

ETHNIC RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

A study of twenty-five local authority areas



Race Equality West Midlands

Race Equality Digest 21

February 2007

Copyright © 2006 Race Equality West Midlands, Unit 10, iBIC,
Holt Court South, Jennens Rd, Aston Science Park, Birmingham B7 4EJ.

Tel: 0121 250 3859, Fax 0121 250 3522, [email:rewm@rewm.org.uk](mailto:rewm@rewm.org.uk)

Web: www.rewm.org

The Race Equality Digest International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) is 1750-7049 (print) and 1750-7057 (online). The Race Equality Digest (RED) is a series of briefings on race equality and related issues published occasionally by Race Equality West Midlands, a registered charity (no: 1102076) that aims to promote race equality and community cohesion through leadership, strategic policy development, consultancy, education and training, research, and improved service quality.

REWM has tried to ensure the information contained in this report has been gathered, collated and presented in as accurate manner as possible. REWM is prepared to issue errata/correction sheets where it believes complaints of error or misrepresentation by it are justified. Opinions expressed in this report are those of REWM. It should not be assumed they are shared by the CRE or West Midlands RECs/REPs.

Additional copies of the RED may be obtained on request from the address above or by downloading from our website.

Please acknowledge Race Equality West Midlands as the source if referring to, or quoting from, the Race Equality Digest.

ETHNIC RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

A study of twenty-five local authority areas

Contents

List of tables	3
Key findings	5
1 Purpose of the research	7
2 Levels of ethnic residential segregation: 2001 census	11
3 Changes in levels of ethnic residential segregation: 1991-2001	15
4 Levels of ethnic segregation amongst school pupils	17
5 Variations in residential segregation between ethnic minority groups	19
6 Levels of residential segregation between Muslims and the white population	24
7 Conclusions	26
Appendix A: detailed analyses of twenty-five local authorities	
by country and region	31
East England	32
East Midlands	37
London	40
North East	55
North West	58
Scotland	63
South East	65
South West	71
Wales	73
West Midlands	75
Yorkshire	92
Appendix B: methodology	99
References	107
Acknowledgements	108
REWM publications	109

List of tables

- Table 1. Levels of ethnic residential segregation: 25 local authorities
- Table 2. Changes in levels of ethnic residential segregation: 1991-2001:25 local authorities
- Table 3. Levels of segregation amongst school pupils by ethnicity: 6 local authorities
- Table 4. Ethnic group comprising 70% or more of EM population: 8 local authorities.
- Table 5. Ethnic group comprising 51%-69% of EM population: 8 local authorities
- Table 6. Ethnic group comprising 30%-50% of EM population: 9 local authorities
- Table 7. List of sampled local authorities
- Table 8. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Cambridge
- Table 9. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Leicester
- Table 10. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Leicester
- Table 11. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Nottingham
- Table 12. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Barking and Dagenham
- Table 13. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Croydon
- Table 14. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Croydon
- Table 15. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Harrow
- Table 16. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Harrow
- Table 17. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Haringey
- Table 18. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Haringey
- Table 19. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Tower Hamlets
- Table 20. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Tower Hamlets
- Table 21. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Newcastle upon Tyne
- Table 22. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Blackburn
- Table 23. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Blackburn
- Figure 24. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Oldham
- Table 25. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Oldham
- Table 26. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Glasgow
- Table 27. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: High Wycombe
- Table 28. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Southampton
- Table 29. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: St. Alban's
- Table 30. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Bristol
- Table 31. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Cardiff
- Table 32. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Birmingham
- Table 33. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Birmingham
- Table 34. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Sandwell
- Table 35. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Solihull

- Table 36. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Stoke on Trent
- Table 37. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Walsall
- Table 38. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Walsall
- Table 39. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Wolverhampton
- Table 40. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Bradford
- Table 41. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Bradford
- Table 42. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Kirklees
- Table 43. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Kirklees
- Table 44. Ethnic minority population 2001
- Table 45. Sample of local authorities

Key findings

The aim of the research was to explore the extent of residential segregation between white and ethnic minority populations in urban areas. Twenty-five local authority areas were examined. The main sources of information were the 2001 and 1991 censuses. The ethnic minority populations of electoral wards in the local authorities sampled varied both in size and ethnic composition. In the majority of the authorities the Asian population was the largest group in the ethnic minority population and this reflected the fact that the Asian population comprised half of the ethnic minority population at the time of the 2001 census. In all the authorities, the size of the ethnic minority population increased in the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, whilst in the majority of authorities the size of the white population declined. It was found:

- Levels of residential segregation between the white and ethnic minority populations in 2001 varied substantially between local authorities. Of the local authorities sampled, 40% had moderate to high levels of segregation. The remaining 60% had lower levels of segregation.
- In 2001, three local authorities, located in Northern England, had high levels of residential segregation. They all had sizeable Asian populations, a majority of which was Muslim. There were also relatively high levels of economic deprivation amongst these populations. These local authorities tended to have similar levels of residential segregation in 1991.
- Some of the local authorities with lower levels of residential segregation in 2001 had large and long-established ethnic minority populations.
- The local authorities with lower levels of residential segregation in 2001 had varied economic characteristics. Some had relatively high levels of unemployment and low skilled work forces. For other local authorities, the reverse situation applied.
- In 84% of the sampled local authorities in 2001, the largest ethnic group within the ethnic minority population was more residentially segregated from the white population than the other (smaller) ethnic minority groups.
- Where the Asian Muslim population was the group in a local authority's ethnic minority population in 2001 which was most residentially segregated from the white population, the level of segregation was at a moderate to high level in 89% of the authorities.
- In six (24%) of the sampled local authorities in 2001, the Asian Muslim population was widely distributed across a number of areas and was less residentially segregated from the white population than other ethnic minority groups.
- Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the levels of residential segregation between the white and ethnic minority populations fell in 60% of the sampled local authorities. In the remaining local authorities, it was largely unchanged.

- There was a pattern in the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses of ethnic minority populations increasing in traditional areas of settlement, as well as moving to newer areas. How much of the growth in the ethnic minority population took place in traditional areas of settlement compared with newer areas determined whether levels of residential segregation with the white population remained the same or declined between 1991 and 2001.
- There would appear to be a link between the level of residential segregation by ethnicity and the level of segregation in the ethnic make-up of school student populations. Low levels of residential segregation produce low levels of segregation in schools, whereas as higher levels of residential segregation produce similar higher levels of segregation in schools.

Chapter One

Purpose of the research

The level of segregation of ethnic groups from one another continues to be a subject of public interest. The interest has not just been about where different ethnic groups live but, more generally, about how persons of different ethnic groups do, or do not, interact with one another.

In recent years, the issue can be said to have come to the forefront of public interest and debate following disturbances in the summer of 2001 in Northern England (Bradford, Burnley and Oldham) that involved Asian (in essence Muslim) youths and, in some cases, white youths. A number of reports of tensions in urban areas was produced at the time. The 2001 Ouseley Report on Bradford stated: 'There are signs that communities are fragmenting along racial, cultural, and faith lines. Segregation in schools is one indicator of this trend. Rather than seeing the emergence of a confident, multicultural district where people are respectful and have understanding and tolerance for difference, people's attitudes appear to be hardening and intolerance towards differences is growing'. In the Cantle Report on potential tensions between persons from different ethnic groups in urban areas more generally, reference was made to 'the depth of polarisation of our towns and cities'. One of the outcomes was that the Government insisted that local authorities addressed social tensions by implementing local community cohesion plans.

The reports on the disturbances in northern towns in 2001 also suggested that the segregation of school pupils by ethnicity could have been a contributory factor. This aspect was highlighted again in a House of Commons Select Committee report on social cohesion in 2004. Research carried out at the University of Bristol (published 2005) found high as well as varied levels of segregation in schools in 2001. High levels of segregation were found for pupils of Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin and it was particularly so in areas where schools served significant Asian populations. Levels of segregation for black pupils were found to be lower.

The attack on the World Trade Centre in New York in September 2001 by the Muslim associated terrorist group, *Al Qaeda*, and what has followed in what is commonly referred to as the 'war on terror' has ensured that issues around the integration of ethnic minority communities in Britain have continued to attract public debate. The debate was re-ignited in July 2005 following the bombings of the public transport network in London by a small group of suicide bombers, all of whom were Muslims. Shortly afterwards, in September 2005, the Chair of the Commission for Racial Equality, Trevor Phillips, in a widely publicised speech suggested that Britain was 'sleep walking to segregation' in a society that was becoming more divided by race and religion, both in terms of where people lived and in the composition of schools. The speech attracted support as well as criticism. The critics, in particular, suggested that residential segregation by ethnicity was not increasing but, in fact, was either static or falling, as there was a movement by ethnic minority groups to live in new areas of settlement. The debate was also broadened by some commentators who suggested that the failure of ethnic minority communities more generally to become integrated into British society was due to the long-standing public policy of multiculturalism, which had the effect of encouraging ethnic minority communities to retain their separate and distinctive cultural identities.

This research seeks to provide a more informed factual base for what may or may not be happening in terms of residential settlement by ethnicity in urban areas in the UK. It does not provide an overall picture for the UK but focuses instead on what has occurred in a sample of urban areas with white and ethnic minority populations.

Twenty-five local authority areas were examined¹. The main source was population data from the 2001 census². The research looks at the population make-up by ethnic origin in each electoral ward in the sampled local authorities. To identify the overall level of segregation in each authority a statistical tool known as the Index of Dissimilarity has been used³. Where the Index produces a value of 60 and over, the level of segregation is regarded as high and, where the value is between 60 and 40, as moderate. Below a value of 30, there are said to be low levels of segregation. The broad aims of the research were to discover:

- Whether where people lived in each local authority showed a wide distribution for all ethnic groups across most areas of the local authority, or whether some ethnic groups largely resided in particular areas.
- What levels of residential segregation between ethnic groups existed in each of the sampled local authorities.
- Other significant features.

To assist in the analysis:

- Similar data from the 1991 census were examined to see what population movements by ethnic group had taken place.
- In six local authorities, the ethnic make-up of the school population was examined to see whether levels of segregation by ethnic group existed in schools and how this compared with the levels of residential segregation that had been found.

At the time of the 2001 census, the ethnic minority population in the UK was 4,635,000 or 7.9% of the total population. The two main groups in the ethnic minority (EM) population were Asian (50%) and black (25%). Of the EM population, 45% lived in Greater London. The remainder lived largely in other conurbations. Within the Asian population, persons of Indian origin accounted for 45% of the population, and persons of Pakistani origin 32%. The EM population in the 25 local authorities examined in this research covered 29% of the total UK EM population. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the EM population in the UK grew by 54%.

In the 2001 census, a question on religion was asked for the first time: 71.7% described themselves as Christian, 3.1% stated they were Muslim (1.5million), 1% stated they were Hindu, 0.5% stated they were Sikh, and 0.5% stated they were Jewish. London was the region with the highest number of persons stating that they

¹ The criteria for selecting Local Authorities are set out in the methodology section.

² Because the data source is the April 2001 census, it will not capture new ethnic minority groups that have subsequently migrated to the UK. The history of migration to Britain suggests that some, if not all, of these groups could be living in urban clusters and be largely separated from other ethnic groups.

³ More detail on the dissimilarity index is provided in the methodology section.

had a religion other than Christianity. It reflected the large and varied ethnic minority population living in London.

Where ethnic groups live will be based on a number of factors. It will almost certainly be influenced by what social scientists call 'self-segregation', or 'congregation', which occurs where a person of a given group prefers to associate with other members of the same group. Family gatherings, for example, could not take place without self-segregation. Many persons within ethnic minority groups choose to live in the same areas, as it provides mutual support for language, cultural and religious traditions. In its entirety, self-segregation is an inevitable and a necessary feature of social life.

Where people live will also be influenced by economic factors such as availability of work, the ability to conduct business, and the income/economic wealth that work generates. Economic wealth helps to determine social class. Irrespective of ethnicity, social class will also determine where people live. There are examples of persons from ethnic minority groups with economic wealth living in areas outside the traditional areas of settlement of their communities. Other factors that determine where people live will be the availability of relevant housing stock (in the case of migrants to Britain, this almost invariably means readily available cheap housing to buy or rent) and preference for the geographical attractions or amenities offered by an area.

None of these varied factors determining where people live is in itself negative. Indeed, in a free society, people are required and entitled to make choices about, amongst other things, where they live.

Where good race relations are concerned, residential segregation by ethnic origin becomes a problem when where people live is determined, or is perceived by people to be determined wholly, or in part, by the racial or ethnic group that the person belongs to. In essence, it means, in a given town, that, if you are white, you are expected to live in one area and, if you are black, in another area. An underlying cause of this will be that persons will have concerns, fear of isolation, and even expectations of hostility, if they live in areas outside of where their own ethnic group largely resides. Economic factors can also contribute to this kind of situation. When such a situation exists and it results in high levels of residential segregation by ethnic group, there is likely to be a reduction in contacts between persons of different ethnic groups, a narrowing of social and personal experiences, a reduction in trust and understanding between ethnic groups, and the creation of conditions that could lead to social strife.

When migrants from the South Asian sub-continent, the Caribbean and parts of Africa came to live in Britain in significant numbers from the mid 1950s onwards, the areas they initially settled in were based on their proximity to work and the availability of cheap housing as close as possible to where they were working. They also, for reasons of family and cultural support, tended to live in the same areas. They faced barriers too, because of their ethnic origin. One of the most prominent was that they were often unable to gain access to cheap rented social (council) housing because they had not lived for a sufficient period in the relevant local authority area to qualify. Consequently, they were driven to live in areas where there was cheap privately-rented housing and where they could also eventually buy houses at relatively low prices (often older housing in need of repair and improvements). Even where they

were able to gain access to council housing, housing officers could place them, irrespective of their housing needs, on estates where the quality of housing was low and where persons from their own ethnic group were already living. The same thing could happen when they sought to buy or rent private housing, with estate agents directing them to areas where their own ethnic groups resided. The result of these policies and procedures was to encourage residential segregation by ethnic group.

The pattern of settlement for this group of migrants was, in many ways, no different from other ethnic groups that had previously migrated to Britain from Ireland and other parts of the European mainland. What is expected over a period of time, as new migrant communities become established in Britain, is that rising economic affluence and aspirations will lead them to disperse gradually into new areas of residence with better housing stock and surrounding amenities. In doing so, they become more integrated, in terms of where they live, with existing and more dominant ethnic groups in the population. With the lapse of some forty or fifty years since persons from the South Asian sub-continent, the Caribbean and Africa settled in significant numbers in Britain, there is, in theory, an expectation that these groups and their descendants will gradually disperse to urban areas outside of these traditional or first areas of settlement. This research seeks to discover whether this is indeed the case.

Chapter Two

Levels of ethnic residential segregation: 2001 census

Levels of ethnic segregation

Table 1. Levels of ethnic residential segregation: 25 local authorities

Level of segregation	Local Authorities		Local Authorities (DI value between white and EM population in brackets)
	No.	%	
High/Very High (DI* value 60 plus)	3	12%	Blackburn (66) Bradford (60)# Oldham (63)
Moderate to High (DI value 41-59)	7	28%	Birmingham (55) Leicester (51) Glasgow (45) Stoke (46) High Wycombe (50) Walsall (46) Kirklees (45)
Low to Moderate (DI Value 30-39)	7	28%	Bristol (32) Sandwell (37) Cardiff (30) Southampton (31) Croydon (35) Wolverhampton (31) Newcastle (33)
Low (DI Value less than 30)	8	32%	Barking & Dagenham (27) Cambridge (9) Solihull (12) Harrow (21) St. Albans (26) Haringey (26) Tower Hamlets (20) Nottingham (28)

* DI = Dissimilarity Index

Comparison of white population is with dominant Asian population (87% of EM population).

Ten (46% of) local authorities surveyed had levels of residential segregation ranging from moderate to high between the white and ethnic minority populations. These are situations which can be classified as of actual or potential concern for the state of race relations in the local authorities involved.

Fifteen (60% of) local authorities surveyed had low to moderately low levels of residential segregation between their white and ethnic minority populations. These can be classified as local authorities that are relatively well ethnically integrated.

Local authorities with high levels of ethnic residential segregation

The local authorities are all located in the North of England. In the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, they all had declining white populations and growing ethnic minority (EM) populations. In all these local authorities, there were significant minority EM populations. The largest ethnic group in all the EM populations was Asian (85% or more of EM population), predominantly Muslim in religion. In all the local authorities, the level of residential segregation between the white population and the largest Asian population was higher than between the white population and the ethnic minority population as a whole. In the case of Blackburn and Oldham there was a very high level

of residential segregation between the white population and the large Asian Muslim populations (Dissimilarity Index values of 70 and 72 respectively).

The 2001 census shows that in these local authorities for the population as a whole there was a relatively high level of economic deprivation. These local authorities were in the top 30% for levels of unemployment and in the top 20% for populations of working age with no qualifications.

These local authorities all had similar high levels of residential segregation by ethnicity at the time of the 1991 census.

The significant characteristics in the residential distribution of the populations in these local authorities that contributed to the high levels of segregation by ethnic grouping can be summarised as:

- Blackburn: There was no electoral ward where the composition of the white and EM populations was relatively close to their 78/22% proportion in the total population. Of the white population, 79% lived in electoral wards where they formed 85% or more of the ward populations. In contrast, 87% of the Asian population (they formed 94% of the EM population) lived in electoral wards where they formed either a sizeable minority (more than 30% of ward populations) or the majority of the ward populations.
- Bradford: A minority of wards (20% of the total) had white and EM (predominantly Asian) populations which were relatively close to their 78/22% proportion in the total population. No ward had a white population which was less than 25%. However, these population characteristics were outweighed by 33% of the electoral wards having largely white populations (over 95%) and where 40% of the white population lived. Further, 60% of the dominant Asian population (they formed 87% of the EM population) lived in just five (17%) of the electoral wards.
- Oldham: There was no electoral ward where the white and EM (predominantly Asian) populations were relatively close to their 86/14% proportion in the total population. Indeed, 83% of the white population lived in the electoral wards where they formed over 93% of the ward populations. Of the Asian population, 88% lived in the minority of wards with significant EM populations.

Local authorities with moderate to high levels of ethnic residential segregation

These local authorities, with the exception of High Wycombe, were located outside of London and South East England. They were in the Midlands, Northern England and Scotland. In the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, they all experienced growing ethnic minority (EM) populations. The white populations either declined or remained relatively static. In some local authorities (Birmingham and Leicester) the EM populations were significant minorities (30% and over), whereas in other local authorities (Glasgow and Stoke) they were relatively small (between 5% and 6%).

In all the local authorities, the largest group within the EM population was Asian (ranged between 62% and 85% of EM populations) and, with the exception of Leicester

with its large Indian Hindu population, the largest religious category within the Asian population was always Muslim.

In all the local authorities, the levels of residential segregation between the Asian and the white populations were higher than the levels between the white and EM populations as a whole, although they remained within the moderate to high range of segregation. The exception was Birmingham, where the level of residential segregation between the white population and the large Asian population (66% of EM population) was at a high level (DI value of 64). It was at an even higher level between the white population and the majority religious category (Muslim) in the Asian population (DI value of 69). There was a similar high level of residential segregation in Walsall between the white population and the majority religious category (Muslim) in the Asian population (DI value of 65).

The 2001 census shows that in these local authorities, for the populations as a whole, there were relatively high levels of unemployment and also relatively high proportions of their populations of working age with no qualifications. There was an exception in the case of High Wycombe, where these indices of economic deprivation were much lower.

Local authorities with low to moderately-low levels of ethnic residential segregation

The seven local authorities were located across most of the major urban areas of England. In the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, they all experienced growing ethnic minority (EM) populations. What happened to the white population was more varied. In five local authorities, the white population declined, whereas in two local authorities it grew. All the local authorities had relatively long-established EM populations. In four local authorities, the EM population was between 7% and 9%, and in three local authorities it was much larger, ranging between 20% and 30% of total populations. In six local authorities the Asian population was the largest group in the EM population but in one local authority (Croydon) the black population was larger.

In all local authorities, the largest EM group had a higher level of residential segregation from the white population than the white population had from the EM population as a whole. In four of the authorities, the level of residential segregation between the largest ethnic minority group and the white population was at a moderate level (a DI value of just over 40).

The 2001 census shows that, for the population as a whole, the local authorities had varied social/economic characteristics. Sandwell was the local authority in England with the highest proportion of its population of working age with no qualifications (46%). Wolverhampton also had 41% of its population of working age with no qualifications. The remaining local authorities had much lower proportions of their populations of working age with no qualifications. The levels of unemployment in Newcastle, Sandwell, and Wolverhampton, were relatively high, whereas in the other local authorities, it was closer to the national average of 3% at the time of the 2001 census.

Local authorities with low levels of ethnic residential segregation

Six of these local authorities were located in London and South East England and two were in the Midlands. The London boroughs had significant ethnic minority (EM) populations. In Haringey, the EM population was 34% of the total population, in Harrow it was 41%, and in Tower Hamlets it was 49% (half the population). Other local authorities, like Solihull and St. Albans, had small EM populations (between 5% and 7% of total populations). In the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, they all experienced growing EM populations, whereas what happened to the white populations in these areas was more mixed. In four local authorities, the white population declined. It was relatively stable in two local authorities and, in the remaining two local authorities, it grew.

In five local authorities, the Asian population was the largest group in the EM population, in two local authorities (Barking and Dagenham, and Haringey), the black population was the largest group, and in one local authority (Cambridge), no single ethnic group was significantly larger than any other group in the EM population. The level of residential segregation between the largest EM group and the white population tended to be slightly higher than between the white population and the EM population as a whole. The exception was Barking and Dagenham, where the level of residential segregation between the white and largest EM group (black population) was slightly lower than the level between the white and total EM population.

The 2001 census shows that, for the population as a whole, these local authorities had varied social/economic characteristics. Four local authorities (Cambridge, Harrow, Solihull, and St. Albans) had relatively low levels of unemployment (at or below the than national average of 3%), and low proportions of their populations of working age with no qualifications. In contrast, the remaining four local authorities (Barking and Dagenham, Haringey, Nottingham, and Tower Hamlets) had relatively high levels of unemployment (5% and above), and Barking and Dagenham, Nottingham, and Tower Hamlets, also had over a third of their populations of working age with no qualifications.

Chapter Three

Changes in levels of ethnic residential segregation: 1991-2001.

Table 2. Changes in levels of ethnic residential segregation 1991-2001: 25 local authorities.

Change in level of segregation	Local Authorities		Local Authorities
	No.	%	
Level increased	1	4%	Blackburn
Level remained same*	9	36%	Birmingham High Wycombe Bradford Leicester Croydon Oldham Haringey Stoke Harrow
Level fell	15	60%	Barking & Dagenham Bristol Sandwell Cambridge Solihull Cardiff Southampton Glasgow St. Albans Kirklees Tower Hamlets Newcastle Walsall Nottingham Wolverhampton

*Defined as the Dissimilarity Index (DI) value in the 2001 census being within 5% of the DI value in the 1991 census.

The overwhelming trend in the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses was that the levels of residential segregation in the sampled local authorities between the white and ethnic minority populations remained largely unchanged or fell.

The one local authority (Blackburn) where the level of residential segregation increased had a moderately high level of residential segregation at the time of the 1991 census (a DI value of 58) between the white population and EM population as a whole, which increased to a high level of residential segregation (DI value of 66) by the time of the 2001 census⁴.

Of the nine local authorities where the levels of residential segregation remained unchanged, two had high levels of segregation in 2001, four had moderate to high levels of segregation in 2001, two had moderately low levels of segregation in 2001, and one (Harrow) had a low level of segregation in 2001.

In the fifteen local authorities where the levels of residential segregation fell, four had moderate to high levels of segregation in 2001, five had moderate to low levels of segregation in 2001, and six had low levels of segregation in 2001. The average fall in the level of residential segregation between 1991 and 2001 was 17%.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the ethnic minority (EM) populations in all the sampled local authorities expanded. In 84% of the sampled local authorities, the white

⁴ In Blackburn there were changes to electoral ward boundaries between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. Whilst this may have contributed to the increase in levels of segregation the scale of the level of increase suggests that it was also due to the almost exclusive expansion of the Asian population in traditional areas of settlement and a decline in the white population in these areas.

population either declined or remained relatively static. In the small number of local authorities where the white population grew, the growth in the EM populations was at a faster rate. These are trends that could point to an increase in the levels of residential segregation. The reason it did not occur with the exception of Blackburn was because:

- In the local authorities where the levels of residential segregation remained largely unchanged, the movement of the ethnic minority population into new areas of settlement was counter-balanced by an expansion of the ethnic minority population in its traditional areas of settlement and a decline in the white population.
- In the local authorities where there was a fall in the levels of residential segregation, the movement of the ethnic minority population to new areas of settlement outweighed any expansion of the ethnic minority population in its more traditional areas of settlement.

The movement of ethnic minority populations to new areas of settlement embraced all ethnic groups. However, there was a pattern in some of the sampled local authorities of the Asian population moving to new areas of settlement at a lower rate than other ethnic minority groups.

In three of the sampled local authorities (Birmingham, Bradford and Croydon), the movement of the EM population as a whole between the 1991 and 2001 census to middle-class areas (electoral wards) was examined to see if there was any significant movement of the EM population in these local authorities from traditional areas of settlement to what had historically been more affluent white middle-class areas. It was found :

- In these middle-class wards, the white population was not declining, whereas it was declining in electoral wards with large EM populations.
- There was a significant numerical increase in the EM populations in these middle-class areas between 1991 and 2001.
- The increase in the EM populations in these middle-class areas or wards comprised only a minority of the increase in the EM populations in the three local authorities between 1991 and 2001. In Birmingham, 17% of the increase in the EM population took place in middle-class areas. In Bradford, it was 16%, and Croydon 25%. The majority of the increase in the size of the EM populations in these local authorities continued to be in more traditional areas of settlement.

Chapter Four

Levels of ethnic segregation amongst school pupils

Table 3. Level of ethnic segregation amongst school pupils in six local authorities

Local Authority	Level of Segregation: Primary Schools		Level of segregation: Secondary Schools		Level of Residential Segregation: (white and EM populations)	
	DI Value	Level	DI Value	Level	DI Value	Level
Barking & Dagenham	34	Low to Moderate	24	Low	27	Low
Birmingham	65	High	57	Moderate to High	55	Moderate to High
Blackburn	62	High	60	High	66	High
Bradford	72	High	65	High	60	High
Croydon	44	Moderate	38	Low to Moderate	35	Low to Moderate
Nottingham	32	Low to Moderate	34	Low to Moderate	28	Low

The aim was to see if the levels of residential segregation found in six of the sampled local authorities between the white population and the ethnic minority (EM) population as a whole were replicated in the ethnic distribution of pupils (defined as both white and ethnic minority, or non-white) in schools.

The table shows that the three local authorities (Birmingham, Blackburn, and Bradford) with higher levels of segregation between white and EM pupils in schools also had high levels of residential segregation. The three local authorities (Barking & Dagenham, Croydon, and Nottingham) with moderate to low levels of segregation between white and EM pupils in schools also had similar lower levels of residential segregation.

Generally, primary schools had slightly higher levels of segregation between white and EM pupils than secondary schools. This was to be expected, given that the catchment areas for the intake of pupils to primary schools are smaller and more closely related to where pupils live than for secondary schools. The catchment areas for the intake of pupils to secondary schools can cover quite wide geographical areas and can include the whole of a local authority district.

In five of the six local authorities examined, the levels of segregation between white and EM pupils was higher than the levels of residential segregation. This trend is to be expected because the proportion of the EM population in schools was higher (and the proportion of the white population in schools correspondingly smaller) than its proportion

in the total population. The EM population tends to be younger than the white population and thus to have a greater proportion of its population in the school pupil age band.

In some of the sampled local authorities, faith schools (essentially Christian) formed a significant part of the school provision. In general, no significant differences were found in the levels of segregation in faith schools compared with state schools. The exception was secondary schools in Bradford. In the majority of Christian faith schools, 80% or more of the pupils were white, and there was also an Islamic school with wholly Muslim pupils.

In the three local authorities with high levels of segregation between white and EM school pupils it was found:

- Birmingham: In primary schools, 54% of EM pupils attended schools where they comprised 90% or more of the school pupils. In the case of white pupils, however, it was only 13%. This suggests that white pupils are more likely to be in primary schools where they have some experience of being with non-white (EM) pupils. In contrast, EM pupils are more likely to be in primary schools where they have no experience of being with white pupils. In secondary schools, the level of segregation was at a slightly lower and more moderate level. Of schools, 30% had significant numbers of both white and EM pupils. In only 23% of schools were white or EM pupils over 90% of the school pupil populations. However, EM pupils were much more likely than white pupils to attend such secondary schools.
- Blackburn: In primary schools, 69% of white pupils and 57% of EM pupils attended schools where their respective ethnic groups comprised 90% or more of school pupil populations. Such schools formed 67% of the primary schools in Blackburn. In secondary schools, 66% of white pupils attended schools where they formed 90% or more of the school pupil populations. Of EM pupils 65% attended schools where they formed 70% or more of school pupil populations. Such schools comprised two thirds of the secondary schools in Blackburn.
- Bradford: In primary schools, 54% of white pupils and 60% of EM pupils attended schools where their respective ethnic groups formed 90% or more of school pupil populations. Such schools comprised 59% of the primary schools in Bradford. In secondary schools, 47% of white pupils and 36% of EM pupils attended schools where their respective ethnic groups formed 90% or more of the school pupil populations. Such school comprised 46% of the secondary schools in Bradford. In general, most white and EM pupils attended secondary schools where a significant majority of the pupils was from their own respective ethnic groups.

Chapter Five

Variations in residential segregation between ethnic minority groups

The findings already provided show that the levels of residential segregation between white populations and ethnic minority populations are not the same for every ethnic minority group. Instead, there are variations in the levels of residential segregation between the white population and specific ethnic minority groups. This issue was analysed in more detail by banding the twenty-five local authorities examined into three groups, depending on the level of dominance by any ethnic minority group within each local authority's ethnic minority population at the time of the 2001 census. The three bands were:

- Local authorities where 70% or more of the ethnic minority population consists of one ethnic group.
- Local authorities where between 51% and 69% of the ethnic minority population consists of one ethnic group.
- Local authorities where between 30% and 50% of the ethnic minority population consists of one ethnic group.

Local Authorities where 70% or more of the ethnic minority population consists of one ethnic group.

Table 4. Ethnic group comprising 70% or more of EM population: 8 local authorities.

Local Authority	Level of Segregation	Largest Ethnic Group(LEG)	Largest Faith Group in Asian Pop. (LFGA)	Level of Segregation (DI Values)	Group Most Segregated from White Pop.
	White v EM Population DI Values *			White/ LEG White/ LFGA	Ethnic Faith Group Group in Asian Pop
Blackburn	66 (H level)	Asian	Muslim	68(H) 70(VH)	Asian Muslim
Bradford	56 (MH level)	Asian	Muslim	60(H) 62(H)	Asian Muslim
Harrow	21 (L Level)	Asian	Hindu	24(L) 26(L)	Asian Hindu
Kirklees	45 (M level)	Asian	Muslim	51 (MH) 53 (MH)	Asian Muslim
Leicester	51 (MH level)	Asian	Hindu	55 (MH) 55 (MH)	Asian Muslim (DI=65)
Oldham	63 (H level)	Asian	Muslim	70 (VH) 72 (VH)	Asian Muslim
Tower Hamlets	20 (L level)	Asian	Muslim	24(L) 25(L)	Asian Muslim
Walsall	46 (M level)	Asian	Muslim	52(MH) 65(H)	Asian Muslim

* In tables 2.4 to 2.6 VH= very high level of segregation, H = high level of segregation, MH= moderate to high level of segregation, M =moderate level of segregation, LM= low to moderate level of segregation and L =low level of segregation.

In all eight local authorities, the Asian population was the largest ethnic group (over 70%) in the ethnic minority (EM) population. The Asian population always had higher levels of residential segregation from the white population than was the case for the EM population as a whole. They were also always the ethnic minority group which was most segregated from the white population.

In six local authorities, the largest religious category in the Asian population was Muslim and in two local authorities (Harrow and Leicester) it was Hindu. In all six authorities where the Muslim group was the largest in the Asian population, it was the group which was most segregated from the white population. In the case of the two authorities where the Hindu group was largest, in one authority (Harrow), it was the group which was most segregated from the white population. However, in the other authority (Leicester), it was the smaller Muslim group that was most residentially segregated from the white population. The Muslim population had a high level of segregation from the white population (DI value of 65).

Local authorities where between 51% and 69% of the ethnic minority population consists of one ethnic group.

Table 5. Ethnic group comprising 51%-69% of EM population: 8 local authorities.

Local Authority ³³	Level of Segregation	Largest Ethnic Group (LEG)	Largest Faith Group in Asian Pop. (LFGA)	Level of Segregation (DI Values)	Group Most Segregated from White Pop.
	White v EM Population DI Values			White / LEG White/ LFGA	Ethnic Group Faith Group in Asian Pop.
Birmingham	55(MH level)	Asian	Muslim	64 (H) 69(H)	Asian Muslim
Glasgow	45 (M level)	Asian	Muslim	50 53 (MH)	Asian Muslim
Haringey	26 (L level)	Black	Muslim	32 (LM) 29 (L)	Jewish Muslim (DI=45)
High Wycombe	50 (MH level)	Asian	Muslim	56 (MH) 59	Asian Muslim
Newcastle	34 (LM level)	Asian	Muslim	38 (ML) 42 (M)	Asian Muslim
Sandwell	37(LM level)	Asian	Sikh	42(M) 41(M)	Asian Muslim (DI=52)
Stoke	42 (LM level)	Asian	Muslim	53 (MH) 57	Asian Muslim
Wolverhampton	31 (LM level)	Asian	Sikh	35 (MH) 33	Asian Muslim (DI=40)

In seven local authorities, the Asian population was the largest ethnic group in the ethnic minority (EM) population, and in one local authority (Haringey), the black population was the largest. In all eight authorities, the largest ethnic group in the EM population had a higher level of residential segregation from the white population than was the case for the EM population as a whole.

In seven local authorities, the largest ethnic minority group was the population group which was most segregated from the white population. In one authority (Haringey), however, this was not the case. Instead, it was the relatively small Jewish population which was most segregated from the white population, rather than the much larger black population. The Jewish population had a moderate level of segregation from the white population (DI value of 45) and a high level of segregation from the EM population (DI value of 64).

In the seven local authorities where the Asian population was the largest ethnic minority group, the largest religious category in the Asian population was Muslim in five authorities, and Sikh in two authorities (Sandwell and Wolverhampton). However, in all seven authorities, it was the Muslim faith group that was most residentially segregated from the white population.

In the one local authority (Haringey), where the black population was the largest ethnic minority group, the Muslim population (both Asian and African) had a lower level of residential segregation from the white population than the larger black population.

Local authorities where between 30% and 50% of the ethnic minority population consists of one ethnic group.

Table 6. Ethnic group comprising 30%-50% of EM population: 9 local authorities.

Local Authority	Level of Segregation	Largest Ethnic Group (LEG)	Largest Faith Group in Asian Pop. (LFGA)	Level of Segregation (DI Values)	Group Most Segregated from White Pop.
	White vEM Population DI Values	Proportion in EM Pop in brackets		White/White/LEG LFGA	Ethnic Group Faith Group in Asian Pop
Barking & Dagenham	27 (L level)	Black (47%)	Muslim	24(L) 48(M)	Asian (DI=40) Muslim
Bristol	32 (LM level)	Asian (35%)	Muslim	34 (LM) 41 (M)	Black (DI=46) Muslim
Cambridge	9 (L level)	Asian (36%)	Muslim	10(L) 13(L)	Chinese (DI=18) Muslim
Cardiff	30 (LM level)	Asian (47%)	Muslim	41 42 (M)	Asian Muslim
Croydon	35 (LM level)	Black (46%)	Muslim	41 (M) 34 (LM)	Black Hindu (DI=37)
Nottingham	28 (L level)	Asian (43%)	Muslim	40 47	Asian Muslim

				(M)	
Southampton	31 (LM level)	Asian (50%)	Muslim	43 46 (M)	Asian Muslim
Solihull	12 (L level)	Asian (46%)	Hindu	30 34 (LM)	Asian Hindu
St. Albans	26 (L level)	Asian (48%)	Muslim	35 38 (LM)	Asian Muslim

In these nine local authorities, the ethnic minority population is not dominated by one ethnic group and is made up of a number of different ethnic groups.

In eight local authorities, the largest ethnic minority group in the ethnic minority (EM) population was Asian and, in two local authorities (Barking and Dagenham, and Croydon), it was the black population. In eight authorities, the largest EM group had a higher (in some cases only slightly higher) level of residential segregation from the white population than was the case for the EM population as a whole. The exception was Barking and Dagenham, where the EM population as a whole was more segregated from the white population than was the case for the black population.

In six local authorities, the largest ethnic group in the EM population was the ethnic group which was most residentially segregated from the white population. These six authorities (relevant ethnic group in brackets) were: Cardiff (Asian), Croydon (Black), Nottingham (Asian), Southampton (Asian), Solihull (Asian) and St. Albans (Asian).

In three authorities, it was a smaller ethnic group in the EM population that was most residentially segregated from the white population. The local authorities were:

- Barking and Dagenham: the Asian population was much more segregated from the white population than the larger black population.
- Bristol: the black population was much more segregated from the white population than the larger Asian population.
- Cambridge: the Chinese population was more segregated from the white population than the larger Asian population.

In eight local authorities, the largest religious category in the Asian population was Muslim. When the levels of residential segregation of the Muslim population from the white population was compared with the levels of residential segregation of other Asian religious categories from the white population, and also the levels of residential segregation of other ethnic minority population groups from the white population, it was found:

- In five authorities (Barking and Dagenham, Cardiff, Nottingham, Southampton, and St. Albans), the Muslim population was the group that was most residentially segregated from the white population.
- In two authorities (Bristol and Cambridge), the Muslim population was less residentially segregated from the white population than other ethnic minority groups.

- In one authority (Croydon), the Muslim population was less residentially segregated from the white population than the Indian Hindu population.

In the one local authority (Solihull) where the Hindu population was the largest religious category in the Asian community, it was more residentially segregated from the white population than other Asian faith groups and also ethnic minority groups.

Chapter Six

Levels of residential segregation between Muslims and the white population

In recent years, the Asian Muslim communities, in particular, have become a focus of concern about whether they are separating themselves from the rest of British society. Where the Muslim communities have come to reside in urban areas is inevitably a crucial part of the political debate.

As a question on religious belief was asked for the first time in the 2001 census, it is possible to identify by local authority electoral wards where persons indicating they are Muslim reside. In most of the local authorities examined, the Muslim population was almost exclusively of Asian origin. Whilst the Muslim population coincided with the population of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin, in some local authorities it also included a significant part of the Indian population. There were two authorities (the London boroughs of Haringey and Barking and Dagenham) where the Muslim population included some persons of African origin (and in the subsequent commentary they have, as far as possible, been excluded).

It was found that of the 25 local authorities examined, the Asian Muslim population was the most residentially segregated group from the white population in nineteen (76%) of the authorities. In six (24%) of the authorities, however, it was less residentially segregated from the white population than other ethnic minority groups or Asian religious categories (Hindu and Sikh).

In the nineteen local authorities where it was the most segregated group:

- This reflected the fact that, in the majority of the authorities, the Asian population was the largest ethnic group and the Asian Muslim population was the largest religious category amongst the Asian communities. Reference has already been made to the existence of a pattern of the largest minority ethnic group or largest Asian religious category being the most segregated from the white population.
- The levels of residential segregation of the Asian Muslim population from the white population were relatively high in the majority of the authorities. In seventeen (87%) of the authorities it ranged according to Dissimilarity Index measurements from moderate to very high. One of the two authorities where this was not the case was the London Borough of Tower Hamlets with its large Muslim population. In this authority, the segregation level from the white population was low.
- The majority (14, or 74%) of the nineteen authorities was located in the Midlands and northern part of the UK.
- The size of the Muslim populations in these authorities varied considerably. In Stoke, it was less than 5% of the total population, whereas in Tower Hamlets, it was over 40% of the population.

In the six authorities where the Asian Muslim population was not the most segregated group:

- In every authority, the Asian Muslim faith population was a minority within the ethnic minority population. The size of these Muslim populations varied according to how large or small the total ethnic minority populations were.
- In every authority, the levels of residential segregation of the Asian Muslim population from the white population had a Dissimilarity Index measurement at the low to moderately low level.
- The authorities tended to be located in London and South East England.

The broad trend is that Asian Muslim populations are likely to be more residentially segregated from the white population than other ethnic groups or Asian religious categories. This is particularly the case with the numerically-large Asian Muslim populations in urban conurbations in northern England and parts of the Midlands. However there are other urban areas, particularly in London and South East England where Asian Muslim populations are much more residentially integrated with the white populations.

Chapter Seven

Conclusions

The findings from the examination of the levels of residential segregation by ethnic group in twenty-five urban local authorities suggest a varied picture. In each local authority what has happened will have been influenced by the particular and often distinct patterns of migration of persons to them from the South Asian sub-continent, the Caribbean, and parts of Africa. It will also have been influenced by the employment circumstances that migrants experienced in their early years of settlement and by the changes that subsequently took place in the social and economic position of each local authority.

It is these influences, for example, that have resulted in three adjoining local authorities in the West Midlands with similar levels of economic deprivation in 2001 having very different patterns of residential segregation between their white and ethnic minority populations. In two, Sandwell and Wolverhampton, there was, at the time of the 2001 census, low/moderate levels of segregation between the white and ethnic minority communities. Further, the levels of residential segregation fell in the period from the 1991 to 2001 censuses. The situation in the adjacent local authority, Birmingham, was rather different. There was a much higher level of residential segregation, particularly between the white and Asian populations. Also, the higher level of residential segregation remained unchanged between 1991 and 2001.

There were differences in the composition of the Asian populations that dominated the ethnic minority populations in these three urban areas. In Sandwell and Wolverhampton, Sikhs were the largest ethnic/religious group in the Asian population (forming between 50/60% of the Asian population). In Birmingham, it was the Muslim group (forming 85% of the Asian population). This could suggest that the Muslim population was responsible for the higher levels of residential segregation in Birmingham. However, in Sandwell and Wolverhampton, the Muslim population and also the Sikh population had much lower levels of residential segregation from the white population, than was the case for their counterparts in Birmingham. This suggests, instead, that there were other factors at work. They can probably be best described as the particular and distinct dynamics within each local authority that led to differences over where migrants from the South Asian continent, the Caribbean and Africa were residing by the time of the 2001 census.

Some broad trends across all the examined local authorities, however, were detected. Some of the authorities had significant levels of residential segregation between their white and ethnic minority populations. They comprised 40% of the local authorities examined and were those authorities where the Dissimilarity Index measurements showed moderate to higher levels of segregation. However, the majority (60%) of the local authorities examined had lower levels of segregation. It is possible to say that, in these local authority areas, the white and ethnic minority communities are relatively well integrated in terms of where they live. It is also the case that some local authorities with low levels of segregation have long-established and large ethnic minority populations. In essence, urban areas in the UK with white and significant ethnic minority communities in 2001 could have patterns of residence that suggest they were relatively well integrated, as well as patterns of residence that suggest the opposite.

A clearer trend emerging from the twenty-five local authorities examined was that levels of residential segregation between the white and ethnic minority populations did not rise in the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. In 60% of the authorities, the levels fell and, in 36%, it remained unchanged. In only one authority was there an increase.

A further trend was that authorities with higher levels of residential segregation between their white and ethnic minority populations at the time of the 1991 census were less likely than those authorities with lower levels of segregation in 1991 to experience a fall in residential segregation by the time of the 2001 census. Instead, it was likely to remain at similar levels, that is, higher levels of segregation in 1991 were replicated again in 2001.

A consistent pattern that was found in nearly all local authorities in the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses was that there was a growth in ethnic minority populations in newer or non-traditional areas of settlement. It included middle-class areas which historically had populations that were almost exclusively white. This movement in the ethnic minority population embraced all ethnic groups although, in some areas, groups in the Asian population were moving to newer areas of settlement at a lower rate than other ethnic minority groups. The effect of this movement was to reduce levels of residential segregation and was the cause for its fall in 60% of the local authorities examined. In those local authorities where the levels of residential segregation remained static, different patterns of population movement were taking place that counter-balanced one another. The growth in the ethnic minority population in new areas was matched or outweighed by its growth in traditional areas of settlement. Further this was often accompanied by a decline in the white population in these traditional areas of settlement.

It is possible from the findings to identify the characteristics common to local authorities with higher levels of residential segregation, as well as the common characteristics for those authorities with lower levels of segregation.

Characteristics of ten local authorities with higher levels of segregation

The local authorities with higher levels of segregation tend to have significant ethnic minority populations. Eight (80%) of the authorities had ethnic minority populations of over 10% of the total population and, in two authorities, the ethnic minority populations were 30% or more. In only two of the authorities was the ethnic minority population below its national 7.9% proportion in the total population at the time of the 2001 census.

The authorities tend to be located in the Midlands and northern part (including Scotland) of the UK. Only one authority out of ten was located in southern England.

In every local authority, the Asian population was the dominant ethnic minority group. It formed over 50% of the ethnic minority population in every authority and had higher levels of residential segregation from the white population than was the case for the ethnic minority population as a whole.

The authorities tend to have large Asian Muslim populations that are highly segregated from the white population. In nine out of the ten authorities, Muslims were the largest

religious category in the Asian population and in seven authorities they formed over 70% of the Asian population. In all ten authorities, the Muslim population was the group that was most residentially segregated from the white population. In six authorities, the level of segregation was at a high level (DI value of over 60).

The authorities are likely to have had similar higher levels of residential segregation at the time of the 1991 census between the white and ethnic minority populations. In seven (70%) of the authorities, there was no fall in the levels of residential segregation between 1991 and 2001.

The authorities tend to have relatively high levels of economic deprivation. At the time of the 2001 census, nine of the authorities had higher than the national average levels of unemployment and proportions of their populations of working age with no qualifications.

The higher levels of residential segregation between the white and ethnic minority populations are replicated in the school pupil populations. In the three authorities where the ethnicity of school pupils was examined, there was a high level of segregation in primary schools between white and ethnic minority pupils. In secondary schools, the levels of segregation were still high, although at a slightly lower level than for primary schools.

Characteristics of fifteen local authorities with lower levels of residential segregation

The size of the ethnic minority population in the local authorities varies. Some have large and long-standing ethnic minority populations, whilst others have relatively small populations. Ten or 66% of the local authorities had ethnic minority populations of over 10% of the total population and this included four London authorities with ethnic minority populations of over 30%. The remaining five (33%) local authorities had smaller ethnic minority populations that were close to, or slightly below, the national 7.9% proportion that the ethnic minority population formed in the total population at the time of the 2001 census.

The authorities are located across the UK and, in particular, in London and southern England. Of the authorities that were examined which were located in London/southern England, 90% had lower levels of segregation.

The composition of the ethnic minority population in the local authorities varies. In some authorities, the ethnic minority population consists of a number of different ethnic groups whereas, in other authorities, one ethnic group dominates the ethnic minority population. Of the fifteen authorities, nine (60%) had relatively mixed ethnic minority groups (i.e. no ethnic group comprised more than 50% of the ethnic minority population) and six had one ethnic group forming over 50% of the ethnic minority population.

Within the Asian populations the dominant religious category varies. Whilst it is more likely to be Muslim, it can also be Sikh or Hindu. Within the fifteen authorities, Muslims were the largest group in eleven (73%), but Sikhs and Hindus were the largest groups in the other four (23%).

The largest faith group in the Asian population is not always the group that is most residentially segregated from the white population. In the eleven authorities where Muslims were the largest faith group they were, in five of these authorities, *not* the group that was most segregated from the white population. In the two authorities where Sikhs were the largest ethnic/faith group in the Asian population, they also were *not* the group that was most segregated from the white population.

In authorities with lower levels of segregation where Muslims are the largest religious category in the Asian population, their levels of residential segregation from the white population tend also to be relatively low. The average level of segregation between the white and Muslim populations using Dissimilarity Index measures was found to be in the moderately low range.

The authorities tend to have experienced a fall in the levels of residential segregation between the white and ethnic minority populations in the period between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. In 12 (80%) of the authorities the level of segregation in this period fell.

The authorities have very varied levels of economic deprivation. At the time of the 2001 census, the population in seven of the authorities had relatively high levels of economic deprivation, whereas in the other eight authorities it was relatively low.

The lower levels of residential segregation between the white and ethnic minority populations are replicated in the school pupil populations. In the three authorities where the ethnicity of school pupil populations was examined, the levels of segregation between white and ethnic minority school pupils, whilst slightly higher than the levels of residential segregation, were still at the moderately low level.

This examination of where people live by ethnic group in twenty-five urban local authorities (and in six authorities the ethnic composition of school pupils) does not cover the totality of how persons from different racial (ethnic) groups interact with one another. They can, for example, interact with one another in the work place and in the many and varied forms of leisure activity. It is also the case that a more detailed examination of the relationship between levels of residential segregation by ethnicity and economic deprivation or wellbeing, and the relationship with the ethnic composition of school pupil populations needs to be undertaken for a complete picture to be obtained. In spite of these limitations, however, the examination carried out does identify the significant and broad trends that were taking place at the time of the 2001 census as to where different ethnic populations were living in a representative sample of urban areas.

Such a factual information base is important, given the sometimes misleading and exaggerated way that public debate can take place on this issue. In essence, residential segregation between minority communities and the white population does exist in some urban conurbations, particularly in northern England and some areas in the West Midlands. However, this has to be counter-balanced against what is happening in many urban areas, namely, that ethnic minority communities are *not* significantly segregating themselves from the white population in terms of where they live.

It is also clear that residential segregation between ethnic groups is not getting worse. The comparisons that can be made with the previous 1991 census suggest that levels of residential segregation are either unchanged or falling. Further, whilst Asian Muslim

communities can be highly segregated from the white population, this is not the case in every urban area. This complexity is all too often not captured in public discussion.

Public bodies under race equality legislation have a duty to promote good race relations and to have certain arrangements in place to do this. Levels of segregation between ethnic groups in terms of residence or school pupil populations should be part of the information base that public bodies use to help them assess what is happening on race relations in their respective areas. Clearly, where levels of segregation are relatively high, there are potential issues of concern. Whilst this does not automatically mean that relations between different ethnic groups are poor, public bodies should be systematically analysing whether higher levels of segregation are having an adverse impact on good race relations. If this is found to be the case, then remedial programmes need to be put in place.

Public bodies should not automatically assume that relations between different ethnic groups are automatically good when levels of segregation are at relatively low levels. This, at the time of writing this report, can best be illustrated by the London borough of Barking and Dagenham. The levels of segregation generally in terms of residence and in schools are low. However, the authority has experienced in recent years some relatively high votes for far-right political parties such as the British National Party (BNP) with its racist agenda. In the last elections to the local authority in May 2006, the BNP won twelve seats and became the main political opposition group in the authority. By definition, this shows negative attitudes by sections of the white population towards ethnic minority communities in the borough. It is a situation where relations between different ethnic groups cannot be described as good. It is also a situation where, even though levels of segregation are low, remedial action is required to improve race relations in the area.

Appendix A: detailed analyses of twenty-five local authorities by county and region

East

Cambridge

East Midlands

Leicester

Nottingham

London

Barking & Dagenham

Croydon

Harrow

Haringey

Tower Hamlets

North East

Newcastle upon - Tyne

North West

Blackburn

Oldham

Scotland

Glasgow

South East

High Wycombe

Southampton

St. Albans

South West

Bristol

Wales

Cardiff

West Midlands

Birmingham

Sandwell

Solihull

Stoke

Walsall

Wolverhampton

Yorkshire

Bradford

Kirklees

EAST ENGLAND

Cambridge

Ethnic composition

Table 8. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Cambridge

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	97,365 (89.4%)	86,549 (94.1%)	+10,816
Ethnic Minority (EM)	11,498(10.6%)	5,437 (5.9%)	+ 6,061
Total	108,863	91,986	+ 16,877

The 2001 census shows a mix of different ethnic minority groups living in Cambridge. The largest groups in the ethnic minority population were Asian (36% of EM population), Chinese (20%) and Mixed Race (19%). Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was an increase in the population of all ethnic minority groups.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- Close to its 89.4% proportion of the population in all 14 electoral wards.

EM population:

- Close to its 10.6% proportion of the population in all electoral wards.
- The highest proportion it formed of a ward population was just over 14% in two wards.
- Different EM groups were almost equally distributed across electoral wards with the exception of the Chinese population. 36% lived in just two wards.

The 1991 census shows a similar distribution across electoral wards (same ward boundaries) for the white and EM populations as the 2001 census.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing across the same 14 electoral wards in the 1991 and 2001 censuses the residential distribution of:

- Residence of the white and EM populations in the 2001 census shows a value of 9 (very low level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Asian populations in the 2001 census shows a value of 10 (very low level of segregation).

- Residence of the white population and the Muslim population in the 2001 census shows a value of 13 (low level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Chinese populations in the 2001 census shows a value of 18 (low level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and EM populations in the 1991 census shows a value of 13 (low level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a growth in the population of Cambridge across all ethnic groups. The EM population doubled in this period. The 2001 census shows that the various EM communities were widely dispersed. This was already the situation at the time of the 1991 census and continued in the decade until the 2001 census. The majority of the increase in the EM population in this period was in areas outside of the more traditional areas of settlement, with the result that there was a fall in the already low level of residential segregation between 1991 and 2001. There is a very low level of residential segregation by ethnic group in Cambridge.

EAST MIDLANDS

Leicester

Ethnic composition

Table 9. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Leicester

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	178,739 (63.9%)	193,539 (71.5%)	-14,800
Ethnic Minority (EM)	101,182 (36.1%)	77,090 (28.5%)	+24,092
Total	279,921	270629	+ 9,292

The 2001 census shows that 84.4% of the EM population were of Asian origin. Of the Asian population, 86% was of Indian heritage, nearly half were Hindu and a third Muslim. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the Asian population accounted for 82% of the increase in the EM population.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions the white and EM populations formed in each of the 22 electoral wards were as follows.

Table 10. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Leicester

Ethnicity	Over 90%	90/80%	80/50%	50/30%	30/20%	20/10%	Less than 10%
White	3	6	7	3	1	2	0
EM	0	2	4	2	5	6	3

White population:

- In 7 (32%) of wards, formed between 50% and 80% of the ward populations and thus was fairly close to its 63.9% proportion in the total population.
- In 3 (14%) of wards, formed over 90% of ward populations.
- Was a minority (less than 50%) of the population in 6 (27%) of wards and in 3 of these wards was less than 30% of the population.

EM population:

- In 7 (32%) of wards, formed between 20% and 50% of ward populations and thus some proximity to its 36% proportion in the total population.
- In 6 (27%) of the wards, formed the majority (over 60%) of the ward populations. 68% of the Asian population lived in these wards.
- In 3 (14%) of wards, formed a small proportion (less than 10%) of the population.

- Muslims comprised 31% of the EM population. 59% lived in just two electoral wards. In terms of residence, they were more concentrated in certain areas than other EM groups.

The 1991 census shows that the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in the then 28 differently constituted electoral wards were:

- The white population formed over 90% of the population in 29% of the wards and was less than 50% of the population in 32% of wards.
- In 21% of the wards, the white and EM populations had some proximity to their then 71/29% proportions in the population.
- The EM population formed 50% or more of the population in 32% of wards and in one ward it was over 80%.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the white population across the 22 electoral wards in the 2001 census with other ethnic and minority religious populations shows:

- For the white and EM populations, a value of 51 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian populations, a value of 55 (moderate to high level of segregation).
- For the Indian Hindu and white populations, a value of 55 (moderate to high level of segregation).
- For the Asian Muslim and white populations, a value of 65 (high level of segregation).

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution in the 1991 census in the then 28 differently constituted electoral wards shows:

- For the white and EM populations, a value of 54 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian populations, a value of 57 (moderate to high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the population of Leicester grew. It was characterised by some decline in the white population and significant growth in the ethnic minority population.

The 2001 census shows that the EM population (primarily Asian) in Leicester was concentrated in traditional areas of settlement. The Asian population was slightly more concentrated in certain areas than other ethnic minority groups. However, there was also the emergence of a pattern of the EM population living in most of the districts in the City. This is evidenced by 86% of the electoral wards in the 2001 census having EM populations of over 10%, compared with 71% in 1991.

Comparisons between the 1991 and the 2001 censuses suggest that much of the increase in the Asian population in this period took place in traditional areas of settlement. In 1991, 79% of the Asian population was living in areas with significant EM populations (over 30% of ward populations) and in 2001 this figure remained almost the same at 77%. This cancelled out the movement that did take place amongst the EM population to new areas of settlement. As a result there was very little change in the levels of residential segregation between the white and ethnic minority and Asian populations between 1991 and 2001.

There is a moderate level of residential segregation in Leicester between the white and EM populations. It is slightly higher for the white and Asian populations generally. However, for the white and Asian Muslim population there is a high level of segregation.

EAST MIDLANDS

Nottingham

Ethnic composition

Table 11. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Nottingham

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	226,710 (84.9%)	235168 (89.2%)	-8,458
Ethnic Minority (EM)	40,278 (15.1%)	28330 (10.8%)	+11,948
Total	266,988	263,498	+3,490

The 2001 census shows that the largest groups in the ethnic minority population were Asian (43% of EM population), Black (28.3%) and Mixed Race (20.8%). The Asian population is of Pakistani and Indian heritage and the majority (69%) are Muslims. The increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses was partly due to an increase in the Asian population and partly due to the new 2001 census ethnic classification of 'mixed'.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 15 (75%) of the 20 electoral wards, it was relatively close to its proportion of 84.9% of the population.
- It did not form less than 69% of the population in any ward and there were only two wards where it formed over 95% of the population.

EM population:

- In 15 (75%) of electoral wards, it was relatively close to its 14.8% proportion of the population. There were both significant black and Asian communities living in most of these wards.
- Just over half the Muslim Asian community lives in 4 or 20% of the electoral wards. It was more concentrated in certain areas than other EM groups.

In the 1991 census, the white and EM populations were relatively close to their 89/11% proportion of the population in half of the then differently constituted electoral wards. In a third of the wards, the population was largely white (over 95%).

Distribution of pupils by ethnicity in schools

In January 2005, there were:

98 primary schools: 68% of pupils were white and 31.7% EM.

17 secondary schools: 76.1% of pupils were white and 22.6% EM.

Primary schools

- 32 (33%) of schools had some proximity (between 80/ 55% white and 45/20% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed in the total primary school population.
- 36 (37%) of schools had 80% plus white pupils but only 6 had over 90%.
- 16 (16%) of schools had 60% plus EM pupils. Only one school had more than 90%.
- There was no significant difference in ethnic composition of pupils in the small number of faith schools.

Secondary schools

- 8 (47%) of schools had some proximity (between 85/60% white and 40/15% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed in the total secondary school population.
- 5 (29%) of schools had 90% plus white pupils.
- 4 (23%) of schools had between 41% and 52% EM pupils.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of:

- Residence of the white and EM populations across the 20 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 28 (low level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Asian [populations across the 20 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 40 (moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Asian Muslim population across the 20 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 47 (moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and EM populations in the 1991 census across the then differently constituted 27 electoral wards shows a value of 35 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- White and EM pupils in secondary schools shows a value of 34 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- White and EM pupils in primary schools shows a value of 32 (low to moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a slight increase in the total population of Nottingham. It was characterised by some decline in the white population and significant growth in the EM population.

The 2001 census shows that across three quarters of the electoral wards, the white and EM populations were close to their 85/15% proportion in the total population. There were only two wards (10% of total) where the ward population was largely white (95% plus) and in no ward was the EM population more than a third. In the majority of areas where the EM population resided, there was a mix of ethnic minority groups, rather than one ethnic minority group being dominant. The group which was most concentrated in certain areas was the Asian Muslim population with just over half living in 4 electoral wards.

The information that can be drawn from the 1991 census suggests that at this time there was quite a wide distribution of the EM population across Nottingham with only a third of wards having largely white (95% plus) populations. In the period between 1991 and 2001, this process continued and the level of residential segregation between the white and EM population groups fell. It took place against a background of a declining white population and an expanding EM population. Between 1991 and 2001, the proportion of wards which were largely white fell and the proportion of wards where the white and EM populations were close to their proportions in the total population increased.

The dominant feature is that residential segregation by ethnic group is not taking place in Nottingham, although there is a concentration of the Muslim population in a small number of areas. Generally a low level of residential segregation exists.

The proportion of EM pupils in schools is higher than the EM population. This suggests a younger population than the white population and an expanding EM population. The low to moderate level of segregation between white and EM pupils in schools is slightly higher than the low level of residential segregation between the white and EM populations.

LONDON

Barking & Dagenham

Ethnic composition

Table 12. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Barking and Dagenham

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	139667 (85.2%)	133,883 (93.2%)	+5784
Ethnic Minority (EM)	24,277 (14.8%)	9,818 (6.8%)	+14,459
Total	163944	143,701	+20,243

The 2001 census shows that the largest groups in the EM population were Asian (34% of the EM population) and Black (47.1%). The majority (64%) of the black population were of African heritage and some were Muslims. The black population and to a lesser extent the Asian population accounted for the increase in the EM population between 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 7 (41%) of the 17 electoral wards, formed between 90 /95% of population.
- In 7 (41%) of wards, was relatively close (between 80/89% of ward populations) to its 85% proportion in the total population.
- In 3 (18%) of wards, formed between 54% and 79% of ward populations.
- It included a white other population of 4348 (3.1% of total population). Just over a third lived in the three wards with more significant EM populations.

EM population:

- In 7 (41%) of 17 electoral wards, was relatively close (between 10/16% of ward populations) to its 14.8% proportion in the total population.
- In one ward (Abbey), formed 45.7% of the population and in two other wards, 32% and 21% respectively. 39% lived in these three wards. It included 51% of the Muslim population.
- The black population was more widely distributed across electoral wards than the Asian population.

The 1991 census in the then differently constituted electoral wards shows that a third of the wards had almost exclusively white populations (over 97%). There was a significant EM population in only one ward (Abbey). A third of the EM population and almost half the Asian population lived in this ward.

Distribution of pupils by ethnicity in schools

In January 2005 there were:

- 49 primary schools: 67.5 % of pupils were white and 32% EM.
- 9 secondary schools: 73% of pupils were white and 26% EM.

Primary schools:

- 38 (78%) of schools had some proximity (between 80/55% white and 45/20% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed in the total primary school population.
- 5 (10%) of schools had 70% plus EM pupils
- All schools had 18% or more EM pupils.

Secondary schools:

- 8 schools had some proximity (between 86/55% white and 45/14% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed in the total secondary school population.
- The remaining one school had almost equal numbers of white and EM pupils.

Dissimilarity Index

The dissimilarity index measure comparing the residential distribution of the population by ethnicity and relevant religious category across the 17 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows:

- For the White and EM populations, a value of 27 (low level of segregation).
- For the White and Black populations, a value of 24 (low level of segregation).
- For the White and Black African populations, a value of 28 (low level of segregation).
- For the White and Asian populations, a value of 40 (approaching moderate level of segregation).
- For the White and Muslim populations, a value of 39 (approaching moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Pakistani/Bangladeshi (Asian Muslim) populations, a value of 48 (level of segregation).

The dissimilarity index measure comparing the distribution across the residential distribution of the population by ethnicity⁵ across the then 19 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows:

- For the White and EM population, a value of 36 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian population, a value of 50 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Black African population, a value of 37 (level of segregation).

The dissimilarity index measure comparing the distribution of:

- White and EM pupils in secondary schools shows a value of 25 (low level of segregation).
- White and EM pupils in primary schools shows a value of 34 (low/moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was an increase in the population generally of Barking and Dagenham across all ethnic groups.. It was particularly so for the EM population (it increased by 148%). The Black (African) population had the biggest increase within the EM population.

The 2001 census shows that there was a concentration of EM communities in a small number (18%) of wards and in one ward they were approaching the majority of the population. In all of these wards, however, there was still a sizeable white population, although it included a significant white other population. In the main areas of settlement for the EM population all ethnic minority and minority faith groups were represented, although the dominant group varied (sometimes it was Asian and sometimes it was black).

The 2001 census analysis shows that the Asian population, including its Muslim population, was more concentrated in traditional areas of settlement than the black, including the black African, population. Although no direct comparison can be made, the data available suggests that the African Muslim population is more widely dispersed than the Asian Muslim population. This is evidenced by the Dissimilarity Index (DI) measure showing a higher level of segregation (DI value of 48) between the white and Asian Muslim (Pakistani and Bangladeshi) populations than between the white and Muslim population (DI value of 39) as a whole.

The data examined suggests that there was a fall in the levels of residential segregation between the white population and the major ethnic minority groups in the period from 1991 to 2001. The alterations to electoral ward boundaries means that it is not possible precisely to identify changes in the areas where the EM population

⁵ No comparison can be made with the Muslim population in the 1991 census because no religious faith question was asked and because the Muslim faith population in Barking & Dagenham is spread across different (Asian and African) ethnic groups.

lived between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. However, the 1991 census does show that, whilst in 1991 a third of the electoral wards had almost exclusively white populations (over 97%), by the time of the 2001 census, no ward had a white population that exceeded 95%. This indicates that there was some movement in the EM population to new areas of settlement.

In Barking and Dagenham there is a low level of residential segregation between the white and ethnic minority population generally. However, there is a higher level of segregation between where the white and the Asian populations live.

The proportion of EM pupils in schools is higher than the EM population. This suggests a younger EM population than the white population and an EM population that is expanding. The level of segregation between white and EM pupils in schools reflects the low to moderate level of segregation found in segregation by residence.

LONDON

Croydon

Ethnic composition

Table 13. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Croydon

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	231,945 (70.2%)	258443 (82.4%)	-26,498
Ethnic Minority (EM)	98,642 (29.8%)	55043 (17.6%)	+43,599
Total	330,587	313,486	+17,101

The 2001 census shows that of the EM population 45.7% were black, 38% were Asian and 13% were Mixed Race. The Asian population accounted for just over 40% of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. The black population and the new 2001 census ethnic category of 'mixed race' accounted for the remainder of the increase.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in each of the 24 electoral wards were:

Table 14. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Croydon

Ethnicity	Over 90%	90/80%	80/60%	60/50%	50/40%	40/20%	20/10%	Less than 10%
White	1	11	6	4	0	2	0	0
EM	0	0	2	0	4	6	11	1

White population:

- In 6 (25%) of wards, was relatively close (between 80/60% of ward populations) to its 70% proportion in the total population.
- In 12 (50%) of wards, formed over 80% of the population but apart from one ward not over 90%.
- In 2 wards where a minority (less than 50%) of the population, it still formed over a third of the population.
- It included a white other population of 14242 (6.1% of the white population). Nearly half lived in wards with the larger EM populations.

EM population:

- In 6 (25%) of wards, formed over 40% of ward populations and thus significantly above its 30% proportion in total population.

- In 6 (25%) of wards, was relatively close (between 40/20% of ward populations) to its 30% proportion in the total population.
- 76.3% lived in the above 12 wards. It included 83% of the black population and 77% of the Asian population.
- Within the Asian population, 49% were Muslim and 47% were Hindu. Hindus and Muslims lived in the same areas.

The 1991 census in the then 27 differently constituted electoral wards shows:

- In 45% of wards, the white and EM populations were relatively close to their then 82/18% proportions in the total population.
- In 40% of wards, the white population was over 90%
- In 14% of wards, the EM population was between 31% and 45%.

Movement of population in middle-class wards

Ten middle class wards were examined which had some similarity in geographical areas between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. The EM population in these wards increased from 8.4% in 1991 to 16% in 2001. The increase in the EM population in these 10 wards accounted for 25% of the total increase in the EM population.⁶

Distribution of pupils by ethnicity in schools

In January 2005 there were:

92 primary schools: 52.5% of pupils were white and 46.2% EM.

21 secondary schools: 54% of pupils were white and 46% EM.

Primary schools

- 28 (31%) of schools had some proximity (between 70/40% white and 60/30% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed in the total primary school population.
- 24 (26%) of schools had 70% plus EM pupils. It included 3 schools with 90% plus EM pupils.
- No school had over 88% white pupils. In all schools at least 12% of pupils were EM.
- No significant difference between state and faith schools in ethnic composition of pupils.

⁶ The middle class areas examined were those represented by the current electoral wards of Ashburton, Coulsdon East, Coulsdon West, Croham, Fairfield, Heathfield, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead and Selsdon.

Secondary schools

- 8 (38%) of schools had some proximity (between 70/40% white and 60/30% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed in the total secondary school population
- 6 (29%) of schools had 70% plus EM pupils (one school had over 90%)
- No school had more than 80% white pupils

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution across the 24 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows:

- For the white and EM populations, a value of 35 (low/moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and black populations, a value of 41 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian populations, a value of 35 (low/moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Muslim populations, a value of 34 and for the white and Hindu populations a value of 37 (low/moderate levels of segregation).
- For the white other and EM populations, a value of 24 (low level of segregation).
- For the white other and white British populations, a value of 22 (low level of segregation).

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of:

- White and EM pupils in secondary schools shows a value of 38 (low/moderate level of segregation).
- White and EM pupils in primary schools shows a value of 44 (moderate level of segregation).

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution in the 1991 census across the then differently constituted 27 electoral wards between the white population and the ethnic minority population generally shows a value of 34 (low/moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the population of Croydon grew. It was characterised by a decline in the white population that was more than compensated for by the expansion in the EM population. Between 1991 and 2001, the EM population expanded by almost 80%. The increase occurred across all the main EM communities.

Whilst the majority of the increase in the EM population was in traditional areas of settlement, there was also an expansion of the EM population into other areas of Croydon.

The 2001 census shows that in most wards with large EM populations, there were both significant black and Asian communities. The black population was more concentrated in certain areas than other ethnic minority group and minority religious categories. The significant but small white other population was not residentially segregated from either the ethnic minority population or the white British population.

By the 2001 census, the EM population was residing in most areas of Croydon. The 1991 census data suggests that this pattern was already in existence. In 1991 45% of the then electoral wards had white and EM populations that were relatively close to the proportions that they formed in the total population. The changes that did occur between 1991 and 2001 censuses were:

- A reduction in the number of largely white wards (over 90% of ward populations).
- A big increase in the number of wards with EM populations of between 10% and 20%.
- Some decline in the white population in the traditional areas of settlement for the EM population.

The net result was similar low to moderate levels of residential segregation between the white and EM populations in both 1991 and 2001.

The proportion of EM pupils in schools is higher than the proportion which the EM population forms in the total population in Croydon. This suggests an EM population that is younger than the white population and which is expanding. The level of segregation between white and EM pupils in schools reflects the low to moderate level of residential segregation between the white and EM populations. However, in the case of primary schools, the level of segregation is higher and is more clearly at a moderate level.

LONDON

Harrow

Ethnic composition

Table 15. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Harrow

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	121,543 (58.8%)	147,562 (73.8%)	-26,114
Ethnic Minority (EM)	85,271 (41.2%)	52,506 (26.2%)	+32,765
Total	206,814	200,163	+6,651

The 2001 census shows that within the EM population 72% were Asian (of whom nearly three quarters were Indian Hindus) and 15% were Black. The Asian population accounted for 80% of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in each of the 21 electoral wards were:

Table 16. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Harrow

Ethnicity	Over 90%	80/70%	70/50%	50/30%	30/20%	Less than 10%
White	0	6	11	4	0	0
EM	0	0	4	11	6	0

White population:

- In 11 (52%) of wards, was relatively close (between 70/50% of ward populations) to its 59% proportion of the total population.
- Not more than 80% or less than 30% of the population in any ward.

EM population:

- In 11 (52%) of wards, was relatively close (between 50/30% of ward populations) to its 41% proportion of the total population.
- In no ward formed more than 70% of the population or less than 20%.
- The Asian population was slightly more concentrated in certain areas. 83% of Asians lived in the 15 (71%) of wards where the EM population was above 30%. This was particularly evident in the Hindu population.

The 1991 census shows that the white population did not form more than 90% or less than 50% of the population in any ward (although these wards were differently constituted). The EM population was relatively close to its 26% proportion of the population in 57% of the then electoral wards.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of the white and EM populations:

- Across the 21 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 21 (low level of segregation).
- Across the then differently constituted 21 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 22 (low level of segregation).

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of the white and Indian Hindu populations across the electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a slightly higher value of 26. The smaller Asian Muslim community was more widely spread across electoral wards. The Dissimilarity Index shows a value of 21 between the white and Muslim populations.

Comment

Between the 2001 and 1991 censuses, there was a small increase in the total population in Harrow. It was characterised by a significant expansion in the EM population that exceeded the decline in the white population.

The 2001 census shows that the EM population was distributed across all wards in Harrow. It did not form less than 20% of the population in any ward or form more than 70% of the population in a ward. It also meant that the white population had similar wide patterns of distribution. The 2001 census also shows that just over 70% of the EM population was of Asian origin. The dominant group in the Asian population was Indian Hindu. It was more concentrated in certain wards than other Asian religious categories.

From the information that can be drawn from the 1991 census, the EM population was already quite widely distributed across electoral wards in Harrow. It also meant that there were no wards which had almost wholly white populations, or wards where the white population was a relatively small minority. As a result, there were similar low levels of residential segregation between the white and EM populations in both the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

There is a low level of residential segregation between the white population and the EM population in Harrow.

LONDON

Haringey

Ethnic composition

Table 17. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Haringey

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	142,082 (65.6%)	143,467 (71%)	-1,385
Ethnic Minority (EM)	74,425 (34.4%)	58,697(29%)	+15,728
Total	216,507	202,164	+14,343

The 2001 census shows that, of the EM population, 58% was black (large communities of both Caribbean and African heritage), 19.5% Asian and 13% of Mixed Race. Within the EM population 32.7% (24371) was Muslim (both Asian and African). There was also a Jewish population of 5724. It was the second largest minority faith group. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the black population and the new 2001 census 'mixed' category accounted for 80% of the increase in the EM population.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in each of the 19 electoral wards were:

Table 18. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Haringey

Ethnicity	Over 90%	90/75%	75/55%	55/45%	45/25%	25/10%	Less than 10%
White	0	7	8	4	0	0	0
EM	0	0	0	4	8	7	0

White population:

- In 8 (42%) of the wards, was relatively close (between 75/55% of ward populations) to its 65.6% proportion of the total population.
- In no ward was the population above 90% or below 45%.
- It included a white other population of 34752 (24% of white population). It was distributed across all wards.
- It included a Jewish population of 5724 (most persons of Jewish faith classified themselves as white). 82% lived in 6 (31%) of the wards.

EM population:

- In 8 (42%) of wards, was relatively close (between 45/25% of ward populations) to its 34.4% proportion of the total population.
- In 4 (21%) of wards, formed over 45% of population but did not exceed 55%.

- The lowest proportion it formed of the population in any ward was 13.2%.
- In most wards, there was a mix of different EM groups.

87% of the black population lived in the 12 wards where the EM population was close to its 34% proportion of the total population or above. It was less for other EM groups.

The 1991 census, in the then differently constituted electoral wards, shows that the white population was not less than 50% or more than 90% of the population in any ward. The EM population was more than 10% of the population in all wards. In 56% of the then electoral wards, the white and EM populations were relatively close (between 80/60% white and 40/20% EM) to their 71/29% proportions of the total population.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the population by ethnicity across the 19 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows:

- For the white and EM populations, a value of 26 (low level of segregation).
- For the white and black populations, a value of 32 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian populations, a value of 24 (low level of segregation).
- For the white and Muslim (Asian and African) populations, a value of 29 (low level of segregation).
- For the white population and Asian Muslim population (defined as Pakistani and Bangladeshi population groups), a value of 29 (low level of segregation).
- For the white other population and the EM population, a value of 15 (low segregation) and for the white other and white British populations, a value of 20 (low segregation).
- For the Jewish and white populations, a value of 45 (moderate segregation) and for the Jewish and EM populations, a value of 64 (high segregation).

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the white and EM populations across the then differently constituted 23 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 25 (low level of segregation)*.

*Further comparisons with the 1991 census are difficult because no question on faith was asked in this census and because in the 2001 census part of the population which classified themselves as black in 1991 re-classified themselves as mixed race in 2001.

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was an increase in the population of Haringey. It was characterised by an increase in the already large EM population and a static or slightly decreasing white population.

In both the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was no ward where the white population exceeded 90%. Also, there were no electoral wards where the EM population was a significant majority and the white population a small minority. The highest proportion that the EM population formed of a ward population in the 2001 census was just over half at 52.5%. As a result there was continuing low or moderately low levels of residential segregation between the white and EM populations in both the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

The 2001 census shows that within the white population there was a significant white other (essentially European) population. It had similar residential distribution patterns to the white British and the ethnic minority populations. It is reflected in the dissimilarity index measurements which show low levels of residential segregation.

The 2001 census also shows that for the residential distribution of the population by minority faith there was a much higher level of segregation for the relatively small Jewish population (it formed just 2.6% of the total population) than for any other ethnic or minority faith group. Over 80% lived in barely a third of the electoral wards.

There is a low level of residential segregation in Haringey between the EM population as a whole and the white population. It is slightly higher for the white and black populations. The exception is for the smallish Jewish population where there is a high level of segregation from the EM population.

LONDON

Tower Hamlets

Ethnic composition

Table 19. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Tower Hamlets

Population Group	2001 census	1991 Census	Change
White	100799 (51.4%)	103767 (64.4%)	-2968
Ethnic Minority (EM)	95309 (48.6%)	57275 (35.6%)	+38034
Total	196108	161042	+35060

The largest group within the EM population was Asian (71807 in total or 75% of EM population). It was almost wholly Muslim and the largest group was Bangladeshi (91% of Asian population). The second largest group was the black population (13% of the EM population). Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the population increased by 35066. The Bangladeshi population accounted for 75% of the increase.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in each of the 17 electoral wards were:

Table 20. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Tower Hamlets

Ethnicity	Over 80%	80/71%	70/61%	60/41%	40/31%	30/20%	Less than 20%
White	0	2	3	7	4	1	0
EM	0	0	5	7	3	2	0

White population:

- In 7 (41%) of electoral wards, it was relatively close to its 51.4% proportion in the total population.
- In no ward was it above 75% of the population or below 30%.

EM population:

- In 7 (41%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 48.6% proportion in the total population.
- In no ward was it above 70% of the population or below 25%.

Electoral ward boundaries changed quite significantly between the 1991 and 2001 censuses to make the number of electors in each ward more equal. The number of wards was also reduced from 19 to 17. Under the 1991 census ward boundaries:

- In 7 (37%) of wards, the white and EM populations were relatively close to their then 64/36% proportions in the total population.
- The EM population was not less than 15% of the population in any ward.

- In two wards, the EM population was over half (more than 50%). In one of these wards, it was 73% of the population.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measuring the residential distribution of the population by ethnicity and relevant religious category across the 17 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows:

- For the white and EM population as a whole, a value of 20 (low level of segregation).
- For the white and Bangladeshi population, a value of 26 (low level of segregation).
- For the white population and Muslim population, a low value.

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the white and EM population as a whole across the then differently constituted 19 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 23 (low level of segregation). Between the white population and the dominant (Bangladeshi) group within the EM population it shows a value of 33 (low to moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was an increase in the population of Tower Hamlets. It was characterised by a significant increase in the already large EM population (by 2001 it comprised in essence half the population) and a static or slightly declining white population.

The majority of the EM population is of Asian origin and the dominant group is Bangladeshi. The 2001 census shows that the EM population, including the Asian population, was relatively widely distributed across all electoral wards. Also, there was a significant white population in every ward (it was never less than 30%). As a result, the level of residential segregation was low.

Comparison between the 1991 and 2001 censuses are difficult because of the changes to electoral ward boundaries. However, what is clear from the 1991 census is that the level of residential segregation at this time was relatively low between ethnic groups and that this process continued in the period to the 2001 census. In essence, the large increase in the EM population in the period between the two censuses took place in all electoral wards. As a result the level of residential segregation fell between 1991 and 2001.

There is a low level of residential segregation by ethnicity in Tower Hamlets.

NORTH EAST

Newcastle upon Tyne

Ethnic composition

Table 21. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Newcastle upon Tyne

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	241,684 (93.1%)	248,987 (95.9%)	-7,303
Ethnic Minority (EM)	17,852 (6.9%)	10,520 (4.1%)	+7,332
Total	259,536	259,507	+ 29

The 2001 census shows that the largest groups in the EM population were Asian (63% of EM population) and other EM groups (18%). Within the Asia population Pakistanis comprised 43%, Indians 27% and Bangladeshis 23%. 77% of the Asian population was Muslim. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the Asian population accounted for 68% of the increase in the EM population.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 14 (54%) of the 26 electoral wards, was relatively close to its 93% proportion of the total population.
- In 8 (31%) of wards, formed 97% plus of the population.
- In 2 (4%) of wards, formed around 75% of the population.

EM population:

- In just over half of the 26 electoral wards, was relatively close to its 6.9% proportion in the total population.
- In 8 (31%) of wards, it was negligible (less than 3% of ward population).
- In 2 wards, it formed around 25% of the population and in 2 other wards, it was over 10% of the population. 42% of the EM population lived in these four wards. In the case of the Muslim Pakistani population, it was 59% and the Muslim Bangladeshi population 65%.

The 1991 census shows across the same 26 electoral wards used in the 2001 census that:

- 14 (54%) of the wards) had largely white populations (97% plus).
- 10 (38%) of the wards had a white population that was relatively close to its then 96% proportion of the population.

- The EM population had significant communities in the same four electoral wards where in the 2001 census it comprised over 10% of the ward populations. 58% of the Pakistani and Bangladeshi Muslim populations lived in two of these wards.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of the white and ethnic minority groups across the same 26 electoral wards in the 1991/2001 censuses shows:

- For the white population and EM population as a whole in the 2001 census, a value of 33 (low to moderate level of segregation). In the 1991 census, it was 40 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white population and the Asian population as a whole in the 2001 census, a value of 38 (approaching moderate level of segregation). In the 1991 census, it was 47 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white population and the Pakistani/Bangladeshi population in the 2001 census, a value of 47 (moderate level of segregation). In the 1991 census, it was 60 (high level of segregation).
- For the white and Muslim populations in the 2001 census, a value of 42 (moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the total population of Newcastle was static. There was a small decline in the white population which was matched by an equivalent increase in the EM population. In 2001, the EM population in Newcastle was still relatively small.

The 2001 census shows that there were EM populations in two thirds of the electoral wards. They included some middle-class areas. There was also a concentration of the EM population in four wards and it applied in particular to the Bangladeshi and Pakistani populations. Almost a third of the wards had largely (97% plus) white populations.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a fall in the level of residential segregation between the white and the EM populations. This was due to:

- The number of electoral wards where the white population was largely white (97% plus) falling from over a half to just under a third. This shows some movement in the EM population to new areas of settlement.
- In 1991, 58% of the Pakistani and Bangladeshi populations were living in two wards (Elswick and Wingrove). By the time of the 2001 census, this had fallen to 44%. Between 1991 and 2001, 74% of the growth in the Bangladeshi and Pakistani populations was in other electoral wards.

There are moderate levels of residential segregation between the white population and the Pakistani/ Bangladeshi population and the Muslim population as a whole. There is a lower level of residential segregation between the white population and the ethnic minority population generally.

NORTH WEST

Blackburn

Ethnic composition

Table 22. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Blackburn

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	107,124 (77.9%)	115,548 (84%)	-8,424
Ethnic Minority (EM)	30,346 (22.1%)	21,062 (16%)	+9,284
Total	137,470	136,610	+ 860

The 2001 census shows that 93.5% of the EM population was of Asian origin. 94% of the Asian population was Muslim and this comprised Muslims of both Indian and Pakistani origin. The Asian population accounted for the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral wards

The 2001 census shows that the proportions the white and EM populations formed in each of the 23 electoral wards were:

Table 23. Ethnic Distribution of the population by electoral ward: Blackburn

Ethnicity	95% plus	94/85%	85/71%	70/40%	40/30%	30/15%	15/5%	Less 5%
White	11	5	0	5	0	2	0	0
EM	0	0	2	3	2	0	5	11

White population:

- In 11 (48%) of the electoral wards, it formed above 95% of the population.
- In no wards was it close (between 85/71% of ward populations) to its 78% proportion in the total population.
- 79% of the population lived in the 16 wards where it formed over 85% of the ward populations.

EM population:

- In no wards, was close (between 30/15% of ward populations) to its 22% proportion in the total population.
- 87% of the Asian population resided, and 90% of the Muslim community in the 7 (30%) of wards where the EM population formed over 30% of ward populations.

The 1991 census with its differently constituted electoral wards shows a similar position to the 2001 census. There were, however, a small number of wards (19%) where the white and EM populations were relatively close (between 90/75% white and 25%/10% EM) to their then proportions in the total population.

Distribution of pupils by ethnicity in schools

In January 2005, there were:

- 57 primary schools (34 were faith): 62% of pupils were white and 37% EM.
- 9 secondary schools (3 were faith): 72% of pupils were white and 27% EM.

Primary schools:

- 28 (49%) of schools had 90% plus white pupils. 69% of white pupils attended these 28 schools.
- 15 (26%) of schools had 70% plus EM pupils of whom 10 schools had 90% plus. 57% of EM pupils attended these 15 schools.
- 5 (9%) of schools had some proximity (between 75/45% white and 55/25% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed of the total primary school population.

Secondary schools:

- 4 schools had 90% plus white pupils. 66% of white pupils attended these schools.
- 2 schools had 70% plus EM pupils. 65% of EM pupils attended these two schools.
- 3 schools had some proximity (between 85/55% white and 45/15% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed in the total secondary school population.

There was no significant difference in the distribution of white and EM pupils between state and faith schools.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of:

- The residence of the white and EM populations across the 23 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 66 (high level of segregation).
- The residence of the white and Muslim populations across the 23 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 70 (high level of segregation).
- The residence of the White and EM populations across the 21 electoral wards (different ward boundaries) in the 1991 census shows a value of 58 (moderately high level of segregation).
- White and EM pupils in secondary schools shows a value of 60 (high level of segregation).

- White and EM pupils in primary schools shows a value of 62 (high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, Blackburn was characterised by an increase in the EM (Asian) population and a corresponding decline in the white population. The 2001 census shows that the EM (essentially Asian Muslim) population and the white population lived largely in different areas. This residential pattern was already in existence at the time of the 1991 census and by 2001 had become even more pronounced. Changes in electoral ward boundaries mean that exact comparisons between where the white and EM (Asian) populations were living in 1991, compared with 2001, cannot be made. It would, however, appear that between 1991 and 2001 the expansion in the Asian population was in traditional areas of settlement and not new areas. Further, the white population declined in the areas where the Asian population expanded.

There is a high level of residential segregation in Blackburn between the white and EM (Asian) populations.

The higher proportion of EM pupils in schools than in the total population is a reflection of the expanding EM population and declining white population in Blackburn. The high level of segregation in schools between white and EM pupils mirrors the high level of residential segregation between the white and EM population.

NORTH WEST

Oldham

Ethnic composition

Table 24. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Oldham

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	187,162 (86.1%)	197,699 (91.3%)	-10,537
Ethnic Minority (EM)	30,112 (13.9%)	18,820 (8.7%)	+11,292
Total	217,274	216,519	+755

The 2001 census shows that 86% of the EM population was of Asian origin (93% are Muslims of Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage). The Asian population largely accounted for the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions the white and EM population formed in each of the 20 electoral wards were:

Table 25. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Oldham

Ethnicity	93% Plus	92/78%	77/60%	60/50%	50/40%	40/23%	22/7%	Less 7%
White	15	0	2	1	2	0	0	0
EM	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	15

White population:

- In 15 (75%) of electoral wards, it formed 93% plus of populations. 83% of the population lived in these wards.
- In no wards was it relatively close to its 86% proportion in the total population.

EM population:

- In 5 (25%) of wards it comprised between 27% and 59% of ward populations. 88% of the Asian population lived in these five wards.
- In no wards was it relatively close to its 14% proportion in total population.
- There were some differences in the areas where the Pakistani and Bangladeshi populations lived.

The 1991 census (same electoral ward boundaries as 2001 census) shows that the white population formed over 95% of the population in 75% of the wards. The EM (Asian) population was largely concentrated in the same five wards where it comprised over 25% of the population in the 2001 census. 72% of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses took place in these five wards.

The remaining 28% of the increase in the EM population was outside the traditional areas of settlement.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the population by ethnicity and relevant religious categories across the 20 electoral wards shows:

- For the white and EM populations in the 2001 census, a value of 63 (high level of segregation).
- For the white and Muslim populations in the 2001 census, a value of 72 (high level of segregation).
- For the white and EM populations in the 1991 census, a value of 66 (high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the total population in Oldham remained almost the same. There was a decline in the white population and a rise in the EM population (predominantly Asian Muslim). The 2001 census shows that the white and Asian populations were largely residing in different areas of the town. The same position existed at the time of the 1991 census.

The reason why there was little change in the level of residential segregation between the white and EM (Asian) populations from 1991 to 2001 was because nearly three quarters of the expansion in the Asian population took place in traditional areas of settlement and only a quarter in new areas. Further the expansion that did take place within the Asian population into new areas was cancelled out by a decline in the white population in traditional areas of settlement for the Asian communities.

There is a high level of residential segregation between the white and EM (predominantly Asian) populations in Oldham.

SCOTLAND

Glasgow

Ethnic composition

Table 26. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Glasgow

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	546,359 (94.5%)	585,560 (96.5%)	- 39,201
Ethnic Minority (EM)	31,510 (5.5%)	21,091 (3.5%)	+10,419
Total	577,869	606,651	- 28,782

The 2001 census shows that of the EM population 69% were Asian (83% were Muslims of Pakistani and to a lesser extent Indian heritage) and 27% from other ethnic minority groups (majority were Chinese). Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the Asian population accounted for 71% of the increase in the EM population.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 33 (42%) of the 79 electoral wards, it formed 98% or more of ward populations.
- In 36 (46%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 94.5% proportion in the total population.
- In 10 (12%) of wards, it formed less than 90% of ward populations and, in one ward, only just over 51.8% of the population.

EM population:

- In 10 (12%) of the 79 electoral wards, formed more than 10% of ward populations. 49% of the EM population and 57% of the Asian population lived in these 10 wards.
- In 36 (46%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 5.5% proportion in the total population. Most of the rest of the EM population lived in these wards.
- In one ward (Pollockshields), it formed 48.2% of the ward population. 95% were Asian (almost entirely of Pakistani origin). 21% of the Pakistani (Muslim) population in Glasgow lived in this ward.

The 1991 census shows that the white population formed 98% or more of ward populations in 77% of the then differently constituted electoral wards. The EM population was above 10% of ward populations in 10% of the electoral wards. In the traditional area of EM population settlement in Pollockshields, it formed 41% of the population in one of the then constituted electoral wards.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of the white and EM population:

- Across the 79 electoral wards in the 2001 census, shows a value of 45 (moderate level of segregation).
- Across the then differently constituted 79 electoral wards in the 1991 census, shows a value of 55 (moderately high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the population in Glasgow declined. The fall in the white population was greater than the increase in the EM population.

The 2001 census shows that within the large population of Glasgow, the EM population was relatively small. In 2001, the EM population was living in just over half the wards in the City. In the remaining areas, the population was almost wholly white. There was some concentration in the areas where the Asian (Muslim) communities lived and, in one ward, they formed nearly half the population.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a fall in the levels of residential segregation between the white and EM populations. This took place against a background of a declining white population and an expanding EM population. It would appear, after taking into account changes to ward boundaries, that this fall in segregation levels was due to some movement within the EM population to new areas of settlement. This is evidenced by a fall in the proportion of white populated wards from over 77% in 1991 to 42% by 2001 and to the proportion of wards in the 1991 census with EM populations of over 10% remaining the same in the 2001 census.

There is a moderate level of residential segregation between the white and EM populations in Glasgow.

SOUTH EAST

High Wycombe

Ethnic composition

Table 27. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: High Wycombe

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	142,430 (87.9%)	144,780 (91.7%)	-2,350
Ethnic Minority (EM)	19,664 (12.1%)	13,134 (8.3%)	+6,530
Total	162,094	157,914	+4,180

The 2001 census shows that of the EM population 62% were Asian (of whom 86% were Muslim) and 20% were black. The Asian population accounted for most of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 18 (64%) of the 28 electoral wards, it formed 95% or more of ward populations.
- In just 5 (18%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 87.9% proportion in the total population.
- In 5 (18%) of wards, it was below 80% of ward populations.

EM population:

- In 5 (18%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 12% proportion in the total population.
- In 18 (64%) of wards, it formed less than 5% of ward populations.
- In one ward (Oakridge & Castlefield), it formed the majority (53%) of the ward population. In four other wards, it formed between 22% and 38% of ward populations.
- 59% of the EM population lived in these five wards. It included 73% of the Muslim population.

The 1991 census shows that the white population formed 95% or more of the population in 77% of the then differently constituted electoral wards and was less than 80% of the population in just two (6%) of the wards. The highest proportion that the EM population formed of a ward population was 33%.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the relevant ethnic groups across the 28 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows:

- For the white and EM populations as a whole, a value of 50 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian populations, a value of 56 (moderate to high level of segregation).
- For the white and Muslim populations, a value of 59 (moderate approaching high level of segregation).

The dissimilarity index measure comparing the residential distribution of the relevant ethnic groups in the 1991 census across the then differently constituted 32 electoral wards shows:

- For the white and EM populations, a value of 53 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian populations, a value of 58 (moderate to high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses there was a small increase in the population of High Wycombe. It was characterised by an expansion in the EM population that exceeded the small decline in the white population.

The 2001 census shows that the EM population in High Wycombe was largely confined to certain areas of traditional settlement in the central areas of the town of High Wycombe. The EM population was very small or hardly existed in the smaller urban towns and rural villages that make up the remainder of the local authority district of High Wycombe. The 2001 census also shows that the majority Asian and predominantly Muslim communities in the EM population were more residentially segregated from the white population than the EM population as a whole.

There was little change in the levels of residential segregation between the white population and the EM (majority Asian) population between 1991 and 2001. It took place against a background of an increasing EM population and a small decline in the white population. After allowing for changes to electoral boundaries, it would appear that the reason for the levels of residential segregation remaining the same was that there was some expansion of the EM (including Asian) population into new (non traditional) areas of settlement. This is shown in the reduction in the proportion of electoral wards with largely white populations (95% plus) between 1991 and 2001. However, this movement was counter-balanced by an expansion of the EM population in its traditional areas of settlement during the same period.

There are moderate to moderately high levels of residential segregation by ethnic group in High Wycombe.

SOUTH EAST

Southampton

Ethnic composition

Table 28. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Southampton

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	200,859 (92.4%)	187,183 (95.1%)	+13,686
Ethnic Minority (EM)	16,586 (7.6%)	9,669 (4.9%)	+6,917
Total	217,445	196,842	+20,603

The 2001 census shows that the largest group in the EM population was Asian (49.8% of EM population). Of the Asian population, nearly 60% was of Indian heritage and 49% was Muslim. The remainder of the EM population was made up of communities from the black, mixed race and other ethnic minority groups. The increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses was partly due to a rise in the Asian population and to the new 2001 census 'mixed' category.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 10 (62%) of the 16 electoral wards, it was relatively close to its 92.4% proportion in the total population.
- In 5 (31%) of wards, it formed between 96% and 98% of ward populations.
- In one ward (Belvois), it was significantly below its proportion in the total population (formed just 69.7% of the ward population).

EM population:

- In 10 (62%) of the 16 electoral wards it was relatively close to its 7.6% proportion in the total population.
- 25% of the population resided in one ward (Belvois). 38.5% of the Asian population as a whole and also of the Asian Muslim population resided in this ward.

The 1991 census shows that the white and EM populations were relatively close to their proportions in the total population in 73% (11) of the then differently constituted electoral wards. In the remaining four wards, there was some concentration of the EM population in two of the wards. 42% of the EM population lived in these wards. In the other two wards, the population was almost wholly white (98% plus of ward populations).

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure for the 16 electoral wards in the 2001 census comparing the distribution of:

- Residence of the white and EM populations shows a value of 31 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Asian populations shows a value of 42 (moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white population and Muslim populations shows a value of 46 (moderate level of segregation).

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution in the 1991 census of the white and EM populations across the then differently constituted electoral wards shows a value of 39 (approaching a moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, Southampton had a growing population across all ethnic groups and this was particularly so for the EM population.

The 2001 census shows that EM communities were distributed across 11 (about two thirds) of the 16 electoral wards in Southampton where they formed at least 4% of ward populations. There was, however, a concentration of the Asian and Muslim communities in the Belvois ward where they formed a significant minority of the population. It also resulted in a higher level of residential segregation of these two groups from the white population compared with the black and mixed race populations.

The analysis suggests that there was a fall in the level of residential segregation between the white and EM populations between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. This took place even though the proportion of wards where the white and EM populations were close to their proportion in the total population was lower in the 2001 census than in the 1991 census. This would indicate a rise in the level of segregation, rather than a fall. The fall in the level of residential segregation was probably due to the EM population being less concentrated in one or two wards by the time of the 2001 census and to no ward in 2001 having essentially white populations (comprising 98% plus of a ward population). The changes to electoral boundaries could also have contributed to the fall.

There is low to moderate residential segregation by ethnic group in Southampton.

SOUTH EAST

St. Alban's

Ethnic composition

Table 29. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: St. Alban's

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	120,105 (93.1%)	119,820 (95%)	+ 285
Ethnic Minority (EM)	8,900 (6.9%)	663 (5.0%)	+2,537
Total	129,005	126,183	+2,822

The 2001 census shows that the largest groups in the EM population were Asian (48% of EM population) and Mixed Race 23%. 79% of the Asian population were Muslims. The new mixed race category in the 2001 census accounted for 80% of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 16 (80%) of the 20 electoral wards, it was relatively close to its 93.1% proportion in the total population.
- In one ward, it formed almost all the population (over 98%).

EM Population:

- In 16 (80%) of the 20 electoral wards, it was relatively close to its 6.9% proportion in the total population.
- In 3 (15%) wards, it formed between 12.5% and 13.5% of ward populations. 30% of the EM population lived in these three wards.
- No single ethnic minority group was residentially concentrated in any ward.
- 82% of Muslims lived in 9 (45%) of the wards.

The 1991 census with the same electoral ward boundaries as in the 2001 census shows that the largest EM populations were in the same wards. Whilst there was an increase in the EM population in these wards between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the majority of the increase in the EM population in this period (over 70%) was in other wards.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing across the same 20 electoral wards in the 1991 and 2001 censuses the distribution of:

- Residence of the white and EM populations in the 2001 census shows a value of 26 (low level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Asian populations in the 2001 census shows a value of 32 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white population and the Muslim faith population in the 2001 census shows a value of 38 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and EM populations in the 1991 census shows a value of 31 (low to moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a small increase in the total population in St. Albans. It was almost wholly due to the growth in the EM population. However, even in 2001, the EM population was still relatively small. It was not approaching a significant minority of the population in any electoral ward. The EM community was quite widely distributed across St Albans, although there was some concentration of the Asian Muslim community in certain areas.

Whilst there was an increase in the EM population in traditional areas of settlement between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was an even bigger increase outside of these areas. It is the reason for the fall in the levels of residential segregation between the white and EM populations during this period.

There is generally a low level of residential segregation by ethnic group in St. Albans.

SOUTH WEST

Bristol

Ethnic composition

Table 30. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Bristol

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	349,530 (91.8%)	356,845 (94.9%)	-7,315
Ethnic Minority (EM)	31,085 (8.2%)	19,268 (5.1%)	+11,817
Total	380,615	37,6113	+4,502

The 2001 census shows that of the EM population 35% were Asian (of whom 70% were Muslim), 28% were Black, 26% were Mixed Race and 11% were from other EM groups. The new 2001 census 'mixed race' category and the Asian population accounted for most of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic Distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 15 (43%) of the 35 electoral wards, it formed between 95% and 98% of ward populations.
- In 16 (46%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 92% proportion in the total population.
- In 4 (11%) of wards, it formed between 68% and 85% of ward populations.

EM population:

- In 16 (46%) of the 35 electoral wards, it was relatively close to its 8% proportion in the total population.
- In one ward, it formed just over 30% of the population and in three other wards it formed between 17% and 26% of ward populations. 35% of the EM population lived in these 4 wards and it comprised all EM groups.

The 1991 census shows that one third of wards was almost exclusively white (over 98% of ward populations) No comparison of the larger EM populations by electoral ward in the 1991 census can easily be made with the 2001 census electoral ward data because of the nature of the changes in relevant ward boundaries. However, in no ward was the EM population above 30%

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of:

- Residence of the white and EM populations across the 35 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 32 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Asian populations across the 35 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 34 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and black populations across the 35 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 42 (moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and mixed race populations across the 35 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 23 (low level of segregation).
- Residence of the white population and Muslim faith population across the 35 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 41 (moderate level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and EM populations across the then differently constituted 34 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 43 (moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a small increase in the total population of Bristol. It was characterised by significant growth in the EM population which more than compensated for the slight decline in the white population.

The 2001 census shows that the EM population in Bristol was quite widely distributed across some 70% of the electoral wards in the City. The black population and the Muslim community were more concentrated in certain areas than other ethnic minority groups, such as the significant mixed race population which had a low level of residential segregation from the white population.. For the EM population as a whole, the general pattern was that, in the areas where there were more significant EM communities, they were mixed and no single ethnic minority group formed the majority of the EM population.

The comparisons that can be made between the 1991 and 2001 censuses suggest a fall in the level of residential segregation between the white and EM populations. It is difficult to identify precisely what changes were taking place between 1991 and 2001 in terms of the areas where the white and EM populations were living due to changes in ward boundaries. The available data, however, does show that, in 1991, a third of electoral wards was white (over 98% of ward populations), whereas this was not apparent by the time of the 2001 census. It indicates some movement in the EM population to new areas of settlement.

There is generally a low to moderate level of residential segregation by ethnic group in Bristol.

WALES

Cardiff

Ethnic composition

Table 31. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Cardiff

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	279,624 (91.5%)	268,152 (93.9%)	+11,472
Ethnic Minority (EM)	25,729 (8.5%)	17294 (6.1%)	+ 8,435
Total	305,353	285,446	+19,907

The 2001 census shows that, of the EM population, 47% were of Asian origin (communities of Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage and 77% Muslim), 15% were Black, 24% were Mixed Race and 14% were from Other EM groups. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the Asian population and the new 2001 census 'mixed' category were responsible for the increase in the EM population.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 20 (69%) of the 29 electoral wards, it was relatively close to its 91.5% proportion in the total population.
- In 6 (21%) of wards, it formed 96% or more of ward populations.
- In 3 (10%) of wards, it formed less than 87% of ward populations.
- It included a white other population of 7197 (2.6% of white population). There was some concentration of this population in areas with larger EM populations.

EM population:

- In 3 (10%) of the 29 electoral wards, the population ranged from 25% to 33% of ward populations. 37% of the Asian and 40% of the Black populations lived in these three wards.
- In 20 (69%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 8.5% proportion in total population.

The 1991 census shows that 54% of the then differently constituted electoral wards had white populations of 96% or more. The EM population was significantly above its then 6% proportion in the population (forming between 40% and 15% of ward populations) in 11% of the electoral wards.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of:

- The white and EM populations across the 29 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 30 (low to moderately low level of segregation).
- The white population and Asian population across the 29 electoral wards in the 2002 census shows a value of 41 (moderate level of segregation).
- The white and Muslim populations across the 29 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 42 (moderate level of segregation).
- The white and EM populations across the then differently constituted 28 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 37 (moderately low level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the population in Cardiff grew across all ethnic groups.

The 2001 census shows that the EM population was close to, or above, its 8.5% proportion of the total population in the majority (79%) of the electoral wards. In no ward was the white population less than two thirds of a ward population. The Muslim population was more concentrated in certain areas than the EM population as a whole.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the EM population continued to live in its traditional areas of settlement but also expanded to live in most areas of Cardiff. Whilst changes in electoral ward boundaries make it difficult to identify precisely what this level of movement to new areas was, the available data does show:

- That in 1991, half the wards in Cardiff had white populations of over 96% whereas, by 2001, this had fallen to 20%.
- That the proportion of wards with larger EM populations remained around 10% in both the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

As a result, there was a fall in the level of residential segregation between the white and EM populations between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

There is a low to moderately low level of residential segregation by ethnic group in Cardiff.

WEST MIDLANDS

Birmingham

Ethnic composition

Table 32. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Birmingham

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	687,406 (70.4%)	754,289 (78.5%)	-66,883
Ethnic Minority (EM)	289,681 (29.6%)	206,681 (21.55)	+83,000
Total	977,087	960,970	+16,117

The 2001 census shows that the largest groups in the EM population were Asian (65.8%) and Black (20.7%). Within the Asian population, 55% were Pakistani, 44% Indian and 11% Bangladeshi. 73% of the Asian population was Muslim. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the Asian population accounted for 66% of the increase in the EM population.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in each of the 39 electoral wards were:

Table 33. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Birmingham

Ethnicity	Over 95%	90/80%	80/60%	60/40%	40/20%	20/10%	Less than 10%
White	12	11	6	2	7	1	0
EM	0	1	7	2	6	11	12

White population:

- In 12 (31%) of wards, it formed 90% or more of ward populations.
- In 6 (15%) of wards, it was relatively close (between 80/60% of ward populations) to its 70% proportion in the total population.
- In 8 (21%) of wards, formed less than 40% of ward populations but not less than 10%.
- It included an Irish population of just over 31467 (4.6% of white population). It was widely distributed across most wards.

EM population:

- In 6 (15%) of wards, it was relatively close (between 40/20% of ward populations) to its 30% proportion in the total population.

- In 10 (26%) of wards, it formed over 40% of the population. 67% lived in these wards. For the Asian population it was 75%, for the Muslim population it was 81%, and for the black population 58%.
- These 10 wards accounted for 52% of the increase in the EM population and 62% of the increase in the Asian population between 1991 and 2001.

The 1991 census with the same electoral wards shows:

- The white population formed over 90% of ward populations in 54% (21) of the electoral wards and was less than 40% of ward populations in 10% (4) of the wards.
- The EM population formed over 40% of ward populations in 23% (9) of the wards. They were all wards which continued to have large and growing EM populations by the time of the 2001 census.

Movement of population in middle-class wards

The analysis focused on 12 electoral wards⁷ (31% of total). It was found that between the 1991 and 2001 censuses:

- The population of these wards overall declined slightly (0.7%)
- The white population fell by 5.8%, compared with 8.9% for the whole of Birmingham.
- The EM population increased by 72%. In the 1991 census, it formed 6.6% of the population. In the 2001 census it formed 11.5% of the population.
- The increase in the EM population in these 12 wards accounted for 17% of the increase in the EM population in Birmingham between 1991 and 2001.

Distribution of pupils by ethnicity in schools

In January 2005 there were:

- 76 secondary schools (including 13 faith schools): 54% of pupils were white and 46% EM.
- 305 primary schools (including 83 faith schools): 49% of pupils were white and 51% were EM.

Of the EM pupils, 63.5% were Asian, 19.6% were Black and 12.4% were of Mixed Race.

⁷ The 12 electoral wards were Sutton Four Oaks, Sutton Vesey, Sutton New Hall, Edgbaston, Harborne, Quinton, Bartley Green, Weoley, Bournville, Brandwood, Billesley and Kings Norton.

Primary schools:

- 46(15%) of schools had some proximity (65/35% white and 65/35% EM) to the proportions that white and EM pupils formed in the total primary school population.
- 69 (23%) of schools had 90% or more EM pupils. 54% of EM pupils attended these schools.
- 24 (8%) of schools had 90% or more white pupils. 13% of white pupils attended these schools.

Secondary schools:

- 23 (30%) of schools had some proximity (between 70/40% white and 60/30% EM) to the proportions that white and EM pupils formed in the total secondary school populations.
- 15 (20%) of schools had 90% or more EM pupils. 35% of EM pupils attended these schools.
- 3 (4%) of schools had 90% or more white pupils. 8% of white pupils attended these schools.

Faith schools had similar pupil ethnicity distributions to state schools.

Dissimilarity Index:

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of:

- The residence of the white population and EM population as a whole across the 39 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 55 (moderate to high level of segregation).
- The residence of the white and Asian populations across the 39 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 64 (high level of segregation).
- The residence of the white and black population across the 39 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 48 (moderate level of segregation).
- The residence of the white and Muslim populations across the 39 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 69 (high level of segregation).
- The residence of the white and EM population across the same 39 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 58 (moderate/high level of segregation).
- The residence of the white and Asian populations across the 39 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 66 (high level of segregation).
- For white and EM pupils in secondary schools shows a value of 57 (moderate to high level of segregation).

- For white and EM pupils in primary schools shows a value of 65 (high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a small increase in the population of Birmingham. It was characterised by a declining white population and an expanding EM population particularly in the Asian communities.

The 2001 census shows that the Asian population, in particular, resided in certain areas of Birmingham. Three quarters (75%) lived in the 10 electoral wards that were their traditional areas of settlement (defined as wards with over 40% EM population in 2001 census). It was more so for the Muslim population with 81% living in these areas. This is reflected in the Dissimilarity Index analysis which shows high levels of residential segregation between the white and Asian and Asian Muslim populations. The 2001 census also shows that, whilst there were areas with concentrations of black and other ethnic minority populations, they were more widely distributed across Birmingham than the Asian communities.

Between 1991 and 2001, there was significant growth in the EM population in its traditional areas of settlement and a decline in the white population. Between 1991 and 2001, 52% of the increase in the EM population was in traditional areas of settlement and for the Asian communities it was even higher, at 62%. This expansion, however, was counter-balanced by some movement of the EM population into new areas of Birmingham. It was more for the black and other ethnic minority populations than for the Asian population. It is evidenced by a decline in the proportion of electoral wards where the white population exceeded 90% from just over half in the 1991 census to less than a third by the 2001 census. Also, the twelve middle-class wards examined show a 72% increase in EM population during this period.

There is a moderately high level of residential segregation in Birmingham between the white population and the ethnic minority population as a whole. In the case of the white and Asian populations, residential segregation is more marked and at a high level. In particular, there is a high level of segregation between the white and Muslim populations.

The higher proportion of EM pupils as a whole in Birmingham schools is a reflection of the declining white population and expanding EM population in Birmingham. In secondary schools, the distribution of pupils by ethnicity is quite wide. A third of schools have some proximity to the proportions that white and EM pupils make up of the total school population. However, a third of EM pupils are also attending secondary schools where the number of white pupils is very small (less than 10%) and this contributes to a moderately high level of segregation. For primary schools, there is a high level of segregation between white and EM pupils. Half of EM pupils attend primary schools where they comprise most of the pupils. The higher level of segregation in primary schools reflects the smaller catchment areas of primary schools. The pupil population in primary schools tends to reflect the make up of the population in the areas immediately surrounding such schools. Given that there are high levels of residential segregation between the white and Asian population, this is then reflected in the ethnic composition of pupils attending primary schools.

WEST MIDLANDS

Sandwell

Ethnic composition

Table 34. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Sandwell

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	225478 (79.7%)	247483 (85.3%)	-22025
Ethnic Minority (EM)	57429 (20.3%)	42710 (14.7%)	+14719
Total	282907	290193	-7286

The 2001 census shows that of the EM population, 69% were Asian (of whom 49% were Sikh, 33% were Muslim and 14% were Hindu). The second largest group was the black population (19%). The Asian population accounted for 58% of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census across the 24 electoral wards shows:

White population:

- In 9 (38%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 78.7% proportion in the total population.
- In 9 (38%) of wards, it formed 90% or more of the ward populations. In no ward did it exceed 96% of the population.
- In 6 (25%) of wards, it was below 70% of ward populations and in two wards it was less than half.

EM population:

- In 9 (38%) of wards it was relatively close to its 20.3% proportion in the total population.
- It was not less than 4% of the population in any ward.
- In 6 (25%) of wards, it formed over 30% of ward populations and in two of these wards it formed over 50% of the population. 50% of the EM population lived in these 6 wards. For the Asian population, it was 54%.

The 1991 census across the same constituted 20 electoral wards shows:

- In 9 (38%) of wards, the white and EM populations were relatively close to the 85/15% proportion that they then formed in the total population.
- In 4 (17%) of wards, the EM population exceeded 30% of the ward populations, and in one ward, it formed over half of the population.

- In 10 (42%) of wards, the white population formed 93% or more of ward populations.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses just 11% of the increase in the EM population occurred in traditional areas of settlement (defined as the four wards with an EM population of over 30% in 1991). Most of the expansion was in newer areas of settlement or other electoral wards. This pattern applied to all ethnic groups.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the population by ethnicity across the 24 electoral wards in the 1991 and 2001 censuses shows:

- For the white population and EM population as a whole in the 2001 census, a value of 37 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian populations in the 2001 census, a value of 42 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white population and the Sikh faith population in the 2001 census, a value of 41 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white population and the Muslim faith population in the 2001 census, a value of 52 (moderate (high) level of segregation).
- For the white population and the EM population as a whole in the 1991 census, a value of 44 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian populations in the 1991 census, a value of 49 (moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a small fall in the total population of Sandwell. It was characterised by a decline in the white population which was greater than the increase in the EM population.

The 2001 census shows that in almost 40% (two fifths) of the electoral wards, the white and EM populations were relatively close to their 80/20% proportion in the total population. Further, the EM population was not less than 4% of the population in any electoral ward. These patterns point to a low level of residential segregation. However, there was also a concentration of the EM population in six, or a quarter of the electoral wards, with half the population living in these areas. The Asian Muslim population was more highly segregated from the white population than the larger Sikh community.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a fall in the level of residential segregation by ethnicity in Sandwell. This was due to a trend within most groups in

the EM population to move to new areas in Sandwell. In traditional areas of settlement, the growth in the EM population was low.

The pattern in Sandwell is of a falling level of residential segregation by ethnicity so that by the time of the 2001 census it was at the low to moderate level. The only EM group with a relatively high level of residential segregation from the white population was the Asian Muslim community, which comprised just 4.6% of the total population.

WEST MIDLANDS

Solihull

Ethnic composition

Table 35. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Solihull

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	188,725 (94.6%)	194,042 (97.1%)	-5,317
Ethnic Minority (EM)	10,970 (5.4%)	5,822 (2.9%)	+4,968
Total	199,515	199,864	-349

The 2001 census shows that, the Asian Population (70% Indian heritage) were the largest EM group. There were also black and mixed race populations. The new 2001 census 'mixed race' category accounted for half of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In all 17 electoral wards, it formed over 90% of ward populations.
- In all 17 wards, it was relatively close to its 94.6% proportion of the total population.

EM population:

- In all 17 wards, it was relatively close to its 5.4% proportion of the total population.
- The Asian population and black/mixed race populations tended not to live in the same areas.
- Within the Asian population, three religious categories (Hindu, Muslim and Sikh) were well represented. The largest of the three groups was the Hindu population.

The 1991 census shows a similar wide distribution of the EM and white populations as in the 2001 census.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution across the same 17 electoral wards in the 1991 and 2001 censuses shows for:

- The residence of the white and EM populations in the 2001 census, a value of 12 (low level of segregation).

- The residence of the white and Asian populations in the 2001 census, a value of 30 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- The residence of the white population and the Hindu population in the 2001 census, a value of 34 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- The residence of the white population and the Muslim population in the 2001 census, a value of 30 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- The residence of the white and EM population in the 1991 census, a value of 14 (low level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the EM population expanded with an equivalent decline in the white population. The EM population however, remained a small part of the overall population in Solihull. The 2001 census shows that the EM population was not concentrated in particular electoral wards but was widely distributed across nearly all wards in Solihull. The Asian population was, however, slightly more concentrated in certain areas. A similar situation on the distribution of the white and EM populations existed at the time of the 1991 census.

There is a low level of residential segregation by ethnic group in Solihull.

WEST MIDLANDS

STOKE ON TRENT

Ethnic composition

Table 36. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Stoke on Trent

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	228,107 (94.8%)	236,952 (96.9%)	-8,845
Ethnic Minority (EM)	12,532 (5.2%)	7,676 (3.1%)	+4,856
Total	240,639	244,628	-3,989

The 2001 census shows that, of the EM population, 68% were Asian (of whom 87% were Muslim and predominantly of Pakistani origin) and 17% were Mixed Race. The Asian population and the new 2001 census 'mixed' category accounted for the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows:

White population:

- In 9 (45%) of the 20 electoral wards, it was relatively close to its 94.8% proportion in the total population.
- In 7 (35%) of wards, it formed 98% and above of ward populations.
- In 4 (15%) of wards, was below 91 % of ward populations.

EM population:

- In the 4 (15%) of electoral wards, with the larger EM populations, it formed between 9.8% and 23.7% of ward populations. 59% of the EM population lived in these wards. For the Asian population, it was 70% and for the Muslim population, 75%.
- In 9 (45%) of wards, it was relatively close to its 5.2% proportion in the total population. 32% of the EM population lived in these wards.

The 1991 census shows that 55% of the then differently constituted electoral wards had white population of 98% or more. The main areas where the EM population was living at the time of the 1991 census were the same as in the 2001 census. In only one ward was the EM population above 10%.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of ethnic groups shows:

- In the 2001 census across the 20 electoral wards for the white population and EM population as a whole, a value of 42 (moderate level of segregation)
- In the 2001 census across the same 20 electoral wards for the white and Muslim population, a value of 57 (moderate to high level of segregation)
- In the 1991 census across the then differently constituted 20 electoral wards for the white population and EM population as a whole, a value of 42 (moderate level of segregation).
- In the 1991 census across the then differently constituted 20 electoral wards for the white population and Muslim population (defined as persons of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin), a value of 58 (moderate to high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a slight fall in the total population of Stoke. It was characterised by a decline in the white population which was greater than the growth in the EM population.

The 2001 census shows that the EM population in Stoke was relatively small (just over 5.0%). It was not a significant or majority proportion of the population in any electoral ward although it was approaching 25% of the population in one ward. The significant Asian population largely resided in a small number of wards (4 or 20% of the total number of wards). This was particularly the case with the Muslim communities. They resided in the same areas as in the 1991 census. This is reflected in the Dissimilarity Index analysis which suggests almost no change between the 1991 and 2001 censuses in the moderately high levels of residential segregation between the white and Muslim populations.

The 2001 census shows that just over a third of the wards (7 or 35% of the total) were almost exclusively white (98% plus of ward populations). There was a reduction in the number of these white areas in Stoke between the 1991 and 2001 censuses and the emergence of small EM populations from a range of different ethnic groups in areas that hitherto had been almost wholly white. However, it had no impact on the overall level of residential segregation between the white and EM populations. This was because the expansion of the EM population in traditional areas of settlement and a decline in the white population in these areas cancelled out the movement that did take place in the EM population to new areas.

The dominant feature in Stoke is that the EM population resides mainly in traditional areas of settlement. There is a moderate level of residential segregation by ethnic group in Stoke and, for the white and Muslim communities, it is approaching a high level.

WEST MIDLANDS

Walsall

Ethnic composition

Table 37. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Walsall

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	219,065 (86.4%)	234,697 (90.4%)	-15,632
Ethnic Minority (EM)	34,427 (13.6%)	24,820 (9.6%)	+ 9,607
Total	253,492	259,517	- 6,025

The 2001 census shows that 77% of the EM population was Asian. Within the Asian population 52% were of Indian heritage, 35% were Pakistani and 10% were Bangladeshi. 63% of the Asian population were Muslims. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the Asian population accounted for 70% of the increase in the EM population.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows **that** the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in each of the 20 electoral wards were:

Table 38. Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Walsall

Ethnicity	Over 95%	95/90%	90/80%	80/60%	60/40%	40/20%	20/10%	Less than 10%
White	8	4	4	3	1	0	0	0
EM	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	12

White population:

- In 8 (40%) of the 20 electoral wards, it formed above 95% of ward populations.
- In 4 (20%) of wards, it was relatively close (between 90/80% of ward populations) to its 86.4% proportion in the total population.
- In 4 (20%) of wards, it formed 80% or less of a ward population but in no ward was it less than half of a ward population.

EM population:

- In 4 (20%) of the 20 electoral wards, it formed above 20% of ward populations. The highest proportion it formed of a ward population was 48% in Palfrey ward.

- In 4 (20%) of wards, it formed between 19% and 11% of ward populations (relatively close to 13.6% proportion in total population).
- In 12 (60%) of wards, it formed 9% or less of ward populations.
- 79% of the EM population lived in the 8 wards (40%) where it was close to its 13.6% proportion in total population or above. 92% of Muslims lived in these wards.

The 1991 census with the same electoral ward boundaries shows that the white population was above 95% of the population in 50% (10) of the wards and less than 80% in 15% (3) of the wards.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the population **by ethnicity and relevant religious category** across the 20 electoral wards shows:

- In the 2001 census for the white population and EM population as a whole, a value of 46 (moderate level of segregation).
- In the 2001 census for the white and Asian populations, a value of 52 (moderate level of segregation).
- In the 2001 census for the white and Muslim populations, a value of 65 (high level of segregation).
- In the 1991 census for the white population and EM population as a whole, a value of 50 (moderate level of segregation).
- In the 1991 census for the white and Muslim (defined as Pakistani and Bangladeshi) populations, a value of 69 (a high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a slight fall in the total population of Walsall. It was characterised by a decline in the white population which was greater than the expansion in the EM population.

The 2001 census shows that the EM population largely resided in the eight wards, where it formed 10% or more of the ward populations. This was particularly the case with the Asian Muslim population, which was more residentially segregated from the white population than other minority ethnic/faith groups. In the remaining twelve electoral wards, the EM population was small and in some of them it was negligible, with the ward populations being almost wholly white.

Comparisons with the 1991 census show a small fall in the level of residential segregation between the white population and the ethnic minority communities by the time of the 2001 census. This took place even though the EM population grew and the white population declined because there was some movement of the EM population

across most ethnic groups to new areas of settlement. It is reflected in the fall between the 1991 and 2001 in the proportion of electoral wards with largely white populations (over 95%).

There is a moderate level of residential segregation between the white population and the ethnic minority population as a whole in Walsall. For the white and Asian (Muslim) populations there is a high level of residential segregation.

WEST MIDLANDS

Wolverhampton

Ethnic composition

Table 39. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Wolverhampton

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	184044 (77.8%)	197217 (81.4%)	-13173
Ethnic Minority (EM)	52540 (22.2%)	45090 (18.6%)	+ 7450
Total	236584	242307	- 5723

The 2001 census shows that the largest group in the EM population was Asian (64%). The majority (86%) of the Asian population was of Indian origin. Within the Asian population, 58% described themselves as Sikh, 29% as Hindu, and 13% as Muslim. The second largest group in the EM population was the black population (20.7%). Just over half (54%) of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses was due to a rise in the Asian population. The new 2001 census category of 'mixed' accounted for the remainder of the increase.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows across the 20 electoral wards:

White population:

- In 13 (65%) of the wards, it was relatively close to its 77.8% proportion in the total population.
- In 3 (15%) of wards, it formed between 90% and 95% of the ward populations.
- In only one ward was it a minority (less than half) of the population.

EM population:

- In 13 (65%) of the wards, it was relatively close to its 22.2% proportion in the total population.
- It was not less than 5% of the population in any ward.
- In 4 (17%) of the wards, it formed over 30% of the ward populations. The highest proportion it formed of a ward population was 61%. 43% of the EM population lived in these 4 wards. It included 48% of the Asian population and 38% of the black population. Just over half of the relatively small Hindu and Muslim communities lived in these wards, compared to 42% of the larger Sikh community.

The 1991 census across the same constituted electoral wards shows:

- In 9 (45%) of wards, the white and EM populations were relatively close to their then 81/19% proportion in the total population.
- In 8 (40%) of wards, the white population formed between 97% and 90% of the ward populations.
- In 3 (15%) of wards, the EM population formed over 30% of ward populations. In two of the wards, it formed over half of the population. 41% of the EM population lived in these wards.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, just 11% of the increase in the EM population took place in traditional areas of settlement (defined as the 3 wards in the 1991 census with EM populations of over 30%). The vast majority (89%) of the increase took place in newer areas of settlement (different electoral wards). It applied to all ethnic groups.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the residential distribution of the population by ethnicity and religious category across the same 20 electoral wards in the 1991 and 2001 census shows:

- In the 2001 census for the white population and EM population as a whole a value of 31 (low/moderate level of segregation).
- In the 2001 census for the white and Asian populations, a value of 35 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- In the 2001 census for the white and black population, a value of 33 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- In the 2001 census for the white population compared with the Sikh religious group, a value of 33 (low to moderate), compared to the Hindu religious category, a value of 40 (moderate) and compared with the Muslim religious category a value of 54 (moderately high).
- In the 1991 census for the white population and the EM population as a whole, a value of 37 (low to moderate level of segregation).
- In the 1991 census for the white and Asian populations, a value of 41 (moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a small decline in the total population of Wolverhampton. It was characterised by a fall in the white population that was larger than the increase in the EM population.

The 2001 census shows that, in two thirds of the electoral wards, the white and EM populations were relatively close to their 78/22% proportions in the total populations.

The EM population comprised at least 5% of the population in all electoral wards. In only one ward was the white population less than the EM population. The black population was slightly more widely distributed across electoral wards than the Asian population. Within the Asian population, the small Muslim community was more highly segregated from the white population than the larger Sikh community.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a fall in the level of residential segregation between the white and EM populations. It also extended to the Asian population. It was due to the increase in the size of the EM population almost wholly taking place in newer areas of settlement.

Historically, much of the EM population in Wolverhampton has been quite widely distributed across a number of different electoral wards or areas. This process continued between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. As a result, there is a low to moderate level of residential segregation between the white population and the EM population, with only the small Asian Muslim population showing a higher level of segregation.

YORKSHIRE

Bradford

Ethnic composition

Table 40. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Bradford

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	366,041 (78.3%)	386,015 (84.4%)	-19,974
Ethnic Minority (EM)	101,624 (21.7%)	71,331(15.6%)	+30,293
Total	467,665	457,346	+10,319

The 2001 census shows that 87% of the EM population was Asian. The vast majority of the Asian population (85%) was Muslim. The Asian population accounted for 86% of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in each of the 30 electoral wards were:

Table 41. Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward: Bradford

Ethnicity	Over 95%	95/85%	85/70%	70/40%	40/30%	30/15%	15/5%	Less than 5%
White	10	6	6	5	1	2	0	0
EM	0	0	2	3	3	6	6	10

White population:

- In 10 (33%) of wards, it formed 95% or more of ward populations. 40% of the population lived in these wards.
- In 6 (20%) of wards it was relatively close (between 85/70% of ward populations) to its 78.3% proportion in the total population.
- It was not less than 25% of the population in any ward.
- 28% did not classify themselves as White British. It reflected the migration to Bradford from Ireland and Eastern Europe. This group was fairly widely distributed across wards.

EM population:

- In 5 (17%) of wards, it formed 40% or more of ward populations. 57 % lived in these five wards. For the Asian population, it was 60%, and for the Muslim population, 63%.

- In 6 (20%) of wards, it was relatively close (between 30/15% of ward populations) to its 21.7% proportion in the total population.

The 1991 census across the same electoral ward boundaries shows that the white population formed over 95% of the population in 15 (50%) of the 30 electoral wards, The EM population was over 70% of the population in one ward and over 40% in two others.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, 64% of the increase in the EM population (for the Asian population it was 67%) was in the eight wards where in the 2001 census they formed 30% or more of ward populations. The rest of the increase in the EM population was in areas that historically had smaller EM populations, or in areas which hitherto had negligible EM populations.

Movement of population in middle-class wards

The analysis dealt with 12⁸ middle-class wards. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the overall population in these wards increased. The white population increased slightly and the EM population doubled. In the 2001 census, the EM population formed, on average, 9.8% of the population in these twelve wards. It accounted for 16% of the increase in the EM population between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

Distribution of pupils by ethnicity in schools

In January 2005 there were:

- 159 primary schools (47 were faith schools): 58.4% of pupils were white and 41% were EM.
- 28 secondary schools (7 were faith schools): 64.2% of pupils were white and 35.1% were EM.

Primary schools:

- 8 (5%) of schools had some proximity (between 70/50% white and 50/30% EM) to the proportion that white and EM pupils formed in the total primary school population.
- 59 (37%) of schools had 90% plus white pupils. 54% of white pupils attended these 59 schools.
- 35 (22%) of schools had 90% plus EM pupils. 60% of EM pupils attended these 35 schools.
- Faith schools had a similar pattern of distribution of pupils by ethnicity as state schools except there were less schools with a majority (over 70%) of EM pupils.

⁸ The 12 electoral wards were Baildon, Bingley, Bingley Rural, Clayton, Craven, Ilkley, Rombalds, Shipley West, Thornton, Queensbury, Wibsey and Worth Valley.

Secondary schools:

- 4 (14%) of schools had some proximity (between 80/50% white and 50/20% EM) to the proportions that white and EM pupils formed in the total secondary school population.
- 14 (50%) of schools had 80% or more white pupils. 74% of white pupils attended these schools. Of the 14 schools, 8 had 90% plus white pupils. 47% of white pupils attended these 8 schools.
- 10 (36%) of schools had 60% or more EM pupils. 73% of EM pupils attended these schools. 5 of the schools had 90% or more EM pupils. 36 % of EM pupils attended these 5 schools.
- Of the 7 faith schools, one is Islamic with wholly Muslim pupils. The other six are associated with Christian faiths. In five of these schools white pupils comprise between 80% and 97% of pupils.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measure comparing the distribution of:

- Residence of the white population and the EM population as a whole across the 30 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 56 (moderate to high level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Asian populations across the 30 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 60 (high level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Muslim populations across the 30 electoral wards in the 2001 census shows a value of 62 (high level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and EM populations across the same 30 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 58 (moderate/high level of segregation).
- Residence of the white and Asian populations across the same 30 electoral wards in the 1991 census shows a value of 60 (high level of segregation).
- White and EM pupils in secondary schools shows a value of 65 (high level of segregation).
- White and EM pupils in primary schools shows a value of 72 (high level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a small increase in the population of Bradford. It was characterised by a declining white population and a growing EM population. In 2001, there were areas in Bradford where the population was almost exclusively white and other areas where the EM population (mainly Asian) formed the majority of the population.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, two thirds of the increase in the EM (primarily Asian) population was in traditional areas of settlement. They were the inner city wards of Bradford and Keighley. The increase here cancelled out the increase in the EM population in other areas of Bradford. Only a third of the increase in the EM population took place in newer areas of settlement. This is evidenced by a fall in the proportion of electoral wards with largely white populations (95% plus) from 50% in 1991 to 33% in 2001. The net result was a continuing high level of residential segregation between the dominant Asian community within the EM population and the white population.

Between 1991 and 2001, half of the increase (16%) of the EM population in new areas of Bradford was in middle class areas with dominant white populations. Whilst in Bradford, overall, the white population was declining, it was more stable in middle-class historically white areas and even increased slightly between 1991 and 2001. This suggests some shift in the white population to the more middle class white dominated areas of Bradford.

The dominant pattern in Bradford is that the areas where the white and Asian (in particular, the Muslim) populations reside are often different. There is, however, a smaller trend emerging of EM and Asian communities residing in areas which hitherto had been almost exclusively white. At the time of the 2001 census though, a high level of residential segregation continued to exist between the white population and the dominant Asian population. It was less for the other smaller EM communities.

The higher proportion of EM pupils in schools than the EM population forms as a whole in Bradford is a reflection of the decline in the white population and the expansion in the EM population. There is a high level of segregation between white pupils and EM pupils in both primary and secondary schools in Bradford. It is at a higher level than the levels for residential segregation. There is only a small minority of primary and secondary schools in Bradford where the proportions of white and EM pupils have any proximity to the proportions that they form in the total school population. The majority of white and EM pupils in Bradford attend primary and secondary schools where they are the majority (often a large majority) of the pupils.

YORKSHIRE

Kirklees

Ethnic composition

Table 42. 2001 and 1991 population censuses: Kirklees

Population Group	2001 Census	1991 Census	Change
White	332,659 (85.6%)	333,393 (89.4%)	-734
Ethnic Minority (EM)	55,908 (14.4%)	39,711 (10.6%)	+16,197
Total	388,567	373,104	+15,463

The 2001 census shows that 79% of the EM population was Asian of which 89% were Muslim (both of Pakistani and Indian origin). The black and mixed race populations comprised most of the rest of the EM population. Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the Asian population accounted for 90% of the increase in the EM population.

Ethnic distribution of population by electoral ward

The 2001 census shows that the proportions that the white and EM populations formed in each of the 24 electoral wards were:

Table 43 Ethnic distribution of the population by electoral ward: Kirklees

Ethnicity	Over 95%	95/75%	75/60%	60/50%	50/40%	40/25%	25/5%	Less than 5%
White	9	10	4	1	0	0	0	0
EM	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	9

White population:

- In 9 (38%) of the 24 electoral wards, it formed 95% or more of ward populations.
- In 10 (42%) of wards, it was relatively close (between 95/75% of ward populations) to its 85.6% proportion in the total population.
- In 5 (21%) of wards, it formed between 74/58% of ward populations.

EM population:

- In 10 (42%) of the wards, it was relatively close (between 25% and 5% of ward populations) to its 14.4% proportion in the total population.
- In 5 (21%) of wards, it formed between 27% and 42% of ward populations. 52% of the EM population lived in these five wards and for the Asian population it was 60%.

The 1991 census across the same electoral ward boundaries shows:

- In 10 (42%) of wards, the white population formed over 95% of the ward populations.
- In 4 (17%) of wards, the EM population formed more than 20% of the ward populations. They were the same wards which in the 2001 census had EM populations of over 25%.The highest proportion that the EM population formed of the population in any ward was just over a third.
- In 8 (33%) of wards, the white and EM populations were relatively close to their 89%/11% proportions in the total population.
- Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the five wards with the largest EM populations in the 2001 census accounted for almost half of the increase in the Asian population.

Dissimilarity Index

The Dissimilarity Index measuring the residential distribution of the population by **ethnicity and relevant religious category** group across the 24 electoral wards in the 2001 and 1991 censuses shows:

- For the white population and the EM population as a whole in the 2001 census, a value of 45 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian population in the 2001 census, a value of 51 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian Muslim population in the 2001 census a value of 53 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and EM population as a whole in the 1991 census, a value of 49 (moderate level of segregation).
- For the white and Asian population in the 1991 census, a value of 52 (moderate level of segregation).

Comment

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, the population of Kirklees grew due to an increase in the EM population. The white population remained almost static between 1991 and 2001.

The 2001 census shows that the EM population largely resided in 15 (just over 60%) of the electoral wards. Whilst they were not a majority of the population in any ward, they formed over a third of the population in three of these 15 wards. In the remaining 9 electoral wards, the population was largely white and the EM population negligible. The wards with larger EM communities were in the central areas of Huddersfield and the towns of Dewsbury and Batley. In Huddersfield, the EM population was mixed. In Dewsbury and Batley the EM population was almost exclusively Asian (Muslim). It is

the reason for the slightly higher level of residential segregation between the white and Asian population.

Between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, there was a slight fall in the level of residential segregation between the white and EM population groups, whereas it remained at the same level between the white and Asian population groups. This took place against a background of an expanding EM (essentially Asian) population and a static white population. There was some movement amongst the EM population to newer areas of settlement between 1991 and 2001. The Dissimilarity Index measurements suggest that this movement was slightly more pronounced amongst non-Asian ethnic minority groups. The movement to newer areas is evidenced by half the expansion in the Asian population being outside traditional areas of settlement and the increase in the number of electoral wards where the EM population was close to its proportion in the total population. The movement to newer areas was, however, counter-balanced by the growth in the Asian population in its traditional areas of settlement.

There is a moderate level of residential segregation by ethnic group in Kirklees. For the Asian population as a whole and for the predominantly Asian Muslim population, there are slightly higher levels of residential segregation.

APPENDIX B

Methodology

Sample of local authorities

Twenty-five local authorities were sampled. The criteria used for selecting them were: geographic spread, traditional areas of settlement of ethnic minority communities, newer areas of settlement for ethnic minority communities, reasonable size of ethnic minority population and its make up (to permit analysis of residential settlement) and local authority areas where potential residential segregation by racial group was believed to exist.

In the 2001 census, the total population in the UK was 58.8 million. The ethnic minority (EM) population was just over 4.6 million (7.9% of the total population). A breakdown of the main ethnic groups at the time of the 2001 census (with the 1991 figures in italics) is set out in the following table.

Table 44. Ethnic minority population, 2001

Ethnicity	Number		%		% Non –White Population	
	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991
White	54,153,898	<i>51,874,000</i>	92%	<i>94.5%</i>		
Mixed Race	677117		1.2%		14.6%	
All Black	1148738	<i>890,000</i>	2.0%	<i>1.6%</i>	24.8%	<i>29.5%</i>
Other Ethnic Groups	230,615	<i>290,000</i>	0.4%	<i>0.5%</i>	5.0%	<i>9.6%</i>
Chinese	247,403	<i>157,000</i>	0.4%	<i>0.3%</i>	5.3%	<i>5.2%</i>
All Asian	2,331,423	<i>1,678,000</i>	4.0%	<i>3.1%</i>	50.3%	<i>55.7%</i>
All EM Groups	4,635,296	<i>3,015,000</i>	7.9%	<i>5.5%</i>		

The 25 sampled local authorities had a total population of 7,202,849 in the 2001 census. It comprised 12% of the UK population and 29% of the ethnic minority (EM) population. The ethnic breakdown of the population in the sampled local authorities was:

Table 45 Sample of local authorities

Ethnic Group	Number	% in sample	% of sampled EM pop
White	5845462	81.2	
Asian	869763	12.1	64.1
Black	268282	3.7	19.8
Mixed Race	143923	2.0	10.6
Other EM Groups (inc. Chinese)	75234	1.0	5.5

From these two tables, it can be seen that the sampled local authorities had a higher EM population and a smaller white population than was the case across the UK. Within the sampled EM population, there was a higher proportion of Asians and a lower proportion of other ethnic minority groups than was the case across the UK. Given the criteria for the selection of the sampled local authorities, this was to be expected.

It is a relatively large sample and, apart from setting out what is happening in the local authorities examined, shows certain broad trends. It is recognised, however, that residential patterns vary within local authorities by ethnicity and some of those local authorities that have not been sampled may have different residential patterns.

Data sources

The primary data were drawn from the 2001 Census of Neighbourhood Statistics. Specifically the data used were of the population by ethnicity and religion by electoral ward in each sampled local authority.

Electoral ward boundaries at the time of the 2001 census were used as the areas or districts in the sampled local authorities. The size of the populations in the wards varied according to the size of the local authority and its functions (some of the sampled local authorities were responsible for all local government services and tended to be larger whereas others were district authorities in county/district local government structures and tended to be smaller). The populations in the electoral wards in the sampled local authorities ranged from 5,000 people to over 20,000. Electoral wards, in theory, are meant to be based on communities. However, they are also expected to have fairly equal populations in any given local authority so that elected councillors represent similar numbers of people. This means that electoral ward boundaries do not always accurately reflect communities or homogeneous areas where people live.

Some social scientists prefer to use smaller population areas (they can be enumeration districts that make up electoral wards) when examining the characteristics of populations in particular areas as they can be more accurate. However, even the boundaries of enumeration districts do not always accurately reflect communities. They also produce large amounts of data which were not manageable for the purposes of this research exercise. Consequently, electoral ward boundaries have been used as they provided a reasonably accurate picture of the areas where the population by ethnic origin live in the sampled local authorities.

To help provide a better understanding of what was happening in each sampled local authority, 1991 census local base statistics data on the ethnic make up of the population in electoral wards were also examined. This trawl provided information on residential patterns by ethnic group in 1991 and thus permitted comparisons to be made with residential patterns by ethnic group at the time of the 2001 census. There were, however, limitations:

In fourteen of the sampled local authorities, there were changes to electoral ward boundaries between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. An examination of the census data for the purposes of this research suggests that the changes to boundaries in some local authorities were relatively minor whereas in other local authorities they were more significant. In each local authority where there were changes in ward boundaries, this has been identified and, where it could influence comparisons between the 1991 and 2001 censuses, it has been commented upon.

It was not possible to draw comparisons between the black population at the time of the 1991 census and the 2001 census because of the introduction of the 'mixed ethnicity' classification for the first time in the 2001 census. A proportion of persons who classified themselves as black in the 1991 census reverted to the 'mixed ethnicity' classification in the 2001 census. This was partially overcome by comparing the ethnic minority population as a whole in the 1991 and 2001 censuses. In doing so, it is recognised that within ethnic minority populations in local authority areas, there can be a range of ethnic groups and minority faiths with different residential patterns. Where a white versus ethnic minority population comparison had limitations in terms of comparing movements in a black population in a local authority area between 1991 and 2001, this is reflected in comments.

Analysis of data

For each sampled local authority, there is a summary setting out what has been found. They contain:

Population in 2001 and 1991 censuses by ethnicity

The ethnic classifications used are:

- White: comprising White British, White Irish, and White Other.
- Asian: comprising Asian/British Indian, Asian/British Pakistani, Asian/British Bangladeshi, and Asian/British Other.
- Black: comprising Black/British Caribbean, Black/British African, Black/British Other.
- Mixed: comprising White/Black Caribbean, White/Black African, White/Asian and Other Mixed.
- Other: comprising Chinese and Other Ethnic Groups.

The ethnic groups that are not part of the white population are collectively referred to as Ethnic Minority (EM). Where, within each main ethnic classification, there are

significant but distinct ethnic populations, information on these populations has been included and analysed.

Ethnic classification of the population by electoral ward

The broad ethnic classifications used are white and ethnic minority (EM). It indicates whether the white and EM populations as a whole are residentially segregated. It also enables comparisons to be made between the levels of residential segregation in the 1991 and 2001 censuses. Comparisons between the white population and some individual ethnic minority groups are not possible due to changes in ethnic classifications between the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

It is however, recognised:

- Within the white population groups, there can be significant groups who are not 'White British'. For example, the Irish population or a population from another European country. Where this is relevant in a sampled local authority, this is identified and its impact on the level of residential segregation analysed.
- Within an EM population, there is a number of different ethnic groups and each can have different residential patterns. In each sampled local authority where there is a significant or dominant ethnic group, this is identified and reference made to its residential pattern. Further, where it is apparent in a sampled local authority, that one or more ethnic minority groups, even though it is relatively small, has a distinct residential pattern of its own, this has been similarly identified.

In each local authority, the distribution of the population across electoral wards by ethnicity is set out. Specifically, information is provided on the number of wards which are predominantly white, the number of wards where the EM population as a whole is concentrated, and the number of wards where the proportions that the white and EM populations form in ward populations are relatively close to the proportions that they form in the total local authority population. Where specific ethnic groups are relevant to this analysis, they are identified.

In the 2001 census, a question on religious belief was asked for the first time. In the case of some religions, for example, Islam, Sikhism and Hinduism, as well as Judaism, there is a link with ethnicity and, following on from this, the areas where members of those religions reside. In the case of the Christian category, there is much less of a link with ethnicity as it covers a range of ethnic groups and a proportion of the white population do not classify itself as having any religious belief. Consequently, comparisons between where Christians live and where persons by ethnicity or other faiths reside are unreliable in terms of identifying levels of residential segregation by ethnicity.

Given this situation where, in a sampled local authority, a significant religious category linked to ethnicity is identified, this is commented upon and it can include an analysis of where persons belonging to it reside in comparison to the white population in order to determine the level (if any) of residential segregation.

Measurement of the level of segregation

The validity of using statistical indices of segregation in the analysis of residential patterns by ethnicity has been the subject of considerable debate amongst social scientists, as has the type of indices that should be used. The index which has ended up being the most recognised and commonly used is the Dissimilarity Index (sometimes also referred to as the Index of Segregation). The formula that comprises the Index largely originates from a paper produced by the American sociologists, Duncan and Duncan, in 1955. It has remained almost unchanged since that time.

The Dissimilarity Index measures the evenness by which two population groups are distributed across the component areas that make up the area which is being examined. The modifications that have been made to the Index since 1955 include attaching to the values arising from the Dissimilarity Index calculations of what they mean for levels of segregation (Massey and Denton 1993). Thus a value, or score, of 60 or more, is considered a high to very high level of segregation. It indicates that two population groups tend to live in different areas or attend different schools. A value of 65, for example, would mean that 65 out of 100 people in a neighbourhood area would have to move across neighbourhoods in order for the population to be more evenly distributed. Values of 40 and 50 are considered to be moderate levels of segregation and values of less than 30 are considered to be fairly low levels of segregation.

The Dissimilarity Index was chosen as the measure of levels of segregation by ethnicity in this research because of its recognition and commonality of use in research on segregation over many years. It was also viewed as being able to provide relevant support to the data collected on the ethnicity of the populations in electoral wards in the sampled local authorities.

In this research, the Dissimilarity Index has been used to measure in the sampled local authorities:

- The level of residential segregation between the white population and the ethnic minority population as a whole using electoral wards as the component sub areas. Where relevant the level of segregation between the white population and a particular ethnic or religious group has been used. The level of residential segregation involving the relevant population groups for both the 2001 and 1991 censuses have been measured so that comparisons can be drawn between the levels of segregation at these two different times.⁹
- The level of segregation between white and ethnic minority pupils as a whole in primary and secondary schools. Each school forms the component sub area.

⁹ For the fourteen local authorities where there were changes in electoral ward boundaries between the 1991 and 2001 censuses the component ward sub areas are not identical. The amount of changes to ward boundaries varied between local authorities. A comparison of ward population ethnic data between 1991 and 2001 does, however, provide some indication of trends in any residential segregation by ethnic group. Also no direct comparison between the levels of residential segregation between the white and Muslim populations can be made as no religious faith question was asked in the 2001 census. In some local authority areas this has been overcome by comparing the distribution of the Muslim Pakistani and Bangladeshi population in 1991 with the then distribution patterns of the white population.

The Index of Dissimilarity has two main weaknesses:

- It measures two population groups at a time. In some of the sampled local authorities there are, apart from the white population, different and dominant ethnic minority populations. In these situations, it can be an indicator of segregation, but not always a completely reliable one. The research has attempted to overcome this weakness by comparing the white population against the ethnic minority population as one group. This has been complemented, where relevant, by comparing the white population against specific ethnic minority groups to see how this varies (if at all) from the outcome of the comparison between the white and ethnic minority populations.
- It measures the relative degree of segregation but not the spatial patterns of segregation, or areas, or particular schools, where it is taking place. The research has sought to overcome this by mapping out in each of the sampled local authorities, the areas (defined by electoral wards) where the population resides by ethnicity. How the examination of schools was addressed is discussed in the next section.

Levels of segregation among school pupils

The Department for Education and Science (DFES) collects returns from schools across the UK on the ethnicity of their pupils. At the time of this research the latest returns available were those for January 2005 and they were the returns that were used. Separate returns are made for primary and secondary schools.

Six local authority areas were examined. They were Barking and Dagenham, Birmingham, Blackburn, Bradford, Croydon, and Nottingham. These local authorities were chosen because it was known from the analysis of residential patterns that it included a sample of areas with different levels of segregation. The aim was to see whether the levels of residential segregation found in the six local authorities were replicated or not in the school populations.

In the analysis of the ethnic make-up of the school pupil population in each local authority the white population and the ethnic minority population as a whole are compared. The analysis:

- Shows the number of schools in each local authority which has a majority of white or ethnic minority pupils.
- Shows the number of schools where the pupil population is more ethnically mixed and in line with the proportions that white and ethnic minority pupils form in the total school population in the local authority.
- Uses the Dissimilarity Index to measure the levels of segregation.

The analysis sets out broad trends and provides some indication of whether patterns of residential segregation by ethnicity are replicated in the ethnic composition of school populations. It provides a more reliable picture for primary schools as opposed to secondary schools. This is because primary school catchment areas for pupils are

smaller and the pupil population tends to reflect the make up of the population in the area immediately surrounding the primary school. This is less so with secondary schools. They have much larger catchment areas for the intake of pupils and in the case of some schools, it can include the whole local authority area, as well as some areas from adjoining local authorities.

It is recognised that this approach does not provide a complete picture of the relationship between the ethnicity of individual school populations and where people live by ethnicity. To do this would require:

- An analysis of the specific ethnic minority groups within each school population.
- An analysis of the ethnic make-up of the population in the catchment area of each school and a comparison with the ethnicity of the school population.
- Matching years when the ethnicity of the school population was recorded and when the ethnicity of the population as a whole was taken.

This has not been done because the amount of data involved was beyond the scope of the particular research. It is however, an area for further study. What the analysis which has been done shows is that there is some relationship between the ethnicity of school populations and the levels of residential segregation. It is apparent there where there are high levels of residential segregation, there are high levels of segregation by ethnicity amongst pupils in schools. In contrast, where there are low levels of residential segregation, there are low levels of segregation by ethnicity amongst pupils in schools.

Level of movement of ethnic minority population to middle-class areas

In three local authorities (Bradford, Birmingham and Croydon), there is an examination of the ethnic make-up of populations in middle-class electoral wards, i.e., wards which largely consist of owner-occupied housing and middle to higher income groups. The examination looked at the movements in the ethnic composition of the population in these wards between the 1991 and 2001 censuses. The comparison was limited to the white population and the ethnic minority population as a whole. The reason for this has already been discussed in the approach adopted in comparing data on population ethnicity in the 1991 and 2001 censuses.

The three local authority areas were sampled because it was known that they historically had large ethnic minority populations living in traditional areas of settlement. Consequently, there was sufficient data available to determine whether between the 1991 and 2001 censuses there had been movement by the relevant ethnic minority populations to the more affluent middle-class areas with their historically largely-white populations.

Comment

At the end of each local authority summary, comment is provided on what the data mean and whether levels of residential segregation by ethnic group exist.

Social /economic data for the sampled local authorities

A fuller understanding of the causes of levels of residential segregation by ethnicity can be obtained by an analysis of social/economic data on the population groups being examined. It will help to determine to what extent social/economic factors contributed to levels of residential segregation in any given area.

In this research, only a limited examination of social /economic data was undertaken. It was confined to an examination of the economic deprivation indices arising from the 2001 census on unemployment and populations of working age with no qualifications for the whole populations in the local authorities sampled. The level of data analysis involved in a thorough research exercise into this causal hypothesis as to the reasons for ethnic segregation, however, was beyond the scope of this particular research. The data examined do, however, show that whilst there is a link between high levels of economic deprivation and high levels of segregation by ethnicity, the position is much more varied in areas that have relatively low levels of residential segregation by ethnicity. These areas can have high levels of economic deprivation and also low levels of economic deprivation. It is a subject that merits further research.

References

- Burgess S & D Wilson (2005), 'Ethnic Segregation in England's schools', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS30: 20-36.
- Carling A (2006), *What Myth? Racial and Ethnic Segregation, the Index wars and the Future of the University of Bradford*.
- Cantle T. (2001), *Community cohesion: a report of the independent review team* Home Office, London.
- Commission for Racial Equality (1990), *Putting Your House in Order: Estate Agents and Equal Opportunity Policies and Racial Discrimination in an Oldham Estate Agency: Report of a Formal Investigation into Norman Lester & Co.* London, CRE.
- Commission for Racial Equality (1993), *Report of a Formal Investigation into Housing Allocations in Oldham*. London, CRE.
- Duncan O.B. and Duncan B, (1955), 'A methodological examination of segregation indexes', *American Sociological Review* 20:210-217, and 'Residential distribution and occupational stratification', *American Journal of Sociology* 60(5):493-503.
- House of Commons (2004), *Social Cohesion*, The Stationery Office, London.
- Massey D.S. and Denton N. (1993), *American apartheid: segregation and the making of the underclass*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
- R Johnson, Poulsen M. and Forrest J. (2006), 'Ethnic Residential segregation and Assimilation in British Towns and Cities: a Comparison of those claiming Single and Dual identities' *Migration Letters*, Vol. 3, No.1.
- Ouseley H. (2001), *Community Pride not Prejudice: Making diversity work in Bradford*, Bradford Vision.
- Race Relations Board (1972), *Annual report 1971-1972*, HMSO, London.
- Simpson L. (2006), 'Ghettos of the mind: the empirical behaviour of indices of segregation and diversity' CCSR Working Paper, 2006-06.
- Taylor C, Gorard S, and Fitz J. (2000), 'A re-examination of segregation indices in terms of compositional invariance' *Social Research Update Issue 30*, University of Surrey.

Acknowledgements

This research was undertaken and RED 21 written by Eric Seward, Associate Director of Race Equality West Midlands (REWM) and a former Director of the Commission for Racial Equality in the North of England.

Research assistance was provided by research departments at two universities familiar with race equality issues which advised on the use of statistical data to analyse levels of segregation. In particular, help was given by Dr. Tahir Abbas, Director of the Centre for the Study of Ethnicity and Culture at the University of Birmingham. Further assistance, proof reading, editorial and clerical support were provided by REWM staff: Frank Reeves, Theodora Spanou and Freda Edwards.

REWM wishes to thank the Commission for Racial Equality for providing funding for much of this research and for the guidance provided by their national research officers. The responsibility for the findings and conclusions arising from this research, however, are those of REWM alone.

REWM was established by local race equality councils to provide a strategic approach to the promotion of race equality in the West Midlands.

REWM would like to thank the officers of the West Midlands Race Equality Forum for their support.

Amir Kabal, Chair of REWM and Director of East Staffordshire Racial Equality Council.

Kenneth Rodney, Vice-chair of REWM and Chief Executive of Dudley Centre for Equality and Diversity.

Dr Derrick Campbell, Secretary of REWM and Chief Executive of Race Equality Sandwell.

Mohammed Tufail, Treasurer of REWM.

We are also appreciative of the good will and support of other members of West Midlands Race Equality Forum:

Diane Cuff, Project Manager, Telford & Wrekin Race, Equality and Diversity Partnership

Adnan Chaudry, Chief Executive, Race Equality Partnership Wolverhampton

Maxi Hayles, Birmingham Racial Attacks Monitoring Unit

Roy McFarlane, Birmingham Partnership Against Racial Harrasment

Neville Meredith, Herefordshire Race Equality Partnership

Peter Oteng, Acting Chief Executive, Worcestershire Racial Equality Council

Joy Warmington, Director, Birmingham Race Action Partnership

Arun Kang, Chief Executive, Warwickshire Race Equality Partnership

Augustine Willock, Manager, West Midlands Discrimination Advisory Service

Race Equality West Midlands

Publications list

Most Race Equality Digests and research reports are available in hard copy from the REWM office or on the REWM website at www.rewm.org.

Race Equality Digests (RED)

- RED 1 *Community cohesion, Bradford, Burnley and Oldham: four significant reports* (January 2003). (superseded by RED 16).
- RED 2 *The draft statutory code of practice on the duty to promote race equality* (February 2002).
- RED 3 *Ethnicity and religious affiliation in the West Midlands region: information from the 2001 Census* (Spring 2003).
- RED 4 *The success of the British National Party and other extreme right-wing parties in the local elections on 1 May 2003* (May 2003). (superseded by RED 19). RED Supplement: *From BUF to BNP: a concise chronology of extreme right-wing activity in Britain and of the responses to it* (May 2003). (supplemented superseded by book, *From BUF to BNP*).
- RED 5 *How should local race equality work be organised? Developing and positioning race equality organisation in the context of Neighbourhood Renewal and the statutory duty of public authorities to promote race equality* (October 2003).
- RED 6 *Race equality councils and partnerships: their strengths, needs and aspirations. The 2003 audit of resources of West Midlands race equality councils and partnerships* (February 2004).
- RED 7 *Gypsy and Traveller Communities in the West Midlands Region with information from the last five ODPM counts* (July 2004). (superseded by RED 15).
- RED 8 *Modelling the delivery of local equality services in rapidly changing circumstances. Exploring the feasibility of local equality and human rights facilities in a world of Race Equality Councils and other single equality strand agencies* (July 2004).
- RED 9 *The 2004 national audit of race equality councils and partnerships* (September 2004).
- RED 10 *Assessing the impact on local race equality work of the Commission for Racial Equality's policy for funding organisations under Section 44 of the Race Relations Act (Getting Results 2004-05)* (October 2004).

- RED 11 *Confronting the racist activities of political parties. A guide for voluntary and community organisations* (January 2005).
- RED 12 *Confronting the racist activities of political parties. A guide for local authorities* (February 2005). (superseded by RED 18).
- RED 13 *What happened to far-right political parties in the West Midlands. An analysis of the 2005 General Election results* (June 2005).
- RED 14 *Planning for multi-strand equality work. The implications for race equality councils of the Commission for Equality and Human Rights* (July 2005).
- RED 15 *Gypsies and Travellers: disadvantage and discrimination. How race equality councils and other voluntary bodies can help* (August 2005).
- RED 16 *How to make the Government's strategy on community cohesion SMARTER (specific, measurable, agreed, realistic, targeted ethnically and reciprocal)*. (September 2005).
- RED 17 *British urban ethnic group conflict and violence. Devising instruments for conflict management and resolution: initial REWM scoping exercise. Working paper 1* (February 2006).
- RED 18 *Confronting the racist activities of political parties - A guide for local authorities and elected members* (March 2006).
- RED 19 *The performance of far-right political parties in the May 2006 local council elections* (May 2006)
- RED 20 *The 2006 Audit of organisation capacity for promoting race equality* (July 2006)
- RED 21 *Ethnic residential and school segregation. A study of twenty-five local authority areas* (March 2007).

BFOREC Manifesto

Race Equality in Local Communities, manifesto to avert the collapse of the voluntary sector race equality movement and its services.

Books in Race Equality Practitioner Series

From BUF to BNP, a chronology of racist extremist and of opposition to it (April 2006), by Frank Reeves and Eric Seward (ISBN 978-0-9552586-0-2).

Race Equality in Local Communities, a guide to its promotion (January 2007), by Frank Reeves (ISBN 978-9552586-1-9).

Research reports

1. *Race equality: the significance of working with local communities. A strategic review of West Midland racial equality councils and partnerships* (August 2001, revised November 2001).
2. *West Midland Race Equality councils' development project. End-of-project report* (August 2002).
3. *Promoting race equality and community cohesion through local strategic partnerships. Report and recommendations based on research into local strategic partnerships in West Midland NRF and local management pilot areas* (Race Equality West Midlands in association with Government Office for the West Midlands and the Commission for Racial Equality, Birmingham office) (November 2002).
4. *Local authority race equality schemes 2002 and their preparation. How local authorities in the West Midlands have responded to their duties under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000* (Race Equality West Midlands in association with Government Office for the West Midlands, the Commission for Racial Equality, Birmingham office and West Midland Race Equality Councils and Partnerships) (December 2002).
5. *Community cohesion: concept, policy, implementation and theory. An introduction to recent community cohesion initiatives, with reference to West Midlands pathfinder programmes* (Race Equality West Midlands in association with Government Office for the West Midlands, the Commission for Racial Equality, Birmingham office and West Midland Race Equality Councils and Partnerships) (October 2003).
6. *Impact assessment as a means of improving race equality schemes, eliminating institutional racism and promoting race equality. Scoping the tasks involved with a view to undertaking further analysis of method and providing guidance* (Race Equality West Midlands in association with Government Office for the West Midlands, the Commission for Racial Equality, Birmingham office and West Midland Race Equality Councils and Partnerships) (December 2003).
7. *A new approach to race equality in Warwickshire* (research report undertaken for Warwickshire County Council and other partners as a joint report by TMP Worldwide and Race Equality West Midlands) (May 2004).
8. *Walsall racial equality and diversity audit, review and plan* (research and development report undertaken for Walsall Borough Strategic Partnership) (August 2004).
9. *Jigsaw Mentoring Partnership. Project Review and Recommendations*, prepared for East Staffordshire Race Equality Council (May 2004, finalised September 2004).

10. *Young people for race equality. A compendium of local youth projects promoting race equality and community cohesion in the West Midlands* (March 2005).
11. *Jigsaw Mentoring Partnership, Project Evaluation with Recommendations*, prepared for East Staffordshire Race Equality Council (February 2006).
12. *Multiple Heritage Voices, Birmingham 1950-2006*, by Ayo Bakare, designed by Bharat Patel (February 2007).

West Midlands Race Equality Forum responses to consultation

1. Response to the West Midlands Regional Assembly Strategic Review of Equality and Diversity (December 2005).
2. Response to the Equalities Review interim report for consultation (Spring 2006).

Conference reports

Combating racism through the ballot box: meeting the challenges of the racist far-right, conference organised jointly by the Commission for Racial Equality, Trades Union Congress Midlands Region and Race Equality West Midlands, 15 March 2004, at the Bescott Stadium, Walsall.

Defeating racial hatred, producing safe communities, conference organised jointly by the Commission for Racial Equality, the Home Office, the Midlands Monitoring and Networking Group and Race Equality West Midlands, 14 March 2005, at Villa Park, Aston, Birmingham.

Sexual orientation and religion or belief in the workplace and training - new regulations, conference organised by Race Equality West Midlands, funded by the Department for Trade and Industry in partnership with the British Federation of Race Equality Councils, 23 March 2005, at the Lakeside conference centre, Aston University, Birmingham (conference training materials by the London Discrimination Unit and conference evaluation report available).

Improving opportunity, strengthening society. The Governments' strategy to increase race equality and community cohesion. Report of the launch event organised by the Community Cohesion Team at the Government Office for the West Midlands, 14 July 2005, at Shimla Pinks restaurant, 214, Broad Street, Birmingham B15 1AY.

The local race equality roadmap: the way ahead, conference organised by Race Equality West Midlands, 22 October 2004, at the Hawthorns, West Bromwich, Birmingham.

Annual report

Race Equality West Midlands, *Annual Report and Audited Accounts, Strategy and Infrastructure Development Framework, Performance Evaluation, April 2005 to March 2006*, approved by the REWM board, 21 June 2006.

Race Equality West Midlands Annual Report and Audited Accounts, 2004-05, presented to the REWM board, 29 June 2005.