

Equality Statement for Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper

Policy and Service Analysis Template for considering Equalities for Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 or the public sector equality duty

1. Name of Directorate

Integration and Communities Directorate, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

2. Please list all the policy streams in your business area.

This document is an equality statement for the Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper.

The Green Paper will invite views through public consultation on the Government's proposals to realise our vision of a society where people of all backgrounds get on – with each other and in fulfilling their potential by making the most of the opportunities and benefits that living in Britain offers them. We define integrated communities as communities where people – whatever their background – live, work, learn and socialise together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities.

We are, on the whole, well-integrated – 85% of people report belonging strongly to Britain and 81% say their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together¹. However, we cannot ignore the very real challenges that exist. We must address these if we are to make sure that everyone has a fair chance to succeed and to share the opportunities and benefits of living in modern Britain.

Dame Louise Casey's independent review into opportunity and integration published in December 2016 highlighted significant challenges² in parts of the country facing rapid changes in population and those with communities divided along racial or religious lines. In some areas, problems of social exclusion have persisted for some ethnic minority groups and poorer white British communities and economic exclusion and poverty has had wide-ranging and long-lasting effects on education, health and employment. In parts of the country segregation has grown and people go about their daily lives – in schools, workplaces, shops and communities – with little or no contact with people from other ethnic, religious or socio-economic groups.

The government's 'Ethnicity facts and figures' website³ which was launched last year sets out the findings of a ground breaking race disparity audit of public services and gives unprecedented insight into how people from different ethnic backgrounds are treated in society, including their access to healthcare, education, employment and in the criminal justice system. It shows a complex picture. Some of the findings are uncomfortable. Across a range of measures and despite improvement in many areas, ethnic minorities have worse outcomes than White people. But on some measures, it is

¹ Cabinet Office (2016). Community Life Survey 2015-16 Statistical Bulletin. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/539102/2015_16_community_life_survey_bulletin_final.pdf

² The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration (2016) https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/575973/The_Casey_Review_Report.pdf

³ <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/>

White British people who are doing worst.

Building on Dame Louise Casey's review and the other evidence and reports, we have sought to identify the main drivers of integration. Although there are gaps in the data – another issue which this strategy will seek to tackle – there is sufficient evidence to point to the key factors associated with poor integration, though their relative importance or their combined impact will vary from place to place and for people from different backgrounds.

Many of these factors are connected to wider economic or social structures but some are personal and are driven by an individual's choice or the influence of their family, friends, their community and social networks.

The new Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper complements and underpins other elements of government's overall aim to create a stronger, fairer and more prosperous country - a country that works for everyone, whatever their background and wherever they come from. It sets out a national framework of priorities to tackle the key drivers of integration we have identified – both external and social and personal factors.

We know that integration challenges are not uniform throughout the country – they are linked to the specific interplay of demographics, patterns of migration, physical geography, industrial history and local economy of a place. The differences in the nature and scale of integration challenges means that tailored local plans and interventions are needed to tackle the issues that are specific to a particular place. Accordingly, the strategy signals a new localised approach to integration which we will trial initially in five areas.

3. Identify any policy streams aimed at or impacting upon a 'Protected Characteristic'.

The protected characteristics are:

- Age;
- Disability;
- Gender Reassignment;
- Pregnancy and Maternity;
- Race; Religion or belief;
- Sex; and
- Sexual Orientation
- Marriage and Civil Partnership, but only in respect of the first aim of the Equality Duty: eliminating unlawful discrimination.

Our vision for integrated communities is one which involves everyone, regardless of background or characteristics. Achieving our vision would therefore bring positive benefits to all over time. We know, however, that the opportunities and benefits of living in the UK are not shared by everyone, with some groups and places experiencing particular disadvantage (Ethnicity facts and figures highlights some of these disparities). Those disadvantages, by both protected characteristic and place, vary considerably depending on the outcomes which are being measured.

The Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper sets out a wide range of proposals which are the responsibility of a number of Government departments and so equality assessment will need to be on going and refined as policy develops. Where proposals extend existing approaches departmental policy leads will need to undertake a review

to assess whether existing equalities statements may require revision. New proposals will be subject to detailed policy development should they be adopted following consultation, drawing on responses to the consultation. As part of the policy development process each proposal will be subject to its own individual consideration of the equalities impacts.

Building on Dame Louise Casey's review, we have analysed literature, evidence and data from academics, think tanks, and official government reports to identify the main barriers to integration. Although there are gaps in the data – another issue which the strategy will seek to tackle – there is sufficient evidence to point to the key factors associated with poor integration at this time. Many of these factors are connected to wider economic or social structures and opportunities but some are personal and are driven by an individual's choice or the influence of their family, friends, their community and social networks. Section 5 summarises our analysis of the key factors which influence integration and underpin our proposals.

Based on this analysis, a major focus of the new strategy will be addressing outcomes for people from different ethnic backgrounds, notably with regard to English language skills and employment outcomes in order that we address the disadvantage that some communities experience disproportionately.

Despite significant progress in recent decades, gender inequalities persist for women and girls, particularly in some minority communities and the voices of minority women are far too often marginalised in political, public and local spaces. This manifests itself across many of the drivers of integration we have identified – for example, women have lower than average levels of access to the labour market and higher levels of poor English language proficiency – so tackling the inequalities faced by women and empowering them is also a theme throughout the new strategy.

Not all relationships and marriages are recognised in law and there is a need for greater awareness about their legal status. For example, despite persistent myths about cohabitation, common law marriages are not recognised in England and Wales. Other relationships, such as unregistered religious marriages, are also not recognised under marriage law in England and Wales; leaving women without full legal rights upon divorce should the marriage break down. This can leave women vulnerable both to financial hardship upon divorce and to unfair treatment by some religious councils. The Strategy sets out steps to address these issues.

The Casey Review highlighted the double discrimination faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people who are also from ethnic minority and faith backgrounds. We will work with local partners in the Integration Areas to address barriers to people enjoying their full rights and opportunities in our communities, including disabled people, LGBT people, women and young people. This may require difficult conversations where cultural practices may be holding people back, especially women or young people.

4. Who has responsibility for developing these policies?

Please name the person/s in MHCLG responsible.

If MHCLG does not hold responsibility please provide full details of organisations that do including any relevant stakeholders and agencies.

The following persons are responsible for the development of the Integrated

Communities Strategy :

- Hardip Begol: Senior Responsible Officer, Director, Integration
- Penny Hobman: Strategy Lead, Deputy Director, Integration Strategy

The Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper is a cross Government strategy and includes proposals which fall under the responsibilities of a number of Government Departments, including Home Office, DFE, DWP, MOJ and DCMS. When those Departments fully work up their policies, they will also need to undertake their own Equality Impact Assessments.

5. Are there any EU or other statutory regulations that need to be adhered to regarding equalities?

n/a

6. The following summary will be analysed and used as evidence which you considered in demonstrating due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty and section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. Have you used information from any of the following sources when developing policies?

This section sets out evidence demonstrating that there are a number of communities in England suffering multiple social and economic disadvantages caused by a lack of integration with wider British society. The evidence below outlines the links between these disadvantages and poor integration.

The content is based on the analysis of literature (academic, think tank, official Government reports) and data primarily drawn from the UK with input from other Government Departments.

Barriers to integration

The degree to which one is integrated can be both an effector of change and an outcome, which makes the disaggregation of causes and effects of a lack of integration a complex process. However, a review of the evidence has identified a range of structural, social and personal factors that can affect integration. These 7 factors are interconnected and one or more may co-exist as drivers of a lack of integration in certain locations and communities across the country.

- Lack of English language proficiency
- Labour market disadvantage
- Residential segregation
- Education (attainment and segregation)
- Level and pace of migration
- Lack of meaningful social mixing
- Religious and cultural norms, values and attitudes

Lack of English language proficiency

English language proficiency is identified to be a driver of integration in the relevant literature – it is fundamental to social mixing, trust, education and employment potential. It is closely correlated to **country of origin, gender, age and number of years resident in the country**.

According to Census 2011 data, **770 000 adults (aged 16+) in the UK reported that they don't speak English well or at all**. English proficiency is lowest for men and women aged 25-44 across all ethnic groups, except for Indians. We know that **by ethnicity Pakistani (18.9%) and Bangladeshi (21.9%) ethnic groups have the highest proportions of people aged 16 or over with poor English language proficiency**. The Bangladeshi and Pakistani community are also communities with the largest gender proficiency gap, with women more than twice as likely as men from these communities to report they can't speak English well or at all. **By faith community, the Muslim population has the highest proportion of people aged 16 and over who cannot speak English well or at all (16%) and more women than men reported poorer English proficiency levels**. The geographic distribution of non-English speaking residents is overlaid on to the wards and local authorities where Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities are most populous (Census 2011).

ONS Census 2011 data confirms this: people who were non-proficient in English had a lower employment rate (48.3%) than those who were proficient (65.4%) and those with English as their main language (71.9%). They were also more likely to work in elementary (38.2%), skilled trade (21.1%) or machine operative (16.9%) occupations.ⁱ English language proficiency is also associated with between a 21% and 23% increase in earningsⁱⁱ. We recognise that this data is old, but in the absence of more recent similar analysis these estimates provide a benchmark for future assessment.

Speaking English as a main language was associated with a stronger sense of belonging to Britain and increased participation in social and economic life. 87% of people with English as their main language felt they belonged strongly to Great Britain compared to 79% of people without. People for whom English is not their first language were also less likely to participate in civic engagement or volunteerⁱⁱⁱ. The evidence also indicates that people with higher proficiency in English are more likely to be in paid employment and in full-time employment^{iv}. The relative benefits that can be achieved across the country as a result of improving English proficiency will need to be measured (in part through a monitoring framework linked to the strategy and through the evaluation of the Integration Areas programme).

Labour market disadvantage

Employment is an important driver of migration. Worklessness can reduce family income, as well as damage families' resilience, health and stability. Work (and progression in work) can increase size and diversity of social networks, build confidence and help shape a sense of belonging. Tackling injustices and inequalities, including amongst deprived and ethnic minority communities, also helps to address grievances built on the perception that not everybody in Britain has the opportunity to fulfil their potential.

For new migrants, a lack of bridging links in social capital and a lack of English language ability will impact on labour market outcomes – this may mean that new migrants have a limited range of employment opportunities to pursue initially.

Some cultural attitudes held by both new and more established migrants towards the kinds of roles that are more appropriate for men and women may reduce the scope to pursue certain jobs or to work in the first place. However, there is evidence that these attitudes are changing in second and third generations (for example among British

Muslims) [Ref: Demos 2015]^v.

Discrimination in recruitment processes and the 'stereotype threat' may disadvantage new and existing migrants from employment opportunities.

In 2011, the highest levels of economic inactivity among women were found among women from Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Arab and Gypsy and Traveller communities. The most common reason for inactivity for BME women included looking after family/home or studying (Census 2011). LFS data (2015) points to continued high levels of economic inactivity among Asian Pakistani and Bangladeshi women. This pattern has been consistent for almost 10 years. Taking a single year (2015) the highest rates of female economic inactivity in the UK, across all working age groups, are found among Pakistani/Bangladeshi women.

Although Pakistani and Bangladeshi women have low labour force participation, this low level is not only driven by low levels of entry into the labour market, but also by relatively high levels of labour market exit compared to other ethnic groups.

An increase in the household income means women are more likely to exit the labour market. Differences in gender role attitudes (including around parenting roles) partially explain why Pakistani and Bangladeshi women have lower labour force entry rates and higher exit rates than White women. According to 2011 Census data, there was a larger proportion of Muslim men and women who have never worked and been long term unemployed than any of the other main religious groups^{vi}. In 2011 there were 430,000 Muslims (23.8%) in England and Wales who have never worked and been long term unemployed – including 98,000 men (10.3%) and 338,000 women (38.6%)^{vii}. In 2011 Muslims also had the smallest proportion of people in Higher managerial, administrative and professional occupations compared to all the main religions (16.4%)^{viii}. Further, Muslim workers in England had the lowest median hourly income (at £8.30) compared to all other religious groups.

In relation to employment the picture is similar with Pakistani / Bangladeshi communities showing the lowest employment rate at 51.8% in 2014.

Residential segregation

Residential segregation has been identified as both a cause as well as a consequence of a lack of integration.

Outside of areas which are predominantly White British, the evidence considers the concentrations of residential settlements among BME groups. Of all BME groups the evidence suggests that **Pakistani and Bangladeshi diaspora have had and continue to have the highest levels of residential concentrations/clustering compared with other groups over the last 3 decades of census returns.**

Many of the places that have the highest residential concentrations (according to popular measures of segregation – Indices of Dissimilarity) are within the northern towns and cities (Bradford, Oldham, Blackburn, Burnley and Birmingham), some of which have **wards comprising of over 50% resident population from a single ethnic minority community** (Pakistani, Indian or Bangladeshi community).

New research by Laurence and Hewstone has found that high concentrations of minorities alone do not appear to be problematic for social cohesion between groups, but **where this is accompanied by segregation, the research found higher levels of prejudice, greater perceived threat and fewer inter-ethnic friendships**^{ix}.

Education (attainment and segregation)

School performance has improved for ethnic groups with a narrowing of gaps for most, except Gypsy, Traveller and Roma pupils and White working class boys. Gaps remain in early years support which can affect future attainment. But FE, HE and employment outcomes vary for ethnic groups.

Educational segregation reduces opportunities for social mixing between pupils of different ethnicities. Schools can provide a key opportunity to build bridges between communities, increase friendship and trust and decrease anxiety among pupils from different backgrounds.

As of January 2016, 59% of minority ethnic pupils are in schools where minority ethnic pupils are in the majority and 93% of white British pupils are in schools where White British pupils are in the majority. **Levels of school segregation relative to all other ethnic minorities tend to be highest among Bangladeshi (ID=0.74) and Pakistani (ID=0.74) pupils**, followed by Indian (ID=0.66) and Black Africans (ID=0.66). For Chinese and White Others the ID is 0.59 and 0.45 respectively. Bangladeshi (21.2%), Pakistani (19.2%) and Indian (9.9%) pupils are also the most likely to be in schools where their own ethnic group is in the majority. For other ethnic minority groups, the proportion is minimal (Source: Demos Integration Hub analysis, 2013). The Casey Review highlighted that there were 511 schools across 43 local authority areas where over 50% of the pupil population were from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds, many of which coincide with the areas identified in the DEMOS report.

Level and pace of migration

For resident communities living in areas which experience high levels of migration, community tensions can form around greater demands and pressures on limited local services and amenities. Secondly, perceptions and concerns about migration have become increasingly important to the public and particularly in areas where levels of immigration have been rapid or, where immigration levels have been lower than average but concerns about migration have been quite high.

The association between social cohesion and socio-economic deprivation suggests that other **LA clusters with high migration, may also experience cohesion issues, particularly where migrants live in areas of pre-existing deprivation.**

Areas classified as 'Migrant Worker Towns and 'Countryside' may experience a greater impact from recent new arrivals due to the often unplanned/unexpected increase in the local population which the local services and residents react to, rather than plan for. **The combination of high volumes of new migrants in an area with little previous experience of receiving migrants appears to give rise to greater challenges and potential tensions.**

Lack of meaningful social mixing

Diverse social networks, especially for migrant or established migrant communities, result in better integration outcomes for employment, educational attainment and social/civic participation [Ref: Pettigrew and Tropp 2008]. Research shows that intergroup contact can promote reductions in intergroup prejudice.

However, evidence from The Challenge 'British Integration Survey' of 4,000 people in 2016, found that **Black, White and Asian Britons take up only around half - 48% - of the opportunities open to them to mix socially with a different ethnicity to themselves** given the demographics of where they live, even in our most diverse regions, such as London and the Midlands.

White Britons are taking up just **38%** of the opportunities they would expect to be open to them given the demographics of where they live and this percentage has

dropped from 40% in 2014.

Black Britons take up just **42%** of the opportunities open to them to mix socially with those from a different ethnicity to them given the demographics of where they live. This has fallen considerably from 2014 when the figure was 52%. Likewise, **Asian Britons** only take up **41%** of the opportunities open to them to mix socially with those from a different ethnicity

Evidence suggests that meaningful social mixing is best undertaken in settings where different communities come together for a purpose e.g. work, schools, or linked to a social or civic event (see earlier reference to Laurence, Schmidt and Hewstone 2017).

Religious and cultural norms, values and attitudes

Religious and cultural values and attitudes are problematic when: attitudes affect people's decisions; people feel disconnected from the host society and its values and practices; or where people engage in practices and customs which are considered harmful.

Impacts can include:

- creating a 'them and us' mentality;
- the expression of views considered extremist;
- increased intolerance and potential for hate crime, and
- lack of shared experiences to build trust and common values.

Analysis of 2009-10 Citizenship Survey data for Migration Advisory Council, found distinctions in the perceptions of new and recent migrants, compared with established migrants and host communities. Key differences were found among **non-EEA migrants (and in particular Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Indian people born abroad) who were more likely than their EEA counterparts or the host community to strongly agree that ethnic groups should maintain ethnic customs and traditions.**

According to the Understanding Society survey, proportionately more ethnic minority groups typically express stronger attachment to British identity and belonging than the White majority. **Asian groups were more likely than other ethnic groups to feel a strong sense of belonging to their neighbourhood. Bangladeshi (88%), Pakistani (83%) and Indian (81%) people felt a stronger sense of belonging to their neighbourhood** than White (77%), Black Caribbean (76%), Black African (74%), Other ethnicity (72%), Chinese (70%) and Mixed Race (69%) people. There was little variation in terms of strength of belonging to Britain among these groups.

Many ethnic minority groups have high levels of agreement that people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area, but levels of trust vary across groups.

There is a weaker evidence base around the nature of social attitudes and views among members of different communities to equal rights under the Equality Act. Previous evidence from the Citizenship Survey highlighted diverging opinions across members of the main religious groups, but that evidence is old now. More recent evidence from national social surveys indicate that there are distinctive opinions between some communities, for example across communities of religious and ethnic lines.

Analysis of the British Social Attitudes Survey across several waves highlights that ethnicity now vies with economic activity as the single most important driver of attitudes across the board, more important than socioeconomic group or gender. Its importance for opinions about same-sex relations and moral issues is especially marked, which may well be closely associated with the religious views of some of the

ethnic groups (BSA 30). Recent market research (ICM / Channel4 survey) has pointed to divergent views on personal liberty and equality matters across a limited number of ethnic/ faith groups from those held by the general population. For example, ICM conducted an opinion poll of British Muslims' social attitudes for Channel 4 in summer 2016. The survey reported findings which indicate a high level of attitudes which could lead to the restriction of the equal rights of women and LGBT people and undermine equal access under the law:

- 39% agreed that 'wives should always obey their husbands' compared with 5% of the British population.
- 47% did not agree that it is acceptable for a homosexual person to be a teacher in a school compared with 14% of the British population.

More analysis across communities and their views is required to fully understand the contexts associated with these views and their impacts on people's life choices and opportunities.

7. Have you discovered any of the following and as a consequence taken actions on identified equality issues?

- *Known difference in needs for those with a protected characteristic, and*
- *Evidence of an adverse equality impact on those with a protected characteristic.*
- *List any actions taken to mitigate against adverse equality impact on those with a protected characteristic*

Overall Impact

Benefits of the new Strategy are expected to be felt by resident communities as a whole through improved integration over the medium to longer term and therefore will not distinguish between those with or without protected characteristics, but we are clear that communities who are experiencing particular disadvantage should receive tailored and targeted support. We acknowledge that some of the benefits of improved integration will be realised sequentially and to varying degrees across communities, depending on the pace and depth to which the strategy (and its recommended policies) are implemented across different places, reach and involve different communities.

As highlighted in the previous evidence section, a number of our proposals focus on addressing disadvantage and inequalities based on the available evidence of the factors which hinder or support integration, particularly those related to race; religion or belief and sex.

We do not consider there is sufficient evidence of potential for an appreciable adverse equality impact on people with protected characteristics. Through the consultation we will invite views across the range of our proposals and will use any evidence provided through responses to consider further whether there may be evidence of the potential for such impacts. As stated earlier, individual proposals will be subject to their own dedicated equalities assessments which will include detailed consideration of the potential for adverse impacts.

Structural factors and interventions are better evidenced than social/personal factors or interventions, which makes it clearer to identify and map communities where barriers to integration are greater (though we acknowledge that local area data may be patchy),

but it is more difficult to map negative social and personal factors, except through attitudinal surveys which currently do not exist. Evidence of what works is also weaker on influencing attitudes and behaviours – so we will need to build the evidence base in order to better understand the relative effects of different policies and programmes.

Structural, social and personal factors may also be the result of varying levels of choice (for example, living in an area dominated by the same ethnic or faith group might be a conscious decision or the result of constrained choices linked to income or the need to live close to amenities and services which meet the specific cultural and religious needs of communities for example).

Proposals, including the Integration Areas programme, will need to be designed and delivered with all of this in mind – to treat factors as potential causes and consequences, to test and evaluate new approaches and to both remove obstacles to improved integration and incentivise positive integration choices. Where proposals are locally targeted, this will be led through a process of co-production with local authorities and their partners. In doing so, local authorities and their statutory partners will be subject to the Public Equality Duty and will need to monitor closely for any adverse equality impacts through delivery of integration focused interventions should they arise.

We are cognisant of the need to handle carefully any national and local communications concerning the new Green Paper in a way that seeks to avoid the stigmatisation of particular communities, which could potentially create further tensions and direct criticism towards particular ethnic groups and faiths (with particular risks around stigmatisation of the Muslim Community). Proposals to build shared values and to challenge cultural and religious norms and values, where they threaten equalities, will also require careful handling in avoiding the perception that this is branding one or more particular faiths as problematic, or that it is indiscriminate in how it addresses the many different branches of the faith.

8. When your policies are finally implemented which characteristics are most likely to benefit?

Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.

Proposals in the Green Paper will have a positive impact on addressing discrimination through the furtherance of shared values (and behaviours) which support equality. The strategy sets out a number of proposals to challenge the cultural and religious attitudes and practices that can hinder integration and equal rights. For example we will:

- support and **empower marginalised women;**
- The recent independent review of sharia law recommended amending marriage legislation to ensure that civil marriages are conducted before or at the same time as the religious marriage ceremony We will therefore **explore the legal and practical challenges of limited reform to the law** to reflect this;
- **improve our understanding of the ways in which overseas influences can undermine attitudes to rights and freedoms among communities in the UK** and make better use of this understanding;

- expand our current Strengthening Faith Institutions programme to help **a wider range of faith institutions to up skill their staff and strengthen their governance**
- continue to **engage with faith communities to harness their energy in tackling serious attacks on rights**, such as female genital mutilation and modern slavery.
- **support delivery of the Hate Crime Action Plan** in the Integration Areas, strengthening local partnerships to identify innovative practices to address hate crime and promote greater reporting of incidents.

Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not.

Advancing equality of opportunity will be one of the primary objectives of proposals in the Green Paper. The positive impacts of the proposals are expected to be broad ranging and will generally focus on making sure interventions are evidenced where possible and sufficiently tailored to the particular needs of different ethnic minority communities and the individuals within them.

The strategy sets out a number of proposals to **increase economic opportunity and ensure no-one is left behind**. For example, we will:

- Provide new funding to Jobcentre Plus so they can support more people from the most segregated communities into work in the Integration Areas;
- use the opportunity of **Universal Credit to engage people who are economically inactive to offer them support and realise their potential through pathways to work**
- **support people from ethnic minorities into work** in places where there remains a big gap between their employment rates and that of the white communities
- **consider providing information to migrants prior to arrival in the UK**, to give them clear information about British values and culture, rights and responsibilities
- To **boost English language skills** we propose to develop a new Strategy for English Language in England and launch a new community-based English language programme to help more people learn English

Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not.

As the evidence presented in section 6 demonstrates, a lack of integration can be linked to a lack of meaningful social mixing. Strong social capital (trust and satisfaction) within specific homogenous communities can provide conditions for separatism to grow. Research shows that meaningful inter-group contact can promote reductions in inter-group prejudice. Moreover, findings reveal that contact theory applies beyond racial and ethnic groups to embrace other types of groups too (for example, class and sexuality). The key factor is the quality of the social mixing

experience involved.

The Green Paper will highlight that the PSED requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people with different characteristics when designing policies and delivering services. It makes explicit that fostering good relations means having a positive impact on relations between groups of people with protected characteristics and those without them. This sits at the heart of good leadership on integration practice. Through the new Green Paper the Government calls on public authorities to include an equality objective outlining specific activity to promote integration, particularly where any significant issues have been identified, as this would further the aim of fostering good relations.

In addition, our proposals include:

- **Identifying and reviewing a number of current priority policies** and services to review across government during this Green Paper consultation period to assess whether they exacerbate segregation and could be developed so that they actively drive integration;
- work with local admissions authorities in the Integration Areas to **enable the admissions system to help ensure the intake of schools are more representative of the area and promote integration**;
- promote **mixing and twinning arrangements between schools** in areas of high segregation.

9. In considering the above information have any gaps in data or equalities information been identified?

We have identified proxy indicators for the structural factors, which will allow us to identify the causal factors and areas where challenges are likely to be the greatest (as detailed earlier in this statement) but are also working to identify future data requirements. For example, with regard to social and personal factors (lack of social mixing and religious/cultural values/norms) we will need to baseline and develop future measurements to measure social mixing and religious and cultural values linked to integration at the local level. This will be addressed in part via the planned area based evaluation and potentially through new agreed data sources which will be used to monitor and track the Strategy's implementation in local areas.

The Green Paper sets out the steps we will take to learn what works in building integrated communities and to share that learning, including developing a clear set of integration measures at the local and national level so that policy makers and practitioners can monitor and measure progress.

The seven causal factors for poor integration we have identified are interconnected and one or more may co-exist as drivers of a lack of integration in certain locations and communities across the country. An important part of the new Integration Areas programme will be to support local partners to develop a deeper understanding of the local dynamics, the contextual factors that help/hinder integration and the potential of and magnitude of change possible with those factors.

10. Overall, can you make an assessment of the potential of this policy; programme/service to have a substantial equalities impact on discrimination, fostering good relations or advancing equality of opportunity? Please try to limit your answer here to less than an A4 page.

Our analysis of the causes of poor integration has highlighted the issues of social and economic exclusion and marginalisation faced by some communities in Britain.

The consequences of social and economic exclusion and marginalisation are notable. There is a clear case for government intervention through the proposals set out in the Green Paper on equality grounds. Proposals in the Green Paper are heavily targeted at improving the integration and opportunities available to communities who are significantly more likely than the national average to be experiencing worse labour market and education outcomes, with poorer English language skills and limited opportunities for social mixing.

Through the new Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper, proposals will aim to improve employment and education opportunities for the groups most likely to be experiencing disadvantage and to improve social integration in and between communities. The benefit of the new Strategy will be felt by all residents to varying degrees, depending on the scale and nature of the intervention rolled out in different places and involving different communities, regardless of their protected characteristics or none through building less divided, more resilient places with increased civic participation and improved access to the benefits that living in the UK brings. We will need to monitor progress towards the Strategy outcomes and capture evidence of what works to improve integration in different local contexts. This should help to inform EIAs for all future integration programmes developed on the back of this strategy.

The consultation on the Strategy will enable us to improve our equality impact assessment and implementation of our proposals will have a significantly positive impact on equality for all, in particular good relations between people with different protected characteristics.

This analysis was undertaken by Peter Fenn

Name/Title	Peter Fenn	
Directorate/Unit	Integration Strategy Team	
Date	12/03/18	

SCS Sign off



I have read the available evidence and I am satisfied that this demonstrates compliance, where relevant, with Section 149 of the Equality Act and that due regard has been made to the need to: eliminate unlawful discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; and foster good relations.

Hardip Begol - Director Integration and Communities, MHCLG

ⁱ ONS (2014), People who could not speak English well or at all had a lower rate of employment.
<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/census/2011-census-analysis/english-language-proficiency-in-the-labour-market/sty-english-language-proficiency.html>

ⁱⁱ Dustmann and Fabbri (2003), Language proficiency and labour market performance of immigrants in the UK,
<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/~uctpb21/Cpapers/languageproficiency.pdf>

ⁱⁱⁱ Cabinet Office. (2014). Community Life Survey, 2013-2014. [data collection]. UK Data Service. SN: 7560,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-7560-1>. (unpublished DCLG analysis).

^{iv} oki, Y. and Santiago, L. (2016) English Language Skills and Socio-Economic Segregation of UK Immigrants;
Discussion Paper in Economics No. 16-7; June 2016; ISSN 0143-4543; University of Aberdeen Business School

^v Reynolds, L. & Birdwell, J. (DEMOS) (2015) “An integrated society requires real equality of opportunity...” *Rising to the Top*. ISBN 978-1-909037-90-8

^{vi} Census 2011 - <http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/DC6207EW>

^{vii} Census 2011 - <http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/DC6207EW>

^{viii} Census 2011 - <http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/DC6207EW>

^{ix} Laurence, J., Schmid, K and Hewstone, M. (2017) Ethnic diversity, intergroup attitudes and countervailing pathways of positive and negative inter-group contact: an analysis across workplaces and neighbourhoods. *Social indicators Research* pp. 1-31