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Background

- Persistent ethnic inequalities in the UK (Collins, 1957; Rex, 1973; Modood et al., 1997; Jivraj and Simpson, 2015) in employment (Heath and Cheung, 2006; Nazroo and Kapadia, 2013), health (Becares, 2015; Nazroo, 2005), housing (Lakey, 1997; Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Spencer et al., 2007) and education (Gillborn and Mirza, 2000; Strand, 2007).

- Ethnic residential segregation seen as synonymous with high levels of socio-economic disadvantage (Phillips, 2006) despite the limited evidence on how they relate to each other, but what evidence exists suggests that the relationship is not clear.

- Ethnic inequalities in diverse deprived areas and less deprived areas with low ethnic minority concentrations, with severe ethnic inequalities seen in districts where ethnic minority concentration increased (Lymperopoulou and Finney, 2016).
Research Questions

- What relationships exist between ethnic residential segregation and ethnic inequality in terms of education, employment, health and housing in districts in England and Wales?
- How do the relationships between ethnic segregation and ethnic inequality differ between 2001 and 2011?
- Are districts that have experienced increasing ethnic residential segregation over the 2000s associated with the highest levels of ethnic inequalities?
Ethnic inequalities and residential segregation: What are the links?

- Interplay between international and national processes (e.g., restructuring, immigration and housing policies) and historical, political and socio-economic characteristics of places.

- The characteristics of the ethnic minority population, access to socio-economic resources, local economic and housing conditions influence both ethnic residential segregation and inequalities.

- ‘Intergroup attitudes’ and ‘intragroup solidarity’ mechanisms (Quillian, 2014).
  
  - **Intergroup attitudes:** racial threat and lower inter-ethnic group contact increases prejudices, hostility and discrimination, leading to poorer ethnic socio-economic outcomes and higher ethnic inequalities.
  
  - **Intragroup solidarity:** dense co-ethnic social networks and neighbourhood institutions facilitate information exchange, resource sharing and support, leading to better socio-economic outcomes and lower ethnic inequalities.
Methods


Absolute Ethnic Inequality
Difference between White British and ethnic minority groups in education, employment, health and housing outcomes.

Indicators of Inequality
- **Education**: % age 16-24 with no qualifications
- **Employment**: % aged 25 and over who are unemployed
- **Health**: % with limiting long term illness (age standardised)
- **Housing**: % overcrowded

Residential Segregation
Index of Dissimilarity ($D$): The percentage of the group’s total is compared to the percentage of the rest of the population in OAs within districts. The absolute difference in percentages is added up across OAs within their respective district, and then halved so that it ranges from 0% (even spread) to 100% (complete separation).

Ethnic groups: White Other, Black African, Bangladeshi, Pakistani.
Patterns of ethnic inequality, 2011

Figure 1. Plots of ranked LAD ethnic inequality scores

Note: Positive ethnic inequality scores indicate ethnic minority disadvantage on a particular dimension.
Patterns of residential segregation, 2011

Figure 2. Plots of ranked LAD ethnic segregation scores
## Relationships between ethnic inequality and residential segregation, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education inequality</th>
<th>Employment inequality</th>
<th>Housing inequality</th>
<th>Health inequality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>.388** (.045)</td>
<td>-0.068 (0.071)</td>
<td>.118* (-.298**)</td>
<td>-.245** (.100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>.215* (.405**)</td>
<td>-.157* (-.127)</td>
<td>-.412** (-.346**)</td>
<td>-.436** (-.269**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>.181 (.316**)</td>
<td>-.322** (-.215)</td>
<td>-.494** (-.396**)</td>
<td>-.222** (-.172*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>-.074 (-.425**)</td>
<td>-.222** (-.400**)</td>
<td>-.622** (-.709**)</td>
<td>-.302** (-.005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Coefficients of correlation between ethnic inequality and segregation, 2011 (2001 coefficients shown in parenthesis)
### Relationships between ethnic inequality and residential segregation, 2001-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education inequality</th>
<th>Employment inequality</th>
<th>Housing inequality</th>
<th>Health inequality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.119*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.281**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>.277*</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>0.249*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>.439**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Coefficients of correlation between ethnic inequality and segregation, 2001-11
Patterns of inequality, 2011 and changes in segregation, 2001-11: White Other

Note: Inequality and segregation scores are only shown if the district ethnic population at risk is at least 100.

Figure 3. Ethnic inequalities 2011 and segregation change 2001-11, White Other
Patterns of inequality, 2011 and changes in segregation, 2001-11: Black African

Note: Inequality and segregation scores are only shown if the district ethnic population at risk is at least 100.

Figure 4. Ethnic inequalities 2011 and segregation change 2001-11, Black African
Patterns of inequality, 2011 and changes in segregation, 2001-11: Pakistani

Note: Inequality and segregation scores are only shown if the district ethnic population at risk is at least 100.

Figure 5. Ethnic inequalities 2011 and segregation change 2001-11, Pakistani
Conclusion and implications

- The association between segregation and socio-economic inequality varies by ethnic group and district suggesting both positive and negative ‘effects’ of segregation.

- Positive relationship between residential segregation and ethnic educational inequality.
  - The nature of diversity and its recency and the differential performance of educational institutions according to the diversity of their catchments may be important.

- Negative relationship between residential segregation and ethnic inequalities in employment, health and housing.
  - This suggests protective effects with intra-group solidarity e.g. lower exposure to racism and discrimination, access to information about employment opportunities and housing opportunities and rights.
Conclusion and implications

- Segregation increased in rural areas where ethnic inequalities in housing and education were higher reflecting the absence of dense ethnic social networks, community resources and associated support.

- The relationships between residential segregation and inequality are significant even after controlling for compositional and contextual factors (e.g. ethnic density, immigration, housing affordability and deprivation levels).

- Analysis raises questions about the relationship between segregation and ethnic inequalities (‘good segregation’ for some and ‘bad segregation’ for others) the way it varies by inequality domain, and the ways it manifests across districts for different ethnic minority groups.
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