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Executive summary

Aims and scope

This review was commissioned in 2001 to provide an independent analysis of key materials and findings relevant to policy concerns. The report presents an overview of the research record and available data in the field of housing, ‘race’ and ethnicity. It also identifies important topics that might deserve further investigation.

As well as referring to general data, we comment on a wide range of very specific housing studies and reports, some of which can be noted as exemplars of useful investigatory practice or constructive research innovation.

The review highlights both strengths and gaps in the evidence base. It will help to inform the development of the research agenda for government, and it is hoped that other research funders and policy makers and researchers will also find it useful.

The review has not directly covered asylum seekers, refugees, gypsies or travellers, although it has drawn upon some writings that include them.

Most of the sources cited relate to England in particular, but many of the issues discussed have wider relevance. The various sections of the report can be read fairly independently of each other, so as to provide readers with convenient points of entry to key research contexts and topics.

Demography and settlement patterns

In 2000 people from black minority ethnic groups made up just over 7% of the total population of Great Britain. * The overwhelming majority, 97%, live in England, with 2% in Scotland and 1% in Wales. About half of minority ethnic group people are of Indian sub-continent origins (Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi). Those referred to in data sources as being of Black origin, (particularly from the Caribbean and Africa), make up nearly a third of the total minority ethnic population. There is also a substantial ‘Other’ category covering people whose origins connect with a very wide range of countries.1

Minority ethnic groups are concentrated in certain regions. London has the highest proportion. Other regions with high concentrations are the West Midlands, Yorkshire and Humberside, and the North-West. (See Section 2.1.)

The small sizes of the populations create problems for sample surveys, which are an important source for understanding changes affecting all groups. Statistics can usually be presented only for the largest population groups and may have serious ‘health warnings’ because of relatively small sample sizes. There is relatively little research or data about particularly small or ‘new’ migrant groups.

* 2001 Census data published since the time of writing shows a higher percentage, 8% of the total population of Great Britain.
Housing conditions and experiences

Data from national survey sources indicate considerable diversity between ethnic groups.

On a number of housing and other indicators, people of Indian origin appear to be doing as well as white people. They are more likely to be owner-occupiers (81% compared with 71% for whites), and to have somewhat higher average weekly incomes of head of household and partner (£505 per week compared with £488 for whites).

However, they are more likely than white people to be:

- overcrowded (7% compared with 2% one or more below the bedroom standard, an indicator of occupation density that relates the number of bedrooms to the age, sex, marital status and relationship of household members);
- to live in poor housing conditions, e.g. unfitness, substantial levels of disrepair, need for essential modernisation, (19% compared with 14%), and poor living conditions, e.g. local concentrations of housing in substantial disrepair, vacant/derelict housing or sites, other forms of neglect or misuse (12% compared with 6%);
- to be dissatisfied with their home (33% compared with 11%);
- and to want to move (45% compared with 35%).

(See Sections 2.5-2.7.)

People of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin are particularly disadvantaged compared with white people. They are less likely to be owner-occupiers (60% compared with 71% for whites), and more likely to have very low average weekly incomes of head of household and partner (£296 compared with £488) they had the lowest incomes on average of any of the main ethnic groups. They are also particularly likely:

- to be overcrowded (23% compared with 2% for whites one or more below the bedroom standard);
- to live in poor housing conditions (35% compared with 14%) and poor living conditions (30% compared with 6%);
- to be dissatisfied with their home (42% compared with 11%);
- and to want to move (52% compared with 35%).

(See Sections 2.5-2.7.)

People of Black origin are also relatively disadvantaged compared with white and Indian households, but apparently less so than Pakistani and Bangladeshi people. They are the group least likely to be owner-occupiers (39% compared with 71% for whites), and have low average weekly incomes of head of household and partner (£355 compared with £488). They are more likely:

- to be overcrowded (9% compared with 2% for whites one or more below the bedroom standard);
• to live in poor housing conditions (23% compared with 14%) and poor living conditions (18% compared with 6%);

• to be dissatisfied with their home (19% compared with 11%);

• and to want to move (52% compared with 35%).

(See Sections 2.5-2.7.)

HOMELESSNESS

The literature reflects a lack of reliable data on homelessness experienced by different ethnic groups, and much of the limited research evidence concentrates on London. It has been indicated that Black heads of household were three times more likely to have experienced homelessness compared with whites, but that Indians, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis were less likely. Members of black and minority ethnic groups appear less likely to be homeless on the street and therefore tend to be less visible. Young black and minority ethnic homeless people were less likely than whites to have slept rough and more likely to have stayed with friends and relatives. Members of black and minority ethnic groups make up 22% of households accepted by local authorities as homeless and are therefore considerably over-represented. (See Section 4.)

RACIST HARASSMENT

Members of minority ethnic groups were four times more likely to see racist harassment as a serious problem in their area than whites. The research evidence suggests that harassment associated with residence remains widespread and can have a negative effect on household choice of residential area. Studies have highlighted problems of the Asian and African/Caribbean communities generally and of both black women and of white women with black children or children of mixed heritage. Researchers have criticised the effectiveness of responses to racist harassment and the take-up of good practice on tackling it by official bodies, including social landlords. (See Section 4.)

SEGREGATION

After five decades of settlement, Britain’s black minority ethnic population is still disproportionately concentrated in the poorest urban, usually inner city, locations and in the most deprived housing. The separation of groups living in different localities in itself is not necessarily a bad thing. It is the continuing association between black minority ethnic segregation and deprivation that is problematic. Clustering has many positive attributes, which are evident through extended social and cultural relations, social support, a sense of belonging and well developed community infrastructures. There is a need to widen the housing choices of minority ethnic groups, both through providing support for those who wish to move away from the established ethnic cluster, and by widening housing options within the ethnic cluster for those who wish to stay. (See Section 5.)
HOUSING NEEDS STUDIES

Housing needs studies serve to highlight the diverse needs of the different communities and the commonality of housing experiences amongst some groups. All communities share the desire to live in areas where there are other members of their community and cultural and religious facilities close by and this becomes particularly important in later life. Common problems are affordability in terms of housing and access to social housing for some groups, while overcrowding and poor housing conditions are particularly important for some groups, e.g. Pakistanis and Bangladeshis. Because of the public policy and investment focus on social rented housing rather than the private sectors, there may be too few means for policy makers to respond to housing and allied disadvantages for some of the communities whose needs are being researched. (See Section 6.)

DISABILITY, AGE AND GENDER

Different minority ethnic communities have differing and changing expectations about both service provision and the changing structures of family life, yet the whole area of aspirations and expectations of older people from minority ethnic groups is relatively unexplored by researchers. The circumstances and perspectives of children in minority ethnic households are another under-researched area. It is believed that stereotypes related to ‘race’ or ethnicity have meant that practitioners have sometimes over-estimated the preparedness of service users’ relatives and social networks to provide informal care, and have been insensitive to members of minority ethnic communities. It seems likely that in many minority ethnic communities there is inadequate knowledge amongst potential users about the available official services, and that cultural insensitivity in provision remains a barrier. (See Section 7.)

HOUSING PREFERENCES AND PATHWAYS

Most studies on preferences of black minority ethnic communities have tended to show the long-term wish for owner-occupancy, sometimes coupled with negative perceptions about social rented housing. Much housing research or local consultation is of an ‘ad hoc’ character, aimed at uncovering present experiences or conditions, and rarely being able to take a longer view. There may be generational as well as ethnic group differences in propensity to migrate out of established areas of settlement. Caution is required on expressed tenure preferences, which may be amended or revised in the light of specific circumstances, and could change over time. (See Section 8.)

REGENERATION AND NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL

There is a significant lack of information about minority ethnic groups and about the impact of regeneration policies and programmes on them. Researchers have argued in the past that renewal or regeneration investments have not led to enough explicit or lasting benefits for minority ethnic communities, that targeting was poor or ad hoc, that funding was too short-term or precarious, and that black-led organisations were not accorded a sufficient role. Targeting resources on council estates has been criticised as side-stepping the problems of deprivation because the most disadvantaged areas for minority ethnic groups are of mixed tenure. Although it is difficult to appraise the current situation comprehensively, there still seems to be room for improving achievements at the implementation level. (See Section 9.)
POSITIVE NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGIES

In view of concerns about segregation, researchers have studied the issue of movement by minority ethnic groups into more peripheral areas and of overcoming barriers to entry to social rented housing estates outside existing areas of settlement. There is a need for sensitive and well-tuned policies to support minority ethnic households now wishing to move to non-traditional areas within the social rented sector. Some housing providers have begun implementing strategies of creating ‘settlement nodes’ or clusters in more outlying areas, perhaps underpinned by inter-agency initiatives and tenant support. Shared ownership is potentially important for minority ethnic groups but affordability of even low cost homeownership is an important issue for some of them. (See Section 10.)

HOUSING INSTITUTIONS AND HOUSING CONSUMERS

Research from the 1960s to the 1980s demonstrated that there were discriminatory practices against minority ethnic groups in both social and private sector housing. Some directly racist practices may persist, but overt racism has far less purchase in housing practice today. Recent research suggests that, for housing associations, black and minority ethnic housing and staffing strategies are not necessarily yet a firm part of business planning and organisational arrangements at a strategic level, while evidence about local authorities is patchy. As far as the private sector is concerned, little is known about current interactions between institutions and consumers. (See Section 11.)

PARTICIPATION AND INVOLVEMENT

The evidence suggests that black minority ethnic tenants of councils and housing associations have been excluded rather than fully involved, while households may not even be aware of tenants’ associations, let alone members of them. Black and minority ethnic housing associations represent about 1.5% of housing association activity. Although firmly established in the policy arena, the minority ethnic associations have remained individually vulnerable to distinct pressures related to their funding opportunities, stock acquisition, limited assets, size, and periods of growth. Despite their small stock sizes, the black and minority ethnic housing associations have played crucial roles in giving minority ethnic participants a voice in housing policy and implementation and have provided valued role models within minority communities. Black minority ethnic groups tend to be under-represented in the professional/technical workforces of white-led housing associations and local authorities. (See Section 12.)

Research and monitoring priorities for the future

We comment now on our overall conclusions about ways forward. Placing these within the Executive Summary makes them more accessible than if we had added a separate summary section at the end of our main report.

The recommended research priorities below are derived from an evaluation of the strengths and limitations of what has been achieved previously, but the policy relevance of specific topics has
been kept very much in mind. Although emphases in research programmes are very properly matters for ongoing debate and discussion amongst sponsors, funders, policy makers, client groups and researchers, we hope that this set of recommendations will be seen as one useful independent starting point.

The research record is a rich one, with an impressive and diverse array of studies and data. Nonetheless, there are numerous important gaps in coverage, frequently relating to topics that are significant for policy evaluation and development. Even when reference can be made to insightful studies, the empirical material has to be viewed with care. Statistics and qualitative information need to be understood in context, bearing in mind their frequent limitations, and the ways that data have been gathered, categorised and analysed.

BUILDING ON PREVIOUS GOOD WORK

• It is important to continue work in directions which have proved productive, including in-depth census analyses as new data become available. It would be valuable to have a successor for the PSI’s Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities; and improvements should be made, if feasible, in the coverage of the English House Condition Survey and the Survey of English Housing. There is also a strong case for further locally-led studies filling gaps in knowledge about particular groups, local policy issues, and specialised needs (such as those linked to supported housing). Local research on needs should be grounded firmly in good relationships between researchers and local communities, with significant contributions from the latter.

FOUR SPECIFIC TOPICS

• When completing our review, we identified four general topics which might merit early attention through substantially-funded research, since studying them could fill important gaps in understanding.

• The first topic was homelessness, where there seemed to be a strong case for an in-depth and up-to-date enquiry into the experiences and causes of so-called ‘hidden’ homelessness, alongside work on the interactions between those market trends, public policies, household characteristics and trajectories, which may help produce the homelessness phenomenon. Although we understand that new work has been commissioned very recently (and this now needs to be taken into account in any research strategy), the topic still deserves a high priority because of the severity of the experiences that are involved.

• Second, it would be very valuable to know much more about children’s experiences and perceptions of housing and environments, and this deserves research.

• Third, housing costs and quality need further investigation, ideally in conjunction with issues of sustainability, tenure choice, and household incomes, outgoings and commitments.

• Fourth, the experiences, strategies, choices and ongoing housing ‘careers’ or ‘pathways’ of differing groups and cohorts deserve further attention, not only in their own right but also from the perspective of scenarios for future policy choices in specific localities.
Research on these four topics should take account of gender issues from the outset, and researchers should also consider the relevance of disability and health issues.

**RESEARCH PRIORITIES CONNECTED WITH IMMEDIATE POLICY CONCERNS**

Several research priorities can be identified that are directly connected with immediate specific policy concerns.

- It would be desirable to revisit in a general way some questions that have been raised by efforts to research local needs.\(^5\)

- There should be more research on the implications and effects of the transfer of social rented stock between landlords, and on the roles, prospects and opportunities for minority ethnic households and organisations here.

- The participation of housing consumers from minority ethnic communities needs further research, both in general terms and in respect of particular ethnic or religious minorities, groups of elders, disabled people, and women.\(^6\) This could build upon recently commissioned investigations, but also emphasise questions about catering for diversity and difference amongst households.

- The activities of RSLs and local authorities need further monitoring in relation to questions about how they deal with particular kinds of clients, and about access to good quality stock. This applies particularly for minority ethnic households in areas of high demand or who are experiencing harassment, for female-headed minority ethnic households (including those who are homeless or affected by domestic violence), and to the inclusion in areas and dwellings of their choice of people from minority communities who are disabled or experiencing chronic illness.

- More solid and comprehensive information is needed on the effects that neighbourhood and renewal investment strategies and priorities are having for minority communities, and on the implications for their capacities to pursue or sustain preferred housing options and tenure preferences.

- It would be valuable to have more ‘before and after’ work on schemes, innovations and mechanisms for dealing with problems or meeting needs. More reporting would be useful on policy successes and failures, helping provide information on ‘what works’ and why (nationally, regionally or locally).

- There is a case for more systematic study of the likely impact of substantial policy developments, to test for the effects on black minority ethnic communities and minority ethnic organisations.\(^7\)

- There is a need for much more information about activities in the private sectors.\(^8\) In particular, little is known about recent trends in the performance of private landlords and lettings agents, or about the effectiveness of private financial services in responding to diverse communities, households and needs.

- A review of the potential and effectiveness of mechanisms and options for guidance, monitoring, audit and regulation might prove valuable. More research into regulatory and
monitoring methodologies and their strengths and limitations might prove particularly helpful, providing information about the merits of the levers available to government and to the Housing Corporation. To facilitate such a review, a fuller picture might be developed of what happens at present within housing organisations, and of the factors which affect change. It is important to focus not only on countering ‘non-compliance’ and promoting best practice, but also on understanding why organisations act as they do. (For further comment see Section 14.)

INFRASTRUCTURE

Steps could be taken to strengthen research infrastructure, collaboration and training, so as to improve the resources for undertaking research and monitoring. It is important to involve black and minority ethnic communities, and to develop the capacity to look more often beyond the immediate short term policy agenda.

Notes

2 See Modood et al., op. cit.
3 Perhaps this could be preceded by a ‘state of the art’ review or consultation exercise to identify the best ways forward.
4 Again, this is a topic which might benefit from a review exercise being carried out beforehand to consider methodologies and coverage.
5 More should be known about the impact such studies have had, about the fit (or lack of it) with policy developments and levers, and about the potential for taking account of households’ longer-term preferences.
6 Women are in many cases the heads of households in RSL tenancies, yet little is known about the responsiveness of housing management to their views or needs. The research topic of participation concerns not only general needs provision (and stock transfers, as noted already), but also specialised services. Research might also touch on participation via minority ethnic-run organisations in housing and community development.
8 One way forward might be to consult with relevant organisations (including the Council of Mortgage Lenders) to explore possibilities of improving data and access to it, and for establishing mechanisms for more monitoring and periodic in-depth research.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction and background to the review

This review provides an overview of the research record on ‘race’ and housing, and identifies important topics that might deserve further investigation. It offers a purposive analysis of key materials and findings which may be significant in relation to public policy concerns and policy development. Thus the report summarises important features in what is already known, analyses studies and writings in the light of their possible policy relevance, and highlights significant gaps where research might aid processes of policy-making, implementation, evaluation and monitoring. From time to time specific studies are highlighted as ‘exemplars’ of good investigatory practice or constructive research innovation.

The review has taken account of two particular ‘drivers’ influencing recent governmental outlooks on ‘race’ and ethnicity. The first is the increased recognition of diversity, and the second the continuing wish to achieve good practice on equality. At the same time governmental interest in improving conditions within neighbourhoods, in processes of capacity-building, and in countering exclusion, has been kept in view. The ODPM’s commitment to improved practice in addressing the housing needs of black and minority ethnic communities has been confirmed in its Action Plan,1 and several of that plan’s concerns connect with research issues touched upon in our report. At the same time the plan stresses the necessity of a sound evidence base, and our assessment of the strengths and limitations of existing empirical material may help identify relevant issues here. The analysis in the present report, however, is an entirely independent one.

Although reference may be made to selected findings from elsewhere in the UK, the central focus is on England. The groups with which the review is concerned are primarily ‘non-white’ or black and minority ethnic communities, but some findings on other minorities (including Irish people resident in England) are also mentioned. There are limits in coverage, however, insofar as experiences and policy issues related primarily to asylum seekers, refugees, Gypsies or Travellers lie outside the scope of this review. Questions of appropriate terminology are also not explored in this report. ‘Black minority ethnic’, ‘black and minority ethnic’ and ‘BME’ are currently used widely in housing writings, and the terms ‘non-white’, minority ethnic and black are also deployed. We have chosen words that we think will convey our meanings reasonably clearly, although the terms are potentially contested. Sometimes census terminologies or similar descriptors for ethnic categories (such as ‘Black’) are used below when data and large surveys are referred to.

This report does not contain an account of the impact of public policies on housing for black and minority ethnic communities, although we make some specific observations about particular contemporary policy matters while reviewing research. Clearly, central government and public bodies engage with minority ethnic housing needs in many different ways, affecting
housing circumstances directly and indirectly. Outcomes for households may be influenced by patterns of public investment, by decisions about systems of financial support and assistance (for households or for organisations), by the behaviour of organisations, and by guidelines, laws and rules. Research has often been informative about outcomes, and there certainly seems to be doubt about how far central government’s expectations for ‘racial’ equality have been met by organisations ‘on the ground’. It would go beyond our brief, however, to offer a developed interpretation of the effects of policy or implementation as such.

It would also prove difficult to tackle any such agenda from a housing perspective alone, since many non-housing decisions and organisations affect housing opportunities. It seems likely that the evaluation or ‘testing’ of policies and policy options by policy-makers will increasingly respond to the need to be sensitive both to ethnic diversity and a recognition of racism. The present report’s contribution to this development is primarily to establish what is available in and from the research material, giving particular emphasis to findings that will help in the assessment of previous or ongoing practices and experiences, perhaps pointing up thereby some implications for the future.

1.1 The plan for this report

Section 2 provides some reminders of present conditions and trends, and Section 3 offers a ‘snapshot’ of the broad position on data availability particularly in relation to housing conditions. We then explore a set of narrower key topics, starting in Section 4 with homelessness and harassment, and continuing through to Section 12 with black and minority ethnic participation and employment issues. It is intended that each of these sections may be used independently to provide an indicator of research findings, current understanding, and questions for the reader. To enhance coverage in the earlier parts of our report, we include some tables prepared by the ODPM, drawing on the Survey of English Housing, English House Condition Survey, and homelessness data (for details of these sources see below, pages 83-84). At the end of the report, two distinctive sections focus on performance by research funders, and achievements and prospects in relation to better monitoring and evaluation. These commentaries are meant to help set the scene for readers interested directly in general research development, or in audit and regulation. The section on good practice, audit and regulatory performance raises some general questions about ways forward.
Setting the scene: key facts about the black and minority ethnic populations and their housing

Britain’s black and minority ethnic communities are very diverse, varying in terms of household characteristics, settlement patterns, culture, tenure, population growth, density of occupation and amenity levels in housing. There are also variations within ethnic groups, along lines of generation, gender, locality, and socio-economic position. Recent population estimates at the time of writing indicated that the minority ethnic population for Britain as a whole exceeds four million, representing 7.1% of the total.\(^*\) The overwhelming majority, 97%, live in England, with 2% in Scotland and 1% in Wales. Within England, Inner London has the largest minority ethnic population, with 33.9% being from minorities. Nearly half the minority ethnic population is South Asian, nearly a third are of ‘Black’ origin, particularly Caribbean and African, and the remainder are from a wide range of other origins.\(^4\) Table 1 shows figures for specific groupings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>Percentage of total minority ethnic group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black – Caribbean</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – African</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – Other (non-mixed)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black – Mixed</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian (non-mixed)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – Other (non-mixed)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Mixed</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All minority ethnic groups</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53,004</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population(^*)</td>
<td>57,057</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All minority groups as% of total</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\) Includes ethnic group not stated


\(^\d\) 2001 Census data published since the time of writing shows a higher percentage, 8% of the total population of Great Britain.
Population growth is very rapid for the minorities taken overall, but with large differences between groups. For instance, currently there seem to be relatively low rates of growth for the Black-Caribbean and Indian categories. Minority ethnic groups are concentrated in specific localities.

2.1 Regional distribution of ethnic groups

Results from the Survey of English Housing for 1998–2000 have been combined to give larger sample sizes for the different ethnic groups; see the notes at the end of this report. Table 2 indicates the regional distributions for five ethnic groupings, with white households most evenly spread geographically. The largest concentrations for minority ethnic groups are in London, but with a substantial presence in several other regions, and low percentages in the North East and South West.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani/</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1998–2000 SEH Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes

A great deal is now known about most of the larger and established non-white minority ethnic groups (including Indians, Pakistanis, and Black Caribbeans), with excellent work on census and other data being supplemented by a flow of detailed qualitative studies and reports. By contrast, some later arrivals and smaller ethnic groupings are less visible and less understood. Furthermore, the UK has increasing numbers of households with mixed ethnic heritages, making distinctions or boundaries between minority ethnic groups less clear-cut (and data less reliable), and complicating questions about identity and ethnicity. Half the present minority ethnic population was born in the UK, and identifying groupings is already complicated by diverse second and third generation affiliations and experiences. In 1991, Indians constituted the largest non-white minority ethnic group in Britain (with a population of approximately 877,000), the two other largest groups being Black Caribbeans and Pakistanis.

2.2 Household size

Average household sizes varied among census categories, being largest for the South Asian (Indian subcontinent) groups, and smallest among whites. This was influenced by differing age
structures, with effects from old people living in small units and dependent children in large households. As Warnes points out, ‘the ethnic minority populations of Great Britain are presently young’, although age profiles differ between groups, reflecting amongst other things distinctive settlement histories and ‘contrasts in the contemporary social and demographic processes that affect them’. There are higher proportions of female-headed, lone-parent families among Black people and more extended household structures among the South Asian groups. None of the black minority ethnic groups has a very high representation of ‘pensioner only’ households. This reflects a youthful age structure (but also the greater tendency for Asian elders to live within extended family households). It is hard to say how far this may have been changing, but growth in numbers of elders raises significant issues when combined with ‘social processes leading to the formation of smaller households, in different ways, across different minority ethnic groups.’

2.3 Age of Heads of Households

Tables 3 and 4 use data from the Survey of English Housing (SEH) to summarise the situation for ages of heads of households, and numbers of persons per household, by ethnic group. Black minority ethnic groups as a whole have a younger household age profile than White households. Black, Indian, Pakistani/Bangladeshi and ‘Other’ groups have fewer households in the 65+ age group, and very few of 75+, compared to the White population. The Indian and White groups have few 16-24 year old households, contrasting with the Black and Pakistani/Bangladeshi groups. All the black minority ethnic groups shown have a higher percentage of larger households. Almost half of Pakistani and Bangladeshi households and a quarter of Indian households have 5+ members, compared to one in twenty of white households. White, Black and ‘Other’ household groups are similar in size (the most common household consisting of one or two people).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Age profile of heads of households by ethnic group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–64</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1998-2000 SEH Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes
2.4 Household composition

Table 5 shows household composition, and indicates the considerable differences between ethnic groups. White households are more likely to consist of a couple without children, and the percentage for multi-person white households is low. Indian and Pakistani/Bangladeshi households are more likely to comprise couples with children. The percentage of lone parents is high for Black households. Indian households have relatively high percentages of couples with no children, and also of multi-person households. Pakistani/Bangladeshi households also have a relatively high percentage figure for multi-person households.

2.5 Tenure of households

As far as tenure is concerned, recent figures have indicated substantial percentages of Indian heads of household in England owning their house outright, compared with far fewer among those heads of households from the Black and Bangladeshi groups. Additionally, more than half of Indian households own with a mortgage. The Black and Bangladeshi groups overall are by far the most likely to be renting from the social rented housing sectors. The position can be
shown by referring again to the SEH data. Table 6 reveals that for the White, Indian, and Pakistani/Bangladeshi groups, substantial percentages own outright, while still more are buying. A lower percentage of households in the Black category own outright, but 30% are nonetheless buying. Social renting is particularly marked as a destination for the Black households group, but the social renting figures for the Pakistani/Bangladeshi groups also point to the importance of the tenure for these households. White and Indian households are less likely to be housing association tenants by comparison with the Black, Pakistani/Bangladeshi and 'Other' groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Ethnic group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned outright</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy + mortgage</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council tenant</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA tenant</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1998-2000 SEH Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes

2.6 Labour market participation and household incomes

Phillips notes that there are ‘forces for both minority ethnic inclusion and exclusion from competition for economic rewards and social status’, and that these forces ‘produce different outcomes for different groups and a variable experience within minority ethnic groups according to generation, gender and class.' Nonetheless, very many black minority ethnic households have relatively low incomes. Specific groups have been over-represented in declining industries, while there are substantial variations in unemployment rates, the Black African, Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups being in the worst positions in 1991, with the unemployment position of Indians being closer to that of whites. Modood indicates a general pattern of inequality, but ‘also of a divergence in the circumstances of the main minorities.' He explains the diversities, but notes the view that there are continuing possibilities of what writers sometimes refer to as ‘ethnic penalties’, whereby all non-white groups (regardless of qualifications and positions in jobs hierarchies), suffer a disadvantage which leads them to fare less well than similarly qualified whites. Berthoud locates Pakistanis and Bangladeshis amongst the poorest, with ‘four times the poverty rate found among white people.'

SEH data are given below on economic status of head of household by ethnic group. Family Resources Survey data on gross weekly income and mean average weekly income of head of household and partner are also presented.

Over half of White, Indian and ‘Other’ ethnic group heads of households are in full-time employment. The Black and Pakistani/Bangladeshi groups also have a high percentage in full-
Table 7  Economic status of head of household by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani/ Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Emp</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Emp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1998-2000 SEH Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes

Table 8  Gross weekly income standardised for region of head of household and partner by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross weekly income (HoH)</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani/ Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under £100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100, under</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£200, under</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£300, under</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£400, under</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500, under</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£600, under</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£700 and Above</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000/01 & 2001/02 Family Resources Survey – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes

Table 9  Average weekly income of head of household and partner standardised for region (£p/w)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardised mean average gross weekly income</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani/ Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per week</td>
<td>£488</td>
<td>£355</td>
<td>£505</td>
<td>£296</td>
<td>£549</td>
<td>£480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000/01 & 2001/02 Family Resources Survey – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes
time employment, but with relatively large percentages in the part-time work and ‘other inactive’ categories. The percentage of White people retired was greater than for other ethnic groups, reflecting the age profile. White and Indian households have the lowest percentages of unemployed heads of households, whilst the highest figures are for the Black and ‘Other’ groups, with the Pakistani/Bangladeshi group also well above the overall national average. Table 8 shows the Pakistani/Bangladeshi and ‘Other’ ethnic groups having the highest percentages of heads of households and partners in the lowest income category and the Pakistani/Bangladeshi group containing the largest percentage of heads of households and partner (37%) receiving under £200 per week. While the White, Indian and ‘Other’ groups are very well represented in the higher income ranges, the reverse is true for the Pakistani/Bangladeshi group. On average, the head of household and partner of ‘Other’ and Indian groups had a higher gross weekly income than in the other ethnic groups, including white households (see Table 9). The Pakistani/Bangladeshi group, by contrast, had a very low figure for average weekly income of head of household and partner.

2.7 Property type, overcrowding and house condition

Local studies have deepened the evidence of disadvantage for specific minority communities, highlighting large proportions of people with long-term illness or impairment, or noting effects of practical problems such as inability to use central heating fully because of costs. Many minority ethnic households are owner-occupiers, but are located very firmly in the lower end of the tenure in terms of property quality. It is worth noting below (Tables 10-12) the patterns of differentiation in terms of property types, overcrowding and house conditions (the latter as assessed through the indicators used in the English House Condition Survey). Table 10 shows some of the variation in dwelling types across ethnic groups, and Table 11 indicates the importance of overcrowding for a significant percentage of households in the Pakistani/Bangladeshi group in particular. White households are less likely to be overcrowded than households of other ethnic groups. As Table 12 shows, they are also less likely to have poor housing conditions (unfitness, substantial levels of disrepair, need for essential modernisation) or live in poor conditions (local concentrations of housing in substantial disrepair, vacant/derelict housing or sites, other forms of neglect or misuse). Households from the Pakistani/Bangladeshi group are most likely to have poor housing and living conditions.

Table 13 indicates that white households are less likely to be dissatisfied with their home or its state of repair, or to wish to move, by comparison with the other ethnic groups. Pakistani and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10 Dwelling type by ethnic group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House/bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/maisonette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1998-2000 SEH Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes
Table 11 Occupation density (overcrowding) by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference from bedroom standard</th>
<th>Ethnic group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more below</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 above</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more above</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ‘Bedroom Standard’ is used as an indicator of occupation density. A standard number of bedrooms is allocated to each household in accordance with its age/sex/marital status composition and the relationship of the members to one another.

Source: 1998-2000 SEH Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes

Table 12 Housing conditions by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House conditions</th>
<th>Ethnic group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In poor housing</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In poor living conditions</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of all households

Source: 1996 EHCS Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes

Table 13 Household responses to poor housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household responses to poor housing</th>
<th>Ethnic group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with home</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with repair</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish to move</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of all households

Source: 1996 EHCS Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes

Table 14 Area satisfaction by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with area</th>
<th>Ethnic group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly satisfied</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly dissatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1998-2000 SEH Data – see note at the end of this report for sample sizes
Bangladeshi households are the most dissatisfied with their home and its state of repair. Minority ethnic groups are also on average less satisfied with their area than are white households, although, on the whole, high percentages from most of the groups covered in the Survey of English Housing are very or fairly satisfied with their area (see Table 14).

2.8 Racist violence and harassment

One aspect of shared experiences across minority ethnic and socio-economic categories is continuing exposure to harassment and violence. Racist incidents have both immediate and long-term effects on individuals, families and communities, and can influence people’s choices of housing and localities. Such incidents are still widespread, and significant roles can be played potentially by housing organisations in preventing them, supporting those at risk, and taking action against perpetrators. Perception of racist harassment as a problem differs as between white and black minority ethnic groups, as should be expected. Table 15 shows that minority ethnic households in general are much more likely to find harassment a problem in their area by comparison with white households.

2.9 Settlement patterns

There is a high degree of geographical concentration of the minorities within parts of urban England, with an apparent tendency for the growing black minority ethnic population to be ‘increasingly spatially concentrated’. Geographical concentration in itself does not necessarily indicate disadvantage, and it is unfortunate that observers sometimes takes a simplistic view that refers to supposed ‘ghettoisation’, without acknowledging the positive dimensions of minority ethnic experience or the merits of living in proximity to people of similar culture and language. There may be important cultural and community resources and infrastructure in particular localities which need to be acknowledged. Relying on stereotypes about behaviours contributes to over-assertive assumptions about areas being problematic places. It seems, for instance, that it is whites (contrary to some popular images) who have the highest incidence of reported drug use among young people, so we should be cautious about adopting concepts of inner city areas dominated by a minority ethnic drug culture. Nonetheless, physical and economic conditions for black and minority ethnic populations are often very poor. Many areas of settlement have high unemployment and/or low pay, poor services and difficult housing. Furthermore, in Greater London, households have to compete for housing in a market where there is a severe shortage of reasonable quality, affordable accommodation in acceptable locations.
Nationally, some black and minority ethnic households (particularly Indian) are relocating in outer urban areas of better quality housing, although for some communities there may be generational as well as ethnic group differences in propensity to migrate (while British-born people may be readier than their elders to move away from core areas of settlement, youth unemployment may restrict spatial dispersal). This last point is a reminder that, when looking at household needs and trajectories, it is important not only to consider the new or less visible groups that we referred to above, but also to be aware of distinctions between cohorts. There may be possibilities of emergent or hidden needs within those communities about which – in other respects – much is already known. For example, only sparse information is available about South Asian women who have become isolated from their ethnic communities, or on elders who can no longer call on the extended family for support. Surprisingly little systematic knowledge is available about the changing housing experiences of young black men, despite the high risks of unemployment, unfair treatment and poverty that they face.

As a final point we can add that existing information on households tells us little about whether or how far housing achievements might parallel or lag behind the other advances (such as educational successes) being secured by households in specific communities. Along with increasing diversity among minorities has come a view that some are becoming very successful in terms of particular socio-economic measures. It is hard to say, however, whether or not some successful households have been prepared to sacrifice housing quality for gains in other areas of daily life, or to determine how far ongoing disadvantages in housing contexts might differ from or be more severe than those in other spheres.
CHAPTER 3

The conditions experienced by households

A good knowledge of housing conditions and household characteristics is essential for understanding changes, and for identifying patterns of progress or exclusion amongst minority ethnic groups. Although there are limitations on obtaining up-to-date and reliable evidence, research has confirmed the continuation of specific problems (including overcrowding or harassment), while also pointing to growing diversity amongst groups and types of households. Quantitative analyses of large survey data sets have provided a fairly good picture of where most of the established minority groups live and of their general housing circumstances. More information on segregation and change is provided in Section 5.

There is uncertainty about some trends (for instance over whether there has been a substantial decline in overcrowding\(^20\)), but consensus about the overall picture. We will begin with a sketch of some key features of housing experience, and then give an account of the research record and its limitations. Although something of a simplification, the seven observations below summarise the general situation:

- As the previous section showed, there are marked differences between various minority ethnic communities in terms of households, tenure patterns, dwelling types, density of occupation and so forth.\(^21\)

- Variable experiences occur within minority ethnic categories according to generation, gender, and socio-economic status,\(^22\) and it is possible that impairment and chronic illness also give rise to further significant variation (although the patterns and implications here remain under-researched). Each minority ethnic group has its own specific settlement geography and its own potential for internal socio-economic polarisation.\(^23\) (See also Sections 2 and 5.)

- Different groups have differing population growth rates and potential for new household formation,\(^24\) with implications for patterns of future local housing needs. Where growth occurs in communities that remain very poor, or in ‘tight’ markets, there may be particular difficulties in meeting those needs.

- Despite variations, disadvantages experienced by non-white groups persist in ways which contribute to continuing patterns of housing difficulties across groups. Black and minority ethnic groups still tend to be relatively poorly housed, even though most have been resident here for a long time, large numbers having been born in Britain. Discriminatory practices and racist harassment can have ongoing effects even for those who are achieving a measure of upward mobility. Housing difficulties sit alongside others. Thus, as the Social Exclusion Unit points out, in comparison to their representation in the population, people
from minority ethnic communities are more likely than others to live in deprived areas, to be poor, to be unemployed compared with white people with similar qualifications, to suffer ill-health, and to live in over-crowded and unpopular housing.25

- Some particular groups settled in specific urban localities have very low incomes indeed, and limited housing choice, and there is little to suggest that this will change in the near future. By contrast, the development of a minority ethnic middle class is associated with reduced exclusion, including the choice of a degree of suburbanisation.26 (See also Section 5.)

- Changing household sizes and structures and population age structures are important, with implications for future needs. For example, it has often been argued that there is a strong need for large family dwellings in particular communities, or that there will be an increasing demand for specific accommodation for elders or for smaller households in years to come.27

- Low income home ownership persists as a major feature of black minority ethnic experience generally,28 but social rented housing is also very important. When considering tenure patterns and preferences, it is desirable to bear in mind local market conditions and the choices available to particular groups of households. While there may be overall patterns of under-representation in council housing for Asian groups, it is necessary to disaggregate to have a proper picture. Housing associations are important for some minority ethnic households.

3.1 Data sets and data limitations; an overview of the quantitative research record

Analyses using census information have been invaluable, although there have been some criticisms, including observations that work has been too heavily influenced by a negative view of minorities, with a tendency for communities' victim status or disadvantages to be stressed too strongly.29 Clearly it is important not to undervalue the progress made by minorities, or their rich 'cultural capital'. In any event, the record is of high quality research work, beginning with a timely set of invaluable summary statistical papers from Owen,30 and culminating in large officially-sponsored collections of detailed interpretations.31 Census data, however, have not given us direct housing quality information, while some separate ethnic categories cannot be distinguished from larger groups. There is also the more general problem that ethnicity divisions used can fail to cater for people with complex origins or for households containing people with diverse ethnic affiliations. Furthermore, census data have become outdated before there have been adequate time or resources to complete the full analyses needed.

Scholars working with the data have been aware of the weaknesses. Phillips, for example, has noted practical limitations with the census in the under-enumeration of certain groups, the limited range of housing variables available, and small sample sizes for some minorities, and has used English House Condition Survey (EHCS) data alongside census information to provide additional information.32 The EHCS and the Survey of English Housing (SEH) provide useful alternative data, and we have drawn on these to provide the tables above. Previous reporting has used the SEH to indicate recent tenure patterns by ethnic group of head of household, with figures showing (for example) 59% of Bangladeshis to be in housing rented from the social sector.33 These sources, although informative, nonetheless have been perceived to have some
limitations (because of the small sample sizes) and have had less impact than the census amongst analysts of ‘race’ and housing. Data on household incomes from the national Family Resources Survey have also been used, reinforcing general impressions about adverse conditions and variations between groups. In addition, information from the Labour Force Survey has enabled valuable estimates for population characteristics and change, the data being seen as the ‘main source for estimates of the minority ethnic populations in inter-censal years.’

Unfortunately, we lack large-scale comprehensive material on housing quality (although as already indicated something is known about conditions of dwellings, house types, etc.), and on the costs experienced by households (which ideally would be linked up with data on incomes, affordability and financial services, including access to insurance). In addition, we do not have data on the housing capital of minorities, and on the terms on which assets are acquired or held. It seems that although the SEH does cover mortgages and allied data, sample size limits the amount of analysis of black minority ethnic housing needs that can be undertaken using the SEH.

While work on the census has been crucial, there have also been important data from specific major independent research enquiries, notably those of the Policy Studies Institute, especially in the Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities. Additionally, there has been analysis sponsored by housing bodies on ‘administrative data’ or on regularly collected information, particularly research under Housing Corporation auspices with ‘CORE’ or allied records. (CORE data consist of household and property details supplied by RSLs for lettings or sales, and have been used in analyses of housing association performance.)

Apart from working directly on housing concerns, writers have commented on general patterns and processes of exclusion, poverty, neighbourhood characteristics, spatial variations in conditions, and so forth, in ways which explicitly or indirectly provide insights relevant when considering minority ethnic groups. Dorsett has drawn on data from the Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities, the 1991 census, and the DoE’s 1991 deprivation index, to explore issues of segregation, concentration, and deprivation. As with many contemporary writers, he indicates that different minority groups have different characteristics and that it is not appropriate to treat the minorities ‘as if they were a single group subject to identical influences.’ Referring to work by Peach he comments on the issue of ghettos, and suggests that while ghettos ‘can be said to exist in the US’, they are ‘not an appropriate model for Britain’ (see also comments in Section 5 below).

One feature of the UK research record that is generally overlooked is a lack of housing-linked surveys focussed directly on ‘race’ and ethnicity at regional level, while even at the level of more local communities well-resourced quantitative work on conditions and change is not very common. Nonetheless, revealing data have been published for the London Region by the Housing Corporation, indicating (alongside other matters) changes in tenure patterns amongst groups. It is also worth noting that Geographic Information Systems relevant to minority ethnic housing analyses are being developed, although we understand that they apparently vary in usefulness between local authorities.

On a different front, Platt and Noble have produced bleak findings using administrative data for receipt of benefits for Birmingham, creating what may be a unique locality-based statistical investigation of risks of poverty for people in different ethnic groups. This report confirms impressions of severe poverty for Bangladeshi, Black African-Caribbean/Black Other and Pakistani groups, and includes the observation that ‘we can calculate that 56% of all Bangladeshi children under the age of 16 are living in poverty’ (at least in this study and within
the constraints of the analysis). Some local housing needs studies also include statistics assembled through relatively large surveys (for more on needs studies see below), and these have helped fill gaps in knowledge. The tendency has been for such material to reinforce impressions of relative disadvantage.

3.2 Supplementing the main quantitative data; progress and limits

Qualitative accounts of aspects of community life are readily found, and sometimes these merge qualitative material with limited amounts of 'hard' data about conditions. With increased numbers of needs studies and allied work focussed on specific groups, the position on data for smaller minorities has improved. Nonetheless, there are 'invisible' or 'submerged' groups for whom not enough is known. Occasional qualitative work highlights very adverse experiences for particular categories amongst hidden or ‘new’ migrant groups, and indeed reveals treatment that is far out of line with expectations for human rights in civilised communities. Writers have occasionally described experiences of groups such as 'unauthorised workers', and the intersection between the labour market and housing circumstances of such specific groups remains important. From a critical perspective it might be asked whether or how far the apparently weak regulation of private landlords and tied housing has had strong negative effects on certain minorities. Yet substantial hard data are not easy to assemble. Locality-focussed research sometimes touches substantially on ethnicity as part of a wider exercise, but the record for research on black and minority ethnic groups within neighbourhoods research in general is patchy.

3.3 Irish households and communities

General analysis of minority ethnic issues in housing rarely focusses on white minorities, although some households amongst these may be experiencing problems that are to a degree similar to those of non-white groups (this perhaps being most likely for elders or recent arrivals). A large minority that has not been very visible in housing policy debates is the Irish, although here there is now quite a substantial literature including studies produced through specific housing associations. Notable amongst broader studies is a major report by Hickman and Walter, which has drawn on census materials, interviews with organisations’ staff, and a pilot survey to create an account of inequality and the sense of hurt among people of Irish origin at the way that they have been treated. In reviewing the available sources, these writers indicate a strong London emphasis within local studies of aspects of disadvantage, which suggests that there may be scope for more research elsewhere.

Despite growing interest, however, it could still be difficult to establish how far Irish people in general suffer today the kinds of 'ethnic penalties' in housing (for this term see Section 2 above) which have been indicated for black minority ethnic groups, especially given the potential difficulty of distinguishing newer arrivals from well-established residents, and the likelihood of there being large numbers of successful and relatively assimilated middle class people within the total population of Irish origin. Census data give only ‘a picture of first generation migrants’, and official data tell us ‘nothing about people of Irish descent who were born in this country’. This is not to deny that a UK legacy of hostility to Catholicism and Irish nationalism may sometimes have effects on Irish people who have been long settled in England. Furthermore, newcomers in particular, and perhaps Travellers, may experience harassment or discrimination.
3.4 Some gaps in the general knowledge base for housing conditions

Before moving to more specific topics, we can highlight some key deficiencies in the general evidence base as far as substantial data sets and allied broad qualitative records are concerned.

- A lack of housing-related data is evident when it comes to discussions about some particular small or ‘new’ migrant groups, although increasing numbers of local studies have modified this. There is scope for a variety of ongoing inquiries here. For instance, more research could focus on housing conditions being experienced by migrant groups recruited into specific low-paid employment niches.

- There does not seem to be much systematic data on housing quality and its relationships with costs, incomes, sustainability, and affordability. Some useful indicative information is available on dwelling type, occupation density, and poor housing by ethnic group (see Tables 10-12 above), but this gives only a limited picture.

- There is limited regional survey or social audit data generally.

- There is a lack of systematic empirical material on the housing and neighbourhood experiences of children (further comment is made on this in Section 7 below).
These two circumstances are likely to be amongst the most distressing of households’ experiences, and therefore deserve separate comment. Key conclusions drawn from studies and trends are summarised below, and sections 4.1 to 4.3 then offer additional comments on the record.

- The literature reflects a lack of hard data on homelessness experienced by different ethnic groups. Reviews of needs studies and homelessness reports and commentaries indicate that black and minority ethnic communities have disproportionately high rates of homelessness, while there seem to be differences between minority ethnic groups in the extent and nature of the experience. Burrows notes that the experience of homelessness has been greatest amongst heads of households identifying themselves as ‘Black’, almost 14% of such heads of households having experienced homelessness. He indicates that a ‘Black’ head of household is over three times more likely to have experienced homelessness than is a ‘White’ head of household, but that the proportions (in the data he deployed) of those experiencing homelessness amongst households with heads identifying themselves as ‘Indian’, ‘Pakistani’ or ‘Bangladeshi’ are below the average for the population as a whole. Chahal (citing Carter) states that data from all those London boroughs that recorded decisions on homelessness applications by ethnic group in 1997 suggest that the minority ethnic groups made up 45.1% of those found to be accepted as statutory homeless. The significance of homelessness has been made clear in a variety of writings for specific minority groups (including African/Caribbeans, Irish and Asians, despite the possibility that ‘visible’ homelessness for the latter has sometimes appeared less significant).

- Although London has the highest concentration of homeless households in England, the phenomenon is not confined to the capital. For instance, the array of evidence taken as a whole has indicated disproportionate levels of homelessness amongst young black minority ethnic groups in specific regions outside London as well as within it (reference being made to the West and East Midlands and West Yorkshire).

- Members of Black and Minority Ethnic groups appear less likely to be homeless on the street and therefore tend to be less visible but make up 22% of households accepted by local authorities as homeless, see Table 16 below, and are therefore over-represented.

- Within communities the literature suggests that there are ‘concealed households’, who are staying with friends or relatives through lack of separate accommodation, and this means that data on homelessness and need can be misleading. It is not known how many people experiencing homelessness do not present themselves as being homeless, so that data on homelessness and need derived from applications to councils have to be viewed with caution.
• Central government seems well informed of the significance of minority ethnic people’s needs for ‘safety-net’ services in this field.  

• Stereotypes about homeless people can prove unreliable. For example it is wrong to rely on ideas about ‘feckless’, demoralised or over-dependent young black people. Nonetheless, homelessness can be a damaging experience with links to poor health.

• Racist harassment has become widely acknowledged as a serious and ongoing issue affecting the daily lives and housing choices of many households; see Section 5 below. As far as harassment is concerned, there is strong recognition within official and practitioner-orientated literature of the desirability of continuing to work towards better practice and ‘signing up’ to ongoing audit processes around practice.

4.1 The research record on homelessness; a rich record in some respects?

A large number of reports have dealt with black and minority ethnic homelessness, sometimes within general data-based analyses not confined to minorities,  more often within enquiries into locality experiences or people’s needs, or service users’ characteristics (for instance into the ethnic origin of people in hostels, or of winter shelter users). In addition, certain qualitative studies have proved informative about homelessness for minority households while discussing households in general. Furthermore, some broad analyses of minority ethnic conditions or housing provider performance for minority groups include data on homelessness. Through this large volume of commentary, understanding of homelessness has grown, despite some limitations in the information available. Reviewing needs studies from the last ten years, Sodhi et al. state that studies on homelessness show ‘that BME communities have disproportionately high rates of homelessness and this is clear in the case of African Caribbeans, Asians and the Irish.’ This appears to contrast with the finding of Burrows noted above with regard to households of Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin. Perhaps the contrast reflects the features of the specific data used by Burrows, and also the possibility that local qualitative investigations have produced findings touching more fully on less visible forms of homelessness. Table 16 shows some recent official figures for ethnic categories, indicating that white people were under-represented and minority ethnic groups were over-represented among those accepted by local authorities as eligible, not intentionally homeless and in priority need, compared with the composition of the population as a whole. Black minority ethnic groups represented 22% of those accepted by local authorities as homeless but only 7% of the population as a whole.

---

Table 16: Households for which decisions were taken during the quarter (July–September 2001) accepted as eligible, unintentionally homeless and in priority need (under the provisions of the 1985 and 1996 Housing Act)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19,703</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Caribbean</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
It is also known that services are sometimes perceived as unwelcoming, and are seen to lack black minority ethnic staff or managements, or to be insensitive to cultural needs.\textsuperscript{67} Conclusive published data on the performance of housing organisations, however, are hard to find. Table 17 gives some outline information about decisions taken by local authorities on cases covered in official returns for the July-September Quarter of 2001. It appears that households in the Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi category applying for accommodation were slightly more likely to be seen as in priority need than those in the other ethnic groups. White households seemed slightly more likely than other groups to be classed as intentionally homeless, while African/Caribbean or ‘Other’ households were most likely to be assessed as ineligible for accommodation. Material of this kind is not easy to interpret adequately without more in-depth information on context, experiences and trends.

In some respects the research record – albeit patchy and stronger for some regions than others – is a very useful one. Spatial variations in markets and populations mean that an accumulation of locality-specific information is valuable. Local or case study approaches focussed solely or partly on minority ethnic experiences can gather qualitative and/or quantitative data which are richly informative, although the material is often limited by the constraints of locality, methodologies or resources that affected the fieldwork. Two examples of homelessness studies that include qualitative material of this kind, focussed directly on minorities, are Davies et al. (1996),\textsuperscript{68} and Steele (1997),\textsuperscript{69} and such work continues to appear. Both these studies may be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African/Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible, unintentionally homeless and in priority need</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible, homeless and in need, but intentionally so</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible, homeless but not in priority need</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible but not homeless</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible but not homeless</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total decisions**</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % households not persons.
** Out of the 354 Local Authorities 26 did not submit information.

Source: Quarter July – Sept 2001 Local Authority Housing Provision for the Homeless Data – see note at end
seen as exemplars of well-focussed qualitative analysis. Davies et al. also referred to data sets from Shelter/CHAR, indicating that disproportionately high percentages of young clients of housing aid centres were black and minority ethnic people, and that people from black and minority ethnic communities were over-represented among hostel residents. Some inquiries have been associated with minority ethnic-led or campaigning organisations (we understand that research is, for instance, in hand at time of writing for Shelter in this field).

Looking across studies in general, one can see plenty in the qualitative material to allow the challenging of stereotypes about homeless people. For instance, Davies et al. found that more black young homeless people reported feeling well physically/mentally and were less likely than white young people to have seen a psychiatrist, psychologist or other mental health professional. White young single homeless people had fewer formal qualifications and at lower levels of attainment than African/Caribbean or Asian young people in the study. Young black and minority ethnic homeless people were less likely to have slept rough than their white counterparts and more likely to have stayed with friends and/or relatives whilst homeless. Most young people were looking for self-contained permanent accommodation from either their local authority or a housing association, very few had ever received any support needs advice, and there was widespread concern amongst the staff of agencies working with young single homeless people at the lack of ‘move on’ support.

A point that has arisen across studies and more general writings is the significance of ‘hidden’ (or perhaps more accurately ‘unrecognised’) homelessness. In a systematic review of minority ethnic homelessness for the NHS Executive (London), Chahal explains that minority ethnic homelessness ‘is less about street homelessness and much more about being hidden’. Thus minority ethnic people ‘tend to use friends and relatives much more than white people’. Davies et al. found some difficulty in contacting homeless young Asian people, perhaps a reflection of reluctance on the part of Asian communities to recognise that youth homelessness was a significant problem, and an insistence that what homelessness that existed was dealt with by and within the community. This is part of a larger methodological problem resulting from rational behaviours. Some minority ethnic homeless people may be reluctant to use white-run institutions, to share facilities with white clients, or to expose themselves to violence, police contact, or racist harassment, through being visibly on the streets. Thus locating a valid sample is difficult.

### 4.2 Some limitations in homelessness research

So far, methodologies and resources for homelessness studies of minority ethnic households have tended to be limited, and it remains hard to gain an assured picture of issues like gender, ethnicity or impairment, as factors in homelessness (although intelligent comment is often made on these). Indeed, Chahal goes further, suggesting that more generally there is a recognised dearth of information on minority ethnic homelessness, its extent, causes, impact and possible solutions, and pointing out that the limited research undertaken has tended to concentrate on the London boroughs. He also states that there is very little stand-alone research on the impact and extent of hidden homelessness and staying with friends and relatives during the course of the homelessness experience. We might add that more attention could have been paid to the experiences of groups particularly close to homelessness, perhaps moving in and out of it, or faced with a strong risk of it. For instance, the housing positions of people leaving institutions (including prisons) deserve more study. It is worth noting that a Social Exclusion Unit report has recently included housing as one of nine key factors that influence re-offending, where stable accommodation reduces the risk significantly.
An additional important point is the suspicion that the connection with policy has often tended to be in terms of seeking solutions after the event, in effect prioritising crisis management, rather than researching and considering in depth a range of potential strategies and appropriate points for prior intervention, support or alleviation of problems. This may be partly because homelessness manifests itself as a visible single event to which an urgent reply is essential, rather than the tip of a bigger ‘iceberg’ of complex housing pathway events which could be the focus of complementary studies linked to preventative strategies. Prediction in the light of market and policy trends is a research-related task deserving a place in decision-making aimed at prevention, but has not figured enough in studies to date. A preventative stance might also prioritise ‘social audit’ activity scrutinising institutional behaviour (in private, voluntary and public sectors) that might have played a part in creating conditions for homelessness, bearing in mind the benefits from a holistic view across services and institutions. Some studies do include consideration of relevant disadvantages experienced by minority ethnic groups, the effects of the practices of those providing housing (such as private landlords), or the immediate causes and increased risks of homelessness.81 Even so, there seems to be scope for some fresh thinking, particularly about how policy-making and research might be linked more effectively for proactive purposes.

There has been little research on statutory homelessness and the drivers of homelessness for families with children from different black and minority ethnic communities. ODPM recently commissioned research into the causes of homelessness amongst households from different black and minority ethnic communities and to provide best practice guidance on appropriate interventions for tackling and preventing homelessness among black and minority ethnic communities. This will look at those accepted as homeless by local authorities and in particular at families with children.

4.3 The research record on harassment

Harassment has been researched extensively, and a great deal has been printed about it. Writing in 1991 Smith indicated that although most studies had focussed primarily on the experiences of the Asian and African/Caribbean communities, it was increasingly apparent that other minorities were also vulnerable, while a number of studies were highlighting the ‘particular problems faced by black women’.82 We should also not overlook the experiences of white women with black children or children of mixed heritage. Smith’s review mentions the issue of ‘no go’ areas that has been noted by other writers, and the particular risks faced by black people living outside the main areas of settlement.83 Recently Chahal and Julienne84 have summarised the extent and limitations of previous work and available data, and presented findings from their own study, which involved research in four areas across the UK. Their report is an outstanding research exemplar, examining the impact of racist victimisation on black and minority ethnic people’s daily lives from their own perspectives, and touching on the strategies that families and individuals adopt to prevent or lessen racist victimisation. From the more general literature it seems that harassment associated with residence remains widespread (albeit difficult to quantify precisely, and difficult to compare across places and studies), and deserves to be the focus of further monitoring. Chahal and Julienne summarise criticisms made in earlier studies about the inadequacy of official responses, noting the negative effects on household choice (including transfer to other, more segregated, neighbourhoods) which we touch on again below. Elsewhere, the penetration and take-up of good practice has been reviewed and monitored, and there is now valuable accessible material on this.85 As far as gaps in present knowledge are concerned, there is not enough systematic up-to-date information about the interactions between – on the one hand – specific types of households experiencing
harassment, and – on the other – organisations that provide and manage housing. The effectiveness of responses is still unclear. Given the strong official interest at present in combating anti-social behaviour, it is surprising to learn, from a study of the use of legal remedies to deal with neighbour nuisance, that only 50% of council landlords would always take possession action in racist harassment cases, while 14% would never take possession action.86
After five decades of settlement, Britain's black minority ethnic population is still disproportionately concentrated in the poorest urban (usually inner city) locations and in the most deprived housing. The processes underlying the concentration, segregation and deprivation of minority ethnic groups have been well documented, as has the disadvantage experienced by minorities as they have competed for resources within the housing market. The close and continuing association between minority ethnic segregation and deprivation has been attributed to a range of factors; the early disadvantages of newcomer status, long-term poverty, systematic institutional discrimination, racist harassment and the pull of the ethnic cluster, for social and cultural reasons and for safety.

While there is nothing to compare with the scale and deprivation of the North American ghetto, black minority ethnic clusters in Britain are well defined and show few signs of disintegrating. The clusters vary in size from single blocks of flats on social housing estates (as may be found in many of the London Boroughs) to extensive tracts of owner occupied nineteenth century terraces or back-to-backs in inner areas, typical of northern cities such as Oldham, Bradford or Leeds. Discussions of black minority ethnic segregation all too readily conjure up images of ‘problem areas’ and ‘people as problems’. Many of the associations are negative; high levels of social deprivation, poverty and exclusion, occasional ‘no-go’ areas which are difficult to police, culturally exclusive populations who appear not to favour integration, and threats of civil disorder. Less is said of the positive attributes of minority ethnic clustering.

Central and local government concern with minority ethnic concentration and segregation has waxed and waned over the decades. In the 1970s there was widespread concern over problems perceived to be associated with the growth of ghetto-like concentrations, which expressed itself in its most extreme form through Birmingham City Council’s attempt to engineer settlement patterns through its policy for the dispersal of black tenants. Although there have been many housing initiatives since the 1970s which have sought to improve the housing conditions of black and minority ethnic groups, many have been underpinned by stereotypes of black and particularly Asian people as resistant to the idea of living away from the main areas of residence. This has served to reinforce existing patterns of segregation. Surprisingly, neither the Runnymede Trust report on The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain, nor the recent Race and Housing Inquiry Challenge Report gave much consideration to ‘racial’ segregation (and indeed the Runnymede Trust report said little about housing). This proved to be a significant omission given the sudden media and political (including ‘Far Right’) interest in segregation and
racialised territories following the disturbances in northern cities in 2001. Questions of black minority self-segregation, so-called ‘white flight’, racialised gangs and the continuing role of institutional discrimination in reinforcing segregation came to the forefront of discussion, once again highlighting the importance of ‘race’ as a social and spatial divider in Britain.

The aim of this section of our review is to argue that the reasons for continuing patterns of black minority ethnic segregation in the more deprived neighbourhoods of our cities are diverse, complex and changing. This must be recognised by policy makers when they are devising positive action plans and setting ‘race equality’ targets. The key points to be emphasised are:

- Although Britain does not have American style ghettos, the forces underlying persistent black minority ethnic concentration, segregation and deprivation in the UK are much the same as in the USA. The persistence of clustering in deprived areas points to structural inequalities manifest in long-term social and economic deprivation and underpinned by systematic discrimination and hostility towards the black and Asian population, in housing and in other spheres.

- The separation of groups living in different localities in itself is not necessarily a bad thing. It is the continuing association between black and minority ethnic segregation and deprivation that needs to be broken. Clustering has many positive attributes, which are evident through extended social and cultural relations, social support, a sense of belonging and well developed community infrastructures. Indeed, the processes of localised ‘community integration’ are likely to be associated with better health and well-being for minorities, and could influence a range of satisfactions and experiences, generating positive health effects amongst other outcomes. Given the potential advantages for personal safety when minorities live in localities where many others are familiar to them, positive health results from clustering would fit logically with the association found between the experience of racist abuse or assault and ill-health. Relocation away from the ethnic core may thus be associated with re-clustering for social, cultural and even political purposes, as exemplified by the re-concentration of affluent Jewish groups in the suburbs of London, Leeds and Manchester.

- Black and minority ethnic views of their established inner city neighbourhoods are often ambivalent, are sometimes contradictory, and vary within and between different origin and religious groups; gender, generation and class all produce important variations in perspective. There are also significant differences in views across localities, which point to the importance of conducting local surveys and consultations with black and minority ethnic communities.

- The level of segregation recorded depends on the scale at which it is measured. A preoccupation with ward data often misses smaller, but significant clusters within wards (measurable at the enumeration district or street level).

- The historical legacy of forces promoting segregation in particular areas is difficult to challenge. The link between community and place, which was once produced by exclusion in the job and housing market, is often now sustained by community ties and the fear of racist harassment.

- From a policy maker’s perspective, there is a need to widen the housing choices of minority ethnic groups, both through providing support for those who wish to move away from the
established ethnic cluster, and by widening housing options within the ethnic cluster for those who wish to stay.

5.1 Evidence of concentration and segregation

Some of our best evidence for patterns of black minority ethnic concentration and segregation comes from the 1991 Census, which although now dated has provided us with insights into the national patterns and processes. These studies indicate that the geography of minority ethnic settlement at the national scale has still not changed substantially since the 1950s. There have, however, been some important spatial changes at the local level. This has taken the form of settlement expansion into areas adjacent to the ethnic cores and, on a smaller scale, there is some evidence of minority ethnic suburbanisation.

The national pattern of black minority ethnic settlement is one of relative stability. Key findings from an analysis of census data over the 1981-1991 period (using population estimates for 1981) reveal that:

- there has been a remarkably low level of minority ethnic spatial redistribution across the country despite the relatively rapid growth of the minority ethnic population.

- There has been a growing metropolitan concentration, with minority ethnic communities in regions such as Greater London (which accounts for 45 per cent of Britain’s minority ethnic population), the West Midlands, Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire increasing their share of the black minority ethnic population between 1981 and 1991. This process of consolidation reflects continuing white out-migration from the ethnic cores (sometimes sensationally and inaccurately referred to as ‘white flight’), household growth and new household formation within established ethnic communities, and some in-migration of newcomers from outside the UK.

- Inter-regional mobility rates for minority ethnic groups are relatively low compared with the white population. The only exception appears in the case of the peripheral and more sparsely populated regions of Britain (where minority ethnic populations are under-represented). Here, minority ethnic out-migration exceeds that for whites. The long established patterns of regional minority ethnic concentration are thus reinforced.

- The pattern of inter-regional and inter-urban moves made by the minority ethnic groups over the 1981-1991 decade largely reflects changing employment opportunities for this population. There is evidence, for example, of some movement of the Pakistani population away from the smaller declining textile towns of Lancashire, where they are disproportionately represented amongst the unemployed, to Greater Manchester.

- The propensity to migrate between regions varies between minority groups and across generations. There is a particularly low level of regional mobility for Black-Caribbeans, a position which is little changed from the 1980s. This has resulted in Black-Caribbeans becoming increasingly distant from the growth sectors of the restructured economy. As in the 1970s, Pakistanis are still relatively mobile (although decreasingly so), driven by the search for employment in the manufacturing sector. This has not, however, resulted in a deconcentration of this group, but rather an exchange of households between core areas of Pakistani settlement in the conurbations of West Yorkshire and the West Midlands.
Important generational differences in the propensity to migrate are emerging. As Robinson has demonstrated, British-born Black-Caribbeans are more mobile than their parents' generation and show signs of moving beyond the conurbations. British-born Indians and Pakistanis have also shown a greater tendency to move to Greater London than their parents, although most circulate between existing communities in the conurbations. New geographies may therefore be in the making, but, to date, the national pattern has proved remarkably stable.

Within the cities, there is some evidence of recent change at the local scale. While segregation is still a striking feature of minority ethnic settlement, some households have relocated to middle ring areas outside the ethnic core and, on a smaller scale, there has been some minority ethnic suburbanisation. Evidence indicates that:

- There has been small-scale movement away from most of the major conurbations. While most moves are highly localised, there has been some longer distance relocation, with minority ethnic groups moving, for example, from Greater London to Essex (mainly of Black-Caribbeans) and Surrey (mainly Chinese and South Asians).

- The most significant deconcentration tendencies have been documented for Greater London. Here, movement from inner to outer areas is as evident for minority ethnic groups as for whites, although the minority ethnic population's moves involve shorter distances. In 1990-1991, net out-migration was evident from inner London boroughs such as Brent (for South Asians) and Hackney and Lambeth (for Black-Caribbeans), while Harrow, Redbridge (South Asians) and Enfield (Black-Caribbeans) gained minority ethnic populations.

- Some caution must be exercised in interpreting the changing ethnic geography of Greater London. It is not clear to what extent the inner to outer London movement represents a 'spillover' effect rather than relocation and/or dispersal. Also, while such a trend does point to some improvement in housing conditions for the groups involved, evidence suggests that within outer boroughs, minority ethnic groups still tend to be over-represented in the worst housing.

- The processes of de-concentration, and more particularly suburbanisation, have been selective. While Indians and British-born Black-Caribbeans are well represented amongst the spatial pioneers, fewer Pakistanis and Bangladeshis have moved outwards. The rapid growth of the latter two predominantly Muslim minorities over the 1981-1991 decade has been largely characterised by a consolidation of their pattern of inner city residence. This reflects the low socio-economic status and high unemployment levels of these groups, religious ties to the centralised ethnic community and its facilities, and in the case of the substantial Bangladeshi population in Tower Hamlets, the restricted structure of housing opportunities open to them through the council.

- Generational differences play a role in selecting those most likely to move away from the inner cities. British-born heads of households are better represented in areas with lower minority ethnic populations than the older generation, particularly if they are of Indian origin. However, recent research in Leeds and Bradford indicates that many second and third generation Asian households still value clustering and may, for a number of reasons, be reticent to move away from traditional areas of settlement.

- The pioneering spirit of the British-born generations is not unexpectedly mediated by the
effects of social class and education. Young Indian and Black-Caribbean middle class households have been living in the predominantly white suburbs since the 1980s.\textsuperscript{111}

- Peach’s analysis of segregation indices over the 1961-1991 period confirms the trend towards modest deconcentration and dispersal of the minority ethnic population in Britain over time.\textsuperscript{112} However, he also highlights a diversity of segregation experiences. While Black-Caribbeans have been characterised by decreasing segregation levels, partly as a result of their movement into the council sector in the 1970s, some South Asian groups have become more segregated and together South Asians achieve ‘a majority position in a number of wards’.\textsuperscript{113} The settlement patterns of particular South Asian sub-groups are, however, highly differentiated: Indians emerge as the least segregated group and Bangladeshis the most.\textsuperscript{114}

Black and minority ethnic deconcentration and suburbanisation is therefore a largely local phenomenon, mainly confined to the metropolitan areas. Despite recent increases in movement away from the inner cities, minority ethnic groups are still under-represented in the affluent suburbs. For example, Owen and Johnson observed that, in the Midlands, 36% of whites lived in affluent suburbs in 1991 compared with 10% of Black Caribbeans and 5% of Pakistanis.\textsuperscript{115} The socio-economic progress of the Indian population within the Midlands was, however, evident by their higher representation in the wealthier suburbs (20% of the group). Meanwhile, 37% of the minority ethnic groups remained in the inner cities of this region (60% of Bangladeshis) compared with only 9% of whites. Significantly, minority ethnic groups are virtually absent from long distance migration flows in and out of rural Britain.\textsuperscript{116} This urban bias is clearly evident in the Midlands, where 9% of whites live in prosperous rural areas, compared with only 1% of the black minorities.\textsuperscript{117}

### 5.2 Recent evidence from Leeds and Bradford

Recent research by Phillips in Leeds and Bradford,\textsuperscript{118} which examines mobility over the 1991-2001 period, provides a more up to date picture of the changing pattern of concentration and segregation amongst the South Asian population. This research uses a names analysis of the electoral register to enumerate the South Asian population in these two cities, and has the advantage of being able to distinguish between religious groups. The availability of postcode unit data from the electoral register also provides a framework for detailed, small-scale analyses of patterns over time. The key findings from this analysis are highlighted below:

- There has been a persistence of clustering in established areas of Asian settlement. Comparisons of 1991 and 2000 data at the enumeration district level indicate a significant growth in the number of Asian households in the inner city, growing numbers of adults in Asian households (as families mature and marriage extends the family), and a continuing out-migration of white households from inner city areas. This points to increasing levels of overcrowding within households and within the neighbourhood. As households mature, young men in particular spend more time on the street, which can lead to a greater propensity for conflict with the police or other street gangs. The issue of increasing racialisation of space and community-police relations in Bradford is developed further in the context of the recent Bradford Race Review Panel’s report, particularly in relation to schooling.\textsuperscript{119}

- High levels of South Asian segregation are evident at ward level in both cities, but a much clearer pattern of settlement emerged from a small-scale analysis at the level of the
enumeration district (ED) or postcode sector. This revealed intense segregation in very localised areas, but also, contrary to the popular image, a considerable degree of ‘racial’ mixing across the core ethnic areas. Some streets in the Manningham area of Bradford and the Harehills and Beeston areas of Leeds are exclusively Asian, and a high proportion of EDs are Asian dominated. While the density of Asian households in Bradford EDs rose to 80%, not one ED in Leeds was more than two-thirds Asian. South Asians are living alongside a mix of Black-Caribbean and white households in these inner cities.

- The geographies of Muslim, Sikh and Hindu residence are broadly overlapping, but distinctive, as is illustrated for Bradford in Figures 1-3. There was clear evidence of segregation between these religious groups at the local scale. There is also a separation of Bangladeshi and Pakistani areas of residence, which is reinforced by the use of separate mosques.

- Religious groups living in Bradford were classified by ‘type of area’ of residence using GB Profiler data. This is a classification system which takes into account a range of variables including social class, housing type, neighbourhood characteristics and the lifestyle of local residents. The ‘status’ of areas associated with minority ethnic segregation was thus revealed. The analysis indicated that:

  - More than 80% of Muslims (mainly Pakistanis/Kashmiris and Bangladeshis) were living in areas classified as ‘struggling’ in 2000. These were typically inner city areas.

  - Sikhs and Hindus were doing better than Muslims, although 45-50% were living in ‘struggling’ areas.

  - All groups were present in smaller numbers in the higher status residential areas of Bradford. For example, over a third of Sikhs (35%) and a quarter of Hindus (28%) were living in reasonably well off suburban areas. 10% of Muslims were also present in these types of neighbourhoods.

  - There is therefore a diversity of experience within South Asian groups as well as between them. Importantly, however, there is clear evidence that all sub-groups are making some progress in terms of access to better living standards and neighbourhood amenities in Bradford. The same is true of Leeds.

  - There was clear evidence of re-clustering within the middle ring areas and suburbs of Leeds and Bradford along the lines of religion.

  - The South Asian populations of Leeds and Bradford are relatively absent from certain areas of these cities, and they are particularly poorly represented in the outer areas of social housing. This is partly a function of social class, a preference for ownership, and past discrimination, which has steered South Asians into particular areas of the city. The pattern is also actively sustained by avoidance. Some larger council estates are feared because of the crime, drugs and youth gangs, while other areas are simply seen as ‘white territory’ to be avoided.

There are thus clear signs of mobility but it is constrained. Certain geographical areas, either by design or by default, are perceived as (or dedicated as) out of bounds for minority ethnic groups. Just as in the early post-war years, these areas tend to coincide with the suburbs, the high status residential areas and the rural.
Figure 1  Sikh households in Bradford: 2000

Projection GB National Grid Crown Copyright Ordnance Survey. An ED INA UKBorders/JISC supplied service. Datasets provided by Bradford City Council (Policy & research Unit) for this project only. Created by Faisal Butt February 2000
Figure 2 Muslim households in Bradford: 2000

Projection GB National Grid Crown Copyright Ordnance Survey. An ED INA UKBorders/JISC supplied service. Datasets provided by Bradford City Council (Policy & research Unit) for this project only. Created by Faisal Butt February 2000
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Figure 3 Hindu households in Bradford: 2000

Projection GB National Grid Crown Copyright Ordnance Survey. An ED INA UKBorders/JISC supplied service. Datasets provided by Bradford City Council (Policy & research Unit) for this project only. Created by Faisal Butt February 2000
5.3 Processes of concentration, segregation and residential mobility

A number of inter-linked processes have been identified as underlying changing patterns of minority ethnic settlement. The main ones are:

5.3.1 Socio-economic progress
Assumptions of socio-economic advancement are integral to models of minority ethnic group desegregation and dispersal. However, minority ethnic employment choice may be constrained by economic changes affecting particular localities, discriminatory labour market recruiting practices, reliance on public transport, or nervousness about journeys to or through white-dominated areas. Although a review of the literature indicates that there is no neat relationship between social class, generation and minority ethnic group, some systematic effects are evident. Occupational advancement correlates with the dynamic pattern of Indian settlement and, up to now, the greater locational inertia of the Pakistani/Bangladeshi groups. Minority ethnic suburbanisation is clearly linked to the growth of a small black middle class. It is important to note, however, that variations in social class do not completely account for the changing geography of ethnic settlement. In contrast to most of their white counterparts – and because of fear of harassment, family obligations and/or cultural ties – by no means all economically successful minority ethnic households move away from inner areas of community settlement. Ultimately, the experience of unemployment, especially amongst young heads of households, may prove to be a more important social and spatial divider than social class per se.

5.3.2 Institutional intervention in the housing market
Housing market institutions have played a major role in producing and sustaining the concentration, segregation and deprivation of minority ethnic groups over the post-war years. In the social rented sector, the directly and indirectly discriminatory effects of allocations policies and practices have directed black tenants into much of the worst rental housing. In the private sector, market segmentation by housing institutions has produced ethnic clustering; for example, ‘racial steering’ by estate agents, inequalities in access to housing finance, and private landlord discrimination have all been powerful determinants of minority ethnic segregation.

Research nevertheless indicates that the strong segregationist tendencies of the past are being eroded within both the public and private housing sectors, although they have by no means disappeared. As our report indicates later (see Sections 11.1-11.2), overt racism has less purchase in housing practice today, and this has been reflected in the changing research agenda. ‘Race equality’ initiatives have curbed the worst discrimination in social rented housing, and some local authorities and housing associations have implemented minority ethnic relocation schemes. The legacy of past discrimination can, however, undermine such schemes’ success, as community ties to deprived areas and fear of racial harassment deter movement. This comes at a time when local authorities are recognising the need to widen minority ethnic choices, particularly those of Asians, because of the acute over-crowding in the core settlement areas, the rapidly expanding Asian population and the shortage of land and suitable housing to meet their needs in these areas. (For analysis of issues related to positive housing strategy options see Section 10.)

In the private sector, changed market conditions have led to lending institutions and estate agents taking a less ‘exclusionary’ attitude to borrowers, buyers, localities and property characteristics. They tend therefore to be more responsive to minority ethnic house buyers than
in the past and some actively pursue minority ethnic clients as a source of profit. Minority ethnic purchasers are thus gaining greater access to resources, although opportunities almost certainly vary according to class, gender, ethnic group, type of institution and locality. Indeed, a survey of estate agents in Leeds in 2000 highlighted a worryingly familiar pattern of discriminatory activity by some agents, and a perception of unequal treatment amongst some Asian clients. Similarly, although research remains underdeveloped on access to financial services, value of property assets, costs of maintenance and so forth, it is probable that inner city insurance and mortgage circumstances are still distinctive for minority ethnic groups. Third, Wainwright and Pawson found in their study in Scotland that many minority ethnic owners had higher monthly mortgage repayments, spent a greater proportion of income on mortgage costs, and appeared to find it more difficult to make their monthly repayments than white owners. Meanwhile, four times as many minority ethnic as white owners had at some time been in mortgage arrears.

Movement into more affluent areas implies growing minority empowerment, either through increased financial security or through the use of strategies (institution-led or individual initiatives) to circumvent ethnic exclusion and disadvantage. Black-led housing associations could play an important role, although their size and distribution may limit their potential contribution to the relocation process. (See Sections 10 and 12 for fuller comments on these organisations.) Meanwhile, increasing trends towards the Large Scale Voluntary Transfers of council stock could have the effect of reinforcing existing patterns of segregation, in certain circumstances. As we make clear later in this report, large-scale transfer of stock raises important questions about minority communities’ involvement in ownership and management. From the point of view of segregation, however, it is important to note now that barriers to movement between areas might be increased if council stock extending across a range of neighbourhoods was being broken up and transferred to the control of a number of smaller community-based RSLs. Potential federal organisational structures and planning and management mechanisms, which might help tackle such issues, remain under-explored (see Section 10).

5.3.3 Racist harassment
Harassment plays an important role in maintaining racial segregation by depriving black households of a wide choice of locations and property types away from the ethnic cores. Evidence shows that minority ethnic groups are more vulnerable to attack outside the core areas, and this particularly limits access to social rented housing. Recent research in Leeds and Bradford confirmed that South Asians avoid a wide range of peripheral council estates because of the fear of racist harassment, and worry about isolation and intimidation in certain outer areas of private housing. Further survey work by Phillips, as part of an ESRC project on Asian housing mobility, has found that some South Asian households in Leeds and Bradford have moved out of the ethnic cluster only to return for reasons of security and support.

Racist violence, or fear of it, thus reinforces institutional forces for market segmentation. This is particularly true for Pakistanis and Bangladeshis in the current climate of anti-Muslim feeling following the World Trade Centre bombing. For those who can afford it, access to middle class owner occupied areas may be less of a problem; wealth can provide a shield in the form of private transport and home security systems, although some minority ethnic households must go to extraordinary lengths to cope with the risk of harassment. The indications are that while money can buy a foothold in the suburbs, there are still ‘ethnic penalties’ to be paid (see Section 2 for this terminology).
5.4 Neighbourhood and community

Modood et al’s survey of minority ethnic groups in Britain and Ouseley’s report on race relations in Bradford have brought issues of community, neighbourhood and minority ethnic ‘self-segregation’ to the fore. Lakey (in Modood et al., 1997) found that 51 per cent of Pakistanis and 42 per cent of Bangladeshis would prefer to live in an area where people from their own ethnic group were in the majority (i.e. making up half or more of the population).

In a similar vein, Ouseley’s inquiry concluded that many in the Muslim community of Bradford favoured leading a separate way of life from the majority population in the city; one rooted in Islam and supported by segregated living.

It is important not to uncritically equate discussions of self-segregation with the idea of voluntary segregation, as has often been the case. It is much more likely that expressed preferences reflect bounded choices. Cultural autonomy, and the segregation which helps to sustain it, can become a resource and a refuge, especially for those who speak little English, or are newcomers to the country as a result of transnational marriages (still very common amongst the Pakistani community of Bradford). However, the expressed desire for social, cultural and spatial separation may also be a response to the perceived hostility and exclusion of the wider society. As Kearns and Parkinson have argued, the home area is ‘an arena of predictable encounter’, and thus the idea of moving away from the ethnic cluster can be threatening. While the ‘middle class’ suburb and the lifestyle associated with it may be a signifier of status for white families, its meaning may be very different for the minority ethnic household, particularly its female members. As Boys has indicated, the notion of ‘home’ as a ‘woman’s place’ is founded on conceptions of white middle class domesticity. For Asian women in particular, separation from the ethnic community through suburban living may make them more dependent upon men in the family for mobility and socialising, especially if racist harassment is perceived to be a threat. It may also affect their chances of work, since many women rely on community networks in their search for a job.

Recognition of the importance of bounded choices has several implications for housing policy makers and service providers. Two which relate to the widening of minority ethnic residential choices will be explained further now, because of the connections with issues of segregation. Later in this report we return again to the question of strategy options in Section 10.

5.4.1 Widening locational choices

There is a need to widen the locational choices of minority ethnic groups within the social rented sector, enabling them to move away from the established ethnic cluster more easily. Very recent research by Phillips and Unsworth has, however, identified shortcomings in institutional attitudes, policies and practices for widening locational choices. Indeed, a survey revealed that for some local authorities and RSLs, the issue of opening up minority ethnic choices was simply not on the agenda.

It must be acknowledged that there are difficulties in bringing about the outward movement of black and minority ethnic households via the social rented sector. Vacancies occur less frequently in the more popular areas, and so it is a slow process to change the mix of people in the more desirable areas and to change the stigma and poor reputations of low demand areas – whether inner or outer city. Providing the support essential for widening ethnic choices can also be expensive in terms of time and finances; this may be especially difficult for smaller RSLs.

Nevertheless, if the social rented sector is to provide a culturally competent service to its local
black and minority ethnic population, then a range of issues must be considered as a framework for policy and action:

- The changing aspirations of black and minority ethnic groups, which are neither fully documented at the local scale nor acknowledged, need to be understood.
- Institutional cultures in local authorities and mainstream RSLs must be conducive to the delivery of a culturally competent service.
- Improved communication and consultation with black and minority ethnic groups is crucial to instilling a climate of trust and confidence in the responsiveness of social landlords. Black and minority ethnic households particularly fear being ‘dumped’ in an isolated area and being left to fend for themselves.
- South Asian minorities in particular retain a strong preference for home ownership. There are nevertheless very real economic constraints on these households achieving this goal. Exploring ways in which a mix of affordable home-ownership and social renting could be achieved in preferred areas of settlement could be one valuable way forward. The greater emphasis since 1998 on ‘Mixed and Flexible Tenure’ (MFT) options in the Low Cost Home Ownership programme has been widely acclaimed by housing policy analysts and by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation as a positive step towards greater choice and flexibility for low income households. This reform might have the potential to integrate tenures within designated neighbourhoods, thus helping to combat the stigma of social housing areas, and to give greater financial choice to low income households.

A key issue for most minority ethnic households is the degree of genuine and low-risk choice open to them. It is therefore likely to be the reduction of barriers and the facilitating of choice that become the hallmarks of well-informed policy, rather than a set of objectives built around notions about the ‘engineering’ of social change and integration for its own sake. This realisation underpins current policy thinking about outward movement in a number of localities. The tone of the debate is captured neatly in the title of the most recent and high profile Bradford housing report, Breaking down the barriers, by Ratcliffe’s team.

### 5.4.2 Regeneration of minority ethnic clusters

There is also a need to recognise the positive attributes of clustering and invest in the ‘social capital’ established in areas of minority ethnic housing. ‘Race equality’ must therefore be addressed through considering regeneration strategies. Key issues here are:

- Housing and environmental upgrading, which might not only be crucial for improving living conditions, but also to combat the stigma associated with the negative labelling of areas and people, and the effects of low self-esteem on young people in particular.
- The widening of housing options within the established ethnic settlement, for example, through the introduction of mixed tenures and housing types to satisfy the housing demands of different generations, social classes and family types within a preferred neighbourhood. An example of this approach may be found in Birmingham, where regeneration is catering to the Asian population’s preference to remain in inner city Saltley, despite encouragement to move outwards to suburban areas of social housing.
- Consultation with and the involvement of the local communities. Evidence presented by Allan and Cars suggests that the functioning and governance of multi-cultural
neighbourhoods have been largely ignored to date.\(^\text{150}\) Too often, the local governance structures are inflexible and reflect the political norms of the dominant cultural group.

The Social Exclusion Unit has placed a firm emphasis on the importance of ‘neighbourhoods’ in its proposals for tackling social and physical deprivation.\(^\text{151}\) However, its reports do not provide a clear framework for defining them. ‘Poor neighbourhoods’ are identified through a ward-level statistical analysis of deprivation indices, but, it can be argued, this does not capture the full meaning of ‘neighbourhood’ and the communities which live in such areas. Our earlier comments on the findings from research in Leeds and Bradford indicate that wards are too crude a measure of neighbourhood. The neighbourhood as perceived by the minority ethnic population living there is a more accurate reflection of the ‘lived spaces’ of communities and the ‘social capital’ invested in them (i.e. the networks of supportive relationships, institutions, care, and informal exchange relationships of both a financial and social nature). The Leeds and Bradford research has indicated that the perceived boundaries of the minority ethnic neighbourhoods are flexible and depend on gender, age, generation, and class. For example, within the Muslim communities, women’s perceptions of neighbourhood are very much more restricted than the men’s, which may have implications for the area targeting of resources in the regeneration process. This necessitates working towards the notion of a neighbourhood as a ‘place based community’, which reflects people’s everyday experience of the locality.
CHAPTER 6

Housing needs in an era of diversity

Housing needs have attracted a great deal of attention recently, with a growing raft of local studies providing a mix of qualitative and quantitative material.\textsuperscript{152} Important stimuli to research activity on black and minority ethnic housing needs have included a wish to inform local policy development, widespread acknowledgement of inadequacies in existing information, and – crucially – the proactive role of the Housing Corporation. Some of the earliest studies were driven partly by the hope of encouraging a political and housing provider response in contexts where there had been a history of previous neglect. In some instances a study formed part of the momentum for establishing a black-run housing association, or helping consider its remit. As time has passed, the local needs study has perhaps come to be seen more as a potential standard tool for acquiring information on aspects of conditions or preferences, for feeding ideas into the policy process, for helping with target setting, or for facilitating or encompassing the social audit of ongoing housing agency practices. It has been endorsed officially, and work has been done to help with methodologies and guidance.\textsuperscript{153} Nonetheless, there is a wide variety of potential approaches, ranging from social audits of existing services and practices through to focus groups and substantial household surveys.\textsuperscript{154} Some investigations have had considerable value in increasing self-knowledge within provider organisations or within local communities. Quite a few have now dealt usefully with specialised issues such as housing for elders, aspects of impairment, or circumstances in particular minority ethnic communities.

To summarise the situation on needs studies we now highlight nine key points. After this an indication is given of the diversity of investigations, to provide a fuller picture for readers (see also Section 7 below). There is then a brief comment on the links with policy analysis and decision-making. Since needs studies are frequently seen as a good local route to incorporating black and minority ethnic housing concerns into the policy process, it is desirable to ‘place’ such investigations in relation to policy making.

- There have been a large number of local studies of black minority ethnic housing needs and allied topics, and these have enriched the understanding that policy makers, researchers and local communities have of housing and allied problems. Inevitably, however, many studies are primarily ‘snapshots’ taken at a particular moment, and there may be no research capacity to revisit households later, or to assess the responses that have been made by agencies to the findings.

- Studies have served to highlight both the diverse needs of the different communities and the commonality of housing experiences across some groups. For instance, it seems that Chinese and Asian communities appear to be experiencing changes in family structure and there may be susceptibility to ‘social isolation because of language difficulties’; yet all
communities share the ‘desire to live in areas where there are other members of their community and cultural and religious facilities close by’, and this becomes particularly important in later life.\textsuperscript{155}

- There are income and affordability problems affecting housing, and ‘access problems in terms of social housing’ particularly amongst the Asian and Chinese.\textsuperscript{156} For these communities overcrowding and housing conditions may exacerbate health problems.

- Studies have often focussed on specific issues or groups, and there is a strong case for continuing such work, especially where it has immediate policy relevance, or connects with previously hidden difficulties, preferences or experiences (a recent example being ongoing research on Somalis, whose needs may have tended to be hidden within larger minority ethnic categories). More knowledge about particular religious groups and their needs or preferences might also be helpful when dealing with design, and community or neighbourhood development issues.

- In many instances it will be desirable to conduct research in co-operation with local communities, and to ensure that local people share in any financial benefits that the research exercise itself can bring.

- There is not enough information on needs, preferences, barriers and opportunities for people with mental health problems in terms of housing and support.

- The methodologies, measures and indicators available for needs studies are varied, and there is potential for disagreements about how far a specific type of information is actually a good guide to needs in a particular locality or community. For instance, ‘traditional’ approaches to measures of households’ relative needs may under-value issues such as isolation or potential harassment, or perhaps even overcrowding.\textsuperscript{157}

- Attention needs to be given to the possibility that there may sometimes be an ongoing mismatch between available policy levers on the one hand, and the preferences or needs revealed for minority ethnic groups on the other. One argument is that insofar as policy and investment preoccupations continue to emphasise social rented housing rather than the private sectors, there presently may be too few means of responding to housing and allied disadvantages for some of the communities whose needs are being researched. This issue of mismatch deserves further analysis at national and local level, as it has potential implications for national policy.

- The issue of local needs studies could be reviewed nationally in the light of experience so far, to see whether there are useful indicators which have been under-utilised, whether social audit approaches might be developed further, and whether in the longer term any more dynamic notion of needs (perhaps linked with household pathways) would be useful and capable of being operationalised. At the same time it would be useful to research how far needs studies have been acted upon, and factors affecting the responses of provider organisations to them. It would also be worth finding out how far inquiries into minority ethnic housing needs have become a regular part of ‘mainstream’ survey and monitoring activity.
6.1 The scope and coverage of needs studies

The wide scope of needs studies can be illustrated by the range drawn on in the systematic overviews by Matthias (covering relevant Housing Corporation Innovation and Good Practice studies), and Sodhi et al. Matthias mentions, amongst others, approaches focusing on Chinese older people, on individuals with mental health problems from the African Caribbean community in Leicester, on Asian people with mental health problems, on Asian elders, on women from minority ethnic groups in Rochdale, on alcohol, housing management and BME tenants of RSLs, and on ‘housing plus’ needs of young Muslims in Hackney. Sodhi et al. include studies on the needs of Bangladeshi older people in Sunderland, the needs of Vietnamese communities, housing and care needs of black and minority ethnic elders in Tower Hamlets, access to housing for Irish single homeless people, and other specialised concerns.

Sodhi et al. note that initial studies tended to focus on the more visible and geographically concentrated communities, rather than those which were more dispersed, and tended not to differentiate between particular communities. They indicate also that earlier studies tended to be very housing centred, with little assessment of associated needs such as social care and support or health, and that the potentially differing experiences and needs of women, elders and young people were not emphasised. Furthermore, they suggest that there is little information on the needs of groups with mental health problems in terms of housing and support.

We agree with Sodhi et al.’s judgement that the studies serve to highlight the diverse needs of the different communities and the commonality of housing experiences amongst some groups. The authors conclude that Chinese and Asian communities appear to be experiencing changes in family structure and there may be susceptibility to ‘social isolation because of language difficulties’. All communities share the ‘desire to live in areas where there are other members of their community and cultural and religious facilities close by’, and this becomes particularly important in later life. The authors also draw attention to affordability problems in terms of housing, and ‘access problems in terms of social housing’ particularly amongst the Asian and Chinese. For these communities there are issues around overcrowding and housing conditions which exacerbate health problems.

The authors also argue that many reports tell us more about the people that use services than about those who do not. This is a valid point in view of the methodological difficulties faced in local studies with limited timescales, where it may be tempting to have recourse to local service or community centres for sampling purposes or assembling focus groups. Summarising the research trends we can say that there is increasing awareness of complexity and diversity, and variation in the targets and purposes of studies, with useful new insights still being obtained at local level.

6.2 Needs studies and the links with policymaking

It is important to place investigations of needs in the context of ongoing efforts to inform and improve policies. It can be argued that local needs studies have not always turned out to be the effective aids to policy that might have been hoped for.

While needs studies have become numerous, diverse and often sophisticated, the fit with policy choices may be uncertain. There are unresolved questions about definitions, data or indicators,
and the links with policy, which must make us cautious when evaluating needs studies. Measuring preferences or dwelling deficiencies does not automatically mean that we know what is needed. In addition, traditional measures of households’ relative needs might under-value issues such as isolation or potential harassment in favour of other criteria, while minority ethnic households could be under-represented amongst groups taken as ‘urgent’ categories, such as medical priority cases. Furthermore, some black minority ethnic households have been prepared to forego higher dwelling quality to achieve more security from harassment, to avoid perceived ‘dangerous’ localities, or to become or remain owner-occupiers.

The recipe of providing more social rented dwellings on the basis of a set of indicators about a shortfall of affordable housing, or a high level of deficiencies in private sector dwellings, is not necessarily reliable or sufficient in this simple form. Approaches to need derived from traditional producer preoccupations may not suit all households, or may require careful tailoring to circumstances. One effect of misalignments between consumers on the one hand, and the inherited preoccupations with social rented housing policy on the other, is that available policy levers (particularly in respect of owner-occupied housing) may be inadequate for responding to present understandings of needs or preferences. Nonetheless, policy analysis aligned with work on needs has become much more well informed in respect of issues of constraints on residential choice and mobility.

Another issue is that we have little information on the practical effects of local needs studies (or lack of such effects), and on how far they are treated in local decision-making networks as ‘one off’ exercises that resolve an immediate political demand, as against being seen as potentially more regularised flexible components of an ongoing effort to improve knowledge for policy purposes. One persuasive view is that black and minority ethnic housing needs should be dealt with automatically as part of the general coverage given to needs analyses by local authorities and RSLs. Investigations should be regularised and integrated into ‘mainstream’ processes of policy review and development. The pattern, however, has been to create ad hoc work which may sometimes soon be forgotten.

A rare example of ‘revisiting’ a set of needs issues after an earlier study is a 1998 report by Jones with Mullins and Davis. This arose as a follow-up study to a 1996 report, to check on progress made in following recommendations affecting organisations. There has also been an effort to learn from and build upon earlier research in recent Bradford work. An alternative way of thinking about needs studies is to see them as means for helping communities improve their knowledge about conditions, trends and services through participating in research and audit. Advocates of community participation might argue that, to avoid this being seen as tokenism, it is desirable to make sure that research expenditure covers employment of local people as well as experienced professionals, and that research is more than an isolated ‘one off’ enquiry.
CHAPTER 7
Disability, age and gender

Some types of households may have rather particular housing experiences or requirements, or may perceive the treatment that they have received as differing in unpleasant ways from that received by other people. Disability, age and gender are potentially important research areas in these respects as far as ‘race’ and housing are concerned.

Smith argued a decade ago that the literature indicated that there were distinctive clusters of unmet need, arising from the ethnocentrism of the housing system, which ‘interact with institutionalised racism to produce a range of groups whose housing needs could be defined as “special”’, and which ‘certainly require further investigation’. At the time of her research review for the Rowntree Foundation (see Section 13), she was only able to comment on a very small group of studies in her sections on the needs of women, older people and people with medical needs. Eight years later, the extensive literature review and bibliography by Tomlins included important additions in relation to needs and experiences for women and elders, and in the disability or community care areas.

Today we would more likely use the term ‘specialised’ rather than ‘special’ needs, given that the latter has been criticised as potentially stigmatising. One can consider research that has explored specialised needs issues as well as research that has reviewed distinctive experiences. Key points about findings and research trends are set out now, and after this we will then provide fuller introductions to work on disability, age and gender. The section ends with a comment on ways forward (in 7.3).

- Research related to housing conditions has frequently considered circumstances for specific groups or categories (such as elders), and calls are often made for more such work focussed on particular types of households (for instance in relation to women within particular communities, or people with specific impairments). Issues of cultural needs have been identified for several groups.

- It is hard to find detailed empirical analyses of housing conditions which centre primarily around the perspectives and circumstances of children in minority ethnic households and communities, despite the potential significance of environmental and housing issues for them. This is an important research gap, and takes on added significance in view of central government’s strong commitment to children and their needs. The issue was raised earlier in the present report (see Section 3). There are occasional casual mentions of the effects of overcrowding on school homework or health, and there is an important and relevant study about minority ethnic families caring for a severely disabled child. On the whole, however, this is neglected territory.

- Studies tackling minority ethnic housing needs have indicated the importance of disability and chronic illness, but it is unclear how far this is being responded to by housing providers.
It seems that public policy responses have been inadequate, and that needs for services, support or adaptations will grow.

- It is believed that stereotypes related to ‘race’ or ethnicity have meant that practitioners have sometimes over-estimated the preparedness of service users’ relatives and social networks to provide informal care, and have been insensitive to members of minority ethnic communities.

- For women from black and minority ethnic communities, attention has been drawn in writings to problems of unacknowledged (or ‘hidden’) homelessness coupled with reliance on temporary accommodation from family or friends, lack of geographical choice in social renting, stigma associated with separation from families, partners or communities, difficulties in private markets because of low incomes, and adverse housing outcomes linked to domestic violence or abuse. Disadvantage is experienced by female heads of household, whether single or head of a family.

### 7.1 Disability and age

Studies tackling minority ethnic housing needs have noted the importance of disability or chronic illness, and the question arises as to whether this has been adequately responded to by housing providers. Hard data are scarce here, although Law notes from a Leeds study that minority ethnic households remained under-represented amongst those households with medical priority, and that a low percentage of minority ethnic households received disabled facilities grants. As with disabled people in general, there is little accessible material on private markets and disabled people from minority ethnic communities. For minority ethnic communities, there is also only a limited amount of research linking housing with disability, chronic illness and impairment, and with social support and health care provision. Nonetheless, a certain amount is known about disadvantage.

Begum (in research touching on housing while covering Asian disabled people) points generally to the ‘dual impact of race and disability’, often placing people in a unique, and ‘particularly disadvantaged position’. 70% of Asian disabled people and carers in her study were in owner-occupied properties, which serves as a reminder (given the relatively low proportions generally of disabled people owning) that tenure variation by ethnicity may be an issue to bear in mind in respect of strategies to assist disabled households. A Rowntree study by Zarb and Oliver found that older disabled people from black minority ethnic communities were more likely than their white counterparts to face problems like extreme isolation and very low incomes. A 1990s report suggests considerable and growing need for sheltered bed-spaces, very sheltered units, aids, adaptations and residential care among Asian elders in London. Thus, in 1996, over 22,000 Asian elders were estimated to require ‘aids and adaptations’, and over 400 to need residential or nursing home care. London as a whole was said to need over 1,700 sheltered units, and a further 1,500 very sheltered units. Between 1996 and 2011, a further 2,000 Asian elders apparently would require sheltered or very sheltered housing. Estimates and predictions of the types found in the report we are referring to here are helpful in suggesting something of the scale of problems, but have to be treated cautiously in view of the difficulties that often surround the precise measurement of needs. For the other end of the age range, Chamba et al. have noted that institutionalised racism, lack of consultation with black minority ethnic communities, and stereotypical beliefs about black families are all problems that have been previously identified within service provision to black families with a disabled child. These authors point to financial hardship, and to other problems faced by minority ethnic parents with...
disabled children, including the unsuitability of much of the housing they live in. Contrary to stereotypes about cultural practices, it may not always be feasible to receive support from an extended family.180

Stereotypes related to ‘race’ or ethnicity have been important, and have meant that practitioners might over-estimate the preparedness of service users’ relatives and social networks to provide informal care, and ‘could be particularly insensitive to members of minority ethnic communities’.181 Lack of explicit demand for a service may be taken wrongly to imply lack of need, ignoring the possibility that problems of information, communications or the cultural insensitivity of provision may have diminished take-up. In any event, at present there is under-provision of culturally sensitive services for some groups, and neglect of problems experienced by minority ethnic disabled people.

A leading study on housing and mental health care needs that illustrates key problems is by Radia, who looked at Asian people in Brent, Ealing, Harrow and Tower Hamlets. Asian mental health service users experienced problems of inappropriate housing, difficulties with neighbours, burglaries, racist attacks or harassment, and fears for their personal safety. Users did not have enough support, or the right kind of support, to be able to take charge of their own lives, and services were not culturally sensitive to their needs (and did not cater for those not fluent in spoken or written English).182 Interviewees did not think that there were community services that were suitable or adequate, or that catered for what they really required. Users felt ignored by professionals. Amongst strategies for change, the report suggests offering a range of quality supported independent housing and residential care, specialist housing catering for the needs of Asian people with mental health care problems, and trained outreach support workers to service both residential projects and those people living more independently in the community.183

It is not known how widespread the problems identified by Radia may be, but it is likely that they are found in many other localities too. Despite the evident deficiencies of practice, however, it is important to acknowledge that central government has become more sensitive about the service delivery issues. Cultural sensitivity is receiving more attention, and Ministers acknowledge that despite pockets of good practice there are many problems of access, inappropriate assessments, and services that do not adequately reflect ways of life and aspirations.184

A substantial number of reports have focussed specifically on elders,185 and Chahal and Temple have recently systematically reviewed the research position here. A key conclusion of their overview report is that different minority ethnic communities have differing and changing expectations about both service provision and the changing structures of family life; yet the whole area of aspirations and expectations of older people from minority ethnic groups is largely unexplored.186 They add that there is no evidence of work being undertaken with younger groups about their future demands on the housing markets.187 Perhaps this is surprising in view of the anticipated rapid increase in numbers in pensionable age groups, but researchers do sometimes include within their coverage people coming up to retirement.188

We would argue that thought should certainly be given to the future implications that differing tenure patterns and access to resources will have for types of demand and need in specific places, taking into account changing expectations and practices within communities. The predicted steep increase in numbers of elders within certain communities, coupled with an altered ratio of younger to older people, is likely to enlarge the demand for community services, and may diminish the potential for households to arrange informal care.189 Factors likely to make forms of accommodation appeal to elders will include a low risk of harassment, culturally
sensitive staffing, outreach or support services, respect shown for people, intelligent design that
takes culture into account, proximity to family, safety from crime, and closeness to community,
shops and places of worship. Chahal and Temple highlight the paucity of research on older
people from minority ethnic backgrounds and mental health needs and abuse.190 They also
indicate that minority ethnic people need to be discussed as individual groups, and even as
individuals in their own right, with very different needs and experiences.

A good illustration of the complications surrounding provision for elders is available in work by
Karn et al. (1999). They found in Manchester that the needs and preferences of elders were
rather different for each ethnic group studied; for instance the 'degree of stress on independent
living and on family care varied considerably', as did 'views on forms of residential care'.191 The
African/Caribbean informants emphasised independence, and had positive views of sheltered
housing, although finding inadequate cultural sensitivity in the way specific sheltered schemes
were currently run. By contrast, the South Asians in this research 'scarcely mentioned
independence', and for them it appeared that good domiciliary services and flexible forms of
housing (allowing older and younger generations to live with or near each other) were likely to
be most effective. Yet there was evidence that overcrowding put severe strain on arrangements
for families caring for their own elders, and dissatisfaction with current arrangements 'included
the elders themselves' who sought greater space and privacy.192 The authors observe that
adaptation of their own (or family's) homes is 'the model most likely to meet the needs of all
but the most frail or isolated', but that at present some Asian families (at least as perceived
within their particular research) regard use of domiciliary services as 'an indictment of their
own level and quality of care'.193

It seems likely that in many communities there is inadequate knowledge amongst potential
users about the available services, and that cultural insensitivity in provision remains a barrier.
On the other hand there may be scope for housing strategy innovations which might help. Karn
et al. indicate that (given a shortage of larger dwellings) acquisition and allocation of adjacent
properties might be useful, perhaps with consideration given to options such as a connecting
door, or simply members of an extended family living next door to each other.194 The main
point to be drawn from this and other studies, however, is that there is a need for ongoing local
consultation and detailed appraisal of preferences and resources (including ability to pay,
availability of support and limitations on this).

7.2 Information and research on women and men

The amount of material available on women from minority ethnic communities has been
growing, albeit slowly. Attention has been drawn in writings to problems of unacknowledged
(or 'hidden') homelessness195 coupled with reliance on temporary accommodation from family
or friends, lack of geographical choice in social renting, stigma associated with separation from
families, partners or communities, difficulties in private markets because of low incomes, and
adverse housing outcomes linked to domestic violence or abuse. Gender is significant for
lifestyles and housing outcomes, and clearly intersects with other variables (age, ethnicity, etc.)
to give complex patterns of experience.

Disadvantage is experienced by female heads of household, whether single persons or heads of
families. Phillips has observed that male heads of household in three broad ethnic groups
(white, Indian and Black Caribbean) are significantly more likely to own property than female
heads, and less likely to be represented in the local authority sector.\textsuperscript{196} Even for South Asian groups with high ownership rates overall, the public sector 'features significantly' when the household is female-headed.\textsuperscript{197} Interestingly, the heads of tenant households of black minority ethnic-run RSLs are more likely to be women than are RSL tenants as a whole, while more new lettings are in any case being made to women than to men across the RSL sector, although it is difficult to explain these findings without detailed enquiries.\textsuperscript{198} What is certain is that for women there is often relative disadvantage on several dimensions. For instance, Phillips found that Indian and Black Caribbean female heads of households were more likely to be living in terraced housing than were the male heads of households within their own ethnic group,\textsuperscript{199} while data for Manchester show that 82\% of lone parents in 1991 had no car, compared with 32\% of two parent households.\textsuperscript{200}

It might seem at first glance that a large amount is now known on gender, but this is illusory. In his 120-page annotated bibliography,\textsuperscript{201} Tomlins notes (amongst other publications) Dhillon-Kashyap’s general commentary (1994), Peach and Byron on ‘race’, class and gender (1993), Ford and Vincent (1990) on homelessness amongst African/Caribbean women, and Anderson, Kemp and Quilgars (1993) on single homeless people, along with the early work by Mama (1989) and Rao (1990) to which Smith had been able to refer in her 1991 review. Yet Tomlins reveals altogether only 15 items focussed around ethnicity and ‘race’ for which gender or women were highlighted explicitly as the main or a subsidiary feature. This unimpressive number suggests a lack of interest among key research funders.

As a study commissioned by Women’s Aid illustrates, however, some valuable material has been forthcoming through involvement of community-based, support or provider agencies in research. In this example Rai and Thiara (1997) explored the needs of black women and children in refuge support services and of black workers in Women’s Aid.\textsuperscript{202} Noting that 40 of the 240 refuge services in England are specialist refuges striving to meet needs of differing groups of black women and children, they indicate a low level of awareness or knowledge about such services among large numbers of women which leads them to endure violence for longer periods. Negative perceptions about refuges and inadequate help from agencies further serve to heighten anxieties and worries about refuges. Most women preferred to go to a refuge outside their locality for reasons of safety, and also wanted to be housed in areas with substantial minority ethnic populations, to avoid racism and to be able ‘to access their culturally specific facilities’. Having their cultural and religious needs met was an important factor shaping the quality of the experience that black women had in both mixed and specialist refuges. Sharing facilities could be problematic, language was a key issue for many Asian women, and women felt that refuges were crucial in helping women escape violence.\textsuperscript{203} Some groups ‘under-use refuge services’, and the report also noted some deficiencies in achieving a racism-free environment.\textsuperscript{204}

The findings reinforce what is known from other kinds of studies about the importance of culturally sensitive services and the significance of racisms in constraining locality choice. In addition, however, problems specific to women and their children are evident. For instance, the authors remark that black women often face ‘the dual problem of racism from the wider society and rejection from their own communities’, and that the ‘specific needs of children of mixed parentage often remain unrecognised’.\textsuperscript{1} Black workers in refuges often experienced marginalisation and racism. We should add that what happens to women when they approach more long-term housing providers is an allied topic of great importance where more information is needed.\textsuperscript{206}

Another example of a helpful study commissioned in association with a women’s housing aid
group is a more recent one by Ahmed and Sodhi in Rochdale.207 This found that few black and minority ethnic women know about supported housing, and lack of knowledge was a barrier to accessing this provision. Service providers identified a range of provision in terms of accommodation type and levels of support to meet the diverse needs of women, and highlighted specific gaps in service provision for women with high support needs. Only a minority of providers felt that services were responsive to the cultural needs of groups, and this was reflected in the research findings with Asian women. Very few Asian women identified a need for supported housing, but many identified a need for support, and some wanted to be close to cultural facilities. Women's needs and preferences for supported housing varied enormously and the authors argue for a range of provision to meet these differing needs and provide choice. Ahmed and Sodhi also indicate a need for greater provision of women-only, age and culturally specific schemes, and more discrete provision for those fleeing domestic violence.208

An exemplar of a different kind, carried out and published through a conventional university research centre, is Third's study, which was supported by the Rowntree Foundation.209 Her report deals with affordable childcare and housing through a case study of tenants of a black-run housing association, and the initiative came from that association, which was concerned about the combined impact of childcare costs and high rents on their tenants' ability to work. Although not specifically targeted on women and housing, the study is relevant to understanding many women's needs. The research focus was on how people themselves perceived those factors which were assumed to be incentives and disincentives to work, on understanding how they reacted to these, and on rents and childcare as potential barriers to taking up employment.210 Childcare was the biggest and potentially most expensive obstacle to employment for those without access to free childcare, but the study also commented on rents and benefits. Although housing benefit might reduce the disincentive effect of high rents, none of the working families found it easy to afford their rent, even with the help of housing benefit, while the financial gains of working 'became quite marginal once housing costs were paid'.211 Cameos were used to highlight circumstances, revealing the character of heavy childcare demands and the financial difficulties of households. It is worth adding that this study found that both the perception of the rent and experiences of meeting housing costs appeared 'to be related more to employment status and household income than to ethnic group'.212

Before offering some conclusions in terms of ways forward, we need to make the additional point about recent research that there has been little interest shown in charting the problems or experiences of men, perhaps partly because a stereotype of their being relatively advantaged is deployed when gender is discussed. The circumstances of young minority ethnic men have been rather ignored outside the context of homelessness or emergency services. While the latter topics are important, there is scope for considering trajectories, barriers and opportunities more generally and systematically, especially given the argument that many men from African/Caribbean communities are faring badly in socio-economic and employment terms,213 and bearing in mind the interactions some have with the criminal justice system.

7.3 Ways forward for research and practice on disability, age and gender

- A 'state of the art' research review might be a useful step in order to establish the most valuable research strategies for improving knowledge in relation to children from minority ethnic communities, and their housing and locality experiences, perceptions and preferences.
- Fuller consultation and participation for elders and disabled people from minority communities will be important in relation to ongoing research projects and planning focussed on improved provision and services. There is a need for more knowledge of aspirations and expectations, but also an understanding of households’ circumstances and realistic options in contexts of local markets and community characteristics. Flexibility in reviewing options is essential, rather than relying on stereotypes about preferences or on pre-determined notions about forms of provision. Participation in running of projects deserves more attention, with emphasis shifting from care and containment to helping participants develop choice and independence. Options for forms of self-management need to be kept in mind and researched where applicable.

- More attention should be given to barriers to choice and good accommodation faced by women. More needs to be known about unacknowledged (or ‘hidden’) homelessness, possible lack of geographical choice or of satisfactory provider responses in social renting, the effects of stigma and isolation associated with separation from families, partners or communities, difficulties in private markets because of low incomes, and adverse housing outcomes linked to domestic violence or abuse.

- Stereotypes about the supposed passivity or lack of involvement of women from particular communities in housing decisions should not be taken as justifying a lack of consultation with them.

- As far as disabled people are concerned, the stereotype that communities manage needs themselves should not be taken to justify an absence of appropriate services or a failure to assess requirements, just as a lack of take-up of white-run services should not be interpreted as evidence of lack of need.

- The housing experiences of young black and minority ethnic men, and their interactions with housing providers and other organisations, should be investigated more fully.
Area and tenure choices are acknowledged as significant features of minority ethnic preferences about which policy-makers need to know, and choice about proximity and co-residence can also seem crucial. Ideally we should be able to place these matters in a slightly broader context, to be able to understand how particular policy developments may match up with or inhibit aspirations or possible future pathways over time. Although there is diversity, there may also often be some similar long-term aspirations across groups and areas. Alongside data on the present, what is required is knowledge of routes and paths over slightly longer periods, from the past and into the future. We have said something above about needs, and the boundary between needs and preferences is often uncertain, but it is nonetheless well worth commenting separately now on strategies and preferences.

8.1 Developing research on strategies and pathways

Along with increasing recognition of diversity has come greater acknowledgement that different households or groups of households may have varying expectations, preferences and housing strategies. It is possible for local needs studies to go beyond questions about specific immediate preferences, by seeking more speculative responses about change for households. It is difficult, however, to unravel strategies and histories satisfactorily in a quantitatively-orientated interviewing exercise carried out within tight timing and resource constraints. Furthermore, questions about future intentions may be unrealistic or lack meaningfulness outside the context of daily constraints which may themselves change. People may lack information about an option such as shared ownership, so that it forms no part of their thinking or planned pathways.

Focus group work can be an alternative to conventional interviews, and has formed a basis or part of studies that have contacted housing consumers or potential users of services. Insights into satisfactions, preferences and strategies have been obtained thereby. Evidence also comes from qualitative information about behaviour, a good example being that the reluctance of homeless youth to be drawn into white-run provision may suggest strategies of resistance or risk-avoidance (either through refusal to accept what is available on the terms offered, or via
recourse to relatively safer accommodation with acquaintances). Similarly, when facing difficulties such as harassment, households remain strategists even in the most adverse of circumstances.

Furthermore, seeking information about whether past choices were constrained can be illuminating. A good example is Third, Wainwright and Pawson’s study of owner-occupiers in Scotland, where 25% of minority ethnic respondents said that they would have preferred an alternative tenure at the time they entered owner-occupation. Such findings might appear to run somewhat against the grain of most recent information on preferences, which has tended to show the long-term wish for owner-occupancy, and has sometimes coupled it with the concept of some social rented housing having in effect a ‘negative utility’ for particular groups. The answer is that caution is required on expressed tenure preferences, which may be amended or revised in the light of specific circumstances, and could change over time.

Without some indications about pathways and resources, statements are difficult to interpret. For instance, it has sometimes been thought that African/Caribbean households might not attach stigma to council housing in the way that is often felt to occur for Asians, and that social rented housing is perceived as a valuable and necessary service. Yet, for some African/Caribbean households, entry to this housing might form part of a longer-term strategy aimed at purchasing a house at a feasible cost (although differentiating effects of family/household structures on tenure opportunities within this minority ethnic group should not be overlooked).

8.2 Problems facing policy-makers

Unfortunately for policy-makers, it is possible to gain false impressions of households' intentions, to rely on mistaken assumptions about preferences, or to lack necessary contextual knowledge. Substantial studies of local policy failure are rare, but an unpublished study by Whittingham, dealing with sheltered housing for minority ethnic elders, points to problems posed by lack of foresight about financial arrangements and other matters affecting households that might influence take-up. More generally, while the dangers of stereotypes are becoming understood, it is still difficult to move beyond the convenient images.

The best example concerns the assumption that certain communities will cater for needs of elders through the extended family, implying that (say) a Pakistani community will use housing differently from a white community, and have less need for separate elders’ accommodation but more need for large family dwellings. This may well be true, but needs verifying in specific times and localities. There are people who may be ‘left out’ of kinship arrangements within an Asian community (and we should think not only about elders here, but also about some women without partners). On the other hand a new stereotype, with the assumption that minorities require specialised provision to parallel that available for white people, needs cautious handling. There is no certainty, either, that research methodologies relying on community leaders and intermediaries as informants or advisors will necessarily always produce the best pointers to ways forward, or to the best fit that could be made between policies and positive pathways for specific groups.

In truth, much housing research or local consultation is of an ‘ad hoc’ character, aimed at uncovering present experiences or conditions, and rarely being able to take a longer view. It can be argued that this means that there is sometimes a failure adequately to understand trends and
histories, or to develop more sensitive explanations of how households interact with institutions over time, and of how ‘housing careers’ or ‘pathways’ emerge and are consolidated or amended.

8.3 Towards a fuller perspective

Smith has argued for a life-course perspective, and there certainly is a strong case for trying to gather materials from which to derive more dynamic accounts of household activity, opportunities and constraints. Perhaps more links might be made with adjacent empirical territories, such as health, illness and disability studies, to review relationships over time between housing and health pathways for minority groups. A similar point might be made for education or for employment. On a practical level, a holistic view of people’s strategies and needs, taking account of finance, employment, religion, ethnicity, care and social support and housing seems the ideal. Yet this is hard to achieve, and researchers face the problem that the more sophisticated an understanding of specific groups becomes, the more difficult it may be to generalise. For policy-making, good consultation processes remain essential (and this should not be neglected for older or disabled people as if they were beyond entitlement to have the opportunity to develop or negotiate strategies of their own).

Pioneering studies have been made for housing by Bowes, Dar and Sim, who make clear the importance of the realisation (or otherwise) of preferences, and the cumulative results of actions in facilitating or restricting choice. Their research can be viewed as a key exemplar. A life history interviewing methodology is used, allowing exploration of how decisions were reached, how ‘trade-offs’ were made between houses, areas or tenures, how household composition changed over time, and how constraints operate.

As a counterpart of a concern with pathways and strategies, it would be useful to know more about the connections with sustainability (allied with environmental quality, social stability and economic viability). We know surprisingly little about the durability of physical improvements, the contribution that policy interventions make to ongoing financial success or difficulty for households, or the manageability of housing for landlords.

Karn et al. ask to what extent the preference for owner-occupation is likely to be undermined by realities of poor conditions and the repair costs. They indicate that forecasts of demand for social rented housing need to be sensitive to changes such as a drop in owner-occupation amongst Pakistanis observed between 1991 and 1996, and ask what steps can be taken to ensure the viability of home ownership or alternative tenures in older terraced areas, especially those (lying outside current area regeneration schemes) where grants are not available. Their account indirectly points up some crucial areas for further policy analysis and development at national level, around the potential integration of governmental strategies across the tenures, the future of improvement policies, scope for purchase and rehousing arrangements for home owners wanting to become tenants, and more successful development and promotion of shared ownership or perhaps collective forms of ownership such as co-ops and self-builds. In any event, policy levers remain rather limited as far as ‘down-market’ owner-occupation and its sustainability are concerned.

Earlier mentions (above) of Irish people and of ‘new’ migrants point towards a more general issue of inter-generational or cross-cohort change, an area which remains under-researched in housing terms. Housing experiences, achievements and strategies may vary not only over lifetimes but between cohorts of migrants or generations of settled groups. It is possible that ‘ethnic penalties’ (see Section 2 above) or market conditions shift, and that upward mobility or
assimilation have significant effects, albeit for some groups more than others. There may be generational as well as ethnic group differences in propensity to migrate out of established areas of settlement. On the one hand younger households might be less determined in their preference for a ‘traditional’ locale, while on the other youth unemployment might constrain spatial dispersal. At the same time the boundaries between groups may become blurred through the increase in numbers of households with mixed ethnic origins.
CHAPTER 9

Regeneration, neighbourhood renewal and change

Since people from minority ethnic communities are disproportionately represented in areas perceived as deprived, they are likely to be strongly affected by central and local government area-based programmes focussed on countering deprivation or exclusion. For more than thirty years central government has sought to combat particular problems by focussing resources through area-based programmes of varying kinds. Unfortunately, despite the significance of these interventions, there is still only a limited amount of reliable or comprehensive data about their direct or indirect effects for minority groups, either in the short or longer term. The lack of ‘hard data’ on outcomes is especially important for recent periods, because it may well be the case that there have been substantial positive effects from central government’s increasing concern to draw in minority groups and ensure that they benefit from area regeneration. Given the research record, it is not possible to make a well-founded judgement on gains that may have been made as policies and practices have shifted. There is a fairly well-known body of critical comment about earlier programmes (from which we draw below),227 but some criticisms have been overtaken by events.

It is clear that central government is aware both of the lack of information and of the need to work towards more inclusive strategies. The Cabinet Office report (2000) on the work of the Social Exclusion Unit and the Policy Action Teams states that people from minority ethnic communities are at disproportionate risk of social exclusion, and summarises SEU and PAT recommendations aimed at improving matters. From the point of view of our review it is important to note comments made by that report on data and research issues: that there is a significant lack of information about minority ethnic groups and about the impact of policies and programmes on them,228 and that one aspect of action tackling exclusion is ensuring mainstream services are more relevant to the circumstances of people from minority ethnic communities by, for example, ethnically monitoring outcomes and involving people from the communities more in design and delivery.229 One implication we can mention here is the prospect of linking up policies more effectively with diversity, ‘tapping in’ to the rich cultural resources that exist, and using this as one route to capacity building in community development.

Despite the positive public policy outlooks evident recently, there are still lessons to be kept in mind from the past, and it is important to note any contemporary findings which suggest continuation of earlier difficulties. The sections below very briefly review the general position on regeneration research, and cover housing investment, and the issue of contractors, suppliers and consultants. We then highlight some ways forward.
9.1 Recent themes and the research record

Chief amongst the criticisms about earlier periods were claims that renewal or regeneration investments did not lead to enough explicit or lasting benefits for minority ethnic communities, that targeting was poor or ad hoc, that funding was too short-term or precarious, and that black-led organisations were not accorded a sufficient role. Critics sometimes doubted the genuineness of government’s commitment to minority ethnic communities, by comparison with its determination to secure general economic or environmental goals. Furthermore, it was sometimes felt that, if locality-focused policies had brought benefits, these might have been offset by effects arising from other policies. Rent rises, for instance, could have had differential outcomes, and in some circumstances these had disproportionately affected minority ethnic households. Similarly, it is possible that more general changes, such as those in state pensions and benefit levels, may have been disproportionately damaging for inner city minority ethnic communities, where occupational benefits were likely to have been obtained by few employees, and unemployment had been high. More recently, in an era of partnerships and influential stakeholders, the question had arisen as to whether minority ethnic groups and organisations had been ‘squeezed out’ by larger players.

Brownill and Darke, in a review forming part of the Rowntree Area Regeneration Programme, argue that while ‘race’ has often been on the policy agenda, this has usually been implicit rather than explicit. Summarising partly from other studies, these authors observe that performance by City Challenges was patchy in specifying strategies to benefit and involve minority ethnic communities, that there had been some reduction in ‘ring fenced’ resources directed to minority groups’ needs with advent of the SRB, and that there was evidence that the minority ethnic dimension had not been much prioritised in SRB bidding (although outcomes might show more positive patterns). Beazley and Loftman, in a recent study building on earlier work, comment on urban policy failure in providing benefits to minority ethnic communities, and the ‘fairly bleak’ picture for minority ethnic groups in relation to regeneration. The poor performance of the SRB had been evident, and obstacles to involvement of black and minority ethnic groups had been noted. These authors indicate the importance of the development of ‘Race Equality Guidance’ in area-based regeneration (particularly in the New Deal for Communities programme), and it does seem to us that across a number of its programmes government is more actively concerned than previously with encouraging minority ethnic participation.

Nonetheless, although it is difficult to appraise the current situation comprehensively, there still seems to be room for improving achievements at the implementation level. Beazley and Loftman argue that, in terms of success in securing funding ‘the results for BME groups are not good’, and barriers remain for voluntary and community organisations in accessing and managing funds. Interestingly, an old phrase recurs in their study; that in some ways ‘BME-led projects had been set up to fail’ (our emphasis; see their p. 41). We endorse the view mentioned that black and minority ethnic-led partnerships or regeneration initiatives may need a ‘champion’ within the appropriate funding body ‘to advocate on their behalf’. Indeed, we would go further to suggest that in the present situation there could be benefits for housing as well as regeneration from having more proactive voices speaking on behalf of inclusion and equal opportunities at regional level, although again there is insufficient information for us to comment with authority on this. The issue of bureaucratic barriers, and the limitations in minority ethnic organisations’ resources or capacities, might also be crucial.

While recognising the ongoing importance of some of the problems noted above, observers should not overlook the positive gains that may have been made from specific types of renewal and neighbourhood regeneration programmes. Perhaps it is a little too easy to be convinced by
the negative tone of much of the independent commentary, forgetting that the evidence base is not always extensive. There is in fact considerable uncertainty about ‘what works’ or does not work, and for whom, while the multi-agency activities and holistic concerns of the present make comprehensive appraisal in some settings a potentially complex task. In many circumstances effective research might well reveal both difficulties and gains.

An interesting recent example is an unusual analysis using a ‘before’ and ‘after’ approach to evaluating renewal, provided in work by Ambrose and MacDonald.237 This area-focussed London research covered a population that included a high percentage of Bangladeshi households.238 The authors note health and other improvements after regeneration, although perhaps offset by negative trends in some aspects of ‘mainstream’ services spending, and with potential local implications in terms of raised household costs (rents, costs of moving, etc.).239 Clearly, the issue of changes in daily living costs is one on which more information would be valuable in future regeneration research.

9.2 Housing and related investment

Within analyses of housing, criticisms have focussed especially on investment. In some localities, targeting resources on council estates ‘side-steps the problems of deprivation because the most disadvantaged areas for minority ethnic groups are of mixed tenure’.240 Thus investment patterns have not been shown clearly to be beneficial, and minority ethnic communities have been by-passed through focussing of mainstream capital programmes on white-occupied areas of social renting.241 Although the negative impressions of outcomes here rest partly on insights from findings about very specific places and times (rather than arising from comprehensive and detailed evaluation of investment effects across regions), the destinations of local authority housing regeneration investments certainly have been extremely important. At the same time, what is known for RSLs suggests that while considerable effort has gone into catering for minority ethnic households in some places, there have been limitations in the benefits achieved (see Section 11.2); but again we do not have enough up-to-date and systematic information on the character and impact of their regeneration work.

Turning to the private sector, it seems that although improvement grant spending remains at a low level, it has had merits from the point of view of a strategy to assist minority ethnic households.242 The same is likely to be true of agency services (such as Care and Repair) and of Disabled Facilities Grant. Nonetheless, when funds have been available (and have been assisting minority households) questions have arisen about sensitivity in terms of advice in appropriate community languages and staffing.243 There might be problems too with delays, affordability, quality of workmanship or relationships with white builders, although a lack of ethnic monitoring data in the past also made it difficult to assess the relative success or failure of some minorities in the ‘grant-aid stakes’.244 Unfortunately, there are few up-to-date studies. Other investment policies have assisted minority ethnic owner-occupiers in various periods in the past. In particular, it seems likely that local authority mortgage loans frequently benefited minority ethnic households over a long period (although the point is sometimes doubted).245 While policies for providing mortgages are not usually on the agenda now, the history here is a reminder of the possibilities of connecting public policies with minority ethnic strategies on which we touched above.
9.3 Contractors, suppliers and consultants

There is much to be said for reviewing public investment not simply in terms of its immediate declared aims, but in a wider way, taking account of multiplier or 'ripple' effects arising from it. Thus investments can be considered in terms of their indirect impact for the opportunities of different groups, and such analyses are essential to gain a fuller picture of the beneficiaries of policies.

Achieving equality through contracts has long been acknowledged as an important issue, and has been the subject of advice from the CRE and others. Apart from ensuring that contractors’ employment practices are satisfactory, organisations with substantial spending budgets may attempt to encourage involvement of local labour, or of appropriate minority ethnic firms, in bidding for or obtaining of contracts. The issue of housing contractors, however, has been a contentious matter in the past, since it was felt that white people or firms were the primary beneficiaries or participants when housing investment took place even within inner city areas. For a long time, few hard data were available to test the argument that minority ethnic tradespeople and firms were being excluded regularly by housing organisations' practices. The CRE included some relevant material in its 1993 report on Housing associations and racial equality, but the first ‘freestanding’ substantial systematic study on the issue – Constructing equality – was published in 1995, and was supported by the Rowntree Foundation. This research involved case study work which demonstrated clearly that surprisingly little of the expenditure flowing through housing associations was finding its way to black-run firms or contractors.

Various barriers and practice issues were reviewed, together with innovations that had developed based on using registers of firms.

More recently, Sodhi and Steele carried out a study focused on London which included interviewing and a postal survey of RSLs. Although able to refer to a few other studies, Sodhi and Steele state nonetheless that ‘only scant attention has been given to RSLs’ investment powers in terms of construction and maintenance work’. We might add that expenditure via services, suppliers and consultants has received even less research attention (although ideas about training residents in consultancy skills have been emerging recently). The wider study of RSL performance for the Housing Corporation (A question of delivery) indicates that ‘the use of BME contractors and consultants is a major area of work requiring the attention of RSLs’, and that the recruitment of contractors and consultants ‘was a reactive process, benefiting those already familiar with RSLs’ networks and ways of working’.

Sodhi and Steele conclude that discrimination is still very much in evidence in the construction industry, and show deficiencies in monitoring and reporting practices in RSLs. Interestingly, we learn that only a quarter of those RSLs surveyed indicated that they did anything with the monitoring information that they collected. Their report also comments that ‘Promotion of Egan principles and Constructionline could be detrimental’ to black minority ethnic small/medium enterprises. (These are recent officially approved developments affecting the construction industry.) Perhaps this point illustrates how easy it is at present for ‘mainstream’ policy developments to take place without adequate consideration of minority ethnic issues or interests.

The Challenge Report suggests that Constructionline should be ‘regularly evaluated and able to illustrate positive race equality outcomes’, and indeed argues that the DTLR should ‘carry out a race equality audit of Constructionline’. Tomlins et al. also comment on Constructionline. More generally, we can conclude that while there have been ongoing attempts to develop positive innovations (by some RSLs), there have also been pressures for
maximising economies of scale, and minimising time spent on recruitment, 'outreach', training, supervision of compliance, or selection. The competitive environment, risk-minimising strategies, and pressures on staffing may be at the roots of the record of slow progress.

9.4 Ways forward

- Amongst key research-relevant ideas in the Cabinet Office report are a call for improving the statistics we have about neighbourhoods, and ensuring that up-to-date information is available about 'what works'.\textsuperscript{257} While there has been a helpful accumulation of good practice material, this process needs to be carried further in the renewal field.

- Minority ethnic participation and leadership are seen as crucial to success, while there are recommendations in the Cabinet Office report for government recruitment of more minority ethnic staff, and staff interchanges with minority ethnic organisations.\textsuperscript{258} Community engagement is perceived by observers and policy leaders as crucial, but it may not be easy to achieve or sustain outside ad hoc short-term projects. Research might have several useful roles here, both in terms of better monitoring and in relation to analysing successes and failures, and reasons for these.

- There is a need to know more about barriers to involvement. This requires much more information on why organisations act as they do. There is little understanding of how good intentions may be offset or undermined by other demands on organisations, including pressures relating to the competitive environment, pressures from the need to work with large and influential partners or 'stakeholders', or general effects from those public policies which have not been 'tested' for the implications they may have for minority ethnic communities.

- More research would be useful on the effectiveness of cross-departmental or holistic strategies related to minorities, and on employment and multiplier effects. There could be more exploration of benefits and any disadvantages as seen from the 'grass roots'. Good examples might include investigations of the situations of children, of young black men, or of single parents in a specific neighbourhood, in the light of renewal effects.
CHAPTER 10

Positive housing strategy options highlighted by researchers in relation to neighbourhoods, tenure and change

Much well-informed current discussion about practical policy options focusses on the issue of movement into more peripheral areas, and on possibilities for overcoming barriers to entry to social rented housing estates outside existing areas of settlement. A widely noted example of a report dealing with such matters is the Bradford study, *Breaking down the barriers*, which built on two earlier reports on housing issues in that city, but studies from other cities have also touched on similar matters. The concern with movement to peripheral areas reflects the particular characteristics of local housing settlement and tenure patterns for individual ethnic groups (especially South Asian ones) presently under-represented in council housing, along with the emergence of ‘surplus stock’ issues in social renting in some localities. It should not be forgotten, however, that social rented housing already plays a very important role for minority ethnic groups (especially for some African/Caribbean or Bangladeshi households). Consequently policy makers also need to keep in mind access for existing tenants into more peripheral estates or higher quality dwellings.

At the same time, questions about low-cost home ownership policies remain salient for minority communities, while the large-scale transfer of local authority stock raises new questions about minority communities sharing collectively in ownership and management. An additional point concerns the probability that RSLs are at present reluctant to develop new schemes, with minority ethnic tenants in mind, away from the ‘traditional’ areas of settlement. These developers may be concerned about anticipated problems of racist abuse, harassment and violence from the local white population, which could undermine the commitment of minority ethnic tenants and create management problems.

Some of the key points about policy concerns are sketched briefly below, and 10.1 then outlines research and policy issues in more detail. This is followed by a comment on ‘asset-based’ approaches in housing policy (including an account of three recent reports about shared ownership).

- Social rented housing may be increasingly available in some localities where demand from white households has been falling, while minority ethnic households (particularly from
some Asian communities) are living not very far away in low quality older private sector dwellings with severe problems of poverty and overcrowding. Social housing may become an increasingly important housing alternative for newly-forming Asian households in such places in future, yet take-up of new council tenancies amongst some minority groups is low (although this does not necessarily imply that such households have not been seeking to become social renters).

- While some minority ethnic households wish to move out of inner city areas of existing settlement, various barriers may be perceived including the absence of other minority ethnic households and appropriate facilities, as well as potential harassment.

- Black and minority ethnic-run housing associations may be good at attracting minority ethnic tenants, but tend to have relatively limited stocks of dwellings, and possess few outlying estates. Furthermore, relatively high rents and any perceived limitations on the long-term availability of the right-to-buy may deter some potential tenants from approaching housing associations in general.

- There are minority ethnic groups already established in social renting who may face difficulties in moving to better quality estates, but there is little information about recent trends affecting the locational options of specific groups (such as homeless people, female-headed households or small minorities), and the picture in areas of strong demand (where tenancy turnover may be low) needs researching.

- Various ideas have been put forward to facilitate outward movement, but programmes attempting to encourage minority ethnic households into areas of existing white settlement are unlikely to be straightforward, even with supportive community development strategies (see Section 5.4.1).

- Who controls property assets and management on estates is potentially a significant matter for households and communities. Possibilities for low-cost ownership, the right-to-buy, ‘staircasing’, and collective forms of ownership and self-management may be relevant when housing choices are considered. This is a relatively under-researched area, but takes on heightened importance because of the desire to utilise ‘surplus’ council stock, and the ongoing processes of large-scale stock transfer (see also our earlier comments in Section 5.3.2). Implications for the roles of minority ethnic housing organisations and potential federal organisational structures in housing management remain under-explored, despite the recent rapid pace of council stock transfer planning.

10.1 The research and ongoing debates in more detail

A good overview of key issues is provided by Phillips and Unsworth, who note an ambivalence about clustering in the traditional areas of minority settlement which may affect younger people in particular (see also Section 5 for this research). Their study involved a national survey of local authority housing departments and housing associations operating in 14 urban localities, and looked at the priority given to widening ethnic choice, the strategies developed, implementation and success. As these writers put it, there is a need for sensitive and well-tuned policies to support minority ethnic households now wishing to move to non-
traditional areas within the social rented sector. Drawing on this and other accounts, we can summarise the background to the policy and research debate as follows.

First, there may be minority ethnic groups already established in social renting who face difficulties in moving to better quality estates. Although concentration within low quality estates was recognised in classic studies of the past, we do not have enough hard information about recent trends affecting the locational options of specific groups (such as homeless people, female-headed households or small, newer minorities), and the picture in areas of strong demand (where tenancy turnover may be low) needs researching.

Second, social rented housing may be increasingly available in some localities, especially where demand has been falling, while minority ethnic households (from some Asian communities) are concentrated not very far away in low quality, older private sector dwellings with severe problems of poverty and overcrowding. It seems likely that social housing may become an increasingly important housing alternative for newly-forming Asian households in such places in future, given the problems of prices and incomes affecting access to owner-occupancy. Indeed, it is possible that there is already a stronger unmet demand in specific towns than has generally been appreciated.

Yet actual take-up of new council tenancies amongst some minority groups seems to be low or slow. Along with responding to direct experiences of harassment, black minority ethnic households may wish to distance themselves from what they perceive as a crime-prone, less respectable and ‘rough’ (generally white) estate culture, just as many white people would wish to do. More attractive white estates that might suit some minority households may well be located further from core areas of settlement, and may present problems because of having few existing black tenants. There is also little to suggest that tenant participation processes have involved black people satisfactorily (although as we indicate elsewhere, this is very under-researched).

Housing association accommodation may have a better image than some council housing (especially if managed by black and minority ethnic housing associations), but there may be few substantial appropriate ‘outliers’ or nodes of development away from established settlement. Black and minority ethnic-run housing associations may attract minority ethnic tenants, but tend to have relatively limited stocks of dwellings, and may well possess few outlying estates. Furthermore, relatively high rents and perceived limitations on the long-term availability of the right-to-buy may deter potential tenants from approaching housing associations.

Third, there is a challenge facing policy makers (perhaps especially in major cities outside the South East), with the focus being on seeking ways of easing movement into areas of social rented housing outside ‘traditional’ places of settlement. At the same time there is evidence that at least some minority ethnic households have a strong desire to move out of inner city areas, although barriers may be perceived in terms of the absence of other minority ethnic households and associated facilities and shops, as well as from the fear of harassment. Research has begun to include coverage of perceptions of localities, and attitudes to precise geographical areas of housing. Organised racist harassment continues to play a strong role as a deterrent. An extremely disturbing example cited in the Birmingham study by a focus group participant who had recently moved to an outer area was that her door handle had been wired up to the mains electricity. Thus moving to the outer city remains ‘a frontier decision’.

A variety of specific proposals have been made about assisting change, and these deserve careful evaluation in particular local contexts. Cameron and Field, for instance, have suggested that
housing providers should prioritise ‘block allocation [allocation of groups of dwellings near each other] as opposed to a process of single house allocation’ for the minorities, and that models of shared equity ‘should form part of the strategic process’. They also indicate that if new housing opportunities are to be found for lower income households, especially in the Bangladeshi community, this might have to involve ‘mediated mobility through public policy interventions of some kind’. Phillips and Unsworth reveal that some housing providers have begun implementing strategies of creating ‘settlement nodes’ or clusters in more outlying areas, perhaps underpinned by inter-agency initiatives and tenant support.

We might argue that elements tailored to community needs and preferences should include conversions to create larger dwellings (or re-conversions of sub-divided properties), adaptable housing where units can be combined or subdivided later, and (if viable) opportunities for low-cost home ownership. For social renting, there might be potential in some towns for black minority ethnic block housing allocations or large targeted shares of tenancies, linked with management and ownership structures facilitating involvement of black-run collective or representative housing organisations (whether within independent or federal organisational structures). Ways of overcoming barriers suggested in Birmingham have included improving housing related services, supporting provision of cultural and religious amenities, providing ‘race’ awareness training for outer area residents’ groups, and providing better public transport links to inner city locations. The Manchester study suggests that the promotion of new areas of residence is an activity ‘which requires the partnership of the local authority, the police, the B&ME and mainstream RSLs and other agencies who need to be “talking the same language”’. The Bradford report, Breaking down the barriers, draws on other research to list various actions which in the longer term might help to increase access to the outer estates (including improving the standard and cultural sensitivity of service delivery, more joined-up policy-making between organisations, developing appropriate property types/sizes, including houses for shared ownership and outright sale, information provision, developing community support networks, aiming for linked lettings where families are rehoused together to improve security, exploring the ‘potential role of BME housing associations’, and others). One feasible strategy in the short term is seen as possibly increasing access to housing locations between the more congested urban areas of central Bradford and the outer estates. Interestingly, one of the noticeable features in Bradford at present is the scarcity of large properties managed by RSLs.

Programmes attempting to encourage minority ethnic households into areas of existing white settlement are unlikely to be straightforward, even with supportive community development strategies. Furthermore, Phillips and Unsworth found that the resources and the political will to devise and implement institution-led initiatives to widen locational choices for minority ethnic groups were often lacking. There is wide variation in the available information about preferences, and much more attention should be given to the implications of ongoing events such as stock transfers, development of common housing registers, recent innovations in approaches to choice and allocations, and organisational change. Nonetheless, as the Bradford study confirms, although owner-occupation is the dominant aspiration of many groups, this should not mean overlooking the significant potential roles of social renting in a period when new households face financial constraints and difficulties in obtaining adequate dwellings in ‘traditional’ areas of settlement. Whether as a transitional option or a longer-term tenure destination, social rented housing may be becoming more significant. Indeed, low take-up figures may mask a demand which in some places is already strong, but cannot be met by social housing allocations within areas regarded as relatively ‘safe’. Awareness of the potential needs to be qualified, however, by recognising that policy-makers also require information on the
changing dynamics of local demand and preferences, and the varying implications these have for very specific neighbourhoods, whether containing private or social rented dwellings (and where, in some cases of low demand, selective demolition may remain appropriate).  

10.2 ‘Asset-based’ welfare strategies: low cost ownership, the right to buy and shared ownership

One possible route for contemporary housing policies is to develop in the direction of ‘assets based’ concepts of need and welfare, in which support might focus more on helping people establish or sustain a stake in housing property, individually or collectively. Such a stake might be for individual households (as with the right to buy), or for larger groups (for instance via co-ops). It is clear that to be effective, policies focussed on ownership need to take account not only of preferences, but also of financial and income realities in specific localities. There are potential problems of financial viability and affordability. Nonetheless, because being able to purchase inexpensively in the long term may be very important as a potential element in household strategies, this may have sometimes influenced take-up for council housing as against RSL dwellings. It should also be kept in mind that sustainability in low-income owner-occupation may be enhanced through improvement grants and other types of support.

Furthermore, there might be potential for developing the existing ‘gateway’ roles black and minority ethnic housing associations play in relation to tenants thinking about social renting, in the direction of a broader range of functions connected with ownership, shared equity, maintenance, social support and sustainability. Little systematic is known about progress or possibilities here. It is clear that black minority ethnic households in council housing have exercised the right to buy, but the geographical or housing quality characteristics of these dwellings are uncertain, as are the prospects for further purchases. So far, however, little has been written about the right to buy as a possible component in local authority or RSL strategic planning for minority ethnic choice. An additional issue concerns problems in areas of relatively weak or declining demand in the private sector, where owners may possess low-value assets, and where it may be difficult to develop sensitive policies.

10.2.1 Shared ownership and allied policies

One interest of policy makers has been in encouraging shared ownership, and research findings about this and its take-up have become available in a number of recent studies. Issues raised have included affordability, implementation measures, relationships with housing need, and relative merits of different forms (including ‘Do It Yourself Shared Ownership’ (DIYSO), where the buyer finds a property on the open market for purchase on a shared ownership basis). While suggesting a potential for exploring the use of shared ownership to meet some of the housing needs of the minorities, Brown and Passmore acknowledge affordability as the main likely difficulty. Looking at Leicester they see the key issue as low incomes compared to housing costs. Shared ownership here would be attractive only for a relatively narrow band of households headed by a full time adult male manual worker on roughly average earnings. The affordability problem is compounded by the need for dwellings with four or more bedrooms, while locations for new schemes may lack appropriate community infrastructure. These authors refer to a specific scheme on a suburban site which included development of the first 4 bedroom/6 person shared ownership semi-detached properties in the country, where take-up was limited. DIYSO might appear more appropriate, but they note possible problems here also.
One conclusion they draw is that shared ownership might be part of a process of gradual renewal involving clearance of unfit housing areas. We can add that perhaps this might be relevant to tackling areas of weak demand or abandonment in the private sector, although options would depend very much upon what proved financially feasible for owners.

Alexander et al. conducted a substantial London-based study which included a postal survey of shared owners, and interviews with agencies and with people who were shared owners, owner occupiers or current tenants. Results suggested that the proportion of shared owners from black and minority ethnic communities reflected their representation in the community as a whole, but that minority ethnic households appeared disadvantaged in terms of finding information about shared ownership presented in ways appropriate to their needs. Lack of knowledge about shared ownership has been noted in other studies. Alexander et al. found that black minority ethnic households were larger on average and more likely to contain children, and this difference was ‘reflected in their higher take up of Do It Yourself Shared Ownership (DIYSO) than white households’. DIYSO also may have offered increased choice of location. On a more negative point, responses suggested that black and minority ethnic households might find it more difficult both to enter shared ownership and to maintain their mortgage and rent payments than their white counterparts. This 1997 report also notes that the Tenants Incentive Scheme (TIS), Cash Incentive Scheme (CIS) and Right to Buy were options mentioned by informants or respondents ‘as options which may be preferable to shared ownership’. While there was some satisfaction generally with shared ownership, specific areas of dissatisfaction with the tenure included the level of the service charge and the responsibility for repairs. There was a preference (particularly amongst potential shared owners) for houses rather than flats, for street properties rather than estates, and for gardens. For most people, shared ownership did not seem to operate as a route into full ownership, and some households felt it was difficult and expensive to ‘staircase’ to full owner occupation.

A third study deserving discussion sought to assess the attractiveness or otherwise of shared ownership tenure to various minority ethnic communities in Preston (Desai, 2000). There was evidence of lack of awareness about shared ownership amongst the Asian community. It was anticipated, furthermore, that shared ownership demand would be limited to low cost housing development, since 71% of the heads of households surveyed were earning less than £10,400. Existing funding mechanisms for newbuild shared ownership and rehab. capital investment could limit potential demand. Various specific recommendations are offered in the report, including targeting an element of the Approved Development Programme for affordable 3, 4 and 5 bedroom newbuild shared ownership houses in specific localities, introduction of a Housing Corporation grant to promote and market shared ownership to the community, increased grant support to allow low income households to make a 25% equity purchase, and enhanced grant levels to reflect higher development costs of larger dwellings. New shared ownership homes culturally sensitive to the Asian community are also recommended. Further suggestions are for the local authority to take a strategic approach in renewal areas, considering (where appropriate) two-into-one conversions and/or selective demolition to accommodate newbuild development, and for RSLs to promote enhanced voluntary sales to existing tenants, in particular larger homes to Asian families.

We have devoted space to the above studies because this is a potentially important field for further policy development, overlapping with renewal policy and with planning for greater choice in outward movement. Writers note that DIYSO is being phased out, and that it and TIS are replaced by ‘Homebuy’, under which qualifying purchasers choose their new home off the open market (and where a 25% interest-free loan is made to the occupier, repayable as a percentage of current market value at time of resale). The purchaser’s mortgage must be
obtained from an approved lender, which might possibly have negative implications for some minority ethnic communities. In any event, it is important that the impact of such schemes is monitored, and that the position of minorities is considered carefully. General findings from Rowntree-supported research on ‘Homebuy’ include observations that, while purchasers prefer the scheme (which is concentrated in the southern half of England) to shared ownership, people buying have considerably higher incomes than those who buy under shared ownership, and making ‘Homebuy’ available to lower-income households would be expensive in subsidy terms. The JRF Findings also comments that a number of local authorities fund their own DIYSO programme in order to continue to offer access to home-ownership (with a choice of which property to buy) to lower-income households who are unable to make use of Homebuy. It would be interesting to know how far minority ethnic households have been involved here. As conditions and prospects for owning vary geographically, and can shift with changing house prices, it would be desirable to have an overview of the potential for low cost ownership across regions, alongside a review of the barriers and limitations implicit in the interactions between costs, available public funding, rules, availability of sites or dwellings, and incomes. It would also help to have some information about cohorts or generations, and how orientations towards tenure options might shift over time.

10.2.2 The community dimension

An urgent topic for research and review concerns possibilities for the transferring of local authority stock into the ownership of black and minority ethnic-run organisations, including housing associations and co-ops, or the involvement of black-run bodies in joint ventures and federal structures for taking control or collective ownership as transfers occur (see also our comments in Section 12). Despite the positive views held by some minority ethnic households towards having a landlord organisation run by black and minority ethnic people, we have found little substantial material touching upon options of this kind, which might be extended in principle to include transfers of estates in need of renovation to organisations that would give minority ethnic (and other) tenants the opportunity to acquire equity through contributing their labour in the same way as with self-build schemes. There is too little research material on the potential for collective forms of ownership or equity acquisition (through co-ops, self-builds, estate transfers to tenant ownership, community land ownership, etc.), or on any previous experience with these for minority ethnic communities (although material exists on self-build, alongside a great deal on black and minority ethnic housing associations). Although some policy debates are now touching increasingly on questions of community control, empirical research is rare. At the same time the implications that possible fragmentation of council stocks might have for offering an integrated service, or for segregation by ethnic group, have not been investigated.

The speed of events for local authority housing transfers has been such that there has been some danger of the full range of options for community-controlled housing not being considered in the local or regional politics of the transfer process. More attention, however, is now being drawn by central government to the issues of minority ethnic needs and participation in this context. Ideally, access to assets and rights by households, and representation through minority ethnic organisations, should be regularly on the transfer agenda. There might be lessons to be learned in the present situation from that of the mid-1980s to the early 1990s. During that earlier period certain key Housing Corporation personnel played highly proactive and constructive brokerage and supportive roles that made it more feasible for community leaders and activists to get black and minority ethnic housing associations ‘up and running’. It has been less clear in more recent years that there has been an equivalent group of ‘good practice champions’ at the regional governmental level or in local government who could ensure that the transfer process explored all the possibilities.
Perhaps the lack of research noted above is unsurprising, since local authority stock transfer has so far been primarily a ‘white experience’ (involving relatively few minority ethnic households, and organised by white people). Nonetheless, the Housing Corporation has produced a report (Communities in control, September 2000) which draws attention to the Corporation’s Community Training and Enabling programme, and indicates interest in ‘community housing’. Resident-controlled housing is discussed positively here, and amongst the matters mentioned is ‘significant potential for community-based and black and minority ethnic (BME) RSLs (including co-ops) to take on the ownership or management of stock’. Some research is in hand supported by the Housing Corporation to look into local authority stock transfer issues in respect of implications for black and minority ethnic communities, and earlier local work did deal with stock transfer from white-run to minority ethnic housing associations. Furthermore, ways forward towards community control in the context of stock transfer are being investigated more generally by the Confederation of Co-operative Housing (CCH) in partnership with the Co-operative Union. We understand that the CCH is working on a programme in partnership with the Housing Corporation to develop best practice in community control for the RSL sector. Knowledge about the situation and prospects for minority ethnic households, however, is very patchy indeed, despite the large changes taking place in ownership and control of estates. However constructive the Housing Corporation is trying to be about ensuring that minority ethnic residents have a say, the onus also falls on central government departments to work with local authorities and RSLs on this matter. In fact there have been signs that a very positive approach is developing at central government level, with recognition of minority ethnic needs and the potential of existing black and minority ethnic RSLs. We have no firm picture of interactions in the regions, however, or of how far present regional input from central government can involve influential personnel acting as ‘champions’ for minority ethnic participation and inclusion.
CHAPTER 11
Interactions by housing consumers with housing agencies

This topic can be approached in terms of two overlapping periods. The first runs from the 1960s through to the early 1990s. The second runs from then to the present. Although this periodisation is crude, the intention is to make the point that there has been a gradual shift into a more sophisticated period as far as organisational activities are concerned, together with something of a change in the focus and purposes of research. Having summarised for each period, we will conclude with pointers towards priorities for further research.

11.1 The ‘classic’ studies

Many of the ‘classic’ housing and ‘race’ studies of the past dealt directly with the performance of housing organisations on ‘racial’ equality. In particular, several widely-known reports clearly demonstrated negative discriminatory practices in council housing allocation processes.\(^{298}\) Black and minority ethnic households often faced barriers in obtaining social rented dwellings, and – when able to enter council housing – minority ethnic tenants were often located in the poorest estates. Housing associations and private sector organisations were also scrutinised critically, although perhaps the latter proved harder to research.\(^{299}\) Writing in 1991 Smith felt that in contrast to the body of work accumulating on the problems of discrimination in the public sectors, work on the privately rented and owner-occupied sectors, ‘with only a few exceptions’, was ‘generally either dated, very small in scale, over-speculative or simply non-existent’.\(^{300}\) This was despite efforts by the CRE to challenge or investigate institutional practices. Researchers having access to substantial data sets were very much the exception to the rule. With building society mortgage lending, for instance, the advent of a support lending scheme operated co-operatively with local authorities opened the door to a significant data source of considerable value,\(^{301}\) but this opportunity was short-lived.

11.2 More recent trends and emphases

Some directly racist practices may persist, but overt racism has far less purchase in housing practice today. This has been reflected in the research agenda. Writers in the 1990s continued to revisit some of the earlier social rented housing practice issues, finding problems for minority ethnic households. Jeffers and Hoggett provide a particularly insightful commentary in this period, pointing to ongoing disadvantage for minority ethnic households in obtaining good quality council housing despite an apparently more responsive local authority stance.\(^{302}\)
Nonetheless, direct or ‘straightforward’ racist practices or outcomes have become far less dominant in the research agenda. It is difficult to know how far some discriminatory approaches documented over time in the past have actually disappeared from practice (an example being policies to prioritise the housing of ‘sons and daughters’ of existing tenants via housing allocation). It is also hard to tell how far particular categories of tenants or potential tenants still face limitations on housing choice because of discriminatory attitudes or crude stereotypes, or even because of assumptions by managers about where minority ethnic tenants will feel safe or comfortable. There are occasional but usually limited insights from writings. Little is known, furthermore, about the quality of service provided to specific kinds of households by social rented housing landlords.

In any event, the thrust of research has altered, perhaps partly because housing associations and the Housing Corporation have taken centre stage, but also because equal opportunities expectations have become more widely established, with consequent interest in the adoption and implementation of specific strategies and forms of good practice. Progress has been tracked in local authorities and housing associations to some degree through periodic studies touching on the adoption of good practices on equal opportunities, effective monitoring, and so forth. At the same time the cultural sensitivity of services has moved up the agenda, so that the adequacy of housing agency responses in that sense is commented on alongside indirect discriminatory effects. Material on high profile topics such as homelessness sometimes makes reference to inadequate responses on cultural issues along with problems of racism. More positively, reports highlighting good practice on aspects of cultural sensitivity (such as scheme and dwelling design) have been appearing.

It has been difficult for research to keep up with the pace of change in public policies affecting housing. There has been important work on housing association (subsequently RSL) performance, and more information has appeared very recently (covering amongst other matters the approved development schemes, investment patterns and lettings outcomes explicitly related to minority ethnic households). The recent Housing Corporation report from the team led by Tomlins (A question of delivery) points to several deficiencies in RSL performance. The report analyses the fall in the percentage of lettings by RSLs to black and minority ethnic households which occurred during the 1990s, and also explores issues of types of dwellings let, rent levels, etc. More of RSLs’ total lettings activity had been occurring in local authorities with a below-average black and minority ethnic population in 1998/99 than in 1990/91. The team’s focus group participants raised several problems about RSLs (difficulties in access or waiting, criteria for allocations, time taken to complete repairs, and rent levels). Furthermore, RSLs’ ‘race’ equality policies continued to lack depth and breadth, although they had become more comprehensive, and there were deficiencies in the extent and adequacy of record-keeping and monitoring. It appeared that ‘race’ equality issues ‘were still not mainstreamed in the work of RSLs’. A lack of consultation by RSLs with black and minority ethnic communities was one of the report’s key themes. The authors also cover the issue of development, contractors and consultants, and the employment of staff (for more on these matters see Section 9.3 above, and Section 12.3 below). One feasible conclusion to draw from this study and other information is that black and minority ethnic housing and staffing strategies are not necessarily yet a firm part of business planning and organisational arrangements at a strategic level. There is, however, no shortage of ideas (encouraged by the Housing Corporation) to try to improve matters; ranging from production of a ‘race equality toolkit’, to mentoring programmes involving senior black minority ethnic housing professionals acting as mentors to white managers.

One deficiency in the research record is that there has been very little on large scale voluntary
stock transfers and other recent changes that might affect minority ethnic households or organisations. One reason for lack of coverage of council transfers has been the location of many transfers outside areas of substantial minority ethnic settlement. An exception to the lack of ongoing research is work in hand by the consultancy Rodney Dykes Housing Services in West Yorkshire (an area where the issue might have particular salience), although this project may well have significance nationally. We understand that the brief includes an examination not only of stock transfer matters, but also of alternative management options by which local communities can be empowered. Although the implications of transfers may vary from place to place, more information is needed as soon as possible about potential policy options as well as the impact for tenants. There is evidence that in some places the need to draw in minority ethnic participants is being acknowledged, even though the prior record of involving them in participation as tenants is poor. Yet it is not clear how far the full range of possibilities has been taken into account before crucial decisions on strategy have been taken by white leaderships.

In the sophisticated environments of today, research might have been expected also to explore more of the specific areas of consumer/provider interaction; including access to agency services and improvement funds, to DFG or to better quality estates, access by specific religious or ethnic groups, access in cases of medical need, access by women and especially women escaping from domestic violence or unwelcome community pressures, and supported housing and responses to specific impairments. When data do become available about a specific specialist service, they often suggest substantial failures to reach minority ethnic clientele or serve their needs. An early report about Foyers, for instance, suggested that participants in the study were primarily ‘of a white ethnic origin’. More generally, it is worth remembering that the classic studies revealed a great deal about why minority ethnic households were being discriminated against. Yet today there is too little information on why barriers may persist, and organisational (and inter-organisational) environments and practices deserve scrutiny here. We have had little to tell us about any specific obstacles that might affect the sensitivity of the development process to the requirements and preferences of minority groups, and it has been difficult to say how far lettings processes are influenced adversely by particular practices on nomination rights, priority needs, or registers. General claims about institutional racism do not have adequate explanatory power. (See also Section 14.)

As far as the private sector is concerned, large-scale research work remains difficult and unlikely, so that little concrete is known about change beyond the fact that market conditions have altered. Today we have no data comparable with that gathered in the 'red-lining' studies of the late 1970s and early 1980s, although there are many questions that could be asked now about lending policies, defaults, and commercial concepts of risk in relation to implications for minorities. Although it is slightly outside our scope to comment on North American studies, it is worth mentioning that there is nothing comparable in the UK with the impressive 'fair housing audit' analyses possible in the USA, and more UK work on the operation of mortgage markets and property intermediaries is long overdue. Private renting also deserves more attention. Occasional reporting on homelessness experiences does give cause for concern about private landlords. One of Steele’s Nottingham respondents, for instance, states: ‘They see me as a single mother (to be) and just stereotype me as being a whore, prostitute and drug user. When they look at my dress sense they just don’t want to know.’ High rents and housing benefit restrictions can be serious problems. None of this is to suggest that there is necessarily persistent and widespread negative discrimination, but rather that our knowledge has not kept pace with shifts in markets, household characteristics and organisations. The lack of information about lenders and financial services is especially problematic. On the other hand there are at least some insights from localised qualitative research. Bowes, Dar and Sim, for
instance, have indicated reluctance of building societies to fund mortgages for Pakistani families (albeit in Glasgow rather than in England), although acknowledging that societies have not generally displayed ‘the same anti-Asian sentiments as estate agents’.

Very recently Phillips has surveyed estate agents in Leeds, suggesting that discriminatory practices may be persisting (see above, Section 5.3.2).

11.3 Priorities for further research

- Private sector performance needs monitoring, both in terms of housing provision and the activities of intermediaries, and in respect of financial services.

- It would be valuable to have more research on how far particular categories of tenants or potential tenants face limitations on housing choice in social renting today because of discriminatory attitudes, cultural insensitivity, or crude stereotypes.

- More research should explore specific areas of consumer/provider interaction, including access to agency services (care and repair/staying put) and improvement funds, access to DFG, access to better quality estates, access by specific religious or ethnic groups, access in cases of medical need, access by women (and especially women escaping from domestic violence or unwelcome community pressures), and supported housing and responses to specific impairments. The impact of recently developed policies should be monitored for particular types of households (choice based lettings schemes, developments in homelessness practices, etc.).

- More information would be useful on possible gaps between good intentions and formal commitments to good practice by housing providers on the one hand, and unsatisfactory performance by these providers on the other. Research should address the specific reasons for poor performance, rather than relying on general assertions about the influence of institutional racism.
CHAPTER 12

Involvement of minority ethnic households and groups in decision processes, and in employment by housing providers

This topic is reviewed under three headings, the first concerning participation in decisions, the second the black and minority ethnic housing associations and other voluntary bodies, and the third covering employment issues. Attention is drawn to evidence of a degree of exclusion of minority ethnic people, but we also indicate that the black and minority ethnic housing associations have provided a crucial channel to community involvement and empowerment, while PATH (Positive Action Training in Housing) has also been significant. We then offer some suggestions for priorities for further research.

12.1 Involvement in decision-making

Although enhancing tenant participation has moved high up the governmental agenda, there has been extraordinarily little firm information about minority ethnic tenants. Occasional observations in the literature, however, suggest strongly that black and minority ethnic tenants of councils and RSLs have been excluded rather than fully involved, while households may not even be aware of tenants’ associations, let alone members of them. Similar criticism is sometimes voiced in respect of minority ethnic inclusion in urban renewal processes and partnerships. Unfortunately the evidence for black and minority ethnic people’s exclusion in social rented housing decision processes often seems more anecdotal than systematic (albeit consistent), and there is very little detailed or comprehensive material about the participation opportunities, experiences or barriers for women, specific minority ethnic or religious groups, elders, or disabled people. Little has been available to tell us whether involvements that do occur are ad hoc and issue-focused or more regularised, or how far specific kinds of individuals are more likely than others to be drawn in. We understand that results will be published shortly from some more solid research carried out by De Montfort University, as part of a project supported by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. A ‘toolkit’ is being produced as part of this exercise. The ODPM has also commissioned work on transferable good practice on the involvement of black and minority ethnic local authority tenants and communities in investment decisions affecting their homes and neighbourhhods. This will report at the end of 2003. Other work is apparently in the planning stages elsewhere. There is also useful research
taking place from a more general perspective, around involvement with governance. It has been pointed out that black and minority ethnic groups remain very much under-represented in the ranks of local government councillors, and the possibility has been raised that current ‘modernisation’ trends in local government may actually damage minority ethnic opportunities to be involved.

12.2 The black and minority ethnic housing associations and other voluntary or community organisations

By contrast with tenant participation, a great deal has been written about the ability of black and minority ethnic communities to obtain a voice, and to create opportunities for participation, through the establishing and development of black and minority ethnic-run housing organisations. There are also other community-based organisations that represent minority ethnic people and play a part in housing or allied concerns, but it is the black-run housing associations that have been central. The development and activities of these associations have been chronicled in a variety of publications, including the journal *Black Housing*. In a recent ‘Sector Study’ report for the Housing Corporation, Lemos and Crane state that on a range of indicators – stock, staff, lettings and new housing – black and minority ethnic registered social landlords represent about 1.5% of RSL activity. Lemos and Crane’s analysis covers 45 of the 63 RSLs recognised as being ‘BME led’ (excluding 18 that are Abbeyfield societies, co-ops, etc.). The individual associations tend to be smaller than their established white-run RSL counterparts involved in development and social renting, and black and minority ethnic RSLs still rely disproportionately on managing stock for others. Black and minority ethnic RSLs own and manage 21,271 units, of which 4,780 are managed for others. Although firmly established in the policy arena, the minority ethnic associations have remained individually vulnerable to distinct pressures related to their funding opportunities, stock acquisition, limited assets, size, and periods of growth. At time of writing there has been a concern, for example, about their being disproportionately disadvantaged by national changes in rent regimes, and government has acknowledged the need to respond on this issue.

Financial problems have often raised possibilities of mergers with larger white-run bodies, or group structures in which minority ethnic autonomy is lost, and this kind of outcome is perceived as racist by some observers. It is not clear whether there might be potential for more equal federal structures, but the key issues remain autonomy and sustainability. There has been much debate about white-run associations helping the minority ethnic-run RSLs to grow by transferring ownership of appropriate stock to them. This has occurred to some extent, but the black-run associations’ efforts to bring such stock transfers about ‘still have some way to go’.

With continuing disposals of local authority stock, and so-called ‘stock rationalisation’ coming onto the housing policy agenda, much more might have been expected in terms of expanded roles for the black and minority ethnic associations than actually seems to have occurred so far (although this view is subject to amendment in the light of any information subsequently available). The issue of black and minority ethnic housing associations having a specific role in large-scale voluntary transfers apparently has been raised by the Chair of the CRE, and has recently been accorded clear recognition by central government. The issue should be kept in mind alongside more general research issues concerning stock transfers, to which we refer elsewhere (see Section 11 above). It has taken rather a long time for questions about stock
transfers from councils to come in an acknowledged way onto the agenda for minority ethnic housing associations, but funded research in this territory has been equally slow to develop.

Looking at a more general topic, there is doubt about how far the associations have been enabled to participate fully in neighbourhood regeneration or renewal, and comprehensive information is needed here. Some information about participation in consortia and work with white-run associations has been gathered in the past, but only of a limited kind. The degree of recent inclusion of minority ethnic housing interests in governmental processes or consultations concerned with housing at regional level has also been questioned, it being found that involvement has been limited in respect of Regional Housing Statements. It may be that the Statements have failed adequately to address the challenges facing the black and minority ethnic housing movement and the housing needs experienced by minority ethnic communities. Looking across the range of governmental organisations and housing policy development activities, it seems unlikely that black and minority ethnic organisations are being encouraged to help shape policies as much as they might; although fuller participation might require financial support (given the demands involved when bodies with small numbers of staff are asked to provide the ‘token black voice’ in a range of contexts). In any event, participation in mechanisms at the regional level deserves more scrutiny.

Despite their small stock sizes, the black and minority ethnic housing associations have played crucial roles in giving minority ethnic participants a voice in housing policy and implementation, have provided valued role models within minority communities, exerted influence on many other housing organisations, provided potential comparators for white-run bodies on issues of equal opportunities and lettings to minority households, and have developed ‘housing plus’ services going beyond bricks-and-mortar housing management. In total, ‘85% of board members and paid staff of BME RSLs are themselves black or from an ethnic minority’, whereas ‘12.5% of all RSL paid staff and 9.4% of all RSL board members are black or from an ethnic minority’; ‘BME RSLs therefore represent a concentration, in terms of leadership in governance and employment skills’, of ‘BME people in the RSL sector’. The associations also have a higher proportion of larger dwellings, reflecting the fact that average family size is larger in many minority ethnic communities, and some of these associations have been important in making the case for this type of provision.

From the point of view of public policy, the Housing Corporation’s five-year strategies for this sector (running from the mid-1980s onwards) represented a very distinctive and important social policy innovation, insofar as the strategies effectively involved ‘top-slicing’ of a mainstream spending programme in order to encourage development of organisations run primarily by people from the minorities. From some perspectives the Corporation’s programmes could be interpreted as ‘a unique and highly significant form of positive action focused on collectivities’. Although the associations cater for white tenants alongside others, they have attracted some minority ethnic tenants who might well have been less likely to approach a white-run association, and have contributed to the development of culturally sensitive and anti-racist practices in provision and management. One question about the associations has concerned their ability to remain close to their community roots in the face of pressures to act commercially and competitively. Information on this has been intermittent and limited, but the question is an important one.

Relatively little is known about unregistered black and minority ethnic housing and allied organisations, and their inputs to local policy, implementation or representation. There is, however, wide interest in the voluntary and community sectors at present, so that perhaps there
may well be an accumulation of evidence about the roles such organisations play, albeit outside mainstream housing literature.339

Before leaving this topic we should add that Irish housing organisations and other bodies representing white minority communities may potentially play roles similar to those of the black-run associations.340

12.3 Employment in housing

Although housing is said to be ‘one of the best service sectors in terms of minority ethnic employment’,341 there has been a record of criticisms of employment practices or performance of housing provider organisations stretching back over many years, occasionally supported well by research or data.342 Since detailed case studies of organisations from a good practice perspective have been rare, material on roles of minority ethnic staff or committee members has tended to be scattered and anecdotal.343 The 1993 CRE report on housing associations found some progress in employment, but ‘a number of familiar areas of concern, including some discriminatory practices’. The report notes a pattern in which minority ethnic staff could be ‘concentrated in manual and lower clerical grades, with few of them at management level, despite the efforts of PATH over the years’.344

PATH has involved bringing black minority ethnic people through into housing work via training packages and planned routes. It has assisted in creating a pool of professionals, some of whom have subsequently found their way firmly into practice and up the career ladder. Somerville and Steele indicate the importance of ‘stepping stone’ posts within staff structures to allow for internal career progression. It seems likely that schemes for positive action training may have been most effective when part of a generally pervasive ‘good practice’ stance within organisations.345 Research commissioned by the DoE to assess the impact and cost-effectiveness of PATH found that ‘by enabling Black people to compete effectively for housing related jobs, their under-representation in those jobs has been reduced’ (within the limited scope, size and funding of the PATH schemes). PATH schemes as individual projects, and ‘the movement as a whole’, had influenced in real terms the ‘racial structure of the housing employment market’, and provided ‘a small yet valuable contribution towards addressing ethnic minority under-representation, through the intensive approach they have adopted’.346 Very recently Julienne has examined the experience of PATH, with the support of the Rowntree Foundation. Noting that over 1,300 people have obtained employment mainly at junior and middle management grades in social housing as a result of PATH, he gives an ‘upbeat’ assessment of the programme’s achievements. What is less clear, he notes, is whether PATH trainees have been able to penetrate the ‘glass ceiling’ of promotion opportunities. PATH seems to have been successful ‘in getting black people entry into housing’, but once there many have felt isolated ‘and have felt they have been denied promotion by a racist culture in the work place’.347

A substantial study has been completed recently indicating that black minority ethnic groups tend to be under-represented in the professional/technical workforces of white-led RSLs, and that ‘BME staff are virtually absent from senior management positions and generally located in the most junior levels of mainstream organisations’.348 This situation has clearly been offset to a degree by the development of black-run RSLs, although career opportunities within these may be different from those within large white-run associations. Furthermore, The Housing Corporation’s recent Sector Study (as we note above) shows that such associations still only represent a small percentage of RSL activity. As far as local government in general is concerned, progress with equal opportunities in staffing practices appears unimpressive (albeit
with exceptions), and there is little to suggest that this is unlikely to apply to housing posts. Unsurprisingly, almost nothing is known about practices within private sector housing organisations.

12.4 Some research priorities related to participation and employment

- There should be more research on tenant participation, and on the involvement of specific groups of tenants both in relation to general housing and specialised services.

- The extent, opportunities and means of involvement of black and minority ethnic representatives, groups and organisations in partnerships, federations, group structures, local authority stock transfer processes and regeneration processes should be kept under scrutiny.

- It would be useful to know more about any possible significant effects that changing policy environments and external pressures may have on the ability of minority ethnic organisations to represent and connect with community interests.

- Employment practices and patterns should be monitored further, across the range of housing sectors and types of organisations where feasible.
We now provide two sections with a different focus from the specific coverage in previous parts of the report. The present section notes briefly some previous research reviews and bibliographies through which readers may obtain additional information, and draws attention to general contributions made by funders and sponsors. In addition we comment briefly on some gaps in the types of research that have tended to be supported, and on research ‘infrastructure’. Our aim is to supplement what we have said in our report about specific under-researched topics, by providing an overview of the general research situation. We then turn to issues of audit in our closing section.

13.1 Previous bibliographies and overviews

Several analyses have been carried out to create annotated bibliographies or to provide indicators of gaps in the research record on housing, ‘race’ and ethnicity. Such accounts and overviews range from fairly short advisory comments to more extensive or systematic descriptions of most or selected parts of the field. Some surveys of research material and literatures have been made in support of high profile attempts to review policy and practice issues (as with preparation of the Challenge Report 2000). Others have formed the basis for conventional journal papers or book chapters. The best systematic and recent general introduction to the literature sources is that of Tomlins, which shows the rich record of UK research activity on housing ‘race’ and ethnicity.

13.2 The impact of sponsors and research funders

Despite the diversity of past investigations and surveys, patterns of sponsorship and funding have influenced trends in research activity very strongly in particular directions. Housing needs studies focussed on minorities have multiplied rapidly in recent years, and are reviewed in reports taking an overview. One strong stimulus to growth here has been the approach of The Housing Corporation, which has encouraged a large portfolio of needs-related and allied studies. We understand that the Corporation has recently completed a major programme of research into ‘race’ and housing, which had been initiated to support its black and minority ethnic housing policy, and which ran for three years. This development has been directly linked...
to the responsibilities of the sponsoring organisation, just as was the highly informative investigatory housing research work carried out by the Commission for Racial Equality in earlier years. Overviews of research tend to highlight indirectly the changing ‘sponsor landscape’. For instance, the recent impact of Housing Corporation Innovation and Good Practice Grant on research projects is apparent from the valuable annotated bibliography of housing and related needs studies by Sodhi, et al., and from the review by Matthias. Although the ERSC has had less of a direct effect on recent research output in this field than the Housing Corporation, the Research Council was one of the four sponsors for the PSI’s invaluable Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities. Recently it has been funding important research by Phillips on South Asian Relocation in Northern Cities. The latter project is examining the scale, patterns, processes and consequences of Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi relocation beyond ‘core’ minority group clusters in Leeds and Bradford. This is expected to provide a contextualised understanding of the changing geography and life-chances of South Asians in Britain, and a re-examination of the role of ‘race’, ethnicity and class in debates about socio-economic inclusion and exclusion.

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation also deserves separate mention. A decade ago it commissioned a research overview which still stands as a landmark enterprise in reviewing research performance ‘across the board’. The centre-piece of this exercise was a major report by Smith, and there was also input from two overseas commentators (J. Goering, from the USA, and H. van Amersfoort from the Netherlands), and a conference where many researchers gave papers. The proceedings pointed to a very large potential research agenda, but the Foundation did not subsequently develop an extensive programme targeted on this. Nonetheless the Foundation has sponsored several excellent studies since then, and from time to time provides informative commentaries on groups of its completed projects to supplement individual research findings. Very recently a day seminar was held by the Foundation which included consideration of achievements, gaps and priorities across a range of fields. Nine papers were commissioned, including one on housing by Chahal. Our bibliography includes a selection from Rowntree (JRF) Findings and allied items, indicating the importance of the Foundation’s activity.

It is clear that research directions have been influenced by key funders. Alongside those mentioned above have been government departments, local authorities, and voluntary sector bodies (including specific housing associations). Perhaps one possible consequence of the activities and preoccupations of sponsors has been the emphasis placed in recent years on researching the roles of social rented housing providers, and the needs of disadvantaged groups that might be considered potential clients for voluntary and public sector organisations. Meanwhile, the private sectors have remained largely under-researched, despite the importance for minority ethnic communities of private landlords, owner-occupation, and the housing finance services sector.

Sponsored research has propelled many researchers into intensive short-term work that is often highly productive, but which, when considered as a whole, may not be very independent of local or national political interactions and pressures. Furthermore, funded research sometimes lags well behind policy developments rather than addressing their implications from the outset. There is even a possibility that instead of having evidence-led policy, we sometimes have policy-led evidence-gathering and evaluation strategies. Thus, immediate policy preferences might dictate too directly what is reviewed and what is not, and the way that an issue is perceived. In any event, the preoccupations of research funders have frequently been aligned closely with major trends in policy and current events affecting social rented housing and specialised services, or
with high profile public issues. There is a continuing national lack of well-funded exploratory or in-depth research about minority ethnic housing that could fall outside work on the large data sets or the tightly focussed policy-related analyses that have been supported by sponsors. Historical or theoretically-orientated investigations are uncommon, while comparative work on minority ethnic housing remains very rare. In-depth USA/UK/Europe comparisons are scarce. Importantly, we lack comparative information on organisational and participatory developments that might help place UK experiences in a broader context. For instance, too little is known about capacity-building and empowerment issues associated with the development of organisations involved with renewal or community development; we understand that at time of writing work in this field may be at the planning stage at Birmingham University.

13.3 Research infrastructure

The housing and ‘race’ research field has attracted increasing interest both from housing organisations and professional researchers, and there are now several research centres with extensive records of funded empirical projects. Substantial contributions have been made in England by staff from (amongst others) Birmingham, Cambridge, De Montfort, Leeds, Lincoln, Salford, Sheffield Hallam and Warwick Universities. There has also been significant research from centres in Scotland and Wales. Nonetheless, in reviewing the research ‘infrastructure’ we find only rather limited institutional support for housing and ‘race’ research as such, or for specific research training in this area.

The recent Rowntree Seminar’s conclusions include the point that it is important to involve communities in framing research questions, and that research should be seen as a potential agent of change, ‘informing social movements and bringing researchers and practitioners together.’ There is already heavy participation of black minority ethnic organisations in localised research, while some academic research teams have made strong efforts to involve local communities in surveys and allied work. On the other hand, however, there is little in the way of institutional machinery to sustain links over the longer term, to provide spaces and funding for rolling programmes of temporary secondments, staff development, and research for higher degrees, or to maintain networks and posts that would enhance general research capacity.
Our concluding comments for this report do not summarise what has gone before, but set out some broad observations about governmental achievements and ways forward. At the level of general principles and leadership, central government has in recent years been adopting an increasingly responsive position in relation both to securing ‘racial’ equality and in terms of encouraging sensitivity to diversity. Government has indicated its commitment to race equality performance indicators aimed at monitoring the contribution public services are making to ‘race’ equality, and ensuring that they are more adaptable and responsive to the communities they serve. There has been commitment, too, on incorporating as a core issue the consideration of ‘race’ equality in departmental and cross-cutting spending reviews. It has also been made clear that housing strategies should be based on a proper assessment of the needs of local minority ethnic populations, and that ‘mainstream’ bodies should work with minority ethnic RSLs and community groups.

At a detailed level, government has been encouraging firmer action against racist harassment, and recommending minority ethnic participation in a variety of settings (for example in neighbourhood warden schemes). With respect to harassment, there is evidence of a degree of valuable co-operation between key players in pursuit of better practice. For instance, the DETR recently produced *Tackling Racial Harassment: Code of Practice for Social Landlords*, in cooperation with the Housing Corporation and the National Assembly for Wales.

Looking at the impact of particular regulatory machinery, we can highlight the role and potential of inspection. The national Housing Inspection process (developed as part of the Audit Commission Inspection Service) seems to be proving a significant means of examining local authority performance and encouraging change. The Inspectorate’s primary role is to support improvements in the performance of local housing authorities through inspection, as well as by promoting good practice through publications and seminars, and through engagement in relevant policy debate. We understand that useful information has become available here on such matters as compliance with the CRE Code of Practice in Rented Housing (a local authority performance indicator since 1995), along with data on quality of services.

Turning to the Housing Corporation we find extensive commitment to research and monitoring via projects, and coherent strategies for progress review as far as the Corporation’s Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Policy is concerned. When our research review enquiries were in
hand, the Corporation had anticipated that by April 2002 there would be a strong framework for implementation through guidance to RSLs. Amongst positive steps cited had been a new regulatory code imposing the duty of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 on RSLs, a strengthening of the ‘BME component in the Housing Investment Programme (HIP)’, ‘by DTLR in consultation with the HC’, an audit guide on ‘race’ equality by the NHF and the FBHO, the ‘RaceActionNet website’ developed by Lemos and Crane, and further codes of practice. A management tool was being produced (the ‘race equality toolkit’) for RSLs and regulators to undertake ‘race’ equality audits and benchmark performance within the Best Value framework. This toolkit was subsequently launched in Spring 2002. The inspection role was also being highlighted at the time of our enquiries. One general weakness identified as significant, however, had been the need for resources on the ground ‘to enable the policy to take hold’, especially in relation to mainstream RSLs.

For practitioners in RSLs and councils there is now some first-rate detailed guidance available, sometimes building on knowledge of earlier research findings and on individual case studies or specific survey exercises. Blackaby and Chahal’s good practice guide is a very sophisticated and comprehensive instance, and indeed can be cited as an outstanding exemplar. We understand that there is also some ongoing development of supportive and advisory networks. Yet there are continuing concerns about how far housing providers and services organisations are actually fulfilling expectations on good practice, on monitoring, or on partnerships and participation. Research findings continue to cast doubt on the extent to which effective action has followed external exhortation and criticism, and it is unclear how far good practices have been sufficiently built into daily proceedings on a permanent and regularised basis (although insights are available from a variety of sources including inspection). Some of the work sponsored by the Housing Corporation has demonstrated that performance of RSLs in delivering and monitoring services has been less satisfactory than might have been hoped. Specific areas require further effort, responses to harassment still perhaps being a key instance, while some basic barriers or limitations persist in language, communications or utilisation of advice services. Furthermore, we cannot be sure that adequate use is made at local level of research findings. There is little follow-up work investigating implementation of recommendations from needs studies. The Housing Corporation has generated some research to assess aspects of current practice by local authorities, and this investigation included the format of written strategies, linkages between agencies, monitoring and evaluation of approaches, and issues of development and implementation. Nonetheless, only modest resources have been put into this kind of exercise.

We can add that while we do not have enough information on the RSL and local authority domains, there is almost nothing recent for the private sectors (although see comments on market professionals in Section 5). It would be desirable to have some material here about performance on ‘racial’ equality, and more information on cultural sensitivity. For example, it would be interesting to know how far UK financial institutions are open to engaging in ‘Islamic financing’ in the property field, and whether (or how far) this matter is actually problematic in housing contexts. The conclusion to be drawn more generally is that while there is no shortage of advice, there is a patchy set of responses across the housing sectors.

Apart from discovering research on the effectiveness of the implementation of good practices by housing providers, the present researcher hoped to find more evaluative reporting about the actual processes of guidance, supervision and monitoring of providers, and the impact of guidelines in specific environments. More systematic research into regulatory methodologies and their strengths and limitations might be helpful here. Equally important, it is crucial to know more about what happens within organisations. If guidelines are not followed, what are
the reasons? Perhaps a case might be made for a new look at a set of interconnected issues, covering the following overlapping questions (amongst others) which stand on the boundary between research and policy development:

- What are the main options for more firmly establishing and resourcing periodic social audit processes – of both specific and cross-service types – and what are the possibilities for such audits being tied into processes which would encourage ongoing reforms in organisations’ practices (‘naming and shaming’, financial incentives, formal inspection procedures, etc.)? What are the most appropriate targeting or ‘benchmarking’ approaches (for services) which might help here, and are there any problems with these? Is the regional level worth considering more for this type of activity, and would identifying ‘champions’ for black and minority ethnic communities within senior staff in government be useful at this level?

- How effective are existing governmental or Housing Corporation levers in influencing practices on ‘racial’ equality (investment decisions, inspection, best value as a monitoring or enforcement tool, or achieving best value through public engagement, etc.)? Relevant research seems to have been infrequent here, although a very recently-published study commissioned by the Housing Corporation includes analysis of the outcomes of ‘ethnic coding’ in investment decision-making, and comments on the monitoring potential of investment code data.379

- If performance and monitoring by providers has remained patchy, what are the main reasons and what are the implications? How good is the coverage in the monitoring information base (CORE, local authority data, etc.)? How much capacity do organisations have for data collection and analysis? Possible barriers to consider might include lack of resources, competition and pressure from other priorities, managerial and financial needs, and (perhaps) the implications of other trends in government’s policies. Factors having an impact on housing association performance have begun to be researched, but more extensive inquiry is needed. Even black and minority ethnic-run housing associations may not be immune from negative factors influencing their activities for tenants and potential tenants. Explanations which fall back on generalised claims about institutionalised racism in housing are not likely to prove sufficient, and may in some circumstances prove counter-productive.

- How can a ‘foresight’ research and monitoring strategy be developed, whereby ongoing social audit processes can provide sensitive analyses about likely effects of changing policies? Put differently, how can research look forward in a predictive way, in order to better inform policies? Can ‘equality testing’ be made a standard feature of public policy development, at regional as well as national level? How far would it be possible to develop ‘before and after’ social audit practices?

- What relationships could be developed amongst potential players in regulation and monitoring processes, so as to make the best use of resources and knowledge? What mechanisms would achieve an effective balance between independent research, official bodies, producer and financial sector self-monitoring, and community representation? Does this have a potential regional dimension?
Survey of English Housing (SEH)

The Survey of English Housing (SEH) is a continuous government survey which collects a wide range of information on households, their housing and their attitudes to housing and related issues through face to face interviews with about 20,000 householders each year.

The sample is designed to yield a nationally representative sample of about 20,000 private households in England. The sample is selected in two stages: first a sample of postcode sectors is selected from the Postcode Address File; then, a sample of addresses is selected within the sampled sectors. The design provides a nationally representative sample in each quarter of the year. Just under 29,000 addresses are selected each year, yielding about 25,000 households eligible for interview. Interviews are achieved with about 80 per cent of eligible households (20,000).

The sample size for the tables provided above includes; 19,197 White households; 475 Black households; 290 Indian households; 239 Pakistani and Bangladeshi households; and 351 ‘Other’ households.

To allow for sampling error a confidence interval is calculated. This is an interval within which it is fairly certain the true population figures lies. The confidence interval set for the SEH is 95 per cent.

The SEH tables combine results from 1998, 1999 and 2000 (except Table 15, which uses only 1999/2000 data).

English House Condition Survey (EHCS)

The English House Condition Survey (EHCS) is carried out to provide a major source of information for the development and monitoring of housing policies directed at the repair, improvement and energy efficiency of the housing stock. The survey has been undertaken every five years, but from April 2002 it changed onto a yearly basis.

The survey has four separate but related parts. The interview survey with householders
determines their characteristics, attitudes to their homes, repair and maintenance, improvements and heating arrangements. The Physical Survey of the dwellings provides a description of the stock and its present condition. The Postal Survey of the local authorities and housing associations identifies work that has been undertaken on their stock, and action taken by local authorities for private sector stock. The final stage is the Valuation survey that estimates the current market value of the property.

Two components of the survey describe ‘Poor Housing’ and ‘Poor Living Conditions’. Poor housing indicators are developed using three measures of housing conditions: unfitness, substantial levels of disrepair, and the need for essential modernisation. However, each of the component measures are distributed differently by dwelling, tenure and household characteristics. The Poor Living Conditions indicator has been constructed from a wide range of information obtained through the survey including the presence of: local concentrations of housing in substantial disrepair; vacant and/or derelict housing or sites; other forms of neglect or misuse.

The results used in the tables include 1996 data. The households included in the 1996 survey consist of 12,308 White households, 306 Black households, 136 Indian households, 160 Pakistani/Bangladeshi households and 125 ‘Other’ households groups.

To allow for sampling error a confidence interval is calculated. This is an interval within which it is fairly certain the true population figures lies. The confidence interval set for the EHCS is 95 per cent. For example, the number of people (thousands) living in poor housing conditions in 1996; 5,400 White (0.6 C.I.), 182 Black (4.4 C. I.), 135 Indian (6.3 C.I.), 339 Pakistani/Bangladeshi (7.8 C.I.) and 144 ‘Others’ (8.4 C.I.). (Figures are given in relation to the population as a whole.)

Family Resources Survey

The Family Resources Survey is a sample survey of approximately 25,000 households in Great Britain (20,000 in England) in each financial year. The FRS has been conducted annually since 1992. Total household income is composed of: Household income before tax and national insurance from earnings, self-employment, total income from investments, disability benefits, retirement pensions and income support, other benefits, other pensions and income from tax credits.

The figures have been standardised by region in order to remove the effect of ethnic groups tending to be concentrated in certain regions. Thus the figures in the above table show the national average income for each ethnic group if that group had had the standard regional distribution (ie the regional distribution of the whole population) and not its actual distribution.

Local Authority housing provision for the homeless

This information comes from the data collected by Local Authorities on the operation of the homelessness legislation in England and framed in the context of the homelessness provisions of the 1996 Housing Act. Any households still being dealt with under the 1985 Housing Act
should have been included in the returns. In the case of Asylum Seekers, only those dealt with under relevant homelessness legislation were included; cases dealt with by the Social Services department under social security legislation (e.g. the Asylum Support (Interim Provisions) Regulations 1999) were excluded. With the introduction of arrangements for the housing and dispersal of asylum seekers, those first seeking asylum from April 2000 were no longer eligible for consideration under homelessness legislation.

The returns cover numbers of households not persons (Tables 16-17 use data results from the Quarter July–September 2001).

Out of the 354 Local Authorities, 9% did not provide any returns. Of those that did provide returns, 3% did not give a break down by ethnic group. The total number of decisions made in the Quarter July–September 2001 was 64,743 according to return data. White households accounted for 42,806. The break-down for the other ethnic groups included; 5,251 African/Caribbean households; 3,025 Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi households and 4,651 ‘Other’ households.
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