit/veg	19.1	16.5	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Three portions of fruit/veg	23.5	15.6	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Four portions of fruit/veg	15.9	13.5	Health Survey for England, 2018	
5-A-DAY	20.8	27.5	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Physically active	40.7	66.3	Active Lives Survey, 2017/18	
Physically active	40.7	73.4	Health Survey for England, 2018	
Physically inactive	44.2	22.2	Active Lives Survey, 2017/18	
Physically inactive	44.2	26.6	Health Survey for England, 2018	



Diek fester fer neer heelth	Percentage		England data course (wear		
Risk factor for poor nealth	Hull	England	England data source / year		
Underweight	4.7	1.7	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Healthy weight	25.7	35.1	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Overweight or obese	69.7	63.3	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Overweight or obese	69.7	62.0	Active Lives Survey, 2017/18		
Obese or morbidly obese	31.1	27.7	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Morbidly obese	3.7	3.2	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Any gambling activity		54.0	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Any gambling (excl National Lottery)		40.2	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Any online gambling (excl NL)		9.4	Health Survey for England, 2018		
No gambling in last year		46.0	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Low gambling PGSI score****		2.7	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Moderate gambling PGSI score****		0.8	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Problem gambler PGSI score****		0.4	Health Survey for England, 2018		
At risk or problem gambler****		3.9	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Low gambling DSM-IV score****		99.5	Health Survey for England, 2018		
High gambling DSM-IV score****		0.5	Health Survey for England, 2018		
Potential gambling problem (weekly)	0.9				
Potential gambling problem (monthly)	1.4				

*By national Index of Multiple Deprivation fifths (ranging from most deprived fifth to least deprived fifth national). Note numbers are relatively small for 'least deprived fifth' with only 81 survey responders locally (compared to 2,027 in most deprived fifth).

**Frequency categories slightly different with 'never' and 'less than once a month' for local survey, but 'not at all in the last 12 months / non-drinker' in the Health Survey for England. Alcohol units have been adjusted so that they are more comparable to England's calculation of alcohol units (so the Hull figures here will not exactly match figures quoted elsewhere in this report).

***Might be slight differences as Health Survey for England quotes figures for number of portions but less than next number, for instance, at least one portion but less than two portions (which has been classified as one portion above). They have also provided figures for no portions and less than one portion separately. In the local questionnaire, people were just asked to provide the number of portions and virtually everyone completing the questionnaire gave a whole number (although there were three people who gave value $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{31}{2}$ with latter in 'three portions' group).

****Two methods used in Health Survey for England to denote (potential) problem gamblers. The survey included more than a dozen questions on gambling. The local survey only asked a small number so has no comparable information. The local survey combines the data from the three frequency questions asked: lied to people important to you about how much you gambled; felt the need to bet more and more money; and bet more than you could afford to lose. Percentages for 'weekly' and 'monthly' above are given for any person answering 'weekly' to one or more of these questions, and for any person answering 'weekly' or 'monthly' to one or more of these questions



In relation to financial resilience, national comparison data is not available, but in North East Lincolnshire where they undertook a financial inclusion survey in 2017, 66% would use their savings or current account to fund a £200 household emergency and 16% would never use this method (they did not have a not applicable option). This compares to 60% and 26% respectively for Hull. The percentages were also much higher for all other options in North East Lincolnshire, for instance, 41% would ask family and friends (26% would never do so) compared to 24% for Hull (42% for never), and 41% would work additional hours in North East Lincolnshire (26% would never) compared to 26% doing so in Hull (58% would never).

4.6. Changes Over Time in Hull

Table 21 gives the changes over time from Hull's Health and Wellbeing Surveys. Not all the surveys asked the same questions, sometimes because of changes in the national guidelines, so the information does not exist for all survey years for all of the different measures. As the age structure of the survey responders will differ among the surveys, age-standardised percentages (standardised to Hull's 2018 ONS population) have been calculated so any differences found should not be due to differences in the age structures among the survey years.

Characteristic		Age-standardised percentages**					
		2004	2007	2009	2011	2014	2019
Excellent or very good health	37.2	*	43.3	41.8	38.2	37.0	35.9
Fair or poor health	27.3	*	21.2	25.2	27.6	27.7	30.1
Poor health	7.5	*	4.7	9.2	8.5	8.7	9.5
Limiting long-term illness	31.5	18.5	23.5	27.9	28.9	28.0	29.7
Low satisfaction with life	*	*	*	*	*	11.2	13.7
Low feeling life worthwhile	*	*	*	*	*	9.2	11.9
Low happiness	*	*	*	*	*	14.1	15.8
High anxiety	*	*	*	*	*	27.3	30.9
No-one to provide support if in crisis	*	1.9	4.5	1.4	1.9	*	2.8
0-2 people to provide support if in crisis	*	21.6	16.5	10.8	14.1	*	16.5
3-5 people to provide support if in crisis	*	27.8	29.1	25.3	32.0	*	32.8
6-10 people to provide support if in crisis	*	20.0	22.0	17.8	22.2	*	20.9
11-14 people to provide support if in crisis	*	13.7	16.4	19.4	17.3	*	16.4
15+ people to provide support if in crisis	*	16.9	16.1	26.7	14.5	*	13.4
There is someone help if ill in bed	*	94.0	86.9	94.0	86.1	*	89.2
There is not someone help if ill in bed	*	2.4	3.7	5.1	4.5	*	5.4
Don't know if there is someone to help	*	3.6	9.3	1.0	9.4	*	5.4
Current smokers	31.8	43.8	31.7	33.5	34.0	30.7	24.8
Daily smoker	27.4	34.4	26.4	30.5	29.4	26.5	19.9
Occasional smoker	4.4	9.4	5.3	3.0	4.6	4.2	4.9

Table 21: Changes over time, age-standardised percentages from local surveys





Characteristic	Age-standardised percentages**							
	2003	2004	2007	2009	2011	2014	2019	
Former smoker	27.8	26.7	25.7	22.2	26.3	27.1	28.6	
Never smoked	40.4	29.5	42.6	44.4	39.7	42.3	46.6	
Usually smokes 0-<10 cigarettes per day	*	*	8.5	9.2	10.7	9.7	10.6	
Usually smokes 10-<20 cigarettes per day	*	*	12.6	13.2	13.8	11.9	8.7	
Usually smokes 20+ cigarettes per day	*	*	10.1	10.1	7.9	6.9	4.5	
E-cigarette user	*	*	*	*	*	8.4	13.4	
Daily e-cigarette user	*	*	*	*	*	3.7	8.6	
Occasional e-cigarette user	*	*	*	*	*	4.6	4.8	
Never drinks alcohol	17.1	*	21.1	25.0	20.5	24.2	21.7	
Drinks alcohol weekly	45.0	*	42.5	46.4	37.5	34.3	34.4	
None in last week	74.9	*	74.3	78.5	79.9	81.0	79.5	
More than 14 units last week	8.4	*	8.6	7.2	6.7	6.3	6.8	
More than 28 units last week	5.2	*	6.0	4.8	3.9	3.4	4.2	
More than 50 units last week	3.7	*	5.3	4.7	2.8	2.3	3.4	
Have healthy diet	*	61.7	74.7	79.3	71.9	68.9	63.5	
Do not have healthy diet	*	24.1	17.8	18.0	21.3	23.9	27.0	
Lack of knowledge about diet	*	14.2	7.4	2.8	6.8	7.1	9.4	
No portions of fruit/veg per day	*	*	2.2	6.9	6.7	6.5	6.6	
One portion of fruit/veg per day	*	*	10.4	10.2	10.9	12.1	13.8	
Two portions of fruit/veg per day	*	*	17.9	17.7	20.7	17.9	19.2	
Three portions of fruit/veg per day	*	*	26.5	24.4	25.8	25.8	23.6	
Four portions of fruit/veg per day	*	*	19.9	13.4	15.8	17.5	16.0	
Not 5-A-DAY	*	*	77.0	72.5	79.8	79.7	79.4	
5-A-DAY	*	*	23.0	27.5	20.2	20.3	20.6	
Physically active	*	*	*	*	*	44.4	40.9	
Physically inactive	*	*	*	*	*	43.4	43.9	
Underweight	5.1	*	5.5	4.8	4.6	5.0	4.6	
Healthy weight	32.9	*	33.1	31.6	30.1	31.4	25.6	
Overweight or obese	62.0	*	61.4	63.6	65.4	63.5	69.7	
Obese or morbidly obese	21.5	*	20.7	25.7	27.5	26.5	31.1	
Morbidly obese	2.3	*	2.6	2.5	3.3	3.1	3.6	
Trust most people in area	*	20.9	32.1	49.4	32.5	*	18.9	
Trust many people in area	*	21.8	21.4	16.2	21.4	*	17.6	
Trust a few people in area	*	44.0	32.7	26.0	32.4	*	43.6	
Trust no one in area	*	13.2	4.9	5.3	5.2	*	10.3	
Don't know about trust	*	0.0	8.9	3.1	8.6	*	9.7	
People look out for one another	*	64.1	60.6	73.8	58.5	*	54.9	
People do not look out for one another	*	23.3	21.8	19.3	21.6	*	22.8	
Don't know if people look out	*	12.6	17.6	6.9	19.9	*	22.3	
Very satisfied with area as place to live	*	*	*	44.2	27.3	*	26.9	



Characteristic	Age-standardised percentages**								
	2003	2004	2007	2009	2011	2014	2019		
Fairly satisfied with area as place to live	*	*	*	43.0	48.5	*	46.1		
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	*	*	*	7.2	16.5	*	16.9		
Fairly dissatisfied with area to live	*	*	*	3.8	5.7	*	7.1		
Very dissatisfied with area to live	*	*	*	1.8	2.0	*	2.9		

*Question not asked for that survey year.

**Survey responders interviewed (rather than self-completion questionnaire) for 2004 (Social Capital Survey) and 2009 (Social Capital Survey and separate mini Health and Lifestyle Survey) so this may have influenced some of the responses.

5. What Does This Mean For Hull?

- Smoking prevalence has decreased in Hull as well as the number of cigarettes smoked among smokers. However, despite these reductions in prevalence Hull has one of the highest prevalence estimates in England, although the inequalities gap is much less pronounced when comparing smoking prevalence with each national deprivation fifth. Despite this, there still is an inequalities gap between the most deprived areas in Hull and the most deprived areas in England, and there is a huge inequalities gap with all of Hull compared to all of England, but also within Hull. Therefore, in order to reduce the inequalities gap in relation to smoking, smoking prevalence needs to decrease at a faster rate than England, and at a faster rate among the most deprived areas of Hull compared to the least deprived areas of Hull. This is very difficult as it is often more difficult for people living in more deprived areas. It is necessary to concentrate on the population with the highest levels of smoking as this not only impacts on health, wellbeing and financial resilience for the individual and their families, but also impacts on the local NHS, economy and communities.
- The high prevalence as well as the increasing prevalence over time of overweight, obesity, poor diets and physical inactivity all contribute to increasing poor health and premature death in the future in Hull. Furthermore, existing poor lifestyle behaviours are likely to be replicated within families and in communities, which will exacerbate the problems stored up for the future. To reduce health inequalities in Hull, it is necessary to target the wards and individuals with the highest prevalence of poor diet, physical inactivity, and overweight and obesity. However, with so many people from all areas of Hull affected by poor diet, physical inactivity, and overweight and obesity, a broad range approach is necessary to maximise the impact. Family approaches may be the most appropriate which can encourage young people to eat more healthily, and older people to become more physically active. Education relating to diet may be necessary as significant numbers of adults appear to not know what a healthy diet is or if they have a healthy diet. Older people and people who were not working due to long-term illness and disability had the highest prevalence of inactivity so any approach to increasing activity needs to be appropriate to the physical abilities of that specific group.
- Whilst the percentage who never drink alcohol is increasing overall and fewer people are exceeding 14 units of alcohol per week, there are relatively high percentages of people who have potential alcohol problems in Hull. The picture across Hull is



complex though with differing behaviours (excessive alcohol, binge drinking and consequences resulting from alcohol) different for different groups of individuals. For instance, middle aged people and people living in the least deprived areas of Hull are more likely to drink excessively over the week and/or binge drink, but younger people as well as people living in the most deprived areas of Hull are more likely to have a higher frequency of problems following drinking such as failing to do what was expected of them or forgetting what happened the night before. This means that the approach to alcohol reduction and messages about alcohol harm needs to be different for different specific groups. Whilst more people are not drinking as much, it is possible that the ones that do drink alcohol are drinking more as hospital admissions and deaths due to alcohol are increasing in Hull.

- This is the first time the local survey has included some information on financial resilience and gambling. Prior to this survey, the numbers with low financial resilience and with potential gambling problems was relatively unknown for Hull, so this survey provides some valuable insight into the actual numbers, and the groups of individuals more likely to have low financial resilience and problem gambling. Whilst the numbers with potential problem gambling are low, it can cause huge problems for both the individual and their families. Similarly, low financial resilience can have a huge impact on individuals and families, as well as affecting the wider economy. Given the high levels of deprivation in Hull, it is not surprisingly that there are high numbers with low financial resilience. Furthermore, it is not surprising that this is causing a relatively high percentage of people to worry most days or weekly, in particular among specific groups such as those who are working-age but not working, lone parents and people living in the most deprived areas of Hull.
- Levels of community spirit appear to have decreased over time, although the measures are relatively variable year-on-year. However, almost three-quarters feel satisfied with their local area as a place to live, and the majority feel neighbours look out for one another and agree that people from different backgrounds get on well in their neighbourhood, although only just over one-third trust most of many people in their neighbourhood, and the majority stating they trust a few (44%) or do not trust people in their neighbourhood (10%). These measures are worse in areas of Hull that are more deprived, which is unsurprising as there will be more problems with the general area, such as quality of housing, crime, etc.

6. Where Can I Find More Information About The Survey?

Further reports are available on different topic areas. If you require further information on this topic or other topics from the adult health and wellbeing survey, you can email the Public Health Sciences team on <u>PublicHealthIntelligence@hullcc.gov.uk.</u>