



# GLASGOW CITY NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

Comparing population and  
health trends over a decade



This briefing describes differences across a range of population, health and socio-economic indicators for Glasgow City over an approximately 10-year period. It draws on data from the recently published Glasgow City profile (2020-2024) undertaken in collaboration with Public Health Scotland, and the previous Understanding Glasgow city profile (2008 and 2012). Comparisons are shown for various indicators and presented under the following headings:

- Population
- Health
- Other comparable indicators<sup>1</sup>

Separate comparative briefings will be available for North East Glasgow, North West Glasgow, and South Glasgow sectors.

## Summary

The following changes were found between the two profile periods:

- The population of Glasgow City increased by 9.3% from 595,080 to 650,300.
- The age profile shifted slightly, with a small increase in working-aged adults and a reduction in those aged 15 years and under and those over 75 years of age.
- The proportion of the population from a minority ethnic background increased from 11.6% to 19.3%.
- Life expectancy has shown limited improvement, with a modest increase for males and minimal improvement for females, indicating a broader pattern of stagnation.
- There has been a slight decline in the proportion of people reporting 'good health' (77.5% to 76.0%).
- Over a quarter of the population (26%) now report being limited 'a lot' or 'a little' by disability, up from 22.7%.
- Income deprivation (21.4% to 19.5%) and employment deprivation (19.1% to 13.6%) have both declined.
- More than half of households now have access to a car (55.7% vs. 49.2%).
- Ten out of 23 indicators used in the most recent profiles are not directly comparable with the 2011 profiles due to changes to measurement or definitions. These include child poverty and overcrowding where considerable percentage reductions are observed under revised measures.

## Methodological note

Several indicators are not comparable over time due to changes in definitions and measurement approaches, and population bases (denominator). Further detail is provided in the 'limitations and caveats' section and accompanying [notes and definitions document](#).

---

<sup>1</sup> As several indicators were not directly comparable between the two profiles, those that were comparable have been grouped under this 'catch all' heading.



# 1. Indicator groups

Indicators are organised under the following groups: 'population', 'health', 'other comparable indicators', and 'non-comparable indicators'.

## 1.1 Population

The population of Glasgow City increased by 9.3% between 2011 and 2024. The age profile of the city shifted slightly, with reductions of around 1 percentage point for those aged 0-15 and 75+, and a similar increase in those aged 16-74 years. The proportion of the population from a minority ethnic background increased from 11.6% to almost a fifth (19.3%) of the total population.

Population		2011-2012		2020-2022		Change
Indicator	Denominator	Count	%	Count	%	
Total population	Total population	595,080	100%	650,300	100%	+9.3%
People aged 0–15	Total population	96,263	16.2%	98,845	15.2%	-1.0%
People aged 16–64	Total population	415,859	69.9%	460,452	70.8%	+0.9%
People aged 65–74	Total population	43,111	7.2%	53,456	8.2%	+1.0%
People aged 75 and over	Total population	39,847	6.7%	37,538	5.8%	-0.9%
People from minority ethnic backgrounds <sup>2</sup>	Total population	68,778	11.6%	119,672	19.3%	+7.7%

## 1.2 Health

The proportion of people reporting 'good' or 'very good' health declined slightly from 77.5% to 76.0%. Over the same period, the proportion reporting limitations due to disability increased from 22.7% to 26.0%.

Male life expectancy increased by 1.3 years, while female life expectancy increased only marginally (0.1 years), indicating limited overall progress in population health.

<sup>2</sup> This figure does not include refugees and asylum seekers.



Health		2011-2012		2020-2022		Change
Indicator	Denominator	Count	%	Count	%	
People in 'good' or 'very good' health	Total population	460,217	77.5%	471,880	76.0%	-1.5%
People limited 'a lot' or 'a little' by disability	Total population	134,889	22.7%	161,700	26.0%	+3.3%
Indicator	Denominator	Count	Age	Count	Age	
Male life expectancy at birth	n/a	n/a	72.3	n/a	73.6	+1.3 years
Female life expectancy at birth	n/a	n/a	78.2	n/a	78.3	+0.1 years

### 1.3 Other comparable indicators

All remaining comparable indicators have been grouped together. Income deprivation, measured using reliance on means-tested benefits, decreased slightly from 21.4% to 19.5%. Employment deprivation measures how many working-age people in an area are unable to access employment, often due to unemployment, ill health, or other barriers. Based on this measure, the percentage of the population experiencing employment deprivation saw a more substantial reduction from 19.1% to 13.6%. The proportion of households with access to one or more cars – an indicator reported under the environment section of the new profiles – increased from 49.2% to 55.7%.

Other comparable indicators		2011-2012		2020-2022		Change
Indicator	Denominator	Count	%	Count	%	
Owner-occupied households	All households	130,407	45.6%	137,381	46.7%	+1.1%
Income deprivation (SIMD)	Total population	127,170	21.4%	119,742	19.5%	-1.9%
Employment deprivation (SIMD)	Population aged 16 to 64	77,220	19.1%	58,374	13.6%	-5.5%
Households with one or more cars	All households	140,702	49.2%	163,857	55.7%	+6.5%



## 1.4 Non-comparable indicators

Ten indicators are not comparable across the period due to changes in definitions and measurement (see Appendix). These include key measures such as child poverty and overcrowding, where substantial differences are observed under revised measures. For example, overcrowding in Glasgow City is reported as 4.7% under the new definition compared to 17.4% previously. Similarly, child poverty is estimated at 26.7% under the new definition, compared to 32.2% in 2011.

These figures are not directly comparable and should not be interpreted as change over time. However, analysis at sector and neighbourhood level can provide insight into how patterns have shifted across the city. This allows for identification of areas where relative improvements are likely to have occurred, even if the scale of change cannot be precisely quantified. This will be explored in detail within the accompanying sector briefings.

## 2. Interpretation

The findings indicate a mixed picture of change across Glasgow over the past decade. While several socio-economic indicators point towards improvement, particularly in relation to employment and income deprivation, these changes have not been matched by equivalent improvements in health outcomes.

Despite reductions in employment deprivation, self-reported health has declined slightly and the proportion of people reporting a disability has increased. Life expectancy gains have been modest overall, with little change for females. Taken together, this suggests that improvements in economic conditions have not translated into substantial gains in population health.

The data also reflect ongoing demographic change. The increase in the population from minority ethnic backgrounds, alongside a growing working-age population, has implications for service demand, housing need, and patterns of inequality across the city.

At the same time, several key indicators – including child poverty and overcrowding, as highlighted above – are not directly comparable over time. While revised measures suggest lower levels, these should be interpreted with caution and not understood as evidence of direct improvement since 2011.

Overall, the evidence points to a divergence between socio-economic indicators and health outcomes. While some measures of deprivation have improved, population health has not followed the same trajectory. Further analysis at sector and neighbourhood level will be important in determining whether these patterns are consistent across the city or driven by changes in specific areas.

## 3. Limitations and caveats

Several indicator comparisons have not been possible due to changes in definitions and measurement approaches over time, including the population base (denominator) used to calculate figures. The appendix presents a list of all the indicators used in the most recent profiles, showing which are comparable, and those that have not been possible to compare. A separate [notes and definition table](#) provides details of the measurement changes over time and why it is not possible to draw comparisons across all indicators. Further, the proportion of the population from a minority ethnic population will be [slightly underreported](#) due to figures relating to asylum seekers and refugees not being included in the Census.



## Appendix: Comparability of indicators

Population	Comparable
People aged 0-15	Yes
People aged 16-64	Yes
People aged 65-74	Yes
People aged 75 and over	Yes
People from minority ethnic backgrounds	Yes
Households	
Lone-parent households	No
Householders living alone	No
Single-pensioner households	New indicator
Owner-occupied households	Yes
Socially-rented households	New indicator
Overcrowded households	No
Environment	
People who travel to work or study by walking, bike or public transport	No
Households with one or more cars	Yes
Socio-economic	
Household reference person (HRP) is grade D or E social classification	No
People in employment (employee and self-employed)	No
Education	
Adults with qualifications at Higher level and above	No
Poverty	
Income deprivation	Yes
Employment deprivation	Yes
Children living in poverty	No
Health	
People in "good" or "very good" health	Yes
People limited "a lot" or "a little" by disability	Yes
Male life expectancy	Yes
Female life expectancy	Yes