RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION OF CHINA'S MINORITY NATIONALITIES FROM THE HAN, 2000

DANIELLE XIAODAN DENG

Texas A&M University

Abstract

There has been an increasingly large literature dealing with the population of the People's Republic of China during the recent decades. However, few sociologists and demographers have engaged in comparative studies of China's ethnic minority populations. In fact, one of the major problems associated with China's attempts at modernization today has been the uneven development of the Han majority, and 55 different minority nationalities. This article is an attempt to fill this void. I principally focus on the residential segregation of China's minority populations from the Han majority in 2000 by discussing ethnic distribution in China and calculating the dissimilarity index for each of the 55 minority groups. The analysis is conducted at provincial and county levels. Further, in order to exam the relationship between residential segregation and socioeconomic and demographic development of Chinese minority groups, three theoretical models are conducted: the **socioeconomic model**, the **women's status model**, and the **demographic model**. And for each model, I define one index. A major contribution of this paper is advancing our understanding of the patterns of residential segregation of China's minority nationalities from the Han majority and rethinking the possible causes of ethnic conflicts in China today.

VITA

Name: Danielle Xiaodan Deng

Title: Graduate Student

Affiliation: Department of Sociology, Texas A&M University

Address (Office): 409 Academic Building, 4351 TAMU, College Station, TX-77843

Address (Home): 1501 Holleman Drive, Apt. #167, College Station, TX-77840

Email Address: danielle523@gmail.com

Education: M.S., Sociology Department, Texas A&M University, 2010
B.A., Sociology, Renmin University of China, 2007

MINORITIES IN THE CONTEXT OF CHINA

All nationality groups in China, including the Han majority and the 55 minorities, are referred to as nationalities or "*minzu*" (民族). In Chinese, the term "*minzu*" (民族) is a concept referring to the presence of legal equality among all the groups and represents as well the fact that "all of China's nationalities are subordinate to a higher authority" (Heberer, 1989). Indeed some 200 years before Christ, Qinshihuang, the First Emperor of China, accomplished the historic mission of founding a centralized, unified state. This marked a great beginning. Since then, China's various nationalities have lived together in a unitary country. In this way, China's many nationalities have over long years lived together in close proximity. As a result, according to the definition of race, the minority peoples in China today are not considered to be separate races. In Figure 1, we notice that Chinese minority people are not distinguished solely on the basis of physical or anthropometric criteria. In fact, their identification depends to a much greater degree upon cultural and linguistic differences that over time have been relatively persistent (Dreyer, 1976; Fei, 1981; Eberhard, 1982; Poston and Shu, 1987).

At present, the Chinese government has identified 56 nationalities including the Han majority. According to 2000 Chinese census, the Han majority constituted almost 92 percent of China's total population in 2000. All the rest minorities combined to make up just over 8 percent. Obviously, the relative number of Chinese minority populations was small However, the absolute number of the Chinese

minorities was huge, 106 million, which greatly outnumbered the total population of all minority groups in the U.S. in 2000.

ETHNIC SEGREGATION IN CHINA

Due to the working of special historical factors, some minority groups are dispersed all over the country such as the Hui. Some of the Hui live in a compact community in the Ningxia area, but the rest are scattered all over China, in virtually all the big cities and even in Xinjiang and Tibet. However, most of the other minority groups are segregated in some provinces or counties.

Figure1: Chinese Minority People

Source: http://hi.baidu.com/gxs0702_/album/item/fa20637b9d514ace2f73b326.html

Different Patterns of Residential Segregation: China and the U.S.

In the United States, ethnic segregation and the residential locations of the racial groups largely result from migration. Patterns of immigration to the country, and the length of time the groups have been in the U.S., both greatly influence the patterns of residential segregation of ethnic groups in the U.S. In "The Growth of the City," Ernest W. Burgess (1923), pointed out that immigrant groups tended to concentrate in segregated areas around the Central Business District (CBD) when first arriving in an American city, but they later tended to adopt American patterns of behavior and assumed high-status social positions; they would then move out of the center of the city, and then other new ethnic groups would move in.

However, patterns and processes of ethnic segregation are not always the same in different eras and in different countries. Unlike in the United States, the geographic locations of the minority populations in China have been to a significant degree invariant for centuries. Therefore the patterns of ethnic segregation in China are more associated with historical factors rather than with migration. Good examples here are the Koreans and Uygurs in China. As one of the minority groups, most Koreans are concentrated in Northeastern China which is next to North Korea. During the Japanese occupation of Korea from 1905 to 1945, many Koreans came to China to seek refuge and finally settled in Northeastern China. Compared with the Koreans, the segregation of Uygur people in Xinjiang were more caused by China’s own national wars and conquests. Beginning in the Han dynasty, Han Chinese fought for hegemony along the Yili and Tarim caravan routes through this region, but it was not until the

Qing dynasty that the area was fully incorporated into the Chinese state. Since then, the Uygur have become one of the ethnic groups in China and have been living in Xingjiang for centuries.

Different Analyses of Residential Segregation: China and the U.S.

Current studies on ethnic segregation in the U.S. has continued the tradition of examining the residential patterns of ethnic groups in metropolitan areas (for a discussion of the history of such studies, see Massey 1985). And the data used to measure geographic segregation in these studies are almost always based at the Census Tract or the Block level.

However, as Rogelio Saenz and Jaime Vinas (1990) argued in their paper, the emphasis on metropolitan areas led to a lack of information about the residential segregation patterns of American ethnic groups across larger areal units (e.g. states). They pointed out that previous research failed to show the full spectrum of the geographic dispersal of ethnic groups. Therefore in their study, they examined the geographic segregation patterns of Chicanos from Anglos across counties in the 50 United States using data from the 1980 census. But other than their paper, few other studies on residential segregation in the U.S. focus on the population distributions across counties.

When examining residential segregation of minority populations in China, we cannot just focus on metropolitan communities. Because, first of all, there are not available data about population distributions at Census Tract or Block level within

metropolitan areas. Secondly, given the unique pattern of ethnic segregation in China, from the research just focusing on metropolitan areas, we cannot get enough information about the distribution patterns of the minority populations across the whole country. Indeed, for ethnic studies in China, it is much more important to know the extent to which minority and majority groups share similar physical environments in areas more diverse than metropolitan areas. Therefore, instead of studying ethnic segregation in several metropolitan areas, in this paper I conduct my analysis about the residential segregation of each of the Chinese minorities from the Han majority at provincial and county levels across the whole country.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Residential segregation is a topic of considerable interest to sociologists and demographers. For decades, researchers have used alternative indices to measure it. Before Massy and Denton (1988) published their major paper, researchers seldom agreed about which measure of segregation is best to use and under what circumstances. After decades of lively debate, Massy and Denton ushered in a long era of peace by designating residential segregation as a multidimensional phenomenon varying along five distinct axes of measurement.

Many earlier studies on ethnic segregation documented the persistent and high degree of black residential segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas (Duncan and Duncan, 1955; Farley, 1977; Sorensen, Taeuber, and Hollingsworth, 1975; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965). And later, attention had focused on Hispanic segregation

(Grebler et al, 1970; Kantrowitz, 1973; Massey, 1979). Over 1980-2000 period, ethnic segregation in the United States is being accompanied by great integration. But Iceland's study (2004) indicated that segregation had been decreasing, mainly due to declines in African American segregation. While at the same time, there was little change or even slight increases in Asian and Hispanic segregation.

Ethnic residential segregation is not limited to the U.S. Many studies on ethnic residential segregation have been conducted in other countries by Jones (1969) in Melbourne, Australia; Warwick (1966) in Singapore; Musi (1968) in Prague, Czechoslovakia; and Mehta (1968) in Poona, India; A. Gordon Darroch and Wilfred G. Marston (1971) in Toronto, Canada; and Vivian Z. Klaff (1973) in three cities, Israel. More recently, Edward E. Telles (1992) examined residential segregation by skin color in 35 of the largest metropolitan areas in Brazil, using census tract data from the 1980 Brazilian census.

However, there has been no systematic attempt to study the 55 minority groups in China for a long time until Dudley L. Poston and Jing Shu (1987) published their paper. They used the D index to measure the degree of difference between the Han and the minority group in their patterns of residential distribution across provinces of China.

Therefore, following Poston and Jing Shu's study, I would like to study residential segregation of China's minority populations by using the new census data in this paper.

Based on what we know about the possible causes and potential consequences of racial and ethnic segregation in the U.S., I think it might be interesting to see if similar patterns exist in China in the year 2000. Are those Chinese minority groups who are the most residentially segregated from the majority Han also the least advanced in regards to socioeconomic and demographic characteristics? Is there any evidence suggesting that more developed minority groups experience lower levels of segregation in China?

In light of the previous literature, I propose three general hypotheses which this paper intends to investigate, all for the year 2000 in China: First, highly residentially segregated minority groups should be characterized by lower socioeconomic development compared to less residentially segregated groups. Second, minority women from highly segregated minority groups should have lower social status than minority women from less segregated minority groups. Finally, highly segregated minority groups are more likely to have traditional demographic characteristics than less segregated groups. I will be using the **socioeconomic model**, the **women's status model**, and the **demographic model** to test these three general ideas in this paper.

DATA AND METHOD

Index of Dissimilarity

Massy and Denton (1988) pointed out in their paper: one of the dimensions of residential segregation is "evenness" which refers to the differential distribution of two social groups among areal units. And the best index to measure "evenness" is the index of dissimilarity (D-index), which is defined as:

$$D=1/2\sum(Mi/M-Hi/H)$$

where Mi and Hi are the numbers of minority and majority persons living in areal unit i, and M and H are the total number of minority and majority persons, respectively. The absolute differences between Mi/M and Hi/H are summed over all the areal units, and one-half of the sum of these differences is obtained. This calculation is performed for every one of China's 55 minority populations in this paper. As a result, the resulting value of the D-index for any one minority group, when multiplied by 100, represents the percentage amount of persons in that minority that would need to move to certain other residential areas in order to for them to have the same residential distributions with the Han majority over the whole country.

The value of the dissimilarity index ranges from 0, indicating perfectly even residential distribution of the minority with the Han majority, to 100, indicating perfectly uneven residential distributions of the two groups. That is to say, the higher the value of the index, the more uneven the minority's residential distribution from the Han; therefore, the higher the value of the D-index, the greater its degree of residential segregation from the Han.

Data

All the data used in this paper are from the 2000 Census of China. The 2000 Census was the fifth national population census conducted in China and the largest of its kind in Chinese history. It was carried out on November 1, 2000 by the Population Census Office under the State Council and National Bureau of Statistics of China. It enumerated people in all the different administrative regions; census data were

obtained for the following characteristics of the population: sex, age, nationality, education, age, employment, industry and occupation, migration, marriage, recent birth and housing.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Residential Segregation at Provincial Level

By using the 2000 census data, I first calculate the D-index for each of the 55 minority groups comparing their distributions with the distributions of the Han across the province-level administrative regions.

Appendix Table 1 shows the values of the D-index for each of the 55 minority groups among the province-level administrative regions in the year of 2000, and Table 1 presents descriptive information. The data in these tables illustrate that minority populations are not evenly distributed with the Han population across all the province-level administrative regions. There is a sizable amount of residential segregation of the minorities from the majority Han in China in the year of 2000.

***Table1*:**
Mean, Stand Deviation, and Minimum and Maximum Scores:
D-index of 55 Minority Groups V.S. Majority Population at Provincial Level, China, 2000

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Indexes of Dissimilarity				
Provincial Level	**89.39%**	10.46	**38.52%** (Gaoshan)	**98.91%** (Kazak)

Table1 shows that, the average value of the D-index for the 55 minority groups is 89.39%. According to the definition of D-index, we can interpret the value

as the average percentage of minority peoples who would have to move to certain other province-level administrative regions in order for them to have the exactly same residential distribution as the Han population. That is to say, in 2000 in China, almost 90 % of minority populations, on average, would have to change their residential locations. The values of the D-index range from a low of 39% for Gaoshan to a high of 99 % for Kazak.

Usually, scholars dealing with residential segregation use a benchmark value of 30% as the threshold for a meaningful level of residential segregation (Alba and Nee, 2003). Based on this threshold, we can conclude that in 2000 in China, all 55 minority groups, including the Gaoshan, are highly and significantly segregated from the majority Han.

Research shows that, ethnic residential segregation at the provincial level has been decreasing in China. Poston and Micklin (1993) calculated D-index values for each of the 55 minority groups using 1982 census data. Their results revealed that the mean value of the D-index was 96.9% in 1982. The value drops to 89.4% in 2000. Clearly, in 2000, the Chinese minority groups were less segregated from the Han majority when compared with the situation 20 years ago. However, based on the 30% threshold, they were still considered as highly segregated in 2000 from the Han.

Residential Segregation at County Level

It is clear that there is ethnic segregation at the provincial level in China. However, we should also notice that many ethnic groups are highly concentrated in just a number of counties within a province or across provincial boundaries. Thus,

analyses based solely on provincial data may not be able to precisely capture the spatial distribution of minority groups or effectively measure ethnic segregation for each group. Therefore, I also use county-level data tocalculate D-index values for the 55 minority groups again. Appendix Table 2 shows the values for each of the minority groups across all counties in China in the year of 2000, and Table 2 presents descriptive information. In general, the county-level analysis of ethnic segregation based on 2000 data is consistent with my previous provincial-level results. However, it appears that the 55 minority groups are more segregated at the county level than at the provincial level. On average, about 94% of minority people have to move to other counties in China in order to have the same residential distribution as the majority Han. Also, at the county level the most segregated group is still Kazak, but the least segregated group is the Hui, as compared to Gaoshan at the province level (Table 2).

***Table2*:**
Mean, Stand Deviation, and Minimum and Maximum Scores:
D-index of 55 Minority Groups V.S. Majority Population at County Level, China, 2000

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Indexes of Dissimilarity				
County Level	**94.08%**	5.72	**68.56%** (Hui)	**99.24%** (Kazak)

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND RESULTS

In this paper, three theoretical models are used in examining the research questions: the **socioeconomic model**, the **women's status model**, and the **demographic model**. For each of them, I define one index to represent the model.

Socioeconomic Model

The purpose of this model is to examine the relationship between residential segregation and socioeconomic development among the 55 minority groups of China (Table 3). Three variables are used to measure socioeconomic status of minority groups in the model: *"Percentage with no education"* and "*Percentage in farming"* and *"Percentage rural."* All of the variables are measured as percentages of the total population for each minority group.

***Table 3*:**
Mean, Stand Deviation, and Minimum and Maximum Scores:
Variables for the "*Socioeconomic Model"*

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Variables				
Percentage with No Education	16。02%	13。82	2。53% (Tartar)	57。96% (Dongxiang)
Percentage in Farming	76.00%	18.54	21.19% (Russian)	94.96% (Lisu)
Percentage Rural	73.84%	18.23	18.64% (Russian)	95.66% (Dongxiang)

Clearly, three of the variables in the mode are hanging together as a whole to reflect the same conceptual domain, socioeconomic status of the 55 minority groups in China. Hence, I create one index named the **socioeconomic index** for the model by adding together the standard scores of the three variables. Obviously, the three

variables have positive relationships with residential segregation of minorities in China. Therefore, I have evidence to believe that the **socioeconomic index** is also positively correlated with residential segregation. That is to say, a high socioeconomic index indicates a low socioeconomic level. And I assume, among the 55 minority groups in China in the year of 2000, those groups with higher socioeconomic indices, which means they are at lower socioeconomic levels than other groups, tend to have higher values of D-index at provincial and county levels.

Women's Status Model

The second model to be examined in this chapter, the **women's status model,** seeks to test the relationship between residential segregation of Chinese minority groups and minority women's social status (Table 4). Four variables are used to measure women's status for minority populations, *"Percentage married women who are exclusively house workers," "Percentage of divorced women,"* and *"Percentage of widowed women,"* and TFR.

***Table4*:**
Mean, Stand Deviation, and Minimum and Maximum Scores:
Variables for the *"Women's Status Model"*

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Variables				
% Married Women House Workers	27.40%	13。58	11.02% (Lisu)	64.37% (Uzbek)
% Divorced Women	1。30%	1。03	0。31% (She)	4。68% (Uzbek)
% Widowed Women	7。66%	1。49	4。33% (Oroqen)	10。84% (Korean)
TFR	1.69	0.44	0.70 (Korean)	2.74 (Lhoba)

In some Chinese minority groups, it is difficult for divorced and widowed women to remarry. Thus, minority women in these minority groups have to stay in

divorced or widowed status. And also fertility levels tend to be high for these minority groups. In this paper, they are considered as a low women's status.

The index for this model is **women's status index**. It is created by adding together the standard scores of the four variables to measure minority women's status. Since all variables in this model have the positive relationships with residential segregation. So I also expect a positive relationship between **women's status index** and residential segregation. That is to say, among the 55 minority groups in China in the year of 2000, if a minority group has a higher women's status index than other minority groups, which means women have relatively lower social status in this minority group than other minority groups, this minority group will also have higher values of D-indices at provincial and county levels.

Demographic Model

In the demographic model, I examine the relationship between residential segregation and population structure among the 55 Chinese minority groups (Table 5). "Median age" and "old dependency ratio" will be used to measure age structure; "sex ratio at birth" will be used to measure sex structure and son preference.

***Table5*:**
Mean, Stand Deviation, and Minimum and Maximum Scores:
Variables for the *"Demographic Model"*

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Independent Variables				
Median Age	25.68	2.69	20.22	35.75
			(Monba)	(Korean)
Old Dependency Ratio	7.44	1.74	2.47	11.12
			(Oroqen)	(Jing)
Sex Ratio at Birth	110.79	12.31	86.21	150
			(Gaoshan)	(Tatar)

I use the demographic index to represent the demographic model by adding together the standard scores of the three variables. A lower value of the demographic index is related to relatively more traditional demographic characteristics, younger median age, lower old dependency ratio, and lower sex ratio at birth. Overall, the hypothesis for the demographic model states that in 2000, among the 55 minority groups, those groups with lower values of the demographic index will be more residentially segregated from the Han majority.

Correlations between the Three Indices and Dependent Variables

Before the regressions analysis, let's look at the correlations between **the socioeconomic index**, **the women's status index**, and **the demographic index** and dependent variables, D-indices at provincial and county level at first.

***Table6*:**
Correlations of the Three Indices and Dependent Variables

	D-index (Provincial Level)	**D-index (County Level)**
Socioeconomic Index	0.6942	0.7285
Women's Status Index	0.5658	0.5772
Demographic Index	-0.6211	-0.6974

Table 6 shows that all of the three indices are correlated with dependent variables well. At provincial level, **the socioeconomic index** and **the women's status index** are positively correlated with the D-index, especially **the socioeconomic index** with a correlation of 0.69. And **the demographic index** has a negative relationship with the D-index (-0.62). A similar pattern can be found at county level. All

correlations have the same directions with the correlations at provincial level, but the three relationships are slightly stronger at county level than the relationships at provincial level. Therefore, I can conclude my hypotheses are partly supported by the correlations.

Regressions and Results

There are two models in my regression analysis (Table 7). In **the province model**, the dependent variable is the D-index at provincial level, and the three independent variables are the **socioeconomic index**, the **women's status index**, and the **demographic index**; while in **the county model**, the dependent variable is the D-index at county level and the three indices are the independent variables. Given that both of the dependent variables are liner, I will use multiple ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions for the two models. I believe OLS multiple regressions will make the best use of the data and are ideal to test my hypotheses. In each of the model, the regression parameters are estimated by the least squares principle, and the dependent variable is viewed as a linear function of the three independent variables.

Prior to running the regression models, I also examine the tolerances of the three independent variables, and table 6 indicates that all of them are good, above 0.40. For example, **the socioeconomic index** has a tolerance of 0.72, that is, 72% of the variation in **the socioeconomic index** is independent of the other two independent variables. Therefore, there will not be a problematic amount of collinearity in the models.

***Table6*: VIF values and the Tolerance Values (1/VIF) for the Three Independent Variables**

Variables	VIF	1/VIF (Tolerance)
Socioeconomic Index	1.39	0.721
Women's Status Index	1.35	0.740
Demographic Index	1.06	0.944

In the model of the province (Table 7), the three coefficients are significant. For **the socioeconomic index**, for example, the coefficient is 1.26 indicating that, every one unit increase of the **socioeconomic index** of the 55 minority groups is associated with 1.26 percent increase of the D-index value at provincial level when the other two indices are controlled. And the relationship is obviously significant (P=0.000). The coefficient of the **demographic index** is negative and statistically significant (P=0.01); the coefficient of the **women's status index** is positive and significant (P= 0.064).

In the model of the county, there is not an obvious difference from the model of the province. The three coefficients still keep the significant. For instance, the coefficient of the **demographic index** is -0.67. It means making the **socioeconomic index** and the **women's status index** constant, every one unit increase of **the demographic index** will associated with 0.67 percent decrease of the value of D-index at county level. This association is significant (P=0.0015). And the coefficient of the **socioeconomic index** is positive and significant, as well as the coefficient of the **women's status index**.

Table7: **Coefficients of Multiple Regression Models**

	D	
	(Province)	(County)
Socioeconomic Index	1.261 * *	0.730 * *
Women's Status Index	1.007 *	0.453 *
Demographic Index	-1.667 * *	-0.665 * *
Constant	89.388 * *	94.080 * *

Significance at 0.10 (*)
Significance at 0.05 (* *)

Testing the Hypotheses

After analyzing the results of the regressions, we have evidence to conclude that my three main hypotheses are confirmed. First, the more residentially segregated minorities do have higher values of the **socioeconomic index** which means lower socioeconomic development than the less segregated minority groups in the year 2000.

Second, the women's status hypotheses are also confirmed. Women from more segregated minority groups tend to have lower social status than women from less segregated minority groups. We can see this pattern from the regressions' results. The minority groups with higher values of **the women's status index** tend to have higher values of the D-indices, and a higher value of **the women's status index** indicates a relatively lower women's social status in those minority groups.

Finally, the demographic hypotheses find support in the regression results too. Basically, minority groups with lower values of the **demographic index** are characterized by more traditional demographic indicators such as a younger age structure or a lower sex ratio at birth, and among the 55 minority groups, they tend to be more segregated from the majority.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

A major contribution of the research I conducted in this paper is advancing our understanding of the patterns of residential segregation of China's minority nationalities from the majority Han in the year 2000. The findings show that most Chinese minorities in 2000 were still considered to be highly segregated from the majority Han at both provincial and county levels. After examining the relationship between China's minority population residential segregation patterns and their socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, my hypotheses are confirmed by the regression results: in 2000 China, the more residentially segregated minority groups were characterized by lower socioeconomic levels than the less segregated minority groups; women from more residentially segregated minority groups tended to have lower social status than women from less segregated minority groups; and the more residentially segregated minority groups were more likely to have traditional demographic characteristics.

China's ethnic issue has always been a major political concern. But Chinese government often treats this issue exclusively as a sovereignty matter and thus attempts to refute outside criticism. And the current ethnic conflicts in China continue to be a complicated issue. An obvious and important question needs to be addressed: what factors are related with minority conflicts in China?

The data and analyses in this paper, I believe, at least give us some evidence to believe that ethnic segregation might be one of the factors behind the continuing ethnic conflict among the minority groups in China. The two most volatile minority

regions in China, Xinjiang and Tibet, are also home to minority groups such as the Uygur, Tajik, and the Tibetan, which are highly segregated from the majority Han. For centuries, the Uygur, Tajik, and the Tibetan have been concentrated in these two regions (Xinjiang and Tibet). In the Xinjiang and Tibet regions these very high levels of residential segregation which have slowed the socioeconomic development of the Uygur, Tajik, and the Tibetan minority groups; also responsible are the very limited social and economic resources available to them. Residential segregation, isolation, and limited interactions with the majority population have undoubtedly leaded to some political and social misunderstandings, abomination, and conflicts between these minority communities and the majority Han society.

China is often seen as a homogeneous society due to the very large percentage of the Han majority population. The government has claimed that socioeconomic advancement is now very similar among the different ethnic nationalities; but the fact is that socioeconomic advancement has not been similar among all the minority nationalities of China. The analyses I conduct in this paper at least provides some support that socioeconomic development varied among the minority groups in the year 2000 and that the variation was closely related to ethnic residential segregation.

Appendix Table 1: **Measures of Residential Segregation from the Han Majority at Province Level: Fifty-Five Minority Nationalities of China, 2000.**

	Minority	D		Minority	D
1	Mongolian	79.5259	30	Daur	90.11279
2	Hui	52.6848	31	Mulam	91.50554
3	Tibetan	87.3568	32	Qiang	91.38546
4	Uygur	98.7013	33	Blang	95.89799
5	Miao	77.9065	34	Salar	95.46947
6	Yi	87.5479	35	Maonan	93.50645
7	Zhuang	90.0288	36	Gelo	94.56686
8	Bouyei	92.2435	37	Xibe	86.4687
9	Korean	84.0161	38	Achang	96.2917
10	Man	79.6451	39	Primi	95.5363
11	Dong	84.3992	40	Tajik	95.6001
12	Yao	80.1991	41	Nu	95.6001
13	Bai	88.4957	42	Uzbek	97.1264
14	Tujia	81.1198	43	Russian	87.5564
15	Hani	96.5006	44	Ewenki	90.1078
16	Kazak	98.9068	45	Deang	96.7901
17	Dai	96.0667	46	Baoan	96.4466
18	Li	95.9576	47	Yugur	94.8086
19	Lisu	93.5603	48	Jing	87.9122
20	Wa	94.0947	49	Tatar	93.1908
21	She	81.8287	50	Derung	77.7858
22	Gaoshan	38.5201	51	Oroqen	86.1711
23	Lahu	96.1818	52	Hezhen	83.9617
24	Shui	90.96435	53	Monba	95.0326
25	Dongxiang	96.46254	54	Lhoba	91.6338
26	Naxi	93.57184	55	Jino	96.4965
27	Jingpo	96.05922			
28	Kirgiz	98.06803			
29	Tu	88.73864			

Appendix Table 2: **Measures of Residential Segregation from the Han Majority at County Level: Fifty-Five Minority Nationalities of China, 2000.**

	Minority	D		Minority	D
1	Mongolian	86.49	32	Qiang	97.14
2	Hui	68.56	33	Blang	97.45
3	Tibetan	97.44	34	Salar	97.64
4	Uygure	98.72	35	Maonan	96.13
5	Miao	90.93	36	Gelo	95.63
6	Yi	94.65	37	Xibe	89.55
7	Zhuang	93.59	38	Achang	97.93
8	Bouyei	94.45	39	Primi	97.06
9	Korean	87.42	40	Tajik	96.14
10	Man	84.52	41	Nu	97.33
11	Dong	93.76	42	Uzbek	97.66
12	Yao	92.62	43	Russian	91.22
13	Bai	95.19	44	Ewenki	93.22
14	Tujia	92.62	45	Deang	98.64
15	Hani	97.90	46	Baoan	98.55
16	Kazak	99.24	47	Yugur	97.12
17	Dai	97.44	48	Jing	93.44
18	Li	97.34	49	Tatar	96.17
19	Lisu	97.56	50	Derung	87.27
20	Va	96.15	51	Oroqen	90.10
21	She	90.84	52	Hezhen	90.94
22	Gaoshan	73.81	53	Monba	96.96
23	Lahu	97.79	54	Lhoba	96.65
24	Shui	96.04	55	Jino	98.34
25	Dongxiang	98.30			
26	Naxi	97.22			
27	Jingpo	97.95			
28	Kirgiz	98.96			
29	Tujia	91.80			
30	Daur	92.50			
31	Mulam	94.24			

REFERENCE

Alba, Richard D., and Victor Nee

2003 "Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration." Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burgess, Ernest

1923 "The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project." American Sociological Society, vol. 18. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Darroch, A. Gordon, and Wilfred G Marston

1971 "The Social Class Basis of Ethnic Residential Segregation: The Canadian Case. The American Journal of Sociology Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 491-510

Dreyer, June Teufel

1976 "China's Forty Millions." Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Duncan, Otis D., and Beverly Duncan

1955 "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indices." American Sociological Review 20:210-17.

Eberhard, Wolfram

1982 "China's Minorities: Yesterday and Today." Berkeley: University of California Press.

Farley, R

1977 "Residential Segregation in Urbanized Areas of the United States in 1970: An Analysis of Social Class and Racial Differences." Demography 14: 497-529

Fei, xiaotong

1981 "Toward A People's Anthropology." Beijing: New World Press.

Grebler, L., J. W. Moore, and R. C. Guzman

1970 "The Mexican American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority." New York: Free Press.

Herberer, Thomas

1989 "China and Its National Minorities: Autonomy or Assimilation?" Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Iceland, John

2004 "Beyond Black and White Metropolitan residential segregation in multi-ethnic America." Social Science Research 33: 248 – 271

Jones, Frank L

1969 "Dimensions of Urban Social Structure: The Social Areas of Melbourne." Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kantrowitz, N

1973 "Ethnic and Racial Segregation in the New York metropolis." New York: Praeger.

Klaff, Vivian Z

1973 "Ethnic Segregation in Urban Israel" Demography, Vol. 10, No.2

Massey, Douglas S

1979 "Effects of Socioeconomic Factors on the Residential Segregation of Black and Spanish Americans in U.S. Urbanized Areas." American Sociological Review, Vol. 44, No. 6, pp. 1015-1022.

1985 "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review." Sociology and Social Research 69:315-50.

Massey, Douglas S and Nancy A. Denton

1988 "The Dimensions of Residential Segregation" Social Forces, Vol.67, No.2, 281-315

Meta, Surinder K

1968 "Patterns of Residence in Poona (India) by Income, Education, and Occupation." American Journal of Sociology 73: 496-508.

Musil, G

1968 "The Development of Prague's Ecological Structure." Pp. 232-259 in Raymond E. Pahl (ed.), Readings in Urban Sociology. New York: Pergamon Press.

Poston, Dudley Jr. and Jing Shu

1987 "The demographic and socioeconomic composition of China's ethnic minorities." Population and Development Review 13: 703-722.

Poston, Dudley Jr. and M. Micklin

1993 "Spatial Segregation and Social Differentiation of the Minority Nationalities from the Han Majority in the People's Republic of China." Sociological Inquiry 63: 150-165.

Saenz, Rogelio and Jaime Vinas

1990 "Chicano Geographic Segregation: A Human Ecological Approach." Sociological Perspectives, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 465-481

Soresen, A., K. E. Taeuber and L. J. Hollingsworth, Jr.

1975 "Indexes of Racial Residential Segregation for 109 Cities in the United States, 1940-1970." Sociological Focus 8: 125-142

Taeuber, Karl E. and Alma F. Taeuber

1965 "Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change." Aldine.

Telles, E. Edward

1992 "Residential Segregation by Skin Color in Brazil." American Sociological Review, Vol. 57, No. 2, pp. 186-197.

Warwick, Neville

1966 "Singapore: Ethnic Diversity and Its Implications." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 56: 236-253.