

## POPULATION AND MIGRATION STATISTICS COMMITTEE (SCOTLAND)

### Census Data Collection and Consultation

The paper is fairly abbreviated because a full consultation document is currently being prepared and will be issued by 17<sup>th</sup> November. That contains many consultation points. This paper has 3 parts:

1. Consultation plan,
2. The 1<sup>st</sup> quarterly summary of the responses to the question consultation
3. The Census Test Plan

### Section 1: The Consultation Plan

The plan is laid out in Table 1. PAMS members are asked for comments.

**Table 1 Consultation Plan and Timetable**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Form of consultation</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Question consultation	Web-based	3 monthly updates
Formal Consultation on all Census issues	Meeting and 12 week response period. Publication of findings	Nov 2004 Feb 2005
2006 Census Test questions	Final e-mail consultation	Aug-Sept 2005
Census Test	Survey of 60,000 households Proposed for Glasgow, Breadalbane, Dunbartonshire.	April 2006
Formal Consultation on all Census issues in light of Test results.	Meeting and 12 week response period - particularly to consider output details with population bases and under enumeration. Publication of findings	Nov 2006 Feb 2007
2008 Census Rehearsal questions	Final e-mail consultation	Aug-Sept 2007
Census Rehearsal	Survey of households	April 2008
Formal Consultation on all Census issues following Rehearsal	Meeting and 12 week response period. Publication of findings	Nov 2008 Feb 2009
2011 Census questions	Finalised by e-mail consultation	Aug-Sept 2009
Census		April 2011

## Section 2: 1<sup>st</sup> Quarterly Summary report August - October

### 1. Responses

We received 15 responses to the 2011 Census Questions Consultation Questionnaire from its release on 6<sup>th</sup> August by Mid October. This is the first 3 quarterly summary. I have edited out responses which either make no sense or which are wrong. In every case I have written to the respondent to tell them why that has been done. I have also omitted questions for which we have no useful comments. Table 2 at the end of this section shows the 'vote' on whether to keep, modify or remove each of the questions.

#### **H1. The type of accommodation household occupies?**

One respondent proposed that we ask about status in the household to pick up people who were sleeping on friends floors etc who were otherwise homeless. Include a question on 'environmental sustainability' (use of material/renewable energy sources/recycling etc)

#### **H6. Does your accommodation have central heating?**

We should look at partial and full central heating or how many rooms have central heating or heating type and useage since so many people have central heating systems. Given the present incidence and the Executive's policy and programme to install central heating in vulneable group housing I see little relevance in this being continued to be asked

#### **H8. Does your household own or rent the accommodation?**

"A lot of people say they live rent free when in fact they do not (a problem in the Scottish House Condition Survey). Probably these people are genuinely mistaken and really very convinced that they do live rent free, so it might be impossible to avoid. But try having two new categories: rents (paid for in full by benefits) and rents (paid for in part by benefits); Ensure that benefit claimants do not consider that they are living rent free

Can data on 'second homes' be collected in this way?

#### **H9. Who is your landlord?**

Specify whether GHA would come under Housing Association or Local Authority - this may confuse some people.

Add a 'Other - Please Specify' category.

#### **H10. Is the accommodation furnished or unfurnished?**

Retain somehow perhaps within another question?

Given the spread of the responses, removal is sensible.

I cannot see the continued relevance of this question when other questions could fill this position.

#### **H11. Name of person and relationship to previous person**

I would support the extension to 6 people

**P4. What is your marital status?**

Does not allow for polygamous or polyandrous relationships  
What about persons long term cohabiting without a legal arrangement?  
It should be modified to take account of civil partnership legislation. 2 new categories should be included - cohabiting couple (same sex) and cohabiting couple (different sex).

**P5. Are you a schoolchild or student in full-time education?**

'School child' is a dated term?? (School Pupil, Student)

**P7. Over the last twelve months has your health been ...?**

Is this looking for chronic illness? Does a broken arm count as 'not good' ?

This question is far too subjective

Is there enough distinction between 'good' and 'fairly good'?

Perhaps change categories to 'very good' and 'fairly good', or 'excellent' and 'good'.

If we are to keep this might need to be more detailed - necessitated a trip to the doctor, hospital, days off work, ??

Needs more objective measure eg. visit to doctor, or off work etc.

Subjective. Refine to have you been hospitalised; attended Dr on X occasions; required no medical treatment etc??

Indicator only of self perceptions of health. It is impossible to interpret the the answers. We can not distinguish good health from optimism!! Too complex an issue for the census.

Given other work showing a link between self opinions on health and actual health I would support the retention of this question. I wonder whether it would be possible to get some health problem breakdown as with the Labour Force Survey to get some idea of prevalence rates?

**P8. Long-term limiting illness**

It depends on your point of view. If you are in a wheelchair (say you can move your legs), but can get to work via taxis/lifts etc, or go shopping etc. etc. you may say that you DON'T have a LLTI when others may sit at home and feel sorry for themselves

Give examples.

More specific data on types of illness/health problem or disability would be helpful

**P10. What address do you travel to for your job or study?**

It would be nice to be able to identify schools who share a post code to benchark attainment levels to other variables. GROS is looking at the si problem. It may require a new response box within one of the current questions.

**P11. How do you usually travel to your work or study?**

As long as you can tick more than one option. if you cycle to a train station and then walk from the station to the office you would need to tick all three

Add 'fly'

I have two proposals for changes to the census form to incorporate information that would improve our ability to accurately estimate local emissions and model air pollution.

The first is an addition to P11, to include distance travelled to work with the mode. This would help environmental assessments as well as transport planners to understand how far people live from their place of work and provide local information on "Cold Starts" that affect the emission intensity from road vehicles.

The introduction of a new question after H6 to collect the type of fuel used would be extremely helpful for national and local air quality assessments. This information would enable scientists to predict, more reliably, the impacts of different fuels used for heating and cooking in different areas of the country. In addition the quantity of fuel consumed (GJ of Gas, Coal, Wood etc) would be useful to again improve the accuracy of air pollution models. However, I have left this out of the proposed new question as I feel it may be too technical to request meaningful quantitative fuel consumption data. If you think this is possible then I would be happy to help refine the questions further.

**P13. What religion, religious denomination or body do you belong to?**

**P14. What religion, religious denomination or body were you brought up in?**

Could split Muslim into Sunni / Shi'ite

More options to take into account the diverse nature of society

Remove questions on religion / belief

The inclusion of both 'Other Christian' and 'Another Religion' confuses or appears to confuse some respondents.

I see little point in continuing with this question in Scotland given the response and the space this takes in the Census.

I write to formally request the addition of a tick box for the Pagan religion to the questions "What religion, religious denomination or body do you belong to?" and "Religion of Upbringing?" to the census form for the 2011 Scottish Census.

These questions (Q13 and Q14 in the 2001 Census) currently include tick boxes for five non-Christian religions - Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim and Sikh. The analysis of detailed responses to the "Another religion" write-in boxes in these questions commissioned by the Pagan Federation (Scotland) and provided by the GROS in March 2004 clearly demonstrated that Pagans (at 1930 responses) constitute the sixth largest non-Christian faith community in modern Scotland. While we appreciate that there are tight constraints on the size of the Scottish

Census form, the addition of a PAGAN tick box to the above list of five non-Christian religions would not require any additional space as it would merely replace the present arrangement of two parallel columns of three and two tick-boxes respectively, with two parallel columns of three tick-boxes each. We remain of the view that it is unjust to require the Pagan community to pay for statistical information on the number of Pagans in Scotland when the equivalent information is provided freely to Buddhists, Christians, Hindus, Jews, Muslims and Sikhs.

**P15. What is your ethnic group?**

*GROS is involved in formulating these questions from a fresh piece of work initiated by the Racial Equality Scheme Implementation Group. The results from this may only be available very late in the 2006 census cycle but this only a part of the development of a new ethnic question for the Scottish public sector. The principles of community acceptability and coherence with the 2001 are classification will be followed.*

Split geography and skin colour into separate questions.

White - Other British change to White - English White - Welsh White - Northern Irish.

Much too cumbersome, takes up too much space in survey forms, that degree of breakdown excessive for small numbers involved. Also, boxes not mutually exclusive.

The questions used in the 1991 Census were based on such a mixed classification. Any changes should permit comparison of the 2011 Census Ethnic Group with 2001 and 1991 data sets.

Clearly the prompt list is highly contentious and I can see why some commentators have argued for change. It does indeed elide skin colour and place of origin or chosen affiliation. However, it is hard to see how one improves on it. 'White' (or something very like it) is essential because without that prompt re colour, the question could be read as asking for a declaration of state or national loyalty. And we would not be able to distinguish the 'native' Scot from the committed Scottish nationalist immigrant. Black Scottish could be dropped.

In thinking about these labels it would be useful to know how the responses crosstabbed with the country of birth and the religious identity questions. If there are strong correlations, for example, between being born in Ireland and claiming 'White-Irish' this would be good reason to leave as is.

I would agree with the proposal to avoid mixing ethnicity and political geography.

**P16. Can you understand, etc Scottish Gaelic?**

If we stick with this how about other languages as well?

Refine to distinguish between 'native speakers', 'fluent/near fluent learners' and 'non-fluent learners'.

**P17. Do you look after etc family members, friends, etc?**

'I give any help or support' is quite fuzzy and too much open

1-19 should be split into 0-7 and 8-21 hours per week to give better indication of care required. 20-49 becomes 21-49. Easier to think in terms of hours per day for those with greatest needs.

1-19 hours very broad.

Would welcome more information on whom care is being given to ie; how many are caring for elderly, children with disabilities, as well as the number of hours care is being provided for

Too few "Yes" responses (esp. when broken down) to be informative.

I believe that it needs to be retained - though it might be useful to have information on the extent that such help is purchased.

**P19. Last week, were you doing any work?**

Include voluntary work?

**P22. Last week, waiting to start job already obtained?**

Small number of returns and given the frequency of the census and relative frequency of other data collection relating to this issue it is not clear that it is productive to obtain this much details about unemployment issues.

**P24. Have you ever worked?**

Do you mean worked, or been in paid (self-)employment? Are councillors (and their like) employees?

If No Why \_\_\_\_\_

It might be more useful to have a question on barriers to work that people face - discouraged workers, childcare, older people care, etc. To get an idea of there extent and inform actions and policies.

**P27. Do (did) you supervise any other employees?**

Couldn't information of similar value be obtained by asking for a job classification e.g. unskilled, semi skilled, managerial, professional etc.

**P28. How many people work where you work (worked)?**

Should split numbers in accordance with workers' rights at work and TU Law Change the tick box categories - Below 3, 3- 24, 25 - 49, 50 - 250, 250+

I think that this question can cause problems for people who may be unclear whether this relates to where they work, or the numbers in the place they work, etc. It should be modified

**P29. How many hours do you usually work?**

Is it necessary to specify whether this includes paid or unpaid overtime?

How is this to be answered by those in casual employment?

**P30. What is (was) the full title of your main job?**

*GROS has no view on this question yet.*

Could you give people the categories which you would code responses into anyway?

How is this to be answered by those in voluntary or casual employment?  
Better to have a 'picking list' of employment types/ categories?

**P31. Describe what you do (did) in your main job.**

Could you give people the categories which you would code responses into anyway?

If question 30 is changed I'd imagine this one could be removed?

Don't see the purpose of the question - and for many people, very difficult to answer easily?

**P32. What is the name of the organisation you work for?**

Limited value given probably diversity of returns and that census is aimed at producing statistical account??? Classify employer as private enterprise, small, medium large, government academic... whatever? Are there not labour force surveys and business surveys which provide info about employers and the number of their employees, one would also expect this to be extractable from Inland Revenue.

As this is really a check question to help with industrial coding I think it would depend on how useful this was for checking.

**P33. What is the business of your work organisation?**

Again, a 'picking list' might be preferred?

**P34. Which of these qualifications do you have?**

Separate first and higher degree categories.

Given the desire to bring vocational and academic qualifications on the same level, then the question may need to be modified to reflect this and also capture the range of qualifications people have.

## New Questions

**ID5**

---

Do you think that you are eligible for benefits?

If yes, do you claim them?

If yes and you don't claim, why don't you?

**ID8**

---

As well as the question on marital status, we would welcome two new questions on: 1. Length of relationship 2. Is this your first or subsequent cohabiting relationship? These relate to the modification of the question to include civil partnership legislation. There is a lack of data on how long cohabiting couples stay together and also how many cohabiting relationships they have. We would welcome questions around these areas. We would also welcome a question on volunteering - have you done any voluntary work within the past year? As policy agendas have focused more on volunteering in recent years, perhaps it is time the Census incorporated a question of this nature.

**ID1**


---

Income Financial inclusion- access to bank accounts Pension provision. Childcare use and cost

**ID18**


---

What is your annual income? Did you vote in the last election

**ID19**


---

Do you consider noise to be a problem in/around your place of residence?

**ID24**


---

Number in household in full and part-time employment

**ID11**


---

I would support an Income Question and a question on Barriers to work/study and on particular health issues.

**Questions To Omit**

I think the religion question could be dropped (or at least the upbringing on), as well as the Central Heating and Self contained, Bath / toilet access questions. The Employer name question I see as a checking question so it is up to the processors of the

**ID12**


---

After H6: What type of energy is used for heating and cooking:

- % Coal/Coke/Solid Smokless Fuel
- % Natural/Bottled Gas
- % Wood or other Biomass
- % Oil
- % Electricity

“The introduction of a new question after H6 to collect the type of fuel used would be extremely helpful for national and local air quality assessments. This information would enable scientists to predict, more reliably, the impacts of different fuels used for heating and cooking in different areas of the country. In addition the quantity of fuel consumed (GJ of Gas, Coal, Wood etc) would be useful to again improve the accuracy of air pollution models. However, I have left this out of the proposed new question as I feel it may be too technical to request meaningful quantitative fuel consumption data. If you think this is possible then I would be happy to help refine the questions further.”

**3 x ID not ascribed as yet**


---

Scots Language

The 'voting' on Census questions so far is shown in Table 2:

**Table 2: Census Question E-mail voting.**

Question	Same	Remove	Modify
Accom Type	11	0	2
Self contained	1	11	1
Rooms	10	0	3
Shared bath	4	9	0
Lowest Floor	10	0	0
Central heating	6	1	6
No of cars	14	0	0
Rent or own	2	0	12
Landlord	11	0	3
Furnished?	4	5	4
Relation matrix	11	0	2
Marital status	2	0	12
Student?	11	0	1
Gen Health	4	5	4
L-t I Illness	12	0	2
Addr 1 yr ago	11	1	0
Wk/study addr	5	0	7
Travel to wk/study	10	0	3
Country of Birth	9	0	3
Religion-combined	10	6	10
Ethnic Group	1	0	13
Gaelic	9	3	2
Caring	6	1	6
Working	7	2	3
Looking for work	8	3	2
Start job in 2 weeks?	4	6	1
Waiting to start work	8	3	1
Activity last week	9	2	2
Ever worked	8	3	2
Employee/self employed	11	0	0
Supervise others	8	2	1
Number of workers	8	0	3
Hours worked	10	0	3
Job Title	9	0	3
What do you do	8	2	1
Who you work for	7	2	2
Business of your org'tion	7	2	2
Qualifications	10	0	2

## Section 3: The 2006 Census Test

### 3.1 Background

1. This section describes the proposed 2006 Census Test. The Census Test is traditionally a test of new features, as distinct from a rehearsal of the main methodological content of the main Census. The Test seeks to generate enough data to allow GROS to develop and evaluate processing options. It also allows us to:
  - Train staff for the Census proper;
  - Trial new technologies which impinge on field methods;
  - Trial new questions; and
  - Evaluate quality of results against cost.

### 3.2 Test questions

2. In September 2004, we launched the internet consultation on questions to be included in the Test. The first summary is in Section 2 above. Two questions have already been highlighted for the Test:
  - We have agreed to test ethnic classification schemes.
  - Consultation for the 2001 Census showed that that the Census would benefit from an income question. This view is shared by the TSC in their 1<sup>st</sup> report<sup>1</sup>. They point out that that most people answered the religion question even though it was not compulsory and suggest that compulsion is not necessarily an essential element in securing a high level of responses to specific questions. They recommended that further consultation should be carried out on whether a question on income should be included in any future Census, and whether it should be voluntary or compulsory.
3. If a question on income is to be included we must work to determine:
  - Wording of the question;
  - Explanatory text to encourage completion;
  - Income banding;
  - Whether achievable accuracy is acceptable?
  - Whether a non-compulsory question would work?
  - Whether it should be an individual or household question?
  - Whether income source is also required or enough?
  - Is there proxy information (e.g. Dwelling Council Tax Banding) or alternative sources which are acceptable?

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmselect/cmtreasy/310/31002.htm>

**We would welcome input on any design aspects of an income question for the 2006 Census Test.**

### 3.3 Test Design

4. The Test is designed to evaluate a number of features, set out in Table 3.

**Table 3: 2006 Test Design Requirements**

Requirement	Comment	
Income question	In 50% of forms	
Ethnicity question	Ethnically rich and diverse area - no split design required but may be many question variants for follow up purposes.	
Cost	Postout/Postback-Collection Single round delivery/ postback collection	Rural Suburban Urban
Data Quality	Enumerator check back	Cost estimate of this procedure
In house pay	Cost estimate of this procedure	
'Address Checkers'	Produce address lists compared to PAF and DNA.	Rural Suburban
	Confirm occupancy status of empty dwellings	Urban
Processing	Allow prototype processing; Allow data quality to be assessed;	

5. We will be comparing the application of 2 methods of enumeration in 3 types of areas, with and without an income question. This gives a 3x2x2 design.
6. Underlying previous Census Test designs was the assumption that an enumerator would only be able to cope with one methodology. The Census Office in Ireland had mixed methods of enumeration by a single enumerator in their Census Test. We propose to do the same, allowing us to compare response rates of closely similar areas with the same enumerator.
7. We will be trialling Address Checkers. They will cover about 4,500 Addresses in preparation for Postout. Our logic is to make delivery as accurate as possible by identifying and correcting address anomalies before enumerators start work, and then concentrate our effort on collection. The enumerator is there to help the household to complete the form if needed and give householders the choice to post or get the form picked up. This has 5 potential advantages:
- We retain the Delivery/Collect option if Royal Mail has problems;

- We retain the Collect option for all households with difficulty completing the form or posting it;
  - It closely ties an enumerator to an area – to give sense of ownership of an area;
  - We can divert enumerator resources to checking form quality;
  - We may achieve savings in field costs over traditional enumeration.
8. We plan that an enumerator would cover 500 households in urban areas and 400 households in rural areas. With 120 enumerators we would cover about 57,000 households. The number of field staff by area is shown in Table 4.
9. With this size of sample, assuming a 60% rate of return, each treatment block (income by enumeration method) would have at least 8,000 - 9,000 returned forms; and 2% differences are statistically significant (Table 5).

**Table 4: 2006 Test Field Staff and Form Count by Area.**

Staff Grade	City centre	Peripheral	Holiday area	Totals
Regional Census Managers	1	1	0	2
Regional Office Staff	2	2	-	4
Local Census Managers	2	1	1	4
Local Census Manager Assistants	6	3	3	12
Enumerators	60	30	30	120
Total no of households	30,000	15,000	12,000	57,000
Est no of forms returned (60% response rate)	18,000	9,000	7,200	34,200

**Table 5: Planned Number of forms issued and estimated forms returned**

	Forms issued	Forms returned
Po/Pb	33,000	19,800
D/Pb	24,000	14,400
Urban	30,000	18,000
Suburban	15,000	9,000
Rural	12,000	7,200
Income qn	28,500	21,735
No income qn	28,500	21,735

### 3.4 Test Areas

10. To meet the aims of the test, we propose to run the Test in:
- Ethnically diverse areas of Glasgow;
  - Public sector estates with high unemployment in Dunbartonshire;
  - Rural area with holiday homes between Killin and Ballachulish, taking in parts of Highland, Argyll & Bute, Stirling and Perth & Kinross.

11. The areas were chosen so that training could be held in Glasgow and travelling reduced as far as possible. To give a high proportion of members of ethnic minorities and a rich variety of ethnicities, the areas chosen in Glasgow are spread across the inner city, while the other two Test areas are formed from contiguous postcode sectors.

### **3.5 New Technology and Data Collection**

12. We have considered whether to test electronic form completion by households – by internet, telephone or interactive TV. We are concerned at the relatively high cost (especially to ensure security) and the scope for cost escalation during the project. Nor do we have evidence that it would guarantee enhanced response rates from sectors of the population who traditionally try to avoid completing a census form. We do not therefore intend to include a full electronic option in the Test. We plan however to include a test question about whether people would prefer to complete the form on-line. We might also adapt the method we use for the web-based question consultation to allow on-line form completion in test areas, making clear however that we do not guarantee confidentiality.
13. Radio Frequency Identification (RFID), which eases the tracking of completed forms by allowing identification of all the forms in a closed mailbag, seems to increase the viability of the Post-out/Post-back option. However, forms would still have to be checked for data quality and if necessary returned to the field. Also barcodes on envelopes may achieve the same end. So we do not propose to use RFID in the Test.

**We would welcome your opinions of how useful/relevant alternative methods of Census data collection would be.**