national STATiSTiCS

2011 Census

Ethnic Group, National Identity, Religion and Language consultation

Summary report on responses to the 2011 Census stakeholders consultation 2006/07

Office for National Statistics, October 2007
© Crown Copyright

Summary Report on Responses to the 2011 Census Stakeholders Consultation 2006/07: Ethnic Group, National Identity, Religion and Language, England and Wales

Contents

Data Conventions

Rounding of figures

In tables where figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number, there may be an apparent discrepancy between the sum of the constituent items and the total as shown.

Units in tables

Figures are shown in italics when they represent percentages.

Summary of Findings

The 2006/07 Census Stakeholders Consultation was held to provide a detailed picture of user needs for information on ethnic group, national identity, language and religion to help decide which questions should be asked in the 2011 Census. There were 606 responses to the consultation. Users who responded to the consultation showed strong requirements for information on three of these four topics: more than eight out of ten respondents said they needed information on ethnic group, language and religion. On the fourth topic, national identity, 58 per cent of consultation respondents needed such information.

Ethnic group

The consultation looked at user needs for information on ethnic group. Key findings are presented below and full details can be found in Section 2 of this report.

Additional information required

Of the respondents to the consultation who needed ethnic group information, less than one-quarter (22 per cent) said they were satisfied with the single ethnic group categories listed in the 2007 Census Test question. Users required more information, either by refining the existing categories or including new categories, on the following groups:

• 'Other White background' – more specific information, for example, on eastern European identities, Cypriots, Greeks, Turkish, Kurds

• 'Asian' – more specific information, for example, East African Asians, Indonesians, Siberians, Sri Lankan, and Vietnamese identities

• 'African' – more specific information, for example, on Nigerian, Somali and Sudanese identities

• 'Mixed' – greater variety of options

• Cornish

• Jewish

• Kashmiri

• Sikh

Acceptability of terminology

The majority of respondents were satisfied with each of the combined ethnic group categories (which included colour terms and the term 'Mixed') and 62 per cent found the single ethnic group categories acceptable.

Users who were unsatisfied with the terminology used raised concerns about the following:

- Colour terminology – some expressed the opinion that colour terminology, or a mix of colour and geographical terms, was not acceptable

- The term 'Mixed' – some expressed the opinion that this was not an acceptable term and that 'Multiple Heritage' was preferable

- 'Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller' – some expressed the opinion that the addition of 'Romany' would make the category ambiguous, others requested separate categories for Gypsies and for Irish Travellers, and that the category should be located under the 'White' combined ethnic group heading

- 'Arab' – some expressed the opinion that this term was ambiguous and would not provide specific enough information

- 'Chinese' – there was concern about the movement of the category to the 'Asian' heading, as the 'Asian' combined category was previously taken to indicate South Asian. Users thought a broader 'Asian' category would be too diverse for useful analysis

- Welsh should be recorded as an ethnic group and not as a sub-group of 'White'

- Unable to identify British Irish and second generation Irish

Need for information based on colour terminology

Almost one-half (46 per cent) of respondents who needed ethnic group information said they also needed information on the visible minority population, which is currently based on colour terminology.

Comparability over time and across the UK

Two-thirds (67 per cent) of respondents who needed ethnic group information needed to compare single ethnic groups in 2011 with 2001. The need was

greatest in local and regional government (90 per cent) and central and devolved government (77 per cent). However, most recognised that small changes to the classification was desirable to provide more accurate or detailed information.

Respondents whose remit covered Great Britain or the UK expressed the strongest requirement for comparability between UK countries. These were mainly central government departments. Comparability across the UK was less of a concern to respondents in local and regional government or experts, community and special interest groups.

Multiple response ethnic group information
In general, respondents recognised that multiple response ethnic group information could have benefits for the accuracy and depth of information, especially on mixed or multiple ethnicities, and on acceptability to respondents. However these advantages were outweighed by the disadvantages of:

- increased difficulty in implementing and interpreting a multiple response classification
- potential inflation of the numbers of people with 'Mixed' ethnic group
- loss of comparability with the 2001 classification
- potential confusion or misunderstanding by respondents, with consequential impact on data quality

National identity
A question on national identity has not been asked in previous censuses and this consultation investigates what users would need from such a question. Key findings are presented below and full details can be found in Section 3 of this report.

Among respondents to the consultation, 58 per cent said they needed information on national identity, primarily to complement ethnic group information.

Less than half (45 per cent) of respondents who required information on national identity thought that the 2007 Census Test question would meet their needs. The main requirements were for information on additional national identities to those listed in the question, whether outside the UK (such as eastern European or African national identities) or from the UK (such as Cornish).

Religion

Following the introduction of a voluntary question on religion in the 2001 Census, this consultation looks at user needs in this area. Key findings are presented below and full details can be found in Section 4 of this report.

Three-quarters (74 per cent) of respondents to the consultation who needed information on religion thought that the religion question for the 2007 Census Test (a repeat of the 2001 Census question) would meet their needs. Those respondents whose needs were not met required the following additional information:

• accurate measurement of non-religious beliefs

• distinction between religious affiliation or identity and active religious practice

• details of religious denominations, for example within the Christian and Muslim religions

A similar proportion of respondents (76 per cent) needed to compare information on religion in 2011 with 2001. The need for comparability was greatest among users in local and regional government (85 per cent).

Language

Proficiency in languages (apart from Welsh) has not been included in previous censuses in England and Wales. Key findings of user needs in this area are presented below and full details can be found in Section 5 of this report.

The strongest requirement for language information was in local and regional government, almost all respondents to the consultation from this group said they required it. Language information was needed to improve service provision and monitor potential disadvantage.

Several different aspects of language information were identified. The strongest requirement was for proficiency in spoken English to be measured, followed by some indication of languages other than English spoken, for example the preferred spoken language for communicating with public authorities, the main language spoken at home, the mother tongue or first language. Each of these was ranked 'very important' by more than 70 per cent of respondents.

Less than half (46 per cent) of respondents who needed information on language thought that the 2007 Census Test question would provide the information they required. The principal problem was the lack of space for recording languages other than English and in particular that there was only space for one other language on the census form.

1. Introduction

The census is carried out every ten years and provides vital information about the UK population. As part of the preparations for the next Census in 2011, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) has developed a programme of consultations to help inform the question development for the 2011 Census and to gain a better understanding of user and stakeholder requirements. The first consultation was held in 2005[1] and in March 2006 ONS published a summary of user requirements for each topic.

This consultation builds on the 2006 summary assessment of initial user requirements on ethnicity, identity, language and religion'[2] and aims to provide a detailed view of user needs for information on these topics in England and Wales. It took place between December 2006 and March 2007.

Comments from interested people and organisations were gathered so that ONS could:
- gain a better understanding of key data requirements
- gain an awareness of the range of views held on these topics
- identify the relative priorities for this information given the constraints of space on the census form

Details of the consultation were published on the National Statistics website, www.statistics.gov.uk, and were also sent to recognised stakeholders. Respondents to the consultation were required to complete a questionnaire, see Appendix (A.5). The organisations and individuals participating in the consultation are listed in Appendix (A.2).

Table 1: Number of respondents: by organisation type

England and Wales

	Number of respondents	Number of respondents (excluding repetitions and non-questionnaire responses)
Central & devolved government	27	23
Experts, community & special interest groups	441	139
Local & regional government	92	89
Local service providers	46	46
All respondents	**606**	**297**

There were 606 responses to the consultation (Table 1). For reporting purposes, respondents have been grouped into four stakeholder types:

- central and devolved government –central government departments and agencies and devolved government

- expert, community and special interest groups – includes community based organisations, academia, private companies, individuals and special interest groups

- Local and regional government

- local Service providers – includes organisations providing services at the local level such as the police, fire service and primary care trusts

Some community organisations and special interest groups organised for copies of their response to be sent in by individuals as well, resulting in some duplication. This occurred particularly among organisations representing Sikh, Kashmiri and Cornish interests. As the main purpose of the consultation was to identify the range of views held, the number of responses presented in this report are based on the unique responses received, without the duplicates. In addition whilst the majority of respondents submitted their responses using the questionnaire, some supplied their views by correspondence. As the data

in the tables are derived from the responses to specific questions in the questionnaire, the data presented in the reports includes questionnaire and unique responses only.

Findings from the consultation have been published in five reports. This summary report conveys the main messages from the consultation from all the respondents. The other four reports summarise the key findings from the different stakeholders that participated in the consultation.

1. ***Consultation Summary Report of Responses to the 2011 Census Stakeholders Consultation 2006/07: Ethnic Group, National Identity, Religion and Language, England and Wales*, Office for National Statistics, 2007 [web address]**

2. *Central and Devolved Government Responses to the 2011 Census Stakeholders Consultation 2006/07: Ethnic Group, National Identity, Religion and Language, England and Wales*, Office for National Statistics, 2007 [web address]

3. *Expert, Community and Special Interest Groups Responses to the 2011 Census Stakeholders Consultation 2006/07: Ethnic Group, National Identity, Religion and Language, England and Wales*, Office for National Statistics, 2007 [web address]

4. *Local and Regional Government Responses to the 2011 Census Stakeholders Consultation 2006/07: Ethnic Group, National Identity, Religion and Language, England and Wales*, Office for National Statistics, 2007 [web address]

5. *Local Service Provider Responses to the 2011 Census Stakeholders Consultation 2006/07: Ethnic Group, National Identity, Religion and Language, England and Wales*, Office for National Statistics, 2007 [web address]

2. Review of Requirements for Information on Ethnic Group

The consultation asked about seven different aspects of ethnicity:
o   requirements for information on concepts of ethnicity
o   suitability of ethnic group categories and suggested changes
o   requirements for comparison with 2001 ethnic group information
o   requirements for comparison between UK countries
o   acceptability of ethnic group terminology
o   advantages and disadvantages of multiple response ethnicity data
o   comments on the Scottish 2006 Census Test ethnicity classification

An ethnic group question was included in both the 1991 and 2001 Censuses, providing information on the self-identified ethnic group of the population. The initial assessment of user requirements for ethnicity data in the 2011 Census[2] and responses to this consultation report the wide range of potential uses of ethnic group information, including:
o   resource allocation and informing the provision of services
o   to enable public bodies to meet their statutory obligations under the *Race Relations Act 1976*, *Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000*, and equal opportunities legislation
o   central and local government policy development and monitoring
o   market research
o   academic research
o   representing the interests of specific groups

2.1 Requirements for information on concepts of ethnicity

Although the census question has always used the term 'ethnic group' rather than 'race' the current legal framework (as set out by the *Race Relations Act*) is phrased in terms of race. However, the Act protects people from discrimination on the grounds of several related factors: colour, race, nationality, or national or ethnic origins.

The vast majority of respondents (92 per cent) require information on ethnic group from the 2011 Census (Table 2). Local and regional government expressed the greatest need, where 97 per cent of respondents need ethnic group information.

Table 2: Requirements for information on ethnic group from the 2011 Census: by organisation type
England and Wales   **Percentages**

Organisation type	Yes	No	Base = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	96	4	23
Experts, community & special interest groups	87	13	130
Local & regional government	97	3	86
Local service providers	93	7	44
All respondents	**92**	**8**	**283**

Users were invited to consider whether their need is for information on ethnic group (a cultural characteristic), or if they require information on other related concepts as well as, or instead of, ethnic group, for example race, visible minorities, non-White groups and ancestry. Classifications of race are generally based on a set of physical characteristics. Visible minority status is related to having a different appearance from the majority. Ancestry relates to historical information about where an individual's forebears come from, though it also has a subjective element in deciding how many generations of ancestry to consider. A relatively low proportion of respondents needed information on concepts related to ethnicity (Table 3).

Table 3: Requirements of information for concepts related to ethnicity from the 2011 Census: by organisation type
England and Wales   **Percentages**

	Visible minority population	Non-White population	Ancestry	Race	Base[1,2] = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	32	41	27	27	22
Experts, community & special interest groups	54	27	28	28	113
Local & regional government	48	57	23	46	83
Local service providers	27	32	22	46	41
All respondents	**46**	**39**	**25**	**37**	**259**

1 Respondents could respond to more than one category.
2 Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed ethnic group information from the 2011 Census in Question 5.

Visible minority population

Information on visible minority populations was required by 46 per cent of respondents and was the most requested concept by experts, community and special interest group respondents (54 per cent) and local and regional government respondents (48 per cent). This information is required to monitor the incidence of discrimination based on physical appearance and to fulfil obligations under race and equality legislation. For example:

> 'The *Race Relations (Amendment) Act* requires local authorities to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and promote good race relations … The visible minority and the Black/White categorisation reflect the fact that discrimination can act on the basis of skin colour, and this needs to be identified.'
> (London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

Some respondents questioned the definition of visible minority. For example:

> 'Visibility is not a matter of skin colour alone.'
> (The Scottish Council of Jewish Communities)

> 'We believe that visibility is a vague term that could refer to a number of things including phenotype [observable characteristics], accent, dress and name.'
> (Commission for Racial Equality)

Non-White

Over half of local and regional authorities (57 per cent) requested information on the non-White population compared with 27 per cent of experts, community and special interest groups. Local and regional authorities use this information to produce headline comparisons of the populations they serve. This is particularly the case for local areas where there are a small number of non-White residents, leading to difficulties in distinguishing between different ethnic groups because of issues of disclosure. For example:

> '… Information about the numbers of non-White is a necessity because many central government returns require this information; in practice Herefordshire has very small numbers of non-White ... '
> (Herefordshire Council)

Race

Around two-fifths of respondents (37 per cent) required information on race. Those that required information on race, as distinct from ethnic group, gave similar reasons. The Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) pointed out in clarification that:

> 'The *Race Relations Act* uses "race" both to describe the catch-all class that receives protection under the Act, that is, "racial group", and as one of five sub-classes that fall within it. Racial groups are groups defined by racial grounds, that is race, colour, nationality (including citizenship) or ethnic or national origins. All racial groups are protected from unlawful racial discrimination under the Act. The census question *What is your Ethnic Group?* appears to use the term "ethnic group" to mean the same as "racial group" as defined by the Act.'
> (CRE)

Ancestry

Where information on ancestry was needed (25 per cent), respondents highlighted its usefulness as a way of understanding second and third (and so on) generation of immigrants.

Some respondents expressed a need for information on ancestry to inform public health, undertaking research into health inequalities and for treating certain health conditions. The Department of Health (DH) is interested in ancestry to help clinicians when diagnosing or treating certain health conditions. However, DH recognises the collection of information on ancestry is "beyond the census … as it is at the individual level that clinicians need to ascertain a person's ancestry".

2.2 Suitability of ethnic group categories and suggested changes

The consultation invited comments on how well the 2007 Census Test question on ethnic group would meet user needs for information. Details of the 2007 Census Test question can be found in Appendix (A.6).

Table 4: Suitability of the proposed ethnic group categories in the 2007 Census Test: by organisation type
England and Wales **Percentages**

	Combined ethnic groups[1]				Single ethnic groups[2]			
	Yes	No	Partially	*Base[3] = 100% (numbers)*	Yes	No	Partially	*Base[3] = 100% (numbers)*
Central & devolved government	36	45	18	22	45	14	41	22
Experts, community & special interest groups	14	71	15	108	13	59	28	112
Local & regional government	30	33	37	84	24	25	52	85
Local service providers	42	42	17	36	30	38	33	40
All respondents	**25**	**52**	**23**	**250**	**22**	**41**	**37**	**259**

[1]*Combined ethnic groups include 'White', 'Mixed', 'Asian or Asian British', 'Black or Black British' and 'Other ethnic groups'.*
[2]*Single ethnic groups refer to individual tick boxes in the ethnic group question e.g. .'Black African', 'Indian',' White English'.*
3 *Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed ethnic group information from the 2011 Census in Question 5.*

Around one-quarter (25 per cent) of respondents thought that the combined ethnic group categories would provide the information they required, with around one-half (52 per cent) of respondents considering these categories would not meet their needs (Table 4). This was generally because the categories were too broad. Respondents from experts, communities and special interest groups were the least likely to say this information would meet their needs.

For the proposed single ethnic group, 22 per cent of all respondents thought these categories would provide the information they required, while 41 per cent did not. Again, respondents from experts, community and special interest groups were least likely to say that this information would meet their needs. Respondents from central and devolved government were the most likely to confirm that this information would meet their needs.

Additional requirements and suggested changes were invited. Respondents required improved information in the following areas

Combined ethnic group categories:
o combined ethnic group categories are too broad
o mixed categories are limited as most refer to White and another ethnic group
o 'Asian or Asian British' is too broad

Single ethnic group categories:
o 'Other White Background' covers a vast and varied population
o 'Chinese' has moved into the 'Asian or Asian British' combined group
o 'Black African' is too broad
o 'Arab' is confusing and too broad
o 'Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller' should be categorised under the 'White' combined group and not 'Other ethnic group'
o 'Welsh' should be recorded as an ethnic group and not as a sub-group of 'White'
o unable to identify British Irish and second generation Irish
o additional single ethnic groups should be included

2.2.1 Details of additional requirements – combined ethnic group categories

Combined ethnic group categories are too broad
Several local service providers and government departments stated that the combined ethnic groups would not provide the level of detail required to tailor services and to meet the diverse needs of ethnic communities.

> 'Evidence from education, housing and labour market data sources for example show massive variations in the experiences of different groups within those combined categories - e.g. the Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Indian groups as well as the Caribbean and African groups profile

distinctly differently. Similarly Whites from English speaking countries will have different needs and profiles compared to those from Western and Eastern European backgrounds.'
(Local Government Association High Ethnicity Authorities Special Interest Group)

'The combined categories (*vs* single categories) are too broad to give the detailed understanding of the local population that is required in a highly diverse geographical area.'
(Barts and The London NHS Trust – Royal National Hospital)

Mixed categories are limited as most refer to White and another ethnic group
The 2007 Census Test ethnic group question for the 'Mixed' ethnic group includes five sub-divisions; four of these sub-groups include 'White' with another broad ethnic group. Users wanted the 'Mixed' category to more accurately reflect the population.

'In some datasets the final 'Any other mixed background' accounts for up to 40% of all 'Mixed' responses. There are therefore arguments to include other 'mixes' most notably Black and Asian (to recognise that mixed race is not simple about white-non white combinations) and White and Chinese (the next largest category – although if the relocation of Chinese goes ahead it is assumed that this will be merged with White and Asian). [This information is needed] to more accurately reflect mixed race population and to signal explicitly that White is not always a component of mixed race.'
(CRE)

'Asian or Asian British' is too broad
As with the 'Other White' and 'Black African' categories some respondents said the 'Asian' category was too broad, and should be broken down into more specific groups.

'"Asian, or Asian British" would include 'Siberians', 'Chinese', Indonesians, Siberians, Vietnamese, and so on… [This] category is too wide to be of any use.'
(British Sikh Federation and affiliated organisations)

'Distinguish between Sri Lankan Asians and East African Asians - within the Asian category.'
(Muslim Council of Britain)

2.2.2 Details of additional requirements – single ethnic group categories

'Other White background' covers a vast and varied population
Users required more detail than is provided by the 'Other White' category. This category covers a large and varied population. The primary requirement was to identify those from eastern Europe and the former USSR. For example:

 '[We require] further breakdown of the 'Other White' group. 'Other White' covers a large and varied population, including [people from] the Americas, Australasia, eastern and western [suggest alphabetical order] Europe … [to] understand more about the changing population of the UK, including concentration/dispersion of different ethnic groups, to target local policies, and in particular, understand more about the diverse self-employed population.'
(Department of Trade and Industry)

Central and local government need to identify specific ethnic groups to ensure they are meeting service demands and that certain groups are not disadvantaged or discriminated against. For example:

'… people from eastern Europe are likely to have vastly differing needs to those from countries such as the USA or Australia, for example, mainly because of language differences.'
(Herefordshire Council)

'Eastern European migrants may be vulnerable to prejudice and discrimination not experienced by other White "Westerners". The failure to identify them makes it impossible to monitor inequality and identify emerging problems and needs.'

(Department of Communities and Local Government)

Some stakeholders suggested ways of tackling the issue. These included having a write-in category, or an option for census respondents to specify continent. However, there was recognition that there may not be 'an obvious, practical way to capture these communities through an Ethnicity question' (CRE).

'Chinese' has moved into the 'Asian or Asian British' combined group
In the 2007 Census Test questionnaire the 'Chinese' ethnic group has been included within the 'Asian or Asian British' combined ethnic group, whereas in previous censuses this ethnic group was categorised within the 'Other ethnic group'. Concerns were raised regarding the impact this would have on analysing changes over time in the 'Asian' and 'Other ethnic group' categories.

Respondents commented that ONS had not provided enough evidence of a need to move the Chinese category under the Asian or Asian British, and expressed concerns that this would hinder 'longitudinal comparisons between "Asian" data sets from either side of the 2001 Census' (CRE).

'Black African' is too broad
The 'Black African' category would not provide enough information on the considerable diversity of this group.

'The Black African population is one of the fastest growing in many parts of the UK. There are very significant differences in language needs, religion, economic and social status, educational attainment and health within the African population, for example between the communities of Somali and Nigerian origin.'

(London Borough of Greenwich)

'Some single ethnic groups are still quite broad in their grouping such as Black African. The experiences of some African communities who have been in England for a long time are not going to be the same as those communities who have arrived more recently, or under more difficult circumstances (such as refugees).'
(Southwark Council and Southwark Primary Care Trust)

'Arab' is confusing and too broad
There was some confusion over the term 'Arab'. While some viewed the term too specific others suggested the category was too large. For example:

'"Arab" looks like it fills a large gap but on reflection in the local context [it] may not do – a gap still remains for identification of substantial groups such as those from Afghanistan, Iran and parts of North Africa.'
(London Borough of Barnet)

'The inclusion of "Arab" is fully supported … Ideally Arab should be broken down to "Arab-North African", "Arab-Iraqi" and "Arab-Other" (because each of these groups are believed to be quite large – more than 100,000 in 2006, but there is little statistical information).'
(Muslim Council of Britain)

'Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller' should be categorised under the 'White' combined group and not 'Other ethnic group'
Several respondents suggested the 'Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller' category should be located under the 'White' heading rather than the 'Other Ethnic Group' heading for consistency with other organisations that collect information about this group. For example:

'Location under "White" is consistent with existing ONS allocation of write-in options, Department for Education and Skills practice and CRE policy.'
(CRE)

Some respondents questioned having one category for Gypsy, Romany and Irish Travellers on the grounds that these were disparate groups with very different cultures and did not belong together. Divisions between these different groups could result in them not answering the question. For example:

> 'The current terminology is confusing: the terms "Gypsy" and "Romany" are two ways of referring to the same ethnic group, that is British Gypsies (the word Romany is superfluous in this context and should be omitted) … Our first preference would be for two categories: Gypsies and Irish Travellers. If this is not practicable, then we would be content for an ethnic category of "Gypsy/Irish Traveller" to be used in the census.'
> (Department of Communities and Local Government)

> 'Use of the term "Romany/Gypsy" may attract responses from European Roma … which would cloud the data set making it effectively useless for developing policy with regard to Gypsies and Irish Travellers … Although European Roma are historically related to Romany Gypsies, they are quite distinct groups with quite different needs. "Gypsy" is thought to be inclusive enough for Welsh Gypsies to identify with as well as English (Romany) Gypsies. We recommend that the term "Gypsy/Irish Traveller" is used instead.'
> (CRE)

'Welsh' should be recorded as an ethnic group and not as a sub-group of 'White'
The Welsh Assembly Government stated a requirement for Welsh identity to be recorded regardless of ethnic group, and not just as a sub-category of 'White'. In addition, Plaid Cymru London Branch would like respondents in England to be able to identify themselves as "Welsh".

'Need to be able to identify Welsh categories other than White Welsh in order to target policy.'
(Office of the Chief Social Research Officer, Welsh Assembly Government)

' … the question creates difficulty for respondents in England who may wish to identify themselves as "Welsh". We are concerned that people are being forced to identify themselves as British when they consider themselves to be firstly Welsh [or] Scottish.'
(Plaid Cymru London Branch)

Unable to identify British Irish and second generation Irish
The London Irish Councillors' Network requested information on second generation Irish.

' … the second-generation Irish are an invisible minority in England (same skin- colour) and are never recognised as being different, which causes great malaise because of lack of respect for their culture … [This information is needed] to analyse and inform on policy regarding the needs of the London Irish community [and] identify Irish who identify themselves as "British".'
(London Irish Councillors' Network)

Additional single ethnic groups should be included
Some respondents requested additional categories to be added to the 2007 Test Census ethnic group question, including Cornish, Greek-Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot, Turkish, Kurdish, Jewish, Kashmiri and Sikh.

Cornish
Several organisations representing Cornish interests have requested that Cornish be measured in the census.

> '… a specific "Cornish" tick-box to permit statistical analysis of
> the Cornish, who are a sizeable minority in Cornwall and, though
> a fully delimited ethnic group, are subject to a high level of
> pressure that has a considerable negative impact in cultural,
> linguistic, economic and social fields. '
> (The Cornish Ethnicity Data Tracking Unit)

Greek-Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot, Turkish, Kurdish
A few local and regional authorities have asked for additional
categories for Greek-Cypriots, Turkish-Cypriots, Kurdish and Turkish
populations to be included to help understand the diverse population in
particular areas of London.

Jewish
A few local and regional authorities and communities and special
interest groups requested the inclusion of a Jewish category in the
ethnic group question. For example:

> 'The categories strongly suggest that ethnicity is only a matter of
> race and nationality. But for Jews, normative ethnicity is related
> to ancestry and peoplehood. It is likely that a majority of these
> people would consider themselves ethnically but *not* religiously
> Jewish – a label that in the eyes of many Jews relates to
> religious practice and not belonging.'
> (The Board of Deputies of British Jews)

Kashmiri
Many local and regional authorities and local service providers that
serve a substantial Kashmiri population cited a need for better
information on this group. For example:

> '… our local surveys/needs-based research show that 80 per
> cent of so-called Pakistanis have Kashmiri heritage and are
> culturally and linguistically are different from other Asian groups.

They define themselves as Kashmiri, therefore, in line with the legal definition of ethnic groups and should be included as a separate category.'
(Leeds City Council)

'Many ethnic Kashmiri's self-identify as Pakistani, thereby potentially depriving themselves of services that might be delivered in their actual mother-tongues.'
(Kashmir Forum)

Sikh

Requests for the inclusion of a Sikh ethnic group category in the 2011 Census were received from numerous Sikh organisations. For example:

'…the number of people with the ethnic group Sikh is important to the Sikh community in regards to the *Race Relations (Amendment) Act* and a fair provision of public services.'
(British Sikh Federation and affiliated organisations)

Although most central government departments and agencies were opposed to the inclusion of 'religious' categories in an ethnic group question, Defence Analytical Services Agency (DASA) commented:

'[DASA requires a] separate category to identify Sikhs from Indian non-Sikhs. Although technically a religion rather than an ethnic group, it may be useful to collect information on Sikhs compared with other Indians, to enable us to understand better whether there are differences between communities in propensity to join/stay in the Armed Forces and the effectiveness of recruiting.'
(DASA)

2.3 Requirements for comparison with 2001 ethnic group information

Any changes to the ethnic group categories in 2011 may reduce the comparability with information collected in 2001, and the degree to which comparability is reduced will depend on the extent of any changes.

Table 5: Need to compare combined and single ethnic group information in 2011 with information from the 2001 Census: by organisation type
England and Wales   **Percentages**

	Combined ethnic groups[1]			Single ethnic groups[2]		
	Yes	No	Base[3] = 100% (numbers)	Yes	No	Base[3] = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	59	41	22	77	23	22
Experts, community & special interest groups	37	63	104	54	46	110
Local & regional government	79	20	81	90	10	83
Local service providers	41	59	39	51	49	39
All respondents	**53**	**46**	**246**	**67**	**33**	**254**

[1]*Combined ethnic groups include 'White', 'Mixed', 'Asian or Asian British', 'Black or Black British' and 'Other ethnic groups'.*
[2]*Single ethnic groups refer to individual tick boxes in the ethnic group question e.g. 'Black African', 'Indian', ' White English'.*
3 Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed ethnic group information from the 2011 Census in Question 5.

The majority of respondents from local and regional government and central and devolved government need to make comparisons between the 2001 and 2011 Censuses, particularly of single ethnic groups (Table 5). Comparison was of less concern to local service providers or experts, communities and special interest groups, particularly for combined ethnic groups.

Comparability with ethnic group data in the 2001 Census was required by most respondents to monitor trends, analyse changes in local populations (in terms of demographics, geography, social and economic characteristics), allocate services, and identify emerging ethnic groups.

In general most respondents recognised that some level of change to the classification was desirable to provide more accurate or detailed information, although this should be minimal so that trends can still be identified.

For many a small loss of comparability was strongly outweighed by the advantage of including an ethnic group that had not previously been identified, or to provide a more accurate reflection of the ethnicity in local areas.

> 'A small loss of comparability would be outweighed by greater detail …'
> (London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

In contrast, other respondents did not see the benefits of the proposed changes. If the loss of comparability was large many expressed concerns that it would have extremely negative consequences. For example:

> 'Pretty much unthinkable. It would lead to such a large loss of information and comparability over time.'
> (Department for Work and Pensions

> 'Comparability is essential in some form, [for] either single or combined ethnic groups, but losing comparability in both would not be acceptable.'
> (Kent County Council)

Specific reservations were expressed about the effect of change on administrative data collection systems, as the ethnic group classifications used in the census are generally used as the recommended categories for a range of data collection systems.

> 'The systems for the school workforce are set up to collect data using the categories from the 2001 Census, so any changes to the categories would have implications and costs for both the Department and for schools and local authorities to change how the data are held, collected, validated and analysed.'
> (Department for Education and Skills)

2.4 Requirements for comparison between UK countries

Any changes to the ethnic group categories in 2011 may affect comparability across the UK. Respondents were asked what impact this would have on their use of the information. In 2001 ethnic group classifications in Scotland and Northern Ireland were different to those in England and Wales, reflecting differences in the ethnic minority populations in each country. The Registrars General of the respective countries are committed to working towards consistent UK census outputs, but it is possible that the differences between ethnic group classifications in England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland may increase if there are different needs for information in each area.

Not surprisingly central government departments and agencies that covered Great Britain or the UK expressed the strongest requirement for comparability of information between the different UK countries.

> '[For the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) a small difference between UK countries would be] problematic, as DWP is a GB based organisation, so the inability to produce consistent information for all of GB would be a significant problem for this Department and [would affect] our ability to report. [A large difference would be] very difficult – among other things [we] would have to re-define the Departmental PSA [public service agreement] target.'
> (DWP)

Those whose remit did not cover Great Britain or the UK were content with a small loss of comparability if changes improved the information. On the whole most local authorities and local service providers did not consider an inability to compare with Scotland or Northern Ireland a significant concern. It was more common for these organisations to benchmark against aggregated areas, usually England, England and Wales or, in the case of several London boroughs, London as a whole.

2.5 Acceptability of ethnic group terminology

The consultation sought feedback on the ethnic group terminology used in the 2007 Census Test, in particular whether it was clear, understandable and acceptable to respondents. Responses were required for the broad ethnic categories and for single ethnic groups. Respondents who found the terms unacceptable were asked to suggest alternatives or improvements.

Table 6: Respondents who found the terms for the combined ethnic group categories in the 2007 Census Test acceptable: by organisation type
England and Wales 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**Percentages**

	White	Mixed	Black or Black British	Asian or Asian British	Other ethnic group	Base = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	100	100	95	88	100	18
Experts, community & special interest groups	76	75	73	54	60	112
Local & regional government	89	82	84	80	86	78
Local service providers	88	79	86	88	92	42
All respondents	**84**	**80**	**80**	**71**	**76**	**251**

In general the majority of respondents (70 per cent and over) thought that each of the combined ethnic group categories used in the 2007 Census Test categories were acceptable (Table 6). For example:

> 'The names are familiar and acceptable to the majority of the general population.'
> (Department of Communities and Local Government)

Table 7: Respondents who found the terms for the single ethnic group categories in the 2007 Census Test acceptable: by organisation type
England and Wales   Percentages

Organisation type	Acceptable	Not acceptable	Base = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	74	26	19
Experts, community & special interest groups	52	48	104
Local & regional government	71	29	78
Local service providers	67	33	42
All respondents	**62**	**38**	**243**

Around two-thirds (62 per cent) of respondents found the terms used in the single ethnic group categories acceptable (Table 7). The respondents who found the single categories least acceptable were the experts, community and special interest groups, where 48 per cent had problems with the terminology used.

Respondents found the terms used in the combined and single ethnicity groups unacceptable for the following reasons:
o   terminology confuses different concepts of ethnicity
o   inconsistent use of 'British' in some combined ethnic categories
o   use of colour (White and Black) to define ethnicity
o   use of the term 'Mixed'
o   use of the term 'Asian'

Terminology confuses different concepts of ethnicity
Several respondents stated that the current terminology is confusing as it combines different concepts relating to ethnicity. For example:

'Use of nationalities (Indian, Pakistani) and geographical areas (Black African, Black Caribbean) does not give us any true info on the ethnicities (the culture) of the people that live in the UK.'
(British Sikh Federation and affiliated organisations)

Inconsistent use of 'British' in some broad categories and not in others

There is a lack of consistency in labelling the 'White', 'Mixed' and 'Others' ethnic categories, as they do not contain British in their label unlike the 'Black' and 'Asian' categories. Some respondents would like to see the term British removed from the broad headings altogether because its inclusion combines two concepts – ethnicity and national identity. For example:

> '[It] Implies that "White" and "Mixed" will always either be British or can't be British at all. Please use main group headings same as for Black and Asian, that is "White or White British" and "Mixed or Mixed British".'
> (Birmingham City Council)

> 'All terms are acceptable, but the terms "Black British" and "Asian British" are confusing as they diffuse the actual picture and offer no value for analytical purposes except for the fact that one cohort was born in the UK.'
> (Environment Department, Hertfordshire County Council)

Use of colour (White and Black) to define ethnicity

Two opposing views have been expressed about the use of colour terms (Black or White) to describe ethnic groups. Many respondents find it unacceptable to use colour to describe different ethnic groups because its use is potentially considered offensive. For example:

> 'Questions oriented towards skin colour are meaningless and insulting in an ethnically diverse society … They argue that the census should not use colour as descriptors of ethnicity, but instead should use ethno/geographical descriptors. *Never* use "Black" for Africans.'
> (Socialist Health Association)

> '"White" and "Black", both seem derogatory definitions. Prefer to use the terms "Caucasian", "African" and "Caribbean".'
> (North West Leicestershire District Council)

In contrast some respondents were in favour of using colour terms, partly in their use in eliminating racial discrimination and upholding responsibilities under the *Race Relations (Amendment) Act*, as well as an expression of personal identity.

> '… the removal of skin colour will make it impossible to monitor racism that is linked to colour. Also, there will be the dangerous deception that, in time, the present significant level of racism towards Black people will disappear statistically if the Black population is subsumed into a large minority ethnic population."
> (Private Individual)

Section 2.7 of this report discusses this issue in the context of the Scottish 2006 Census Test question.

Use of the term 'Mixed'

Respondents questioned the use and acceptability of the term 'Mixed' as it can be perceived to be derogatory. Alternative terms suggested were 'Dual Heritage' or 'Multiple Heritage'. For example:

> '"Mixed" is a generally understood term. However, a more positive term such as "Dual Heritage" or "Multiple Heritage" might be better ... dual implies a richness; and heritage implies gain and culture.'
> (Department of Health)

> 'The term "Mixed Race" is becoming controversial in certain quarters and being replaced by "Dual Heritage", but what of those who are more than dual, would they be happy to describe themselves as "Multi-heritage"?'
> (Rajdhani Cultural Society)

Use of the term 'Asian'

Most respondents (71 per cent) found the term 'Asian or Asian British' acceptable, although the proportion for local and regional government

respondents was lower, at 54 per cent. The 'Asian' category has been criticised for number of reasons including ambiguity over what is included or excluded from this category. For example:

> 'Some ambiguity about what falls in "Asian" and what falls in "Other", for example China, Japan, the Middle East, the former Soviet Asian republics, Turkey, etc.'
> (Birmingham City Council Children and Census and Population Group)

> '"Asian" is acceptable but not very meaningful in demographic terms, since there is confusion between the commonly accepted meaning (South Asian) and a geographic meaning (anyone originating from anywhere in the continent of Asia). Asian should at least be broken down into "South [Asian]" and "East/South-East [Asian]" categories or clearly defined to mean just "South Asian".'
> (Cambridgeshire County Council)

2.6 Advantages and disadvantages of multiple response ethnicity data

Ethnic group information on previous UK censuses has been based on asking people to tick one box only. Specific categories were introduced in 2001 to record people with 'Mixed' ethnicity. As the proportion of the population with Mixed ethnicity is likely to increase, ONS proposes to test whether a multiple response ethnic group question, based on asking people to tick all categories that apply, would allow people to record their ethnic group more efficiently/accurately. In the 2001 Census in England and Wales around 2 per cent of respondents ticked more than one answer to the ethnic group question, despite the instruction to tick only one box.

When asked to comment on the concept of multiple response data generally respondents could see the benefit of having more detailed information, but expressed serious concerns over a number of issues. These included:

- o comparability with 2001
- o the complicated nature of the question (both for the respondent and for those undertaking analysis) would lead to confusion
- o having too many groups would lead to smaller numbers and less data becoming available because of disclosure issues – particularly at a small area level.

2.6.1 Advantages of a multiple response ethnicity question

Respondents identified potential advantages of a multiple response ethnic group question:
- o improved accuracy and depth of information captured in the question
- o enables self-identification
- o enhanced information on mixed ethnicity
- o would improve completion of the question

Improved accuracy and depth of information captured in the question
Respondents commented that the multiple response question would provide a more accurate measurement of ethnicity, particularly in ethnically diverse populations.

> 'It could enable a more accurate response from individuals, and provide a truer picture of an area's ethnic composition, particularly in respect of the "Mixed" categories.'
> (City and County of Swansea)

> 'The option of multi-ticking is conceptually attractive as it focuses on multiplicity and allows for much more flexibility than pre-designated categories … Multiple response answers may be more acceptable to some respondents as they do not force people to choose only one identity and indeed may encourage people to choose identities that they would not otherwise have indicated.'
> (CRE)

Enables self-identification

In addition, a multiple response question would allow for self-identification and enable individuals to determine their own ethnic group.

> 'Meets needs of the individual for self-classification in a flexible way.
> Allows the system to respond to changes in the population and how people perceive their identities.'
> (Royal National Hospital, Barts and The London NHS Trust)

Enhanced information on mixed ethnicity

A multiple response question would potentially enhance the understanding of those people with multiple ethnicities.

> '[Multiple response ethnic group] recognises the complexity of ethnicity in modern Britain; would improve information about the true size and variety within the "Mixed" population; and may make it possible to identify second/third generation Irish who currently identify as "White British" (but only for those who choose to register their Irish ancestry).'
> (Department of Communities and Local Government)

Would improve completion of the question

Respondents also recognised that a multiple response question could encourage better completion of the ethnicity question in the census. For example:

> 'Users more likely to respond with full information.'
> (Caerphilly Local Health Board)

2.6.2 Disadvantages of a multiple response ethnicity data

Although respondents viewed gaining a more accurate response as an advantage of a multiple response question, this was also regarded as a disadvantage. Many held the view that any advantages of a multiple response ethnic group question would be outweighed by the following disadvantages:

o difficulty in implementing and interpreting a multiple response classification

o number of people with 'Mixed' ethnic group would increase

o loss of continuity with information based on the single response 2001 classification

o impact on existing systems measuring ethnic group

Difficulty in implementing and interpreting a multiple response classification
Respondents were concerned that the perceived advantage of having a more detailed response would not be borne out in practice, as it would be difficult for data users to interpret the results and respondents would be confused by a multiple tick option.

> 'In the University of Kent's Mixed Race in Britain Survey [2006],
> respondents found the multiple tick option confusing and there was a
> fair bit of evidence of misinterpretation.'
> (CRE)

> 'Producing tables that count all people who have ticked any box would
> result in statistics for London, for example, (with the most diverse
> population in the country) which added up to many times the population
> of London and could not be used for resource allocation. If it was
> thought that an extra tick in a box for any group might result in more
> resources or money allocated to services for that group then there
> could easily be local campaigns for people to tick an extra box … For
> this reason it is essential to produce data that is fit for this use.'
> (Greater London Authority)

Number of people with 'Mixed' ethnic group would increase
A multiple response category would change the concept of a Mixed group, and would potentially inflate the numbers than if the question had been a single response. For example:

'Simple multi-response does not show how respondents rank their responses, that is which they regard as primary and which secondary aspects of their self-definition. The proposal seems likely to lead to much larger numbers being recorded as "Mixed" groups; or more or less arbitrary rules for deciding a primary group. Ultimately we need a single classification that enumerates the whole population without double counting, and this is best provided by single-coded responses.'
(Transport for London)

'… If those who tick more than one box are allocated to Mixed groups this would result in a very large proportion of London's population being described simply as Mixed. This would be of limited use. If people are allocated to one particular group as their main group this may not be the same ethnic group that the person would have chosen had the question required a single response.'
(Regeneration and Strategic Planning, London Borough of Havering)

Loss of continuity with information based on the single response 2001 classification
A multiple response question would pose problems for interpreting and presenting results and for making comparisons over time.

'A multiple response ethnic group [question] could result in considerable chaos, render any sensible analysis almost impossible, and render comparisons with 2001 completely impossible …'
(Department of Health)

Impact on existing systems measuring ethnic group
Since ethnicity categories from the census are used by organisations as a basis for a range of data collection systems, the proposed change would have a significant impact and be difficult for organisations to implement. For example:

'To be sure we are comparing like with like we would have to change all of our systems and re-survey up to 300,000 personnel - – a major undertaking.'

(Defence Analytical Services Agency)

2.7 Comments on the Scottish 2006 Census Test ethnicity classification

The 2006 Census Test in Scotland used a different ethnic group classification to the one proposed for the 2007 Census Test in England and Wales. The main difference was that it replaced the term 'White' with 'European' and the term 'Black' with 'African or Caribbean'. It also contained a larger number of tick-box categories. Respondents were asked to compare the two classifications and provide views on the advantages or disadvantages between the classifications of ethnic group.

2.7.1 Advantages of the Scottish 2006 Census Test ethnicity classification

Respondents identified a range of advantages to the Scottish classification, including:

o   Scottish classification better reflected current society
o   removal of colour terms
o   inclusion of additional categories that would give more detailed information
o   expansion of the African category
o   use of term 'Multiple ethnic groups' for 'Mixed' categories

Scottish classification better reflected current society
In general many respondents felt the Scottish categories reflected the changes in society and cultural identities more closely and provided a greater level of detail than the categories used in England and Wales.

'It would provide greater detail of cultural background and distinctive cultural groups.'
(Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council)

Removal of colour terms
Some respondents welcomed the different terminology used in the Scottish classification, such as the removal of skin colour (White and Black) from the categories and replacing these with geographical regions.

'[The Scottish] 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 and reflected in the England and Wales 2007 Test classification …'
(The African Women's Group Aberdeen and The East African Network)

Inclusion of additional categories that would give more detailed information
The inclusion of additional categories would provide a greater level of detail and clarity of an individual's ethnic group. Several respondents favoured the better defined single group categories such as 'Arab', 'Other European', 'Jewish' and 'Sikh'

Expansion of the African category
Some respondents valued breaking down the African category into different geographical areas; Central African, East African, North African, Southern African and West African.

Use of term 'Multiple ethnic groups' for 'Mixed' categories
Some respondents stated that the term 'Multiple ethnic groups' was preferred to the term 'Mixed' that was used in the 2007 Census Test questionnaire in England and Wales.

2.7.2 Disadvantages of the Scottish 2006 Census Test ethnicity classification

Some of the advantages of the Scottish ethnicity classifications outlined above were also considered to be disadvantages by respondents. These included:

o Scottish classification combines different ethnic concepts and contains too many categories

o confusion of ethnic terms, for example, inclusion of Jewish and Sikh categories

o the removal of colour terminology

o problems with identifying African and Arab/Middle Eastern tick-boxes

o loss of comparability with the 2001 Census and across the UK

o too little information on respondents from 'Multiple ethnic groups'

o lack of detail provided by combined categories

o excludes certain ethnic groups

Scottish classification combines different ethnic concepts and contains too many categories

Despite some respondents citing the increased detail of the Scottish classification as an advantage, others were critical that the classification combines different ethnic concepts and contains too many categories. As a result some respondents commented that the classification would be confusing to users and that an 'order effect' could have a significant impact on the response. For example:

'The proposed Scottish codes are a confusing mix of nationality, race, ethnic group, country and religion.'
(Department of Health)

'It contains 27 categories and may impose respondent burden, although cognitive testing could investigate this.'
(University of Kent)

Confusion of ethnic terms, for example, inclusion of Jewish and Sikh categories

Concerns were raised regarding the mixing of different ethnic concepts related to the inclusion of the Jewish and Sikh categories.

> 'This list confuses ethnicity, geography, nationality and religion. Even though the two religions listed are recognised by the United Nations as being ethnic groups, it is not helpful to treat them as such in this context as they are included in the religion question...'
> (Manchester City Council and Manchester Primary Care Trust)

> '"Jewish" is a religion not an ethnicity – why confuse the whole list by the inclusion of this category? And the same goes for "Sikh".'
> (The School Development Support Agency)

Removal of colour terminology

The removal of colour terminology from the Scottish classification was seen by some respondents as a disadvantage. Many organisations preferred the inclusion of colour terms to help measure exclusion and discrimination.

> 'This version has totally forgotten the original need for this question. It is not based on skin colour and so it prevents the ability of local authorities to tackle racial discrimination on the grounds of skin colour.'
> (Manchester City Council and Manchester Primary Care Trust)

More specifically, removing 'White' from the classification would potentially provide some confusion for certain groups. For example, in 2001 some nationalities (such as Americans, Australians, Canadians and White South Africans) may have categorised themselves as 'Other White', whereas in the Scottish classification they would tick the 'Other Ethnic' box.

> '… The combined category groups do not reflect colour therefore may make fundamental changes to the way people answer the question. For example, a White South Africans could now tick "Southern African",

whereas previously they would be "Other White" and European could include a number of people who are of Black or Asian origin. Additionally, it would remove the ability to identify visible minorities if colour is not part of the categorisation …'
(London Borough of Waltham Forest)

In addition, having no labels for 'White' introduces confusion over the 'Scottish', 'English', 'Welsh', 'British', 'Northern Irish' and 'Irish' categories, as it confuses concepts of national identity with ethnicity.

Problems with identifying African and Arab/Middle Eastern tick-boxes
Some respondents saw problems with the sub-division of the African and the Arab categories. They were concerned that it would not always be apparent to the respondent which part of Africa or which Arab tick-box they should choose.

'… Good data collection requires that people can easily allocate themselves to a group – the many African categories may create difficulties for some people, undermining the validity of the data …'
(Department of Communities and Local Government)

'Difficult to place major groups (Afghan, Iranian, etc). Combined term for "Arab" is problematic if it contains many non-Arab groups in the Middle East and central Asia.'
(North East Public Health Observatory)

Loss of comparability with the 2001 Census and across the UK
Another disadvantage cited was that the Scottish categorisation would be incompatible with the 2001 Census in England and Wales and with other countries in the UK.

Too little information on respondents from 'Multiple ethnic groups'

Concerns that the Scottish Classification would provide too little information on 'multiple ethnic' groups were expressed

> '… The Scottish categories give no depth to the issue of multiple ethnic groups, which is short-sighted given the diversity of today's population…'
> (Shropshire County Council)

Lack of detail provided by combined categories

Several respondents found the combined categories to be too broad, especially 'Asian' and 'Other' groups, making similar points to those raised about the England and Wales combined categories (refer to section 2.2.1 in the report).

> 'The major disadvantage of the Scottish Census Test question sticks to the absolutely meaningless term "Asians".'
> (The British Sikh Women Organisation)

> 'For our purposes it is not sufficient to have one category for all Asian groups, and one for "Other" ethnic groups. There are differences in culture and healthcare between different Asian communities – to put them all together would make it more difficult to provide specific care. [Also] not appropriate to put Jewish and Travellers in same category because [they have] different cultural needs.'
> (Buckinghamshire Primary Care Trust)

Excludes certain ethnic groups

Some respondents were unhappy that specific ethnic groups were not represented within the Scottish classification, these included African, Mixed Arab, Sudanese, and the Deaf.

3. Review of Requirements for Information on National Identity

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) developed a national identity question after controversy around the 2001 Census. Public and political concerns were expressed in Wales about the lack of a Welsh tick-box category in the ethnic group question to enable Welsh people to specify their national identity in the same way that people in Scotland could record themselves as Scottish. A question on national identity has not been included in previous censuses in England and Wales, though it has been asked in surveys such as the ONS Labour Force Survey since 2001.

National identity is subjective and self-perceived, unlike objective information such as country of citizenship. It records, for example, British, English, Scottish and Welsh national identities independently from ethnic group. It also allows recording of national identities outside the UK. Testing of the national identity question showed that British-born people from ethnic minority groups preferred answering the ethnic group question if they were asked to record their national identity first. The proposed national identity question is a multiple response question, so would provide information for different combinations of national identities.

3.1 Requirements for information on national identity

Table 8: Requirements for information on national identity from the 2011 Census: by organisation type

England and Wales			Percentages
Organisation type	Yes	No	Base = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	50	50	22
Experts, community & special interest groups	57	43	114
Local & regional government	67	33	81
Local service providers	45	55	40
All respondents	**58**	**42**	**257**

Information on national identity was required by 58 per cent of respondents (Table 8). Local and regional government expressed the greatest need, 67 per cent of respondents.

Respondents gave a range of requirements for a national identity question in the 2011 Census. The reasons for needing national identity data were:
o   to gain a better understanding of local populations and communities
o   to encourage response
o   to provide a measure of community cohesion
o   to measure how people from different areas of the UK perceive their national identity

To gain a better understanding of local populations and communities
Local and regional authorities and local service providers require information on national identity to gain a better understanding of the local populations and communities they serve, by acting as a complement to the ethnicity, religion and country of birth questions.

> '[Information on national identity can help] to ensure we have a wide an understanding as possible of the communities we police.'
> (Dyfed Powys Police)

> 'National Identity may identify significant groups in the UK which have not been recognised effectively in the past, for example, Kurds. [This information] could provide a rich dataset to complement country of birth since it is how people view themselves rather than a fact e.g. a person born in Turkey might rather write in Kurdish than Turkish or British.'
> (Greater London Authority)

To encourage response

Enabling respondents to provide information on national identity might improve response.

> '... It is also believed that it [a question on national identity] would increase the response rate from certain sections of the community in Bolton, for instance second or third generation Asian immigrants who may wish to record their national identity as British or English but their ethnic background as Asian.'
> (Bolton Council)

To provide a measure of community cohesion

A national identity question will enable stakeholders to measure community cohesion by providing a clearer understanding of how people identify themselves within the UK, as well as provide a sense of how many people from ethnic minorities might identify themselves as British.

To measure how people from different areas of the UK perceive their national identity

Some respondents wanted national identity information about people with particular identities within the UK (such as the Cornish, Scottish and Welsh), in terms of where they live and how they identify themselves.

3.2 Suitability of the proposed national identity question and suggested changes

Table 9: Suitability of the proposed national identity categories in the 2007 Census Test: by organisation type
England and Wales **Percentages**

Organisation type	Yes	No	Partially	Base[1] = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	*64*	*18*	*18*	11
Experts, community & special interest groups	*39*	*15*	*46*	72
Local & regional government	*40*	*27*	*32*	62
Local service providers	*70*	*17*	*13*	23
All respondents	**45**	**20**	**35**	**168**

1 Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed national identity information from the 2011 Census in Question 30.

Of the respondents who needed information on national identity, 45 per cent thought that the proposed categories would provide the information they require (Table 9). A further 35 per cent thought the categories would partially provide the required information. Central and devolved government and local service providers were the most likely to state that the categories provided the information they require.

One-fifth of respondents (20 per cent) thought the national identity categories would not meet their needs. Reasons given for this included:
o   the question focuses on too few UK national identities
o   A multiple response question would be difficult to analyse

Question focuses on too few UK national identities
The format was criticised because there was too much emphasis on British national identities, as all other national identities were amalgamated into one category. Respondents were interested in identifying specific non-UK nationalities, as well as other UK nationalities (for example, Cornish).

> 'It could be argued that nationality is something that we need to know more about for non-UK nationalities than [for] UK nationalities.'
> (Dyfed Powys Police)

> 'Cornwall is a nation for all the same reasons that Wales is a nation and Scotland is a nation. Although many English people find this concept strange or puzzling, there are very sound historical, cultural, ethnic and linguistic reasons for the assertion.'
> (Private Individual)

Some stakeholders were concerned that only limited outputs would be available from the question, particularly data from the 'Other national identities' category.

> 'If this information is only available in certain tables it may not be detailed enough for our purposes.'
> (Department for Education and Skills)

A multiple response question would be difficult to analyse

A few respondents commented that because it allowed multiple responses, the national identity question would be difficult to analyse and interpret. Also, respondents may have difficulty answering the question.

> 'Multiple response does not provide useable statistical information. [We should ask for a] single response to the question to which national identity do you feel the strongest affiliation?"
> (London Borough of Brent)

> 'Taking the question on the Census Test form it is doubtful whether respondents would realise they could tick more than one category; people who might otherwise tick English and British might tick English (top of the list) and pass straight to the next question. The results would be difficult to evaluate as a result.'
> (Norfolk County Council)

4. Review of Requirements for Information on Religion

A voluntary question on religion was asked for the first time in England and Wales in 2001. The question in England and Wales gathers information on religious identity or affiliation, a subjective and self-ascribed characteristic. It is not intended to provide information on religious observance or frequency of religious practice and it does not aim to determine the number of practising members of each religious faith. The form of the question in England and Wales differs from the religion questions in the Scottish and Northern Irish censuses, which ask two questions, one on the religion people were brought up in and one on their current religion.

4.1 Requirements for information on religion

Table 10: Requirements of religion information from the 2011 Census: by organisation type
England and Wales   **Percentages**

Organisation type	Yes	No	Base = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	68	32	22
Experts, community & special interest groups	78	23	120
Local & regional government	91	9	81
Local service providers	77	23	43
All	**81**	**19**	**266**

The majority of respondents (81 per cent) require information on religion from the 2011 Census (Table 10). Local and regional government expressed the greatest need for this information (91 per cent). Respondents cited a variety of reasons for the need for a religious question in the census, which included:

o to provide a clearer view of society and to gain a better understanding of certain ethnic groups

o to improve understanding of local populations and markets

o to promote legal obligations to prevent discrimination and promote equality

To provide a clearer view of society and gain a better understanding of certain ethnic groups

Several respondents expressed the view that religion data complement information on ethnicity, providing a more distinct picture of a population. Information on religion would also inform research and analyses on topics such as inequalities, community cohesion, interaction and participation.

To improve understanding of local populations and markets

Several local authorities and community organisations want to use religion information from the 2011 Census to improve their understanding of local populations so they can more accurately plan, deliver and evaluate services. Similarly private companies would like information on religion for market research, to help companies to target specific markets and ensure ranges are sensitive to cultural and religious needs.

To promote legal obligations to prevent discrimination and promote equality

There are particular requirements for information about religion to help respondents to meet obligations under the *Race Relations (Amendment) Act* and the *Employment Equality (Religion and Belief) Act*.

4.2 Suitability of religion categories and suggested changes

Table 11: Suitability of proposed religion categories in the 2007 Census Test: by organisation type

England and Wales			**Percentages**	
Organisation type	Yes	No	Partially	Base[1] = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	79	0	21	14
Experts, community & special interest groups	65	19	17	96
Local & regional government	82	4	14	72
Local service providers	85	11	4	27
All respondents	**74**	**11**	**14**	**209**

1 Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed religion information from the 2011 Census in Question 35

In general the proposed religion categories would provide respondents with the information that they require (Table 11). The needs of community and special interest groups were least likely to be met, 65 per cent of respondents in this group who needed this information thought the religion question would meet their requirements. Reasons why respondents did not think the question on religion would meet their needs included:

o   religious activity should be measured

o   non-religious beliefs should be included

o   Christian category is too broad

o   Muslim category is too broad

o   Need for information on additional religions and non-religious beliefs

Religious activity should be measured

At present the religion question in England and Wales asks *'What is your religion?'* Some respondents suggested that this question is too ambiguous and that responses may differ depending on how each respondent interprets the question. For example does the question refer to a religion that is actively practised, or to an individual's religious upbringing. The question could be reworded to address this. For example:

> 'It might be more suitable to rephrase the question *'Do you have a religion?'* qualified by '*If so what is it?'* rather than *'What is your religion?'* This would be consistent with the British Social Attitudes Survey [carried out by the National Centre for Social Research] and would offer more accurate data on *actively* (as opposed to *culturally*) religious individuals and the impact of such activity upon discrimination and disadvantage.'
> (Commission for Racial Equality)

Other respondents suggested that England and Wales should adopt the same approach as the Scottish census, which asks separately about religious upbringing and religion practised now.

Non-religious beliefs should be included

Several respondents required information on non-religious belief as well as on religion.

> 'Local authorities need to monitor for both religion and belief to prevent unlawful discrimination according to the Employment and Equality (Religion or Belief) regulations (2003) and the *Equality Act (2006).*'
> (London Borough of Greenwich)

> 'The category "No religion" is too vague and simplistic. A further breakdown of categories, including ideologies and beliefs such as secularism, agnosticism, humanism and atheism, among others, should be made.'
> (The Ethnic Minority Foundation)

Christian category is too broad

The 2007 Census Test questionnaire has one tick box for Christians. However, some respondents needed information on specific denominations of Christianity. Reasons for needing a more detailed breakdown include providing services that are sensitive to religious belief and understanding inequalities by denomination, particularly in the health field.

> 'The Christian category is too broad … At the very least, the Christian category should be split into Catholic and Protestant. Consideration should also be given to separating Jehovah's Witnesses and Pentecostal religions, because of religious "rules" on blood transfusions, etc and because of the way these religions need to be observed in communal settings such as hospitals.'
> (Department of Health)

> '"Christian" conceals heterogeneity. [It] could be made a free text field or subdivided through predesignated categories. [This would be] useful for investigating health inequalities in some of the different ethnic communities, for example to have a Catholic/Protestant/Other

breakdown. It would also provide a useful basis for subdividing the "Irish group".'
(University of Kent)

Muslim category is too broad

Similarly, some respondents required information that would differentiate between different types of Muslims. For example:

'… There might also be good reasons for separating Sunni and Shia Muslims. The advice of the Muslim Council should be sought on this matter … A fuller breakdown of religion would allow a fuller analysis of the links between religious affilation and health inequalities.'
(Department of Health)

Need for information on additional religions and non-religious beliefs

Respondents suggested other religions and non-religious beliefs should be recognised in the 2011 Census, possibly with their own tick boxes. These suggestions were sometimes motivated by a requirement for information, and sometimes by the need to ensure the question is acceptable and inclusive. These included:

o Agnosticism
o Atheism
o Baha'i
o Brahma Kumaris
o Heathenism, Asatru)
o Holistic / Generalised Spirituality / Contemporary Spirituality
o Humanism
o Jain
o Pagan (and different Pagan traditions such as Druidry, Wicca, Witchcraft,
o Pan-Africanism
o Rastafarian
o Secularism
o Yoruba
o Zoroastrian

4.3 Requirements for comparison with 2001 religion information

Table 12: Need to compare information on religion in the 2011 Census with the 2001 Census: by organisation type
England and Wales   **Percentages**

Organisation type	Yes	No	Base[1] = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	73	27	11
Experts, community & special interest groups	69	31	51
Local & regional government	85	15	52
Local service providers	70	30	10
All respondents	**76**	**24**	**124**

1 Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed religion information from the 2011 Census in Question 35.

Over three-quarters (77 per cent) of respondents would like to compare information on religion from the 2011 Census with information from the 2001 Census (Table 12). Local and regional government had the greatest need, with 92 per cent requiring comparability. Respondents who wanted to monitor trends needed to do so for policy evaluation, service provision and to understand specific religious groups.

5. Review of Requirements for Information on Language

A question on Welsh language proficiency has been included in every census in Wales since 1891. ONS proposes to continue to measure Welsh language proficiency in Wales in 2011. Proficiency in other languages has not been recorded in previous censuses in England and Wales, and is currently much less likely to be included than the other topics covered in this consultation. Languages other than Welsh will not be measured unless there is space on the census form. This consultation aimed to gain a better understanding of user requirements for language information throughout England and Wales, and assess additional requirements to those provided by the language question already asked in Wales.

5.1 Requirements for information on language

Table 13: Requirements for information on language from the 2011 Census: by organisation type
England and Wales   **Percentages**

Organisation type	Yes	No	Base = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	86	14	21
Experts, community & special interest groups	88	12	121
Local & regional government	96	4	84
Local service providers	93	7	45
All respondents	**92**	**8**	**271**

The majority of respondents (92 per cent) had a need for language information from the 2011 Census (Table 13). The need was highest for local and regional government (96 per cent).

Respondents would like information on language for the following reasons:
o monitor and analyse disadvantage
o improve service provision
o as an indicator of integration [as text]
o enhance information from the ethnicity and religion questions [as text]
o monitor the use of British languages
o monitor the use of British Sign Language

Monitor and analyse disadvantage

Language is an important concept when monitoring and analysing disadvantage. For example:

> 'For analysis on how different languages impact on pupil attainment.'
> (Department for Education and Skills)

> 'Need to study link between labour market disadvantages and ethnic minority fluency in English language.'
> (Department for Work and Pensions)

> 'Lack of proficiency in English is a significant barrier to social inclusion and particularly linked with labour market outcomes. The *Local Government Act 1966* states that authorities should provide special services in areas with high numbers of people who are migrants or have different languages.'
> (London Borough of Brent)

Improve service provision

The majority of respondents were interested in information on language so they could effectively target service provision and make information and services accessible to the populations they serve.

> "To target service delivery more effectively, for example [producing] benefit leaflets in alternative languages.'
> (Department for Work and Pensions)

> 'For public bodies to meet their statutory duties under section 71 of the *Race Relations Act*, monitoring languages used by the public is an important instrument for overcoming barriers and ensuring equity of access.'
> (Commission for Racial Equality)

Respondents highlighted the need to communicate with users about their products and services. Information on language was needed so they could provide appropriate spoken and written translation services.

As an indicator of integration
The Commission for Racial Equality suggests that proficiency in English language could be used as 'an indicator of integration (English language proficiency)'. Other respondents agreed, for example:

> 'English should be recognised as the official language of government and public authorities. Residents must be encouraged to learn English or accept problems of integration.'
> (West Midlands Cancer Intelligence Unit)

Enhance information from the ethnicity and religion questions
A few local and regional authorities thought that the language question would enhance their understanding of their ethnic populations from the information gained from the ethnicity and religion questions, and could (in some cases) provide a proxy for ethnicity.

> "This question is also useful to assess the size and distribution of immigrant communities, and can compensate for any shortcomings in the ability of the 'ethnicity' and 'nationality' categories to provide this information.'
> (London Borough of Tower Hamlets)

Monitor the use of British languages

Respondents require information on the use of British languages other than English, such as Welsh, Cornish and Gaelic. This information on regional and minority languages is used to monitor their use for protection and promotion under the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

Monitor the use of British Sign Language

Several requests were received for the inclusion of British Sign Language within the language question.

> 'There is currently no accurate information on the numbers of British Sign Language users in the UK, despite it being an officially recognised language. The Disability Equality Duty *and Disability Discrimination Act* also require understanding of the communications requirements of disabled people.'
> (RNID)

> 'British Sign Language (BSL) … To influence where service [providers] need to consider Deaf people [and] who may use BSL as a first language. This will help service [providers] to map out where services can be targeted.'
> (Brighton and Hove Deaf Equality and Access Forum)

5.2 Suitability of proposed language question in the 2007 Census Test

The proposed language question in the 2007 Census Test in England and Wales measured aspects of language ability. It included categories for the ability to understand, speak, read and write English, Welsh and one other language (to be specified by the respondent). Categories for the ability to understand and sign British Sign Language (BSL) were also included.

Table 14: Suitability of proposed language categories in the 2007 Census Test: by organisation type
England and Wales   **Percentages**

Organisation type	Yes	No	Partially	Base[1] = 100% (numbers)
Central & devolved government	63	6	31	16
Experts, community & special interest groups	39	37	24	100
Local & regional government	48	18	34	82
Local service providers	53	28	20	40
All respondents	**46**	**27**	**27**	**238**

1 Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed language information in Question 42.

Less than half of respondents (46 per cent) who required information on language thought that the proposed language categories would meet their needs (Table 14).

The lack of space for recording other languages was identified as a problem. The 2007 Census Test question on language allows respondents to add information on only one other language (other than English, Welsh and BSL) and many respondents felt that this was too limiting. In particular it did not enable respondents to include both a UK regional and minority language and a foreign language. Some suggested that respondents should be able to include all the languages they used.

5.3 Additional requirements on language ability

Respondents who thought that the language question in the 2007 Census Test would not meet their requirements were asked to specify what additional information they required on different aspects of language in the 2011 Census. Requests included:
o English language proficiency
o information on minority languages used
o Illiteracy

English language proficiency

Respondents requested information on English language proficiency, especially where English is not the first language. This information was required to ensure that service providers were able communicate with the people they serve, improve access to services, and be aware of any differences in experiences for people who are not proficient in English.

> ' The Department of Health (DH) is interested in whether individuals can communicate effectively in English; effective enough so that health access may be understood, and health issues and proposed treatment may be described and discussed.'
> (DH)

> 'English language proficiency is related to labour market and income differentials, and is important for community cohesion.'
> (Department of Communities and Local Government)

> '...To know the actual number of households that do not use English as a first language is vital. It could have an effect on information, services and publications from numerous organisations.'
> (London Borough of Brent)

Information on minority languages used

Many respondents asked for information about specific languages used. These included 'main language spoken at home' and 'level of proficiency'. Some respondents requested information on what other languages are spoken. These included:

o Albanian
o Arabic
o Arabic Hebrew
o Bengali
o British Sign Language
o Chinese

- o Cornish
- o Farsi
- o French
- o Gaelic
- o German
- o Gujarati
- o Kiswahili
- o Lipreading
- o Pahari/Mirpuri
- o Polish
- o Portuguese
- o Punjabi
- o Russian
- o Sign Support English (SSE)
- o Somali
- o Spanish
- o Welsh (in England)
- o Urdu
- o Yiddish
- o Yoruba

Illiteracy

Respondents were also interested in finding out about the ability of certain groups to be able read and write.

> 'Illiteracy is widespread in the Gypsy/Irish Traveller community – answers to this question would identify illiterate members of the community.'
> (Department of Communities and Local Government)

> '… the ability to use Standard English, and the level of literacy therein, among the English themselves.'
> (Steadfast North East)

5.4 Most important aspects of language ability

There are many different aspects of language ability. Respondents were provided with a list of 19 different aspects of language ability, and were asked to indicate whether they required this information and if so, to what extent.

Table 15: Requirements for specific aspects of language ability: all respondents
England and Wales   **Percentage**

	Very important	Quite important	Do not need	Base[1] = 100%
Ability to speak English	78	15	7	239
Ability to understand spoken English	77	15	8	240
Mother tongue or first language	75	20	5	237
Main language (spoken at home)	75	19	6	237
Preferred spoken language for communicating with public authorities	74	17	9	234
Preferred written language for communicating with public authorities	72	18	10	230
Ability to read English	72	19	9	239
Which languages are spoken, other than English	70	25	6	243
Ability to write in English	65	25	10	232
Which languages are understood, other than English	63	30	8	240
Which languages are read, other than English	60	31	8	239
Which languages are written, other than English	50	37	12	236
Frequency of speaking other languages	45	29	27	231
Other aspects of language ability	27	6	66	124
Frequency of speaking Welsh	13	13	74	222
Ability to understand speak Welsh (among population in England)	11	14	75	224
Ability to understand spoken Welsh (among population in England)	10	16	74	219
Ability to write in Welsh (among population in England)	10	13	77	221
Ability to read Welsh (among population in England)	10	14	76	223

1 Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed language information in Question 42.
2 Responses were only sought for requirements for Welsh in England as a Welsh language question is already asked in Wales.
3 Requirements for language ability for each organisation type can be found in the consultation reports relating to that stakeholder group.

The top eight different aspects of language ability in Table 15 were considered to be very important by 70 per cent or more of stakeholders. Single aspects were more important to some stakeholders than for others. For each stakeholder group the single most important aspects were:

Central and devolved Government – Ability to speak English (79 per cent)

Experts, community and special interest groups – Main language (spoken at home) (83 per cent)

Local and regional government – Ability to speak English (86 per cent)

Local Service Providers – Ability to understand spoken English (88 per cent)

APPENDIX

A.1 References

1. *The 2011 Census: Initial view on content for England and Wales*, Office for National Statistics, May 2005

http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/consultations/2011Census.asp

2. *The 2011 Census: Assessment of initial user requirements on content for England and Wales – Ethnicity, identity, language and religion*, Office for National Statistics, March 2006

www.statistics.gov.uk/about/consultations/downloads/2011Census_assessment_of_user_requirements.pdf

A.2 Consultation Respondents

Central and devolved government respondents
Andrew George, Member of Parliament
Bòrd na Gàidhlig / The Gaelic Development Agency
Bwrdd yr Iaith Gymraeg / Welsh Language Board
Commission for Racial Equality (CRE)
Defence Analytical Services Agency (DASA)
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), Gypsy and Traveller Unit
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), Race Equality Unit and Cohesion and Faith Unit
Department for Education and Skills (DfES)
Department for Trade and Industry (DTI)
Department for Transport (DfT)
Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), Administrative Statistics
Department of Work and Pensions (DWP), Diversity and Equality Centre of Expertise
Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), Incomes Monitoring Division
Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), Older People and Ageing Society Division
Department of Health (DH)
Department of Health (DH), Equality and Human Rights Group
Equal Opportunities Commission
Gary Titley, Member of the European Parliament
Home Office (HO)
House of Commons Library (HoCL)
Jobcentre Plus Ethnic Minority Employment Partnerships Team
The British Council
Welsh Assembly Government, Office of the Chief Social Research Officer
Welsh Assembly Government, Julie Owen
Welsh Assembly Government, Kevin Griffiths
Welsh Assembly Government, Steve Marshall

Expert, community and special interest group respondents: Organisations
African Women's Group Aberdeen
Age Concern Leicester, Mark Melaugh
Age Concern Leicester, Saeed Malek
Akal Sikh Group
Akali Dal (Panthic) - Derby
Akali Dal (Yorkshire)
All Wales Ethnic Minority Association (Awema)
An Comunn Gaidhealach
Anglia Ruskin University
Asian Resource Centre
Aspiana Community Project
Aspire and Excel
Aston Youth Forum and Network
Asylum Support and Immigration Resource Team
Awaze Qaum International (Sikh newspaper)
Aziz Textiles Ltd
Aziz Welfare Trust
Baba Ajit Singh Gatka Akhara
Queen Mary's School of Medicine & Dentistry
Birmingham Foundation
Birmingham Mirpur Friendship Association, Khizar Jamil
Birmingham Mirpur Friendship Association, Mohammed Jamil
Birmingham Settlement (Charity tackling social disadvantage)
Bloomsbury Cyber Junction
Board of Deputies of British Jews, David Graham
Board of Deputies of British Jews, Alex Goldberg

Bristol Sikh Temple, Bristol
British Humanist Association
British Sikh Federation, Gurmukh Singh
British Sikh Federation, Kashmir Singh
British Sikh Women's Organisation
Burton Street Project
CACI Limited
Cardiff Buddhist Centre
Cardiff Gypsy and Traveller Project
Cardiff Interfaith Association
Central Scotland Racial Equality Council
Centre for Evidence in Ethnicity, Health & Diversity, Warwick Medical School
Centre for the Aston Family
Cheshire, Halton & Warrington Racial Equality Council
Christian Research Association
Church of England Diocese of Southwark
Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and The Humber
Churches together in England
CILT - The National Centre for Languages
CILT Cymru (Centre for International Language Teaching and Research, Wales)
City University, London
Community Unity
Comunn na Gàidhlig (Gaelic Language Forum
Consortium of Leeds Kashmiri Organisations
Cornish Ethnicity Data Tracking Group
Coventry Sikh Federation
Coventry University
Coventry Young Sikhs
Cowethas Peran Sans (Fellowship of Saint Piran, Cornwall)
Cwmni Iaith (Wales Language Planning Agency)
Undeb Cymru a'r Byd / Wales International
De Montfort University, Mary Seacole Research Centre
Derby Sikh Society
Diocese of Manchester Church and Society Department
Druid Network
Diocese of Southwark
East African Network
Ethnic Minority Foundation
East Birmingham Community Forum
Ekta One
Euro London Appointments
Experian
Federation of Irish Societies
Foundation for Holistic Spirituality
Foundation for Holistic Spirituality
Friends of Small Heath Park
GAD Khalsa Sports
GAG Consultancy
German Cultural Centre in Wales
Giantpowerhouse 1409 ltd
Glenfield Sikh Association
Gorseth Kernow (promoting Cornish culture)
Gypsy Council
Gravesend Sikh Womens Association
Green Association
Groundwork West Midlands
Gurdwara Baba Budha Ji
Gurdwara Baba Zorawar Singh Ji Baba Fateh Singh Ji
Gurdwara Dasmesh Darbar
Gurdwara Guru Hargobind Sahib Charitable Trust.

Gurdwara Guru Nanak Dev Ji Wakefield Road Bradford
Gurdwara Guru Nanak Parkash
Gurdwara Leeds
Gurdwara Milton Keynes
Gurdwara Singh Sabha London East
Gurdwara Sri Guru Hargobind Sahib Ji, Tividale
Gurmat Parchar Committee
Gurmat Parcher
Gurmat Sangeet Academy
Guru Nanak Darbar Education Committee
Guru Nanak Gurdwara (Telford)
Guru Nanak Gurdwara Bedford
Guru Nanak Gurdwara Smethwick
Guru Nanak Language Cultural and Religious Academy
Guru Nanak Satsang Sabha (Karamsar) UK Gurdwara
Guru Nanak Sikh Temple (Wolverhampton)
Hayes Sikh Federation
Hayes Young Sikhs
Heartlands Older Peoples Forum
Heathens For Progress
Hillingdon Sikh Welfare Association
Hindu Cultural Association (Wales)
Ikra Welfare Association
Indian Community Centre
Insaka
Inter Leyton F.C.
Islamic Resource Centre
Istari Satsang Leamington and Warwick
Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front
Kashmir Development Foundation (KDF)
Kashmir Forum
Kashmir Refugee Association, Mahmood Asim
Kashmir Refugee Association, Mahmood Zia
Kashmir Refugee Association, Sardar Zia Mahmood
Kashmir Youth Project, Ismail Fluet
Kashmir Youth Project, Zulfiqar Ali
Kashmiri Association of Viewers and Listeners
Khalistan Council
Khalsa Human Rights
Khalsa Human Rights (Oadby and Wigston)
Khalsa Satsang Jatha (Southampton)
Kingston Racial Equality Council
Kingston Sikh Society
Kirtan Sewa (UK)
KMC
Kowethas an Yeth Kernewek (The Cornish Language Fellowship)
Lancaster University (Department of Linguistics and English Language)
Leamington and Warwick Young Sikhs
Leeds Muslim Consortium
Leicester Gatkha Akhara
Leicester Literary Group
Leicester Punjabi Academy
Ligali (African British organisation)
Lincoln Sikh Association
Liverpool University
Local Leagues
Lokh Palayee Party UK
London Metropolitan University
London Southbank University
MEWN (Minority Ethnic Women's Network) Cymru

Mirpur Community Development Trust
Mott MacDonald Ltd (Integrated Transport Birmingham)
Muslim Council of Britian
Muslim Council of Wales
Muslim Education Consultative Committee
Nanaksar Thaath Isher Darbar (Wolverhampton)
National Association of British Arabs
National Council of British Indians
National Council of Gurdwaras
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education (ContinYou)
New Dadyal Cash & Carry
Nirvair Khalsa Dal (UK)
North Satley Neighbourhood Forum
North Wales Race Equality Network Ltd
Northern Oak (newsletter for members of the Pagan Federation in the North)
Nottingham Sikh Lions F.C.
Nottingham Young Sikhs
One NorthEast
One NorthEast - Regional Language Network
Oxford & Cambridge Universities Sikh Alumni Association
Pagan Association UK
Pagan Federation and PEBBLE (Public Body Liaison Committee for British Paganism)
Pagan Federation North East
PaganDASH and PEBBLE (Public Body Liaison Committee for British Paganism)
Pakistan Directory
Pakistan Welfare Association, Wales
Panjabi Cultural & Information Centre
Panjabi Sikh Association (Derby)
Plaid Cymru London Branch
Policy Research Institute on Ageing and Ethnicity
Polish Social & Cultural Association Ltd (POSK)
Public Bodies Liaison Committee for British Paganism (PEBBLE)
Punjab Community Centre, Bradford
Punjab Human Rights
Punjab United Football Club
Punjabi Cultural Society
Punjabi Writers Society
Rajdhani Cultural Society
Regional Language Network London
Regional Language Network: North East, North West, Yorkshire and Humber
Research Councils UK
RNID (Royal National Institute for the Deaf)
Royal Holloway, Uni.of London & the British Council
S.E.V.A. (Bedford)
Sarangi
Satley Community Association
Satley South Neighbourhood Forum
Satnam Network
Schellekens Consultancy
School Development Support Agency
Scottish Council of Jewish Communities
SGRUD Research
Sheffield Hallam University
Shiromani Akali Dal, Leamington and Warwick
Sikh Centre - Leeds
Sikh Community & Youth Service (Southampton)
Sikh Community & Youth Service UK
Sikh Community Action Network (Slough)
Sikh Education Society Leamington Spa

Sikh Education Welfare and Advancement Network UK
Sikh Federation (Bedford)
Sikh Federation (Birmingham)
Sikh Federation (Bradford)
Sikh Federation (Bristol)
Sikh Federation (Grays)
Sikh Federation (Halifax)
Sikh Federation (Handsworth)
Sikh Federation (Handsworth)
Sikh Federation (Ilford)
Sikh Federation (Leeds)
Sikh Federation (Loughborough)
Sikh Federation (Milton Keynes)
Sikh Federation (Nottingham)
Sikh Federation (Slough)
Sikh Federation (Slough)
Sikh Federation (Southampton)
Sikh Federation (Stafford)
Sikh Federation (UK)
Sikh Federation (Wolverhampton)
Sikh Federation Derby
Sikh Federation Gravesend Branch
Sikh Federation Leamington and Warwick Branch
Sikh Federation Lincoln
Sikh Heritage Society
Sikh Recreation & Learning Centre
Sikh Resource Centre (Oadby and Wigston) Leicester
Sikh Secretariat
Sikh Women's Alliance
Sikh Women's Federation (Birmingham)
Sikh Womens Federation (Handsworth)
Sikh Women's Federation (Loughborough)
Sikh Women's Federation (Milton Keynes)
Sikh Womens Federation (Oadby and Wigston)
Sikh Women's Federation (Slough)
Sikh Women's Federation (Southall)
Sikh Women's Federation (Southampton)
Sikh Women's Federation (UK)
Sikh Women's Federation (Wolverhampton)
Sikh Women's Federation (Derby)
Sikh Womens Group (Hounslow)
Sikhs In England (SIE)
Sikh's Women's Federation Leicester
Singh Sabha Gurdwara Bradford
Slough Sikh Forum
Slough Sikh Forum
Slough Sikh Forum
Small Heath Community Forum
Small Heath Youth and Connexion Centre
Solutions Consulting Ltd
South Satley Residents Association
Southall Sikh Federation
Southall Sikh Forum
Southall Young Sikhs
Sparkbrook Neighbourhood Forum
Sparkhill Neighbourhood Forum
Sri Guru HarKrishan Gurdwara, (Oadby and Wigston)
Sri Guru Nanak Darbar Gurdwara, Gravesend
Sri Guru Singh Sabha Gurdwara, Bristol
Sri Guru Singh Sabha Gurdwara, Slough

Sri Guru Singh Sabha Gurdwara, Derby
University of Leeds
Stafford Sikh Youth Organisation
Steadfast
Steadfast North East
Sudanese Coptic Association
Synovate (research company)
Taryaby Translation Services
Tehreek-e-Kashmir UK
Tettenhall Sikh Students Forum
The Association of Nigerians in The Grampian Region
The Co-operative Group (CWS) Ltd
The Council of Sikh Gurdwaras in Wolverhamtpon
The Honourable Society of Cymmrodorian
The Market Research Society
The Market Research Society Census and Geogemographics Group
The MultiLingual City Forum
The Muslim Council of Britain
The Pagan Federation
The Sikh Channel
The Sikh Temple Chapeltown Rd Leeds
Unity FM
University College London
University of Central England
University of Durham, Medical Anthropology Research Group
University of Kent
University of Oxford
University of Manchester
University of Wales, Newport
Urban Asia Radio
UWIC
Vaisakhi Radio
Voice of Aston
Wales Council for Voluntary Action
Walsall Sikh Forum
Wandsworth Community Empowerment Network
Ward End Asian Elders Welfare Association
Washwood Heath Youth & Community Network
Washwood Heath Youth Inclusion Project
Welsh Centre for International Affairs (WCIA)
Witton Neighbourhood Forum
Witton Youth Association
Wolverhampton Sikh Society
Womens Group Kashmiri
Worcester Sikh Society
Young Sikhs (UK)
Young Sikhs (Birmingham)
Young Sikhs (Birmingham)
Young Sikhs (Bradford)
Young Sikhs (Bristol)
Young Sikhs (Brownhills)
Young Sikhs (Dagenham)
Young Sikhs (Derby)
Young Sikhs (Grays)
Young Sikhs (Handsworth)
Young Sikhs (Ilford)
Young Sikhs (Keighley)
Young Sikhs (Leeds)
Young Sikhs (Slough)
Young Sikhs (Slough)

Young Sikhs (Southampton)
Young Sikhs (Stafford)
Young Sikhs (UK)
Young Sikhs (Willenhall)
Young Sikhs (Wolverhampton)

Expert, community and special interest group respondents: private individuals
Dr Amarjit Singh
Gordon Harrison
Keith Budden
Roger Beeson
Devinder Sivia
Miri Song
Phil Hosking
Prof R J Pentreath
Ted Chapman
Yowann Byghan
James Corin
Julyan Holmes
Lavinia Hines
Theo Brueton
E.M. Le Comber
A W Ballisat
Adam Reeve
Adrienne Pollock
Alan Trevarthen
Andrew Bamber
Andy Stuart
Angela Cannon
Anita Bernstein
Anita Hoener
Arts Society
B.D. Scott
Bob Todhunter
Bryn Colvin
Carol Evans
Cathy Parker
CE Turne
Celestine Alteryus
Cheryl Houkes
Christine Denwood
Christopher Spence
Claire Bellenis
Claudine Bulpitt
Colin Loveless
Dave French
David Daniel
David Gray
David Manser
Dawn Loveless
Diane Firmin
Douglas Jo
Dr A Drakakis-Smith
Elizabeth Jones
Geoff Palmer
Gillian Shelton
Gina Dodd
Glyn James
Glynis Jones
Helen Mostyn

Hempner Sharkey
Holly Owen
J. Manton
Jacquelyn Kimber
Jan Summers
Jane Kayley
Jason Hunt
Jean Willis
Jenny Luddington
Joanie Willett
Joanne Roberts
John Chidlow
John Ellery Gillingham
Julyan Holmes
Justine Feather
K. Davies.
Kathleen Elliot
Kathryn Libby
Kathryn Wheeler
Keabestoe Monegeng
Kiel Vaughan
Laura Kelly
LC Sykes
Lesley Stansfield
Lyndsey Shir-McDermott-Pour
Lynn Rishworth
Mandy Sanderson
Matthew Atha
Miss E Cafferty
Miss J Richards
MR Davey
Mrs Nicola M Bevan
Ms K Harding
Ms S Williams
Natelie Wells
Nigel Pengelly
Patricia Carline
Peter Humphreys
Peter Maxey
Philip Harvey
Pippa Moss
Princess Aphrodite (email address)
R.M. Wellman
Rev Martin Hazel
Richard le Corney
Rowenna W Williams
Sally Thomas
Sara Lonie
Simon Harris-King
Stephanie Thompson
Stephen Kent
Stuart Welbourn
Sue Rodger
Ugo
Vicci Daniels

Local and regional government respondents
Aylesbury Vale District Council
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Bedfordshire County Council

Birmingham City Council (responses from Adult and Communities Section; Children, Young People & Families Directorate; Corporate, Census and Population Group; and Corporate Policy and Performance Team)
Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council
Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council
Caerphilly County Borough Council
Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council
Cambridgeshire County Council
Charnwood Borough Council
Cheshire County Council (Research and Intelligence)
City and County of Swansea
City of Stoke-on-Trent (Directorate of Corporate Resources)
Comhairle nan Eilean Siar / Western Isles Council
Cornish Language Partnership
Cornwall County Council
Derby City Local Authority
East Sussex County Council
Enfield Council
Suffolk County Council (Environment and Transport)
Gateshead Council
Government Office for the South West
Greater London Authority
Haringey Strategic Partnership (HSP)
Herefordshire Council
Hertfordshire County Council, Environment Department
Kent County Council
Kent County Council (Canterbury Coastal and Swale Cluster)
Kirklees Metropolitan Council
Lancashire County Council
Leeds City Council
Leeds West Homes
Leicester City Council (Mohamed Arshad Sheikh, Roy Roberts)
Leicestershire & Leicester City Learning Partnership
Leicestershire County Council
Local Government Association High Ethnicity Authorities Special Interest Group
Local Government Data Unit – Wales
London Borough of Barnet
London Borough of Brent
London Borough of Greenwich
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough of Harrow
London Borough of Harrow
London Borough of Havering
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Lewisham
London Borough of Newham, Corporate Research
London Borough of Redbridge
London Borough of Richmond
London Borough of Southwark and Southwark Primary Care Trust
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Waltham Forest
London Borough of Wandsworth
London Borough of Westminster
Manchester City Council and Manchester Primary Care Trust
Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council
Newport City Council
Norfolk County Council
North Tyneside Council
North West Leicestershire District Council
Nottingham City Council

Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
Powys County Council
Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council / Rochdale Interagency Information Group
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (Jessie Hamshar, Roger Morgan)
Sheffield City Council
Shropshire County Council
South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Holland District Council
Stockport Metropolitan Council
Stoke-on-Trent City Council
Sunderland City Council
Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (coordinated joint response from the Borough Councils of
Darlington, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar & Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees)
Tyne and Wear Research and Information (TWRI)
Warrington Borough Council
Warwickshire County Council
West Lothian Council
Wiltshire County Council
Wolverhampton City Council (Megan Montgomery, Bela Sandhu)
Worcestershire County Council
Wycombe District Council

Local service provider respondents
Asthma UK
BID Services with Deaf People
Birmingham Voluntary Service Council
Bordesley Green Girls' School, Birmingham
Brighton and Hove Deaf Equality and Access
Buckinghamshire Primary Care Trust
Caerphilly Local Health Board
Chevin Housing Group
Comenius (CfBT Education Trust)
Connexions Leicestershire
Dyfed Powys Police
EAL (English as an Additional Language) Advisory Service Professional Education Centre,
Ceredigion
East Midlands Consortium for Asylum and Refugee Support
England's Public Health Observatories (completed on behalf of)
Grassroots (Cardiff) Ltd
Gwent Police
Leeds Mind
Leeds Primary Care Trust
Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service
London Underground
Millfield Medical Centre
National Clinical Assessment Service
National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education
NHS Sickle Cell and Thalassaemia Screening Programme
NHS Wales Business Services Centre
North East Public Health Observatory
Nottingham City Primary CareTrust
Rawlins Community College, Quorn, Loughborough
Royal National Hospital, Barts and The London NHS Trust - Royal National Hospital
Saltley School, Birmingham
Saltley and Washwood Heath Practical Care Project
Shaw Hill School, Birmingham
Socialist Health Association
South Asian Health Foundation
South Wales Fire and Rescue Service
Thames Valley Police

Transport for London
Traveller Education Service, Cardiff
The WM Merritt Disabled Living Centre & Mobility Service, St Mary's Hospital, Leeds
West Midlands Cancer Intelligence Unit
West Midlands Police Authority
West Midlands Police, Force Diversity Unit
West Yorkshire Police Authority
West Midlands Regional Observatory

A.3 2007 Census Test Question for Ethnicity, National Identity, Language and Religion, England and Wales

Information on the entire 2007 Census Test questionnaire is available at:

www.statistics.gov.uk/censustestquestionnaire

12 What do you consider your national identity to be?
- ♦ Tick all boxes that apply.
- ☐ Welsh
- ☐ English
- ☐ Scottish
- ☐ Northern Irish
- ☐ British
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Other, write in

13 What is your ethnic group?
- ♦ Choose one section from A to E, then tick the box to show your ethnic group.

A White
- ☐ Welsh
- ☐ Other British
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Any other white background, write in

B Mixed
- ☐ White and Black Caribbean
- ☐ White and Black African
- ☐ White and Asian
- ☐ Any other Mixed background, write in

C Asian or Asian British
- ☐ Indian
- ☐ Pakistani
- ☐ Bangladeshi
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Any other Asian background, write in

D Black or Black British
- ☐ Caribbean
- ☐ African
- ☐ Any other Black background, write in

E Other ethnic group
- ☐ Arab
- ☐ Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller
- ☐ Any other, write in

14 What is your religion?
- ♦ This question is voluntary.
- ♦ Tick one box only.
- ☐ None
- ☐ Christian (including Church in Wales, Catholic, Protestant and all other Christian denominations)
- ☐ Buddhist
- ☐ Hindu
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Muslim
- ☐ Sikh
- ☐ Any other religion, write in

15 What languages can you understand, speak, read or write?
- ♦ Tick all boxes that apply.

	No ability	Understand spoken	Speak	Read	Write
Welsh	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other language, write in	☐		☐	☐	☐

	No ability	Understand sign	Sign
British Sign Language	☐	☐	☐
Other sign language, write in	☐	☐	

16 How often do you speak Welsh?
- ♦ Tick one box only.
- ☐ Daily
- ☐ Weekly
- ☐ Less often
- ☐ Never

A.4 2006 Scottish Census Test Ethnicity Classification

Information on the 2006 Census Test in Scotland is available at:

http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/census/censushm2011/2006-census-test/index.html

---

What is your ethnic group
Tick one box which best describes your
ethnic background or culture.

European
☐ Scottish   ☐ British
☐ English   ☐ Northern Irish
☐ Welsh   ☐ Irish
☐ Other, write in

[   ]

Multiple Ethnic Groups
☐ Any multiple background,
    write in

[   ]

Asian
☐ Pakistani   ☐ Chinese
☐ Indian   ☐ Bangladeshi
☐ Sikh   ☐ Other, write in

[   ]

Arab
☐ Middle East   ☐ North African
☐ Other, write in

[   ]

African or Caribbean
☐ North African   ☐ East African
☐ Southern African   ☐ West African
☐ Central African   ☐ Caribbean
☐ Other, write in

[   ]

Other ethnic group
☐ Gypsy/Traveller   ☐ Jewish
☐ Other, write in

[   ]

A.5 Consultation Questionnaire on Ethnicity, National identity, Language and Religion for 2011 Census in England and Wales

Please fill in this questionnaire by checking the ☐ boxes with your mouse or typing in the shaded sections. The shaded sections expand as you type so your answer can be as long or short as you wish. Save this document when you have finished and email it back to ethnicity&identity@ons.gov.uk. (If you have any questions please contact us at ethnicity&identity@ons.gov.uk.)

Your comments will help to inform the development of the 2011 Census. Your answers may be made public and attributed to you/your organisation.

Please leave blank any sections that are not relevant to you/your organisation.

About you/your organisation

Name	
Organisation	
Address	
Postcode	
Telephone number	
Email address	

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

1. Ethnic group	☐
2. National identity	☐
3. Religion	☐
4. Language	☐
5. None of these	☐

Q2.   What roles or responsibilities does your organisation have with respect to the areas you have ticked above (at Q1)? *Please describe.*

Q3.   Which of the following sources of information on ethnic group, national identity, language and/or religion do you use? *Tick all that apply.*

1. Census	☐
2. Government social surveys (such as the Labour Force Survey or British Crime Survey)	☐
3. Surveys or information collected by/on behalf of your own organisation	☐ *Please describe*:
4. Information collected by other public authorities (e.g. NHS, Local Authorities)	☐ *Please describe*:
5. Other information on these topics	☐ *Please describe*:

Q4.   For which UK countries/geographies do you need this information? *Tick all that apply.*

1. England	☐
2. Wales	☐
3. Scotland	☐
4. Northern Ireland	☐
5. Great Britain	☐
6. United Kingdom	☐
7. Other	☐ *Please describe*:

Your views on ethnicity

A question on ethnic group has been included in previous censuses (1991 and 2001). This provides information on the self-identified ethnic group of the population.

The 2007 Census Test questionnaire contains some new ethnic group categories. But there may not be space to include these in the 2011 Census. Alternative options include repeating the 2001 ethnic group question or having a multiple-response question for ethnic group.

Q5.   Do you need ethnic group information from the 2011 Census?

1. Yes	☐ → go to next question
2. No	☐ → go to Q20

Q6. Which of these do you require? *Tick all that apply.*

1. General information on the ethnic composition of the population	☐
2. Information on specific ethnic groups	☐ *Please describe*:
3. Information on combinations of ethnic groups (e.g. the total ethnic minority population; the Asian population; etc)	☐ *Please describe*:
4. Other information on ethnic groups	☐ *Please describe*:

Q7. For what purposes do you/your organisation need this information? *Please describe.*

Q8. Do you require information on any of the following concepts? (See the accompanying consultation document for definitions.) *Tick all that apply.*

1. Visible minority population	☐
2. Non-White population	☐
3. Ancestry	☐
4. Race	☐
5. Any other concepts related to ethnic group	☐ *Please describe:*

Q9. For what purposes do you/your organisation need this information? Please describe.

If the question proposed for the 2007 Census Test questionnaire was used in 2011, it would provide information for the following categories:

Single ethnic group categories:	**Combined** ethnic group categories:
1. White English (in England)	1. White (categories 1 to 4)
2. White Welsh (in Wales)	2. Mixed (categories 6 to 9)
3. Other White British	3. Asian or Asian British (categories 10 to 14)
4. White Irish	
5. Other White background	4. Black or Black British (categories

Single ethnic group categories:	**Combined** ethnic group categories:
6. Mixed: White and Black Caribbean 7. Mixed: White and Black African 8. Mixed: White and Asian 9. Mixed: Other Mixed background 10. Indian 11. Pakistani 12. Bangladeshi 13. Chinese 14. Other Asian background 15. Black Caribbean 16. Black African 17. Other Black background 18. Arab 19. Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller 20. Other Ethnic Group	15 to 17) 5. Other ethnic groups (categories 18 to 20)

(Note: information on the 'other' ethnic categories, based on respondents' written answers, is likely to be available in a limited number of tables but not in standard outputs.)

Q10. Would the categories for **single** ethnic groups listed above provide the information you require?

1. Yes	☐ → go to Q12
2. No	☐ → go to next question
3. Partially	☐ → go to next question

Q11. If no or partially, please state why, describing what additional information you need and the reasons you need it.

Reasons why: *Additional information needed:* *Reasons needed:*

Q12. Would the **combined** ethnic group categories (White; Mixed; Asian or Asian British; Black or Black British; or Other ethnic groups) provide the information you require?

1. Yes	☐ → go to Q14
2. No	☐ → go to next question
3. Partially	☐ → go to next question

Q13. If no or partially, please state why, describing what additional information you need and the reasons you need it.

| *Reasons why:* |
| *Additional information needed:* |
| *Reasons needed:* |
| |

Q14. Will you need to compare the information on **single** ethnic groups in 2011 with the information from the 2001 Census?

| 1. Yes | ☐ → go to next question |
| 2. No | ☐ → go to Q16 |

Q15. If yes, please state for what purposes.

| |
| |

Q16. Will you need to compare the information on **combined** ethnic groups in 2011 with the information from the 2001 Census?

| 1. Yes | ☐ → go to next question |
| 2. No | ☐ → go to Q18 |

Q17. If yes, please state for what purposes.

| |
| |

Comparability over time and across the UK

Q18. Any changes to the ethnic group categories in 2011 may reduce the comparability with information collected in 2001. The degree to which comparability is reduced will depend on the extent of any changes.

Changes may also affect comparability across the UK. The ethnic group classifications in Scotland and Northern Ireland in 2001 were different from that in England and Wales, due to differences in the ethnic minority populations in each country. The Registrars General of the respective countries are committed to working towards consistent UK Census outputs, but it is possible that the differences between the ethnic group classifications in England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland may increase if there are different needs for information in each area.

What would be the effect of a **small** loss of comparability on your use of ethnic group information? (For example if a few of the single ethnic group categories are not comparable, but comparisons between the combined categories White, Mixed, Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British and Other ethnic group could still be made.) *Please describe for each aspect of comparability.*

Comparability with 2001:

Comparability across UK or GB:

Q19. What would be the effect of a **large** loss of comparability on your use of ethnic group information? (For example if a majority of the single ethnic group categories and the combined categories White, Mixed, Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British and Other ethnic group are not fully comparable.) *Please describe for each aspect of comparability.*

Comparability with 2001:

Comparability across UK or GB:

Your views on the acceptability of ethnic group terms

Q20. Ethnic identity and the terms used to describe it can change over time. Sometimes terms that were initially perceived as acceptable come to be seen as unacceptable (for example out-of-date or derogatory), and vice versa. ONS aims to use terminology that is clear, understandable and acceptable to respondents and we welcome comments on the terminology used.

For each of the following terms, do you find them acceptable for use in an ethnic group question? *Tick 'yes' or 'no' for each term.*

	Yes	No
1. White	☐	☐
2. Mixed	☐	☐
3. Black or Black British	☐	☐
4. Asian or Asian British	☐	☐
5. Other ethnic groups	☐	☐

Q21. Please give reasons for your answers to Q20.

Q22. What alternatives or improvements (if any) would you like to see to any of the terms listed in Q20?

Q23. Do you find any of the names used to describe the single ethnic group categories **unacceptable** for use in an ethnic group question? (The single ethnic group category names are listed after Q9.)

1. Yes	☐ *Please describe:*
2. No	☐

Q24. Please give reasons for your answer to Q23.

Q25. What alternatives or improvements (if any) would you like to see to any of the ethnic group category names? (The ethnic group category names are listed after Q9.)

Your views on multiple response ethnic group information
Ethnic group information from previous UK censuses has been based on asking people to tick one box only. Specific categories were introduced in 2001 to record

people with mixed ethnicity (see list after Q9, categories 6 to 9). As the proportion of people with mixed ethnicity is likely to increase, ONS proposes to test whether a multiple-response ethnic group question, based on asking people to tick all categories that apply, would allow people to record their ethnic group more efficiently/accurately. (Note that in the 2001 Census in England and Wales around 2 per cent of respondents ticked more than one answer to the ethnic group question, despite the instruction to tick only one box. They were re-allocated to a single ethnic category during the data processing stage.)

The information from a multiple response ethnic group question would be reported in two different ways.
   a. A count of all **individuals** (with people who tick a single response recorded as being of this ethnic group and people who tick more than one response recorded as 'Mixed: X and Y' according to the combination of their responses)
   b. A count of all **responses** (for example, the total number of people who ticked each ethnic group, whether singly or in combination with other responses)
The majority of outputs and reporting would use a count of all individuals. This would contain the ethnic group categories listed in the question, with additional 'Mixed' categories for the most common multiple responses.

Since 2000 several other countries, including USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, have provided multiple-response information on ethnicity or related topics in their censuses. However, changing to multiple-response ethnic categories will reduce the comparability with the single-response information from previous UK censuses.

Q26. What would be the effect of changing to multiple-response ethnic group on your use of the information? *Please describe.*

Q27. What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of multiple-response ethnic group information?

Advantages *Please describe*	
Disadvantages *Please describe*	

Comparison with Scottish test categories

The 2006 Census Test in Scotland used a different ethnic group classification to the one proposed for the 2007 Census Test in England and Wales. The main difference is that it replaces the term 'White' with 'European' and the term 'Black' with 'African or Caribbean'. It also contains a larger number of tick-box categories. If the 2006 Scottish ethnic group question was used in 2011 it would provide information for the following categories:

Single ethnic group categories:	**Combined** ethnic group categories:
1. Scottish 2. English 3. Welsh 4. British 5. Northern Irish 6. Irish 7. Other European 8. Multiple ethnic groups 9. Pakistani 10. Indian 11. Sikh 12. Chinese 13. Bangladeshi 14. Other Asian 15. Middle East 16. North African Arab 17. Other Arab 18. North African 19. East African 20. Southern African 21. West African 22. Central African 23. Caribbean 24. Other African or Caribbean 25. Gypsy/Traveller 26. Jewish 27. Other ethnic group	1. European (categories 1 to 7) 2. Multiple ethnic groups (category 8) 3. Asian (categories 9 to 14) 4. Arab (categories 15 to 17) 5. African or Caribbean (categories 18 to 24) 6. Other ethnic groups (categories 25 to 27)

More information on the 2006 Census Test in Scotland is available here:
www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/census/censushm2011/index.html

Q28. What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of the Scottish 2006 test classification (above) compared with the England and Wales 2007 test classification (shown after Q9)?

Advantages *Please describe*	
Disadvantages *Please describe*	

Other comments on ethnicity

Q29. If you have any other comments on ethnic group in the census please record below.

Your views on national identity

A question on national identity has not been included in previous censuses, though it has been asked in surveys such as the Labour Force Survey since 2001. National identity is subjective and self-perceived, unlike objective information such as country of citizenship. It records (for example) English, Welsh and Scottish national identities separately from an overall British identity and independently from ethnic group. It also allows recording of national identities from outside the UK. Testing of the national identity question showed that British-born people from ethnic minority groups preferred answering the ethnic group question if they were asked to record their national identity first.

Q30. Do you need national identity information from the 2011 Census?

1. Yes	☐ → go to next question
2. No	☐ → go to Q34

Q31. For what purposes do you/your organisation need this information? *Please describe.*

If the question proposed for the 2007 Census Test questionnaire was used in 2011, it would provide information for the following national identity categories:

1. English
2. Welsh
3. Scottish
4. Northern Irish
5. British
6. Irish
7. Other national identities

National identity is a multiple response question, so it would also provide information for different combinations of national identities. (Note: information on the 'other' national identity categories, based on respondents' written answers, is likely to be available in a limited number of tables but not in standard outputs.)

Q32. Would the proposed categories for national identity provide the information you require?

1. Yes	☐ → go to Q34
2. No	☐ → go to next question
3. Partially	☐ → go to next question

Q33. If no or partially, please state why, describing what additional information you need and the reasons you need it.

Reasons why:

Additional information needed:

Reasons needed:

Q34. If you have any other comments on national identity in the census please record below.

Your views on religion

A voluntary question on religion was asked for the first time in England and Wales in 2001. The question in England and Wales gathers information on religious identity or affiliation, rather than observance or practice. It differs from the religion questions used in the Scottish and Northern Irish censuses.

Q35. Do you need religion information from the 2011 Census?

1. Yes	☐ → go to next question
2. No	☐ → go to Q41

Q36. For what purposes do you/your organisation need this information? *Please describe.*

If the question proposed for the 2007 Census Test questionnaire was used in 2011, it would provide information for the following religion categories in England and Wales:

1. No religion
2. Christian
3. Buddhist
4. Hindu
5. Jewish
6. Muslim
7. Sikh
8. Other religions

(Note: information on the 'other' religious categories, based on respondents' written answers, is likely to be available in a limited number of tables but not in standard outputs.)

Q37. Would the proposed categories for religion provide the information you require?

1. Yes	☐ → go to Q41
2. No	☐ → go to next question
3. Partially	☐ → go to next question

Q38. If no or partially, please state why, describing what additional information you need and the reasons you need it.

Reasons why:
Additional information needed:
Reasons needed:

Q39. Will you need to compare the information on religion in 2011 with the information from the 2001 Census?

3. Yes	☐ → go to next question
4. No	☐ → go to Q41

Q40. If yes, please state for what purposes.

Q41. If you have any other comments on religion in the census please record below.

Your views on language

A question on Welsh language proficiency has been included in previous censuses in Wales. ONS proposes to continue to measure Welsh language proficiency in Wales in 2011.

Proficiency in other languages has **not** been recorded in previous censuses in England or Wales, and will only be included in 2011 if there is space for four pages of individual questions per person. But we are aiming to get a better understanding of users' requirements for language information. If there is a strong requirement for language information it may be possible to collect it using another survey, subject to funding.

Language ability can be difficult to measure using a self-completion form, and there are many different aspects of language. Please use the section below to record your requirements on this topic.

Q42. Do you need language information?

1. Yes	☐ → go to next question
2. No	☐ → go to Q50

Q43. Which languages are you particularly interested in, if any? *Please write in.*

Q44. For what purposes do you/your organisation need language information?

[blank answer box]

If the question proposed for the 2007 Census Test questionnaire was used in 2011, it would provide information for the following **new** aspects of language ability in England and Wales:

1. Ability to understand spoken English
2. Ability to speak English
3. Ability to read English
4. Ability to write in English
5. Ability to understand spoken Welsh (new for population in England)
6. Ability to speak Welsh (new for population in England)
7. Ability to read Welsh (new for population in England)
8. Ability to write in Welsh (new for population in England)
9. Ability to understand British Sign Language (BSL)
10. Ability to sign in BSL
11. Other languages understood
12. Other languages spoken/signed
13. Other languages read
14. Other languages written

Q45. Would the proposed categories for language ability provide the information you require?

1. Yes	☐ → go to Q47
2. No	☐ → go to next question
3. Partially	☐ → go to next question

Q46. If no or partially, please state why, describing what additional information you need and the reasons you need it.

Reasons why:

Additional information needed:

Reasons needed:

Q47. To what extent would information on the number of people who do not speak English, and the languages spoken by those who do not, be useful to you?

1. Very useful	☐
2. Useful	☐
3. Not useful	☐

Q48. There are many aspects of language ability. Which of the following aspects of language ability do you need to know about, and to what extent? *Tick the relevant box in each row.*

	Very important	**Quite important**	**Do not need**
1. Ability to understand spoken English	☐	☐	☐
2. Ability to speak English	☐	☐	☐
3. Ability to read English	☐	☐	☐
4. Ability to write in English	☐	☐	☐
5. Which languages are understood, other than English	☐	☐	☐
6. Which languages are spoken, other than English	☐	☐	☐
7. Which languages are read, other than English	☐	☐	☐
8. Which languages are written, other than English	☐	☐	☐
9. Ability to understand spoken Welsh (among population in England)	☐	☐	☐
10. Ability to speak Welsh (among population in England)	☐	☐	☐
11. Ability to read Welsh (among population in England)	☐	☐	☐
12. Ability to write in Welsh (among population in England)	☐	☐	☐
13. Frequency of speaking Welsh	☐	☐	☐
14. Frequency of speaking other languages	☐	☐	☐
15. Mother tongue or first language	☐	☐	☐
16. Main language(s) spoken at home	☐	☐	☐
17. Preferred spoken language for communicating with public authorities	☐	☐	☐
18. Preferred written language for communicating with public authorities	☐	☐	☐
19. Other aspects of language ability, please specify	☐	☐	☐

Q49. If only **one** piece of language information could be collected, what would be the most useful to you/your organisation?
Choose one aspect from Q48 above and write in the number below, or describe in your own words.

Piece of information required	
Specific language (if applicable)	

Q50. If you have any other comments on language please record below.

Prioritising your requirements

The eventual questions used in 2011 will have to balance the requirements for information with the constraints on questionnaire length.

Q51. Please rank these four topics in order, based on how important each piece of information is to you/your organisation.
Number each topic from 1 to 4, where 1 is the most important topic and 4 is the least important.

Ethnic group	
National identity	
Religion	
Language	

Q52. Of all the requirements you have mentioned in this questionnaire, which are the most important to you/your organisation? *List up to three.*

1.
2.
3.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Q53. Use the space below for any other comments you want to add.

Thank you for contributing your views. Please return this form to:
ethnicity&identity@ons.gov.uk

Emailed forms are preferred. We can also be contacted at:

    Ethnicity and Identity Branch

    Room D201, Office for National Statistics

    1 Drummond Gate

    London SW1V 2QQ

    Tel: 020 7533 5741