Purpose of this Paper

This paper has been designed to help inform service and policy planning. It is part of a series of seven guides to available research and statistical evidence relating to the varying needs, experiences and outcomes of different equality characteristics in Bournemouth protected under the Equality Act 2010. It provides a top-level view of this specific subject area and identifies contacts and resources for people who would like more detailed information.

Structure of this Paper

Each protected characteristic has 10 domains which focus directly on the most important aspects of life that people identify with, in terms of who they are and what they do. They are central to the Equality Measurement Framework which provides a baseline of evidence that enables the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) to evaluate progress and decide priorities.
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The Local Population of Interest

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bournemouth data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘White British’ was the majority ethnic group in 2011, representing 86% of the population in England and Wales. However, ‘White British’ and ‘White Irish’ populations decreased between 2001 and 2011, while the remaining ethnic groups increased with ‘White Other’ seeing the largest increase by 1.1 million. They were followed by ‘Indian’ with 2.5% of the population and ‘Pakistani’ with 2% which
supported other census findings that South Asian countries (India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh) continue to rank highly within the most common non-UK countries of birth (Ethnicity and National Identity in England and Wales 2011, ONS).

In 2011, 29,739 residents in Bournemouth were from a Black, and Minority Ethnic group (BME), representing 16% of the total population (2011 Census, ONS). This was above the national average, and double the BME population seen in Bournemouth in 2001. It is important to note that there are various definitions of what “BME” represents so, for the purposes of this paper, “BME” represents all groups other than ‘White British’. In addition, two new categories were added to the 2011 census ethnicity survey, ‘White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller’ and ‘Arab’ which have been included as BME groups below.

It’s also likely that a significant proportion of the ethnic minority population were studying in Bournemouth in higher education or at the many language schools that operate in the town. Bournemouth University now recruits approximately 1,200 overseas students a year and, therefore, could account for up to 4,000 of the ethnic minority population (The Minority Ethnic Population of Dorset: reflections on census data 1981 – 2011, Dorset Race Equality Council).

The chart and table below shows the changes in the ethnicity profile for Bournemouth between 2001 and 2011. The largest increase since 2001 was in the “Other White” ethnic group which includes Europeans from within, and outside, the European Union, and people of European descent from Australasia and the Americas:

### Bournemouth Ethnicity Profile: 2001 vs 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>2001 (%)</th>
<th>2011 (%)</th>
<th>Diff +/- (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All White</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All BME</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>+8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white BME</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source – 2001 Census statistics, ONS / 2011 Census statistics, ONS)
Gypsies and Travellers

Persistent inequality faced by Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils are evidenced in continued lower academic attainment. \textit{(National Literacy Trust, 2011)}. Under 10\% of Gypsy and Traveller pupils attain 5 GCSEs or equivalent at A*-C grades including English and Maths compared with over 50\% in the average population \textit{(The Equality Strategy: Building a Fairer Britain, HM Government, 2010)}.

The 2011 census added the category ‘White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller’ to its ethnicity measurements. It found that there were 57,680 people in England and Wales who fell into this category \textit{(2011 Census: Ethnic group, local authorities in England and Wales)}.

In 2011, 55.3\% of Gypsy or Irish Travellers in the UK aged 16-24 were unemployed, compared to 19.9\% of those who were White British \textit{(Annual Population Survey 2011, ONS)}.

In the same year, the majority (247) of Gypsy or Irish Travellers living in national parks in the UK, lived in the South Downs National Park which was a trend also seen amongst other ethnic groups \textit{(2011 Census: Ethnic group, national parks in England and Wales)}.

Also in 2011, the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) indicated that there were 18,383 caravans in England, with 17\% being on unauthorised land. 12\% of these caravans were on land owned by Gypsies and Travellers without planning permission. It’s important to note that, Gypsies and Travellers living in caravans on unauthorised land in England are considered homeless according to the Housing Act (1996) \textit{(Human Rights Review 2012: How Fair is Britain?, EHRC)}.

The 2011 Census identified 218 ‘White: Gypsy or Irish Travellers’ residing in Bournemouth which represents 0.1\% of the population \textit{(2011 Census: Ethnic group, local authorities in England and Wales)}. These figures were lower than expected for the area and it is possible that a number of people of Roma origin chose to classify themselves as ‘White British’ \textit{(The Minority Ethnic Population of Dorset: reflections on census data 1981 – 2011, Dorset Race Equality Council)}.

Migrant Workers

There is recognition nationally that there are difficulties in calculating accurately the numbers of international migrants.

In 2011, 7.5 million (13\%) of usual residents in England and Wales were born outside the UK. In 2001 this was 9\%. The most common non-UK countries of birth were India, Poland and Pakistan. Poland showed the highest increase, with a nine-fold rise over the last decade \textit{(International Migrants in England and Wales 2011, ONS)}.

A 2011 survey found that the more pessimistic people were about their own economic situation and their prospects for the future the more hostile their attitudes were to new and old immigrants. In addition, while Black and Asian minority groups were more likely to consider ethnicity and religion to be important to their identity than nationality, they shared many other groups’ views on a range of issues, including the national and personal impact of immigration \textit{(Fear and HOPE (n=5,054), Searchlight Educational Trust 2011)}.

In the year to June 2012, 173,000 people migrated to the UK for work which is lower but not significantly different to the 194,000 seen the previous year. The number of citizens who immigrated to the UK from EU Accession countries decreased significantly. This decline was driven largely by
fewer EU8 citizens (from Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Slovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia) which could have been caused by the expiry in May 2011 of transitional controls that applied to EU8 citizens seeking work in other EU countries. For people intending to stay in the UK for less than a year, 145,138 work-related visas were issued in the year to December 2012, a 3% drop from the previous 12 months (Migration Statistics Quarterly Feb 2013, ONS).

In 2012, there was a 3% fall in work-related visas issued in the UK, largely relating to highly skilled workers and an 11% fall in grants of permission to stay permanently. However, there was a 5% increase in grants of extensions to stay (Immigration Statistics October - December 2012, Home Office).

In 2013, a hostile political debate about A2 migrants has unfolded with concerns expressed about the potential numbers of Bulgarian and Romanian migrants coming to the UK once transitional restrictions are lifted in 1st January 2014 (Migrants Rights Network Blog 2013, more info here).

In 2010, there were 7,380 A2 (Romania and Bulgaria) and A8 (Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Slovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia) migrant workers in Bournemouth, with 69% of these from Poland. After this the largest groups were from Slovakia (6%) and Czech Republic (6%) (Work Registration Scheme 2010, The Migration Observatory).

In 2010, migrant workers in Bournemouth and Poole were mostly young (under 35), highly qualified and working in low-paid jobs: hospitality and catering, factories, care homes and administration. Approximately 50% came to Bournemouth and Poole because of some kind of family network. On average, A2 and A8 migrants lived in the area for almost three years but the majority did not have specific plans for their long-term future. Migrants’ level of English corresponded more closely with their level of educational attainment rather than the duration of their time spent in the UK (The needs of migrant workers in relation to accessing public services in Bournemouth and Poole (n=52), Dorset Race Equality Council 2010).

In 2011, 4% of non-UK employed people in Bournemouth were Polish (Annual Population Survey 2011, ONS).

Key Domains for this Protected Characteristic

Health and Longevity

Evidence from the fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities suggested that inequality in health in the UK increased with age, with relatively small differences at younger ages and larger differences emerging from the mid-30s onwards (LIFE & HEALTH: An evidence review and synthesis for the Human Right’s Commission Triennial Review 2010).

Evidence from 2010, suggested that services designed to support disabled people’s health and wellbeing frequently did not adequately respond to ethnic and religious diversity (LIFE & HEALTH: An evidence review and synthesis for the Human Right’s Commission Triennial Review 2010).

Between 1993 and 2007, the prevalence of psychotic disorders was significantly higher among black men (3.1%) than men from other ethnic groups (Key facts and trends in mental health 2011, Mental Health Foundation).

Health needs assessments carried out in Cumbria between 2009 and 2011 discovered low levels of immunisation amongst Gypsy and Traveller children. This could have been for numerous reasons including, homelessness and mobility, cultural, discrimination and low literacy skills (The Health and Wellbeing of Gypsies and Travellers, Irish Traveller Movement in Britain 2012).
In 2012, people who were from White or Indian backgrounds in the UK scored significantly higher than any other ethnic group when asked how satisfied they were with their lives today, and whether they felt the things they do in their lives are worthwhile. People from White and Indian backgrounds scored significantly higher than people from a Black or Pakistani background when asked how happy they felt yesterday. By contrast, all BME groups said they were more anxious the previous day than people from a White background, with statistically significant differences for all groups except Chinese people. People from a Black background were the least satisfied with life and felt least happy the day before the survey (Annual Population Survey 2012, ONS).

In 2010, Central Eastern European (CEE) migrants’ level of satisfaction with GP services in Bournemouth and Poole were found to be high. However, anecdotal reports from medical practitioners and others have indicated that CEE migrants often fail to register with a GP and make inappropriate use of hospital and A&E services as a result. Dental services in Poole and Bournemouth were particularly underused and levels of dissatisfaction were higher than with any other service used by this group (The needs of migrant workers in relation to accessing public services in Bournemouth and Poole (=52), Dorset Race Equality Council 2010).

In 2010/11, there was a higher rate of hospital admissions amongst some ethnic minorities in Bournemouth, compared to the rates of admissions in England as a whole for these groups. Admissions for the ‘Asian’ and ‘Chinese’ ethnic groups were just above the national average, whilst the biggest differences were in the ‘Other’ ethnic group which was over 10% higher than the national average (Bournemouth Health Profile 2012, NHS).

In 2011, “Flag 4” registrations, ie. GP registrations made by people who had previously been living outside of the UK, were particularly high in Bournemouth and have remained high since 2006 (Migration in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole between 2002-2011, Dorset Race Equality Council).

Physical and Legal Security

In 2009, ethnic minorities showed a high interest in accessing affordable housing but continued to be influenced by area restrictions due to both the fear of racial harassment, and a desire to remain in areas where they could access the services and support of their ethnic group (Understanding Demographic, Spatial and Economic Impacts on Future Affordable Housing Demand, Markkanen, 2009).

In 2009/10, a higher proportion of children from BME groups reported that they avoided travelling on buses because they were worried about their safety or avoided using a mobile phone in public all or most of the time, compared to children who said the same from the White group (Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System 2010, ONS and Ministry of Justice).

The 2010/11 British Crime Survey showed that the risk of being a victim of personal crime was higher for adults from a mixed background than for other ethnic groups. In addition, all BME groups were at greater risk than for the White group (Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System 2010, ONS and Ministry of Justice).

In 2010/11, 51,187 racist incidents were recorded by Police, a decrease of almost 18% in the number of incidents reported in England and Wales over the five year period. During the same period, there were 31,486 racially or religiously aggravated offences across England and Wales (2006/07 – 2010/11) (Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System 2010, ONS and Ministry of Justice).

Research in 2011 found that profound economic and social change had increased isolation and fear in traditionally white estates. Residents often claimed that things were better in the past (White
working-class neighbourhoods: common themes and policy suggestions, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

In 2011, overall safety of the area and proximity to good schools was becoming increasingly important to the housing decisions of younger minority ethnic households (Poverty, ethnicity and place, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

In the same year, ethnic minority homicide victims in the UK were younger than those in White groups. Black homicide victims were proportionally more likely to have been shot (27% of black victims), while White victims were more likely to have been killed by hitting or kicking (22%) than other ethnic groups (Focus on: Violent Crime and Sexual Offences 2011/12, ONS).

A 2011 survey showed that political violence was strongly opposed by the vast majority of society and that this was a ‘firewall’ between those concerned with immigration/multiculturalism and more open and extreme racists (Fear and HOPE (n=5,054), Searchlight Educational Trust 2011).

In 2010/11, Bournemouth had a crime rate of 60.5 offences per 1,000 population which was higher than both the South West (33.8 per 1,000) and England and Wales (40.2 per 1,000) (Bournemouth Local Profiles 2012, South West Observatory).

Racial hate crime in Bournemouth dropped from 31 incidents in early 2012 to 24 in early 2013. In 2011/12, 61% of racial incidents in Bournemouth and Poole were ‘non-crime’ racial incidents. The majority of victims of racial crime were White British, closely followed by people from ‘Any other white background’ and ‘Any other Asian background’. 28.6% of victims of racial crime in Dorset in 2011/12 were aged between 35-44, while 65.8% of perpetrators were strangers to the victim (Prejudice Free Bournemouth and Poole, 2012).

Education

In 2011, mothers from ethnic minorities were more likely to stay at home to look after their children, and to rely more on a network of extended family members, friends and neighbours. This was interesting as most ethnic minority children had better outcomes at primary school and beyond (Poverty, ethnicity and education, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

In the same year, over 60% of ethnic minority participants in higher education were from Black female and Asian male groups compared with 38% from the white group. However, students from some ethnic minorities were less likely to achieve a higher degree class than White British and Irish students (Poverty, ethnicity and education, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

In 2012, 27.6% of pupils in state funded primary schools were classified as being of minority ethnic origin, which is an increase from 26.5% in 2011. In the same year, the proportion of pupils of minority ethnic origin in state funded secondary schools rose from 22.2% in 2011 to 23.2% (Briefing on ethnicity and educational attainment, Runnymeade, 2012).

In 2012, Chinese students were the highest attaining group with 78.5% achieving 5 A*-C grades including English and Maths, compared to 58% of White British pupils. Indian students closely followed with 74.4%, while 59.7% of Bangladeshi pupils achieved 5 A*-C grades which was an increase of almost 20% since 2006/07. 57.9% of Black African pupils achieved this level, compared to 40% in 2006/07, with the same increase seen in the achievements of mixed White and Black African pupils. In contrast, Pakistani and Black Caribbean pupils’ attainment levels were still lower than the national average with 52.6% and 48.6% respectively achieving 5 A*-C grades including English and Maths. This, however, was still an improvement on what these groups achieved in 2006/07. Travellers, Gypsies and Roma were still the lowest attaining groups in 2012, with 17.5% of Irish travellers and 10.8% from Gypsy and Roma backgrounds achieving 5 A*-C grades including English and Maths. This was a notable improvement from 2006/07 when only 5% of these groups
combined achieved the required grades (Briefing on ethnicity and educational attainment, Runnymeade, 2012).

In 2012, Black Caribbean boys were twice as likely to be characterised as having behavioural, emotional or social difficulty compared to White British boys. In addition, the Office of the Children’s Commissioner found that Black Caribbean boys were 37 times more likely to be excluded than girls of Indian origin. If they also had special needs and were eligible for free school meals, they were 168 times more likely to be permanently excluded from a state-funded school than a White girl without special needs from a middle class family (Briefing on ethnicity and educational attainment, Runnymeade, 2012).

Whilst attainment gaps were decreasing among ethnic minorities in 2012, they still experienced unequal outcomes at university and in the workplace post school. This was particularly evident for Indian students who were far more successful at school than White students yet were more likely to attend less prestigious universities and were more likely to be unemployed (Briefing on ethnicity and educational attainment, Runnymeade, 2012).

There are over 60 languages spoken in Dorset schools with the main ones being English, Polish, Bengali and Chinese. The main issues for schools and ethnic minority and Traveller pupils relate to isolation and mobility (EMTAS, dorsetforyou.com).

2011 data from the Boscombe Children’s Centre shows that 45% of pupils in reception year at schools within Boscombe West and Springbourne were from non-White British/Irish ethnic groups. Of these, 15% were from White Eastern European ethnic groups (Boscombe Strategic Assessment October 2011, Bournemouth 2026).

In 2012, 19% of pupils in state-funded primary schools in Bournemouth were from ethnic minorities, which was well below the national average. The largest numbers of BME pupils were from the Mixed (5.4%) and Asian (3.1%) groups, while the ‘Other White’ group represented 8.2% of the student population (2012 Schools Census, Depart of Education).

In 2012, the number of students from ethnic minorities in state-funded secondary schools in Bournemouth was lower than in primary schools at 16%. Most BME pupils were also from the Mixed (4.7%) and Asian (2.3%) ethnic groups, while 6.1% were from the ‘Other White’ group (2012 Schools Census, Depart of Education).

13% of students who attended Special Schools in Bournemouth in 2012 came from ethnic minorities (2012 Schools Census, Depart of Education).

In 2013, 17.8% of the school population in Bournemouth aged 5-16 years old are from BME groups, compared to 10% in the South West and 25.6% in England (Bournemouth Child Health Profile 2013, ChiMat).

**Standard of Living**

By 2011, there was well documented evidence of an ‘ethnic penalty’ in terms of income and employment at national levels. Income poverty rates for White British people across the UK were similar but ethnic minorities were on average 40% more likely than White British people to be in income poverty. This discrepancy was higher in inner London, the North of England, and the Midlands where there was a higher concentration of ethnic minorities (Poverty, ethnicity and place, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

Indian groups were more likely than any other ethnic groups, including white groups, to own their own homes. Pakistani communities also had high levels of home-ownership. Other ethnic minority groups,
such as Black African, had very low levels of home-ownership, preferring instead to rent from the private sector, which was a trend also seen amongst Chinese and non-British white groups (Poverty, ethnicity and place, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

It is estimated that 40% of households affected by the benefit cap (introduced in 2013) will contain a person from an ethnic minority. This is in contrast to the DWP’s statistics that shows 17% of Jobseeker’s Allowance claimants, 16% of lone parents claiming Income Support and 9% of Employment and Support Allowance can be attributed to people from ethnic minorities (Benefit Cap: Equality Impact Assessment 2012, DWP).

In 2011, the majority of people in Bournemouth Council housing were White British (80.7%). Other ethnic groups in council housing were very small apart from Other White (10.7%) and White Irish (0.9%) (Housing Landlord & Parks: Equality and Diversity Report, Bournemouth Borough Council).

In 2012, BME residents (60%) in Bournemouth were more likely than non-BME residents (39%) to consider drug use and drug dealing a problem (Bournemouth Opinion Survey 2012 (n=2,756), Bournemouth Borough Council).

Productive and Valued Activities

Gypsy and Traveller communities in the UK were less nomadic in 2010. They were also working less in the traditional Traveller Economy (eg. gardening, tarmacing, drive laying etc) as greater numbers were entering the waged economy as a result of changing gender roles, access to accommodation and altering work patterns (Road to Success: Economic and Social Inclusion for Gypsies and Travellers (n=95), ITMB, 2010).

The clustering of the “ethnic neighbourhood” offers more substantial economic rewards to minority entrepreneurs, particularly those who are able to offer goods and/or services that enable migrant or minority groups to retain a connection to their country of origin or to access specialised goods that reflect the cultural preferences of that community. However, this may lead to the over-concentration of minority entrepreneurs in a limited range of activities (Poverty, ethnicity and place, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

In 2011, evidence on BME remittances was mainly concerned with the impact these transactions had on the countries of origin. A high proportion of these transactions used informal (often ethnically specific) networks and unofficial channels, such as hundi or hawala, but little was know about the complex decisions that determined what proportion of migrant workers’ incomes was sent back and the impact this had on standard of living in the UK (Social networks, poverty and ethnicity, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2011).

Compared to their numbers in the population as whole in 2011, young people from ethnic minorities were significantly under-represented in apprenticeships. Those who completed a pre-apprenticeship course were less likely to gain an apprenticeship than their white counterparts (Poverty, ethnicity and education, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

In 2011, a study identified six ‘identity’ tribes in modern British society using “Dfactor Modelling” but did not carry out socio-economic analysis. It discovered a new ‘middle ground’ of English politics made up of two tribes: “Cultural Integrationists” who were older, more prosperous, identified with the Conservative Party and were concerned about the impact of immigration on national identity and immigrants’ willingness to integrate; and “Identity Ambivalents” who were less financially secure, less optimistic about the future and more likely to live in social housing and to be working class. Muslims and BME groups were more prevalent in this group and more likely to view immigration according to
its economic impact on their opportunities and the social impact on their communities. Together they represented 52% of the population (Fear and HOPE (n=5,054), Searchlight Educational Trust 2011).

Interestingly, the same survey found that “Identity Ambivalents” were in danger of being pushed further to the Right, unless mainstream political parties tackled the social and economic insecurity which dominated their attitudes. Almost half of all voters who did not identify with a party were “Identity Ambivalents” (Fear and HOPE (n=5,054), Searchlight Educational Trust 2011).

Also, 60% of respondents thought that positive approaches such as community organisations, education, and using celebrities and key communal figures, were the best way to defeat extremism in communities. Over two-thirds of the population said they would ‘definitely’ or ‘probably’ support a positive campaigning organisation that opposes political extremism by bringing communities together (Fear and HOPE (n=5,054), Searchlight Educational Trust 2011).

According to the Searchlight Educational Trust, in 2011 the British Nationalist Party (BNP) was in decline due to their adherence to the old politics of race and immigration. Instead, groups such as the English Defence League (EDL) who were better adapted to the new politics of identity were replacing them. However, there was popular support for a sanitised, non-violent and non-racist English nationalist party (Fear and HOPE (n=5,054), Searchlight Educational Trust 2011).

In 2012, there was a significant increase in the rate of unemployment amongst ‘Mixed’ and ‘Asian’ ethnic groups compared to 2011. The ‘Mixed’ group saw an increase of 3.9%, while the ‘Asian’ group saw an increase of 6.9% (ONS Labour Force Survey 2012).

Chinese boys were among the highest achievers in UK schools in 2012, however, after university they can expect to earn 25% less than White graduates. Similarly, despite being the second highest achievers, young Indian people looking for work were 4.2% more likely to be unemployed than their White British counterparts (Briefing on ethnicity and educational attainment, Runnymeade, 2012).

At the time of writing, local data was unavailable for this dimension.

**Individual, Family and Social Life**

80% of all people said they mixed with people from different ethnic or religious backgrounds in 2010. Only 77% of Christians said this, 94% of Sikhs and Muslims, and 96% of Hindus. Ethnicity is a major driver for these differences (Citizenship Survey 2009/10 via British Religion in Numbers).

In a 2011 survey, nearly half the population in England said they do not have friends from other ethnicities. (Social networks, poverty and ethnicity, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2011).

The same survey found that for individuals, there was an advantage in living among people who shared your ethnic background because you were more likely to hear of job opportunities or be recommended for employment. However, there was also evidence that showed an area’s economic development contrasted with the diversity of residents’ connections which poses a paradox for policy-makers, planners, and communities themselves (Social networks, poverty and ethnicity, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2011).

61% of the 23 million or so households in England and Wales in 2011 had the same ethnic group in their household, compared to 9% who had multiple ethnicities in their households (2011 Census: Multiple ethnic groups, local authorities in England and Wales). Half of multiple-ethnicity households have mixed ethnicity partnerships and about a quarter have different ethnicity only between generations, such as an Irish parent with White British children (More segregation or more mixing?, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2012).
53% of all households in Bournemouth had the same ethnic group in their household, which is below the national average. 5.2% had multiple-ethnicity partnerships and 2% had different ethnicity between generations only, both well below national averages (2011 Census: Multiple ethnic groups, local authorities in England and Wales).

60% of residents in Bournemouth agree that their local area is a place where different ethnic groups get on well together (Bournemouth Opinion Survey 2012 (n=2,756), Bournemouth Borough Council).

Participation, Influence and Voice

In 2011, people on traditionally white estates felt they were not listened to by outside agencies, with consultations initially raising hopes but ultimately reinforcing disengagement. Furthermore, initiatives to promote equality amongst this group were associated with political correctness (‘PC’). They were also frustrated by the closure and lack of access to community facilities, while there was widespread perception that minorities were given preference. Blaming incomers for decline was common (White working-class neighbourhoods: common themes and policy suggestions, Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2011).

Several factors were said to have hindered integration between different ethnic groups in the UK in 2011, including lack of social contact, different values or cultures and lack of understanding (Social networks, poverty and ethnicity, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2011).

At the time of writing, local data was unavailable for this dimension.

Identity, Expression and Self-Respect

In 2011, England and Wales became more ethnically diverse with rising numbers of people identifying with minority ethnic groups. Although the proportion of the White ethnic group reduced, it was still the ethnic group that the majority of people identified with. The Asian/Asian British ethnic group had some of the largest increases between 2001 and 2011 censuses with people identifying themselves as Pakistani and Indian each increasing by 0.4 million (Ethnicity and National Identity in England and Wales 2011, ONS).

At the time of writing, local data was unavailable for this dimension.

Marriage and Civil Partnerships

In 2001, 98% of all marriages in the UK were between people from the same ethnic background. 2% of marriages were between people from different ethnic backgrounds and, of these inter-ethnic marriages, most included a White person. The most common inter-ethnic marriages were between White and Mixed race people (26%), while Mixed race people were most likely to be married to someone outside their ethnic group (78%). People from South Asian backgrounds were least likely of all minority ethnic groups to marry someone from a different ethnic group. In addition to cultural and racial differences this could be explained by the fact that people from South Asian backgrounds generally have different religions to people from other ethnic groups which may explain the low inter-marriage rate. In 2001, White people were least likely to marry outside of their group, only 1% of men and women had done so (Focus on Ethnicity & Identity, ONS 2001).

The Government does not envisage an adverse impact on any marital or civil partnership groups in the UK following the introduction of benefit caps in 2013. However, it is not possible to give any accurate assessment of the impact as the DWP does not collect information on the marital or civil partnership status of claimants (Benefit Cap: Equality Impact Assessment 2012, DWP).

At the time of writing, local data was unavailable for this dimension.
Pregnancy and Maternity

In 2004, ethnic minority women were twice as likely to die during pregnancy, or immediately after birth, as white women in the UK. Over one fifth of mothers who died during this period received poor quality maternity care, and ethnic minority women were more likely to receive sub-standard care than women from other groups (Experiences of Maternity Services: Muslim Women’s Perspectives, The Maternity Alliance, 2004).

A survey in 2009 discovered that socially conservative communities tended to have fewer teenage pregnancies and ethnic communities more heavily represented in neighbourhoods of concentrated social disadvantage were those most at risk of teenage pregnancies. Reasons for this included a web of 'cultural' and parental restraints on embarking on sexual experiences early; different attitudes to the use of contraceptives; peer pressures in certain disadvantaged neighbourhoods; and different attitudes towards relationships and monogamy (Reducing teenage pregnancies and their negative effects in the UK, Lemos & Crane 2009).

In 2011, fertility rates for non-UK born women were higher than UK born women, with the non-UK born Total Fertility Rate (TFR) being 0.4 births per woman higher but the differences were narrowing over time. Poland was the most common non-UK maternal country of birth in the UK, with approximately 23,000 births. In 2011, the top five non-UK born mothers' countries by number of births were Poland, Pakistan, India, Bangladesh and Nigeria (Childbearing among UK born and non-UK born women living in the UK, ONS, 2012).

In 2012, the vast majority of women in the UK booked antenatal care within the first 12 weeks of pregnancy. The proportion was substantially lower in some BME groups. The main barriers to early initiation of antenatal care for these groups included the complexity of the UK healthcare system; lack of knowledge about available services and the purpose and importance of antenatal care; lack of resources to travel to services outside the local community; women’s perception that they will not be treated respectfully by staff; and failure to provide professional interpreters when needed amongst others (Increasing the early initiation of antenatal care by Black and Minority Ethnic women in the UK, University of Oxford, 2012).

At the time of writing, local data was unavailable for this dimension.

Sources of Information Regarding Ethnicity:

The following section provides links to local reports and datasets that offer further insight into the diverse nature of the varying ethnicity groups in Bournemouth. However, it should be noted that due to population sizes and inconsistent data monitoring, the information available at local level is often limited. For more robust, national sources of equality information, please refer to the Local Government Association ‘Equality Evidence Base’, and the Equality and Human Rights Commission ‘Review of Equality Statistics’. If you are aware of any further local information please contact statistics@bournemouth.gov.uk.

Please note that a more detailed analysis of all subject areas will be possible once relevant 2011 Census cross tabulation data is made available by the Office for National Statistics.

Reports Providing Specific Information on Ethnicity


**Prejudice Free Bournemouth and Poole** – a breakdown of hate crime and prejudice incidents in the region between October 2011 and September 2012. Available [here](#).

**Place Survey 2008, BME report** – Report on a focus group held with 9 Bournemouth residents from a range of BME communities, discussing differences highlighted in the Place Survey results. Available [here](#).

**Reports Which Contain Analysis of Information By Ethnicity**

**Bournemouth Health Profile 2012** – NHS report on health in the area. Available [here](#).

**Bournemouth Opinion Survey 2012** – a summary of residents’ attitudes to a range of issues on life in Bournemouth. Available [here](#).

**Housing Landlord & Parks: Equality and Diversity Report 2011-2012** – a report by Bournemouth Borough Council on council housing tenants by age, ethnicity, disability etc. Available [here](#).

**Place Survey, 2008** – A statutory survey carried out by all Local Authorities every 2 years, monitoring residents’ perceptions of the area, and collecting data on which a number of national indicators are set. Available [here](#).

**Reports on Ethnicity Related Services**

**What are the needs of migrant workers in relation to accessing public services in Bournemouth and Poole?** – outlines the results of a short survey with the migrant communities in Bournemouth and Poole about accessing public services. Available [here](#).

**Local Ethnicity Relevant Datasets and Indicators**

**Joseph Rowntree Foundation** - Independent development and social research charity, supporting a wide programme of research and development projects in housing, social care and social issues. [http://www.jrf.org.uk/](http://www.jrf.org.uk/)

**Knowledge Base, Equality South West Data Tool** - collates and disaggregates (where possible), by local area and by equality characteristic and socio-economic status, existing data from a wide range of reliable and widely used national data sets, and is capable of detailed interrogation and analysis for a range of local equality purposes. Available [here](#).

**Neighbourhood Statistics** – Allows you to find detailed statistics within specific geographic areas e.g. Local Authority, Ward, Super Output Area. [http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/](http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/)

**Nomisweb** – service provided by the Office for National Statistics providing detailed and up-to-date UK labour market statistics. [https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/](https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/)

This paper is one in a series of seven profiling the protected Equality Characteristics produced by the Corporate Research Team, Borough of Poole, in co-operation with the Research & Information Team, Bournemouth. These reports have been produced in line with LGA guidance (2012) on measuring equality at a local level. To view the papers on Age, Gender, Disability, Religion/Belief, Sexual Orientation and Social Inequality [insert link for profiles].

For more information on research and consultation reports for Bournemouth please contact the Research & Information team on (01202) 454684 or email statistics@bournemouth.gov.uk.