

2011 Census - Processing Units

PU code	Included Local Authorities				
PU 1	East Lothian	Scottish Borders	South Lanarkshire		
PU 2	East Ayrshire	North Ayrshire	South Ayrshire		
PU 3	Edinburgh	Midlothian			
PU 4	North Lanarkshire	West Lothian			
PU 6	Clackmannanshire	Falkirk	Fife		
PU 7	Glasgow				
PU 8	East Dunbartonshire	East Renfrewshire	Inverclyde	Renfrewshire	West Dunbartonshire
PU 9	Angus	Dundee	Perth & Kinross	Stirling	
PU 10	Aberdeen City	Aberdeenshire	Shetland		
PU 11	Argyll & Bute	Eilean Siar	Highland	Moray	Orkney

Note: PU 5 was used to refer to the Census Coverage Survey (CCS)

Source: National Records of Scotland

2011 Census: Variables collapsed and reasons for collapsing key estimation variables by Processing Unit

PU code	HIC				Age sex group				Ethnicity		Tenure		Activity last week		Postcodes			
	HIC in EA	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Dropped for	LA name	HIC Group	How many?	Reason
PU1	1	yes	2, 3 and 4	Small number	yes	MF 0-2	to smooth sex ratio	yes	Mixed / multipl	Small sample	yes		no	yes	South Lanark 1		1	Postcodes with no CCS observations
	2			A large amount		MF 3-17	difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%, to smooth sex ratio											
	3					M 18-24	difference in adjustment levels between adjacent age groups implausibly large											
	4					M 65+	Census only and/or CCS only DSE cells smaller than 5, adjustment level inconsistency by HIC											
PU2	1	yes	3 and 4	Small number	yes	MF 3-7	difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%, to smooth sex ratio	yes	Mixed / multipl	Small sample	yes	Owens with a r	no	no				
	2					MF 8-17	to smooth sex ratio					Rents (with or Response to						
	3					M 18-24	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC					Rents (with or Small sample						
	4					M 30-39	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC											
PU3	1	yes	3, 4 and 5	Small number	yes	MF 0-2	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC	yes	African/Black	Small sample	yes	Owens with a r	no	yes	Edinburgh, Ci 1		2	Outlier
	2			A large amount		MF 3-7	to smooth sex ratio					Rents (with or Small sample					1	Outlier
	3					MF 8-17	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC										4	1 Outlier
	4					M 18-29	difference in adjustment levels between adjacent age groups implausibly large										5	1 Excessively high Cesus/CCS ratio
PU4	1	yes	3 and 4	Small number	yes	MF 3-7	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC	yes	Mixed / multipl	Small sample	yes	Owens with a r	no	yes	West Lothian 2		1	Postcodes with no CCS observations
	2					MF 8-17	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC					Rents (with or Response to						
	3					M 18-29	difference in adjustment levels between adjacent age groups implausibly large											
	4					M 30-39	difference in adjustment levels between adjacent age groups implausibly large											
PU6	1	yes	3 and 4	Small number	yes	MF 0-2	to smooth sex ratio	yes	Mixed / multipl	Small sample	yes	Part rent part	no	yes	Clackmannan 2		2	Postcodes with no CCS observations
	2					MF 3-7	difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%, to smooth sex ratio					Rents (with or Response to					1	Postcodes with no CCS observations
	3					MF 8-17	to smooth sex ratio					Rents (with or Small sample					2	Postcodes with no CCS observations
	4					M 55-64	Census only and/or CCS only DSE cells smaller than 5										1	Postcodes with no CCS observations
PU7	1	yes	1 and 2	Small number	yes	MF 0-2	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC	yes	African/Black	Small sample	yes	Owens with a r	no	no				
	2					M 30-44	difference in adjustment levels between adjacent age groups implausibly large					Rents (with or Response to						
	3					M 70+	Census only and/or CCS only DSE cells smaller than 5											
	4					F 30-39	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC											
PU8	1	yes	3 and 4	Small number	yes	MF 0-2	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC	yes	Mixed / multipl	Small sample	yes	Part rent part	no	yes	Renfrewshire 4		2	Outlier
	2					MF 3-7	difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%, to smooth sex ratio					Rents (with or Response to						
	3					M 35-49	difference in adjustment levels between adjacent age groups implausibly large											
	4					M 60-69	to smooth sex ratio											
PU9	1	no			yes	MF 0-2	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC	yes	Mixed / multipl	Small sample	yes	Owens with a r	no	no				
	2					MF 3-7	difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%, to smooth sex ratio					Rents (with or Response to						
	3					MF 8-17	to smooth sex ratio											
	4					M 55-64	Census only and/or CCS only DSE cells smaller than 5											
PU10	1	yes	1 and 2	Small number	yes	MF 0-2	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC	yes	Mixed / multipl	Small sample	yes	Owens with a r	no	yes	Aberdeenshir 1		1	Postcodes with no CCS observations
	2					MF 3-7	difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%, to smooth sex ratio					Rents (with or Response to						
	3					MF 8-17	difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%, to smooth sex ratio											
	4					M 18-24	difference in adjustment levels between adjacent age groups implausibly large											
PU11	1	yes	2, 3 and 4		yes	MF 0-2	difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%, to smooth sex ratio	yes	White/ Mixed	Small sample	yes	Owens with a r	no	no				
	2					MF 3-7	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC					Rents (with or Response to						
	3					MF 8-17	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC											
	4					M 40-49	adjustment level inconsistency by HIC											

2011 Census: Variables collapsed and reasons for collapsing key estimation variables by Processing Unit

PU code	HIC		Age sex group		Ethnicity		Tenure		Activity last week		Postcodes		
	HIC in EA	Collapsed? Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Collapsed?	Which ones? Reason	Dropped for LA name	HIC Group	How many? Reason
				F 60-69 F 70+		Census only and/or CCS only DSE cells smaller than 5 Census only and/or CCS only DSE cells smaller than 5							
Reasons for collapsing categories during estimation													
1 difference in adjustment level between sex greater than 5%													
2 difference in adjustment levels between adjacent age groups implausibly large													
3 adjustment level inconsistency by HIC													
4 Census only and/or CCS only DSE cells smaller than 5													
5 CCS only DSE cells by HIC smaller than 2													
6 to reduce the width of extremely wide Confidence Intervals													
7 to smooth sex ratio													
© Crown Copyright 2013													

LA name	Number of postcodes dropped
Aberdeen City	0
Aberdeenshire	1
Angus	0
Argyll & Bute	0
Scottish Borders	0
Clackmannanshire	2
West Dunbartonshire	0
Dumfries & Galloway	0
Dundee City	0
East Ayrshire	0
East Dunbartonshire	0
East Lothian	0
East Renfrewshire	0
Edinburgh, City of	5
Falkirk	1
Fife	5
Glasgow City	0
Highland	0
Inverclyde	0
Midlothian	0
Moray	0
North Ayrshire	0
North Lanarkshire	0
Orkney Islands	0
Perth & Kinross	0
Renfrewshire	2
Shetland Islands	0
South Ayrshire	0
South Lanarkshire	1
Stirling	0
West Lothian	1
Eilean Siar	0

Source: National Records of Scotland

© Crown Copyright 2013