









## **Executive Summary**

This report was commissioned by the House of Lords Appointments Commission to provide data on diversity in the House of Lords. This data is presented in two principal areas: the

above it is a matter of subjective judgement where the most important gaps appear. For example should the many defence specialists in the Lords be balanced by the inclusion of some peace campaigners? When attendance is taken into account some of these gaps become more evident and others, such as psychiatry and mental health, are added.

All of the data in this report is also presented broken down by political party/group. The trends seen are generally unsurprising. For example most former trade unionists are Labour, the Conservatives have strong representation from the private sector and from agriculture, and the Crossbenchers have strong representation from the legal professions (despite departure of the Law Lords), the civil service and the Armed Forces.

We finally show some data on the backgrounds of former MPs, applying more lenient rules in order to take greater account of experience as ministers, shadow ministers or select committee chairs. This shows, for example, that there are relatively large numbers of former MPs with backgrounds in economic policy, defence, foreign affairs and education, but relatively fewer with backgrounds in agriculture, housing, health and culture media and sport.

## **Introduction**

We have been









## Regional Data

This section of the report provides data on members' area of residence, broken down by region.

### Data sources, rules and caveats

Unlike the other data in this report, which covers all members of the House, this data is based on a sample. It is drawn from members' own responses to postal questionnaires circulated by the Constitution Unit in 2005 and 2007, plus a few questionnaires sent to new members in 2009. In these questionnaires members were asked to indicate in which region of the country they had their first home and their second home. The categories shown are those from which members were invited to choose. They are intended to reflect official administrative regions (for which population data is available: as shown in the tables).

There are some obvious caveats which apply to this data:

**Residence figures are based only on a sample.** Our questionnaires were answered by over 450 current members of the House and we have no reason to believe that this sample is unrepresentative of the House as a whole. But we of course have no way of knowing. An alternative source of data is the House of Lords' own records on members' area of residence, which obviously apply to all peers, but these may suffer more seriously from the third problem indicated below. We therefore consider our data more reliable.

**Self-reported figures may not perfectly match official regions.** It was necessarily left to peers' own interpretation to decide whether they lived in the "North West", "South West", etc. There is no reason to think that this will introduce consistent bias.

**"Primary" home figures may exaggerate residence outside London.** As exposed recently, the expenses system creates a financial incentive for peers with more than one home to register properties outside London as their main residence. Although peers were assured anonymity in our surveys, this may be reflected in our figures for "primary" home. However there is no particular reason to believe that this would affect the figures on "total" homes, which are in any case more useful for analysis.

**Many peers have a London home, but this does not in itself indicate that the House is "London centric".** It



### **Regional spread of homes by party, particularly Crossbenchers**

Table 7 provides a breakdown of “Total” homes (i.e. primary and secondary homes combined) by party. This indicates some variance in regional spread between parties. Labour has significantly fewer members with homes in the South West than either the Conservatives or

**Table 9 – Total homes by attendance**

\* Source: see table 6 above.

## Professional data: general introduction

In its tender document the Commission asked for an analysis of the “experience and expertise” of peers. It was agreed that this should be interpreted principally as relating to peers’ “professional background”, and the remainder of the report provides data on this question.

Professional background is different from, for example, “political interests”: which do not necessarily relate to any significant period of professional expertise. For example, a peer may have a long professional background as a lawyer but also have a political interest in the Middle East (which is not directly related to the field of law they practised). It is valid to investigate the political interests of peers, but this is a separate dimension from their professional background and expertise, and necessarily more subjective. Public statements of political interest (even in *Dods*, etc) also do not necessarily indicate “expertise”. Investigating this thoroughly would require use of different sources to those on which we are basing this research: for example, analysing parliamentary questions asked or speeches made by peers.

### Definitions

Even classifying peers’ professional background is far from straightforward. The first challenge is to come up with a classification scheme which categorises these in a meaningful way. Following careful consideration we devised a 3-part scheme which captures different dimensions of professional background, and this is used to structure the remainder of this report. The scheme codes peers on three levels:

1. **Professional area:** this is the kind of broad area often cited when describing the backgrounds of peers. For example “medical and healthcare”, “legal professions”, “culture, arts and sport”. It is a relatively short list of areas.
2. **Job:** this is a more functional classification, describing what the peer actually did in this professional area. E.g.: “dental surgeon”, “barrister”, “journalist”.
3. **Specialism:** this describes the more precise expertise that the peer has, which may be relevant to polic9(o)1

dominant in peers' backgrounds, and therefore where they have a deeper experience and expertise. This approach was agreed with the Commission.



Shell and Emma Crewe for study of the House of Lords,<sup>5</sup> and the Constitution Unit's questionnaire to peers. These categorisations alone would have been too simplistic for our purposes, as they are essentially limited to "professional area". They do not go on to distinguish, for example, between different jobs within the medical profession.

We therefore

significant experience in an area, despite not having published dates, we have included them in the tables but noted their presence in footnotes.

**Other missing data**

**Unclassified** peers are those who either had no clear professional background at all, or for whom no data was available from the sources that we consulted.

### **Discussion of overall diversity of professional area**

The basic data for peers' primary and secondary professional areas is shown in Table 10. This demonstrates that there are some professional areas very strongly represented in the Lords, some of which are well known. The largest such area is "representative politics", which includes

**Table 10 – Primary and secondary professional area**

Area	Primary	Secondary	Total	% of House with this area as primary	% of House with this area as primary or secondary
Architecture, engineering and construction	5	8	13	1%	2%
Agriculture and horticulture*	20	4	24	3%	3%
Banking and finance**	59	28	87	8%	12%
Business and commerce	61	34	95	9%	14%
Other private sector	23	10	33	3%	5%
Legal professions	54	13	67	8%	10%
Manual and skilled trades***	1	7	8	0%	1%
Culture, arts and sport	14	9	23	2%	3%
Journalism, media and publishing	25	10	35	4%	5%
Education and training (not HE)	5	13	18	1%	3%
Higher education	59	17	76	8%	11%
Medical and healthcare	15	12	27	2%	4%
Transport	5	2	7	1%	1%
Police	8	0	8	1%	1%
Representative politics	151	37	187	22%	27%
Political staff and activists	15	9	24	2%	3%
International affairs and diplomacy	18	3	21	3%	3%
Civil service (UK)	10	6	16	1%	2%
Armed forces	12	1	13	2%	2%
Royal family staff	2	0	2	0%	0%
Local authority administration	8	10	18	1%	3%
Other public sector	12	15	27	2%	4%
Trade unions	21	7	28	3%	4%
Voluntary sector, NGOs and think tanks	25	9	34	4%	5%
Clergy or religious	29	2	31	4%	4%
Unclassified	42	0	42	6%	6%
Total	699	265	964	100%	100%

\* Includes six in the primary field with no dates

\*\* Includes one primary, three secondary with no dates

\*\*\* Includes one secondary with no dates

### Professional area by age and attendance

Table 11 shows peers' primary and secondary professional areas broken down by attendance, including the proportion in each professional area who are high attenders. Across the House as a whole the proportion who are high attenders (defined as attending at least two thirds of sittings) is 51 n 509.7s635e f Q f

of regular attenders include peers with a trade union background (the highest attenders of all, with 90% attending at least two thirds of the time) and those with a voluntary sector background (at 68%). Two groups which might be considered underrepresent

**Table 12 – Professional area by age**

Area	Primary					Total
	<65	65-80	>80	Total	% >80	

**Professional area by party**

Table 13 shows a breakdown of peers' primary professional areas by party/group. It should be

**Table 13 – Primary professional area by party**

Area	No of peers						% of area					% of party					
	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth	Total	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth	Total
Architecture, engineering and construction	1	1	1	2	0	5	20%	20%	20%	40%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%



## Jobs

Tables 14 - 16 include more detailed data on the jobs that peers have held. The key conclusions from these tables are discussed below, but first it is again necessary to draw attention to the rules that have been applied in gathering this data, and some caveats. These should be read in conjunction with the general rules and caveats in the earlier section introducing the professional background data.

### Data sources, rules and caveats

Again the data on jobs have been primarily drawn from *Dods* and *Who's Who*, supplemented in places by other data.

As for professional areas, we applied a general **eight-year rule on jobs**.

**Primary job** is usually the most time spent in the peer's primary professional area. This means that it does not necessarily reflect the most senior position that a peer achieved. For example a member may be classified as "engineer" even if they rose to management. However, we recorded a peer's most senior role *within* a particular job if they held the role for over five years. For example, a diplomat would be given 'Head of the Diplomatic Service' if they held this role for over five years. This example differs from the engineer example as head of the Diplomatic Service is a type of diplomat, whereas a manager is a different job from an engineer.

We added and grouped together experie

has worked within the field in numerous different roles, with most jobs being of equal length, e.g. “various public sector”, “various private sector”; **other** essentially means “none of the above” and generally comprises small fields only covered by one peer, merged together, e.g. “private sector: other consultant”.

As a result of these rules **some jobs appear underrepresented**. This is particularly true at senior levels, where peers did not hold positions long enough for these to qualify as their primary or secondary job, or where other jobs were more dominant in their careers. For example it is well known that there are many former Heads of the Civil Service in the House of Lords, but our figures show only two such members. This is because we only recorded this as a job if it had been held for over five years. For example Lord Wilson of Dinton was Head of the Civil Service for only four years, and has therefore been given “Various Civil Service” as his job.

Additionally **other jobs are not visible**, either because peers held them for only a short time, or had other “primary” and “secondary” jobs which were more significant, or because these jobs have been merged into “other” fields. We have avoided this as far as possible, but it is clearly one result of the rules that we have applied.

### **Discussion of overall diversity of jobs**

Table 14 shows the basic data for peers’ primary and secondary jobs. This is structured according to the same professional areas used in the previous section. At this level it is even more difficult than at the previous level to identify gaps (particularly given the caveats above). This is largely a question for the Commission to consider. But it may be worth drawing attention to some potential areas that we have noticed.

Within the table itself we see that there are no peers with a significant background as primary school teachers, or in early years education, and few as headteachers (though there are several others with backgrounds as teachers where the precise nature of that background was unclear). As also already noted



**Table 14 – Primary and secondary job**

<b>Job</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Architecture, engineering and construction</b>			
Architect	2	0	2
Engineer	2	8	10
Construction: Director/Chair	1	0	1
<b>Agriculture and horticulture</b>			
Farmer*	18	4	22
Environment and Agriculture: Consultant	0	1	1
Horticulture: Director/Chair	2	0	2
<b>Banking and finance</b>			
Investment Banker	1	0	1
Stockbroker	1	1	2
Insurance Broker/Underwriter	2	0	2
Accountant**	6	9	15
Fund Manager	1	0	1
Financial Consultant	1	1	2
Economics Adviser	2	1	3
Banking and Finance: Director/Chair	41	19	60
Banking and Finance: Various	4	2	6
<b>Business and commerce</b>			
Shop Owner	0	1	1
Retail: Director/Chair	11	1	12
Manufacturing: Director/Chair	17	1	18
Trade Association: Director/Chair	2	1	3
Industry: Director/Chair	6	0	6
Energy: Director	3	2	5
Other Private Sector: Director/Chair	10	3	13
Various Private Sector: Director/Chair	12	24	36
<b>Other private sector</b>			
Management Consultant	1	3	4
Public Relations: Consultant	4	0	4
Public Relations: Director/Chair	2	1	3
Public Affairs: Consultant	4	0	4
Public Affairs: Director/Chair	2	2	4
Advertising: Director/Chair	2	1	3
Property Developer	3	0	3
Market Researcher	1	1	2
Computing: Consultant	1	0	1
Private Sector: Other Consultant	3	0	3
<b>Legal professions</b>			
Solicitor	10	4	14
Barrister	14	30	44
Judge	26	5	31
Advocate	2	1	3
Legal Adviser	2	0	2
<b>Manual and skilled trades</b>			
Shipyards Worker***	0	2	2
Textiles Cutter	1	0	1
Coal Miner	0	2	2
Steel Worker	0	1	1

<b>Job</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Total</b>
British Steel: Electrician	0	1	1
Draughtsman	0	1	1
<b>Culture, arts and sport</b>			
Artist	1	0	1

<b>Job</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Total</b>
Other Transport: Director/Chair	3	0	3
<b>Police</b>			
Police: Inspector of Constabulary	1	0	1
Police: Chief Superintendent	2	0	2
Police: Chief Officer	5	0	5
<b>Representative politics</b>			
MP: Prime Minister	1	0	1
MP: Party Leader	3	0	3
MP: Chancellor of the Exchequer	4	0	4
MP: Secretary of State	32	8	40
MP: Minister	41	7	48
MP: Speaker/Deputy Speaker	4	0	4
MP: Shadow Cabinet or Spokesperson	24	4	28
MP: None of the above	21	3	24
Peer: Secretary of State	1	1	2
Peer: Lord Chancellor	1	2	3
MEP	5	2	7
Assembly Member	3	1	4
MSP	0	1	1
Council Leader	5	5	10
Councillor	6	3	9
Member Irish Senate	0	1	1
Member: Hong Kong Council	0	1	1
<b>Political staff and activists</b>			
Political Party: General Secretary/ Secretary	3	2	5
Political Party: Regional Secretary	1	0	1
Political Party: Various	10	1	11
Political: Assistant/Adviser	0	6	6
Number 10 Policy Unit	1	0	1
<b>International affairs and diplomacy</b>			
Diplomat	9	3	12
Head of Diplomatic Service	3	0	3
European Commissioner	0	1	1
Commander-in-Chief, Hong Kong	1	1	2
Secretary General European Commission	0	1	1
Various European Commission	3	0	3
Various United Nations	1	0	1
Various World Bank	1	0	1
Various International Organisations	0	1	1

**Civil service (UK):**

<b>Job</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Total</b>
Social/Community Worker	3	1	4
Education Officer	1	0	1
Various Local Authority	2	7	9
<b>Other public sector</b>			
Public Body: Director/Chair	10	5	15
Bank of England: Governor	0	2	2
Probation Officer	0	2	2
Health and Safety Consultant	0	1	1
Postal Worker	0	2	2
Post Office: Various Managerial	1	0	1
Nationalised Industry: Clerk or Administrator	0	2	2
Nationalised Industry: Ind Relations Officer	0	1	1
National Coal Board: Various	1	0	1
Public Services Administrator	0	1	1
Public Sector: Other Consultant	0	1	1
Public Sector: Various	1	3	4
<b>Trade unions</b>			
Trade Unions: Dep/ Gen/ National Secretary	13	1	14
Trade Unions: Arbitrator	0	1	1
Trade Unions: Various	8	6	14
<b>Voluntary sector, NGOs and think tanks</b>			
Charity/NGO: Researcher	1	0	1
Charity/NGO: Fundraiser	1	0	1
Charity/NGO: Public Affairs Consultant	1	0	1
Charity/NGO: Director/Chair	18	4	22
Charity/NGO: Skilled Craftsman	0	1	1
Charity/NGO: Various	3	2	5
Think Tank: Researcher	0	1	1
Think Tank: Director	1	1	2





Job	Attendance						Age					
	Primary			Total			Primary			Total		
	<1/3	1/3-2/3	> 2/3	< 1/3	1/3-2/3	> 2/3	< 65	65-80	> 80	<65	65-80	>80
Judge	17	7	2	17	9	5	2	19	5	5	20	6
Advocate	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	0
Legal Adviser	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0

## Attendance

Job	Attendance	Age
-----	------------	-----



**Table 16– Job by party**

Job	Primary					Total				
	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth Total	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth Total





Job	Primary					Total				
	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth Total	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth Total





## **Discussion of overall diversity of specialisms**

Table 17 introduces the data on specialisms, and also - in order to save space - includes the breakdown by attendance (discussed in the next section). Once again it is primarily a matter for the Commission to identify where they believe there are gaps amongst members' specialisms, but a few areas may be worth pointing out.

Amongst the specialisms shown in the table, it is perhaps surprising that there are so few peers with specialisms in engineering, etc, as noted above. There are also very few with specialisms in energy, and in conservation and the environment generally: which is clearly now a policy field of enormous importance. For example we found nobody whose specialism was waste management, recycling, water, flooding, forestry, etc, and bigger areas such as climate change might be considered underrepresented. There are also few peers with specialisms in transport (particularly road transport, including buses). As already noted there are also relatively few peers with main specialisms in heritage matters, and leisure industries, and relatively few peers have main specialisms in school education, and none evidently in early years or adult education. There is only one peer whose main specialism is the probation service. Other areas within the Home Office and Ministry of Justice field, such as terrorism, organised crime and immigration may be underrepresented (though perhaps to some extent represented by peers classified elsewhere, such as police). There are no peers whose primary specialism is local government management (but see caveats above, and also note that there are several peers classified with a specialism of "politics: local"), no library specialist, and few public health specialists: for example specialists in health education, health inequality or obesity. Once again it may be considered that there are some gaps amongst scientific specialisms (marine biology, for example), and medical specialisms (for example there is no psychologist listed either here



Specialism	Primary				Total			
	<1/3	1/3-2/3	>2/3	Total	<1/3	1/3-2/3	>2/3	Total

Culture, Arts and Sport

Specialism	Primary				Total	Total			
	<1/3	1/3- 2/3	>2/3	Total		<1/3	1/3- 2/3	>2/3	Total

Specialism	Primary				Total			
	<1/3	1/3-2/3	>2/3	Total	<1/3	1/3-2/3	>2/3	Total
diplomatic relations	3	5	4	12	3	8	4	15
foreign affairs	1	3	5	9	2	3	5	10
<b>Policy/Public/Civil Service</b>								
economics and finance policy								









**Specialism**

**Primary**

Specialism	Primary						Total					
	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth	Tot	Con	Lab	Lib	XB	Oth	Tot
employment relations; public services	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	5
employment relations; transport	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	3
industrial management	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2

**Table 19 – Primary, secondary and tertiary specialisms of former MPs**

<b>Specialism</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Tertiary</b>	<b>Total</b>
Farming and Agriculture	2	3	1	6
Trade and Industry	4	6	0	10
Energy	3	4	1	8
Environment	1	4	1	6
Economics and Finance Policy	14	7	0	20
Technology Policy	0	1	1	2
Culture, Media and Sport	7	0	0	6
Law	5	2	1	8
Constitutional Affairs	3	1	0	4
Scottish Affairs	6	1	2	9
Welsh Affairs	6	2	0	8
Northern Irish Affairs	8	0	2	10
Health	2	0	2	4
Education	9	3	0	12
Transport	3	0	2	5
Home Affairs	7	2	0	9
Social Services	0	3	0	3
Disability	1	0	0	1
Social Security	5	2	0	7
Defence	8	8	0	16
Foreign Affairs	13	5	2	20
International Development	6	0	0	6
Employment	5	4	1	10
Consumer Protection	1	0	2	3
Housing	0	3	0	3
<b>Total</b>				

