

# **Changing ethnic identities in England and Wales (1991-2001)**

**For LS workshop on ethnicity, 11 Nov. 2005 at LS**

**Dr Yaojun Li**

**BA MA MPhil (Oxon) DPhil (Oxon)**

**Reader in Sociological Analysis**

**Department of Sociology**

**Birmingham University**

**Email: [y.li.3@bham.ac.uk](mailto:y.li.3@bham.ac.uk)**

**Tel: 0121-4158625**

**Web: [http://www.sociology.bham.ac.uk/staff/yaojun\\_li.htm](http://www.sociology.bham.ac.uk/staff/yaojun_li.htm)**

# Ethnic identity changes by sex (% by row)

**Table 2** Ethnic identity distribution 1991-2001 by sex (percentage by row)

Ethnic Group 91		Ethnicity 2001									Total	N
Male	White	Black Caribbean	Black African	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Chinese	Black Other	Other Other			
White	99.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	100	175,050	
Black Caribbean	<b>9.1</b> <sup>***</sup>	81.2	0.7	0.2	<i>0.2</i> <sup>*</sup>	0	0	8.0	0.9	100	1,287	
Black African	<b>9.6</b> <sup>***</sup>	2.6	80.9	<b>1.8</b> <sup>***</sup>	<i>0.5</i> <sup>***</sup>	0	0	3.7	1.3	100	470	
Indian	<i>2.2</i> <sup>***</sup>	0.3	0.2	<b>91.5</b> <sup>***</sup>	0.5	0.1	0	0.1	5.5	100	3,839	
Pakistani	<b>1.9</b> <sup>***</sup>	0	0.2	<i>1.2</i> <sup>***</sup>	93.2	0.2	0	0	3.6	100	1,957	
Bangladeshi	<b>1.3</b> <sup>***</sup>	0	0	<i>1.0</i> <sup>**</sup>	0.5	95.1	0	0	2.4 <sup>**</sup>	100	651	
Chinese	<b>0.9</b> <sup>***</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	93.0	0	6.3	100	480	
Black Other	<i>46.2</i> <sup>***</sup>	17.4	2.8	<b>5.7</b> <sup>***</sup>	<i>3.9</i> <sup>***</sup>	1.2	0.4	7.8	15.2	100	622	
Other Other	<i>51.0</i> <sup>***</sup>	2.1	0.9	5.4	2.7	0.7	1.8	0.8	35	100	1,587	
<b>Female</b>												
White	99.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	100	192,922	
Black Caribbean	10.8	78.9	0.6	0.3	0	0	0	8.6	1.0	100	1,714	
Black African	11.6	2.0	79.0	2.3	0	0	0	3.7	1.6	100	571	
Indian	1.6	0.2	0.3	93.3	0.4	0.1	0	0.1	4.4	100	3,866	
Pakistani	2.3	0	0.2	0.6	94.3	0	0	0	2.8	100	1,893	
Bangladeshi	1.6	0	0	0.7	0.7	96.2	0	0	1.1	100	774	
Chinese	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	91.8	0	6.1	100	498	
Black Other	44.4	18.8	3.3	7.8	2.8	0.7	0.7	8.4	13.6	100	740	
Other Other	48.5	3.0	1.0	5.4	2.7	0.3	1.3	1.3	36.8	100	1,693	

Note:

1. Based on recode: (1/6=1)(12=2)(13=3)(8=4)(9=5)(10=6)(15=7)(14=8)(7,11,16=9).
2. Significance tests are conducted for the gender differences in each of the corresponding cells. Figures in bold indicate greater female than male changes, and figures in italics indicate greater male than female changes in the respective cells.
3. \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01 and \*\*\* p<0.001.

**Table 3 Ethnic identity distribution 1991-2001 (percentage by row)**

Ethnic Group 91	Ethnicity 2001										
	White	Black Caribbean	Black African	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Chinese	Black Other	Other Other	All	N
White	99.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	100	367,972
Black Caribbean	10.1	79.9	0.6	0.3	0.1	0	0	8.3	1.0	100	3,001
Black African	10.7	2.3	79.9	2.1	0.2	0	0	3.7	1.5	100	1,041
Indian	1.9	0.2	0.3	92.4	0.5	0.1	0	0.1	4.9	100	7,705
Pakistani	2.1	0	0.2	0.9	93.8	0.1	0	0	3.2	100	3,850
Bangladeshi	1.5	0	0	0.8	0.6	95.7	0	0	1.7	100	1,425
Chinese	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	92.4	0	6.2	100	978
Black Other	45.2	18.2	3.1	6.8	3.3	0.9	0.6	8.1	14.3	100	1,362
Other Other	49.7	2.5	1.0	5.4	2.7	0.5	1.6	1.1	35.9	100	3,280

Note:

1. Recode eth01cat16 (1/6=1)(12=2)(13=3)(8=4)(9=5)(10=6)(15=7)(14=8)(7,11,16=9) into eth01cat9.
2. For males and females combined.
3. We shall code the cells in pink as moving to White, cells in red (on the diagonal) as retainers and all others within the dotted line as changers to other ethnicities.

# Ethnic identity changes 91-01

Table4 Ethnic identity change by demographic-socio-economic factors (% by row)

	Retainer	To White	To Other	N
Ethnicity at 1991				
White	99.9	0	.1	376163
Black Caribbean	78.2	12.7	9.1	3142
Black African	78.6	12.5	8.8	1077
Indian	95.7	3.1	1.2	7575
Pakistani	94.8	3.5	1.7	3912
Bangladeshi	94.6	3.2	2.2	1474
Chinese	96.3	3.1	0.6	943
Black Other	8.9	54.2	36.9	1255

---

Sex				
Male	99.2	0.4	0.4	187962
Female	99.2	0.4	0.4	207849
Age in 1991				
Under 20	98.6	0.8	0.6	105730
20-29	98.9	0.5	0.7	61850
30-39	99.3	0.4	0.4	62479
40+	99.6	0.2	0.2	165482
Religion in 2001				
Christian	99.5	0.3	0.2	300093
Other	96.4	1.1	2.5	16263
No religion	99.2	0.5	0.3	52941
Not stated	97.5	1.4	1.1	26244
Nativity				
Foreign born	96.4	1.8	1.9	24268
Native born	99.4	0.3	0.3	371273

---

---

Heath status 91-01				
Y91Y01	99.2	0.4	0.4	304468
Y91N01	99.3	0.3	0.4	57146
N91Y01	98.3	0.9	0.8	7836
N91N01	99.4	0.3	0.3	26091
Owner occupier 91-01				
Y91Y01	99.5	0.3	0.3	264586
Y91N01	98.8	0.6	0.7	31734
N91Y01	98.7	0.7	0.6	32800
N91N01	98.5	0.9	0.7	66421
Marital status 91-01				
Y91Y01	99.6	0.2	0.2	162131
Y91N01	99.4	0.3	0.3	34890
N91Y01	99.1	0.4	0.5	33067
N91N01	98.8	0.7	0.6	165453
HH head status 91-01				
Y91Y01	99.4	0.3	0.3	116389
Y91N01	99.4	0.3	0.3	33839
N91Y01	99.2	0.4	0.4	71699
N91N01	99.0	0.5	0.4	173614

---

<b>Degree status 91-01</b>				
Y91Y01	99.5	0.3	0.3	22793
N91Y01	98.9	0.4	0.5	36384
N91N01	99.2	0.4	0.4	336364
<b>Employment status 91-01</b>				
Y91Y01	98.5	0.2	0.3	139392
Y91N01	99.5	0.2	0.3	53544
N91Y01	98.9	0.6	0.5	58102
N91N01	98.9	0.6	0.5	144503
<b>Class status 91-01</b>				
Y91Y01	99.6	0.2	0.2	49022
Y91N01	99.5	0.2	0.3	19252
N91Y01	99.1	0.4	0.5	49156
N91N01	99.1	0.5	0.4	278111
<b>Deprivation in 1991</b>				
Top quintile	99.8	0.2	0.1	57413
2 <sup>nd</sup>	99.7	0.2	0.1	65041
3 <sup>rd</sup>	99.6	0.2	0.2	73431
4 <sup>th</sup>	99.3	0.4	0.3	89754
Bottom quintile	98.2	0.9	0.9	110059
<b>Ward-level %BME 91-01</b>				
%91 GE %01	98.8	0.9	0.5	66558
%91 LT % 01	99.3	0.4	0.4	328983

# Table Logit regression models

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sex (ref. = male)			
Female	.044	.013	.011
Nativity (ref. = native born)			
Foreign born	2.026***	2.269***	1.974***
Age in 1991 (ref. = 40+)			
Under 20	1.317***	1.294***	1.246***
20-29	.884***	1.007***	.864***
30-39	.741***	.869***	.753***
Religion in 2001 (ref. = Christian)			
Other religion	.337***	.289**	-.047
No religion	-.175*	-.191**	-.189**
Not stated	1.369***	1.363***	1.322***
Health status (ref. = Y91Y01)			
Y91N01	.019	-.074	-.109
N91Y01	.749***	.696***	.614***
N91N01	.093	-.055	-.115
Owner occupation status (ref. = Y91Y01)			
Y91N01	.341***	.316***	.291***
N91Y01	.642***	.636***	.389***
N91N01	.983***	.909***	.604***
Marital status (ref. = Y91Y01)			
Y91N01	.308**	.263*	.264*
N91Y01	.289**	.303**	.265*
N91N01	.725***	.680***	.647***
HH head status (ref. = Y91Y01)			
Y91N01		-.083	-.082
N91Y01		-.066	-.049
N91N01		-.096	-.025
Degree status (ref. = Y91Y01)			
N91Y01		.051	.088
N91N01		.092	.075
Employment status (ref. = Y91Y01)			
Y91N01		.310*	.267*
N91Y01		.173	.157
N91N01		.452	.405
Class status (ref. = Y91Y01)			
Y91N01		-.097	-.118
N91Y01		.042	-.002
N91N01		-.032	-.128
Social deprivation in 1991 (ref. = top quintile)			
2 <sup>nd</sup>			.003
3 <sup>rd</sup>			.224
4 <sup>th</sup>			.725***
Bottom quintile			1.345***
Ethnic concentration (ref. = %1991 ≥ %2001)			
%1991 < %2001			-.328***
Constant	-7.616***	-7.822***	-8.031**
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	.110	.111	.132
Model comparison			
$\chi^2$		34.35	421.52 <sup>b</sup>
p-value		<.000	<.000
N	393954	393954	393931