



TEES VALLEY
JOINT STRATEGY UNIT

JSU 04/20

June 2004

**2001 Census:
Ethnic Minorities in the Tees Valley**

Alan Tinkler

2001 Census: Ethnic Minorities in the Tees Valley

1. Introduction

- 1 This report presents information on people by ethnic group. It shows data at district level within the Tees Valley, for the sub-region in total and presents comparative regional and national data. Data for wards in the Tees Valley are included in the appendix. The report also includes data on country of birth and religion.
- 2 The 2001 Census used a more updated description of ethnic group than in 1991 with the option for 'mixed' ethnicity a new feature. For the purposes of this report, therefore, all people non-white are included as part of the ethnic minority population and people of mixed ethnic group are included as non-white.
- 3 The majority of tables in this report show the comparison between white and non-white populations as totals.
- 4 A census of population has taken place every ten years since 1801 (with the exception of 1941). It is the most complete source of information about the population and households that exists and the latest was undertaken on Sunday 29 April 2001. Since it is the only survey which provides a detailed picture of the entire population it lends itself to analysis for small geographical areas across different parts of the country.
- 5 The information the census provides allows central and local government, health authorities and many other organisations to target their resources more effectively and to plan housing, education, health and transport services for years to come. In England and Wales the census is planned and carried out by the Office for National Statistics.

2. Number of People in Ethnic groups

- 6 Table 1 below shows numbers of people in each ethnic group. There were almost 18,000 people whose ethnic group was non-white in the Tees Valley. Almost half of these were in Middlesbrough and a further quarter in Stockton-on-Tees.
- 7 In the sub-region over 7,400 (40 percent) of the non-white population were Pakistani and 2,400 (14 percent) Indian.


Table 1 Number of People by Ethnic Group (rounded to nearest 10)

	All People	Number of people in ethnic groups:							
		white	all non-white groups	non-white groups included in 'all non white groups'					
				mixed	indian	pakistani	bangla-deshi	chinese	other
Darlington	97,840	95,730	2,120	610	430	80	290	240	470
Hartlepool	88,610	87,570	1,030	320	190	210	70	100	140
Middlesbrough	134,860	126,400	8,450	1,280	840	4,840	70	270	1,150
Redcar & Cleveland	139,130	137,660	1,470	440	160	290	120	110	350
Stockton-on-Tees	178,410	173,480	4,920	1,000	780	1,990	50	300	800
Tees Valley	638,840	620,840	17,980	3,650	2,400	7,400	590	1,020	2,920
North East	2,515,440	2,455,420	60,020	12,230	10,160	14,080	6,160	6,050	11,340
England & Wales	52,041,920	47,520,870	4,521,050	661,030	1,036,810	714,830	280,830	226,950	1,600,600

- 8 Only 2.8 percent of the population in the Tees Valley were non-white compared to 2.4 percent regionally. Nationally, the proportion was 8.7 percent. Middlesbrough had the highest proportion of ethnic minorities in the sub-region with 6.3 percent whilst Redcar & Cleveland was lowest with 1.1 percent.
- 9 The largest individual ethnic group in the sub-region is Pakistani, representing 1.2 percent of the Tees Valley population. Nationally, Indian was the largest individual group.

Table 2 Percentage of people in Ethnic Groups

	All people	% of people in ethnic groups :							
		white	all non-white groups	non-white groups included in 'all non white groups'					
				mixed	indian	pakistani	bangla-deshi	chinese	other
Darlington	97,840	97.9	2.1	0.6	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4
Hartlepool	88,610	98.8	1.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2
Middlesbrough	134,860	93.7	6.3	0.9	0.6	3.6	0.1	0.2	0.9
Redcar & Cleveland	139,130	98.9	1.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3
Stockton-on-Tees	178,410	97.2	2.8	0.6	0.4	1.1	0.0	0.2	0.5
Tees Valley	638,840	97.2	2.8	0.6	0.4	1.2	0.1	0.2	0.3
North East	2,515,440	97.6	2.4	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.4
England & Wales	52,041,920	91.3	8.7	1.3	2.0	1.4	0.5	0.4	3.1



- 10 Table 3 gives a breakdown of numbers white and non-white by male and female. There were slightly more male ethnic minority people in the Tees Valley (9,300) than female (8,700). Nationally there are actually more women than men who are non-white.

Table 3 Ethnic Group - Numbers of Males and Females

	Males			Females		
	Total	White	Non-white	Total	White	Non-white
Darlington	46,962	45,906	1,056	50,878	49,841	1,037
Hartlepool	42,555	42,052	503	46,057	45,520	537
Middlesbrough	64,694	60,371	4,323	70,156	66,030	4,126
Redcar & Cleveland	67,081	66,361	720	72,039	71,300	739
Stockton-on-Tees	87,139	84,486	2,653	91,275	88,998	2,277
Tees Valley	308,431	299,176	9,255	330,405	321,689	8,716
North East	1,218,575	1,187,364	31,211	1,296,865	1,268,049	28,816
England & Wales	25,325,926	23,104,290	2,221,636	26,715,990	24,416,576	2,299,414

- 11 Table 4 shows the proportion of the population non-white in 1991 and 2001. The comparison between censuses is not a direct one due to changes made to the question on ethnicity in 2001 in particular the introduction of new categories of 'mixed' ethnicity. Mixed groups in Table 4 have been defined as non-white and in 2001 represented 0.4 percent of the total population of the Tees Valley, 0.5 percent of the regional population and 1.3 percent of the population of England. Since this distinction was not available to respondents in 1991 it is possible that people of mixed race in 1991 chose to be either white or another ethnic group. This must be noted when considering the following table.

Table 4 Ethnic Group - Change 1991 to 2001

	1991	2001
	%	%
Darlington	1.5	2.1
Hartlepool	0.7	1.1
Middlesbrough	4.4	6.3
Redcar & Cleveland	0.7	1.1
Stockton-on-Tees	1.6	2.8
Tees Valley	1.9	2.8
North East	1.4	2.4
England & Wales	5.9	8.7

- 12 The percentage of people non-white in the Tees Valley increased between censuses from 1.9 percent to 2.8 percent. These proportions both represented a third of those nationally but were slightly above the regional average. As in 1991, Middlesbrough had the highest proportion of the non-white population rising from 4.4 percent in 1991 to 6.3 percent in 2001.

3. Ethnicity by Age

- 13 Tables 5, 6 and 7 show the age distribution of the population by main ethnic group. The general pattern is that the non-white population has a higher proportion of children and lower proportion of elderly than the white population whilst the population of working age is broadly similar.
- 14 In the Tees Valley 21 percent of the population were under 16 years which is the same for the white population. However, 34 percent of the non-white population were in this age group. Furthermore, over 50 percent of the mixed population were under 16 years, 33 percent of asians and only 19 percent of all other groups. Figures for each district showed similar age distributions to those for the sub-region.

Table 5 Children aged under 16 years % of population

	Number of people	All People %	% people in ethnic groups :				
			white	all non-white groups	non-white groups included in 'all non white groups'		
					mixed	asian	all other
Darlington	97,838	20.2	19.9	33.7	56.0	30.2	16.6
Hartlepool	88,611	21.8	21.6	31.8	46.7	29.8	17.8
Middlesbrough	134,855	22.3	21.5	33.9	45.5	34.0	19.4
Redcar & Cleveland	139,132	20.5	20.4	32.4	48.8	26.1	23.1
Stockton-on-Tees	178,408	21.1	20.8	34.1	54.0	32.1	18.4
Tees Valley	638,844	21.2	20.8	33.7	50.1	32.5	18.8
North East	2,515,442	19.8	19.5	30.7	43.9	30.9	18.8
England & Wales	52,041,916	20.2	19.2	30.1	50.0	28.7	24.0

15 Table 6 shows the population of working age by ethnic group. There was very little difference between the proportions of white and non-white populations in this age group although the proportion 'mixed' was slightly below average whilst that of 'other groups' was higher.

Table 6 Working age population - % of population

	Number of people	All People %	% people in ethnic groups :				
			white	all non-white groups	non-white groups included in 'all non white groups'		
					mixed	asian	all other
Darlington	97,838	60.0	60.0	60.4	41.4	64.8	72.8
Hartlepool	88,611	59.3	59.3	59.0	45.1	63.2	67.8
Middlesbrough	134,855	60.4	60.4	60.9	51.7	60.7	73.2
Redcar & Cleveland	139,132	59.9	59.9	59.3	46.6	61.8	72.4
Stockton-on-Tees	178,408	61.5	61.6	61.1	43.2	62.6	76.7
Tees Valley	638,844	60.4	60.4	60.6	46.5	61.7	73.6
North East	2,515,442	61.0	60.9	63.9	51.7	63.5	75.4
England & Wales	52,041,916	61.4	61.2	63.4	46.5	64.6	68.6

- 16 The proportion of elderly people in the non-white population was much lower than that for the white population and this was the case in all areas (see Table 7). In the Tees Valley under 6 percent of the non-white population were retired compared to 19 percent of the white population. Only 3.4 percent of the 'mixed' ethnic group were retired whilst almost 8 percent of 'other' groups were. The proportion of asians retired was virtually the same as the non-white figure overall.

Table 7 Retired population - % of population

	Number of people	All People %	% people in ethnic groups :				
			white	all non-white groups	non-white groups included in 'all non white groups'		
					mixed	asian	all other
Darlington	97,838	19.7	20.0	5.8	2.5	4.9	10.7
Hartlepool	88,611	19.0	19.1	9.2	8.3	7.1	14.4
Middlesbrough	134,855	17.4	18.2	5.2	2.7	5.4	7.3
Redcar & Cleveland	139,132	19.6	19.7	8.2	4.6	12.2	4.5
Stockton-on-Tees	178,408	17.3	17.7	4.8	2.7	5.3	4.9
Tees Valley	638,844	18.4	18.8	5.7	3.4	5.8	7.6
North East	2,515,442	19.2	19.6	5.4	4.4	5.6	5.9
England & Wales	52,041,916	18.5	19.6	6.5	3.5	6.7	7.4

4. People with a Health or Disability Problem

- 17 Respondents were asked in both censuses whether they considered they had any limiting long-term illness or disability and these proportions of people with a health problem by ethnic group are shown in Table 8 below. Tables 9 and 10 show the state of health of people with a health or disability problem. For these three tables comparisons are made between white and non-white populations only.
- 18 A higher proportion of the white population in the Tees Valley had a health or disability problem than the non-white population 22 percent compared to 13 percent.

Table 8 Percentage of people with a health or disability problem by ethnicity

	Male		Female		Total	
	White	Non-white	White	Non-white	White	Non-white
Darlington	20.0	14.3	21.2	11.5	20.6	11.8
Hartlepool	24.2	10.5	24.8	15.5	24.5	12.2
Middlesbrough	22.6	14.4	23.1	13.7	22.9	14.0
Redcar & Cleveland	23.1	14.4	23.7	17.1	23.4	16.1
Stockton-on-Tees	19.6	12.1	20.6	12.5	20.1	12.1
Tees Valley	21.7	13.5	22.5	13.5	22.1	13.3
North East	22.6	11.9	23.3	12.4	23.0	12.2
England & Wales	17.7	12.3	19.7	13.2	18.7	12.8

19 Health problems are linked very much to the age structure of the population, particularly, the proportion of elderly. The following table shows the percentage of people in each age group with a health problem and by ethnicity. In the Tees Valley there is very little difference between the white and ethnic populations. This was generally reflected at borough level although older ethnic minorities in Hartlepool had lower proportions of people with a health problem.

Table 9 Percentage of people with a health or disability problem by ethnicity and by age group (percentage of people white or non-white in each age group with a long-term illness)

	0 – 15 yrs		16-49 yrs		50-64 yrs		65 plus yrs	
	White	Non-white	White	Non-white	White	Non-white	White	Non-white
Darlington	4.5	3.8	11.0	9.6	29.6	34.7	54.3	48.9
Hartlepool	5.4	0.9	14.5	10.9	39.9	27.0	60.5	53.3
Middlesbrough	7.0	6.3	12.9	11.3	37.4	44.4	59.0	59.0
Redcar & Cleveland	6.4	4.8	12.4	10.9	35.3	33.6	58.5	73.2
Stockton-on-Tees	6.0	5.8	10.5	9.9	31.4	34.0	55.5	52.4
Tees Valley	6.0	5.5	12.0	10.7	34.4	38.0	57.4	57.8
North East	5.2	4.6	12.5	9.3	35.5	36.2	58.5	56.9
England & Wales	4.3	4.5	9.7	9.4	26.2	35.6	51.4	56.0

5. Household Characteristics

- 20 The following tables describe the composition of households broken down into total, those where the household reference person was white and those where the household reference person was non-white. Table 11 shows the numbers of these.

Table 10 Number of Households

	Total Households	HRP* White	HRP* Non-white
Darlington	42,300	41,600	700
Hartlepool	37,400	37,100	300
Middlesbrough	55,200	52,900	2,300
Redcar & Cleveland	57,400	57,000	400
Stockton-on-Tees	73,000	71,600	1,400
Tees Valley	265,300	260,200	5,100
North East	1,066,300	1,048,800	17,500
England & Wales	21,660,500	20,250,100	1,410,400

* HRP – Household Reference Person

- 21 Ethnic minority households had almost double the proportion of households who were married couples with dependent children compared to white households in the Tees Valley. This was reflected in all districts in the sub-region and followed the regional and national trend. However, the proportion of cohabiting couple households with children was generally less for ethnic minority households except in Darlington which bucked the trend for other areas.

Table 11a Family Type - percentage of households

	Married couple households with dependent children			Cohabiting couple households with dependent children		
	All	White	Non- white	All	White	Non- white
Darlington	16.9	16.7	28.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Hartlepool	16.8	16.6	37.2	4.6	4.6	1.1
Middlesbrough	16.7	16.0	32.5	4.0	4.0	2.7
Redcar & Cleveland	17.1	17.0	27.1	4.3	4.3	3.3
Stockton-on-Tees	19.5	19.2	35.4	3.6	3.6	1.8
Tees Valley	17.6	17.3	32.5	3.9	4.0	2.5
North East	16.9	16.7	31.8	3.6	3.6	2.3
England & Wales	17.5	17.0	25.6	3.3	3.3	2.4

- 22 In the Tees Valley as a whole ethnic minority households were less likely to be lone parent households with dependent children. However, this is not the case in Darlington or Redcar & Cleveland where the ethnic population is possibly more diverse. Nationally there was a much higher percentage of non-white households which were lone parents.
- 23 In all areas there were higher proportions of other types of household structures with dependent children who were ethnic minority households compared to white households.

Table 11b Family Type - percentage of households

	Lone parent households with dependent children			Other households with dependent children		
	All	White	Non- white	All	White	Non- white
Darlington	7.5	7.5	10.1	1.7	1.6	7.1
Hartlepool	8.7	8.7	7.4	2.2	2.2	6.4
Middlesbrough	9.9	10.0	7.8	2.7	2.3	12.6
Redcar & Cleveland	7.1	7.1	9.7	2.5	2.5	3.6
Stockton-on-Tees	7.6	7.6	5.1	2.2	2.0	9.3
Tees Valley	8.1	8.1	7.5	2.2	2.1	9.8
North East	7.4	7.4	6.6	1.9	1.9	8.0
England & Wales	6.5	6.1	11.5	2.3	1.8	8.8

24 The ethnic population tends to be a younger population so not surprisingly there are much fewer pensioner households in all areas. Only 4.3 percent of ethnic minority households contain a lone pensioner compared to 14.9 percent of white households and only 2.4 percent of non-white households in the Tees Valley contained two or more pensioners compared to 9.4 percent of the white population. These figures reflected the regional and national proportions and only Hartlepool bucked the trend on lone pensioner households.

Table 11c Family Type - percentage of households

	Lone pensioner households			Two or more pensioner only households		
	All	White	Non-white	All	White	Non-white
Darlington	15.7	15.9	5.0	9.4	9.5	3.1
Hartlepool	15.3	15.4	11.9	9.3	9.3	4.2
Middlesbrough	15.0	15.5	3.4	8.0	8.3	1.5
Redcar & Cleveland	15.0	15.0	4.4	10.4	10.4	4.0
Stockton-on-Tees	13.5	13.7	3.7	9.2	9.3	2.4
Tees Valley	14.7	14.9	4.3	9.2	9.4	2.4
North East	15.6	15.8	4.3	9.3	9.4	2.2
England & Wales	14.4	15.1	4.7	9.4	9.8	2.2

6. Household Circumstances

Tenure

- 25 The proportion of ethnic minority households in owner-occupation was slightly less than the white population in the Tees Valley. This was the case in each district in the sub-region except Middlesbrough.
- 26 The proportion of non-white households in private rented accommodation was, however, much higher than that of the white population in all areas in the Tees Valley and reflected the regional and national rates.

Table 12a Tenure - Percentage of households owner-occupied and private rented

	Owner-occupied			Private rented		
	All	White	Non-white	All	White	Non-white
Darlington	71.7	71.9	62.5	9.2	9.0	20.5
Hartlepool	63.0	63.0	62.4	8.0	7.9	17.2
Middlesbrough	61.4	61.2	65.2	7.9	7.5	17.0
Redcar & Cleveland	69.6	69.7	56.2	6.2	6.2	11.2
Stockton-on-Tees	71.6	71.7	64.5	6.0	5.8	17.7
Tees Valley	67.9	67.9	63.7	7.2	7.0	17.2
North East	63.6	63.7	56.6	7.2	7.0	21.3
England & Wales	68.9	69.9	53.9	9.9	9.5	15.4

- 27 Ethnic minority households are much less likely to be in council rented houses in the Tees Valley and this applies to each district in the sub-region. Whilst this follows the regional situation, nationally the reverse is true.
- 28 The proportion of non-white households in housing association property is slightly higher in the Tees Valley than the white population. However, the actual numbers of households non-white at district level in housing association property were relatively small.

Table 12b Tenure - Percentage of households renting from council or housing association

	Council rented			Housing association/ other social rented		
	All	White	Non- white	All	White	Non- white
Darlington	14.3	14.4	11.1	3.8	3.8	2.8
Hartlepool	19.7	19.8	10.6	6.9	6.9	6.9
Middlesbrough	21.0	21.5	8.0	7.2	7.2	6.9
Redcar & Cleveland	19.6	19.6	15.6	3.3	3.4	2.1
Stockton-on-Tees	17.2	17.4	8.0	4.3	4.3	4.2
Tees Valley	18.4	18.6	9.2	5.0	5.0	5.2
North East	22.4	22.5	12.5	5.3	5.3	4.8
England & Wales	13.2	12.9	17.6	5.9	5.6	10.5

Central Heating

- 29 A higher proportion of ethnic minority households were without central heating in the Tees Valley compared to the white population. This applied to all districts in the sub-region except Hartlepool which had significantly reduced the number of houses without central heating in the last few years. Whilst the sub-region followed the regional trend, nationally there was no difference in the proportions of white or non-white households.

Table 13 No central heating - percentage of households

	Households without central heating	
	White	Non-white
Darlington	7.4	7.5
Hartlepool	5.9	3.0
Middlesbrough	6.8	10.9
Redcar & Cleveland	5.5	10.2
Stockton-on-Tees	3.8	6.0
Tees Valley	5.7	10.7
North East	3.9	5.5
England & Wales	8.5	8.5

Car Ownership

- 30 There was very little difference in the Tees Valley between the percentages of white and non-white households without a car. However, there are significant differences at borough level with the ethnic population having much greater access to a car in Hartlepool but much less in Redcar & Cleveland. Nationally, the ethnic population is significantly less likely to have access to a car.
- 31 A slightly higher proportion of non-white households in the Tees Valley had access to two or more cars compared to the white population. This was particularly accentuated in Hartlepool. Whilst the sub-region followed the regional trend it was at odds with the national proportions.

Table 14 Car ownership - percentage of households

	Households with no car			Households with 2 or more cars		
	All	White	Non-white	All	White	Non-white
Darlington	31.3	31.3	30.3	23.5	23.5	23.2
Hartlepool	39.3	39.4	30.0	18.3	18.2	29.0
Middlesbrough	41.0	41.1	37.0	18.4	18.3	22.0
Redcar & Cleveland	32.3	32.2	43.6	22.8	22.9	18.8
Stockton-on-Tees	29.6	29.7	28.1	27.1	27.0	30.9
Tees Valley	34.2	34.2	33.8	22.6	22.5	24.7
North East	35.9	36.0	34.6	21.0	20.9	25.2
England & Wales	26.8	26.2	35.0	29.4	30.0	21.3

7. Economic Activity etc

- 32 The following tables look at the differences between the white and ethnic population in relation to economic activity, employment, unemployment and qualifications. For these tables the population group included is 16 to 74 years.
- 33 Generally, the ethnic population was less economically active than the white population in the Tees Valley and this reflected regional and national rates. Only Hartlepool. Within the sub-region, proved an exception to this.

Economic Activity

Table 15a Economic activity rates - percentage of people 16-74.

	All %	White %	Non-white %
Darlington	65.6	65.6	63.5
Hartlepool	59.2	59.2	61.0
Middlesbrough	58.1	58.6	50.5
Redcar & Cleveland	59.8	59.8	54.3
Stockton-on-Tees	64.0	64.3	54.9
Tees Valley	61.4	61.6	54.1
North East	61.3	61.5	54.5
England & Wales	66.5	67.1	60.2

- 34 Male economic activity rates are little different in the Tees Valley between the white and non-white populations but the female ethnic population was significantly less economically active than the white population in the Tees Valley. For males, Hartlepool was once more the exception with a significantly higher proportion of the ethnic population economically active. All boroughs followed the sub-regional pattern for females.

Table 15b Economic activity rates - percentage of males/females 16-74.

	Males			Females		
	All %	White %	Non- white %	All %	White %	Non- white %
Darlington	72.7	72.7	72.0	58.8	58.9	54.7
Hartlepool	66.2	66.1	74.0	52.6	52.6	47.3
Middlesbrough	65.6	65.7	64.4	51.1	52.0	35.3
Redcar & Cleveland	67.2	67.3	60.2	52.7	52.7	48.2
Stockton-on-Tees	71.2	71.3	68.5	57.2	57.6	38.8
Tees Valley	68.7	68.8	66.6	54.5	54.9	40.4
North East	67.8	67.9	63.9	55.1	55.3	44.0
England & Wales	73.8	74.2	60.0	59.5	60.2	51.9

- 35 There was a greater proportion of white people aged 16-74 years in full-time employment in the Tees Valley and this was consistent with results regionally and nationally. These figures were also reflected at borough level although there were differences. In Darlington, for example, a third of ethnic minorities of working age were in full-time employment whereas in Middlesbrough less than one in five were.
- 36 The difference between white and non-white male and female rates of full-time employment were similar to those overall although male rates were significantly higher than those for women for both groups.

Table 16 Percentage Full-time Employed - percentage of all people/males/females 16-74.

	All People		Males		Females	
	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %
Darlington	40.4	33.6	53.0	43.4	28.5	23.3
Hartlepool	34.3	30.4	47.0	41.8	22.4	18.5
Middlesbrough	32.5	19.6	44.7	25.0	21.3	13.6
Redcar & Cleveland	35.1	25.0	48.5	30.0	22.2	20.0
Stockton-on-Tees	38.7	24.7	51.7	31.4	26.1	16.7
Tees Valley	36.3	23.7	49.1	30.2	24.1	16.4
North East	37.7	23.3	48.9	27.8	27.0	18.3
England & Wales	41.2	33.5	52.5	39.6	30.2	27.8

37 More white people than non-white were in part-time employment in the Tees Valley and this was consistent with the regional and national figures. Whilst for women the overall trend was followed this was not the case for men. A higher proportion of non-white males were part-time employed. These differences were reflected at borough level.

Table 17 Percentage Part-time Employed - percentage of all people/males/females 16-74.

	All People		Males		Females	
	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %
Darlington	13.2	9.9	3.5	5.9	22.4	14.2
Hartlepool	13.4	10.9	3.6	6.2	22.5	15.8
Middlesbrough	13.5	8.2	3.9	7.5	22.4	8.9
Redcar & Cleveland	13.0	7.5	3.1	4.4	22.5	10.6
Stockton-on-Tees	13.7	8.9	3.7	7.8	23.3	10.1
Tees Valley	13.4	8.7	3.6	7.1	22.7	10.4
North East	12.0	8.1	3.2	6.8	20.3	9.6
England & Wales	12.1	8.4	3.2	5.4	20.7	11.2

38 Rates of self-employment were higher amongst ethnic minorities than for the white population with over 11 percent of non-whites self-employed compared to under 5 percent white. These differences were similar to those for the North East but were not reflected nationally. The difference between white and non-white people of working age was even more marked for males in all areas but national levels of self-employment remained higher for white males. Although female rates were lower for both groups, non-white females were still better represented among the self-employed.

Table 18 Percentage Self-employed - percentage of all people/males/females 16-74.

	All People		Males		Females	
	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %
Darlington	6.2	10.7	9.0	14.2	3.5	6.9
Hartlepool	4.2	11.0	6.5	14.1	2.1	7.7
Middlesbrough	3.5	10.8	5.5	17.4	1.8	3.7
Redcar & Cleveland	4.7	10.2	6.9	13.1	2.6	7.2
Stockton-on-Tees	4.7	12.1	7.0	18.3	2.5	4.8
Tees Valley	4.6	11.1	6.9	16.7	2.5	4.9
North East	5.1	12.6	7.6	17.2	2.7	7.3
England & Wales	8.4	7.2	12.4	11.2	4.5	3.5

39 Unemployment rates were higher for the non-white population of working age in all areas except Hartlepool. This was the case for males and females of both groups with Hartlepool remaining the exception in having lower rates for ethnic minorities.

Table 19 Percentage Unemployed - percentage of all people/males/females 16-74.

	All People		Males		Females	
	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %
Darlington	4.0	4.3	5.5	4.2	2.5	4.5
Hartlepool	5.5	4.3	7.6	6.8	3.5	1.8
Middlesbrough	6.1	7.2	8.9	9.7	3.5	4.5
Redcar & Cleveland	5.2	6.9	7.2	9.4	3.3	4.5
Stockton-on-Tees	5.0	5.7	6.9	7.1	3.1	4.0
Tees Valley	5.2	6.3	7.2	8.2	3.2	4.2
North East	4.5	5.5	6.3	6.9	2.8	3.9
England & Wales	3.1	6.0	4.0	7.6	2.3	4.5

40 The following two tables give information on qualifications for the white and non-white population of working age (16-74 years). In the Tees Valley the white population had a higher proportion of people with low level qualifications (ie level 1 or 2 up to 5 or more GCSEs) yet the ethnic minority population of working age were better represented at higher level qualifications (level 3 and above – two or more A levels to degree level). There was a slightly higher proportion of non-whites with no qualifications in the sub-region. The sub-regional figures reflected those for the North East and nationally.

Table 20a Qualifications - percentage of all people 16-74.

	Tees Valley		North East		England & Wales	
	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %	White %	Non- white %
No qualifications	34.6	36.5	34.8	30.2	29.3	27.1
Level 1	17.3	12.0	17.0	10.2	16.9	13.0
Level 2	19.8	15.8	18.9	14.5	19.6	17.2
Level 3	6.7	8.5	7.2	10.6	8.1	10.3
Level 4/5	13.5	23.0	14.6	30.1	19.1	27.7
Other qualifications/ level unknown	8.0	4.2	7.5	4.4	7.1	4.8

- 41 Results at borough levels followed the sub-regional trend with minor exceptions. In particular, the proportion of ethnic minorities with very high level qualifications (level 4/5 – degree level) was marked in Darlington and Hartlepool.

Table 20b Qualifications - percentage of all people 16-74.

	Darlington		Hartlepool		Middlesbro'		Redcar & Cleveland		Stockton-on-Tees	
	White %	Non-white %	White %	Non-white %	White %	Non-white %	White %	Non-white %	White %	Non-white %
No qualification	32.0	31.0	39.3	33.3	36.6	39.9	35.8	34.8	31.3	34.1
Level 1	17.2	11.8	16.4	10.4	16.8	12.3	17.4	12.9	18.2	11.7
Level 2	20.0	16.4	18.7	12.6	19.4	15.7	19.4	19.9	20.8	15.3
Level 3	6.7	7.0	6.0	5.3	7.7	8.9	6.2	7.9	6.8	9.2
Level 4/5	16.2	29.4	11.2	35.3	12.4	19.0	12.4	20.0	14.9	25.1
Other quals/ level unknown	8.0	4.4	8.4	3.0	7.0	4.1	8.7	4.6	8.0	4.7

Country of Birth

- 42 The following table gives information on the country of birth of residents. In the Tees Valley only 3.0 percent of the population were born outside the United Kingdom including 2.1 percent born outside the European Union (EU). Middlesbrough had the highest proportion born outside the EU with 3.3 percent and Hartlepool the least with 1.2 percent. All boroughs in the Tees Valley had below the national average of people born outside the EU.

Table 21 Percentage of People by Country of Birth

	All people	% people born in :						
		England	Scotland	Wales	Northern Ireland	Republic of Ireland	Other EU Countries	Elsewhere
Darlington	97,838	93.1	2.5	0.7	0.4	0.3	1.0	2.1
Hartlepool	88,611	96.3	1.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.4	1.2
Middlesbrough	134,855	93.6	1.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.7	3.3
Redcar & Cleveland	139,132	95.1	2.0	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.5	1.3
Stockton-on-Tees	178,408	94.2	1.9	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.6	2.2
Tees Valley	638,844	94.4	1.8	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.6	2.1
North East	2,515,442	94.4	1.9	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.7	2.0
England & Wales	52,041,916	83.7	1.6	5.4	0.4	0.9	1.4	6.6

Appendices

Table 1. Ethnicity - percentage of people non-white in Darlington wards.

Ward	Total population	Total number ethnic minorities	Percentage ethnic minorities	Rank in District	Rank In Tees Valley
Bank Top	3,729	99	2.7	4	24
Central	3,605	172	3.8	2	16
Cockerton East	5,077	42	0.9	22	82
Cockerton West	4,180	24	0.7	23	101
College	3,752	45	1.2	17	71
Eastbourne	5,095	85	2.1	7	34
Faverdale	1,505	18	1.1	19	76
Harrowgate Hill	5,913	115	2.0	8	39
Haughton East	4,129	57	1.5	13	54
Haughton North	3,453	70	1.8	11	46
Haughton West	5,523	114	1.9	10	41
Heighington and Coniscliffe	2,955	36	1.1	20	77
Hummersknott	3,562	74	2.2	5	32
Hurworth	3,399	24	0.6	24	104
Lascelles	3,514	54	1.4	15	63
Lingfield	3,532	72	2.2	6	33
Middleton St George	3,826	27	1.2	18	73
Mowden	3,649	88	2.0	9	40
North Road	6,062	103	1.8	12	47
Northgate	4,411	428	9.5	1	8
Park East	6,054	212	3.4	3	19
Park West	3,504	72	1.3	16	67
Pierremont	5,528	84	1.5	14	55
Sadberge and Whessoe	1,830	24	1.0	21	80

Table 2. Ethnicity - percentage of people non-white in Hartlepool wards.

Ward	Total population	Total number ethnic minorities	Percentage ethnic minorities	Rank in District	Rank In Tees Valley
Brinkburn	5,122	42	0.9	7	85
Brus	5,152	88	1.7	5	50
Dyke House	5,990	69	0.9	8	88
Elwick	1,611	9	0.4	15	112
Fens	6,141	21	0.2	16	115
Grange	5,992	155	2.6	1	25
Greatham	2,230	6	0.1	17	116
Hart	5,380	54	0.8	9	89
Jackson	5,455	117	2.4	2	29
Owton	4,806	39	0.7	12	102
Park	5,528	88	1.9	3	42
Rift House	5,555	18	0.4	14	111
Rossmere	4,760	21	0.6	13	103
Seaton	6,510	51	0.7	11	100
St. Hilda	6,012	33	0.8	10	92
Stranton	4,967	99	1.8	4	45
Throston	7,430	126	1.5	6	58

Table 3. Ethnicity - percentage of people non-white in Middlesbrough wards.

Ward	Total population	Total number ethnic minorities	Percentage ethnic minorities	Rank in District	Rank In Tees Valley
Acklam	5,656	266	4.6	8	13
Ayresome	6,666	311	4.8	7	12
Beckfield	4,912	78	1.4	19	62
Beechwood	5,429	201	4.1	9	15
Brookfield	6,000	138	2.1	15	35
Clairville	5,710	143	2.7	12	23
Coulby Newham	8,640	183	2.2	14	31
Gresham	8,786	1,386	15.6	3	4
Hemlington	6,058	54	1.0	23	79
Kader	5,017	289	5.5	6	10
Ladgate	5,746	126	2.0	16	36
Linthorpe	8,173	876	10.5	4	5
Marion	6,530	143	3.1	11	20
Marion West	4,860	161	1.9	17	44
Middlehaven	5,211	921	22.6	2	2
North Ormesby and Brambles Farm	4,055	64	2.5	13	28
Nunthorpe	4,700	199	3.5	10	18
Pallister	6,043	69	1.4	18	61
Park	5,534	582	10.5	5	6
Park End	6,440	65	1.2	20	70
Stainton and Thornton	2,900	21	1.1	22	75
Thorntree	6,055	54	1.2	21	74
University	5,636	2,066	36.4	1	1

Table 4. Ethnicity - percentage of people non-white in Redcar & Cleveland wards.

Ward	Total population	Total number ethnic minorities	Percentage ethnic minorities	Rank in District	Rank In Tees Valley
Brotton	7,113	30	0.3	21	113
Coatham	5,153	60	1.3	5	66
Dormanstown	7,274	45	0.7	15	99
Eston	7,541	66	0.7	11	94
Grangetown	5,888	60	1.3	4	65
Guisborough	7,404	51	0.7	14	98
Hutton	7,446	42	0.6	16	105
Kirkleatham	6,996	130	1.6	3	52
Lockwood	2,097	6	0.3	22	114
Loftus	7,086	21	0.6	17	106
Longbeck	6,003	24	0.4	20	110
Newcomen	4,875	62	1.7	2	51
Normanby	7,160	54	0.7	13	96
Ormesby	6,382	45	0.8	8	90
Saltburn	6,432	48	0.9	7	83
Skelton	5,926	24	0.6	18	107
South Bank	6,387	421	5.3	1	11
St Germain`s	8,047	63	0.8	9	91
Teesville	6,874	51	0.6	19	108
West Dyke	7,528	54	0.7	12	95
Westworth	4,757	51	1.1	6	78
Zetland	4,776	30	0.8	10	93

Table 5. Ethnicity - percentage of people non-white in Stockton-on-Tees wards.

Ward	Total population	Total number ethnic minorities	Percentage ethnic minorities	Rank in District	Rank In Tees Valley
Bishopgarth	7,597	116	1.5	18	57
Blue Hall	6,091	75	1.4	20	60
Charltons	4,808	27	0.9	26	84
Egglescliffe	7,905	173	2.0	11	37
Elm Tree	4,513	44	1.3	22	68
Fairfield	4,948	139	2.6	8	26
Glebe	6,148	79	1.5	17	56
Grange	4,028	42	1.0	25	81
Grangefield	4,919	195	4.3	4	14
Hardwick	4,825	154	3.0	6	21
Hartburn	6,620	109	1.8	14	48
Ingleby Barwick	16,288	583	3.6	5	17
Mandale	6,443	94	1.4	21	64
Marsh House	7,845	45	0.7	29	97
Mile House	5,545	81	1.2	24	72
Newtown	5,653	106	2.0	12	38
Northfield	4,452	51	0.9	27	86
Norton	6,762	98	1.7	15	49
Parkfield	5,783	964	16.5	1	3
Portrack and Tilery	5,260	324	6.2	3	9
Preston	2,989	62	2.3	10	30
Roseworth	5,421	78	1.3	23	69
St. Aidan`s	4,711	21	0.5	30	109
St. Cuthbert`s	5,851	57	0.9	28	87
Stainsby	5,593	70	1.4	19	59
Victoria	5,541	574	10.4	2	7
Village	5,048	126	2.6	9	27
Whitton	4,609	72	1.9	13	43
Wolviston	3,611	54	1.6	16	53
Yarm	8,693	248	2.9	7	22

Table 6. Number ethnic minorities by group – selected wards.

Ward	Total ethnic minorities	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Chinese	All other groups
Darlington						
Central	172	46	3	15	9	99
Northgate	428	55	15	234	22	102
Park East	212	33	6	0	40	133
Hartlepool						
Grange	155	3	71	27	15	39
Middlesbrough						
Acklam	266	74	108	0	21	63
Ayresome	311	46	123	0	21	121
Beechwood	201	64	34	6	15	82
Gresham	1,386	71	886	3	44	382
Kader	289	113	107	0	9	60
Linthorpe	876	50	652	9	6	159
Marton	161	52	34	0	6	69
Middlehaven	921	44	622	13	21	221
Nunthorpe	199	52	30	21	18	78
Park	582	24	386	19	18	135
University	2,066	62	1,572	9	32	391
Redcar & Cleveland						
South Bank	421	21	203	89	21	87
Stockton-on-Tees						
Grangefield	195	0	129	15	21	30
Hardwick	154	58	15	0	21	60
Ingleby Barwick	583	171	119	9	30	254
Parkfield	964	42	695	0	27	200
Portrack and Tilery	324	18	223	3	6	74
Victoria	574	94	357	0	13	110
Yarm	248	64	46	0	9	129

Table 7. Percentage ethnic minorities by broad age group.

Ward	under 16	working age	retirement age
	%	%	%
Darlington			
Central	27.9	59.9	12.2
Northgate	36.0	61.2	2.8
Park East	37.7	59.4	2.8
Hartlepool			
Grange	32.9	57.4	9.7
Middlesbrough			
Acklam	36.8	60.9	2.3
Ayresome	40.5	51.8	7.7
Beechwood	23.9	71.6	4.5
Gresham	32.8	61.7	5.6
Kader	33.2	63.7	3.1
Linthorpe	34.0	62.4	3.5
Marton	34.8	61.5	3.7
Middlehaven	30.9	62.6	6.4
Nunthorpe	30.7	64.8	4.5
Park	37.5	58.2	4.3
University	35.3	59.0	5.7
Redcar & Cleveland			
South Bank	29.7	63.9	6.4
Stockton-on-Tees			
Grangefield	45.6	52.8	1.5
Hardwick	36.4	63.6	0.0
Ingleby Barwick	34.0	64.0	2.1
Parkfield	33.9	61.8	4.3
Portrack and Tilery	33.0	63.0	4.0
Victoria	30.1	62.7	7.1
Yarm	31.9	64.5	3.6

Table 8. Percentage of people by religion – selected wards.

Ward	Christian	Hindu	Sikh	Muslim	Other religion	None or not stated
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Darlington						
Central	74.1	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.6	23.6
Northgate	67.2	0.7	0.1	6.1	0.6	25.3
Park East	72.4	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.5	26.0
Hartlepool						
Grange	80.7	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.4	17.0
Middlesbrough						
Acklam	82.3	0.2	1.0	2.4	0.4	13.7
Ayresome	76.9	0.2	0.5	2.1	0.1	20.2
Beechwood	78.6	0.9	0.2	1.1	0.2	19.1
Gresham	63.5	0.4	0.5	11.9	0.4	23.4
Kader	83.1	0.3	2.0	2.5	0.1	12.1
Linthorpe	71.7	0.1	0.3	8.9	0.4	18.6
Marton	84.6	0.2	0.9	1.5	0.1	12.6
Middlehaven	57.5	0.3	0.4	17.3	1.2	23.3
Nunthorpe	82.3	0.8	0.3	1.3	0.3	14.8
Park	71.5	0.4	0.2	7.1	0.4	20.4
University	44.5	0.4	0.7	31.7	0.7	22.1
Redcar & Cleveland						
South Bank	79.1	0.1	0.1	4.0	0.2	16.5
Stockton-on-Tees						
Grangefield	78.5	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.7	17.6
Hardwick	76.5	0.6	0.2	0.6	0.2	21.8
Ingleby Barwick	81.3	0.4	0.5	1.1	0.2	16.4
Parkfield	63.6	0.1	0.3	13.7	0.5	21.7
Portrack and Tilery	72.5	0.1	0.2	4.6	0.3	22.2
Victoria	71.6	0.3	1.4	7.6	0.5	18.7
Yarm	80.9	0.4	0.2	1.0	0.5	17.0

Table 9. Percentage with limiting long-term illness – selected wards.

Ward	Total population with limiting long-term illness	Total white population with limiting long-term illness	ethnic minority populations with limiting long-term illness
Darlington			
Central	25.4	26.2	8.7
Northgate	20.3	21.4	10.0
Park East	20.1	20.4	11.3
Hartlepool			
Grange	20.0	20.2	9.7
Middlesbrough			
Acklam	19.0	19.5	9.0
Ayresome	21.1	21.4	16.7
Beechwood	28.5	29.0	14.9
Gresham	20.5	21.9	13.1
Kader	21.1	21.5	13.5
Linthorpe	18.4	19.2	12.3
Marion	16.8	17.2	7.5
Middlehaven	25.9	29.3	14.3
Nunthorpe	16.1	16.5	6.0
Park	22.6	23.8	12.4
University	19.4	22.1	14.6
Redcar & Cleveland			
South Bank	25.6	26.0	18.8
Stockton-on-Tees			
Grangefield	19.2	19.5	12.8
Hardwick	21.9	22.3	9.7
Ingleby Barwick	9.5	9.4	12.2
Parkfield	23.8	25.6	15.1
Portrack and Tilery	29.5	30.6	13.3
Victoria	23.2	24.2	14.1
Yarm	14.5	14.8	6.0

Table 10. Percentage economic activity of ethnic minority population 16-74 – selected wards.

Ward	economically active	in employment part-time	in employment full-time	self-employed	unemployed	full-time students economically active
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Darlington						
Central	64.4	6.7	34.4	13.3	3.3	6.7
Northgate	57.8	7.0	34.0	8.6	4.7	3.5
Park East	42.3	9.8	25.2	4.9	2.4	0.0
Hartlepool						
Grange	62.0	8.3	29.6	4.6	5.6	13.9
Middlesbrough						
Acklam	60.4	15.0	21.4	14.4	8.0	1.6
Ayresome	57.2	11.9	21.1	10.3	7.7	6.2
Beechwood	68.9	4.1	52.0	4.1	4.7	4.1
Gresham	45.1	8.5	15.7	6.3	8.8	5.8
Kader	59.8	9.8	22.1	20.6	1.5	5.9
Linthorpe	52.6	7.9	21.5	15.1	3.7	4.4
Marion	70.8	13.2	35.8	18.9	2.8	0.0
Middlehaven	43.4	7.0	15.7	9.0	8.5	3.2
Nunthorpe	60.2	10.6	26.5	17.7	2.7	2.7
Park	53.8	8.1	17.2	13.3	7.6	7.6
University	43.7	7.7	13.1	10.1	8.1	4.6
Redcar & Cleveland						
South Bank	52.6	4.9	17.8	10.1	14.3	5.6
Stockton-on-Tees						
Grangefield	55.5	8.2	24.5	17.3	2.7	2.7
Hardwick	63.3	9.2	51.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
Ingleby Barwick	62.8	7.9	31.3	14.1	6.5	3.0
Parkfield	46.2	5.5	16.4	10.5	10.2	3.6
Portrack and Tilery	43.0	2.7	17.5	9.4	10.8	2.7
Victoria	45.3	11.3	12.3	12.0	6.5	3.1
Yarm	59.5	11.7	29.4	11.0	5.5	1.8

Table 11 Percentage economic inactivity of ethnic minority population 16-74 – selected wards.

Ward	Econo- mically inactive	retired	students	looking after home or family	Perman- ently sick	other inactive
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Darlington						
Central	35.6	6.7	6.7	11.1	4.4	6.7
Northgate	42.2	3.5	11.3	17.6	2.3	7.4
Park East	57.7	7.3	26.0	7.3	9.8	7.3
Hartlepool						
Grange	38.0	8.3	5.6	15.7	2.8	5.6
Middlesbrough						
Acklam	39.6	4.8	10.7	12.8	3.2	8.0
Ayresome	42.8	6.2	12.9	12.9	3.1	7.7
Beechwood	31.1	4.1	8.8	6.1	6.1	6.1
Gresham	54.9	7.3	15.3	15.2	4.8	12.4
Kader	40.2	4.4	8.3	15.2	3.9	8.3
Linthorpe	47.4	3.5	11.6	18.7	4.9	8.6
Marton	29.2	5.7	8.5	9.4	2.8	2.8
Middlehaven	56.6	5.5	17.0	16.5	6.0	11.5
Nunthorpe	39.8	0.0	10.6	18.6	2.7	8.0
Park	46.2	5.0	15.9	12.8	3.7	8.9
University	56.3	5.2	13.9	18.4	6.0	12.7
Redcar & Cleveland						
South Bank	47.4	5.2	10.5	15.7	5.9	10.1
Stockton-on-Tees						
Grangefield	44.5	2.7	5.5	15.5	3.6	17.3
Hardwick	36.7	0.0	15.3	18.4	3.1	0.0
Ingleby Barwick	37.2	3.2	10.2	11.4	2.7	9.7
Parkfield	53.8	4.4	12.1	14.6	4.2	18.4
Portrack and Tilery	57.0	4.5	10.8	16.1	8.1	17.5
Victoria	54.7	4.3	17.1	16.6	5.3	11.3
Yarm	40.5	1.8	15.3	17.8	3.7	1.8

Table 12 Percentage ethnic minority households by tenure and amenity. – selected wards.

Ward	Number of ethnic minority households	ethnic households owner-occupied	ethnic households socially rented	ethnic minority households private rented	Ethnic minority h'hlds with no central heating	Ethnic households with no car
		%	%	%	%	%
Darlington						
Central	59	72.7	6.8	20.5	13.6	40.9
Northgate	116	63.9	0.0	36.1	3.1	22.7
Park East	49	50.0	31.3	18.8	6.3	37.5
Hartlepool						
Grange	42	88.2	0.0	5.9	0.0	17.6
Middlesbrough						
Acklam	48	86.4	6.8	6.8	6.8	13.6
Ayresome	100	71.4	14.3	10.7	7.1	22.6
Beechwood	36	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	45.0
Gresham	385	56.2	12.5	23.1	20.2	47.7
Kader	74	78.9	0.0	21.1	4.2	16.9
Linthorpe	186	79.3	4.4	16.3	1.5	18.2
Marton	58	83.0	0.0	11.3	0.0	5.7
Middlehaven	274	53.7	15.8	26.5	16.2	57.4
Nunthorpe	37	87.8	0.0	12.2	0.0	12.2
Park	151	76.6	8.0	15.3	6.6	32.8
University	496	69.1	11.1	18.4	14.4	37.7
Redcar & Cleveland						
South Bank	111	59.0	9.0	15.0	27.0	39.0
Stockton-on-Tees						
Grangefield	55	65.9	6.8	27.3	13.6	13.6
Hardwick	49	18.8	32.8	34.4	4.7	42.2
Ingleby Barwick	130	79.5	0.0	20.5	0.0	6.2
Parkfield	273	51.0	8.0	22.6	13.2	46.5
Portrack and Tilery	93	51.5	22.2	13.1	3.0	54.5
Victoria	162	62.6	15.5	21.9	5.8	31.6
Yarm	71	79.7	0.0	20.3	4.1	8.1

Table 13 Percentage ethnic minority households with dependent children by type - selected wards.

Ward	Number of ethnic minority households	married couple with dependent child (ren)	cohabiting couple with dependent child (ren)	lone parent with dependent child (ren)	other hhld types with dependent child (ren)
		%	%	%	%
Darlington					
Central	59	20.3	0.0	15.3	10.2
Northgate	116	44.8	2.6	7.8	8.6
Park East	49	26.5	12.2	12.2	6.1
Hartlepool					
Grange	42	42.9	0.0	7.1	14.3
Middlesbrough					
Acklam	48	50.0	0.0	0.0	6.3
Ayresome	100	36.0	0.0	12.0	9.0
Beechwood	36	33.3	8.3	0.0	8.3
Gresham	385	30.4	3.4	7.3	9.1
Kader	74	50.0	0.0	4.1	9.5
Linthorpe	186	47.3	3.2	5.4	16.7
Marton	58	37.9	0.0	0.0	10.3
Middlehaven	274	24.5	2.2	8.0	9.9
Nunthorpe	37	59.5	0.0	0.0	8.1
Park	151	39.7	2.0	7.9	11.3
University	496	33.3	1.2	6.0	21.6
Redcar & Cleveland					
South Bank	111	34.2	2.7	5.4	9.0
Stockton-on-Tees					
Grangefield	55	41.8	5.5	10.9	9.1
Hardwick	49	34.7	6.1	6.1	6.1
Ingleby Barwick	130	54.6	4.6	0.0	9.2
Parkfield	273	26.7	0.0	4.8	11.4
Portrack and Tilery	93	25.8	3.2	6.5	12.9
Victoria	162	37.7	0.0	3.1	12.3
Yarm	71	42.3	4.2	4.2	4.2

Table 14 Percentage ethnic minority households with pensioners by type – selected wards.

Ward	Number of ethnic minority households	One pensioner	
		living alone %	all pensioners %
Darlington			
Central	59	10.2	5.1
Northgate	116	2.6	0.0
Park East	49	6.1	0.0
Hartlepool			
Grange	42	7.1	0.0
Middlesbrough			
Acklam	48	0.0	0.0
Ayresome	100	3.0	3.0
Beechwood	36	8.3	0.0
Gresham	385	6.5	2.3
Kader	74	0.0	0.0
Linthorpe	186	0.0	0.0
Marton	58	0.0	5.2
Middlehaven	274	5.5	1.1
Nunthorpe	37	0.0	0.0
Park	151	6.0	0.0
University	496	2.0	1.4
Redcar & Cleveland			
South Bank	111	0.0	0.0
Stockton-on-Tees			
Grangefield	55	0.0	0.0
Hardwick	49	0.0	0.0
Ingleby Barwick	130	0.0	0.0
Parkfield	273	3.3	0.0
Portrack and Tilery	93	6.5	6.5
Victoria	162	3.7	0.0
Yarm	71	4.2	4.2

Conclusion

The JSU has been disseminating and analysing the Census results as they become available. This report links with other census reports published by the unit such as those relating to Changes in the 90s and deprivation which are available on the JSUs website. Also the unit has published a 2001 Census - Fact Card which can be obtained from information contact points in the Tees Valley as below:

Darlington Borough Council - 01325 388017.

Hartlepool Borough Council - 01429 523584.

Middlesbrough Borough Council - 01642 729216.

Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council - 01287 612354

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council - 01642 526750.

Other information is also available relating to 2001 Census data on the JSU website.

Further information can also be obtained from public libraries in the Tees Valley area and from the JSU web-site at www.teesvalley-jsu.gov.uk (which will include all the above reports and statistics card), as well as, from the Office for National Statistics website at www.statistics.gov.uk.

Further details on these latter sources are available from the above contact points.

Alan Tinkler
June 2004