

## **2011 Census**

---

### **Ethnic group, national identity, religion and language consultation**

Local and regional government responses to  
the 2011 Census stakeholders consultation  
2006/07

**Office for National Statistics, October 2007**

© Crown Copyright

**Local and Regional Government Responses to the 2011 Census  
Stakeholders Consultation 2006/07: Ethnic Group, National Identity,  
Religion and Language, England and Wales**

**Contents**

<b>Summary of Findings from Local and Regional Government</b>	<b>3</b>
Ethnic group	3
National identity	5
Religion	6
Language	6
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2. Review of Requirements for Information on Ethnic Group</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 Requirements for information on concepts of ethnicity	12
2.2 Suitability of ethnic group categories and suggested changes	16
2.3 Requirements for comparison with 2001 ethnic group information	23
2.4 Requirements for comparison between UK countries	26
2.5 Acceptability of ethnic group terminology	27
2.6 Advantages and disadvantages of multiple response ethnicity data	32
2.7 Comments on the Scottish 2006 Census Test ethnicity classification	37
<b>3. Review of Requirements for Information on National Identity</b>	<b>45</b>
3.1 Requirements for information on national identity	45
3.2 Suitability of the proposed national identity question and suggested changes	48
<b>4. Review of Requirements for Information on Religion</b>	<b>51</b>
4.1 Requirements for information on religion	51

4.2 Suitability of religion categories and suggested changes	53
4.3 Requirements for comparison with 2001 religion information	54
<b>5. Review of Requirements for Information on Language</b>	<b>56</b>
5.1 Requirements for information on language	56
5.2 Suitability of proposed language questions in the 2007 Census Test	60
5.3 Additional requirements on language ability	62
5.4 Most important aspects of language ability	64
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>66</b>
A.1 References	66
A.2 Consultation Respondents	67
A.3 2007 Census Test Question for Ethnicity, National Identity, Language and Religion, England and Wales	68
A.4 2006 Scottish Census Test Ethnicity Classification	69
A.5 Consultation Questionnaire on Ethnicity, National Identity, Language and Religion for 2011 Census in England and Wales	70

## **Data Conventions**

### *Rounding of figures*

In tables where figures have been rounded to the nearest final digit, 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 from Local and Regional Government**

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. The Local and Regional Government report summarises the responses from local and regional government.

Almost all (97 per cent) of local and regional government respondents stated that they needed information on ethnic group, 67 per cent on national identity, 91 per cent on religion and 96 per cent stated that they had a requirement for language information from the 2011 Census.

### **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, one-quarter (24 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
- 'Black African' – more specific information, for example, on Nigeria and Somali
- Jewish
- Kashmiri

### *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 71 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 national identity, 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 there should be separate categories from Gypsies and for Irish Travellers, as well as the acceptability of these two terms
- Arab – some expressed the opinion that this term was too specific

### *Requirements for other concepts of ethnicity*

Respondents who needed ethnic group information, said they also needed information on the non-White population (57 per cent) and the visible minority population (48 per cent). Non-White population information was required to produce headline comparisons of local populations. Information on the visible minority population was needed to help fulfil their responsibilities under the *Race Relations (Amendment) Act*.

### *Comparability over time and across the UK*

Local and regional government respondents were more likely than any other group of respondents to need to be able to compare ethnic group data between the 2001 and 2011 Censuses; 90 per cent needed to compare single ethnic groups, while 79 per cent needed to compare combined ethnic groups categories. However, most recognised that small changes to the classification was desirable to provide more accurate or detailed information.

In general, respondents were not concerned about being able to compare with Scotland or Northern Ireland. Respondents more commonly benchmarked against aggregated areas, usually England, England and Wales or in the case of several London boroughs, London as a whole.

#### *Multiple response ethnic group data*

In general, local and regional government respondents recognised that multiple response ethnic group information could improve accuracy and depth of information, enable self-identification, and provide enhanced information on mixed or multiple ethnicities. However these advantages were outweighed by the disadvantages of:

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

#### **National identity**

A question on national identity has not been asked in previous censuses and this consultation investigated what users would need from such a question. The rationale for including a separate question on national identity is to make the census form more accessible and clearer. Key findings are presented below and full details can be found in Section 3 of this report.

Around two-thirds (67 per cent) of local and regional government respondents stated that they needed data on national identity. Respondents used this information to promote a measure of community cohesion, to gain a better

understanding of their local communities so they can better serve their needs, and to provide information on specific national identities.

Four in ten (40 per cent) of respondents who required information on national identity thought the 2007 Census Test question would meet their needs. The main requirements for this information were to provide a measure of community cohesion, gain a better understanding of local communities and to provide information on specific national identities.

## **Religion**

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

The majority (91 per cent) of local and regional government respondents required information on religion. They used this information to help them develop policies on community cohesion and promote equality, to decide on the allocation of resources, to monitor service provision and to enhance information on ethnic group. Of these respondents 82 per cent stated that the proposed categories for religion in the 2007 Census Test would provide the information they required.

Respondents whose needs were not met required the following additional information:

- non-beliefs should be included
- additional religions and non-religious beliefs should be included

Most respondents (85 per cent) who needed religion information stated the need to compare information on religion in the 2011 Census with data from the 2001 Census to allow them to monitor changes at a local level.

## Language

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

Almost all (96 per cent) of local and regional government respondents stated that they had a requirement for a language question on the 2011 Census. The main purposes were to:

- ensure accessibility of information and services
- target translation and interpretation services
- provide information on minority languages used
- enhance information from the ethnicity and religion questions

Several different aspects of language information were identified. The strongest requirement was for information on the ability to speak and understand spoken English.

The proposed language question in the 2007 Census Test included categories for the ability to understand, speak, read and write for English, Welsh and one other language (to be specified by the respondent). Categories for the ability to understand and sign British Sign Language were also included. Almost one-half (48 per cent) of respondents stated that the proposed categories for language provided the information they required, and a further 34 per cent stated that their requirements would be partially met.

Problems identified with the proposed question by various respondents included that the main languages used in an area could not be identified, it was unclear whether a write-in response would be available, and information on neither British Sign Language nor the Welsh language was required.



## 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<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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 collected 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](http://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). Local and regional government respondents 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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>297</b>

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

- central and devolved government – includes central government departments and agencies and devolved government
- experts, community and special interest groups – includes community based organisations, special interest groups, academia, private companies and individuals
- 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 arranged 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 responses presented in this report are based on the 297 unique responses received, without the duplicates. In addition, while respondents were invited to submit 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. A 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 consulted and this report summarises responses received from local and regional government.

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 Providers 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:

- requirements for information on concepts of ethnicity
- suitability of ethnic group categories and suggested changes
- requirements for comparison with 2001 ethnic group information
- requirements for comparison between UK countries
- acceptability of ethnic group terminology
- advantages and disadvantages of multiple response ethnicity data
- 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. Local and regional authorities require data on particular aspects of ethnicity to fulfil their obligations under equality legislation and to plan and monitor the provision of services. Respondents also highlighted their responsibilities under the *Race Relations (Amendment) Act* to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination.

‘Equal opportunity monitoring, educational needs, access to public services, community cohesion, labour market analysis, comparator statistics, central government returns, census analysis ... unemployment rates, education, social services uptake.’

(Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit)

## 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.

Nearly all local and regional government respondents (97 per cent) stated a requirement for ethnic group information from the 2011 Census (Table 2).

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

England and Wales	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Base = 100% (numbers)
Organisation type			
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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>283</b>

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 <sup>1,2</sup> = 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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>259</b>

*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.*

There was not such a great requirement for information on concepts relating to ethnicity by local and regional government respondents (Table 3)

#### *Visible minority population*

Several local authority respondents requested information on visible minority populations (48 per cent). They needed this information to fulfil their responsibilities under the *Race Relations (Amendment) Act*. For example:

'The *Race Relations (Amendment) Act* requires local authorities to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and promote good race relations. To this end LBHF needs to monitor ethnic groups and their service needs within its area. The "visible minority" and "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)

'[Information on] visible minority population would be valuable as a summary indicator for informing resource allocation aimed at combating disadvantage. "Non-White" is probably too value-laden to be an acceptable term.'

(Norfolk County Council)

### *Non-White population*

More than one-half of local and regional authority respondents (57 per cent) required information on the non-White population. Local authorities need this information to produce headline comparisons of their populations, although respondents who wanted this information also acknowledged that it was not necessarily their preferred summary measure.

' ... 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 residents and the vast majority of the county's rapidly growing ethnic minority population are non-White British, namely eastern European.'

(Herefordshire Council)

'''Non-White", to provide simple headline comparisons between areas. However, this suggests a higher degree of homogeneity than probably exists.'

(Birmingham City Council, Corporate Policy & Performance Team)

' ... where disclosure control measures render data by individual ethnic group useless, it may be appropriate to use the broader groups of "White" and "non-White".'

(Shropshire County Council)



### *Race*

Although 46 per cent of local and regional government respondents expressed a requirement for information on race, others were critical of the need for and the use of the term 'Race'. For example:

'Current definitions of ethnicity, stemming from "Race" are flawed and insulting. Skin colour should be removed from the categories and instead true biogeographical ancestries need to form the basis of any categorisation.'

(Kent County Council, Canterbury Coastal & Swale Cluster)

### *Ancestry*

Less than one-quarter (23 per cent) of local and regional government respondents required information on ancestry. They highlighted its usefulness as a way of examining second and third (and so on) generations, for example:

'... the growing numbers of residents born in the UK but whose parents originated overseas. While the questions that are the focus of this consultation can be supplemented with country of birth – for many more established groups this approach has become less useful.'

(London Borough of Barnet)

While some respondents agreed that ancestry would be interesting, they were concerned that:

'The inclusion of this question should not be at the expense of other more important questions.'

(Shropshire County Council)

## 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.3).

**Table 4: Suitability of the proposed ethnic group categories in the 2007**

**Census Test: by organisation type**

**England and Wales**

**Percentages**

	Combined ethnic groups <sup>1</sup>				Single ethnic groups <sup>2</sup>			
	Yes	No	Partially	Base <sup>3</sup> = 100% (numbers)	Yes	No	Partially	Base <sup>3</sup> = 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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>259</b>

<sup>1</sup>Combined ethnic groups include 'White', 'Mixed', 'Asian or Asian British', 'Black or Black British' and 'Other ethnic groups'.

<sup>2</sup>Single ethnic groups refer to individual tick boxes in the ethnic group question e.g. 'Black African', 'Indian', 'White English'.

<sup>3</sup> Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed ethnic group information from the 2011 Census in Question 5.

Less than one-third (30 per cent) of local and regional government respondents who required information on ethnic group thought that the combined ethnic group categories would provide the information that they needed (Table 4). Less than one-quarter (24 per cent) thought that the single ethnic group categories would meet their needs. They had the following problems with the categories:

Combined ethnic group categories:

- 'Other White' is too broad

Single ethnic group categories:

- 'Black African' is too broad
- 'Arab' is too specific
- 'Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller' should not be categorised together
- additional single ethnic groups should be included

### **2.2.1 Details of additional requirements – combined ethnic group categories**

*'Other White' is too broad*

The main concern of local and regional government respondents regarding the 'Other White' ethnic group category was its breadth. For many, this category could include a number of disparate groups:

"'Other White' background could mean Australian/ Canadian/ Polish/ Czech/German/Spanish, etc.'  
(Stoke-on-Trent City Council)

The primary concern was that it hides those from eastern Europe and the former USSR.

'... under current guidance "Other White" is classified as part of the BME [Black and Minority Ethnic] population, but 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)

'In light of EU expansion, greater detail is needed to identify accession migrants to measure the impacts on London Boroughs; other White non-European migration levels are also increasing and greater detail on these groups is needed to assist delivery.'  
(London Borough of Wandsworth)

'Country of birth' is used by local authorities to produce estimates on new migrants to an area that are concealed by general categories such as 'White Other', therefore:

'A wider range of cross-tabulations with the country of birth variable in the 2011 Census, at small area level, ... may meet this need [for information on new migrants].'

(Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council)

Some respondents suggested ways to improve data on people currently included within the 'Other White' category.

'The "Other White" background is too general and suggests a "please specify" box, on the proviso that ONS guarantees to classify these write-in responses into a pre-defined list of English and non-English speaking countries, which would be included as two separate categories on all standard output (it would likely be too difficult to expect respondents to classify themselves into these categories).'

(Herefordshire Council)

'If it is not possible to include additional categories, any "Write-in" category that accounts for, say, 1 per cent of the population should be analysed... and provided to the local authority concerned at all geographical levels.'

(Cambridgeshire County Council)

## 2.2.2 Details of additional requirements – single ethnic group categories

### *'Black African' is too broad*

As with the 'Other White' group, local and regional government respondents commented on the diversity of the 'Black African' group, and the need for sub-groups with particular requirements to be identified, for example different nationalities.

'The experiences of some African communities that have been in England for a long time are not going to be the same as those communities that have arrived more recently, or under more difficult circumstances.'  
(Southwark Borough Council)

'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)

### *'Arab' is too specific*

A few local and regional government respondents were concerned that the term 'Arab' was too specific and that they required information on Middle Eastern ethnicity in addition, or instead.

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

'... suggest that "Arab" be replaced with "Middle Eastern".'  
(Birmingham City Council)

*'Gypsy/ Romany/Irish Traveller' should not be categorised together*

A few local and regional government respondents questioned the category for 'Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller' on the grounds that these were disparate groups that did not belong together. The terminology of 'Irish Travellers' and 'Gypsy' was also questioned.

'... suggest re-labelling the category "Nomadic Groups".'  
(Local Government Association High Ethnicity Authorities Special Interest Group)

'It would be useful to be able to count travellers, but this combination seems to combine different things. Romany may be counted as an ethnic group, but why distinguish between White Irish and Irish Traveller and say, not between White English and English Traveller? Gypsy not so long ago was dropped as it was said to be offensive to Romany. Is it acceptable again and will it remain so for any length of time? Travellers of all types can be identified in the dwellings question and sites could be treated separately as equivalent to communal establishments.'  
(Manchester City Council and Manchester Primary Care Trust)

*Additional single ethnic groups should be included*

In addition to comments regarding the pre-defined ethnic groups, some local and regional government respondents requested additional categories to be added.

These included:

- eastern European
- Greek-Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot, Turkish, Kurdish
- Jewish
- Kashmiri

### *Eastern European*

As discussed in relation to the 'Other White' group, many respondents called for a category for those from eastern Europe and the former USSR. Although few suggested how this might be done, there were suggestions to add categories for 'White Eastern European', 'White Western European' and 'Other White'.

### *Kashmiri*

Local and regional government respondents with a substantial Kashmiri population cited a need for better information.

'Kirklees has a large Kashmiri population that will not be adequately enumerated using the proposed single ethnic group categories ... Currently Kashmiri people have to tick either "Pakistani" or "Other Asian" background.'

(Kirklees Metropolitan Council)

'... our local surveys/needs-based research show that 80 per cent of so-called Pakistanis have Kashmiri heritage and are culturally and linguistically different from other Asian groups. They define themselves as Kashmiris, therefore, in line with the legal definition of ethnic groups and should be included as a separate category.'

(Leeds City Council)

### *Jewish*

A few local government respondents asked for a Jewish category to be included in the ethnic group question, arguing that the Jewish community was undercounted because of the voluntary nature of the religious question in the 2001 Census.

'[Information on Jewish ethnicity, as distinct from Jewish religion] will enable anti-semitic practices to be more easily identified through equality monitoring ...'

(London Borough of Greenwich)

*Greek-Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot, Turkish, Kurdish*

Local government respondents with substantial Greek-Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot, Kurdish and Turkish populations required better information on these groups to help understand the diversity within their area.

'[Additional information is required on] Turks, Kurds, Greek and Turkish Cypriots.'

(Greater London Authority)

The following additional categories would be required: Greek-Cypriot, Kurdish Turkish-Cypriot and Turkish.'

(Haringey Strategic Partnership)

### **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 <sup>1</sup>			Single ethnic groups <sup>2</sup>		
	Yes	No	Base <sup>3</sup> = 100% (numbers)	Yes	No	Base <sup>3</sup> = 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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>254</b>

<sup>1</sup>Combined ethnic groups include 'White', 'Mixed', 'Asian or Asian British', 'Black or Black British' and 'Other ethnic groups'.

<sup>2</sup>Single ethnic groups refer to individual tick boxes in the ethnic group question e.g. 'Black African', 'Indian', 'White English'.

<sup>3</sup> Respondents only answered this question if they stated that they needed ethnic group information from the 2011 Census in Question 5.

As well as requiring data accurate at the time of the census, most local and regional government respondents expressed a need for both the combined and single ethnic group categories in 2011 to be comparable with those used in the 2001 Census. A larger proportion (90 per cent) required comparability for single ethnic groups than for the combined ethnic groups, required by 79 per cent of respondents (Table 5).

Being able to compare between censuses allows the local and regional authorities to understand the changing nature of their population. A comparison can show the changing sizes of different ethnic groups, and the changing circumstances and experiences of each group. It also helps to identify emerging ethnic groups.

'[We need to] see how the make-up of that ethnic group has changed over the last ten years. Has their population size grown or decreased? Have some of their circumstances improved or become worse?'

(London Borough of Southwark and Southwark Primary Care Trust)

'Need to look at comparative rates of change in the numbers, and [at] changes in the comparative and absolute deprivation.'

(London Borough of Barnet)

Although respondents outlined a requirement to compare across censuses, several expressed a desire to change the ethnic group categories, which would make comparison more problematic. They acknowledged this difficulty and hoped that any changes would still allow for comparability – but that priority should be given to a 2011 Census ethnic group question that accurately reflects the needs of local and regional authorities.

'It is useful to be able to compare but we would be prepared to sacrifice this if we felt the new categories gave us a better understanding of the community.'

(London Borough of Greenwich)

'A small loss of comparability would be outweighed by greater detail ...'

(London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

A number of respondents felt that it was important for additional categories to be able to 'nest' within the 2001 categories.

'... it is more important, in practical terms, to understand the current community, so we would prefer that additional categories be included even if that does create some difficulties with comparisons between 2001 and

2011. Any additional categories should, however, be collapsible back to those used for the 2001 Census.'

(Local Government Association High Ethnicity Authorities Special Interest Group)

Several respondents asserted that comparability with 2001 information was essential. There was a general agreement that comparing the broad ethnic groups was useful, although not as useful as comparing single ethnic groups.

While most respondents accepted the need for small changes to the ethnic group question and the effect this would have on comparing over time, many expressed concern at the prospect of changes meaning a large loss of comparability between censuses.

' . . . [which would effectively] make trend analysis meaningless.'

(Birmingham City Council, Adult and Communities Section)

'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)

## **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.

On the whole, local and regional government respondents did not consider an inability to compare with Scotland or Northern Ireland a significant concern. It was more common for them to benchmark against aggregated areas, usually England, England and Wales or, in the case of London boroughs, London as a whole.

'It is more important for census information to be tailored to the area in which it is gathered, especially as devolution widens gaps in policy and services. We mostly compare ourselves with our regional and English statistical neighbours.'

(Wolverhampton City Council)

However, some respondents viewed an inability to compare across the UK or Great Britain would be a problem.

'A small loss of comparability would be acceptable in return for a more detailed breakdown of ethnic groups. A large loss of comparability would not be acceptable.'

(Caerphilly County Borough Council)

## **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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>251</b>

**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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>243</b>

In general, the majority of local and regional government respondents found the ethnic group terminology acceptable; more than 80 per cent for each of the combined ethnic group categories, and more than 70 per cent for the single ethnic group categories (Tables 6 and 7).

'There is no evidence to suggest that anyone in Bolton Council or the population of Bolton find any of these terms unacceptable.'

(Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council)

'These combined categories have been used on our survey for years without problems.'

(South Holland District Council)

Despite the general acceptance of terms, some respondents commented on specific problems:

- terminology confuses different concepts of ethnicity
- inconsistent use of 'British' in some combined ethnic categories
- 'White' and 'Asian' categories are too broad
- use of the term 'Mixed'
- use of colour (White and Black) to define ethnicity

*Terminology confuses different concepts of ethnicity*

Several local and regional government respondents stated that the current terminology is confusing as it combines different concepts relating to ethnicity.

'The terminology isn't ideal, as the ethnic group question is a mix of race, colour and origin.'

(London Borough of Harrow)

' ... these categories confuse ethnicity, race and skin colour, and derive from out-dated Victorian theories of racial groups ... '

(Kent County Council, Canterbury Coastal and Swale Cluster)

*Inconsistent use of 'British' in some combined ethnic categories*

The 'White' and 'Mixed' headings were most problematic. The main concern with both these groups was the lack of consistency in labelling between these and the remaining groups, and a request to see term British removed from the broad headings as they felt that this caused confusion, by combining two concepts – ethnicity and national identity.

'[It] implies that "White" and "Mixed" either will always 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.'  
(Hertfordshire County Council, Environment Department)

*'White' and 'Asian' categories are too broad*

Several local and regional government respondents felt that the 'White' and 'Asian' categories were too broad to be useful. For instance, the 'White' heading includes White British, White Irish and Other White categories – who are likely to have significant differences, particularly with the increasing numbers of migrants from EU countries.

'The problem with "Other White" background is the much greater diversity since 2001 – it includes (in the case of Norfolk) Portuguese or Portuguese-speaking migrants and latterly migrants from the A8 EU countries; in addition to a significant number of American Armed Forces personnel and their dependants based at USAF Lakenheath just across the border in Suffolk (there are significant numbers of Black US personnel as well). A single category of "Other White" would lose these distinctions and yet the numbers concerned could be significantly greater than in some of the BME [Black and Minority Ethnic] categories.'  
(Norfolk County Council)

Similarly, the 'Asian' category was highlighted by two local authorities as being ambiguous as there was confusion about which groups should be included.

'Some ambiguity about what falls in "Asian" and what falls in "Other", for example Middle East, China, Japan, 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)

#### *Use of the term 'Mixed'*

In addition several local and regional government respondents questioned the term 'Mixed', which can be perceived to be derogatory, offering instead terms such as 'Dual Heritage' or 'Multiple Heritage'.

"Mixed" – might the term "Dual Heritage" be more appropriate, though ... accept that for some people the heritage will be more than dual.'

(Leicestershire County Council)

'These are terms generally used and acceptable. "Mixed" has a more acceptable term known as "Dual Heritage". "Dual Heritage" could be a better option.'

(Leicester City Council)



### *Use of colour (White and Black) to define ethnicity*

Some local and regional government respondents cited the responsibilities of local authorities under the *Race Relations (Amendment) Act* to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination as a reason to continue using colour terminology.

'... discrimination can act on the basis of skin colour and this needs to be identified.'

(London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

In contrast, some local authorities viewed the use of skin colour as unacceptable.

'It should be noted that many Africans and Caribbeans find the term "Black" unacceptable, so alternative terminology should perhaps be pursued.'

(London Borough of Harrow)

"White" and "Black" both seem derogatory definitions. Prefer to use the terms "Caucasian" and "African" and "Caribbean".'

(North West Leicestershire District 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 local and regional government respondents could see the benefit of having more detailed information, but were concerned over a number of issues. These included:

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

‘In principle, we would welcome the multi-response option if it can be shown to work as a question (that is not to confuse ... ). However, there is great worry that the sheer complexity of outputs would obfuscate and hinder analysis.’

(London Borough of Barnet)

### **2.6.1 Advantages of a multiple response ethnicity question**

Local and regional government respondents identified potential advantages of a multiple response ethnic group question:

- improved accuracy and depth of information captured in the question
- enables self-identification
- enhanced information on mixed ethnicity

#### *Improved accuracy and depth of information captured in the question*

In general respondents expected that multiple response would provide a more accurate reflection of ethnic identity, 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 to the “Mixed” categories.’

(City and County of Swansea)

### *Enables self-identification*

Several local and regional government respondents felt that a multiple response question would help the concept of self-identification and allow respondents to determine their own ethnic identity.

'Individuals who feel strongly about being able to tick multiple boxes will get their choice – therefore the concept of self identification is better served.'

(Local Government Association High Ethnicity Authorities Special Interest Group)

' ... This would allow people far more adequately to describe their overall ethnicity, instead of having to chose what they are "primarily". It would give us a much more refined view of people's identity ... '.

(London Borough of Tower Hamlets)

### *Enhanced information on mixed ethnicity*

A multiple response question could help identify mixed ethnicities for the purposes of service provision.

'More accurate targeting of services and provision of culturally sensitive care ... [but] would need to ensure that mixed parentage within a group category, for example Asian, would feed into that group category *not* into the "Mixed" group.'

(Birmingham City Council)

## 2.6.2 Disadvantages of a multiple response ethnicity question

Disadvantages of a multiple response question for local and regional government respondents included:

- difficulty in implementing and interpreting a multiple response classification
- loss of continuity with information based on the single response 2001 classification
- number of people with 'Mixed' ethnic group would increase

### *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.

A few local and regional government respondents identified the problem that without a standard order to the responses, data users would find it impossible to determine which group the respondents most identify with and therefore make meaningful use of the data.

'Data users would have no good basis for deciding which of the multi-responses takes precedence, so the responses are greatly devalued in their usefulness.'

(London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

It will make the analysis of data much more complex for the census and for any local and government surveys/systems that wish to have comparable data.'

(Local Government Association High Ethnicity Authorities Special Interest Group)

'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)

'Introduces the prospect of a lack of clarity between ancestry and cultural identity. For instance, while many people have Irish ancestry, their cultural life may not differ significantly from that of White British people who do not tick "Irish". This, and similar scenarios, would make it impossible to estimate the extent of genuine need for specific policies and services ...

While there are clear intrinsic benefits to allowing people to describe themselves appropriately, we feel the priority should be a *workable* classification system that has a defined purpose that it will aim to fulfil.'

(London Borough of Tower Hamlets)

Similarly several commented that census respondents could find a multiple response question confusing and could have difficulty in completing the form.

'There is greater risk that individuals/households with a similar ethnic background will respond in different ways.'

(City and County of Swansea)

Similarly there was also concern that the benefits of gaining additional information would be lost, as more of the results would be restricted because of disclosure issues or would be aggregated together to create a large 'Other' category.

'It would make output from the question and cross-tabulations with other questions much more complicated, including presumably increasing suppression of small numbers, and is not supported.'

(Nottingham City Council)

'Additionally because Kent has a relatively small BME [Black and Minority Ethnic] population in some areas, having multiple response ethnic group categories could mean the numbers are very small for some categories and we would be concerned that numbers may be too small to release for all geographies.'

(Kent County Council)

*Loss of continuity with information based on the single response 2001 classification*

As census data users, most local and regional government respondents were concerned about how this additional information would be used. A major concern was the potential loss of comparability between the 2001 Census and other data sources.

'There would be no comparability with previous Censuses which would be a huge loss.'

(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:

'It might mean that we would have large numbers of people in the 'Mixed' categories who are not 'Mixed' in the sense of having mixed ancestry but in their chosen identity. It would not be possible to distinguish between the two.'

(London Borough of Greenwich)

'... 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.'

(London Borough of Havering)

## **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 their advantages and disadvantages.

### **2.7.1 Advantages of the Scottish 2006 ethnicity classifications**

In general most local and regional government respondents noted that the additional categories would provide a greater level of detail and more clarity of an individual's ethnic group.

'Detailed information allows us a much more refined view of the communities served, and would allow much more meaningful service intervention.'

(Local Government Association High Ethnicity Authorities Special Interest Group)

'Provides a much larger choice from which to select as the current options are quite limited and often people feel that they have to select an option that is a best fit, as opposed to what their ethnic group actually is.'

(Wolverhampton City Council)

'An extensive list, minimising the likely use of "write-in".'

(City and County of Swansea)

A number of respondents approved of the different terminology used in the Scottish classification.

' ... The term multiple ethnic groups seems far preferable to "Mixed".'

(West Lothian Council)

'Uses a consistent "geographical" approach to ethnicity terms, rather than the mixture of geography, for example "Asian", and colour or race, for example "Black", "White", in the England and Wales questionnaire.'

(Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council)

The other advantages stated were specific to particular ethnic groups, such as the inclusion of the 'Other European', 'Arab' and 'Jewish' and 'Sikh' categories and the expansion of the African category. For example:

'It provides more disaggregated data about geographical origins within Africa.'

(Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea)



“Other European” will identify people from A8 countries, plus Bulgaria and Romania, as well as other countries of Europe.’

(Suffolk County Council)

‘Welcome the inclusion of a category “Arab”, which would be useful information to know.’

(Shropshire County Council)

“Gypsy/Traveller” category description preferred to [the] England and Wales 2007 category.’

(Cambridgeshire County Council)

‘More specific data for authorities with large proportion of Asian or African residents.’

(South Holland District Council)

‘Inclusion of "Sikh", "Jewish" and "Northern Irish" and Subdivision of "African".’

(Nottingham City Council)

One particularly positive response was:

‘That is exactly what I want. Although it is cumbersome to use on a day to day basis, it is perfect for strategic considerations.’

(Stockport Metropolitan Council)

However several respondents did not identify any advantages and wrote ‘None’.

## **2.7.2 Disadvantages of the Scottish 2006 Census Test ethnicity classifications**

Local and regional government respondents identified several disadvantages to the Scottish question. The most common were:

- loss of comparability with the 2001 Census
- contains too many categories
- confuses concepts of ethnicity
- too little information of respondents from 'Multiple Ethnic' groups
- removal of colour terminology

### *Loss of comparability with the 2001 Census*

One of the most common disadvantages identified by local and regional government respondents was that the Scottish categorisation would be incompatible with the 2001 Census in England and Wales.

'It appears to rely much more on geographical origin rather than any concept of group identity; it is not comparable with previous data collections.'

(London Borough of Newham)

### *Contains too many categories*

Although some local and regional government respondents identified the increased detail as an advantage, others thought that the list was too long and that the 'order effect' would have a significant impact on the response.

'... The longer the list then the greater the chances of respondents opting for a less satisfactory description if it is higher up the list and they come to it first.'

(London Borough of Barnet)

‘The larger number of potentially small ethnic grouping means more aggregating at a higher level needs to take place when comparing information at a local level.’

(Charnwood Borough Council)

*Confuses concepts of ethnicity*

A number of local and regional government respondents saw the responses as a potentially confusing mixture of different concepts, including ethnicity, nationality, religion and country of origin.

‘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)

A few respondents questioned the need for such an emphasis on British identities, given the inclusion of a national identity question. However, one respondent identified the following disadvantage:

‘Indian, Pakistani or Chinese residents, etc cannot also classify themselves as “British” (as the Asian or Asian British categories do in the English and Welsh question).’

(Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council)

In addition to comments about the inappropriate mixing of concepts, some respondents cited specific problems to the Scottish Classification, such as the inclusion of a Jewish and Sikh category, the simplicity of using geography to determine ethnic categories and the breakdown of the African group.

Geography alone doesn't necessarily reflect ethnicity.

'Using a purely geographical approach to ethnic terminology may mean that many of the subtleties behind a person's ethnic and cultural background are missed ... The categories used in the England and Wales questionnaires are perhaps less consistent in their geographical approach, but they are based on colloquial terms the majority of the population understands and uses about themselves, such as "White", "Black" or "Asian". Using a simple geographical method of categorising groups could also confuse respondents about the true meaning of the question and overlap with the information gained in the "Country of Birth" and "National Identity" [questions], despite the fact they are all supposed to be different concepts.'

(Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council)

Several authorities also saw problems with the subdivision of the African categories. They were concerned that it would not always be apparent to the respondent which part of Africa they should choose.

'It would not necessarily be obvious to people which geographical region of Africa they related to unless there were extensive explanatory notes.'

(London Borough of Greenwich)

#### *Too little information of respondents from 'Multiple Ethnic' groups*

Several local and regional government respondents were concerned that the Scottish Classification would provide too little information on 'Multiple Ethnic' groups:

'Why is there a need for as many as three categories of "Arab" and seven categories of "African" or "Caribbean", but no subdivision at all of "Multiple Ethnic" groups? Does this reflect a very different distribution of all ethnic

groups in Scotland at present as against England and Wales, or is it just driven by the need to test a very wide range of categories in the Census Test?’

(Norfolk County Council)

‘ ... 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)

### *Removal of colour terminology*

There was concern from several local and regional government respondents about the lack of any reference to colour (Black or White).

‘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)

‘The lack of use of term “White” surely makes the fight against discrimination harder.’

(London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

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, 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)

'The "White" category is limited in that if you have a White person from Australia, for example, they would be classified under "Other Ethnic Group", because [of] the use of the word "European" rather than "White". In effect you would be undercounting the White population.'

(Kent County Council)

'... division of "Other White" into "Other European" and "Other Ethnic Group". This would mean that ethnically British persons from USA, Canada, Australia, plus non-native English speakers from former Russian countries, Turkey, South America are separated from other Europeans, but put in with all other groups. "Other White" is our largest non-British category, and we are looking for further detail, not adding them to other "Other" groups.

(Hertfordshire County Council)

### 3. Review of Requirements for Information on National Identity

In the 2005 consultation national identity was requested so that census respondents could describe their national identities more accurately and identify with groups that do not currently have a specific tick-box in the ethnic group question.

A question on national identity has not been included in previous censuses, 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 will 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 Organisation type	Percentages		
	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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>257</b>

More than one-half (58 per cent) of all respondents to the consultation required information on national identity. Local and regional government respondents expressed the greatest need with two-thirds (67 per cent) requiring this information (Table 8).

Local and regional government respondents required information on national identity for the following reasons:

- to provide a measure of community cohesion
- to gain a better understanding of their local communities
- to provide information on specific national identities

*To provide a measure of community cohesion*

Local and regional government respondents stated that information on national identity would enable them to measure community cohesion by providing a clearer understanding of how people identify themselves.

‘An expression of national identity, where different from birthplace, could provide one measure of social and community cohesion.’

(Sheffield City Council)

‘Although it is not an essential requirement, information about the national identity of our population would be useful, particularly in relation to issues such as citizenship and community cohesion.’

(London Borough of Southwark and Southwark Primary Care Trust)

*To gain a better understanding of their local communities*

Several local authorities felt that information on national identity will give them a better understanding of their local communities, by acting as a complement to the ethnicity, religion and country of birth questions.



' ... need to steer away from putting UK born minorities in the same category as non-UK born. Their needs are vastly different and being unable to distinguish between them creates an uneven impression of service needs.'

(Stockport Metropolitan Council)

' ... 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 Metropolitan Borough Council)

*To provide information on specific national identities*

Some local and regional government respondents were interested in specific national identities.

'National identity data would greatly improve our understanding of the composition of, for example, the "Other White" ethnic grouping, which is very significant in this borough and would give us data on A8 nationals and, for example, Somalis within the Black African ethnic category ... '

(London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

"Many thousands of Welsh people felt annoyed that they were prevented from stating their Welsh identity. I would strongly lobby that this was included in the next Census.'

(Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council)

'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)

Those local and regional government respondents who did not require information on national identity commented:

‘With a census questionnaire struggling to accommodate a number of critical socioeconomic questions, the issue of national identity seems to be an obvious contender for early elimination (unless ... it has been found to be an essential prerequisite to obtaining an accurate ethnicity response).’  
(Sunderland City Council)

‘It is difficult to see how "national identity", even in Wales, has much relevance to policy formulation in local government.’  
(Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council)

### 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**

Organisation type	Percentages			
	Yes	No	Partially	Base <sup>1</sup> = 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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>168</b>

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

Four in ten (40 per cent) of local and regional government respondents who required national identity information stated that the question met their needs (Table 9). A further one-third (32 per cent) thought it would partially meet their needs.

Around one-quarter (27 per cent) considered the proposed national identity question would not provide them the information they require. Reasons given for this included:

- question focuses on too few UK national identities
- a multiple response question would be difficult to analyse
- a national identity question was unnecessary

*Question focuses on too few UK national identities*

Local and regional government respondents criticised the format of the question because there was too much emphasis on British national identities, with all other national identities amalgamated into one category. They expressed particular concern about the limited census outputs planned for this group.

‘The "Other national identities" would be great if they were not simply aggregated – at least one detailed table would be needed. This would enable understanding of the population changes from international migration, and the demographic characteristics of the migrants.’

(London Borough of Newham)

‘Our interest would be in the “Other national identities” more than GB national identities. If these data are only going to be made available in a very limited form then we would question the usefulness of including this question.’

(Shropshire County Council)

'Too much emphasis on British identities. Need "Other national identities" to be broken down or to include a "Please state" [box]. In community cohesion terms, it is [more] important to identify whether non-indigenous people now identify themselves as British or European than it is to identify association with minor British cultures.'

(Sheffield City Council)

*A multiple response question would be difficult to analyse*

A few local and regional government respondents felt that as it was a multiple response question, responses would be difficult to analyse.

'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)

'While a question on national identity could enhance understanding of the information on ethnic group, the utility of the data would be severely compromised if this question was multiple response ...'

(Herefordshire 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. It is not intended to provide information on observance or practice. It differs from the religion questions used in the Scottish and Northern Irish censuses.

### 4.1 Requirements for information on religion

**Table 10: Requirements of religion information from the 2011 Census: by organisation type**

England and Wales	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Base = 100% (numbers)
Organisation type			
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
<b>All</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>266</b>

Local and regional government respondents were most likely of all types of respondents to this consultation to require information on religion from the 2011 Census, with 91 per cent needing this information (Table 10). Reasons for needing religious information included:

- to aid policies on community cohesion and promote equality
- to gain a better understanding of ethnic groups

*To aid policies on community cohesion and promote equality*

Several local and regional government respondents commented that information on religion would aid their community cohesion strategies.

'Religion does give a valuable added dimension to ethnicity and helps to ensure that services are properly targeted, and that our community cohesion strategy reflects the make-up of the population. For instance, the term Indian ethnic group suggests to many that a person is a Sikh or Hindu, whereas in Kirklees the 2001 Census shows that most Indians are in fact Muslim.'

(Kirklees Metropolitan Council)

In addition, information on religion assists local and regional authorities to promote equality. For example:

'The *Race Relation (Amendment) Act* requirements mean that the Council needs adequate data on particularly significant groups within its area. Some people in the community think of themselves as belonging to a particular religion rather than for example an ethnic group, so this should be recognised.'

(London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

'... to obtain information on the number of people belonging to the main religious groups. The *Employment Equality (Religion and Belief) Act 2003* places a duty on all local authorities to monitor employment practices and to address the needs of religious groups.'

(London Borough of Havering)

#### *To gain a better understanding of ethnic groups*

Several local and regional government respondents required religion data to use in conjunction with ethnicity data to provide a broader picture of their local population.

'Religion complements data about some ethnic groups, for example the religious composition of the Indian and Black African groups.'

(Birmingham City Council, Census and Population Group)

'Information on religion is used to complement the information provided in the ethnicity section. For instance, Bolton has a large Indian population, however there is a significant difference between Indian Muslims and Indian Hindus within the Borough for the purposes of population analysis.'

(Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council)

'For effective service planning and allocation of resources in all council activities (housing, education and social services, etc) ... '

(Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea)

## 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**

Organisation type	Percentages			
	Yes	No	Partially	Base <sup>1</sup> = 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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>209</b>

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

Most local and regional government respondents (82 per cent) stated that the proposed religion categories would provide the information they required (Table 11).

A minority (4 per cent) did not think the religion question would meet their needs because it did not provide information on some religions and on non-religious beliefs

Some local and regional government required additional religious categories, including a fuller Christian classification and categories for other religions such as Jain, Zoroastrian and Ba’hai. Some also required information on non-religious beliefs such as Humanism, Atheism and Agnosticism.

’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)*. They called for the “No Religion” category to be changed to “No religion or belief identity”.’

(London Borough of Greenwich)

### 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 <sup>1</sup> = 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	7	30	10
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>124</b>

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



A greater proportion of local and regional government respondents than any other type of respondent required comparability of data on religion between the 2001 and 2011 Censuses, 85 per cent required comparability (Table 12). This comparability enables local authorities to monitor changes at a local level.

'To monitor and project numbers in each group, particularly those requiring specific provision. Also to monitor change in circumstances within groups, for example economic activity rates.'

(Birmingham City Council, Corporate Policy & Performance Team)

'Being able to compare with the 2001 religious group data will help in looking at population change and the changing demographic profiles of the major religious groups in the borough and in the development of service plans.'

(Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council)

## 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
<i>All respondents</i>	<b>92</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>271</b>

Nearly all local and regional government respondents (96 per cent) required language information from the 2011 Census, the highest proportion of all groups of respondents (Table 13). They needed this information for the following reasons:

- improve service provision
- monitor and analyse disadvantage

- monitor the use of British languages
- enhance information from the ethnicity and religion questions

*Improve service provision*

Understanding the language needs in an area enables local and regional authorities to effectively target service provision and to ensure that information and services are accessible to their population.

‘Lack of language in English is a critical barrier that prevents council services reaching residents who require them. Resources can be allocated to overcome language problems if there is a complete and understood language profile.

(London Borough of Westminster)

‘Identifying the needs of specific language speaking groups, allocating resources and delivering services, monitoring and tackling discrimination and social exclusion related to lack of ability in English, providing forms and other information in appropriate languages, providing interpreting services, allocating resources for teaching English language and literacy in schools, providing appropriate library services; enhancing the locational analysis of minority groups by augmenting the information provided by religion, national identity and ethnic group.’

(Norfolk County Council)

‘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 on services and publications from numerous organisations. Knowing how many people speak certain languages is required in order to channel funds in the right way and to provide suitable services to those whose first language is not

English ... 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.'

(Greater London Authority)

Several local and regional government respondents highlighted the need to communicate with users of their services, more specifically concerning the targeting, assessment and development of translation services.

'Proficiency in English and first language are both needed to identify particular local areas where residents do not understand English at all or very well, and also to identify an alternative language they do understand in order to provide accessible information.'

(London Borough of Wandsworth)

'Identifying need for translation services and designing effective and inclusive means of consulting the communities in different parts of the city. Allocating resources to areas where service delivery faces challenges.'

(Birmingham City Council, Corporate Policy & Performance Team)

' ... There would also be significant practical benefits, for instance in assessing the need for translation services and ensuring that documents/publications are printed in the correct languages ... '

(Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council)

'To plan our communication with the public, we need to identify the most common languages in order to arrange translation services.'

(Worcestershire County Council)

### *Monitor and analyse disadvantage*

Some local and regional authorities required information on language to monitor and analyse disadvantage.

'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)

'Lack of proficiency in English is a significant barrier to social inclusion and [is] particularly linked with labour market outcomes.'

(Greater London Authority)

### *Monitor the use of British languages*

A few local and regional government respondents wanted information on the use of British languages other than English, such as Welsh, Cornish, and Gaelic.

'The UK Government needs to know about the use of Cornish, so it can monitor the impact of its implementation of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and understand properly the state of the language.'

(Government Office for the South West)

'The increase in numbers of Welsh speakers would strengthen the hand of language planners, thus emphasising the healthy state of the language.'

(Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council)

To ensure a distinctive intelligence contribution to policy decision making on promoting and safeguarding the Gaelic language, it is vital to the

Comhairle (and other agencies involved in Gaelic development) that a baseline for the number of Gaelic speakers who are resident in the UK (outwith Scotland) is established ...’.

(Comhairle nan Eilean Siar / Western Isles Council)

*Enhance information from the ethnicity and religion questions*

A few local and regional government respondents stated that the language question would enhance their understanding of their ethnic and religious populations.

’This question is also useful in order to assess the size and distribution of immigrant communities, and can therefore compensate for any shortcomings in the ability of the ‘ethnicity’ and ‘nationality’ categories to provide this information.’

(London Borough of Tower Hamlets)

## **5.2 Suitability of proposed language question in the 2007 Census Test**

The proposed language question in 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 <sup>1</sup> = 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
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>238</b>

Nearly one-half (48 per cent) of local and regional government respondents thought the proposed language categories in the 2007 Census Test would provide the information they required (Table 14). A further 34 per cent thought that the categories would partially provide the required information.

Problems identified included:

main language in an area could not be identified

- write-in response
- information on British Sign Language not required
- information on Welsh language not required

*Main language in an area could not be identified*

Several local and regional government respondents felt that the language question would not help them identify the main languages in their area.

'This information collected on the proposed question does not provide any meaningful data for our purposes. Just knowing whether they have an ability in a language is too vague. We need to aim services at people, so

we need to know their main language (other than English) and if English is not their main language we need to understand their proficiency in English.'

(London Borough of Southwark and Southwark Primary Care Trust)

'We need to know what people's preferred language for communicating with public authorities is, so that we can make sure we provide appropriate translation and interpretation services ... '.

(Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea)

#### *Write in response*

Some local and regional government respondents questioned whether census respondents will be able to write in more than one language they speak or write: It was also unclear whether there would be a facility for census respondents to write in their main language. Some authorities stated that the question was sufficient providing this option was available.

'If the "Other" section allows free text to be entered so respondents can list all languages they have skills in, then it would be sufficient.'

(One North East)

#### *Information on British Sign Language not required*

A few local and regional government respondents stated that they did not require information on British Sign Language (BSL). One local authority felt the information was useful, but in its present format would not distinguish between those for whom BSL is a first language and those who have the ability to communicate in BSL (such as interpreters).



‘There are some categories that are unneeded – we do not need information about Welsh and those who understand BSL will also have some understanding of English as a language.’

(London Borough of Newham, Corporate Research)

#### *Information on Welsh language not required*

Several local and regional government respondents in England did not require Welsh language information.

### **5.3 Additional requirements on language ability**

Local and regional government 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:

- English language proficiency
- information on minority languages used

#### *English language proficiency*

Several local and regional government respondents mentioned the need for information on respondent’s proficiency in English, 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 and improve access to services.

‘...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 and services and publications from numerous organisations.’

(London Borough of Brent)

### *Information on minority languages used*

Local and regional authorities that required information on mother tongue tended to need details of all the languages spoken in their area or of specific languages that they were already aware of. Several authorities mentioned using information from the Department for Education and Skills' Annual Pupil Level Annual Schools Census as an existing source to monitor languages spoken. For example:

'PLASC will become a good source of information about younger people, but there is a need to know about the language skills and needs of older members of families that immigrated over the past 30 years.'

(London Borough of Barnet)

### **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).

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

**Percentage**

	Very important	Quite important	Do not need	Base <sup>1</sup> = 100%
Ability to speak English	86	13	1	78
Ability to understand spoken English	81	18	1	79
Main language (spoken at home)	79	15	6	80
Ability to read English	77	19	4	79
Mother tongue or first language	75	18	8	80
Preferred spoken language for communicating with public authorities	72	22	6	79
Ability to write in English	69	28	3	78
Which languages are spoken, other than English	69	23	7	81
Preferred written language for communicating with public authorities	69	22	9	77
Which languages are understood, other than English	60	31	9	80
Which languages are read, other than English	54	36	10	81
Which languages are written, other than English	43	46	11	80
Other aspects of language ability	39	6	56	36
Frequency of speaking other languages	30	31	39	77
Frequency of speaking Welsh	9	11	80	74
Ability to speak Welsh (among population in England)	5	15	80	75
Ability to understand spoken Welsh (among population in England)	4	16	79	73
Ability to write in Welsh (among population in England)	4	12	84	73
Ability to read Welsh (among population in England)	4	13	83	75

*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 six different aspects of language ability in Table 15 were considered to be very important by 70 per cent or more of local and regional government respondents.

Information about knowledge of English was a key requirement for local and regional government respondents. Nearly all (99 per cent) thought the ability to speak English and the ability to understand spoken English was either 'Very important' or 'Quite important'. The ability to read/write English was considered to be either 'Very important' or 'Quite important' by 96 per cent of respondents.

## 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](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/consultations/downloads/2011Census_assessment_of_user_requirements.pdf)

## **A.2 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

### 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](http://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

**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

**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

**15** What languages can you understand, speak, read or write?

◆ Tick all boxes that apply.

	No ability	Understand spoken	Speak	Read	Write
Welsh	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other language, write in	<input type="text"/>				
	No ability	Understand sign	Sign		
British Sign Language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other sign language, write in	<input type="text"/>				

**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>

<b>What is your ethnic group</b> Tick one box which best describes your ethnic background or culture.	
<b>European</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	<input type="checkbox"/> British
<input type="checkbox"/> English	<input type="checkbox"/> Northern Irish
<input type="checkbox"/> Welsh	<input type="checkbox"/> Irish
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, write in	
<input type="text"/>	
<b>Multiple Ethnic Groups</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Any multiple background, write in	
<input type="text"/>	
<b>Asian</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese
<input type="checkbox"/> Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> Bangladeshi
<input type="checkbox"/> Sikh	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, write in
<input type="text"/>	
<b>Arab</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Middle East	<input type="checkbox"/> North African
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, write in	
<input type="text"/>	
<b>African or Caribbean</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> North African	<input type="checkbox"/> East African
<input type="checkbox"/> Southern African	<input type="checkbox"/> West African
<input type="checkbox"/> Central African	<input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, write in	
<input type="text"/>	
<b>Other ethnic group</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Gypsy/Traveller	<input type="checkbox"/> Jewish
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, write in	
<input type="text"/>	



## 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](mailto:ethnicity&identity@ons.gov.uk). (If you have any questions please contact us at [ethnicity&identity@ons.gov.uk](mailto: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	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. National identity	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Religion	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Language	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. None of these	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Government social surveys (such as the Labour Force Survey or British Crime Survey)	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Surveys or information collected by/on behalf of your own organisation	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>
4. Information collected by other public authorities (e.g. NHS, Local Authorities)	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>
5. Other information on these topics	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>

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

1. England	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Wales	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Scotland	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Northern Ireland	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Great Britain	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. United Kingdom	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Other	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>

### **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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to Q20

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

1. General information on the ethnic composition of the population	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Information on specific ethnic groups	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>
3. Information on combinations of ethnic groups (e.g. the total ethnic minority population; the Asian population; etc)	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>
4. Other information on ethnic groups	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Non-White population	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Ancestry	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Race	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Any other concepts related to ethnic group	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>

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:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. White English (in England)</li> <li>2. White Welsh (in Wales)</li> <li>3. Other White British</li> <li>4. White Irish</li> <li>5. Other White background</li> <li>6. Mixed: White and Black Caribbean</li> <li>7. Mixed: White and Black African</li> <li>8. Mixed: White and Asian</li> <li>9. Mixed: Other Mixed background</li> <li>10. Indian</li> <li>11. Pakistani</li> <li>12. Bangladeshi</li> <li>13. Chinese</li> <li>14. Other Asian background</li> <li>15. Black Caribbean</li> <li>16. Black African</li> <li>17. Other Black background</li> <li>18. Arab</li> <li>19. Gypsy/Romany/Irish Traveller</li> <li>20. Other Ethnic Group</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. White (categories 1 to 4)</li> <li>2. Mixed (categories 6 to 9)</li> <li>3. Asian or Asian British (categories 10 to 14)</li> <li>4. Black or Black British (categories 15 to 17)</li> <li>5. Other ethnic groups (categories 18 to 20)</li> </ol>

(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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to Q12
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
3. Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question

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

<i>Reasons why:</i>
<i>Additional information needed:</i>
<i>Reasons needed:</i>

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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to Q14
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
3. Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question

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

<i>Reasons why:</i>
<i>Additional information needed:</i>
<i>Reasons needed:</i>

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

1. Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → 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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Black or Black British	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Asian or Asian British	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Other ethnic groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please describe:</i>
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 <i>Please describe</i>	
Disadvantages <i>Please describe</i>	

**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:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scottish</li> <li>2. English</li> <li>3. Welsh</li> <li>4. British</li> <li>5. Northern Irish</li> <li>6. Irish</li> <li>7. Other European</li> <li>8. Multiple ethnic groups</li> <li>9. Pakistani</li> <li>10. Indian</li> <li>11. Sikh</li> <li>12. Chinese</li> <li>13. Bangladeshi</li> <li>14. Other Asian</li> <li>15. Middle East</li> <li>16. North African Arab</li> <li>17. Other Arab</li> <li>18. North African</li> <li>19. East African</li> <li>20. Southern African</li> <li>21. West African</li> <li>22. Central African</li> <li>23. Caribbean</li> <li>24. Other African or Caribbean</li> <li>25. Gypsy/Traveller</li> <li>26. Jewish</li> <li>27. Other ethnic group</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. European (categories 1 to 7)</li> <li>2. Multiple ethnic groups (category 8)</li> <li>3. Asian (categories 9 to 14)</li> <li>4. Arab (categories 15 to 17)</li> <li>5. African or Caribbean (categories 18 to 24)</li> <li>6. Other ethnic groups (categories 25 to 27)</li> </ol>

More information on the 2006 Census Test in Scotland is available here:

[www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/census/censushm2011/index.html](http://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 <i>Please describe</i>	
Disadvantages <i>Please describe</i>	

**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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → 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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to Q34
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
3. Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> → 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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → 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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to Q41
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
3. Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question

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

<i>Reasons why:</i>
<i>Additional information needed:</i>
<i>Reasons needed:</i>

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

3. Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
4. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → 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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → 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?

--

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	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to Q47
2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question
3. Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> → go to next question

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

<p><i>Reasons why:</i></p> <p><i>Additional information needed:</i></p> <p><i>Reasons needed:</i></p>
---

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Useful	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Not useful	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.*

	<b>Very important</b>	<b>Quite important</b>	<b>Do not need</b>
1. Ability to understand spoken English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Ability to speak English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Ability to read English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Ability to write in English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Which languages are understood, other than English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Which languages are spoken, other than English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Which languages are read, other than English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	<b>Very important</b>	<b>Quite important</b>	<b>Do not need</b>
8. Which languages are written, other than English	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Ability to understand spoken Welsh (among population in England)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Ability to speak Welsh (among population in England)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Ability to read Welsh (among population in England)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Ability to write in Welsh (among population in England)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Frequency of speaking Welsh	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Frequency of speaking other languages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Mother tongue or first language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Main language(s) spoken at home	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Preferred spoken language for communicating with public authorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Preferred written language for communicating with public authorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Other aspects of language ability, please specify	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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](mailto: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