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The changing nature of global migration and increasing diversity of populations have transformed the social landscape of many countries.

The number of international migrants (people residing in a country other than their country of birth) reached 244 million in 2015.
Working with such complex social movements/formations has challenged public health, and also other private/public agencies.

Demographic data are required (e.g. by ethnicity) that can appropriately capture such population heterogeneity and recognize how identities are produced and flux.

For public health, this information is necessary:
- to identify the health needs of diverse groups
- to detect and address inequities in healthcare provision and outcomes.
BACKGROUND AND AIM

- Project to identify and develop strategies and opportunities for disaggregating ethnic/racial group data in the US

- Approached UoE team. Aim: identify global approaches lessons from the EU and selected countries (outside Europe and the US) with exemplary models related to collecting, reporting on and analysing granular ethnic classifications
METHODS/SCOPE OF ENQUIRY

1. **European overview**
   - Examined population registers and census of EU28 countries to identify granularity of approaches to classification.
   - Definition of granularity based on the OMB Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity - considered to be granular (having a fine level of detail) those countries that collected more than 6 ethnic categories.

2. **Seven in-depth reports** from countries identified as potentially having valuable lessons in their approaches to ethnic classification.
   - Partnered with expert investigators.
   - Great Britain, Denmark, Hungary, Aotearoa New Zealand, Malaysia, Canada, Bolivia.
RESULTS FOR EU-28 COUNTRIES
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RESULTS FOR EU-28 COUNTRIES
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RESULTS FOR EU-28 COUNTRIES

- Lack of data collection by ethnic categories in EU28
- Where ethnicity is recorded the number of categories vary widely and ethnicity is conceptualized in different ways with consequent diverse terminology
- Ethnic categories influenced by
  - historical events
  - politics and legislation
  - ideology and sensitivity towards cultural identity
  - ongoing migration patterns
There is diversity in how ethnicity is conceptualized and terminology used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A17</th>
<th>What is your ethnicity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Byelorussian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other ethnicity (NOTE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. ETHNIC/RELIGIOUS GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is ...........?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek Cypriot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maronite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Cypriot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your ethnic group?
Choose **ONE** section from A to F, then tick **ONE** box which **best describes** your ethnic group or background

**A. White**
- Scottish
- Other British
- Irish
- Gypsy/Traveller
- Polish
- Other white ethnic group, please write in…

**B. Mixed or multiple ethnic groups**
- Any mixed or multiple ethnic groups, please write in…

**C. Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British**
- Pakistani, Pakistani Scottish or Pakistani British
- Indian, Indian Scottish or Indian British
- Bangladeshi, Bangladeshi Scottish or Bangladeshi British
- Chinese, Chinese Scottish or Chinese British
- Other, please write in…

*Where there is granularity, there is variation in the focus of disaggregating categories*
What is your nationality understood as the national or ethnic affiliation?

- Ethnic category
- Religion
- Nationality
### Example: Southern-Europe (Proxy Variables for Ethnicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Region</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Census/Population Register Year</th>
<th>Proxy Variables for Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern-Europe</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CoB and citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CoB, nationality and parents’ CoB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>CoB, citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>CoB, citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Ethnicity

*Information is not obligatory. You may state two ethnicities.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT ETHNIC GROUP DOES THE PERSON CONSIDER HE/SHE BELONGS TO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These countries demonstrate a diversity of approaches to ethnic group classifications internationally which follow a complex pattern.

Outside the EU:

- Bolivia, Aotearoa New Zealand and Canada particularly focus on categorisation of their indigenous populations – relating to indigenous rights
- Malaysia has a focus on identifying their Bumiputera population – a politically defined ethnic group
- Aotearoa New Zealand appears to have the most developed and granular approach

Many contextual factors influencing the development of systems of classification – whether ethnicity is collected, the degree of granularity, and the concepts/terminology
**Contextual Factors**

- **Historical:**
  - Colonisation
  - Migration (varying contexts & experiences)
  - Conflict
  - Abuse of data
  - Discrimination

- **Political:**
  - Political rights
  - Assimilation
  - Bi/Multi-culturalism
  - Immigration policies
  - Economic policies
  - Political agendas

- **Geographical:**
  - Global position
  - Shifting boundaries
  - Migration flows
  - Globalisation (increase ‘mixed’ populations)

- **Social:**
  - Indigenous rights
  - Activism/lobbying
  - Ethnocentrism
  - Stigma and discrimination
  - Social tension (‘migrant crisis’)

---

**Legend:**
- **Colonisation** Impact of one or more foreign rule or occupation.
- **Migration** Movement of people, including both internal and international.
- **Immigration Policies** Legal frameworks governing the entry and stay of individuals.
- **Global Position** Involves all aspects of a national status.
- **Shifting Boundaries** Events that lead to national changes.
- **Migration Flows** Movement of individuals.
- **Globalisation** A process where local characteristics and conditions are melded into a global framework.
- **Indigenous Rights** Rights of indigenous communities.
- **Activism/Lobbying** Political activities.
- **Ethnocentrism** The belief in the superiority of one’s own group.
- **Stigma and Discrimination** Negative social processes.
- **Social Tension** Severe state of social crisis.
- **Migrant Crisis** An international crisis.
- Statistics New Zealand has a standard official definition of ethnicity
- 4 levels of categorisation ranging from 8 categories + free text response (level 1) to over 230 categories (level 4)
- Health sector protocols require ethnicity to be recorded at a minimum of level two (21 ethnic categories)
- Allows for multiple responses (up to 6 per person and counted in all groups)
- However, even with this system, still a tendency to revert to aggregate categories in analysis and reporting
Identified reasons why disaggregated data not collected:

- organisational factors; for example, the logistics and cost of designing and implementing new categories (e.g. UK, Denmark)
- methodological reasons and administrative barriers
- a lack of advocacy for greater granularity
- fear of stigma (e.g. Hungary) and potential for harm (e.g. Canada)
- political reasons
- tendencies towards still aggregating data at the point of analysis (e.g. Aotearoa New Zealand)
CONCLUSIONS

- Internationally there is great variation in approaches to ethnic classification, and granularity of data, including: underlying concept of ethnicity; the number of categories used; the way in which questions are phrased; the format of responses permitted; and to what level responses are analysed.

- These diverse approaches appear to be contingent on contextual factors unique to each country, including the country’s social, political, economic, historical and geographical circumstances.

- Therefore problematic to specify an ideal way ‘globally’ that data should be collected, analysed and reported – we can identify and share good practice and work towards generating a set of consideration/principles.
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