

**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES
TO THE SPRING 2007
CENSUS CONSULTATION**

Scotland's Census 2011
Scotland Counts

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

GROS would like to thank the individuals and organisations who contributed to this consultation.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND TO THE CONSULTATION	13
Background	13
Census Consultation Programme	13
Timetable	14
Aim of this report.....	14
CHAPTER 2: THE CONSULTATION PROCESS	15
Introduction.....	15
Consultation Document	15
Promotion of the Consultation	15
Response Problems	16
Responses and Respondents	17
CHAPTER 3: APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS	18
The team.....	18
Defining respondents	18
Duplicate responses	18
Categorising respondents	18
Analysing responses.....	19
Quotation of respondents	20
Quality Assurance.....	20
Factual accuracy.....	20
Interpretation of findings	20
CHAPTER 4: FORM LENGTH.....	21
Respondents in favour of four pages of personal questions	21
Respondents in favour of three pages of personal questions	22
Other Responses.....	23
Summary – Form Length.....	23
CHAPTER 5: HOUSING	24
Central Heating	24
State of Repairs.....	26
Household amenities.....	27
Number of rooms	27
Accommodation type.....	27
Tenure	27
Landlord.....	28
Number of cars/vans	28
Energy Efficiency	28
Crofting	28
Gardens	29
Lowest Floor Level.....	29
Eating Together.....	29
Summary - Housing	29
CHAPTER 6: INCOME	30
Personal Income.....	31
Household Income	32
Identified problems with current household question.....	33
No specific preference	34

Responses against the inclusion of an income question	34
Proposed question improvements	35
Summary - Income.....	35
CHAPTER 7: HEALTH AND CARE.....	36
Carers.....	36
Limiting long-term illness / disability.....	37
General Health	38
Summary – Health and Care	39
CHAPTER 8: RELIGION	40
Strength of support for religion of upbringing.....	40
General comments about religion	41
Other comments.....	42
Summary - Religion.....	42
CHAPTER 9: TRAVEL TO WORK OR STUDY	43
Travel to work or study.....	43
Travel to work.....	44
Recommended changes to question design.....	45
Summary – Travel to work or study	45
CHAPTER 10: LANGUAGE	46
Requirement for language information.....	47
Aspects of Language.....	47
Simple Language Question.....	49
Languages of Interest.....	49
Differences in languages requested between response categories.....	51
Summary - Language	51
CHAPTER 11: MIGRATION	52
Address one year ago.....	52
Country of birth.....	53
Date of entry	53
Citizenship	54
Other comments	54
Summary - Migration.....	55
CHAPTER 12: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND NS-SEC.....	56
Industry	57
Hours Worked.....	58
Size of workplace.....	58
General Comments on Labour Market & NS-SEC.....	58
Results by Respondent Category	59
Summary – Labour Market & NS-SEC	60
CHAPTER 13: QUALIFICATIONS	61
Strength of user demand	61
Uses of qualifications data	62
Recommended changes to the question design.....	63
Summary - Qualifications	63
CHAPTER 14: POPULATION BASES AND DEFINITIONS	64
Second Residence	64
Population Definitions	66
Summary – Population bases and definitions	66
CHAPTER 15 : ETHNICITY	67
CHAPTER 16: CARRYING OUT THE CENSUS	76

Support for an internet form	76
Caveats relating to internet completion	77
Other suggestions for internet completion.....	78
Other issues regarding carrying out the Census.....	78
Summary – Carrying out the Census	79
CHAPTER 17: GAELIC LANGUAGE POLICY	80
Gaelic Language Policy – Specific Suggestions.....	80
Gaelic Language Policy – General Comments	82
Language Policies - Other.....	82
Summary – Gaelic language policy	83
CHAPTER 18: THE OUTPUTS OF THE CENSUS	84
Priority Aims.....	84
Output Medium.....	86
Flexible Table Generation.....	87
Statistical Disclosure Control	87
Summary – The outputs of the Census	88
CHAPTER 19: GEOGRAPHY.....	89
Support for 2001 approach.....	89
Consistency with other geographies	90
Other comments	91
Summary - Geography.....	91
CHAPTER 20: OTHER VIEWS	92
Sexual Identity	92
Support for other questions.....	94
Comments on the marital/civil partnership question	94
Other Comments	94
Summary – Other views.....	95
CHAPTER 21: THE NEXT STEPS	96
ANNEX A: LIST OF RESPONDING ORGANISATIONS	97
ANNEX B – CONSULTATION POINTS	99

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background Overview

1. The General Register Office for Scotland carries out the Census of population every 10 years in Scotland. The data collected, about the characteristics of people and households in the country, is widely used by central and local government, health boards and many other organisations to allocate resources and plan for future services.
2. In order to ensure the success of the 2011 Census, it is vital to consult with users on the content of the questionnaire and the general conduct of the Census.
3. The Spring 2007 consultation forms part of GROS' wider consultation programme. It constitutes the second of the planned three formal 12 week consultations on all aspects of the Census.
4. The consultation document set out the background to the consultation, key milestones leading to the delivery of the Census, details of consultations that have been carried out to date, findings from the 2006 Census Test, and future plans. It asked for views on a total of 16 separate consultation points although stated that comments would be accepted on all aspects of the Census.
5. This report provides a summary of responses received to the Spring 2007 Census consultation. It sets out the full range of views presented and identifies any differences in opinion between types of organisation, where appropriate. Responses are summarised by consultation point and a section of wider responses is included.

Overview of respondents

6. A total of 128 responses were received from within Business & Commercial organisations, Central Government, Community & Special Interest Groups, Local Government and Local Service Providers as well as Individuals. The responses do not include the Scottish Government itself, which was consulted separately.
7. The majority of respondents (52%) responded on behalf of organisations or groups, with the remainder responding as individuals. However, it is worth noting that many of these individuals were employed by relevant organisations or groups and that their views may therefore bring to bear important professional experience, despite not being officially on behalf of the organisation.
8. The largest numbers of organisational responses were received from Community & Special Interest Groups (22) and Local Government (21). These represented 64% of the total number of organisational responses and 34% of the total number of responses.

Summary of responses to the Consultation Points

Form Length

9. There were 57 respondents to the consultation point which asked for views regarding the number of pages of personal questions that should be included in the 2011 Census household form. In summary, just under half of respondents were in favour of four pages of personal questions. Around a quarter of respondents indicated that their preference would be for three pages of personal questions, while the remainder did not indicate in favour of either three or four pages. However, of these, most felt that the decision should be driven by key data requirements.

Housing

10. There were 57 replies to the consultation point on the Housing section of the form, which asked for views on questions relating to housing quality. The new format of the central heating question was generally commended as it provides information on the type of fuel used as well as enabling comparability with 2001. State of repairs was a question also of interest to many respondents; a small number stated a preference for this information over central heating. Although this question was deemed highly subjective, the overall feeling was that this information would still be beneficial and better than nothing at all. Suggestions were received to improve the question by providing better examples and using terminology and categories used in existing surveys. There was also demand to collect information on houses adapted for special requirements.
11. Several respondents wished information to be collected on energy efficiency via questions such as double glazing, insulation and the age of the central heating system. Many also commented on other issues such as tenure and accommodation type, with a few respondents indicating an interest in the question oncrofting.

Income

12. Sixty-three respondents expressed their views on this topic with over three quarters in favour of including an income question in the 2011 Census. Just over ten per cent provided comments against the inclusion of such a question, mainly due to concerns around confidentiality, accuracy, complexity and intrusiveness, as well as the suggestion that the information could be obtained from other sources. The remainder provided general comments without a specific view on whether or not an income question should be included.
13. Of those in favour of income, the majority preferred a household question or felt that it would be sufficiently useful if there were not enough space for a personal question on the individual form. Those with a specific preference for personal income tended to be from Central and Local Government.
14. Only a small number of respondents addressed the topics they were prepared to exclude in order to accommodate a personal question and the most common suggestions were national identity or religion of upbringing. Increasing the size of the individual form to four pages was also put forward as a solution.

Health and Care

15. There were 60 responses to the consultation point on health and care, the vast majority of which considered at least one strand of this topic area to be of high importance. Mixed views were received regarding the general health question. While some respondents found the information valuable, others considered it too subjective for practical use and suggested it be removed altogether or replaced with a more appropriate question. There was also debate as to whether or not the newly introduced 5-point scale was better.
16. The introduction of a question which identified the nature of a limiting long-term illness received strong support as it provides information not currently available elsewhere. The general demand was for the ability to separate disability from illness. It was also suggested that such a question could encompass the issue of health problems which limit day-to-day activities. However, it was acknowledged that further consideration should be given to the design of the question to ensure its categories meet user needs.
17. There was strong demand for the continued inclusion of a carers question, with the view expressed that an ageing population will mean an increasing demand for this information in the future.

Religion

18. There were 58 respondents to the consultation point on religion, most of whom were content with the proposal to drop the question which asked 'religion of upbringing'. Those in favour of its removal stated this would have little or no impact as the 'current religion' question provides sufficient information. Limited support was received to retain this question, with the argument that its inclusion leads to more accurate data on current religion, enables better service planning for those with particular religious upbringings and gives an indication of the shift in beliefs from childhood to adulthood.

Travel to work or study

19. There were 55 responses to the consultation point on travel to work or study. Considerable user requirement was shown for this question with the vast majority wishing for the continuance of a question about both work and study. It was suggested by several respondents that the question should include a tick box allowing respondents to state whether the address was for work or study. There was much less support for a question which only asked about travel to work.

Language

20. There were more responses to the language consultation point than to any other topic with 83 respondents, of whom by far the majority were in favour of collecting information on languages other than Gaelic through the Census. There was most interest in 'spoken' language but there was also support for a question based around 'proficiency or competency' in a language and in 'first and second' languages rather than the existing 'understand, speak, read, write' approach.
21. English and Gaelic were most commonly requested, although the consultation specifically asked about demand for languages other than Gaelic. Capturing information on English was thought to be particularly useful in planning service delivery for those with little or no ability in the language. For similar service planning reasons, there were requests for the inclusion of Eastern European and ethnic minority languages. A number of respondents, particularly those working with the deaf community, supported collecting data on British Sign Language.
22. The Scots language was frequently requested but polarised respondents, with others expressing the view that it should not be included, primarily because of the difficulties in defining the term. Support for Scots was predominantly from Individual respondents and was not so prevalent among Organisations.

Migration

23. There were 58 responses to the consultation point on migration, nearly all of which considered the collection of information regarding this subject to be of great importance. Many respondents felt that the more questions asked, the better, although it was noted by some that this information was sensitive and perhaps inappropriate for inclusion in the Census. The question which attracted the highest level of user demand was address one year ago, with more than a third considering it a high priority and no-one suggesting it be omitted. The next most sought after information was that on country of birth with around a quarter of respondents supporting its retention.
24. Mixed views were received on the month and year of entry question. Some respondents expressed interest in gathering this information, while several deemed the question unnecessary. The citizenship question was the least popular with only around 10% of respondents requesting inclusion, and many considering it a low priority.

Economic Activity and Socio-Economic Class (NS-SEC)

25. There were 44 responses to this consultation point with the majority indicating, with varying degrees of strength, that they were against the reduction in detail of the data collected. In particular there was strong support for retaining the questions on industry and hours worked, with concern around the drop in NS-SEC and Occupation coding quality if industry were excluded. However, there was generally less interest in the question on size of workplace and it was often stated that this would be the easiest question to drop. These findings are driven by central and local government respondents who held the strongest views and supplied over 50 per cent of the responses.

Qualifications

26. There were 56 responses received to the consultation point on qualifications, with the majority of respondents stating a clear requirement for the inclusion of this question. Almost all respondent categories indicated use of the data, with a wide range of uses being cited. Support was also received for foreign qualifications to be included in the question framework.

Second Residence and Population Definitions

27. There were 50 responses to this question, with just over 60 per cent having an interest in second residence information to varying degrees of strength. Only a small proportion indicated that this topic was a high priority for them whilst a third would make no use of the information. Respondents from Central and Local Government as well as Business & Commercial users had more interest in second residency data whilst Community & Special Interest Groups and Individuals were less concerned about its collection.
28. Very few comments were received on the proposed population definition and these generally welcomed the proposals for 'usual residents and visitors'. However some respondents did express concern that this definition may be confusing or lead to double counting.

Ethnicity

29. There were a total of 12 separate questions asked under the 'Ethnicity Consultation' heading. Information gathered in this section of the consultation will feed in to the ongoing Review of Ethnicity Classification being conducted by the Scottish Government.
30. There were a total of 77 responses to the consultation point on ethnicity. Most respondents indicated interest primarily in the topic of ethnic group; however, a fair proportion highlighted interest in both ethnic group and national identity.

31. As part of the exploration of peoples' views on national identity, respondents were asked to indicate what use they would make of data on national identity, were a separate question on this topic to be asked in the 2011 Census. It was clear from responses given to this question that there was some misunderstanding of the concept of national identity – commonly there was confusion with nationality and/or citizenship, ethnicity and country of birth. While some other respondents indicated that they would not use such data, almost half of respondents to this section said they would. Most commonly these respondents cited using the data to build a more complete picture of how people identify themselves, in conjunction with ethnic group data.
32. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they preferred the 2001 Census or the 2006 Census Test question on ethnic group. Of the 51 respondents who answered this question, just over half indicated preference for the 2006 Census Test question, although many highlighted that further development of the question was still required. Around a quarter indicated preference for the 2001 Census question, while the remainder indicated no preference for either.
33. Where preference was indicated for the 2006 Census Test question on ethnic group, respondents most commonly indicated the more detailed information/better breakdown of categories that the question yielded, as the reason why it best met their data needs. There was also support on the grounds that it did not use colour terminology, with some users strongly indicating that it was inappropriate to use colour as a descriptor of ethnicity. Those in favour of the 2001 question frequently cited comparability as the reason why it best met their data needs. Additionally, many respondents highlighted that it was important to be able to monitor discrimination on the basis of skin colour (which the 2006 Test classification would not allow) and the fact that the categories used in the 2001 question were felt to be more clear and concise.

Carrying out the Census

34. There were 62 responses received to this consultation point, which asked for views on having an internet option for completion of the Census form. There was very strong support for this facility to be made available as it offered greater convenience and accessibility, especially for young people and those with special needs. However, support was conditional on full testing and resolution of questions of data security, confidentiality and accuracy, duplicate responses and IT systems. Many respondents also stressed the importance of retaining the option of the paper form for those who prefer not to use, or do not have access to, the internet.

Gaelic Language Policy

35. This consultation point drew one of the smallest responses at 38, most of whom were generally in favour of a Gaelic policy to promote the use of the language. Roughly half gave specific suggestions as to what this should include and most of these were in favour of a Gaelic or bilingual questionnaire. A handful were satisfied with the 2001 policy and two indicated that it was unnecessary or of low priority.

36. Some respondents suggested that forms should be available in other languages (e.g. ethnic minority languages) and there were a few requests (primarily from Individuals) for the use of Scots to be encouraged similarly.

Census Outputs

37. There were 65 responses to this consultation topic and the aim most commonly identified as a priority was that outputs should be free at the point of delivery. There was also support for flexible table generation on-line, a facility for comparing 2001 and 2011 results, an effective and flexible approach to output geographies and an on-line facility for mapping and graphing of standard and user defined output. Local Government respondents, in particular, felt that flexible table generation was important.
38. The majority of respondents expressed a preference for outputs to be released on-line and indicated that they would make use of a flexible on-line table generation system. However, some also noted that pre-planned output in electronic format should be available.

Geography

39. There were 55 responses received to the consultation point on geography, most of which encouraged the adoption of an approach similar to that in 2001. Most respondents were pleased with the size of the output areas and the method of freezing the geographies and felt comparability was the priority. Harmonisation between Census and Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics geographies was sought in addition to consistency between all UK Census offices.

Other views

40. In addition to the consultation topics above, respondents were also welcome to provide wider comments on other aspects of the Census. A small number of such responses were received, with the majority commenting on the topic of sexual identity.
41. Of the 10 responses which commented on sexual identity, all but two were in favour of including a sexual identity question in the 2011 Census. The most commonly identified user need for the data was in monitoring new equalities legislation. Those against the inclusion of such a question were concerned about its intrusiveness and the accuracy of the data it could provide.
42. There was also very limited support for other questions on discrimination, number of children given birth to, individual fathers and how safe people feel in their area.

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND TO THE CONSULTATION

Background

- 1.1 The General Register Office for Scotland (GROS) currently carries out the Census of Population every 10 years in Scotland. The data collected, about the characteristics of people and households in the country, is widely used by central and local government, health boards and many other organisations to allocate resources and plan for future services. The great strength of Census data is its accuracy for small areas and the way it can link information on different characteristics, which provides a detailed picture of Scotland's people. However, the primary aim of the Census is to produce an accurate count of the population.
- 1.2 In order to ensure the success of the 2011 Census, it is vital to consult with users on the content of the questionnaire. GROS aims to collect as much of the information required by users as possible, without compromising on data quality, placing an unacceptable burden on respondents, or jeopardising the accurate count of the population. However, it will not be possible to incorporate every request. The results from this consultation will therefore help to prioritise the questions to be included, as well as informing other aspects of the design and carrying-out of the Census.

Census Consultation Programme

- 1.3 The Spring 2007 consultation forms part of GROS' wider consultation programme. The first formal consultation was held in Autumn 2004 and was intended to initiate discussions around requirements for 2011 as well as informing the questionnaire design for the 2006 Test. The process consisted of seminars in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Inverness as well as formal responses to the consultation document, a summary of which can be found on the GROS website¹.
- 1.4 Wider work has also been carried out to establish user requirements including:
- *Questionnaire Consultation (web based, 2005)* – views on the 2001 Census questions were sought on-line.
 - *Informal Consultation (2005)* – publication of two informal documents outlining GROS' proposals for Census topic content. A number of users and community members responded to these documents.
 - *Specific Events and Initiatives (2005)* – a number of events and meetings were run with particular communities to seek their views on questions and enumeration.
 - *Scots Language Consultation (2005)* – the Scots Language Resource Centre, which acts as secretariat to the Cross-party Group of the Scottish Parliament on the Scots Language, sought views on an early draft of the language question and GROS has considered the results.
 - *Review of Census Ethnicity Classifications* - the Scottish Government is undertaking an ongoing review of the 2001 Census ethnicity classification.

¹ <http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/files/autumn2004consultationreport.pdf>

- 1.5 It is intended that a final formal consultation will be conducted in advance of the 2011 Census. This is likely to deal, in particular, with Census output. Further details on all of these consultations can be accessed via the GROS website².
- 1.6 The consultation work undertaken by GROS does not stand alone. We are aware that many of our users are interested in comparable information for the whole of the UK and we therefore aim to harmonise key features of the Census with the other UK Census offices where possible. This is outlined in the Registrars General's Harmonisation Agreement³ and would include the Census questions except where there are compelling arguments for differences. The other Census offices – the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in England and Wales and the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA) – have carried out separate consultations and GROS keeps in close contact with them on the outcomes of their work.

Timetable

- 1.7 The Spring 2007 consultation document⁴ set out the key milestones to be met in the run up to the 2011 Census. This is included below for information:

Milestone	Timing
Spring 2007 Consultation Findings Published	September 2007
Evaluation of 2007 Census Test in England & Wales and Northern Ireland	Winter 2007
Topics for 2009 Rehearsal agreed	Spring 2008
Questionnaire for 2009 Rehearsal finalised	Summer 2008
Formal proposals on Census to Scottish Parliament	Autumn 2008
Census Rehearsal	Spring 2009
2011 Census Questionnaire Final draft	Autumn 2009
Parliamentary Approval of Questionnaire	Spring 2010
2011 Census	Spring 2011

- 1.8 As work to meet this timetable progresses, we will continue to consult with users and the wider public, for example through the presentation of formal proposals to the Scottish Parliament. It is likely that the Scottish Parliament will also consult on the Census legislation – the Census Order (covering the Census date, who is to be included on the Census forms and question topics) and the Census Regulations (covering the detail of how the Census will be conducted and the Census forms) – before they are approved.

Aim of this report

- 1.9 This report provides a summary of responses received to the Spring 2007 Census consultation. It sets out the range of views presented and identifies key differences in opinion between types of organisation. Responses are summarised by consultation point and a section on wider responses is included.

² <http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/census/censushm2011/consultation-and-research/index.html>

³ <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/census/pdfs/RGsAgreement.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/files1/stats/spring-07-census-consult.pdf>

CHAPTER 2: THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

Introduction

- 2.1 The Spring 2007 Census consultation was launched on 15 March 2007 and closed on 7 June 2007. In total, 128 responses were received, covering the 16 different points included in the consultation document as well as wider views.

Consultation Document

- 2.2 The consultation document set out the background to the consultation, key milestones leading to the delivery of the Census, details of consultations that have been carried out to date, findings from the 2006 Census Test and future plans.
- 2.3 It then described GROS' current working assumptions for the 2011 Census questionnaire as well as associated issues. Respondents were asked a series of questions which covered questionnaire length, topics, ethnicity, carrying out the Census and outputs. However, it was clearly stated that users were welcome to provide wider comments on other aspects of the Census. All comments and views provided have been taken into account.
- 2.4 Ethnicity was dealt with separately to the other Census topics since responses to that section of the consultation will inform the next stages of the Review of Ethnicity Classifications⁵. This review will contribute to the choice of ethnicity questions in the Census and other future surveys and is being taken forward by the Equality Scheme Implementation Group within the Scottish Government. A series of 13 questions were asked on the ethnicity section.
- 2.5 A copy of the consultation response template, including the points asked, is given in Annex B and details of the responses received are given in subsequent chapters of this report.

Promotion of the Consultation

- 2.6 GROS recognised that it was vital to ensure that the consultation reached a wide range of users. The consultation document was therefore published on the GROS website to give all interested parties the opportunity to respond. In addition, around 1,000 contacts from organisations, who had registered their interest in the Census and whose details are maintained in the GROS Census consultation database, received an email notification with links to the web pages.
- 2.7 This email notification also invited data users to a series of Census consultation meetings in Aberdeen, Glasgow, Inverness and Edinburgh. Colleagues from ONS, NISRA and the Welsh Assembly Government were also invited to attend. These meetings aimed to outline GROS' thinking around the 2011 Census and to explain the consultation process. The events were held in May 2007 and around 130 users attended. Detailed minutes of these meetings have been published on the GROS

⁵ <http://www.onescotland.com/ethnicityclassificationreview>

Census web pages⁶ and the comments have been included in this analysis of consultation responses.

- 2.8 Paper copies of the consultation document were also available and were sent to MSPs as well as to 14 organisations which requested the document in hard copy. In addition, the documents were handed out to all those who attended the consultation meetings in May.
- 2.9 The Scottish Government (SG) was not invited to submit a formal response to the consultation. GROS works closely with SG colleagues on the development of Census questions and will be taking their views into account as work on the topics progresses.
- 2.10 Thus, through the mailings, web pages, email and Census meetings, the consultation document was circulated to key stakeholders, local authorities, health boards, community groups and voluntary organisations as well as being open to the general public.
- 2.11 Submissions to the consultation were accepted through the website, via email or letter, over the phone and on paper.

Response Problems

- 2.12 During the course of the consultation, GROS was made aware of a flaw in the submission of forms through the internet and was concerned that a small number of responses may not have been received. Every effort was made to rectify this situation. Emails were circulated to the distribution list and users were advised that, if they had not received a confirmation message from GROS, they should re-submit their response via email. A message to this effect was also placed on the website. By doing so we believe that we successfully captured all of our user responses.
- 2.13 At the later analysis stage, another problem was identified with the internet submission form. It became clear that, in ethnicity question 8 which asks whether users prefer the 2001 Census or 2006 Census Test questions, the tick box for indicating that they 'Prefer the 2006 Census Test questions' was not working. If users had selected this option, the form was returned with no answer. However we were able to correctly identify users' preference by comparison with their answer to subsequent questions or by re-contacting the persons concerned. In this way we successfully resolved the problems associated with this error in the form.
- 2.14 No further problems were encountered during the consultation process.

⁶ <http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/census/censushm2011/consultation-and-research/index.html>

Responses and Respondents

- 2.15 A total of 128 responses to the consultation were received. These included structured responses on the consultation template which were received through the website, via email or on paper. Respondents were not required to provide an answer to every question on the consultation template and several more detailed responses were provided. These often focussed on one specific issue, which did not follow the consultation questions, but tended to put forward a full argument for the inclusion or otherwise of a particular question. In addition, relevant comments received at the consultation meetings in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Inverness and Glasgow were included at the appropriate consultation point.
- 2.16 GROS entered all responses into an Access database and analysed the results to each question. Full details of the approach to the analysis are given in the next chapter.
- 2.17 Responses were received from a wide variety of organisations with interests in each of the consultation points. There are no obvious gaps in the response base.

Table 2.1 Number of respondents by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Total Respondents (%)
Central Government	13	10
Local Government	21	16
Local Service Providers	6	5
Business & Commercial	3	2
Academic	2	2
Community & Special Interest Groups	22	17
Individuals	61	48
Total	128	100

- 2.18 The number of responses is presented in Table 2.1, broken down by type. This illustrates that just under half were received from individual respondents. However, it is worth noting that many of these Individuals did work for relevant organisations or groups and that their views may therefore be based on professional experience despite not being officially on behalf of the organisation.
- 2.19 Of the organisational responses, Table 2.1 shows that the majority were received from Community & Special Interest Groups (17%), Local Government (16%) and Central Government (10%). Academic, Business & Commercial and Local Service Provider respondents represented fewer than 10% of the total responses.
- 2.20 A note of the organisations who responded (and who were happy for their response to be made publicly available) is included in Annex A.

CHAPTER 3: APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS

The team

- 3.1 Two administrative staff were responsible for the collection and recording of consultation responses. These were stored using an Access database, which allowed the responses to be entered as free text and any attachments to be included. There was a separate record created for each respondent, with the fields within the records corresponding to each of the different consultation points.
- 3.2 Three statisticians were responsible for analysing the results from the consultation exercise. Analysis of each consultation point was carried out by one statistician, although procedures were established beforehand to ensure a consistent approach was adopted throughout.

Defining respondents

- 3.3 A comprehensive list of respondents was firstly agreed upon - comprising those answering the consultation by internet, paper template, email, letter, telephone, and through consultation events.
- 3.4 For those attending events who also submitted a formal consultation response – either as an individual or on behalf of an organisation – comments they raised at the event were added to the appropriate consultation point(s) within their formal response. If someone raised a comment at an event but did not submit a formal response, a new record was created and the respondent recognised as an Individual (because it was not possible to be certain that they were responding on behalf of their organisation).

Duplicate responses

- 3.5 In a small number of cases, there was more than one response submitted by the same person. Where the responses were identical, only one record was kept to avoid double counting. If the responses were different, the respondent was contacted to discuss how best to handle these responses.
- 3.6 A small number of respondents submitted identical consultation responses and were counted as multiple respondents. GROS is interested in the user demand for questions, hence it is important to measure the strength of support received for these. Such duplicate responses only accounted for a very small percentage of responses.

Categorising respondents

- 3.7 Each respondent was assigned to one of seven (GROS defined) categories. In the analysis of responses, this gave a broad indication of the variety of user interest and requirement for each of the topic areas. Any differences in response between these different types are highlighted where relevant.

- 3.8 These categories were:
- Central Government - encompassing UK departments and agencies but excluding the Scottish Government, e.g. Scottish Enterprise, Disability Rights Commission
 - Local Government – these were respondents from Local Authorities (LAs) within Scotland
 - Local Service Providers e.g. NHS Health Scotland, Lothian and Borders Police
 - Business & Commercial e.g. Demographics User Group
 - Community & Special Interest Groups e.g. Capability Scotland, British Sikh Federation
 - Academic – those associated with universities
 - Individuals
- 3.9 Table 2.1 provided the number and percentage of respondents in each category.

Analysing responses

- 3.10 Counts of respondents to each consultation point were based on the number of valid responses only. Respondents who left a consultation point blank or had written ‘no comment’, ‘no opinion’, ‘not applicable’ or ‘don’t know’ were not included in the analysis.
- 3.11 If a response was submitted which did not answer the consultation point(s) directly, it was treated as a general comment on the issue surrounding that particular consultation point.
- 3.12 However, as not all consultation points addressed every issue within a particular topic area, some respondents provided comments which were unrelated to the question(s) asked but still relevant to the topic area. These points were equally valid and are included in the appropriate chapter.
- 3.13 There was also a space at the end of the consultation document which allowed for ‘General comments’. Those received which related to existing consultation points were included under the relevant chapter. Otherwise, they were dealt with separately at the end. General comments received through emails, phone conversation, letters or consultation events were dealt with similarly.
- 3.14 Some comments were located under the wrong consultation point. These were transferred to the correct consultation point to be analysed and included in the relevant chapter as necessary.
- 3.15 Where a respondent had submitted a reply which was unclear or ambiguous, and they had indicated willingness to be approached, they were contacted and asked to clarify their response.
- 3.16 One response was received partly in English and partly in Gaelic; GROS commissioned the translation of the Gaelic element.

- 3.17 Chapters 5 to 20 summarise the findings for each of the consultation points; additional comments are detailed in Chapter 21.

Quotation of respondents

- 3.18 Verbatim quotations have been taken from the database for illustrative purposes and are shown in italics surrounded by “”. This was only done where respondents had agreed to share their responses publicly.
- 3.19 If there was a missing or incorrect word within the quote, this was added or amended as required. The new word is denoted by [].
- 3.20 Spelling and grammatical errors have also been corrected where appropriate.

Quality Assurance

- 3.21 Quality assurance underpins all statistical analysis conducted by GROS. To ensure the consultation findings were reported accurately and objectively, all consultation points were analysed at least twice by separate members of the statistical team.
- 3.22 Where any discrepancies occurred another opinion was sought and it was agreed how best to handle the response.

Factual accuracy

- 3.23 Comments received from respondents are not necessarily based on factual evidence, but on what they perceive to be true. Either way, these are all valuable inputs and are included in the analysis.
- 3.24 It is impossible to determine whether or not a respondent has fully understood the proposals set out in the consultation document. It is therefore important to note that views expressed will be subject to respondents’ interpretation. Misperceptions are sometimes important and these have been highlighted throughout the document where necessary.

Interpretation of findings

- 3.25 A wide range of users were able to respond to the consultation exercise. Its intended purpose was to give those wishing to comment an opportunity to do so. Those replying did so voluntarily, each with their own particular motivation. It should therefore be kept in mind that these views are not necessarily representative of the wider population.

CHAPTER 4: FORM LENGTH

- 4.1 Respondents to the consultation were asked to give their views about GROS' plans to have three, rather than four pages, of personal questions in the 2011 Census questionnaire.
- 4.2 There were 57 responses to consultation point on form length, which stated:

We would welcome your views about our plans to have three rather than four pages of personal questions in the 2011 Census questionnaire

Table 4.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent:

Table 4.1 Total number of respondents to the form length consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	7	12
Local Government	18	32
Local Service Provider	4	7
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	1	2
Community & Special Interest Groups	9	16
Individuals	15	26
Total	57	100

- 4.3 In summary, of the 57 respondents, just under half were in favour of four pages of personal questions. Around a quarter of respondents indicated that their preference would be for three pages of personal questions, while the remainder did not definitively indicate in favour of either three or four pages.
- 4.4 Within each of these groups, the strength of response varied somewhat. Of those who were in favour of either three or four pages, some strongly supported their chosen option, while others offered only conditional support. Most respondents who did not definitively indicate in favour of either three or four pages stated that the decision should be based solely on assessment of need, in terms of requirement for the key questions which should be asked in the Census.

Respondents in favour of four pages of personal questions

“We strongly disagree with your plans – four pages will capture significantly more individual data than three, and evidence from UK research suggests that the impact on response rate would be minimal.” (Business and Commercial)

- 4.5 Five respondents strongly supported a four page option, with the primary reason being the extra information which could be collected via four pages. Three respondents also mentioned that they were not aware of any evidence to suggest that the impact on response rate would be such as to warrant the exclusion of a fourth page of questions.

The importance of better form design, which having four pages could allow, was also mentioned. One respondent quoted the exclusion of certain questions (namely industry of occupation, hours worked, personal income and linguistic ability) which a three page option might necessitate, as a compelling reason for their support of a four page option.

- 4.6 Two of these five respondents suggested that the number of persons for whom details can be recorded on the form, could arguably be reduced (based on a continuing reduction in average household size). This would consequently reduce the pressure on the number of pages of personal questions.
- 4.7 Of the other 21 respondents who indicated support for a four page option, the most frequently quoted reason, by far, was the capacity for collecting extra (in some instances, crucial) information that four pages of personal questions would allow (or alternatively, the loss of information that three pages would imply). Other reasons given included capturing the diversity of the population and the improved formatting that would be possible (font size).
- 4.8 The five respondents who indicated conditional support for four pages indicated two main caveats. Firstly, that four pages were preferable only if the response rate was not affected and secondly, that there should be a clear identified need for the data that would be collected on the fourth page. Again, the suggestion was made to reduce the number of persons per form to four, in order to free up space for more questions.

Respondents in favour of three pages of personal questions

- 4.9 In terms of reasons for supporting a three page option, of those who offered unconditional support, some mentioned obtaining a better response rate via a shorter form. Another noted more accurate completion of shorter forms whilst one respondent deemed a three page option to be sufficient for their needs since they would be able to build similar profiles to those from the last Census.

“It is essential that a high response rate is achieved if the census results are to be meaningful. Consequently I agree that it would be preferable to keep the questionnaire to 3 pages rather than 4, even if this means the questions need to be limited.” (Central Government)

- 4.10 Of those respondents who offered conditional support for a three page option, three stated that three pages would be acceptable only if there was no effect on the quality and usefulness of the information that would be collected. One of these also mentioned their concern at the potential exclusion of what was regarded as a key question (educational attainment) if there were only three pages of questions. Another respondent indicated that they would support a three page option only if the assumption that there would be a detrimental effect on response rate if a longer form was chosen, was found to be correct. A point was also made in relation to the effect which restricting the number of pages would have on the presentation of the questionnaire. This respondent stated that they would only support three pages if factors such as font size and readability (plain English) were acceptable.

Other Responses

- 4.11 Just over 15 per cent of respondents, who did not indicate a preference for form length, indicated that they thought the decision on whether to have three or four pages of personal questions should be based primarily on an assessment of need for the additional data, rather than being judged on other factors, such as cost or acceptability.

“There is always a balance to be struck between the depth of individual data needed to enable disaggregated interpretation of Census findings, the willingness of people to fill in longer forms, the costs associated with printing, processing etc.....our preference would be that decisions on the number of pages of personal data are driven primarily by assessment of need (particularly with awareness of the Census predominance as a key information source in Scotland and other Scottish data gaps) rather than on simple costs.”
(Central Government)

- 4.12 Four respondents did not indicate any preference but did discuss the issues involved.
- 4.13 Whether in favour of three or four pages, several respondents expressed their concern about the possible exclusion of questions which they considered to be the most useful or vital. The question on negative discrimination was commonly mentioned, as were industry, hours worked, qualifications and language.

Summary – Form Length

- Just over half of all respondents indicated preference for four pages of personal questions in the 2011 Census Household Questionnaire.
- A quarter of respondents indicated preference for three pages of personal questions.
- The remaining quarter did not indicate preference for either three or four pages, with the majority commenting that a decision on this matter should be driven by key data needs.

CHAPTER 5: HOUSING

- 5.1 The housing section of the form spans one page, comprising of a number of questions on housing and other household topics. These questions are asked separately at the beginning of the form, since the answers should be the same for all members of the household.
- 5.2 The 2011 Census will continue to ask questions on accommodation type, number of rooms, tenure and type of landlord. It is extremely likely a question on the number of cars and vans will also be asked. GROS currently proposes to drop the question on the availability of household amenities (bath/shower/WC).
- 5.3 In the 2006 Census Test, the 2001 Central Heating question was adapted to ask about the fuel source of a household's central heating. There were also questions introduced on state of repair, crofting and allotments or gardens. GROS considered including questions on housing quality, such as the age of the heating system, insulation and double glazing, but considered these too complex.
- 5.4 There were 57 replies received to the consultation point on housing, which stated:

We would welcome views on the approaches to gathering information on housing quality.

Table 5.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent:

Table 5.1 Total number of respondents to the housing consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	7	12
Local Government	20	35
Local Service Provider	4	7
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	8	14
Individuals	15	26
Total	57	100*

* Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

- 5.5 The main issues raised from the collated responses are detailed below by sub-topic area.

Central Heating

- 5.6 Around 70% of respondents commented on Central Heating. Half of these were within Local Government with the remaining half consisting of other respondent categories except Business & Commercial. The majority of these wished the question

to be retained in some format, with most supporting the new 'fuel source' type question and less than 9% persons stating the information was not required at all.

- 5.7 No-one specifically requested that the old form of the question be kept and feedback on the new question design, which asked about fuel type, was generally positive. There was strong encouragement to keep a 'none' category so that those with no Central Heating can still be identified. Users were also pleased that this would allow for comparability with 2001 results. One Individual commented:

“As long as the question on fuel source allows for a response of "no central heating", this should be adequate. I think it is still important to identify inadequate heating, especially in rural areas.”

- 5.8 One respondent felt it was perhaps necessary to emphasise that people with no working heating should also select the 'none' option. Another suggested it might be useful to capture information separately on those who have non-working Central Heating systems.

- 5.9 It was noted that the new question could be used as an indicator of fuel poverty. However, some respondents suggested that this might only be powerful if income data is also available from the Census. For example, a Local Service Provider said:

“We are not persuaded that a question on fuel type alone provides a measure of fuel affordability: a question on household income would also need to be included.”

Other uses included the identification of inadequate heating and as an indicator of deprivation, especially in rural areas.

- 5.10 Although feedback was generally positive, some users did feel more work was required to get the question right. There were several suggestions for changes or improvements to be made to the question. For example:

- change the wording to 'What type of fuel does your central heating use?';
- change the category ordering so it reads from most popular to least popular;
- allow for a way of collecting information about households which only have partial heating;
- include a tick box for pre-payment meters as this is a useful proxy for fuel poverty;
- include a category for 'energy from a renewable source' since this would provide useful information on energy efficiency and carbon footprints.

- 5.11 Other respondents suggested different questions, for example one user recommended asking 'How much does it cost to heat your household?', but again, this would only be useful if used in conjunction with income data. Another user stated a preference for a question on 'What type of fuel would you like to use?'

- 5.12 One respondent thought that asking 'Do you use your heating?' might be a better indicator of heating affordability and there was also a suggestion to ask 'How many months of the year do you use your Central Heating?.'

- 5.13 One respondent suggested removing the questions on central heating completely and including a tick box for ‘no central heating’ in the state of repairs question.
- 5.14 It was noted by a few respondents that, although this information is useful, the Census might not be the most appropriate vehicle for collecting it. They suggested that surveys already in place provide sufficient data for this topic, in particular, the Scottish House Condition Survey.

State of Repairs

- 5.15 Thirty respondents commented on the State of Repairs question. Around half of these were within Local Government with the remainder from all other categories. The majority of respondents wished the question to be included with only two Business & Commercial organisations stating that this was of low priority.

- 5.16 A small number reflected the view stated by one Local Government respondent:

“Of the two additional questions proposed, on state of repair, and type of central heating, the question on state of repair is of greater priority if only one can be included.”

- 5.17 State of repairs was thought to provide valuable information on:

- Housing quality
- Availability of suitable housing for those with disabilities
- Availability of suitable housing for the elderly

- 5.18 The main concern expressed with this question, especially by those in Local Government, was its subjectivity. However, there was still a strong demand to collect such information and the overall feeling was that it was better than no question at all. A respondent from Local Government commented:

“The drawback of the proposed question on dwelling repairs is that it is self assessed and so would not be on a consistent basis.....However, self assessment questions have been used before in the Census – e.g. on limiting long term illness – with a reasonable degree of success.”

- 5.19 Many were of the opinion that the question could be improved by providing better, more explicit examples. For instance, the response below from another Local Government user, states:

“However, unsure that the current question format would give a good measure of quality and based very much on inconsistent views. Feel a list of "quality" options would give more effective answers.”

- 5.20 One respondent felt that ‘unsuitable/dangerous heating’ should be cited as an example of a major repair. Another gave suggestions of ‘minor repairs’ e.g. cracked window.

- 5.21 It was suggested that categories should be aligned with those already in use elsewhere e.g. the Scottish housing quality standard or stock condition survey. The Scottish

House Condition Survey was also highlighted as a useful vehicle for testing the question before its inclusion in the Census.

- 5.22 Other suggested improvements to the question were to:
- ask ‘likelihood of repairs being completed within the next 12 months’.
 - gather information on hearing loops and disability aid adaptations, perhaps by asking ‘Is your household adapted for...’ instead of ‘state of repairs’. It would be useful to find out how many households have been modified to suit disability needs.
 - ask about safety and security of accommodation as this may be more relevant than state of repair for assessing housing quality.
- 5.23 It was noted by a small number of respondents within Local Government that, although this information is useful, the Census might not be the most appropriate vehicle for collecting it. Surveys already in place provide sufficient data for this topic.

Household amenities

- 5.24 No-one asked for the 2001 question on household amenities (bath/shower/WC) to be retained. Of those who commented on this subject, all supported its removal and the use of space for more valuable questions.

Number of rooms

- 5.25 One respondent questioned whether number of bedrooms may be more useful than number of rooms. Another also showed an interest in this information.
- 5.26 One Local Government enquired why ‘landings’ were listed but not ‘halls’.
- 5.27 A suggestion to list conservatories in the example of a room was received. It was thought that the inclusion of these in the count of rooms will lead to a jump in figures between 2001 and 2011.

Accommodation type

- 5.28 A couple of respondents struggled to identify the distinction between ‘tenements’ and ‘purpose built flats’, and therefore felt there was no need to have separate categories for these. One of these respondents felt a ‘multi storey’ category may be of more use.
- 5.29 A Local Government respondent noted that there is still no clear category for flats which have been converted from previous commercial buildings.
- 5.30 One respondent suggested adding ‘registered croft’ as a category.

Tenure

- 5.31 There was general acknowledgement that there were problems in reporting those ‘living rent free’. A Local Government organisation suggested providing a definition

so that it is clear what this term means and another thought that there should perhaps be a separate tick box for rent (paid by housing benefits).

- 5.32 One respondent suggested including an additional category for 'Homestake' (i.e. where the owner pays for the majority of the property, with the remainder held by a registered social landlord).

Landlord

- 5.33 A small number of requests were received to change to ordering of the landlord categories so they read from most to least popular. The main concern was that SEERAD appeared too high in the list. One suggestion was for Housing Association etc. to be listed second and SEERAD placed further down the list, probably after 'private landlord or letting agency'.

Number of cars/vans

- 5.34 It was noted by a small number of respondents that the retention of a question on cars and vans is important. A Local Government organisation suggested having a write in box for the number of cars to increase space on the form.

Energy Efficiency

- 5.35 With the increasing importance of energy efficient homes there were several respondents who wished for questions on 'age of central heating system', 'double glazing', use of renewable energies and 'insulation'. A Central Government user asked:

"...why questions on insulation, age of heating system and double glazing are considered too complex to include."

- 5.36 One Local Government respondent felt including a question on renewable energy sources would be helpful and could be used as a baseline for future data collections. As mentioned in paragraph 5.10, some respondents were also interested in collecting information on renewable energy through the type (fuel source) of central heating question.

Crofting

- 5.37 A few respondents showed interest in collecting information on crofts. However, the main support was received from the Crofters Commission and comments from them included:

- A large percentage of the population of the former crofting counties live in crofting households and crofting is established in over 50% of Scotland's land area. This was thought likely to increase with the introduction of new crofting legislation.
- Crofting is of particular importance in the Highlands and Islands where it retains population in remote rural areas, which brings with it a unique social and cultural heritage. It makes an important contribution to Scotland's economy.

- There is currently no source of accurate economic and other household data regarding crofting households, this is needed for current and future policy making.
- Collection of this information was supported by many partner organisations.

Gardens

5.38 Two respondents stated they would like to see the inclusion of a question regarding access to a private or communal garden as it would provide information on access to amenity space.

Lowest Floor Level

5.39 One respondent wished for the retention of the ‘lowest floor level’ question so that high rise living could be identified.

Eating Together

5.40 One Individual suggested asking the eating together question in this section, with support for the inclusion of this question from two Local Government respondents also.

Summary - Housing

- There was general support for the new format of the central heating question and it was thought to be important to retain a ‘none’ category.
- Some support was also received for a question asking about state of repairs, although it was acknowledged that this may be too subjective and further work is required on the question design.
- Although the consultation point asked about housing quality, many respondents chose to comment on other housing topics such as accommodation type, tenure etc. Most comments suggested improvements or changes to the questions.
- A small number supported information on energy efficiency although, as there was not a specific consultation point on this issue, strength of demand is hard to measure.
- Likewise for the question on crofting, a small number wished for its inclusion, with the main expression of interest being received from the Crofters Commission.

CHAPTER 6: INCOME

- 6.1 In the consultation document, GROS acknowledged that there is a widespread demand for a question about income in the 2011 Census. Both Central and Local Government users have identified areas of need for such information at the level of geographic detail afforded by the Census.
- 6.2 Evaluation of the 2006 Census Test did not find the inclusion of a household income question to have a detrimental effect on response rates. However, there is still some evidence that such a question is problematic, for example where households are composed of unrelated adults. The aim of the consultation was therefore to assess views on whether an income question should be included in the Census.
- 6.3 A personal income question cannot be accommodated in the questionnaire without excluding other topics. For this reason GROS sought to identify whether a household question would be sufficiently useful and, if not, what topics users would be prepared to exclude to accommodate a personal question.
- 6.4 There were 63 responses to this consultation point on income, which asked:

We would welcome your views on whether or not a question on income should be included in the 2011 Census. In particular, if a personal income question takes up too much space, would a household question be sufficiently useful? If you believe a personal income question is vital, what other topics would you be prepared to exclude to accommodate it?

- 6.5 Income was therefore among those consultation topics that generated the most interest. Table 6.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent.

Table 6.1 Total number of respondents to income consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	8	13
Local Government	21	33
Local Service Provider	5	8
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	7	11
Individuals	19	30
Total	63	100

- 6.6 Of these 63 respondents, the vast majority were in favour of including an income question in the 2011 Census. For example, one Local Government respondent commented:

“We strongly support the inclusion of an income question in the 2011 Census.”

- 6.7 A number of respondents added a caveat to this view, noting that a question would be desirable only if it is sufficiently robust. Others gave their current view but noted that they would be interested in further reviewing evidence from the England & Wales 2007 Census Test which trialled a personal income question. For example, one Local Government respondent noted:

“Providing that the evidence from the trial of the personal income question in England and Wales is positive, our preference would be for a personal question.”

- 6.8 Views were more mixed on whether the question should be on the household or individual sections of the form. Users were not asked to express their overall preference for a household or individual question, rather they were simply asked if a household question would be sufficient or not. However, many did indicate that a personal question would be their preference although a household question was thought to be sufficient in most of these cases.

Personal Income

- 6.9 Around thirteen per cent of respondents (mainly from Central and Local Government) preferred a personal question and did not think a household question would be sufficient or provided no opinion on the household question. These users often had a business need for personal income data at a small area level (rather than the larger geographies available through household surveys), preferred the detailed cross-tabulations which personal income could allow or were concerned about the inaccuracy of responses which may be generated through one person replying on behalf of a household. For example:

“Information on levels of pay for different individuals is crucial for understanding the reasons for their being lower levels of income across the H&I, providing direction for [our] investment and measuring progress towards achieving higher incomes in the area...In the H&I, there is evidence to show that income is not driven by geographical location but by personal circumstances. It is therefore, vital that income is gathered on a personal basis.” (Central Government)

- 6.10 Very few respondents made specific suggestions for questions which should be excluded in order to accommodate a personal income question. The most common suggestion, from both this group and those who found a household question sufficient, was to drop the questions on national identity or on religion of upbringing. However, there were also suggestions that ethnicity, current religion citizenship, nationality, gaelic information, caring, limiting long term illness, address one year ago, organisation worked for, supervisor status and travel to work/study could be excluded (or simplified). In addition, there were suggestions that a personal income question could be accommodated by moving to a four page individual form.

- 6.11 Some housing questions were also proposed for exclusion, such as lowest floor level, amenities and housing quality. However since these would be included on the household section of the form, their exclusion would not generate any more space for a personal income question.
- 6.12 Local Government respondents, in particular, provided details of why personal income data would be preferred. Such reasons included:
- it would allow more detailed cross-tabulation with other individual Census variables such as age, gender, disability, ethnicity, employment status, hours worked and accommodation;
 - household income values could be generated from the banded individual level data (although some work would be required to do so);
 - it would increase the quality of responses;
 - it would help to identify benefit take up and any issues associated with low pay;
 - it could be used in targeting services and investments;
 - it would come closer to measuring individual deprivation.
- 6.13 There were also some general comments from Local Government respondents about its usefulness in resource allocation and in identifying disadvantage.

Household Income

- 6.14 Over half of the respondents preferred a household question or would find it sufficient if a personal question took up too much space.

“Such a question – preferably individual-based, but at a minimum relating to household income – would be a desirable addition...”

(Local Service Provider)

“The two main relationships I would be interested in are a) between personal income and vehicle ownership / availability and b) personal income and location and mode of travel to work or study. However the relationship between household income and these choices should be sufficient for my needs.” (Individual)

- 6.15 In a few instances it was noted however, that personal income would afford a deeper understanding of income issues. On the other hand, there were also comments in preference of household income, particularly if there was a risk that a personal income question could reduce response rates. For example:

“...the most important thing is to get a question on income and we would be prepared to accept a question on household income if that proves to be the better question in terms of response and design of the Census form. Testing a household question in Scotland and a personal income question in England & Wales will be a useful way of helping to decide which question(s) on income will prove the most successful.” (Local Government)

6.16 One Community & Special Interest Group felt that *“household income may be more readily comparable to other sources than personal income”*, with others supporting this view. In addition, it was commented that household income would be a better indication of living standards, affluence or deprivation since earnings are often unequal between partners. These views were more commonly expressed by Individuals as well as Community & Special Interest Groups and in these instances users stressed that, if a personal question were asked, it would be important to be able to aggregate the output to household level.

6.17 Two respondents who would find a household question sufficient (one Individual and one Local Government respondent) specifically commented on the possible intrusiveness of a personal income question. For example:

“Too much emphasis on financial detail or reason to complain about intrusive questioning could lead to problems of non-compliance.” (Individual)

6.18 Respondents who would be satisfied with household income also gave some indication of the uses they would make of income information, which included:

- to identify disadvantage as evidence in public sector equalities duties;
- to determine the affordability of housing and housing need;
- to target service delivery at areas where people are identified as living in poverty;
- to monitor area based deprivation and affluence;
- to cross-tabulate results with reference to other factors such as age and the number of people in the household (although there was recognition that less cross-tabulations will be available than if personal income were included);
- to analyse links between income, car ownership and propensity to travel;
- to examine the profile of criminality or victimisation by income levels;
- general links to access, fuel poverty, disability and social inclusion;
- to investigate the relationship between poverty and disability.

Identified problems with current household question

6.19 There was some discussion by respondents of problems with the household income question as it currently stands. These reflected many of the issues already identified by GROS in the consultation document and included:

- it may result in inaccurate and unreliable information from problems with unrelated adults and others being unwilling to reveal their income;
- calculating gross household income including benefits may be too complex for a self completion questionnaire;
- cash in hand details are likely to be withheld from respondents calculation of total household income.

6.20 However, in relation to the fact that this question had the lowest item response rate in the 2006 Test, one Local Government respondent did note that:

“We believe that with publicity and advice from enumerators this item response rate could be significantly improved.”

No specific preference

- 6.21 Nine respondents were generally in favour of including an income question in the Census but had no strong view as to whether that should be at an individual or household level. These respondents noted that any question may be answered inaccurately and that there may be resistance issues around persons who did not wish to disclose their income. One felt that both questions may be necessary and commented:

“I think the Census should distinguish between households who share their income and groups of accommodation-sharing adults who don’t, then use household income questions for the former and individual income questions for the latter.” (Individual)

- 6.22 A small number of respondents (less than 10 per cent) did not indicate a specific preference for or against an income question but made some general comments including:

- the fact that the inclusion of such a question does not seem to deter response was viewed positively;
- issues of confidentiality and accuracy were discussed;
- the suggestion that other new measures such as the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation make a Census question less essential;
- any decision should take account of the availability of administrative data and information on deprivation and social justice as well as how long the data will remain relevant and useful for decision making.

Responses against the inclusion of an income question

- 6.23 A small number of respondents (just over 10 per cent), either Individuals or from Local Government and Business & Commercial organisations, expressed the view that an income question is not necessary. The reasons for this tended to be around the issues, already identified, of confidentiality between household members and the complexity of gathering and calculating all of the different sources of income. There was also the suggestion that the information could be gathered from other sources, for example through the Inland Revenue. In addition, there were comments about the intrusiveness of any type of income question and the suggestion that a self-completion questionnaire is not the best place to gather this data. For example:

“Income would be nice to have, however the cost of including (in terms of other questions not asked) would probably be too great. Income can be modelled from other sources and so is not essential. We also believe that it would be very difficult to get accurate answers as people will answer it in different ways.” (Business & Commercial)

Proposed question improvements

- 6.24 As well as providing answers to the specific questions in the consultation point, some users made suggestions for ways in which an income question could be improved. These included:
- expand the upper bandings (currently the highest band is ‘over £52,000’), for example: *“Income is a high priority topic, provided that the question ranges are not too heavily skewed to low incomes.”* (Business & Commercial);
 - develop a question which distinguishes between earned income and benefits;
 - base an individual question on bandings derived from benefit thresholds e.g. income support;
 - move to a write in box for exact income to gain more detailed analysis;
 - include a tick box option to indicate ‘no income’;
 - include ‘gross income’ in the question as further clarification;
 - provide an option for residents to identify where they have been unable to include their income;
 - collect data on sources of income.
- 6.25 One Business & Commercial respondent noted that harmonisation and the delivery of consistent results across the UK should be an important consideration. There was also the suggestion from a few users that individual income information could be sought from other Government Departments rather than collected in the Census. One Individual suggested that income could be imputed from information on occupation to avoid asking sensitive questions.
- 6.26 Another Individual respondent suggested a new question around disposable income rather than total income, which they felt could be of greater interest and could identify situations where income may be stressed.

Summary - Income

- There still exists strong demand for a question on income to be included in the 2011 Census.
- Respondents tended to prefer a personal income question but most indicated that a household question would be sufficient if there were not space on the individual form.
- There are some concerns around the quality of income data collected via a self-completion survey.
- There were several suggestions that the upper income bands should be expanded to better capture affluence.

CHAPTER 7: HEALTH AND CARE

- 7.1 The Census in 2001 asked questions on general health and limiting long-term illness and disability. As there is still a strong requirement to collect this information, GROS proposes to retain both these questions, but with slight amendments. In particular, the general health question will move from a 3-point to a 5-point scale. An extended question on nature of disability or long-term illness is under consideration for inclusion, but is dependent on available space. Care is still considered a high priority and is likely to be asked in 2011.
- 7.2 There were 60 replies received to the consultation point surrounding health and care which asked:

We would welcome your views on the proposed changes to the questions on health and care. Would an extended question on limiting long-term illness which identifies specific conditions add value to your use of the Census data? Do you consider that the question on care should be high priority?

Table 7.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent.

Table 7.1 Total number of respondents to the health and care consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	7	12
Local Government	21	35
Local Service Provider	4	7
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	8	13
Individuals	17	28
Total	60	100

- 7.3 Overall, there was considerable support for the inclusion of questions which gathered information on health and care. These were found to provide useful information for service planning, monitoring service delivery, policy making and gaining an understanding of social factors. It is thought that demand for this information will increase due to an ageing population.

Carers

- 7.4 The question which generated the most support was that of carers. Many respondents were in favour of continuing to include this question, with one from within Local Government stating:

“We believe that a significant proportion of our population undertakes ‘unpaid care’ and we would welcome a question which seeks to ascertain who undertakes it and to what degree.”

- 7.5 As well as the reasons mentioned above, this information was thought to be important as:
- caring duties may lead to social exclusion;
 - caring duties may result in limited economic activity;
 - it is important to identify child carers and collect more information on them;
 - in some areas, particularly rural communities, there is likely to be dependence on community service by those requiring care.
- 7.6 A couple of respondents wished to gain information on the relationship between the person receiving care and the carer.
- 7.7 A suggestion was received to have 35 hours as one of the categories on number of hours of care given as this is the cut off point for carers allowance.
- 7.8 There were a few respondents who considered information on carers to be of low importance. One respondent felt that priority should be given to questions for which there is a legal obligation to collect information, such as disability.

Limiting long-term illness / disability

- 7.9 The extended limiting long-term illness question, which asked respondents to identify particular health conditions, also received strong support. However, many felt that two separate questions were required; one on long term illness and one on disability.
- 7.10 The introduction of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) has led to an increased requirement for the collection of disability information. The Act gives public authorities a statutory duty to promote equality of opportunity for disabled people. Such information is important for issues surrounding policy making, resource planning or allocation, measuring service provisions and their outcomes and to encourage and inform others of services provided.
- 7.11 One Central Government respondent commented:
- “...there is a statutory duty on GROS, the Executive and other data users to promote equality of opportunity for disabled people. This, along with the attendant duties on race and gender should be seen as being “givens” on which accurate data must be collected.”*
- 7.12 The importance of collecting information on those with visual or hearing impairments and psychological conditions was emphasised. Details on whether a disability is physical or non-physical was also requested.
- 7.13 However, it was also acknowledged that people with such conditions may not necessarily think of themselves as ‘disabled’ and find this terminology insulting.

7.14 There were many problems identified with the extended limiting long-term illness question proposed. The comment below, from a Local Government organisation, was similar to several others received:

“While the information in the Census on limiting long-term illness is the only readily accessible source on small area statistics about disability and incapacity, its usefulness is reduced by the fact that it is unclear what conditions are being included.”

7.15 Common issues with this question were:

- concern about the practical value of data generated from such a self-disclosed question;
- having mixed approaches to defining disability is unhelpful and suggestions were received to model the question design on definitions set by the DDA;
- the wording does not necessarily imply that recently diagnosed respondents whose conditions are likely to last 12 months or more should identify these conditions;
- there is no indication as to the severity of a condition. However, it was acknowledged that this might be too subjective;
- a stronger definition of terms is required e.g. ‘emotional problem’ and it may be useful to list specific conditions.

7.16 Some respondents felt that the extended question was not required as sufficient information was obtained from the shorter one. Generally, people supported the wording used in the 2001 shorter question for comparability.

7.17 Several suggestions were received to integrate the shorter question into the extended one, particularly as it is important to identify conditions which limit day to day activities.

7.18 One request was received to include a question which asked length of illness due to intentional injury incurred at home.

General Health

7.19 Mixed views were received regarding the general health question. While some respondents found this information valuable, others considered it too subjective for practical use and not a reliable indicator for demand on health services, as was its intended purpose. For example, a Local Government respondent said:

“...I would query whether it truly reflects an individual’s actual health and the demands they put, or might put, on the health service.”

7.20 Generally, respondents felt that the 5-point scale provided consistency with other UK departments and still allowed for broad comparability with 2001. However, it was noted that difficulties may be encountered when trying to distinguish between categories such as ‘good’ and ‘very good’ and retaining the 3 point scale would enable direct comparability.

7.21 There was a suggestion that this question be replaced with one asking ‘How many times have you contacted your GP/hospital/NHS24 within the last 12 months?’

Summary – Health and Care

- There is high user demand for a question on Carers.
- General support was found for an extended question on limiting long term illness, although it was suggested that the question design needs further work.
- There was strong demand for the inclusion of a question on disabilities.
- However, views on general health were mixed. Some found it useful whilst others thought it was too subjective. There were also differing opinions on the move to a 5-point scale.

CHAPTER 8: RELIGION

- 8.1 The 2001 Census in Scotland asked two questions on religion, one on current religion and one on religion of upbringing. Given the demand for space on the form, GROS currently proposes to exclude the question on religion of upbringing as this, and its relation to current religion, are unlikely to have changed greatly since 2001. This will also be in line with the one question asked in England and Wales.
- 8.2 There were 58 replies received to the consultation point surrounding religion which asked:

What impact would dropping the question on religion of upbringing have for you or your organisation? If you think this is still a priority, what other topic would you be prepared to exclude to accommodate this question?

Table 8.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent.

Table 8.1 Total number of respondents to the religion consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	6	10
Local Government	19	33
Local Service Provider	3	5
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	1	2
Community & Special Interest Groups	11	19
Individuals	15	26
Total	58	100

Strength of support for religion of upbringing

- 8.3 There was strong support to exclude this question from the 2011 Census, with the majority of respondents stating its removal would have little or no impact on them or their organisation. Many commented that they had not made much use of the 2001 information.
- 8.4 It was felt that a question on current religion would provide sufficient information for this topic area. Although, one Individual said they were only happy to exclude the question if greater disaggregation of current religion was published.
- 8.5 Another Individual commented:

“The question on religion seems to me to be dated, in our modern society there are so many issues that need to be prioritised now...”

Preferences were stated for questions on income, health and care and language.

8.6 A small number of respondents stated that the data on religion of upbringing was useful and interesting but did not consider it a priority for inclusion. For example, an Individual respondent felt:

“Religion of upbringing is a nicety.”

8.7 Some support was received for the retention of this question. It was considered useful because it:

- allows for a truer reflection of ‘current religion’; otherwise people may state their ‘religion of upbringing’ although they are not currently practicing, thus leading to inaccurate figures. A response from one Local Government organisation stated:

“The existence of a question on religion of upbringing improves the quality of response to the question on current religion. Elimination of the religion of upbringing question would require a clear statement with the question on current religion, i.e. that current religion is asked for, irrespective of religion of upbringing.”

- enables effective service planning for those with a particular religious upbringing and preference for culturally specific services. As recognised by one respondent from a Community & Special Interest Group:

“...religion is part and parcel of their way of life...”

- provides an indication of the shift in religious belief from childhood to adulthood.
- would allow the impact of this on equal opportunities to be measured.
- may be required as part of the equality legislation under the Public Sector Duty.

General comments about religion

8.8 Some respondents also offered reasons why it was important to retain at least one question which gathered information on religion. It was felt that this would provide essential information to:

- allow service provision for health, social care and education as these services are all affected by religious diversity;
- monitor religion related victimisation;
- gain knowledge of society as religion is an indicator of attitudes and values;
- inform organisations of equality issues;
- monitor demographic changes within faith groups.

- 8.9 Some suggested changes and comments regarding the question were also received. These were:
- re-word the question to identify with those people who have ‘beliefs’ and ‘faiths’ as well as those with ‘religions’. This would include an option for ‘Other faith / belief’ or simply ‘Other’.
 - include a tick box for ‘Pagan’. Although another respondent felt this was unnecessary as they did not view it as a major world faith and the information can be captured by the write in box.
 - introduce a tick box for ‘Baha’i Faith’.
 - have ‘Agnostic’ and ‘Atheist’ categories along with ‘None’.
 - have a small area only for write in answers to save space.
 - stick to the wording used in the 2001 question.
 - give careful consideration to the order of the questions. A respondent felt that religion should be kept separate from ethnicity so it is not influenced by perceptions of those answers.
- 8.10 One respondent wished for a further question ‘Are you a practising member of your religion?’ to be asked, to better capture this information.

Other comments

- 8.11 Two Individuals regarded asking a religion question to be an invasion of privacy.
- 8.12 Some users felt that it was of greater importance to have a question which generates meaningful data than one which is consistent with 2001.
- 8.13 Others stated that a harmonised question which would allow UK comparability would be appreciated. This was not the case in 2001, however, this issue was raised by a very small number of respondents and is not especially representative of the overall views.

Summary - Religion

- There was strong support to exclude the question on religion of upbringing as current religion will provide sufficient information. There was limited user demand for the question on religion of upbringing to be retained.
- It was generally agreed that it is important to have a religion question of some form in the Census.

CHAPTER 9: TRAVEL TO WORK OR STUDY

- 9.1 In 2001, the Scottish Census asked respondents to answer a question on their method of travel to work or study. There is some concern that including travel to study has a negative impact on the quality of travel to work data, particularly for those who do both. However, GROS considers there to be a strong requirement for information on travel to study and intend to ask a combined question again in 2011.
- 9.2 There were 55 replies received to the consultation point on travel to work or study which asked:

Do you think that we should continue to ask a combined question on travel to work or study? Or should we only ask about travel to work (asking two separate questions is unfeasible on space grounds)?

Table 9.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent.

Table 9.1 Total number of respondents to the travel to work or study consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	5	9
Local Government	21	38
Local Service Provider	5	9
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	6	11
Individuals	15	27
Total	55	100*

* Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

- 9.3 Respondents considered information on method of travel to be important for a variety of reasons. It is used as a predictor for traffic flows and congestion, to inform transport planning and modelling, for policy making and environmental issues such as climate change.

Travel to work or study

- 9.4 The majority of respondents wished for a combined question on travel to work or study since it is the volume of travel which is required for planning purposes and this data will provide a fuller picture. Travel to study is generally considered to be as pertinent to the above mentioned issues as travel to work, with one Individual noting that travel to work and study are both economically important.

- 9.5 It was also pointed out that particular areas of the country have a large student population meaning vital information would be lost by asking travel to work only. One particular Individual responded:

“Yes – so many people are studying. Excluding them means our travel data are grossly incomplete.”

- 9.6 Travel to study was identified to be a valuable source of other information as described by one Local Government respondent:

“We would strongly support the continuation of the question on travel to work and study. The analysis which we have done on travel to study shows that the means of travel patterns for travel to study are quite different from the means to travel to work. Travel to study is a major component of all travel trips and a cause of congestion at peak times. It also provides better information on the day time population. Campaigns to encourage children to walk or cycle to school can also use this information to find out the current means of travel to different schools.”

These views were shared by numerous other data users, mainly within other Local Government departments.

- 9.7 Several respondents stated a clear need for comparability with 2001 and did not want to lose this by asking a question which gathered information on travel to work only.
- 9.8 However, many respondents suggested amending the current question to include a tick box which would identify whether the address they were referring to was study or work. A few stated that they would only accept a combined question if this was the case.

Travel to work

- 9.9 There was some demand to drop study from the question. Several respondents deemed information on travel to work essential but travel to study of little or no use.
- 9.10 It was also thought that, by asking both, the question could lead to confusion, especially for those who study and work, hence compromising data quality.
- 9.11 These points were summarised in the response below, received from a Business & Commercial user:
- “Travel to work is vital. Travel to study adds little value, was asked only in Scotland (not UK-wide), and caused confusion amongst some respondents last time”*
- 9.12 One respondent felt it was unreliable due the short term and cyclical nature of study. Another thought it was irrelevant as most places of study are local to the individual.
- 9.13 Two respondents specifically requested a question on travel to work only as this would enable comparability with England and Wales.

9.14 It was suggested by one respondent that students who also work should provide travel to work information as they play an important role in the economy. Only if a student does not work should they supply travel to study information.

Recommended changes to question design

9.15 Some proposed improvements to the question were also given:

- allow respondents to select more than one method of travel;
- re-order the categories so it reads most to least popular; underground is not a popular option for Scotland whereas travel by car (either as a driver or passenger) should be placed higher up the list;
- include a category for 'Ferry';
- include a text box for the 'Other' category;
- insert categories so people who are unemployed/retired/etc. can identify themselves;
- highlight that it is the main journey which is of interest;
- ask about length (in time) or distance to work or study address.

Summary – Travel to work or study

- The vast majority of respondents wished for the continuation of a combined question on travel to work or study as valuable information would be lost by asking travel to work only.
- However, suggestions were also received to include a tick box which would enable respondents to identify whether the address given is that for work or study.
- There was some demand to remove travel to study from the question. These respondents thought that this data was not essential and would cause confusion for those with work and study addresses.

CHAPTER 10: LANGUAGE

10.1 GROS is aware of a number of different requests for the Census to collect information on language. However, meeting all of the requirements would take up a lot of space on the Census questionnaire. The 2006 Test attempted to address this by including an experimental question in matrix format but the results suggested that respondents may have difficulty completing the question correctly and that the quality of information collected may be unacceptable.

10.2 It is certain that the 2011 Census will collect information on Gaelic. However, given the matrix issues noted above, a simpler language question may need to be developed to capture the others or space constraints may mean that other languages cannot be included. This consultation therefore sought to identify the strength of need for information on other languages as well as the aspects of language in which users are interested. It asked:

- *Do you consider that information on languages other than Gaelic should be a priority for the Census?*
- *If so, what aspects of language should be gathered?*
- *If a comprehensive question cannot be accommodated, would a simpler question be better than nothing?*
- *What languages are you interested in?*

10.3 There were 83 responses to this section of the consultation (a particularly high figure) and Table 10.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent.

Table 10.1 Total number of respondents to language question by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	8	10
Local Government	20	24
Local Service Provider	4	5
Business & Commercial	3	4
Academic	2	2
Community & Special Interest Groups	14	17
Individuals	32	39
Total	83	100*

* Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

10.4 Responses to each part of this consultation question are dealt with separately below. Since it is certain that information on Gaelic will be collected in the 2011 Census, this section focuses on the demand for other language data.

Requirement for language information

10.5 Respondents were asked whether they viewed the collection of information on languages other than Gaelic to be a priority for the Census. Of the 83 respondents, by far the majority were in favour of collecting information on languages other than Gaelic through the Census. Eighty-two per cent (68 persons) of respondents expressed this view, for example one Central Government organisation commented that they:

“Support the collection of data on the degree of language mix in Scotland, as providing useful information on the linguistic environment in which Gaelic development operates.”

10.6 Most respondents were agreed that information from the language question would help to inform service planning and delivery; investment; the provision of literature / communications; and translation services. There was also interest in language as a proxy for ethnicity, particularly for new migrants who are not distinguished by the ethnicity question.

10.7 Other uses included:

- establishing a baseline profile of language skills and needs;
- English proficiency as an indicator of integration;
- identify disadvantage resulting from language ability;
- to help public bodies meet their statutory duties under the Race Relations Act;
- promotion of cultural languages.

10.8 Of the remainder, less than 15 per cent did not think languages other than Gaelic were a priority or only stressed the importance for continuity with the Gaelic question from 2001. In particular, Business & Commercial respondents did not view this information as a priority, one noted that language is:

“difficult to question, and country of birth and ethnic group are sufficient indicators.”

10.9 The small remaining number of respondents (less than 5 per cent) did not express a particular preference for or against the collection of language information. Instead, they made general comments about the possible usefulness of language information or commented on the format and content of the question.

Aspects of Language

10.10 The majority of the 83 respondents provided information on the aspects of language that they felt should be gathered. Speaking ability was the most commonly returned answer, closely followed by reading, writing and understanding. These skills were often listed in combination and several respondents highlighted all four aspects as was used in the 2006 Test question. It was noted on occasion that possession of these abilities is a subjective matter and one person’s interpretation may differ from another’s. There was also a suggestion that this list could be expanded to cover how and where the language is used, for example whether at home or in the workplace.

10.11 Also commonly requested was information on the proficiency or level of ability of the respondent, for example basic, proficient and fluent, which would allow greater distinctions to be drawn between the different languages people use. One Local Government respondent noted:

“Ability in language, either picked up in a natural or classroom environment, usually comes from learning in a combination of ways; reading, writing, listening and speaking. Therefore, dividing knowledge in this manner may not be useful. Perhaps a more useful categorisation would be by ability: basic, proficient, fluent. This may be subjective but so is e.g. speaking; you can speak a language without necessarily knowing a lot of vocabulary.”

10.12 Another frequent suggestion was to focus on the respondent’s first and / or second language, preferred language or dominant language. Linked to this were a small number of respondents who felt that the question should focus on ability in English and capture other main languages where English was not dominant. For example, a Local Service Provider commented that:

“Those unable to communicate in English require special services; those able to communicate in English do not (or do so to a much lesser degree) regardless of their first language.”

10.13 These patterns in language aspects requested were observed across all respondent groups.

10.14 Other suggestions were each put forward by a very small number of respondents and these included:

- include use of BSL and other sign languages;
- focus on communication rather than, or in addition to, language e.g. ‘what is your preferred language or communication method?’;
- capture instances where people have communication support needs i.e. if they need language support to access public services and if so, what support?;
- collect information on the frequency with which the language is used as well as other aspects;
- allow space to write in special skills, such as translation and tuition, or qualifications obtained in the language.

10.15 Bord na Gaidhlig were particularly interested in additional questions on Gaelic, specifically around how many persons were raised, or are being raised, with Gaelic in the home. This data would help Gaelic development by providing information on the numbers of persons who are raised as native speakers and of those who have come to Gaelic as learners, two groups with different needs. It would also *“reveal the impact of the emphasis placed by the National Plan for Gaelic, which has been agreed by the Scottish Ministers, on the increasing number of users of Gaelic and also of Gaelic as the “mother tongue of an increasing number of speakers””*.

- 10.16 A few users suggested removing the ‘no ability’ tick box or, if it is retained, moving it to the first column to ensure that this information is captured. The idea behind removing this tick box was that, if no other boxes are ticked for a particular language, then it should be assumed that the person has no ability. One user specifically stated that the ‘no ability’ tick box should be retained.
- 10.17 Others felt that the information, on any language, from the matrix style question would be unreliable and providing a write in box would be a much more sensible approach.

Simple Language Question

- 10.18 Less than a fifth of respondents directly answered the consultation point on whether a simple question would be better than nothing if a comprehensive language question cannot be accommodated. However it should be noted that, in the discussion of aspects above, a number of suggestions were made to improve the question and respondents may have felt that, where they provided these suggested changes, the question on simplification was not relevant.
- 10.19 All but two of these respondents indicated that a simplified question would be better than nothing. There were suggestions around spoken language, for example, ‘what language do you speak at home or what is your first language?’. Others commented that more write in boxes could be provided for coding post-collection.
- 10.20 Of the remaining two respondents, one was unsure whether a simplified question would be better than nothing whilst the other, a Community & Special Interest Group, noted that:

“The comprehensive question is much better than a simplified question on language, since it enables different facets to be considered, e.g. spoken, read, write, etc.”

- 10.21 Another Local Government user noted that they felt a matrix-style question could still be developed with further testing:

“We think that a matrix question as used in the test could work with the inclusion of English, Scottish Gaelic and other (please write in main).”

Languages of Interest

- 10.22 Around 80 per cent of the 83 respondents listed the languages which they are interested in. English and Gaelic were most commonly requested. However, it is difficult to gauge whether the demand for Gaelic is underestimated, since the question specifically asked about other priority languages. Many of those who did request Gaelic information stressed the need for continuity with the 2001 question and there was concern that including a matrix style language question would affect this comparability.

10.23 The demand for English generally resulted from the need to plan service delivery for those with little or no ability in the language, both within the general population and new migrants. One Central Government respondent commented that:

“Given the recent influx of in-migrants from Eastern Europe to the H&I area, the other language that [we] recommend as a priority for the Census is English. A lack of English language skills is frequently identified as a barrier for Eastern Europeans to progressing in the labour market.”

10.24 Similarly, a Local Government user noted:

“Migrants and residents who cannot communicate in English are at a distinct disadvantage and integration into the community is hindered. With knowledge of if or where this problem occurs, assistance could be offered.”

10.25 For similar reasons, demand for English and Gaelic was closely followed by requests for Eastern European languages (particularly Polish) as well as the languages of migrant workers and minority ethnic languages such as Urdu, Punjabi, Hindi, Cantonese, Chinese, Arabic and Bengali. One respondent cautioned against including Eastern European languages since current trends in migration from these countries may not be sustained.

10.26 The Scots language was next most frequently requested but polarised respondents, with some users (just under half the number who wanted to include the language) also directly suggesting this should be excluded. Those who were in favour of collecting this information commented on the fact that there are no existing statistics on the Scots language available and that it would offer enhanced information on the Scottish culture. In a few cases attention was also drawn to the SNP manifesto commitment to a Scots language question.

10.27 However they also often included caveats, for example:

“we accept that there is a strong lobby for inclusion of this item and if there is to be a question on languages, in addition to Gaelic, we would therefore support its inclusion although we are very doubtful of the value of the results.”
(Local Government)

and:

“If other languages are to be included explicitly then Scots should probably be there also, although we have considerable misgivings as to the existence of any commonly accepted understanding of the term ‘Scots’ qua language.”
(Local Government)

10.28 Just under a tenth of respondents preferred not to include the Scots language in this question. One organisation with this view did not expect to make any practical use of the data. Another Individual noted that it *“can be quickly learned by a native English speaker, to comprehension level at least”*. Others commented on the difficulty in defining the Scots language.

- 10.29 There was also support for the inclusion of sign language / BSL, particularly from those organisations working with the deaf community. It was noted that BSL is more widely used than Gaelic in Scotland and is an indigenous language which should therefore be recognised in the Census. These respondents often noted that the aspects of language currently considered would have to be amended to include BSL, perhaps by adding signing to the list of skills.
- 10.30 Only a handful of users suggested other European or UK languages such as French, Spanish, Welsh, Irish or Cornish (although these could possibly be added to the example list under ‘other’) and only one Individual suggested including African languages such as Lingala, Kiswahili and Sylheti.
- 10.31 In a few instances, users did not specifically state the languages they would like to see included but were interested in:
- first and second languages;
 - all languages through a balance of tick boxes and write ins;
 - languages spoken in the local area;
 - the languages most widely spoken in Scotland.

Differences in languages requested between response categories

- 10.32 Support for the inclusion of the Scots language came predominantly from Individual respondents and was not so prevalent among other organisations.
- 10.33 Similarly, Central and Local Government were more interested in English and Eastern European languages than the other respondent categories, particularly from the perspective of service provision.
- 10.34 Minority ethnic languages were most likely to be requested by Community & Special Interest Groups and Individuals.

Summary - Language

- The language consultation point generated more responses than any other section of the consultation.
- By far the majority of respondents were in favour of collecting information on languages other than Gaelic through the Census.
- Users were interested in ‘spoken’ language but there was also demand for a question based around ‘proficiency or competency’ in a language and in ‘first and second’ languages.
- English and Gaelic were most commonly sought. There were also requests for Eastern European and ethnic minority languages and British Sign Language.
- The Scots language was frequently requested but polarised respondents with others expressing the view that it should not be included, primarily because of the difficulties in defining the term. Support for Scots was predominantly from Individual respondents and was not so prevalent among other respondent types.

CHAPTER 11: MIGRATION

11.1 GROS acknowledges that migration is a topic which provides valuable information on population trends and demographic profiles. It is likely that questions on country of birth and address one year ago will continue to be asked in 2011. Since migration is a topic of increasing policy importance, GROS is considering whether to ask a question on month and year of entry into the UK in order to improve the monitoring of international migration. GROS feels that entry to the UK would better meet user need than entry to Scotland only. Citizenship / nationality is another possible question and is asked by most other European countries. However, this does not appear to be a priority in Scotland.

11.2 There were 61 replies received to the consultation point on migration which asked:

What are your priorities for migration information from the Census? What are your views on the collection of information on citizenship?

Table 11.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent.

Table 11.1 Total number of respondents to the migration consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	7	11
Local Government	21	34
Local Service Provider	3	5
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	1	2
Community & Special Interest Groups	8	13
Individuals	18	30
Total	61	100

11.3 Strong support was received for the inclusion of questions on migration. This data was thought to provide useful information for population estimation, measuring outflows and inflows to an area, tracking the demographic change of the population and service provision. Many respondents wished for as much information as possible regarding this topic. For example, one Local Government respondent commented:

“It is beneficial to see the demographic profile for areas, the more information the better the profile.”

Address one year ago

11.4 Address one year ago was the migration question which generated the highest user demand. Over one third of respondents supported its retention and no-one requested it be omitted.

11.5 Many found it useful for identifying recent within-UK and between-country migration patterns. One Local Government organisation summarised that this question:

“...provides information on macro-level migration to and from Highland as well as migration within Highland”

11.6 The data was also found to be a useful indicator of enrolment to local schools for those in areas of new housing developments.

11.7 There were a small number of suggested changes to the question, including:

- ask only for the postcode of the previous address, with a text box for those who lived outwith the UK to identify their country;
- eliminate the ‘no usual address one year ago’ category or seek an indication of the non-usual address;
- offer a tick box for migrants to identify if they were students a year ago;
- consider asking for additional information e.g. to identify whether the respondent made a move from the private rented to the public sector or became an owner-occupier.

11.8 One respondent also noted that they require better information on mobility between private houses and communal establishments etc.

Country of birth

11.9 Country of birth was the next most requested question. More than a quarter of respondents felt the inclusion of this question was a high priority as it provided information on longer term migration. However, two respondents, both within Local Government, stated the data had been of limited use.

Date of entry

11.10 There was also strong support, mainly from Individuals and Local Government representatives, for a question on month and year of entry. It was thought this would provide useful information on intermediate and seasonal migration trends which could not be addressed by the other questions. One Individual commented:

“The 2001 census included two broad indicators by which migration status could be determined: country of birth and address one year ago. The latter is essential for identifying recent migrants, the [former] for more long-term migrants and return migrants...What the existing questions do not allow us to do is to differentiate migrants according to their length of stay in Scotland...A question like this would give us much more detailed understanding of contemporary migration patterns in Scotland, which is especially important given the current increase in net migration. It would also allow us to differentiate those who actively chose to migrate as adults from those who came to Scotland involuntarily as children.”

11.11 A small number of respondents considered this information to be more beneficial than address one year ago.

11.12 However, there were mixed views on whether the question should ask entry date to the UK or Scotland. The slight majority thought UK information would be sufficient whilst others stated a clear need for specific migration information for Scotland, such as the Local Government respondent who stated:

“It is felt that migration to Scotland is of interest, in order to ascertain what proportion of people move directly to Scotland & what proportion subsequently relocate.”

11.13 A few respondents suggested asking entry dates for both UK and Scotland, although they did recognise the restriction on space.

11.14 A small number of suggestions were received to ask year of entry only as month did not add value and was possibly too intrusive. However, others pointed out that month is important for identifying seasonal workers.

11.15 Several respondents deemed the inclusion of this question unnecessary as they felt it would provide no added value. One respondent suggested using existing administrative records to access this information.

Citizenship

11.16 A question on citizenship was generally regarded to be of little use and considered low priority. The main reasons for this were:

- it would generate unusable data as it did not deal with issues such as dual nationality;
- incorrect answers may be received through lack of comprehension of the question;
- there may be confusion between this terminology and that for ethnicity, national identity and country of birth;
- citizenship is not an issue which is particularly pertinent to Scotland.

11.17 However, there was some interest, mainly from Individual respondents, in this question. One Individual in particular commented:

“Citizenship and nationality likely to become much more important issues if (as seems likely) the high rates of immigration from new member states of Europe persist.”

Other comments

11.18 Further information associated with migration was also requested, such as asylum seeker/refugee status, attitudes to migrants, the right to work and stay in the UK, intended length of stay and month and year of entry into Local Authority area.

11.19 Some noted that migration information is sensitive and people may not be willing to complete the questions honestly, or even at all. The view below, expressed by an Individual, is representative of other comments received:

“Migration is important but migrants may be reluctant to complete census forms because of insecurity”

11.20 One respondent expressed a wish for UK consistency and another felt comparability with 2001 was important.

Summary - Migration

- There was strong user demand for the retention of questions which asked for respondents' address one year ago and country of birth.
- In addition general support was received for the inclusion of a question on date of entry, although there were mixed opinions as to whether UK or Scotland entry would be more useful.
- There was little support for a question on citizenship which was thought to cause confusion and provide little useable data as a result.

CHAPTER 12: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND NS-SEC

- 12.1 In the consultation document, GROS proposed to drop the questions on hours worked and size of workplace (number of employees) from the 2011 Census. It is estimated that this would reduce the quality of NS-SEC by about 2 per cent. No decision had been taken on whether or not to ask about industry although it was noted that, should this be dropped, it would have a knock-on effect on the ability to assign Standard Occupational Class (SOC) and NS-SEC codes, reducing the quality of NS-SEC by between 8 and 24 per cent.
- 12.2 The purpose of this consultation was therefore to seek views on the proposals to collect less detailed data on the labour market and NS-SEC topic and to identify what impact this would have on the use of Census data by respondents. The consultation point asked:

What impact would the changes to the collection of NS-SEC and Labour Market data have on your use of Census data?

- 12.3 There were 44 responses to this section of the consultation (a relatively low number) and Table 12.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent:

Table 12.1 Total number of respondents to economic activity and NS-SEC questions by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	6	14
Local Government	19	43
Local Service Provider	3	7
Business & Commercial	3	7
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	4	9
Individuals	9	20
Total	44	100

- 12.4 Responses varied across these 44 respondents from those who described the potential impact on their Census data to those who indicated whether they were for or against the changes and those who made some very general comments on the format or content of the questions.
- 12.5 The majority of respondents were against the changes and many users felt that there would be an adverse impact on their use of Census data and/or were keen to retain some or all of the questions which are proposed to be dropped. In particular there was strong support for including the questions on hours worked and industry. There was generally less interest in the question on size of workplace and it was often stated that this would be the easiest question to drop.
- 12.6 A couple of respondents who were against dropping the questions acknowledged that the questions take up a great deal of space and a necessary trade off may need to be

made. A further two respondents had no strong views on this topic but did seem generally in favour of collecting as much information as possible to remain consistent with 2001.

- 12.7 General comments on the negative impact of these changes included:
- questions should remain the same as in 2001 to avoid the drop in NS-SEC quality and achieve consistency;
 - without these data it would not be possible to derive the ‘Social Grade’ classification;
 - the Census is the only source of information on certain industries and variables such as place of employment and number of employees;
 - alternative data sources do not provide small area information and have fairly high confidence intervals;
 - it would not help understanding of the local economy and would reduce the scope and quality of analysis that can be carried out.

- 12.8 One Central Government respondent did not indicate whether they were for or against the reduced collection of labour market data, but did comment that:

“It would only have an impact if there is a significant reduction in quality especially when looking at small area information.”

- 12.9 Less than 20 per cent of respondents were content with the proposed changes and these users tended to make use of surveys as their primary source of information or require only high level and non-technical analyses. One respondent commented that, whilst they found the reduction acceptable, they would ideally like to collect as much labour market information as possible.

Industry

- 12.10 Where users were against the reduction in collection of labour market data, many specified the particular variables which they viewed as important to retain. Industry was most commonly identified and there were concerns that its loss would impact on respondents’ use of Census data. For example:

“any labour market data which did not include industry of employment would be seriously compromised.” (Local Government)

- 12.11 There were also some comments that the reduction in NS-SEC and Standard Occupational Class (SOC) quality resulting from dropping the industry question would be unacceptable, more so than if only hours worked and size of work place were lost. Several respondents felt that information on industry was essential to providing a full and comprehensive picture of the labour market. Some users commented that the Census is the only full survey covering industry. For example:

“We also regard information on industry as essential...Although similar information can be obtained from the Annual Business Inquiry (ABI) it is from a survey and is less accurate, and cannot be linked to people and their characteristics in the same way as Census data.” (Local Government)

12.12 Other users suggested that the loss of industry information would have a great impact on their ability to distinguish between different job titles, such as engineer, or on their analysis of ethnic occupational segregation by industry. There was also the suggestion that it is not possible to access information on certain industries from other sources.

Hours Worked

12.13 Almost as frequently requested was the question on hours worked, which would be used in particular to distinguish full time and part time employment. The information was also felt to be useful in labour market monitoring such as:

- assessing the quality / range of local employment and deprivation / affluence;
- analysing hours worked by industry, occupation, ethnicity, gender and other variables;
- understanding working patterns, particularly in rural communities
- providing an indication of work/life balance.

12.14 However several respondents from Local Government did note that, if this was dropped, it would be essential to amend the economic activity question to include options for full time and part time employment. Some users felt that if this amendment were made, hours worked would not be so crucial to retain.

Size of workplace

12.15 This variable was not so keenly sought as hours worked and industry. There was some, limited, demand for the question. However, more often, users felt that it could be obtained from other datasets or questioned the quality of the information it could provide. Several respondents felt this was the least useful of the variables and could most readily be dropped.

General Comments on Labour Market & NS-SEC

12.16 A few respondents did not provide a specific opinion for or against the proposed changes or a description of how they would impact on their use of Census data. Instead they provided general comments on the topic including:

- a request for consistency in questions across the UK;
- continue to collect economic activity and occupation information;
- the extent of seasonal working is an issue;
- persons in certain occupations may find it difficult to count their working hours;
- add a tick box for voluntary working to the economic activity question;
- replace the question on whether respondents have 'ever worked' with one on whether employment is full time, part time or voluntary;
- balance the importance of labour market questions with the fact that they take up a lot of questionnaire space;
- concerns about the definition of economically inactive, particularly for women;
- do not restrict labour market and NS-SEC questions to 16 to 74 years olds;
- divert persons who last worked many years previously away from the questions around their 'last job'. This would avoid confusion for older and retired respondents.

Results by Respondent Category

12.17 The majority of respondents to this consultation point were from Local Government and these respondents, along with those from Central Government, also held the strongest views on this topic. For example:

“We are deeply concerned about the GROS proposals to reduce the quality of NS-SEC information. The specific proposals to drop the part-time/full-time work distinction, to drop size of workplace and to drop industry, are all unacceptable. The comment in paragraph 4.11.8 that dropping industry would reduce the accuracy of the simplified method by 24% is particularly alarming.” (Local Government)

12.18 As a result, the findings are driven by the views of Central and Local Government respondents and tend to reflect their interests. Responses from other categories were more varied and opinions tended to be less strong.

12.19 Local Service Providers, Community & Special Interest Groups and Individuals were fairly evenly distributed between those who were generally content with the proposals to reduce the data collected or did not provide any details of the specific impact this would have on their use of Census data, and those who had concerns about the loss of accuracy or preferred to retain some or all of the variables. Where there was a preference, these users tended to be most concerned about the loss of the industry and hours worked questions. For example:

“if the quality loss for dropping industry is the 8-24% anticipated we would prefer for it to be retained.” (Local Service Provider)

12.20 From the small number of respondents in the Business & Commercial sector, one was content with the proposed changes whilst the other two were most concerned about the potential loss of information on industry, which could be used, for example, to identify categories of workers suffering deprivation or to differentiate between workers who use the same terminology but mean different jobs. Hours worked was also of interest and there were some general comments about the impact of collecting less detailed data. For example:

“Social Grade is a more widely used classification in the business sector... We wish to obtain Social Grade data from the 2011 Census, however your proposed changes would significantly reduce the accuracy of the approximation.” (Business & Commercial)

Summary – Labour Market & NS-SEC

- The majority of respondents were against the proposals to reduce the volume of labour market and NS-SEC data collected.
- Most support was received for the retention of the questions on industry and hours worked, with concern around the drop in NS-SEC and Occupation coding quality if industry were excluded.
- Very little interest was expressed in the size of workplace question and several respondents noted that this would be the easiest question to drop.
- Findings are driven by Central and Local Government respondents who held the strongest views and supplied over 50 per cent of the responses.

CHAPTER 13: QUALIFICATIONS

- 13.1 GROS is currently considering whether or not the 2011 Census will collect information on qualifications. Although there is a user requirement for this data, the 2001 question was thought to be difficult to understand and, as a result, did not generate as accurate information as had been hoped. It is acknowledged that further work on a qualifications question is required if it is to be included.
- 13.2 There were 56 replies received to the consultation point on qualifications which asked:

Do you use qualifications data from the Census? If you consider it a high priority, please tell us why.

Table 13.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent:

Table 13.1 Total number of respondents to the qualifications consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	5	9
Local Government	21	38
Local Service Provider	4	7
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	8	14
Individuals	15	27
Total	56	100

Strength of user demand

- 13.3 Of the 56 respondents, over 60% stated a clear need for qualifications data and encouraged GROS to retain the question. There were also non-users of the data who remarked that they could see the benefits in collecting it and felt it would be a great loss of information if the question was removed. For example, one Individual commented:

“I have not used qualifications data from the census. But can see that the information could be useful and important both in planning education provision and in comparisons with other countries”

- 13.4 Some respondents commented that, despite having used the data previously, they would not consider the question to be a high priority for inclusion. Less than a fifth of respondents stated no need for the data or wished for the question to be dropped. A Local Government organisation pointed out:

“Qualifications are increasingly meaningless in reality - as higher education is increasingly becoming the 'norm'. Therefore the priority of these should be set low.”

- 13.5 The primary concern respondents had with the omission of a qualifications question was the lack of an alternative source for this information. The two statements below, from Local Government and an Individual, respectively, identify areas where there would be a gap in information if a qualifications question was no longer asked.

“Qualifications data from the Census is the only measure we have at a local level of the qualification base in the general population (as opposed to school based information).”

“...it allows us to examine the educational profile of minority groups which are scarce even in surveys with large sample sizes - e.g. even in the Labour Force Survey with its large sample sizes it is difficult to generate sufficient sub-samples of migrants. Only the census allows us to do that.”

Uses of qualifications data

- 13.6 A broad range of uses were quoted to underpin the assertion that qualifications data is important. Most of these were supported by users in at least two respondent categories, although the strongest user requirement came from those in Local Government. Data on qualifications was noted as being used:
- to provide an overall picture of the skills base in Scotland. This is extremely useful when comparing small areas, ethnic groups etc.
 - to enable skills gaps to be identified, which in turn pinpoints training requirements there are within individual areas.
 - for planning and funding purposes.
 - to identify areas of underemployment. This is thought to be a particular concern for ethnic groups and migrant workers. It is also used to provide appropriate employment opportunities and ensure accessibility to relevant jobs.
 - in deprivation analysis, where it is vital. Several respondents pointed out that it is required for the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation.
 - in one instance, it was found to be a better indicator of socio-economic status than other measures already in place.
 - in research on graduates and graduate migration to be carried out.
- 13.7 It was also noted that as there is a high correlation between qualifications, income and occupation, having all three pieces of information would provide a valuable insight to the labour market and economic activity. Another respondent referred to the strong correlation which has been shown between mother’s qualifications and attainment of their children. This information, along with other data (on deprivation, for example) is used to identify comparator schools for benchmarking purposes. The monitoring of qualifications of people with a disability was also highlighted as becoming increasingly important for future policy work. Qualifications data is also required when responding to data requests received by Local Authorities.

13.8 Additionally, some potential uses of this information were identified. These were received from respondents who had particular interests in these areas and were not identified by others. No Central Government or Local Government responses are included here. Responses received indicated that qualifications data could potentially be used to identify areas to target for recruitment, as an indicator of personal expectations based, for example, on place of residence, and may be a useful predictor of consumer activity and behaviour. One respondent also mentioned the potential to explore the correlation between qualifications and understanding of / likelihood to change climate change behaviour. Cross tabulation with religion to explore any relationship with qualifications was noted as a potential use.

Recommended changes to the question design

13.9 A few respondents gave general comments or suggested improvements on the design of the question. For example, it was noted that it would be useful to have a question which allowed comparability with England (and other countries). Similarly, the inclusion of categories which enable the identification of foreign qualifications would be helpful. One Central Government respondent commented:

“If only Scottish/UK qualifications are recorded, then this is unlikely to tell us anything about the skills that migrant workers actually possess.”

Another respondent suggested including more generic descriptions of the level of qualifications rather than the name of them to overcome this problem. This would be useful for graduate migration.

13.10 Suggestions were also received to have fewer categories, to replace ‘none of the above’ with ‘no qualifications’ and to add a separate category for ‘time served’ apprenticeships as not everyone gains a formal HNC/HND qualification. Collection of information on highest qualification information only was also suggested, as was not placing any age restriction on the question so similar information can be recorded for those beyond the age of 74.

Summary - Qualifications

- The vast majority of respondents wished this question to be retained and outlined their user requirements.
- The Census is the only source of this information for small geographies and the only one which enables cross tabulation of qualifications with other variables such as ethnicity.
- There is a requirement to collect information specifically on those with no qualifications and those who have foreign qualifications.

CHAPTER 14: POPULATION BASES AND DEFINITIONS

- 14.1 In order to reflect today’s increasingly mobile lifestyles, the three UK Census offices have agreed in principle that the 2011 Census will count ‘Usual residents and visitors’ rather than ‘Usual residents’ as in 2001. The Spring consultation therefore sought users views on the proposed definitions.
- 14.2 In addition, respondents were asked to consider whether they would use information on second residences. The aim of such data would be to allow outputs to be produced for more than one population base and it would also be useful for housing and transport planning. However, the questions take up a considerable amount of space and the quality of information collected may not be sufficiently high. Respondents opinions, together with evaluation of results from the 2006 and 2007 Tests carried out by GROS and ONS respectively, will inform a final decision on whether questions on second residences should be included in the Census.
- 14.3 The consultation point on this topic stated:

Would you use Census information on second residences? We welcome your views on the proposed population definitions.

- 14.4 Fifty respondents expressed their views on this section of the consultation and it is clear from Table 14.1 that this topic was of most interest to Local Government respondents (40 per cent).

Table 14.1 Total number of respondents to population bases and definitions consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	5	10
Local Government	20	40
Local Service Provider	4	8
Business & Commercial	3	6
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	6	12
Individuals	12	24
Total	50	100

Second Residence

- 14.5 The majority of respondents, just over 60%, had an interest in the second residence question although with different levels of strength. Only around 10 per cent specifically stated this was a high priority for them, for example:

“This is second only to Income as a new priority topic.”
(Business & Commercial)

- 14.6 An additional 35 per cent noted that they would use the data generated by such a question. The remainder noted their interest in the data but did not tend to view it as crucial especially if there is limited space or other higher priority topics would be squeezed out.
- 14.7 Some of those who had an interest in this data commented that it would be useful in ensuring better coverage, providing accurate population counts and estimating household populations for small areas.
- 14.8 Other uses that these organisations and Individuals would make of the data included:
- to understand patterns in second home ownership;
 - planning, resource allocation and service provision, particularly for housing and transport;
 - understanding inflated house prices;
 - to assess the demand for (affordable) housing;
 - as an indicator of dwelling and non-effective stock;
 - providing information on the buy to let market;
 - understanding complex living arrangements;
 - providing information on persons who retain a family home in one area but have a base in another location during the week;
 - as an indicator of affluence;
 - trip generation (travel);
 - community safety and crime prevention;
 - to compare local and national figures.
- 14.9 One Local Government respondent also felt that the data would be a useful comparator with council tax information since that source will not capture all second residences – they noted that the discount for a second home has been reduced to 10% which may discourage people from claiming it and homes let for over 140 days a year will be subject to business rates rather than council tax. Census data on second residence could therefore allow adjustments to be made to household estimates as necessary.
- 14.10 Just over 30 per cent of respondents said they would make no use of this information. Comments included that it was hard to justify the space a second residence question would require, that other questions were a priority and that the data could be sought from elsewhere, for example through the council tax records.
- 14.11 There were a small number of comments and suggestions for questions which could be asked on second residence. Most suggested additional information that it would be desirable to collect, including the use of the property (e.g. commuter flat or holiday home), the location (including outwith the UK) and the time spent at each address. One respondent thought that all of the household questions should be asked of second residences in order to give a complete picture.

14.12 The remainder wanted to reduce the current number of questions and felt that they may not all be necessary or that the data they would generate may not be accurate. There was a suggestion that dropping the questions on the number of nights and weeks spent at the other address would be acceptable if space is limited. Another user suggested asking for only the postcode of the second property.

Population Definitions

14.13 Less than a quarter of the 50 respondents to this section of the consultation provided any comments on the population definitions and these users generally welcomed the current proposals for a 'Usual residents and visitors' definition. Information on visitors was often thought to be useful as a means of increasing the quality of the population count.

14.14 However, three respondents commented that this definition may be confusing or could lead to double counting.

14.15 Although mostly in favour, Local Government respondents provided some caveats around the use of visitors in the population definitions. For example, one such organisation noted that they only viewed this as acceptable "*if the main population tables were based on usual residents and are consistent with the GROS mid year estimation of population*". Another council cautioned that the volume of visitors may vary depending on the time of year in which the Census is carried out. A further response stressed the need to enumerate visitors at both addresses and one respondent felt that better use should be made of visitors data in 2011 than had been in 2001. One of these respondents did not express a preference for definitions but did comment on the quality of information required:

"our primary concerns would be to ensure that the visitor information is sufficiently reliable and that a usually resident population base remains available also for historical comparison." (Local Government)

Summary – Population bases and definitions

- Respondents, predominantly from Local Government organisations, expressed some requirements for information on second residence.
- Those users from Central and Local Government and Business & Commercial organisations had more interest in second residency data than those from Community & Special Interest Groups and Individuals.
- Very few comments were received on the proposed population definitions and these were generally in favour although there were some suggestions that 'usual residents and visitors' might be confusing and potentially lead to double counting.

CHAPTER 15 : ETHNICITY

Background - Review of the Ethnicity Classification

- 15.1 In 2001, the Race Equality Advisory Forum (REAF) recommended to the (then) Communities Minister that Scottish Census categories for ethnicity be reviewed. This followed complaints about the inconsistent use of colour and geography within the classification and earlier complaints to Parliament before the 2001 Census. The review aims to develop a more effective classification which reflects Scotland's changing population and provides the information needed to eliminate discrimination and tackle inequality. This has involved an extensive programme of work which began in 2004 and is due to conclude in early 2008.
- 15.2 Responses given to this part of the consultation will be used in the evidence gathering to inform the ongoing review of the ethnicity classification scheme.
- 15.3 Respondents to the consultation were asked to give their opinion on a number of separate questions concerning ethnicity and the related concept of national identity. There were 77 responses received in total to this part of the consultation, a relatively high number (note, however, that not all respondents supplied answers to all questions).

Table 15.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent:

Table 15.1 Total number of respondents to the ethnicity consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	9	12
Local Government	20	26
Local Service Provider	4	5
Business & Commercial	3	4
Academic	2	3
Community & Special Interest Groups	12	16
Individuals	27	35
Total	77	100

* Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

- 15.4 Responses to each question within the ethnicity consultation point are dealt with separately below.

Question 1:

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their interest was in the topic of ethnic group, national identity or both.

- 15.5 Of the 58 responses received to this question, the majority indicated that their primary interest was in ethnic group (33, 57%). Another 23 respondents (40%) stated that they were interested in both ethnic group and national identity. Only two Individual respondents indicated interest solely in national identity.

Question 2:

Respondents were asked what role or responsibility their organisation (where applicable) had in respect of the areas highlighted in question 1

- 15.6 Responses varied by category of respondent. These included carrying out market research, targeting and analysis (Business & Commercial respondents) whereas others had more of a supervisory and/or monitoring role, particularly bodies such as the Commission for Racial Equality, who have both a role to promote race equality and legal powers to enforce compliance with the Race Relations Act 1976 (and the later Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000). The duties placed on public sector bodies as a result of such legislation meant that monitoring of service users and workforce, policy planning and service provision figured highly in the responses from Central Government, Local Government and Local Service Providers. It was also clear that Census data on ethnicity was regarded as the definitive source against which to benchmark. Many mentioned their obligations in terms of the relevant legislation.

“The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 places key public bodies (including local authorities) under a statutory duty to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups. This applies to both internal employment practices and to policy and service delivery functions.”
(Local Government)

- 15.7 A couple of respondents mentioned providing data to other parties, while several Local Government respondents mentioned their role in supporting, working with and providing advice to, local ethnic groups. Providing data to other parties was also cited and monitoring changes in the local population over time was highlighted by one. Responsibility for informing resource allocation calculations was referred to by a respondent in the Local Service Provider category.
- 15.8 Community & Special Interest Groups’ roles were centred around representation for specific groups, including the promotion of culture and traditions along with encouraging good relations with members of other minority and majority ethnic groups. Responses from individuals in terms of roles and responsibilities were varied, with involvement in research, consultancy, service delivery, policy implementation, political debate, volunteering and personal interests all mentioned.

Question 3:

Respondents were asked for which UK countries/areas the information was required

- 15.9 There were 53 responses to this question, of which 51 required ethnicity information for Scotland, 19 for England, 18 for Wales and 17 for Northern Ireland. Data was required for Great Britain and the United Kingdom by 31 and 34 respondents, respectively. Of these, two respondents required data for the United Kingdom but did not specify a need for the Scotland breakdown.

Question 4:

Respondents were asked to indicate what use they would make of data on national identity, if a separate question on national identity were to be adopted for the 2011 Census.

15.10 A total of 43 responses were received to this question. From these, it was clear that some respondents misunderstood the concept of national identity – commonly there was confusion between national identity and nationality and/or citizenship, ethnicity and country of birth. Other responses in this category mentioned issues such as measuring levels of immigration and entitlement to live and work in this country. Some respondents expressed concern that people generally may not understand the concept of national identity. One Community & Special Interest Group respondent commented:

“...Any question on national identity should be entirely unambiguous about what information it is seeking otherwise some respondents may interpret the question as asking about their actual nationality, others about their country of birth, and others about familial or emotional attachment to a nationality that might or might not be their own. Counting responses has no merit if the respondents intended different things by their responses.”

15.11 Around a third indicated that they would not use, or make little use of, the data, were it to be collected. A small number noted that the inclusion of such a question may also have a detrimental effect on response rates. For example, a Business & Commercial user stated:

“Low priority. A waste of space and potentially disruptive for the Census.”

15.12 Over 40% of respondents identified uses that they would make of the data. Most frequently, respondents indicated that data on national identity would help build a more complete picture of how people identify themselves, used in conjunction with ethnic group data.

“When combined with a separate question on ethnicity, this allows the expression of a Scottish, or British or Welsh (etc.) identity by all respondents.....In terms of policy, developing a fuller picture of people’s national identities will enable relationships between identity and integration to be explored for the first time. For example, is there a correlation between national identity and economic and social integration amongst different ethnic groups?”

(Central Government)

15.13 Having such data would enable related issues to be explored more fully in terms of integration, affiliation, attitudes and so on. Several also thought it would give a useful indication of areas of social, cultural and spiritual need for service provision purposes. Also mentioned was use of the data for market analysis, providing information on access to services, informing political debate and research purposes. A couple of respondents felt that the national identity question might help respondents to answer the ethnic group question or add to the understanding of responses to the ethnic group

question. The interaction of faith and national identity was also highlighted in another response.

Question 5:

Respondents were asked if they required ethnic group information from the 2011 Census

15.14 A total of 55 respondents answered this consultation point, of whom 50 indicated that they did require ethnic group information from the 2011 Census. The remaining five indicated that they did not.

Question 6:

Respondents were asked to indicate which type of ethnic group information they required

15.15 A requirement for general information on the ethnic composition of the population was indicated by 47 respondents. Around 30 respondents indicated a need for information on specific ethnic groups, either as well as or instead of information on general ethnic composition. Not all of these respondents actually specified which groups they require information about. However, groups required were new migrants/information on EU accession countries, African, white minority groups (e.g. Polish, gypsy/traveller), mixed ethnic group, East African, Black African, Nigerian, Jewish, white European, Irish, pan-ethnic groups, Indian, Pakistani and Chinese. Two respondents also asked for information on all groups listed in the 2006 Test ethnic group question. Requirements for information on ethnic group as it relates to faith and as it relates to social/cultural needs were each noted by one respondent.

15.16 Of those respondents who indicated a need for information on specific ethnic groups, over a third also wanted information on combinations of ethnic group. A further 21 respondents signified a need for information only on combinations of ethnic group.

Question 7:

Respondents were asked to indicate for what purpose(s) they required this information (as referred to in question 6)

15.17 The categories indicated are summarised in the Table 15.2 below

Table 15.2 Categories of use of ethnic group information, by number of respondents

Category of use	Number of respondents
Service provision	42
Policy development	43
Workforce monitoring	33
Promoting equal opportunities	35
Tackling discrimination	36

15.18 Additionally, an ‘other’ category was provided, in order that respondents could write in any other uses that they might make of the data.

15.19 These other uses included:

- monitoring of the interaction between people from different communities;
- monitoring of the participation by people from all communities in decision making;
- demographic profiling of the population;
- academic study/research;
- helping clients understand minority ethnic communities and develop products, services and marketing that meets their needs;
- planning the preservation of linguistic and cultural heritage;
- provision of information/education and cultural activities;
- ensuring that the health needs and costs of supplying services to ethnic groups are understood and funds allocated appropriately to NHS Boards to meet those needs;
- inclusion in work on tackling health inequalities;
- aiding community engagement, understanding local and regional needs and promoting good race relations;
- yielding broader information on languages;
- social inclusion work;
- use as comparator for estimates from own surveys.

Question 8:

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they preferred the 2001 Census or 2006 Census Test question

15.20 Of the 51 respondents who answered this question, the majority (53%) preferred the 2006 Census Test question. Thirteen (25%) indicated a preference for the 2001 Census question, while a further 11 indicated no preference.

Question 9:

Respondents were asked to indicate why their preferred choice of question (re question 8) best met their data needs

15.21 Those in favour of the 2006 question most commonly indicated preference for the more detailed information/better breakdown of categories that the question yielded. Specific examples given included:

- better breakdown of 'White', 'African or Caribbean' and 'others', notably gypsies;
- sub-UK classifications under 'European';
- support for the inclusion of 'Gypsy/ Traveller', 'Arab' and 'Sikh' as separate categories;
- support for 'Jewish' in the 'Other ethnic group' category;
- support for the geographical breakdown of the 'African' or 'Caribbean' category (albeit a small population in Scotland).

"The 2001 Census question was an irrational mix of colour, nationality and geography, and we strongly support its replacement."

(Community & Special Interest Group)

15.22 There was also support for the 2006 question on the grounds that it did not use colour terminology, with some users strongly indicating that it was inappropriate to include colour as a descriptor of ethnicity. Many respondents also felt the question contained more accepted and/or accurate terminology, with one respondent suggesting that this would be less likely to make members of minority communities feel alienated or excluded. Other issues mentioned included preference for the disaggregation of national identity and ethnic group, with one respondent specifically mentioning how this would allow those in minority groups to also assert a UK national identity.

15.23 However, although these respondents indicated preference for the 2006 over the 2001 question, many indicated that they considered further development of the classification was still required. Concerns raised included:

- colour is still an important issue in terms of identifying discrimination. The 2006 classification, however, would not pick up the difference between ‘black’/‘white’ South African making it difficult to directly compare with 2001 data.
- information useful in challenging discrimination on the basis of colour may be lost.
- some groups of Caucasian origin such as Australasians and those from North America, who are likely not to see themselves as ‘European’, could not be readily categorised / identified.
- the mix of ethnic group and religion.
- questioning of the inclusion of ‘Sikh’ and ‘Jewish’ as categories of ethnic group, while not including other religions.
- lack of a measure of European immigration.
- ‘African’ and ‘Arab’ breakdown being excessively detailed for the size of their populations in Scotland.
- the need to distinguish between ‘Afro-Caribbean’ and ‘African’ groups.
- ‘North African’ was listed twice (under ‘Arab’ and ‘African or Caribbean’).
- ‘White’ not being an ethnic group.

15.24 Many of those in favour of the 2001 Census question mentioned comparability as the reason why it best met their data needs. Additionally, many respondents highlighted that it was important to be able to monitor discrimination on the basis of skin colour (which the 2006 classification would not allow) and the fact that the categories used in 2001 were felt to be more clear and concise. Concern was specifically raised over the 2006 categories; for example the lack of a suitable category for people from USA/Canada/Australia and ‘White’ South Africans, who would not classify themselves as ‘European’. One respondent mentioned that they felt the national identity question from the 2006 Test was very exclusive (i.e. the options listed all related to British groups).

“The 2001 Census questions best meet our data needs because they are clear and consistent both in terms of compliance with legislative requirements and in terms of clarity.” (Local Government)

15.25 Despite favouring the 2001 question, a couple of respondents indicated that they still did not find it satisfactory and felt that more work would still be required.

Question 10:

Respondents were asked if, in 2011, an ethnicity classification were to be adopted which replaced the terms ‘Black’ and ‘White’ with ‘European’ and ‘African’ (such as the 2006 question in the consultation document), what impact this would have on their organisation’s ability to use the Census data or other surveys conducted which are based on the Census classification

15.26 Local Government respondents mainly indicated loss of comparability as the main issue – in terms of comparing the population profile, identifying changes in the population over time, workforce/equalities monitoring and so on. One mentioned a serious impact on their ability to meet their duties under the Race Relations Amendment (2000) Act. Many others in this category were also generally concerned about their ability to monitor change over time or report on racial discrimination, as information on certain groups may be lost. Another respondent, in the Individual category, went as far as to state that they may not use the suggested 2006 categories, were they to be implemented, as they felt they did not make sense.

“The main impact would be on lack of comparability with previous figures which would impact on our monitoring of change over time. Information on racial groups could be lost. This could reduce our ability to report on racial discrimination.”

(Local Government)

15.27 Some respondents did indicate that there would be little or no impact to them if the suggested changes were implemented. A couple of respondents mentioned that advice on mapping between the two categorisations would be helpful whilst another stated there would only be no impact if the new categories did not alter responses. However, others, mainly in Community & Special Interest Groups, stated positively that they would be able to use the data with confidence and sense of equality if colour labels were taken out. One in particular said they could better allocate resources as small groups previously not identified now would be.

“The use of colour as an indicator of belonging to an ethnic minority is highly problematic..... Since the Scottish 2006 test classification has been constructed to avoid offensive and ambiguous terms, these categories are much more acceptable and more likely to provide reliable data than those used in the 2001 census. ”

(Community and Special Interest Group)

15.28 Generally, many comments given in response to question 10 re-iterated views already stated, in terms of giving reasons why they either supported or were opposed to the removal of colour terminology, with representation being made strongly by some respondents on both sides of the debate.

Question 11:

This question stated that a revised ethnicity classification, if used on the 2011 Census, would have an impact on the level of comparability that could be achieved with 2001 Census data. Respondents were asked what effect, if any, this would have on their organisation.

- 15.29 The main issue raised in relation to loss of comparability was that it would create difficulties in being able to monitor change over time. Two Local Government respondents indicated that it would have huge impact for them with one mentioning how useful comparable figures would be in light of the rise in migration between these two Census years. Another mentioned the effect on their ability to comply with legislation, indicating that systems had been designed around the current (2001) classification.

“A revised ethnic classification would have an enormous impact on us as an organisation in our endeavour to comply with a range of legislation which requires us to monitor employment and service use by ethnicity....The current system is clear and concise and we are using these classifications across a range of multi-agency partnerships. It would be an enormous undertaking to re-do this and would put us back in terms of the work we have done and the results we have achieved to date.”

(Local Government)

- 15.30 However, many, across all category of respondents, felt that comparability, while desirable, was not as important as getting the question correct in order to collect meaningful data.

“There is no point in collecting unintelligible data and it is more important that the 2011 classifications should be meaningful than that they should be unduly constrained by comparability with the 2001 figures.”

(Community & Special Interest Group)

- 15.31 Others felt that the change would affect them in a positive way, that the loss of comparability would have a minimal effect on their uses of the data or that they be willing to work round the change, making compromises where necessary.

Question 12:

This question stated that an ethnicity classification adopted on the 2011 Scottish Census which differed slightly from that adopted on the other UK Censuses would have an impact on the level of achievable UK comparability. Respondents were asked what effect, if any, this would have on their organisation.

- 15.32 There were some evident differences within respondent categories for this question. Business & Commercial users felt strongly that UK comparability was very important and if this were not achievable, the value of the information would be greatly diminished. Community & Special Interest Groups generally thought comparability (either over time or within the UK) should not be used as a reason to continue using categories which they considered unacceptable/offensive. Responses from Individuals varied, with some stating that while desirable, comparability across the UK was less important than, for example, the retention of the ‘innovative approach’ taken in

Scotland, or being able to compare within an area over time. Another two respondents felt quite strongly that UK comparability was important.

- 15.33 In the Local Government category, the vast majority of respondents indicated that the comparisons they carried out were between Local Authority areas in Scotland, rather than between Scotland and other UK countries, hence loss of UK comparability would have limited (if any) impact on them. One noted that the ethnic composition of the population in Scotland is different from that of other UK countries, hence there is justification for using a different classification. A couple of respondents in the Central Government and Local Service Provider categories indicated that some loss of UK comparability would be acceptable as long as comparisons were possible at combined or broader category level, while others indicated that UK comparability was preferred if possible.

Question 13:

Respondents were invited to provide any additional comments in relation to the ethnicity consultation point

- 15.34 There were only a few comments received which had not already been mentioned in the earlier questions.
- 15.35 Many suggested amendments to the categories currently listed in the ethnic group classification, including some which suggested a write-in box in place of any classification, which would allow respondents to fully express or identify themselves. A limited number of respondents indicated that the deaf community represents an indigenous UK culture, dating back centuries. As such, there was a suggestion that information could be collected via the ethnic group question, with a tick-box for 'deaf culture'.
- 15.36 Respondents also took this opportunity to express their recognition of the sensitivities around the concept of ethnic group and/or national identity. One user supported a radical simplification of the ethnicity section of the form, provided that it was comparable with the approach taken by ONS for England and Wales.

Summary – Ethnicity

- There was some misunderstanding of the concept of national identity.
- Responses given indicate greater preference for the 2006 Census Test ethnicity question than for the 2001 Census question. However, many respondents consider further work on the classification is required.
- Reasons given for preference for the 2006 question included more detailed breakdown of categories and more acceptable terminology, based on the removal of colour labels.
- Reasons given for preference for the 2001 question included comparability and the ability to monitor discrimination on the basis of colour.

CHAPTER 16: CARRYING OUT THE CENSUS

- 16.1 It is likely that GROS will offer the option to respond via the internet in 2011, as an alternative to the completion of paper forms. Work will be carried out with the other UK Census offices to develop a secure internet data capture system, which will provide a more convenient service for many respondents.
- 16.2 There were 62 replies to the consultation point on the issue of internet completion which stated:

Comments and views on the suggestion that we should offer the option of filling in the Census form on the internet are welcome.

Table 16.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent:

Table 16.1 Total number of respondents to the internet consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	6	10
Local Government	20	32
Local Service Provider	5	8
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	11	18
Individuals	17	27
Total	62	100

Support for an internet form

- 16.3 There was strong support for the suggestion that GROS should offer the option of filling in the Census form online. Around 80% of respondents indicated that they were in favour of this, but many specified caveats. Only two respondents stated they did not think it should be provided and did not wish it to be given further consideration, with one highlighting the problems and cost associated with developing an internet system.
- 16.4 The general feeling was that, as people are becoming increasingly competent in using the internet and completing forms online, this service would be well received. One Local Service Provider stated:
- “I am confident in peoples’ ability now to use this method.”*
- 16.5 Many respondents felt that providing the option of filling in a form online would lead to wider coverage and, in turn, a higher response rate, due to its greater convenience generally and improved accessibility, particularly for those with special needs or in remote areas. It was felt also that younger people would be more likely to respond.

- 16.6 Additionally, respondents felt that data quality would be improved, due to:
- the facility to provide ‘pop-up’ guidance and explanations for each question. Videos of BSL translations could be provided via this option also;
 - the ability to carry out real-time checks;
 - the facility to navigate respondents through the questionnaire. This may involve a prompt to complete questions missed or routing away from irrelevant questions;
 - smoother data capture, particularly for write in boxes which would contain typed responses rather than handwritten;
 - the ability to implement drop down menus.
- 16.7 Some respondents felt the introduction of this service may also result in less time being required to process and release the data. Two comments were received, from an Individual and Local Government organisation, respectively, to this effect:
- “...saves time needed for digitising.”*
- “It could make data gathering and analysis easier and could lead to a quicker release of information.”*
- 16.8 Other advantages cited included the capacity to ask more complex or additional questions (perhaps at the end of the questionnaire), preservation of confidentiality between household members and the fact that the issue of whether to have 3 or 4 pages of personal questions would become less significant. It was also indicated that filling in a Census form online would be more user and environmentally friendly and less burdensome for enumerators.

Caveats relating to internet completion

- 16.9 Potential risks and problems associated with providing this service were recognised by respondents in all categories. Most users in favour of this option stated they would only be in agreement if these were overcome. Some respondents mentioned the security and confidentiality of information. It was felt that necessary protocols must be implemented beforehand to deal with these issues. Over-enumeration due to double counting of people filling out forms online and on paper was also highlighted, with the indication that enumerators must have the ability to track responses received online. Under-enumeration in case people are ‘lost’ between the two systems was cited, as were IT problems, system difficulties and accuracy of information.
- 16.10 Some users felt that the system would have to undergo robust testing before implementation. A Business & Commercial respondent commented:
- “If it can be done technically given the issues of accuracy, security and multiple collection then it is to be welcomed. It must however be fully field tested before use and must not put the Census at risk.”*

16.11 Others stressed the importance of retaining a paper form option for those with no access to, or confidence in using, the internet. Both of these issues were highlighted in responses received, respectively, from a Community & Special Interest Group and a Central Government organisation:

“...internet access is not as widespread as is sometimes presumed...”

“...many older people will prefer a paper form.”

16.12 As there are likely to be errors in forms completed online, one Individual stated that it must be possible for enumerators to chase up those completing their forms over the internet.

16.13 Concern was raised by two Local Government respondents about the possible difficulties and resultant bias that could arise due to the difference in layout between the internet and paper forms.

16.14 Concern was also expressed that resources given to this exercise would detract from those required elsewhere. Another respondent stressed that it would be important to ensure that the resource given to internet completion does not increase the time it takes for the Census results to be analysed.

Other suggestions for internet completion

16.15 Some respondents offered further comments and recommendations regarding the option of internet completion. These were:

- the option to save part way through and complete the form at a later stage should be offered;
- respondents should be able to fill in their form online in Gaelic;
- two Local Government respondents stressed that the design of the form should be such that no bias is introduced due to differences in layout between the internet and paper versions;
- a facility should perhaps be available to allow respondents to answer the questionnaire via a telephone service;
- prior to Census day, promotion of the facility will be needed as well as sufficient information about the service.

Other issues regarding carrying out the Census

16.16 There were concerns surrounding the enumeration of the Census, as certain groups of people are considered particularly difficult to capture. Those identified were:

- illiterate people who do not have the capability to fill in a Census form;
- those with special requirements, e.g. blind and deafblind, who find forms inaccessible;
- those within Communal Establishments. Many problems were experienced in 2001, especially for those in the Armed Forces;
- the homeless and rough sleepers. Even if visitors information is collected, these people will still be missed;

- migrants who have limited English skills, or may not wish to fill in a Census form for security reasons;
- unrelated adults in a household who may return a form with only one person's details.

16.17 Many respondents suggested the provision of drop in surgeries, which would provide help with filling in Census forms for those with particular needs. Another idea suggested was to recruit enumerators who were able to communicate in foreign languages and British Sign Language.

16.18 A small number of respondents stated a preference for hand delivery of forms. However, it was acknowledged that this may be difficult in rural areas and mail delivery may be the only feasible option. Where this is the case and respondents have difficulty filling in their forms, they felt that adequate support must still be available.

16.19 The date of the Census was also raised as an area of concern by a small number of respondents. It was noted that a time of year must be chosen which took into consideration student term times, the number of daylight hours (so enumerators were not out in the dark) and the timing of other surveys or paper returns so that the burden placed on individuals was minimal.

Summary – Carrying out the Census

- There was strong support for the suggested option of filling in a Census form online.
- This was thought to provide greater convenience, accessibility, improve response rates and allow for better data capture.
- However, the majority of respondents stressed that online completion is only desirable if it is possible to resolve issues such as those surrounding security, confidentiality and the robustness of IT systems.

CHAPTER 17: GAELIC LANGUAGE POLICY

- 17.1 GROS is currently considering its Gaelic language policy for the 2011 Census and has not yet established its view on a Gaelic form. It therefore consulted on the following point:

Comments and views on the 2011 Census Gaelic Language policy are welcome.

- 17.2 There were 38 responses, considerably lower than other sections of the consultation. Table 17.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent and indicates that the majority (over 55 per cent) of respondents were Individuals or from Community & Special Interest Groups.

Table 17.1 Total number of respondents to Gaelic language policy consultation by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	6	16
Local Government	6	16
Local Service Provider	3	8
Business & Commercial	1	3
Academic	0	0
Community & Special Interest Groups	8	21
Individuals	14	37
Total	38	100*

* Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

- 17.3 Of these 38 respondents, most were generally in favour of a Gaelic policy to promote the use of this language although many were not specific about what it should include.

Gaelic Language Policy – Specific Suggestions

- 17.4 Just under forty per cent of all respondents on this topic were in favour of a Gaelic or bilingual questionnaire although this view was expressed with varying degrees of strength and was most commonly presented by Central Government and Individual respondents. For example, one Central Government user noted a firm preference for such a form:

“...fully endorses the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005 and its recommendations that Gaelic is an official language which enjoys the same respect as English in Scotland...a Gaelic (or bilingual) questionnaire should be available for the 2011 Census.”

- 17.5 The Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005 was often stated as a reason for implementing a suitable Gaelic language policy and a few respondents noted that supplying a Gaelic form or allowing respondents to answer in Gaelic would be in the spirit of this Act.

17.6 Bord na Gaidhlig stated that they would like to see a public commitment to a bilingual form. However, were this not possible, they suggested that there should be Gaelic translations of the introduction and section headings. In addition, they would like it to be possible to answer write-in questions in Gaelic and noted that consideration should be given to the recommendations for forms in their Guidance on the Development of Gaelic Language Plans.

17.7 The Bord specifically stated that it would **not** recommend the continuation of the 2001 Gaelic policy where a Gaelic version of the form was published but the form had to be completed in English. They noted:

“This does not suit a bilingual community, or the aims of the National Plans such as increasing the profile and prestige of Gaelic in Scotland.”

17.8 The view that it should be possible to complete forms in Gaelic was supported by other respondents although there was one user who felt that submission in English would be sufficient.

17.9 There were a few suggestions that a Gaelic form should be available on request only whilst one Individual felt that it should be delivered in addition to the English form in relevant areas.

17.10 In addition one respondent proposed that wider media advertising should be available in Gaelic and another suggested that other UK Census offices should also ask a question on Gaelic language ability. Although these respondents supported a Gaelic form one did note that it would not be necessary to create Gaelic versions of all the reports, whilst another welcomed the continuation of the Census’ Gaelic Report from 2001.

17.11 There were also proposals that the form should be available in a variety of other languages as well as Gaelic. For example, one Local Service Provider noted that:

“the census questionnaire should be available in a variety of formats and languages to ensure as many respondents from non English speaking/visually impaired residents as possible. This would include Gaelic.”

17.12 The reasons put forward for producing a Gaelic or bilingual form tended to focus on supporting or developing the language. For example:

“Since Gaelic is to be recognised as a language of all of Scotland, we believe that a separate Gaelic language questionnaire needs to be produced.”

(Community & Special Interest Group)

“The presence of Gaelic in a wide range of forms (Gaelic or bilingual), can also greatly enhance the visibility and prestige of the language. The preparation of Gaelic versions of forms, applications and similar documents will assist in expanding the range of Gaelic terminology and the awareness of the Gaelic speaking public of such terminology, helping the development of the language itself.” (Central Government)

17.13 Only three respondents indicated that the 2001 Gaelic policy of an information leaflet would be sufficient. One further Individual suggested that an expensive Gaelic policy should not be necessary since the number of people unable to read English in Scotland is small. In addition the one respondent from the Business & Commercial group noted that a Gaelic language policy is a low priority topic for them.

Gaelic Language Policy – General Comments

17.14 Just under a quarter of respondents had no specific view on what a Gaelic language policy should contain but had some general comments to make and were, on the whole, in support of a policy in this area. For example, one Local Service Provider noted:

“Gaelic language is an important part of the Scottish nation and its identity. To exclude or marginalize this area of census collection would be inappropriate.”

This was supported by a Community & Special Interest Group respondent who also agreed that:

“The use of Gaelic Language should be supported as it is part of Scottish culture and identity. A nation must have its fundamental culture and language is one of them. So we support Gaelic language programmes and its promotion.”

Language Policies - Other

17.15 A few other users did not specifically comment on the Gaelic language policy but, instead, made general comments in relation to wider language requirements.

17.16 There were a small number of requests from Community & Special Interest Groups involved with the deaf community, on the need for policies around other languages, particularly British Sign Language.

17.17 This was supported by a few respondents from other groups who did not comment on a Gaelic form but felt that questionnaires should be available in additional languages (e.g. ethnic minority languages) or that a Gaelic policy will lead to similar requests from users speaking other languages. There were two specific requests from Individual respondents for the use of Scots to be encouraged similarly.

17.18 It should be noted that the question specifically asked for views on a Gaelic language policy and views on other languages will not necessarily have been expressed fully in responses on this section.

17.19 Two users had no specific opinion but noted that the costs and benefits of any policy should be considered as well as any available statistics from Scotland or other countries.

Summary – Gaelic language policy

- The need for a Gaelic language policy, to promote the use of the language, was generally supported by respondents to this topic. However, this topic drew the smallest response rate of the whole consultation.
- Where specific suggestions for the policy were made, most were in favour of a Gaelic or bilingual questionnaire.
- A very small number of respondents noted that they were satisfied with the 2001 policy and only two respondents noted that the Gaelic language policy was of low priority to them.
- In addition to Gaelic, there were also suggestions that policies should be put in place for other languages.

CHAPTER 18: THE OUTPUTS OF THE CENSUS

18.1 The three UK Census offices have agreed that the final product of the Census should be consistent, coherent and accessible statistics for the UK and for each component country, with a common approach to output specifications, quality, data format and timing of releases. As part of the Registrar's General's Harmonisation Agreement⁷, discussed in paragraph 1.6, a joint output strategy has been agreed with 17 aims for the delivery of outputs (see Table 19.2 below).

18.2 Respondents to the consultation were asked:

Comments and views on the provision of Census Output are welcome.

- *Which three of the 17 aims are the most important to you?*
- *Would you prefer to obtain most of the 2011 Census data that you need on-line rather than on paper?*
- *Would you use a flexible on-line table generation system, or would you expect to rely on pre-planned output (in either paper or electronic form)?*

18.3 There were 65 responses to this section of the consultation and Table 18.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent. This indicates that 60 per cent of these were provided by persons from Local Government and Individuals.

Table 18.1 Total number of respondents to outputs question by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	6	9
Local Government	21	32
Local Service Provider	6	9
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	1	2
Community & Special Interest Groups	10	15
Individuals	18	28
Total	65	100

18.4 Responses to each part of this consultation question are dealt with separately below.

Priority Aims

18.5 Respondents were asked to list the three aims that were most important to them from the 17 agreed in the output strategy. Of the 65 respondents, 53 did so, although a small number of respondents listed more than the three aims requested and all of those identified aims been included in the analysis. In these instances, it was commonly noted that all of the aims are important and it was difficult to restrict priorities to only three.

⁷ <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/census/pdfs/RGsAgreement.pdf>

- 18.6 One respondent noted that dissemination methods and media should keep up to date with technology as a matter of course and they did not therefore feel the need to specify this aim as a priority. They made similar assumptions that the data would not be subject to revision, that the outputs timetable would be adhered to and that they would be free at the point of delivery. It is possible that other respondents may have done the same.

Table 18.2 Joint Output Strategy Aims by Frequency of Selection as Most Important

Aim		Frequency
1.	Outputs free at the point of delivery.	31
3.	Flexible table generation on-line.	24
6.	A facility for comparing 2001 and 2011 results.	22
13.	An effective and flexible approach to output geographies.	20
5.	An on-line facility for mapping and graphing of standard and user-defined output.	17
12.	Joining-up of Census output with other Government statistics.	13
4.	Improved data utility of some data outputs through differential access levels (providing specialised users with data fitting their needs).	11
11.	Joined-up and comparable UK outputs.	11
14.	A database fully adjusted for missing question responses and under- and over-coverage.	9
2.	Dissemination methods and media that keep up to date with technological innovation.	7
7.	A pre-release output prospectus and timetable that's adhered to.	4
9.	Statistics to be released concurrently for all areas within a country of the UK.	4
10.	Appropriate associated metadata published concurrently with statistical output.	4
15.	Data which will not be subject to revision.	3
16.	A corrections policy in place in advance.	3
8.	Concurrent first release of statistics across the UK.	1
17.	A joined up and co-ordinated quality assurance policy to involve internal and external experts and bodies.	1
	Did not provide list of most important aims	12

- 18.7 Table 18.2 shows the frequency with which respondents selected an aim as most important. This indicates that the aim for outputs to be free at the point of delivery (aim 1) was most commonly identified as a priority.

- 18.8 There was also strong support for flexible table generation on-line (aim 3), a facility for comparing 2001 and 2011 results (aim 6), an effective and flexible approach to output geographies (aim 13) and an on-line facility for mapping and graphing of standard and user defined output (aim 5). On the other hand there were a few comments, particularly from Local Government respondents, to the effect that aim 5 is not necessary since the bulk of their mapping and graphing requirements are carried out in-house.
- 18.9 All of the remaining aims were selected by at least one respondent as being most important, however, no others were identified so frequently.
- 18.10 The results were broadly similar for each of the respondent categories. Local Government users, in particular, felt that flexible table generation on-line (aim 3) was important whilst Local Service Providers also valued a database that is fully adjusted for missing question responses and under- and over- coverage (aim 14).
- 18.11 Joined up and comparable UK outputs (aim 11) was felt to be amongst the most important aims by Local Service Providers and Business & Commercial respondents.
- 18.12 Some general comments on the output aims are listed below:
- it would be useful for certain groups of users to be able to access anonymised data sets or bulk downloads;
 - further consultation on the geographies for which outputs will be available is required;
 - there was support for the integration of Census outputs with Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics;
 - there was a requirement for tabulations for England, Scotland and Wales to be available in the same format and web location;
 - it was suggested that outputs require a simply user-friendly website that non-specialist users will find easy to use;
 - one user felt that accessibility and ease of understanding underpins all of the aims;
 - another stressed the importance of confidentiality;
 - the early availability of data is more important than concurrent releases within countries.

Output Medium

- 18.13 Users were then asked by which medium they would prefer to obtain Census data, on-line or on paper. The vast majority of respondents preferred outputs to be released on-line. Of the 46 persons who answered this question, 45 (98%) specified a preference for on-line. Only one Individual preferred paper based output.
- 18.14 Although the majority preferred on-line access, several users commented that paper options would also be welcomed in support of the on-line system. This would provide a useful back up and quick reference material as well as being available to those without internet access.

18.15 Other respondents requested an on-line system which would allow bulk delivery or data downloads (in different formats and at different levels) for further analysis. One further respondent noted that they would support the release of data on-line for environmental reasons, in order to reduce the use of paper.

Flexible Table Generation

18.16 The final question on outputs was around flexible table generation and asked whether users would expect to use such a system or if they would expect to rely on pre-planned output. Thirty-nine respondents answered this question and the majority (31 respondents) indicated that they would make use of a flexible on-line table generation system. A further, three respondents felt that both mediums of delivering outputs would be required. The remaining five respondents (13%) expected to rely on pre-planned output.

18.17 Two of those respondents who indicated they would use the flexible on-line system stressed that pre-planned output in electronic form should also be available. There were also a few comments about the output from the system itself with 3 respondents requesting that the data should be easily downloadable and compatible with common software, for example, for use in GIS mapping. In addition one user was keen that the outputs should not be

“geared to predefined tables and areas which the census system designers consider a user should be using.” (Local Government)

18.18 The reasons why some respondents expected to rely on pre-planned output varied from the fact that they only require to use high level statistics to the suggestion that a more flexible system might be too complicated for users and the concern that not everyone has access to the internet. One respondent suggested that flexible table generation:

“has too many pitfalls for most users, since the metadata attached to each table is as important as the table itself.” (Local Government)

18.19 Another respondent indicated that users would prefer to request data than learn how to use a new on-line system. There was also a suggestion that a new flexible system could be viewed as a bonus to the pre-planned output and may partly replace the need to commission tables.

Statistical Disclosure Control

18.20 Whilst the consultation document did not specifically ask users to comment on methods of ensuring that Census outputs do not disclose information about individuals, four responses dealt with this issue. All stressed the need for tables to aggregate to consistent totals and cautioned that small cell adjustment should be avoided for this reason.

Summary – The outputs of the Census

- The aim most commonly identified as a priority was that outputs should be free at the point of delivery.
- There was also support for flexible table generation on-line, a facility for comparing 2001 and 2011 results, an effective and flexible approach to output geographies and an on-line facility for mapping and graphing of standard and user defined output.
- Local Government respondents, in particular, felt that flexible table generation was important.
- The majority of respondents expressed a preference for outputs to be released on-line and indicated that they would make use of a flexible on-line table generation system.

CHAPTER 19: GEOGRAPHY

19.1 In 2001, Output Areas were created as a group of postcodes nesting as well as possible into areas such as council area, electoral ward etc. The main aim was to provide continuity with 1991 whilst ensuring they fitted into the locality or urban area. The Output Area boundaries were finalised in December 2000 to strike a balance between the need for current information and the lead time required for the production of maps for enumerators. GROS viewed users in Scotland as being largely content with this approach and does not have any plans to make major changes to the methodology.

19.2 There were 55 replies to the consultation point on geography which asked:

Do you share our view that the 2001 approach to geography should be adopted again in 2011?

Table 19.1 provides a breakdown by type of respondent.

Table 19.1 Total number of respondents to the geography consultation point by category

Respondent Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Central Government	5	9
Local Government	21	38
Local Service Provider	5	9
Business & Commercial	3	5
Academic	1	2
Community & Special Interest Groups	5	9
Individuals	15	27
Total	55	100*

* Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Support for 2001 approach

19.3 Of the 55 respondents, over three quarters stated that they would be happy if a similar approach to geographies as in 2001 was adopted in 2011.

19.4 Small area geographies were viewed as critical. On the whole, people were pleased with the size of Scotland's Output Areas and found them a good tool for building up to higher level geographies.

19.5 There was general support for freezing the geographies shortly before Census day, and using these geographies for enumeration and output.

19.6 The Local Government response below supports the points made above and is representative of many others which were received:

“We welcome the continued use of output areas of similar size and threshold to 2001. The proposal of freezing geography the same as in 2001 is also welcome.”

19.7 Around 10 respondents stated that comparability and continuity with 2001 was vital, hence it would be important to continue the use of previous methodologies.

19.8 However, two respondents, both from the Business & Commercial sector, disagreed with this approach. Their replies were:

“We mainly believe that the geography should be optimised for communication of the 2011 Census results, rather than for comparability over time”

“...OA’s should be recreated to provide maximum usage and not be forced in to a geography that will be 20 years out of date.”

19.9 There was evidence, particularly from those who did not support the proposed GROS approach to geography, that some respondents did not fully understand the methodology and the results should be interpreted in this context.

Consistency with other geographies

19.10 General support was received for UK consistency. Respondents felt that it would be desirable to have Output Areas of the same size across the UK. However, it was stressed in a few responses that those for England and Wales should be reduced in size as opposed to Scotland’s being increased.

19.11 There were requests received for Output Areas to map to other areas such as datazones, intermediate geographies and multi-member wards. For example, the Local Government response below was reflective of many others received:

“Census outputs need to align to the ‘new’ geographies now in use i.e. datazones & multi-member wards.”

A few respondents said they would only support the 2001 approach on the understanding that there is consistency with these other such geographies.

19.12 It was also noted, mainly by those within Local Government, that more joined up working between GROS and The Scottish Government is required to ensure consistency with Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics (SNS) geographies.

19.13 A few respondents stressed that it was the boundaries which are the main concern and it would be helpful if these remained the same. In particular, a Local Government respondent said:

“Where revisions to OAs are required we would recommend that any revised OA boundaries are constrained to datazones (and, consequently, intermediate zone boundaries).”

Other comments

- 19.14 One respondent found datazone boundaries were not always flexible enough for their purposes, hence it is important to have all statistics available at Output Area level.
- 19.15 One respondent, from a Central Government organisation, felt it would be helpful to have the flexibility to group data geographically to suit their own requirements.
- 19.16 Another respondent wished for Local Enterprise Company (LEC) level data to be a standard output geography.
- 19.17 It was suggested that names should be assigned to datazones so they are more meaningful.
- 19.18 A recommendation was received to consider 'Lewis and Harris' as two separate island areas in the 'inhabited island' data sets.
- 19.19 A few respondents requested that GROS approach them for help when deciding on Output Areas, especially for areas with new builds etc.

Summary - Geography

- There was strong support to adopt the same approach to geographies as 2001. Most users were pleased with the size of Output Areas and freezing geographies.
- Comparability and continuity with 2001 was a high priority.
- Respondents generally agreed that consistency with geographies from other sources such as England and Wales and SNS would be appreciated.

CHAPTER 20: OTHER VIEWS

20.1 In addition to the 16 specific consultation points discussed in the preceding chapters, respondents were given the opportunity to submit comments on wider topics. The greatest number of such responses related to sexual identity.

Sexual Identity

20.2 GROS has acknowledged that there is an increasing demand for information on sexual identity but noted in the consultation document that it does not currently plan to ask a question on this topic in the 2011 Census. The reasons for this were based around GROS' concerns about asking the question in a survey like the Census, which may be completed by one household member for all and lead to inaccurate replies or pressure on individuals to disclose information they would prefer not to. Sensitivities around this topic might also tend to lead to reduced Census response rates if such a question were included.

20.3 Ten consultation responses dealt with the topic of sexual identity, three of which were from groups representing Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) communities. The remaining seven representations came from Central Government, Local Government, Community & Special Interest Groups and Individuals. Of the ten, all but two were in favour of including a sexual identity question in the 2011 Census. A small number of these respondents also felt that information on transgender identity would be useful.

20.4 New equalities legislation was most commonly given as a reason for including this question. In particular, the Equality Act (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2007 and the forthcoming UK-wide Single Equality Bill were thought likely to provide organisations with a statutory duty to promote sexual identity alongside the existing equalities duties. These would need to be monitored and baseline data would be required to support this. For example, one Central Government organisation noted:

“We are likely to be subject to a public sector duty under sexual orientation in the near future. We would find this more difficult to do with no background information on lesbian, gay and bisexual people and recommend that this is included in the census. Similarly transsexual data would be helpful.”

20.5 Other reasons put forward for including a sexual identity question on the Census included:

- to inform service planning;
- to provide a definitive figure for the LGB population;
- to give sexual identity the same status as other equality strands, questions about which are currently included in the Census.

20.6 Organisations also commented on GROS' arguments against including this question in the Census and there was a suggestion that other questions such as religion, ethnicity, household income and civil partnership status might be equally sensitive. One local government respondent did note, however, that if a sexual identity question is not possible then it would be important to include one on discrimination. Another

Organisation also supported the inclusion of a negative discrimination question, although in addition to one on sexual identity.

- 20.7 The two respondents, one Individual and one from a Community & Special Interest Group, who were against the inclusion of this question on the Census were concerned about the accuracy of the data generated and the possible intrusiveness of the question.

Specific points from groups representing the LGB community

- 20.8 The three responses from these organisations were strongly in favour of a sexual identity question in the 2011 Census. They were not satisfied with the arguments put forward against the inclusion of a sexual identity question on the Census, believing that a sexual identity question would be understood by the public and that this understanding would increase as 2011 approached.
- 20.9 In relation to a potential reduction in response rates resulting from this question, the respondents highlighted a recent survey carried out by YouGov on behalf of Stonewall Scotland. This was felt to indicate a change in public attitudes with around 9 in 10 persons supporting new legal protections around sexual identity.
- 20.10 In addition a small scale survey by the Equality Network (of their members) was mentioned, in which 88% of respondents indicated that they would accurately answer a Census question on sexual identity. It was therefore suggested that issues of non-disclosure, and the associated under-reporting, would not invalidate the question. Indeed, under-reporting would be expected in the first instance and response could be maximised by appropriate publicity about the purpose of the question as well as confidentiality reassurances. It was felt that the benefits of a first set of benchmarking statistics at a local and national level would outweigh the under reporting and provide, at the very least, an adequate lower bound for the derived statistics on this topic.
- 20.11 There were also comments on the issue of forms being completed by one household member and the possibility of individuals being put under pressure to reveal their sexual identity with one such organisation noting that only a minority of LGB adults “*are not out to other members of their household*” and that these are more likely to be in a narrow younger age group. The associated under reporting was therefore felt to be acceptable, particularly if the question were addressed only to the over 16s. They also commented that “*We do not think that the additional need to conceal the truth once more, over the Census question, is likely to cause significant additional difficulties for people in this situation*”.
- 20.12 Two of these organisations expressed concern about the terminology ‘sexual identity’, noting that ‘sexual orientation’ is the term defined and applied in equality legislation and that the meaning of ‘sexual identity’ is less clear.
- 20.13 All three users also commented on the marital / civil partnership status question and were generally pleased with the question included in the 2006 Test, which distinguishes between the two. However, one organisation commented that “*it is illogical to include a question on marriage and civil partnership or same-sex households without including a question on sexual orientation.*” and another did

suggest that marital / civil partnership information could be obtained from other sources to allow more space for the inclusion of a sexual identity question. There was also a suggestion that the relationship matrix should be updated to ask about 'Husband, wife or registered civil partner' and 'Partner (opposite or same sex)'.

Support for other questions

- 20.14 Several respondents requested the inclusion of a question which asked about the nature of negative discrimination. One in particular commented that it is important for all strands of equality and relates to a range of factors why a person may feel discriminated against. However, another respondent thought it was too subjective and should not be included. Support for negative discrimination was also discussed in relation to form length in paragraph 4.13 of chapter 4.
- 20.15 Two Local Government respondents thought a question (as in the 2006 Census Test) on how safe people feel in their area should be asked.
- 20.16 Number of children given birth to was also requested as it provides useful information on fertility trends, although one Local Government organisation did support its exclusion.
- 20.17 A respondent from a Community & Special Interest Group would like to see the inclusion of a question which collects information on fathers who have part-time care responsibilities for their children. This is particularly useful when recording the number of non-resident parents. It also has implications for service provisions if a child stays with their biological father part-time.

Comments on the marital/civil partnership question

- 20.18 There were a few suggestions made regarding the question on marital or civil partnership status. These were:
- single people may find it discriminatory to be described as 'never married and never formed a civil partnership' rather than 'single';
 - there is not a category to allow the identification of couples who live together but have not entered into a formal marriage or civil partnership;
 - for clarification, add 'church or registry office' after the worded 'married' and 'still legally in civil partnership' in the definition of 'separated from civil partner';
 - the 'widowed' category implies this is for women only;
 - the wording of this was also thought to be too complex for deaf and blind BSL users whose first language is not English or have learning difficulties.

Other Comments

- 20.19 There was a support received for UK harmonisation of questions included in the Census. This would allow UK level analyses to be carried out and would be helpful in validating similar data received from other sources e.g. government department surveys.

20.20 Several respondents provided comments on the questionnaire design. These were:

- give careful consideration to the order and grouping of the questions on the form so there is a logical flow;
- front page needs to be more accessible e.g. for those with visual impairments;
- allocate a space, perhaps on the front of the form, to describe uses of Census information;
- make it clear where the end of the form is e.g. have a box which says 'End' and thanks respondents for their participation.

Summary – Other views

- Although a specific consultation point was not included about sexual identity, a number of respondents did express their requirements for this data – this was the topic most frequently raised in the “Other views” section.
- Monitoring new equalities legislation in this area was the most commonly identified user need.
- Only two of the respondents who commented on this section did not support the inclusion of this question on the Census - they were concerned about the intrusiveness of the question and the accuracy of the data it could provide.
- There was very limited support for other questions on discrimination, number of children given birth to, individual fathers and how safe people feel in their area.

CHAPTER 21: THE NEXT STEPS

21.1 Responses received to the consultation will shortly be made publicly available, where respondents indicated agreement to this.

21.2 Further consideration will be given over the coming months to the topics for inclusion in the 2011 Census questionnaire. This will take account of:

- responses to this consultation, in addition to evidence gathered previously;
- input from the Scottish Government;
- technical considerations, particularly the number of pages of personal questions that the form will contain but also other issues such as viable wording for questions and layout;
- continued liaison with the other UK Census offices, in light of the Registrars General's Statement of Agreement on the Conduct of the 2011 Census.

21.3 This phase of work will conclude in Spring 2008, when a provisional decision will be taken by GROS about the topics that will be included in the 2011 Census questionnaire. That decision will be presented to Parliament later in 2008, for final agreement.

ANNEX A: LIST OF RESPONDING ORGANISATIONS

Organisation	Organisation type
Aberdeenshire Council	Local Government
African Women's Group Scotland (Aberdeen Branch)	Community & Special Interest Groups
Argyll and Bute Council	Local Government
Bord na Gaidhlig	Central Government
British Sikh Federation	Community & Special Interest Groups
Cairngorms National Park Authority	Central Government
Capability Scotland	Community & Special Interest Groups
Children in Scotland	Community & Special Interest Groups
Commission for Racial Equality in Scotland	Central Government
Crofters Commission	Central Government
DeafBlind Scotland	Community & Special Interest Groups
Disability Rights Commission	Central Government
East Lothian Council	Local Government
Equality Network	Community & Special Interest Groups
Falkirk Council	Local Government
Glasgow City Council	Local Government
Heriot-Watt University, Languages & Intercultural Studies (SML)	Academic
Highlands & Islands Enterprise	Central Government
Home Safety Scotland	Local Service Provider
Inverclyde Council, Planning and Transportation	Local Government
LGBT Youth Scotland	Community & Special Interest Groups
Lothian and Borders Police	Local Service Provider
MRS Census and Geodemographics Group	Business & Commercial
NHS Health Scotland	Local Service Provider
NHS Scotland Resource Allocation Committee (NRAC)	Local Service Provider
North Lanarkshire Council	Local Government
Ordnance Survey	Central Government
Renfrewshire Council	Local Government
RNID Scotland	Community & Special Interest Groups
Scots Tung	Community & Special Interest Groups
Scottish Borders Council	Local Government
Scottish Council of Jewish Communities	Community & Special Interest Groups
Scottish Enterprise	Central Government
South Ayrshire Council, Corporate Policy & Communications	Local Government
South East of Scotland Transport Partnership (SEStran)	Local Service Provider
South Lanarkshire Council	Local Government
Stirling Council	Local Government
Stonewall Scotland	Community & Special Interest Groups

Strathclyde Partnership for Transport	Local Service Provider
Organisation	Organisation type
The Association of Nigerians in the Grampian Region	Community & Special Interest Groups
The Demographics User Group	Business & Commercial
The East African Network	Community & Special Interest Groups
The Highland Council	Local Government
The Pagan Federation (Scotland)	Community & Special Interest Groups
The Scottish Inter Faith Council	Community & Special Interest Groups
West Lothian Council	Local Government

ANNEX B – CONSULTATION POINTS

General Information

- Name
- Are you responding as an individual or on the behalf of an organisation?
- Do you agree to your responses being made available to the public?
- Would you be prepared for GROS to contact you if we need to clarify your response?
- Address
- Telephone number
- Email address

Topics and Questions other than Ethnicity

Consultation Point 1

We would welcome your views about our plans to have three rather than four pages of personal questions in the 2011 Census Questionnaire.

Consultation Point 2

We would welcome views on the approaches to gathering information on housing quality discussed in paragraphs 4.3.4 and 4.3.5 in the consultation document.

Consultation Point 3

We would welcome your views on whether or not a question on income should be included in the 2011 Census.

- If a personal income question takes up too much space, would a household income question be sufficiently useful?
- If you believe a personal income question is vital, what other topics would you be prepared to exclude to accommodate it?

Consultation Point 4

We would welcome your views on the proposed changes to the questions on health and care.

- Would an extended question on limiting long term illness, which identifies specific conditions, add value to your use of Census data? If so, please tell us how.
- Do you consider that the question on care should be a high priority? If so, please tell us why.

Consultation Point 5

What impact would dropping the question on religion of upbringing have for you or your organisation?

- If you think this is still a priority, what other topic would you be prepared to exclude to accommodate this question?

Consultation Point 6

Do you think that we should continue to ask a combined question on travel to work or study?

- Or should we only ask about travel to work? (asking two separate questions is unfeasible on space grounds.)

Consultation Point 7

Do you consider that information on languages other than Gaelic should be a priority for the Census?

If so:

- What aspects of language should be gathered?
- If a comprehensive question cannot be accommodated, would a simpler question be better than nothing?
- What languages are you interested in?

Consultation Point 8

What are your priorities for migration information from the Census?

- What are your views on the collection of information on citizenship?

Consultation Point 9

What impact would the changes to the collection of NS-SEC and Labour Market data, discussed in section 4.11 of the consultation document, have on your use of Census data?

Consultation Point 10

Do you use qualifications data from the Census?

- If you consider it a high priority, please tell us why.

Consultation Point 11

Would you use Census information on second residences?

- We welcome your views on the proposed population definitions.

Ethnicity (Consultation Point 12)

Q1 In which of these topics do you or your organisation have an interest? Tick all that apply.

- Ethnic Group
- National Identity

Q2 What role or responsibility does your organisation have in respect of the areas you have ticked above (Q1)?

Q3 For which UK countries/areas do you need this information? Tick all that apply.

- Scotland
- England
- Wales
- Northern Ireland
- Great Britain
- United Kingdom

Q4 If a separate question on national identity (i.e. the country which a person identifies with most) were to be adopted on the 2011 Census, what would you use this information for?

- Q5 Do you need ethnic group information from the 2011 Census?
- Yes, go to Q6
 - No, go to Question 13
- Q6 Which type of ethnic group information do you require? Tick all that apply.
- General information on the ethnic composition of the population
 - Information on specific ethnic groups, please specify.
 - Information on combinations of ethnic group (e.g. total minority ethnic population, the Asian population etc.)
 - Other, please write in
- Q7 For what purpose(s) do you need this information? Tick all that apply.
- Service provision
 - Policy development
 - Workforce monitoring
 - Promoting equal opportunities
 - Tackling discrimination
 - Other, please write in
- Q8 Looking at the ethnicity questions presented on page 28 of the Consultation Document, which do you consider best meet your data needs? Tick ONE box.
- Prefer the 2006 Census Test questions, go to Q9
 - Prefer the 2001 Census question, go to Q9
 - No preference, go to Q10
- Q9 Why does the 2001 **or** 2006 Census Question best meet your data needs? Please state your reasons.
- Q10 If, in 2011, an ethnicity classification were to be adopted which replaced the terms 'Black' and 'White' with 'European' and 'African' (such as the 2006 question shown on page 28 of the consultation document) what impact would this have on your organisations' ability to use the Census data or other surveys you conduct which are based the Census ethnicity classification?
- Q11 If a revised ethnicity classification is used on the 2011 Census this would have an impact on the level of comparability that could be achieved with 2001 Census data. What effect, if any, would this have on your organisation?
- Q12 If the ethnicity classification adopted on the 2011 Scottish Census differs slightly from that adopted on other UK Censuses this would have an impact on the level of achievable UK comparability. What effect, if any, would this have on your organisations? Please state in the box below.

Q13 Please use the space provided below for any other comments you wish to add.

Carrying out the Census

Consultation Point 13

Comments and views on the suggestion that we should offer the option of filling in the Census form on the internet are welcome.

Consultation Point 14

Comments and views on the 2011 Census Gaelic Language policy are welcome.

Outputs

Consultation Point 15

Comments and views on the provision of Census Output are welcome.

- Which three of the 17 aims listed in paragraph 7.1.2 are the most important to you?
- Would you prefer to obtain most of the 2011 Census data that you need on-line rather than on paper?
- Would you use a flexible on-line table generation system, or would you expect to rely on pre-planned output (in either paper or electronic form)?

Consultation Point 16

Do you share our view that the 2001 approach to geography should be adopted again in 2011?