



Home Office

A feasibility study for a survey of migrants

Technical Report

January 2011

This report was commissioned in January 2009

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Home Office (nor do they reflect Government policy).

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Introduction

The Analysis, Research and Knowledge Management Directorate (ARK) in the UK Border Agency commissioned Ipsos MORI and the Institute of Education, via competitive tender, to undertake a feasibility study for a large-scale face-to-face survey of migrants in the UK. A survey of migrants might help fill in a number of evidence gaps important for policy development for the UK Border Agency and other government departments which might only be filled by surveying migrants themselves:

- why migrants choose to come to the UK and why they might leave or settle permanently;
- what migrants and their dependants are doing in the UK (e.g. work, education);
- social impacts of migration, including the use of public services and integration;
- how migrants are contributing to the UK;
- experiences of the immigration system; and
- perceptions of the UK and local areas.

The purpose of the feasibility study is to inform the design of a survey of migrants. It comprised five interdependent modules:

1. workshops with the UK Border Agency and other stakeholders to identify survey requirements;
2. the development of a definition of 'migrant' for use in the survey;
3. the development of a sample design;
4. testing fieldwork recruitment and data collection methods to be used; and
5. the development of a questionnaire, including cognitive testing in several languages.

The work was undertaken between January 2009 and April 2010.

This is a supplementary technical report, which accompanies the main report. This report focuses on the question development and translation process undertaken as part of a feasibility study for a survey of migrants. A proposal for a possible questionnaire for use in a survey of migrants is published separately. This report also describes findings from a local area consultation, used to support the sampling and fieldwork methods outlined in the main report.

Contents

1.	Local Area Consultation Report – May 2010	1
1.1	Summary	1
1.2	Introduction	2
	Complementary study: a consultation with local area migration experts	2
	Methodology	3
1.3	Key research findings	4
	Local area knowledge	4
	Data sources used in the local area	5
	Perceptions of Feasibility Study data	6
	Factors affecting delivery of a survey of migrants	7
	General perceptions of a survey of migrants	8
1.4	Recommendations	9
1.5	Findings from individual areas	10
	Newham	10
	Blackburn	13
	Gateshead	15
	Edinburgh	17
	Peterborough	19
	Inverness	22
2.	Cognitive Testing in English Report – February 2010	25
2.1	Introduction	25
	Methodology	25
	Recruitment	26
	Topic guide and question areas covered	29
	Report structure	29
2.2	Questionnaire Section 1: Calendar	30
2.3	Questionnaire Section 2: Coming to the UK	33
2.4	Questionnaire Section 3: Citizenship	37
2.5	Questionnaire Section 4: The immigration system	40

2.6	Questionnaire Section 8: Integration	42
2.7	Questionnaire Section 11: Feelings about yourself and others	49
2.8	Additional sections	51
2.9	Next steps	57
3.	Cognitive Testing in Translation Report – May 2010	58
3.1	Introduction	58
	Methodology	58
	Recruitment	59
3.2	Findings	59
	Arabic	59
	Bengali	61
	Chinese	61
	Farsi	62
	French	63
	Gujarati	64
	Kurdish Sorani	65
	Polish	66
	Portuguese	67
	Somali	67
	Turkish	68
	Urdu	68
3.3	Next steps	68

1. Local Area Consultation Report – May 2010

1.1 Summary

As part of the feasibility study for a survey of migrants, Ipsos MORI conducted a short consultation exercise with local experts on migration in six areas across Scotland and England. Mini-discussion groups (ranging from five to ten participants) were held in Blackburn, Edinburgh, Gateshead, Inverness, Newham and Peterborough. A total number of 45 participants took part in the consultation. Participants were drawn from local UK Border Agency officials, Local Authorities, and voluntary sector organisations. All participants had in-depth knowledge of migration within their local communities.

The purpose of the consultation was to inform the development of the sampling approach being designed by Ipsos MORI, which could be used to appropriately engage migrants for a large, face-to-face random probability survey. Data gathered by Ipsos MORI in conjunction with the UK Border Agency were presented to the local experts in order for them to feed back on the extent to which estimates of the migrant population reflected their knowledge and understanding of local populations. In addition, participants were asked to identify any further data sources they used in estimating populations. Participants also provided feedback on the acceptability of such a survey in general and the challenges that might be faced in administering it, particularly around languages the survey should be offered in, how they felt migrants might react to the survey in their local area, and the extent to which homelessness amongst local migrants may have an impact.

The intention was to sense-check the approach developed by Ipsos MORI and identify any potential problems with the accuracy of the data, and the consultation served this purpose well. It also served to identify any issues which would need to be accounted for in designing the overall approach for delivering a survey.

Overall, participants generally felt the data presented to them accurately reflected their local populations. Differences of opinion over the local population were uncommon and where highlighted were due to very recent changes in populations not being reflected in the modelling, for example closure of a factory employing migrants. Participants were typically using the same data sources as those utilised by the sampling design, with a few additional sources mentioned:

- the Electoral Register,
- Higher Education Statistics Authority (HESA) data;
- National Health Service (NHS) data on women giving birth in hospital;
- local data on Citizenship ceremonies.

In terms of delivering the survey, participants identified several additional languages that might be useful in their own areas; Russian, Lithuanian, Czech, Tagalog, Spanish and Punjabi. Aside from these, they felt the current range of languages offered were useful and reflected their local areas. Participants felt it was very important that a survey of migrants included Roma and represented them appropriately. In terms of the potential exclusion of homeless migrants, participants did not have clear feelings on how much homelessness was a problem in their areas. Homeless migrants were typically felt to be those without sufficient documentation or refused asylum seekers and therefore likely to be outside the remit of the survey as currently envisaged.

Participants were enthusiastic about the potential for a survey, but there were concerns over intentions behind conducting it and the willingness of migrants to participate. It is clear from this that clear communication about both the intentions behind a survey and how the data would be used would be critical. This is not just to secure migrants' participation in a survey, but also to ensure it is supported by relevant local agencies. Indeed, successful implementation of strategies to inform and engage local stakeholders will probably play a key role in the success of the roll-out and subsequent impact of a survey of migrants. However, findings from this qualitative piece of research provide some reassurance that wide-scale local consultation around data sources is unlikely to be necessary or prove cost-effective, given the small impact it would probably have on survey sampling or materials. Nonetheless, there are some examples (e.g. closure of local companies) where local knowledge clearly has benefits in bringing statistics up to date.

1.2 Introduction

Complementary study: a consultation with local area migration experts

The UK Border Agency wished to undertake a small-scale, qualitative consultation with selected regional and local area migration 'experts' who have knowledge of the migrant population in their area. This work provides a 'sense check' for the quantitative work already undertaken and attempts to establish the value of using local area experts on a wider scale for a possible survey of migrants.

Structure of the report

This report is structured in the following way.

- Methodology – an explanation of how the research was conducted and notes on interpretation of the results.
- Key research findings – a summary of the shared findings drawn from all six groups.
- Recommendations – a series of suggested actions based on the findings.
- Findings from local areas – summaries of the discussion from each individual group.

Methodology

The local area consultation consisted of six, 90-minute discussion groups in six areas across Scotland and England: Blackburn, Edinburgh, Gateshead, Inverness, Newham and Peterborough. The areas were chosen based on the level of migrant penetration as determined by the data model used for the Feasibility Study (outlined in the main report). All areas chosen had a level of penetration high enough to make them eligible for inclusion in a survey of migrants, but varying levels of penetration within this to achieve a spread of low-high penetration. In addition, areas were chosen to allow for a geographical spread as well as an urban/rural spread.

Potential participants were identified through advertising by the UK Border Agency and through recommendations of initial contacts with agencies. Participants were core stakeholders with in-depth knowledge of migrant groups living in their regions. They included UK Border Agency regional directors or nominated colleagues, Local Authority representatives and voluntary sector migrant, refugee or asylum groups. Some participants were representatives from organisations representing particular sectors of the local migrant community; others worked with migrants from all communities. As a result, some participants were only able to reflect views on the groups they worked with rather than the general experience. Participants did not receive any financial recompense for their participation in the consultation.

The number of participants in the discussion group varied from area to area due to the number of contacts available locally. The minimum number of participants for a group was set at five participants, and the maximum ten participants. Numbers were restricted to ten to allow all participants to contribute to the discussion. A total of 45 local experts engaged in the research.

A discussion guide (available upon request) was designed to guide the groups through the key areas of interest. However, a degree of flexibility was ensured to steer the discussion to the areas most important to participants and, importantly, where they had most knowledge. The key responses focused on the following questions.

- Where particular migrant groups live in the local area, what the approximate size of the migrant populations in the area are and what types of migrants they are.
- If the data used for the feasibility study reflect their own knowledge of where they think migrants are living.
- Why differences exist between what local experts expect, and what the data shows.
- What evidence local experts base their opinions on.
- Which languages are spoken by migrant groups in the local area.
- The history of migration in the local area, how it has changed and how mobile the population is.

- Migrant visibility in the local area, including contact with the wider community and use of public services.
- Evidence on social impacts of migration in local areas.

Interpretation of qualitative findings

Please note that qualitative research is not intended to be representative of all local areas in the UK. Compared with quantitative research, which can be representative, the number of people surveyed in a qualitative project is relatively small, and they are speaking in depth strictly about their own experiences which may or may not be similar to those of others. While some patterns or common experiences may emerge, results should be interpreted as indicative only.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all those who took part in the research for their valued input.

1.3 Key research findings

The key findings from the research can be aggregated into five categories:

- 1) local area knowledge;
- 2) data sources currently used in the local area;
- 3) perceptions of Feasibility Study data;
- 4) factors affecting delivery of the proposed survey;
- 5) general perceptions of the proposed survey.

This section presents the key overall findings across these five categories. Following this, detailed findings from each individual group discussion are presented. While the two key issues around data sources currently used in the local area and perceptions of the Feasibility Study area are addressed in every group, content of discussion across the other areas vary reflecting the knowledge of the participants and their priorities for discussion.

Local area knowledge

As would be expected given the audience, participants displayed very strong knowledge of local area populations and the history of their migration patterns. They reported a great deal of change – whether due to migrants from EU accession states and Eastern Europe, or through becoming a dispersal area and seeing the arrival of more asylum seekers. The extent of and complexities around these changes mean that participants felt it was difficult to keep up to date with accurate migrant numbers. Patterns of migration were different across the six areas, for example in Peterborough there were large numbers of seasonal workers; Inverness had seen more immigration from Eastern Europe in recent years, and also more migrants

from the Philippines. Blackburn is a dispersal area and therefore asylum seekers were a key community, whereas Edinburgh had fewer asylum seekers as Glasgow is the dispersal point for Scotland.

Participants had developed their local knowledge through day-to-day working or liaison with people working with migrants, or through direct contact themselves. They also used official data sources as an additional source of information. Participants were subsequently able to draw upon their own local area knowledge to compare with the Feasibility Study data and make judgements on its likely accuracy. However, their ability to do so did vary across the six areas, and while most could comment on a few of the wards, they knew from personal experience that in most of the areas data/knowledge were insufficient to comment at ward level and certainly not below. This would suggest that the information would be quite patchy if similar consultation was undertaken more widely before the main survey.

Data sources used in the local area

Participants did not report that significant additional data on migrants were collected locally. Community organisations and service providers did collect information on the people using their services, but this was not felt to be comprehensive. That said, it was recognised as serving to further inform local knowledge, and therefore a good source for sense-checking national datasets and building up a picture of an area.

When using datasets locally, participants typically used data sources already being utilised for creating the Feasibility Study sampling framework.

- Census 2001
- UK Border Agency data
- General Practitioner (GP) registrations (Flag 4)
- National Insurance Number (NINo) applications
- Workers Registration Scheme (WRS)
- Pupil Census (PLASC)

Participants did identify a few additional sources used locally.

- Data on women giving birth in NHS hospitals (captures country of birth of mother)
- Electoral register (for EU citizens)
- Higher Education Statistics Agency data – to capture international students
- Citizenship ceremonies

Participants were very aware of the weaknesses inherent in the data they used, whether it was the age of the data, the accuracy, or the definitions used within it. They also could not access all data sources at a postcode level to build up accurate population details at a more local level.

Perceptions of Feasibility Study data

Participants were shown draft estimates of their local migrant populations based on the data available for the Feasibility Study. As the data were still in draft form they are not included with this report. Participants were shown maps of their local area detailing population estimates by data source (e.g. Census 2001, Flag 4) and an overall estimated migrant population level by ward. These figures were based on the definition of migrant established for the purposes of the Feasibility Study, which is:

‘Someone who moved to the UK in 1990 or later, who was a non-British national on entry, whose usual place of residence prior to entry was not in the UK, and who has lived in the country for at least three months (or one month if an asylum seeker).’

Overall, participants generally felt the data presented to them were broadly reflective of the populations in their local area. They were typically impressed with how the various data sources had been used and the level of detail that could be provided with them. This level of detail in particular was felt to have practical implications at a local level and they subsequently felt it would be useful to have access to it for their own work.

However, there were some instances where participants did not feel the data reflected the current local population profile due to recent notable changes locally. For example, in Inverness a ward identified as high penetration by the Feasibility Study was considered to be low penetration by the local experts. This was because a fish factory had closed in the original ward and reopened elsewhere, and subsequently all the migrants who had been living in that ward had moved with the work. This highlights the potential for local knowledge to keep up to date with relevant events that will only be reflected in population studies at a later date. However, this was the only such example out of the wards included in the consultation.

Some areas were also felt to be more diverse than the data presented suggested. However, as the migrant definition only includes those who came to the UK from 1990 onwards, this diversity may not always be relevant for the survey if it reflects mainly long-standing migrant communities.

There were also concerns raised about some of the data sources used. In particular, the Census was recognised as out of date and of limited usefulness in understanding local populations. For example, in Blackburn, the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) population was noted as having almost doubled since the 2001 Census (this was a recurring theme; in many of the areas participants were quite challenging of the Office for National Statistics (ONS) population estimates for their areas). This underlines the need to ensure Census data are carefully checked and appropriately communicated when liaising with these types of informed audiences.

As a result of some of these perceived limitations of the data and the changing nature of local populations, participants felt it would be useful (and expressed willingness to help) for local area experts to be consulted before agreeing the final sample for a survey. The focus would be on the selections of points, rather than process itself, and potentially would ensure that any recent changes in the area could be accounted for and make the sampling more accurate.

Factors affecting delivery of a survey of migrants

Participants discussed a number of issues surrounding the delivery of a survey of migrants and challenges they saw to conducting a large-scale survey of migrants.

Language

A possible questionnaire for the survey had been translated into the following twelve languages:

Arabic	Bengali	Cantonese/Mandarin
Farsi	French	Gujurati
Polish	Portuguese	Somali
Sorani	Turkish	Urdu

Generally participants felt these were appropriate, although they also identified some additional languages which they felt would be needed in their areas. These were as follows.

- Russian – mentioned by participants in several groups who felt it was useful to have as Eastern Europeans may speak Russian as well as their own language.
- Lithuanian – felt by some to be more important than Polish.
- Tagalog – only mentioned in the Inverness group; many Filipinos work in the tourist industry in the Highlands.
- Czech – particularly for ensuring the participation of Roma.
- Punjabi – felt to be important in Edinburgh.

Hard-to-reach groups

While participants noted that all migrants could be defined as ‘hard-to-reach’, some migrant communities were felt to be more challenging to recruit than others, though very important to include. Participants in several groups felt that it was important to ensure the participation and identification of Roma within a survey of migrants they are often excluded from research or not highlighted in findings due to problems classifying ethnicity. As the questionnaire, designed for the purposes of the Feasibility Study, asks open questions about nationality, home country and allows self-definition of ethnicity it may capture Roma more effectively.

Migrants living in communal establishments were also identified as particularly hard-to-reach though participants did not have clear ideas about the scale or extent of their populations who might be living in these establishments. Participants could not suggest effective ways of approaching communal establishments and recognised this was a huge challenge for the survey.

The numbers of homeless migrants were also felt to be difficult to judge, though participants tended to focus on undocumented migrants within this category who were not regarded in the Feasibility Study as eligible to take part in such a survey.

In some cases it was felt that reaching migrants who have been in the UK longer, or live in rural communities may be challenging. In two areas there was little knowledge of how many migrants were living in the rural wards, nor details of their backgrounds. Other groups recognised that migrants tended to live centrally when they first came to the UK, then moved to lower-penetration areas once they were more established.

Maximising participation in a survey of migrants

There was a general feeling amongst participants that persuading some migrants to take part in a survey would be difficult. Participants felt that some would be sceptical of a UK Border Agency survey and not wish to take part. There was some debate over whether a survey could be presented in a way that did not require the UK Border Agency to be mentioned (in the main survey the authors recommend that respondents are told who the survey sponsor is only if they ask).

In order to improve uptake of a survey of migrants, participants recommended involving local agencies and organisations to promote the survey to local communities, helping to build trust and acceptance. Some felt that providing payment for completing a survey would be needed, otherwise individuals would not take part (however, there is also considerable cost involved in doing this). Ensuring that participants understood the purpose of the survey and the impact their involvement would have was also felt important.

Some also expressed concern about the effect of a survey on vulnerable migrants and recommended providing interviewers with details of local services where migrants could access support if needed.

General perceptions of a survey of migrants

While there was a good deal of interest in a survey of migrants, and in the data being used to create the sample, there were also some concerns. Participants were very interested in hearing more about the purpose of any survey and, particularly, what would be done with the data collected. Indeed, this tended to dominate the early discussions in the groups. In the groups held in Scotland, there were notable concerns around whether the intention of a survey of migrants was to find ways to discourage migrants from moving to the UK. The Scottish participants in particular noted how Scotland needed more migration and wanted to be able to attract more people to the country. They wanted a survey to help achieve this.

There were also concerns about the ability of a survey to do what it set out to do. Although the sampling data were felt to be accurate, participants still questioned the ability to put enough detail into the sample to ensure subsequent survey findings were useful. Participants felt it was important to have data available at local level, with some urban/rural distinction, if the data would be useful to them. ward-level data were recognised to be too low a level to be meaningful, and participants felt data had to be available at least at a regional level.

1.4 Recommendations

Broadly speaking, the experts consulted were supportive of the patterns found by the modelling or in many cases did not have sufficient local knowledge to challenge them. This work has added credibility to the modelling and the authors are able to recommend the model-based estimates for a possible survey of migrants with more confidence as a result. In addition, the consultation exercise has raised the following points that should be taken into consideration when developing and finalising the approach for a migrant survey.

- The data currently used for designing the sampling approach are generally felt to provide an accurate representation of local situations. That said, consideration could be given to whether the additional data sources identified (e.g. NHS data on pregnant women, HESA data, PLASC data) would add any value to the understanding of the population and might be included in the estimates. In the authors' view the model-based estimates already include the populations one might find from these sources, and a further important consideration is that none of them cover the full population or necessarily lead one to migrants' homes, which the current model sources do. At best they could provide additional confirmation of the model estimates and be used to be better prepared, e.g. advance warning of big student populations in selected wards.
- Where differences do occur between the Feasibility Survey data and local estimates, this is due to very recent changes in the population, where there has not been sufficient time delay to pick up these changes. However this finding was uncommon (one ward out of nearly 100) and would be more likely to happen in lower concentration wards where small-scale events could sway the results –such areas may not be included in the survey. In the authors' view it would not be practicable or cost-effective to reality-check the full selection of sampling points with local experts before a survey. The level of information was in most cases insufficient to do this consistently across the wards, and the authors note that this was the case for six areas who were willing to take part in a consultation about migrant data, i.e. they are likely to represent some of the better areas in terms of data knowledge. To be done across all areas in the main survey, all Local Authorities would need to provide the same quality of information to avoid biasing the patterns in the frame, and the authors do not think this would be the case.
- Consideration could be given to whether additional translations of the questionnaire should be undertaken, particularly Russian and Latvian, or alternatively provision could be made to use translation agencies for these languages.
- Regardless of decisions to include local experts on the selection of sample points, it will be important to consider how such local contacts can potentially increase participation in the survey through reassurance, building up trust, and clarification at a local level.

- If a migrant survey were to happen, it is recommended that the UK Border Agency provide clear information on the purpose of the survey and how the data will be used, to address any concerns local agencies may have. It will also be important to clarify how datasets may be shared more widely at future points.
- Consideration should be given to developing an information sheet for migrants taking part in the survey that provides details on where to obtain help and support if they feel they need it. Similarly, interviewers should be appropriately briefed regarding ethics around disclosure of information and given clear instructions for different scenarios.
- As it stands, homeless people could not be sampled for the survey by nature of their not having an address to sample. Limited evidence of homelessness was found as part of the research in these areas but there is no reason to expect instances of homelessness would be on a sufficient scale to suggest a significant proportion of migrants are not covered by the survey if provision is not made for this group.

1.5 Findings from individual areas

Newham

Group 1: Newham

Date: Friday 19 February
Time: 10.30-12.00
Participants: 7

Data sources currently used in the local area

Participants highlighted a number of data sources currently used in estimating the local migrant population. The electoral register was discussed in some detail as well as a number of other sources such as education data, National Insurance Numbers and health data.

Electoral register

- The electoral register has country of origin data and could cover those eligible to vote such as British citizens and EU citizens for some elections.
- These data could be used to assess the whereabouts of such groups as there is a wider dispersal of migrants in Newham than there are in other areas of the country.
- Participants recognised that a large proportion of the Eastern European community actually vote at a local level, so these data can be very useful. (One of the key reasons migrants may go on the electoral register is so that they can receive credit checks.)

- The frequency with which voters need to register is also a benefit of using data from the electoral register as people need to fill in an annual form to stay on it. This makes for more up-to-date information as addresses are updated.

Other sources

- Data from education sources can identify international migrants as the registration processes involves data on language spoken.
- National Insurance Numbers are also used.
- It was understood that the 2001 Census is a good starting point for information but can be considered out of date especially when assessing a fluid community such as migrants.
- The Worker Registration Scheme registers employers' addresses, but it is not as useful as some other sources at accounting for employees, such as NINo which splits data by country and looks at A8 and A2 nations as well.
- The New Entrant Scheme (UK Border Agency) goes some way to keeping a tab on those claiming asylum or refugee status. There is also the transition team which deals with migrants and migrant students, in an attempt to get them to register as these groups traditionally struggle to register with Local Authorities on entering the country.

Discussion of Feasibility Study data

- There was surprise over some of the ward level figures presented. Participants expected Beckton to show more signs of being a hub for EU migration, as the electoral register had identified it as a ward high in Eastern Europeans.
- Participants suggested that it could be a good idea to use different sources of data when trying to identify different migrant communities. The type of accommodation available in certain areas also needs consideration when estimating migrant concentrations. For example, student halls and hostels offer relatively cheap accommodation on a much wider scale than most other classifications.
- Participants felt that the data used for the mapping could over-emphasise the South Asian population and underrepresent more recent influxes of Black Africans and Eastern Europeans. "I think this is likely to over-emphasise the South Asian migration and not reflect other migrant streams that come into Newham, as well, because there is also quite a lot of Black African migration, which the Flag 4s would probably pick up. And the Eastern European migration is not reflected in this."
- ONS results have traditionally shown that the origins of migrants in Newham have been largely Southern Asian, but participants point out that Eastern Europeans now exceed that channel of migrant flow. In particular, as has been found through recent work done in Newham with the Department of Health, the Roma are the largest ethnic group from New Europe.

- Participants also highlighted that Flag 4 data would be a useful source when looking at ward concentrations, as this would lead to feedback from a wider cross-section of migrant communities rather than it being weighted too heavily towards the South Asian community.

General discussion

- Participants estimated that there are around 800,000 undocumented migrants living in the UK, 500,000 in London, based on research published by the London School of Economics (LSE). These people are not registered in many of the ways discussed above. Participants speculated that visa overstays could account for a proportion of them, i.e. people staying in the country when their visas have expired or remaining even after their asylum application has been rejected. This leads to much illegal working, which in turn drives demand for black market NINOs.
- Participants mentioned that to access these migrants for previous surveys they have had to access them through the people working with them to build trust. This was cited as being successful. The trust issue was flagged as potentially a major impact on responsiveness of migrants, especially those with insufficient documentation who do not want to be pulled up by law enforcement at some point afterwards. Studies done by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation with City University and Bridget Anderson at COMPAS (Centre of Migration Policy and Society) were cited by participants.
- Participants also pointed out the discrimination they felt that certain groups of migrants face, especially those from countries such as Nigeria or Ghana. They felt these groups are more likely to be asked for their passport at different stages of registration processes. For example, passports are not required for GP registration, but often migrants from these parts of Africa do get asked for their documents.
- In terms of the translated languages offered for the proposed survey, participants mention that Lithuanian would potentially be beneficial, as Lithuanian is now more of a concern for language provision than Polish for the area. “We had the largest Lithuanian population at the time of the last census, and that has acted as a magnet community to further migration.”
- On the subject of homelessness, participants recognised that the issue is not only a problem for refugees and asylum seekers but also for the Eastern European community more widely. The Eastern European community is very sensitive to changes in the wider economy, and with the recession there has been a rise in the amount of homelessness seen locally.
- Recommended data sources for homelessness included organisations such as Shelter or Department of Communities and Local Government, although participants did not know if it could be broken down by ethnicity or nationality.

- As a result of the economic downturn participants had noticed a knock on effect in the number of migrants coming into Newham. On the whole, in 2009, data from the Flag 4 show that migration numbers slowed down. But there had been steady increases this year.
- Participants had looked at the effect of overcrowding in housing, which has been an issue in boroughs such as Haringey and Newham. This was seen to impact on community cohesion as local residents were upset about the way in which houses become very overcrowded with people who were perceived not to hold a great deal of interest in the immediate community.

Blackburn

Group 2: Blackburn

Date: Monday 22 February
Time: 15:30-17.00
Participants: 6

Knowledge of the local area

- Participants noted that the migrant population had changed considerably in recent years. For a long time there has been a considerable South Asian population as well as pockets of 'Old Europe' migrants such as Italians.
- Around 2003 Blackburn became a dispersal area – before then only the town centre school had migrant populations, but now almost every school in the area has migrants. Participants who work with schools noted the extensive language needs across schools, some extending to all the children within the school.
- Migrants come from a broad range of backgrounds – in the more remote areas it is difficult to reach them and to meet their needs, particularly in terms of language assistance and learning.
- Participants felt that it had been a very big learning curve for local services. In the past they could rely on Gujarati and Urdu speakers within the local community. Now there is such a range of languages, it is not always possible to locate the resources to interpret and teach.
- Participants said that Iraqi Kurds were one of the first asylum seeking groups to arrive in the area, but recently the countries of origin of asylum seekers have changed and become more diverse.
- Blackburn with Darwen cluster levels for asylum seekers with numbers managed so that the population did not become higher than 600. These cluster levels are based on 0.5 per cent per capita, or one in 200, which means that there are usually no more than 550 at any given time.

Data sources currently used in the local area

Again participants were using much of the data used in the Feasibility Study, with different services finding different data sets more/less useful. Participants were not aware of any comprehensive additional data collected locally.

- The schools data – PLASC – were felt to be the most comprehensive. In addition, the language services tend to be alerted when schools have new language needs.
- UK Border Agency data tend to be used by housing providers and the Local Authority but they have limits.
- The local adult learning college collects data on who requests a place on a course, but does not cover the people who do not present themselves. Most of those who do present themselves are Indian or Pakistani.
- Participants' perceptions were that it was easier to measure asylum seekers than economic migrants, as the latter may be counted on their way in to the country, but not counted out. "We've been trying to put together statistics, without much success really because the only accurate figures are from the Home Office on supported asylum seekers. The problem with migrant workers, EU accession migrant workers, is that people come here and although they are counted in they are not counted out."
- They also felt that worker registrations (WRS) and National Insurance Number issues are a good proxy for people coming in, though again it is difficult to know whether people have stayed and for how long.
- Participants noted difficulties in trying to aggregate different databases because of the different methodologies used to collect data.
- Participants felt that the 2001 Census is now out of date and does not accurately reflect the current population – it might be able to show high penetration areas, but in Blackburn the BME population has almost doubled since 2001, giving Blackburn one of the youngest BME populations in the country. (Participants understood that BMEs are not the subject of the study, but felt that this type of information was important when deciding on the extent to which a source can be trusted.)

Discussion about Feasibility Study data

Again, the figures presented to participants were felt to be reasonable and did not include any surprises.

- The top six areas identified for projected migrant numbers were the top six in terms of where participants thought the largest number of schools with the highest percentage of children needing English language support were located.

- Participants felt that the high penetration areas were usually the Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Indian areas, and that to get at some of the other groups the survey would have to include lower penetration areas.
- The two rural areas in Blackburn were thought to be too difficult to survey due to lower numbers and the difficulty of finding people.
- Participants felt that the survey would be more likely to find rural migrant workers in West Lancashire, as Blackburn had very few rural areas.

General discussion

- Participants felt that the use of local intelligence would be crucial in getting a survey of migrants right both in terms of identification of sampling points and in building trust through working with local agencies.
- They also felt that language was key, but that the translations which have been undertaken were helpful, and covered most of the languages they had come across locally.
- Participants thought it was probable that people would be suspicious of a survey, and that if it were to proceed, the UK Border Agency needed to “get the communities familiar with the interviewer in the area, in the locality, going to the places where these communities go” and to “get their names and faces known and build up that trust”.
- Participants recommended using local community groups and community centres to promote a survey and to encourage buy-in.

Gateshead

Group 3: Gateshead

Date: Tuesday 23 February
Time: 16.00-17.30
Participants: 7

Data sources currently used in the local area

As with Peterborough, participants in this group were generally using sources included in the Feasibility Study approach and had varying views of the reliability of these sources. They also identified some additional data sources, including data collected on women giving birth.

- UK Border Agency data were felt to be fairly reliable (some participants said about 70-80%), though did not always contain the more circumstantial aspects of people’s lives like pregnancy and disability which could be quite important for their housing and other service needs.

- UK Border Agency data were thought to be useful for “point in time” information such as how many received support or had been refused but it says nothing about movement or people who have received status or been refused but stayed in the North East.
- Flag 4 was mentioned by participants, but it only captures those whose last address was outside of the UK.
- NINo and WRS were felt to be quite useful, though local agencies cannot get this by postcode (The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) does have this information).
- HESA for students could be useful, and PLASC for schools is also comprehensive.
- The North East Information Partnership (NEIP), which works under One North East RDA, have done a great deal of analysis on numbers of migrants coming into the country and on nationalities, using the sources mentioned above.
- Citizenship ceremonies have the potential to be a good source of data, but they are obviously limited to those who have become citizens recently.
- Participants also discussed the data collected on women who give birth in NHS hospitals and thought that it could be useful: “It’s 100 per cent data as well, and some doctors collect it in the surgery, some NHS trusts do it in the hospital, but it’s always done.... We’re picking up Polish babies now, 70 last year”.
- In Newcastle there are third sector service providers, such as the West End Refugee Centre, who know where refused, even destitute refused asylum seekers are residing, and so they could also be good sources of intelligence.

Discussion of Feasibility Study data

Overall, participants felt the data appeared accurate, based on their own local knowledge, but had reservations about some of the data used.

- Participants felt that the Census is misleading, highlighting only those people who have been in the UK for a relatively long time.
- Participants knew the areas very well, and provided a great deal of commentary to confirm that the data seemed accurate: “You could find that Byker has quite a large African asylum seeker population, because it’s lower down here and because we just know it’s not got many students and it’s not got many professional, longer-term, it’s almost entirely, I would say, asylum seekers in Byker. West Gosforth are all kind of professionals, longer-term residents, and some academics as well. So the ones you’d expect to see at the top, Wingrove, Elswick and Westgate are much more likely to be within your post-1990, much more likely to contain a very large spread of asylum seekers, refugees. But also quite a lot of third and fourth generation BME as well.”

- Participants thought that to bring local knowledge to the sampling was a good idea, and they recommended that voluntary organisations be approached. They recommended: HAREF, Newcastle Healthy City, and The Rights Project.
- Participants felt that it is also possible to get an idea of illegal migrants from those picking up people who come in on ships as they would have an idea of how regularly that is happening.

General discussion

- Participants classed many migrant communities as ‘hidden communities’ and expected that they could be quite suspicious of the survey.
- They were also sceptical that people would take part for free.
- One participant estimated there were 300 refused asylum seekers sleeping rough, though this did not necessarily mean sleeping on the streets and they were not able to state a source for this.
- It was felt that Czech could be useful language-wise (this was often spoken by Roma refugees as well as economic migrants) but otherwise the languages chosen made sense.

Edinburgh

Group 4: Edinburgh

Date: Wednesday 24 February

Time: 16.00-17.30

Participants: 9

Knowledge of the local area

- Participants felt that it was very difficult to collect data locally.
- Their knowledge was based on grassroots studies conducted by community groups and local projects. These typically consisted of service-users linking up with others and building a shared picture of the local area. “We link up with all the different agencies across Edinburgh, but for our own participants and activities it’s all very local level too, just connecting to who comes in and to then link it to other communities and mapping where they are.”
- Edinburgh has not been a dispersal city since 1989 and instead asylum seekers are sent to Glasgow, subsequently asylum seeker numbers in Edinburgh are noted as low. Only asylum seekers receiving subsistence support and those staying with friends/family tend to reside locally.

- Participants identified a number of key migrant populations in Edinburgh: Sudanese, Kurdish, Turkish and Nigerian, with smaller pockets of other African nationalities.

Data sources used in the local area

The data used by participants in their day-to-day work tend to mirror the sources used in the Feasibility Study, for example, NINo, the Labour Force Survey, and UK Border Agency data on asylum applications and awards.

- Participants also use data collected from the Local Authority Schools Census.
- Public Health colleagues have been researching ways of capturing information about migrants, for example by analysing surnames, but this does not provide very robust nor very rich data. For example, it does not distinguish between new migrants and established communities and says little about those who have not registered or who have left the UK recently. “There are various software packages that can look at names and they’re trying to assess how accurate that is in terms of mapping where migrants are.”
- Although NHS data were used by some, it was seen as problematic as it records ethnic minorities, but not necessarily migrants. In addition, it is not centrally collated so while it may be useful on a local level it is less useable on a national level.

Discussion about Feasibility Study data

As in other groups, participants felt some data sources used in the Feasibility Study were more reliable than others. Overall they felt the data accurately represented their own knowledge of the local area.

- Participants lacked confidence in the Census data which they felt were too old, and that Edinburgh has changed too much in the last decade for it to be relevant. For example, the BME proportion of the population in 2001 was around 4.7 per cent and it is now estimated to be closer to ten per cent.
- Participants were more open to the accuracy of the EU NINo data. They agreed that Leith Walk, Sighthill and Gorgie are the areas they would consider to have large populations of people from the new EU countries.
- However, there was the feeling that Gorgie was more diverse than this, with more migrants than just the EU migrants. For example, there is also a large Indian population and it is generally diverse.
- Participants broadly felt that the mapping was correct and expressed a great deal of interest in what the minimum penetration would be for an area to be sampled.

General discussion

- Participants felt that in Edinburgh the languages required would be Punjabi, Sorani, Mandarin (Mandarin speakers are increasing in number), Lithuanian and Russian. The questionnaire has been translated into Sorani and Chinese simplified script (allowing it to be delivered in Cantonese and Mandarin).
- Participants also felt that Spanish would be more useful locally than would Portuguese.
- How a migrant survey is presented was felt to be very important, and participants queried whether the UK Border Agency should be mentioned and whether migrants would want to take part.
- Participants felt that it would be difficult to include people in communal establishments as they are very difficult to approach and the establishments may not respond to calls asking for access. “That is an issue for us who work at the admin, because unless you entice them in some way or another, or warn them then they’re not going to respond.”
- There was also the feeling amongst participants that there is a large hidden community of migrants who have been refused asylum or are here illegally and have “dropped out of the system”.
- Participants expressed concern about what the UK Border Agency and the other government agencies want to get out of a possible survey of migrants.
- Some felt that Scotland should be trying to attract people and expressed some concern that a survey may be used to ultimately reduce levels of migration from outside the UK.
- Participants also expressed concern about interviewers encountering vulnerable people and suggested that they ought to carry information referring migrants to appropriate services for support if they felt it was appropriate to do so.

Peterborough

Group 5: Peterborough

Date: Wednesday 24 February

Time: 16.15-17.15

Participants: 5

Knowledge of the local area

- The most recent large influx of migrants in Peterborough has come from Latvian nationals, and these have added to the communities of Polish, Roma, Lithuanian and Czech nationals who have arrived in recent years.

- Participants perceived a rise in the number of individuals and families migrating to the area to live with other migrant families who had been there longer. This joining of families leads to increases in numbers reported by the schools but not necessarily numbers of new clients seen by participants representing migrant groups or an increase in the number of WRS registrations.
- Peterborough sees steady numbers of seasonal workers coming to the area for work, particularly during the summer months. Students were felt to be a noticeable proportion of these workers, coming to raise income before heading back to their home country to further their education.
- Participants felt that recently the recession had resulted in a rise in the number of migrants seeking information on procedures for returning to their home countries, but local support groups have not seen a significant drop in the usual numbers of clients they are seeing or receiving information about.
- Rough sleeping is not accounted for by many of the sources that those in Peterborough use to make their estimates on migrant populations, though participants recognised the need to quantify this.

Data sources currently used in the local area

Participants are using many of the data sources also utilised in the Feasibility Study approach.

- NINo registrations, Asylum Certificates, GP and health organisation registrations, and data from school registrations were all cited as sources of data.
- These data were used by the LSP (Local Strategic Partnership), who divert it to the relevant sectors within the partnership, such as doctors, police and voluntary organisations.
- Participants pointed out that data fed back from schools and health organisations in the area may not add up to the same numbers as the WRS or NINos because, over time, migrant workers do not stay in the same place to work.
- However, whilst there were felt to be inconsistencies in the data, participants felt that the patterns observed in terms of the groups coming in were fairly accurate.
- Discussion of Feasibility Study data
- Participants in Peterborough broadly agreed with the local data created for the Feasibility Study.
- For example, the findings for the 'central' ward show a high concentration of migrants and this was confirmed by participants as an accurate reflection of reality.

They noted that the central ward is often the area where most migrants take up residence when moving to Peterborough because it is close to community centres and offers comparatively cheap accommodation. When migrants feel more secure in employment and have settled in their way of life they are then more likely to move out of the area.

- Participants noted that in this area there were also established groups of South Asian migrants who will not move out of the area in the same way that more recent EU migrants tend to.

More general discussion

- In commenting on the potential reach of a survey of migrants, participants felt that migrants would be more likely to participate in a survey if they felt that their views would make a difference to future decision-making. Participants also highlighted that a lot of research is done in Peterborough with migrants and that they tend to be paid for interviews. One participant felt many would not participate without this incentive.
- It was thought that if respondents do not feel a sense of involvement or that their input is worthwhile then the communities could be difficult to penetrate.
- Participants believed that the desire to take part in a survey could fluctuate between areas.
- Participants highlighted the need for any subsequent research to be inclusive of the Roma community in Peterborough, as they have not been fully picked up in previous research initiatives. Participants felt this was mainly due to ethnicity categorisations, and because the local Roma community often hold Czech passports so can be classified as Czech. Currently the main source for picking up Roma individuals is through education data, usually at admissions level. The Roma were noted as having particular needs for certain public services, such as housing, and therefore the authorities need to ensure that research is reflective of them, which means making sure they are accounted for in surveys with suitable questioning about race and ethnicity.
- There is a sizeable community of Latvians, and they often view themselves as Russian – this was noted as important in the identification process as well as when trying to accommodate language needs.

Inverness

Group 6: Inverness

Date: Thursday 25 February
Time: 16.00-17.30
Participants: 10

Knowledge of local area

- Participants reported that the migrant population in the Highlands is somewhere between 4,500 and 5,000. It tends to fluctuate as people follow work.
- The migration of Eastern European migrants to the Highlands has increased in recent years.

Data sources used in the local area

Participants were again using many of the data sources utilised in the Feasibility Study. Recent work has also been undertaken in the area trying to improve estimates of the local migrant population.

- Participants in Inverness were more positive about the Census than some in other areas, although they recognised its limitations. They felt that it was very difficult to get information about specific communities because the numbers are so small; they can only combine them into regions, such as South Asia. In addition, the Census data do not capture Eastern European migration – they tend to reflect more established groups and migration patterns.
- NINo data can also be useful. Participants wondered if it were possible to find out if people have registered but stopped making contributions, which could give an indication of who had left the UK.
- WRS data can also be useful, but again it does not capture longevity or movement.
- Participants thought that the Annual Schools Census is very helpful, but that it will miss out any indication of migrants who do not have children, and it does not capture migrants who are English speaking – so Caribbean and Australian migrants, for example, would not be included
- The NHS database tries to capture the nationalities of mothers, but often it does not capture the country, just their region of origin. Although this is not ideal it is possible to use the data as a basis for estimates. “We’ve assumed that if there’s a big increase in births to European non UK mothers then a lot will be attributed to A8 countries.” Participants also suggested that these data can be broken down by ward.
- Participants suggested it was worth looking at the work of Cameron Thomas who has attempted to quantify the migrant population in the area.

Discussion about Feasibility Study data

Participants tended to agree with the data presented to them, and agreed that these data matched other mapping exercises, such as those by Cameron Thomas mentioned above. However, some of the ward level data were felt to be out of date, where changes in available work had turned a high penetration area into a low penetration area.

- Participants felt the estimated number of households seemed reasonable, based on the data they already had.
- The migrant population in Strathspey was agreed to be high, and participants confirmed that there were a large number of Australians, New Zealanders and South Africans working in hospitality and on fruit farms.
- In Dingwall and Seaforth the Feasibility Study data indicated low penetration, but participants felt that the penetration here was actually higher than this. This is because a fish factory moved to the area and approximately 300 migrants moved with it. This happened in 2009, which is why it would not show up in the current data.

General discussion

- Participants discussed language needs extensively. Tagalog (Filipino) was thought to be one of the most prevalent languages spoken in the Highlands and Edinburgh, though Polish was also key. They thought that there were a few Spanish speakers, some who spoke Bengali, and then pockets of those who spoke other languages – there are Latvians in Fort William and Stornoway, Hungarians in Fort William and Portuguese in Morayshire.
- They felt that Russian would be a good language to include as it is understood by many Eastern European people as well as Russians.
- There was concern that the purpose of a survey and the confidentiality of respondents needed to be communicated well to get people to take part.
- There was little feeling that there are very many undocumented people, except for an education provider who felt that classes shrink when there is an immigration officer in the area.
- Participants named a number of areas in which they were interested, for example employment. In particular they thought that underemployment is very interesting, since Inverness is not an area with much well-paid work. They felt that comparing qualifications to employment would be interesting. They were also interested in what brought people to Scotland and their reasons for leaving – this is particularly interesting since Scotland was felt to need to encourage new people whilst retaining current residents.

- The urban/rural divide was thought to be very interesting for Scotland – participants thought that Scotland was mostly rural, but that the definitions were a bit different for England which means that more areas are labelled 'urban' than they truly are.
- It was thought that it is necessary to involve the Highland Council and a variety of service providers in decisions such as what would be meaningful in terms of numbers of responses, and the subgroup analysis which would be useful.
- Participants also wanted to discuss the reasons behind a potential survey of migrants and felt that for it to be meaningful it could not be a one-off; it would have to be repeated regularly. They also felt that Scotland needs younger people and to find ways to retain people, and were concerned that the purpose of the survey was to help the Government find methods to reduce and control immigration which, participants noted, could be damaging for the local area and Scotland more widely.

2. Cognitive Testing in English Report – February 2010

2.1 Introduction

A key aspect of the Feasibility Study was to develop a possible questionnaire for a survey of migrants. This report documents findings from the cognitive testing process, which aimed to develop and test a wide range of questions to help fill the evidence gaps surrounding migration. It was important that questions could be understood and answered by migrants, some of whom may not have good English language skills or come from different cultural backgrounds. For comparison purposes, it was intended that questions should be harmonised, as far as possible, with questions used in other large surveys (e.g. the Citizenship Survey). However, this was the first time a number of these questions had been specifically tested on migrants and revisions to such questions, where necessary, are proposed within this report.

A draft questionnaire was initially developed taking into consideration requirements from the steering group. Following this, a period of cognitive testing and initial piloting of the questionnaire took place. The testing took place over two phases between 23 October 2009 and 6 November 2009 and from 26 November 2009 until 16 December 2009. The break between the two phases allowed time for feedback of findings followed by redesign of the questionnaire. During the second phase, changes were made after each set of interviews if problems were identified.

Methodology

Cognitive testing

Cognitive testing aims to ensure that survey questions are interpreted in the way they are intended. It involves carrying out a small number of interviews in which the questions are asked in the usual way but, instead of the answers themselves being important, it is the thought process of the respondent that is of most interest. For each question included in the testing the interviewers examine, with the respondents, what the question means to them, what made them give the response they gave, and which factors influenced their answer. This technique can identify areas of uncertainty for respondents and gives an opportunity to revise and improve the questions before the survey takes place.

Piloting

In addition to the cognitive testing, field interviewers also conducted pilot interviews of the entire questionnaire with individuals. This approach was taken as the length of the questionnaire meant cognitively testing the entire questionnaire which was not possible. The aim of the pilots was to test the length of the questionnaire, provide feedback on how the positioning of questions and general flow, and contribute to identifying questions which were

difficult for respondents to understand. The pilot was not testing the sampling approach and the questionnaire was administered on paper, so it was not intended to be a full pre-main stage practice run of the full survey.

For both cognitive testing and piloting, interviews were conducted in a place of the respondent's choosing, whether this was the respondent's home, a local community organisation, or another venue such as a café. Interviews conducted in public places were always done at the respondent's request. Respondents taking part in cognitive testing received £20 in high street vouchers as a thank you for their participation. During the first wave of pilot interviews, respondents received £25 in high street vouchers, reflecting the longer time commitment; this was reduced to £20 in the second wave.

Recruitment

In total, 50 cognitive interviews and 46 pilot interviews took place with economic migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. For the cognitive interviews, eight were conducted with asylum seekers, eight with refugees, and thirty-four with economic migrants (including six students and six dependants). For the pilot interviews, the proportion of asylum seekers and refugees was the same (eight each), and thirty interviews were conducted with economic migrants.

Recruitment was done on a free find basis, using face-to-face recruitment and contacts established by the recruiters. Asylum seekers and refugees were generally recruited via contacts with voluntary sector organisations and support services, which proved a very successful approach. Participants were open to the idea of taking part in a survey of migrants. There was a great deal of interest in the purpose of such a survey and what would be done with the information gathered. Communicating this information will be an important part to get right in the mainstage of a migrant survey. Participants were informed the survey was being conducted by Ipsos MORI on behalf of the UK Border Agency and a range of government departments, with the aim of helping better understand why people come to the UK, what their lives are like in the UK, and what encourages people to stay or leave the UK.

There was reluctance amongst some participants to be interviewed in their own homes or at Ipsos MORI offices, particularly amongst asylum seekers and refugees. As a result interviews were conducted in public places or the offices of support organisations where necessary.

General perceptions of a survey of migrants were positive. Participants in the cognitive testing were asked if there were any questions they were surprised by or felt uncomfortable answering. Few raised any problems, although a small number found questions about finances or their family somewhat intrusive.

Cognitive testing took place in Glasgow, Edinburgh, London and Manchester. Pilot interviews took place in Edinburgh, London, Birmingham and Cambridgeshire. Recruitment was conducted face to face, with some done in-street, particularly for economic migrants, and some via community organisations and refugee centres. The aim of recruitment was to capture migrants

from a wide range of countries; it was not intended to be representative of migration to the UK but to capture a range of respondents from all regions, as well as different backgrounds, immigration status and English language abilities. The regions identified for the purpose of recruitment and eligible countries are presented in the following table.

Table 1 Countries of origin for cognitive testing participants

Region	Eligible countries for nationality	Interviews achieved
Old Europe	Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden	10
Australasia & South Africa	Australia, New Zealand, South Africa	4
North America	USA, Canada	4
New Europe	Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania	9
Central and South America	Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Belize, Costa Rica, Other	6
East Asia	China, Japan, North Korea, South Korea, Hong Kong	6
South East Asia	Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, Laos	5
South Asia	India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka	12
Sub-Saharan Africa	Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Republic of Congo, Central African Republic, Cameroon, Sudan, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Any other Africa not listed under North Africa	27
Middle East and North Africa	Algeria, Afghanistan, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, Mauritania, Western Sahara, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Other Middle East	13

The recruitment criteria were adjusted between Phase 1 and Phase 2 to rule out countries which had been over-represented in Phase 1; this led to Somalia, Poland and Ireland being ruled out as eligible countries. The following map illustrates the range of countries respondents were drawn from.

Figure 1 Map to show countries of origin for cognitive testing participants



Topic guide and question areas covered

For the cognitive testing, a topic guide with key prompts and priority areas for testing was developed. The sections of the questionnaire identified for cognitive testing during the first phase were as follows.

- Calendar
- Coming to the UK
- Citizenship
- The immigration system
- Perception of the UK Border Agency
- Integration
- Feelings about your home and local area
- Dependants

The questions included in the sections on Education and Employment were mainly drawn from pre-existing standard questions that have been tested in the past so these were not subject to the same level of cognitive testing. However, they were still tested in both phases and were included in the pilot testing. Findings from this are included in this report.

Report structure

This report is intended to be a reference document explaining the decisions taken during the cognitive testing period. A summary of the main findings follows this introduction. The rest of the report provides detailed findings on each of the tested sections of the questionnaires. The main sections for testing were as follows.

- Calendar
- Coming to the UK
- Citizenship
- The immigration system
- Integration
- Feelings about your home and local area
- Feelings about yourself and others

Sections which were not a main focus for testing, as they primarily consisted of pre-existing harmonised questions were as follows.

- Education
- Employment
- Volunteering
- Health

As these were tested less extensively, the findings from these sections are presented together in a single chapter at the end of the report. Finally, next steps for questionnaire development and the project are outlined.

2.2 Questionnaire Section 1: Calendar

Overall findings

The Calendar section was revised through the phases to allow for easier recall from participants and a more natural flow. In the original questionnaire tested, participants were first asked about their move to the UK and then about previous countries they had lived in. During the first phase participants did, at times, have difficulty recalling dates so a number of fixes were tested. In the final questionnaire, respondents were shown a showcard calendar to use as a memory prompt, and are first asked about where they were living in December 1989, and then work forward until the present date. This has worked well in testing, particularly where participants have moved countries more than once during the time period. New questions on nationality, country of birth, and home country have been added in order to capture enough information to properly illustrate an individual's circumstances.

Questions

Feedback on questions which proved problematic or were added during the testing are presented below. Where questions were widely understood, individual feedback is not included.

Deleted question: For how long have you continuously lived in the UK?

INTERVIEWER PROBE FOR YEAR AND MONTH MOVED TO UK (LAST TIME MOVED HERE)

There were some difficulties reported with this question tested in the first phase. One participant confused the question with how long he had meant to live in the UK; another interpreted 'continuously' as living somewhere for more than six months. Others did not report problems, but they had not left the UK and it was not clear there was a standard way of defining 'continuously'. As a result this line of questioning was replaced with the showcard calendar approach. Rather than starting from moving to the UK and then working backwards, respondents are now asked about countries lived in, moving forward through time.

Deleted question: In the past 12 months, have you spent more than three months outside of the UK in total?

This question became unnecessary when the changes to the calendar were put in. While included in the questionnaire, some participants found it difficult to answer. One participant found the question very confusing as he had only been in the UK for three months. Another found it difficult to recall exactly how long she had been outside of the UK; she had spent nearly three months in another country caring for her mother.

Deleted question: In which country were you living immediately before you moved to the UK onDATE AT C101..?
PROBE FULLY AND WRITE IN

The data for this are now captured in the general calendar approach, so this became unnecessary.

Deleted question: For how long were you *continuously* living in ...**COUNTRY AT C104**.. before you moved to the UK in ..**DATE AT C101**?

INTERVIEWER PROBE FOR YEAR AND MONTH MOVED TO COUNTRY AT C104

When you lived in COUNTRY did you consider it to be your usual place of residence?

This question was originally part of the calendar and used to establish the reference date for moving to the UK that would be used in subsequent questions later on in the survey. Participants found it difficult to understand what was meant by 'usual place of residence' and therefore could not answer this question accurately. Some participants interpreted it along the lines of "I lived there and did not live anywhere else".

The recommendation was made to delete this question due to the poor understanding of what is a technical term. In addition, respondents were naturally excluding holidays and short trips from the calendar, therefore it was felt this question was not providing useful data and it could be removed.

Final question: 1.1 What country were you born in?

This question was added to the questionnaire during the testing phase. Previously the questionnaire asked only how long people had been living in a country; where this was the country they were born in the question became difficult to answer. Including a code for 'born in the country' was considered, but as participants attempt to answer the length of stay question numerically, this approach would have relied on the interviewer being able to judge the age of the person answering to determine the code. Beginning the questioning on countries lived in with country of birth is a more logical approach to gathering the required data.

Final question: 1.2 What is your nationality? 1.3 What other nationalities have you held?

A question on nationality was also included as country of birth does not always equate to nationality. One participant interviewed did not hold nationality for the country she was born in, only for the country she moved to shortly after birth.

An alternative version of this question asked about Citizenship, but this was a term not always understood in this context. One participant, who did understand the term, felt that nationality is a more appropriate term as this is what is commonly asked on visa application forms and given in passports.

The follow-up question on other nationalities allows for those with dual nationality, or who have given up nationality of a country, to give all nationalities they have held in the past. A number of participants in the testing were either of dual nationality, either also holding UK nationality having gained Citizenship, or being a national of another European country.

Final question: 1.4 And what do you consider your home country to be?

The purpose of this question is to allow participants to self-identify their home country in order to answer questions around identity and belonging in later sections of the questionnaire. Using country of birth or nationality for this purpose proved difficult during the testing, as participants' views of their home country do not necessarily tally with factual data. For example, one participant considered her home country to be where her parents were born rather than where she herself was born. It was felt important to be able to capture where there were differences between country of birth, nationality and home country, so the explicit question asking about home country was included in order to allow this to happen.

Original question: Can you tell me what countries you have lived, worked or studied in, for longer than two weeks in the last five years?

Final question: 1.12 Can you tell me what other countries you have spent at least a month in during the last five years?

This question was included during the testing period to gather more information about people's movements and capture any countries lived in that respondents miss from the calendar as they are for short periods.

The question wording was difficult for participants to understand. They were unsure whether to include holidays; if they did include holidays whether visits to family counted as a holiday; and whether they should include overseas trips undertaken for a UK-based job. In order to counter this, the question was simplified and the time period raised from two weeks to one month.

Original question: You mentioned you were living in [COUNTRY] prior to seeking asylum in the UK. Is [COUNTRY] the country you were seeking asylum from?

Revised question 1. Which country were you seeking asylum from?

Final question: 1.16 You said you were living in [LAST COUNTRY BEFORE UK] before you came to the UK. Is that the country you were seeking asylum from?

Final question: 1.17: [if 1.16=no] Which country were you seeking asylum from?

The original question was asked of refugees and asylum seekers in the 'Coming to the UK' section of the questionnaire. It proved too complicated for asylum seeker and refugee participants and they found it difficult to answer, probably due to its length. An easier version

'What country were you claiming asylum from' was trialled, but was revised again after one participant gave the UK as her answer, as in her view she was in the UK claiming asylum, so therefore was claiming asylum from the UK. It is important to include this question as some participants had moved to a third country before coming to the UK to claim asylum. For example, one participant had travelled from Somalia to Ethiopia before coming to the UK and claiming asylum.

The question was amended again and moved to the Calendar section to let it sit more naturally with questions about movements. The question was split in two, with the first question reverting to a similar format to the original. Although the wording in the final question is similar to the original, the use of simpler language and moving this question into the Calendar section overcame the original problems.

2.3 Questionnaire Section 2: Coming to the UK

Overall findings

Selected questions in this section saw a number of changes during the testing. Overall, however, the section worked well and gathered the required information. A number of questions were removed from this section as the questionnaire was refined, but this was due to priorities and managing the length of the questionnaire, rather than difficulties with respondent understanding. Some questions were also moved to other sections, such as the Calendar, to improve flow.

Importantly, the question asking about visa types was well understood. It utilises a large number of showcards to allow participants to choose their visa type. Although there were concerns, these showcards might prove difficult for people to understand, during the testing participants found it straightforward to locate their visa type from the lists.

More problematic in this section were questions around satisfaction with life, length of stay, and dependants. These are considered in detail in the rest of the section.

Questions

Original questions: Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you and the bottom represents the worst possible life for you. Where on the ladder do you feel you personally stood before you came to the UK on REF DAT?

Where on the ladder do you feel you personally stand right now?

Final question: 2.1 How satisfied or dissatisfied with your life in the UK are you right now? 2.2 How satisfied or dissatisfied with your life in COUNTRY were you before you came to the UK in YEAR?

Participants found the original version of the question difficult to understand and did not grasp the concept of the ladder. They also found it difficult to separate how they felt before they came to the UK with how they felt when they learnt they were coming to the UK. This was particularly the case for asylum seekers and refugees, who when prompted talk about how they felt knowing they were coming to the UK and how happy they were. They tended to place themselves very high on the scale for the first question because of this, which could lead to very misleading results. Participants also found this question very broad, which made it difficult to answer. One participant, an economic migrant, felt he did not want to say bad things about his own country and felt he had to put himself high on the scale.

Participants find a satisfied/dissatisfied scale, as used in the final wording, easier to understand than the original approach. By asking about life in the UK first and including the country and date in the follow up, the issue of participants focusing on their life in that country, not on the fact they were about to come to the UK, is resolved. A key question for the testing was how participants understood 'satisfied' and 'dissatisfied' and whether 'happy' and 'unhappy' might be better understood. The testing showed that participants did understand the terms and, importantly, saw them as different from happy/unhappy. Some participants felt that satisfied/dissatisfied was a wider judgement, taking many things into account, whereas happy/unhappy was an immediate state of mind and therefore very changeable.

Original question: Before arriving in the UK, did you think the UK was a very good place to live, a fairly good place to live, neither a good nor a bad place to live, a fairly bad place to live, or a very bad place to live?

Revised question 1. Looking at this list, can you tell me which, if any, you thought were true about the UK before you came here?

- a. The UK is a place where human rights and the law are respected
- b. The UK welcomes people from other countries
- c. The UK has good job opportunities
- d. The UK offers good educational opportunities
- e. It is easy for people from other countries to get a visa to come and live in the UK
- f. The UK always offers protection to asylum seekers
- g. I am able to follow my religion freely in the UK
- h. The UK has a good health service
- i. The UK offers good health and welfare benefits
- j. None of these

Final question: 2.3 Using this card, can you tell me how strongly you agreed or disagreed with these statements before coming to the UK?

2.4 And how strongly do you agree or disagree with these statements now?

- a. The UK is a place where human rights and the law are respected
- b. The UK welcomes people from other countries
- c. The UK has good job opportunities
- d. The UK offers a good quality of life
- e. It is easy for people from other countries to get a visa to come and live in the UK
- f. It is easy to obtain welfare benefits in the UK

Some of the participants interviewed during the cognitive testing and piloting felt they did not know enough about the UK to be able to answer the original question, so put themselves in the neutral middle position. The question was followed by an open question asking why participants said that, and then the same question for their views now. For the open questions, participants identified similar reasons for their answers. It was therefore suggested that an alternative question, asking people whether they agreed with certain statements be tested.

However, the first revised version of the question seemed to potentially be too leading, with participants choosing virtually everything on the list. Even if the question was not leading them, the usefulness of the data collected was affected and the question was revised to an agree/disagree scale. The number of options was also reduced, as reading long showcards was burdensome for participants. In addition, as a number of participants spontaneously noted that their opinions had changed on certain issues, a follow-up question asking about current feelings was included.

Final question: 2.11 How long had you been in the UK before claiming asylum?

This was tested as an open question, allowing participants to give their own answer. Most participants had claimed asylum either immediately upon entry or within one week. Generally this was a straightforward question for participants to answer. However, its follow-up was more difficult.

Final question: 2.12 Why did you not claim asylum straight away?

The answers to this question were very specific to each participant and with the small numbers tested no clear themes can be identified. One participant answered that he/she did not understand how to claim asylum; another participant had been a student and intended to return home to Zimbabwe but was unable to after the situation there changed. One participant could not give a clear answer to the question and had to provide a long explanation which was not easy to record. The interviewer felt he was uncomfortable with the question and reported this back in his findings. This may be a challenging question to code for the final survey. The question may need to be revised following a larger-scale pilot of the questionnaire.

Final question: 2.17 When you arrived in the UK on REF DAT how long did you intend to stay? 2.20 How much longer do you now intend to stay in the UK?

Although participants understood these two questions, they found them difficult to answer. Some economic migrants responded that they did not have a fixed idea of how long they would stay when they came, or how long they would now remain. It was felt by some to be highly dependent on other factors in their lives, for example whether they were offered a better job elsewhere, or could obtain funding for studies, or on their personal relationships. With so many factors influencing their decision to stay or leave, they felt unable to put a time period on it.

In order to address some of these issues, additional answer codes were added to the first question and the follow-up changed to a question which appeared later in the questionnaire **2.18 Do you [still] hope to live in the UK for the rest of your life?** Only those who answer negatively to this are asked the follow-up for how long they intend to stay. Some participants who had been unable to answer 2.20 had answered 2.18 easily when asked that. One participant put this down to the difference between hoping something and having a definite plan. While he hoped to live in the UK for the rest of his life, he could not predict exactly what would happen, so if asked to put an exact time period he might only say “for another five years” to account for unexpected changes.

Original question: Do you have any dependants in the UK

Retested question 1: Looking at this card, can you tell me if you have any of the following living in the UK?

- a. Husband, wife or civil partner
- b. Unmarried partner
- c. Children aged under 18 years old
- d. Other (please specify)

Retested question 2: Looking at this card, do you have any of these types of dependants living in the UK? By dependants I mean people who depend on you for financial support.

- a. Husband, wife or civil partner
- b. Unmarried partner
- c. Children aged under 18 years old
- d. Other (please specify)

Final question: 2.21 Do you have any dependants living in the UK? By dependants I mean people who depend on you for financial support.

2.22 From the options on this card, what is their relationship to you?

- a. Husband, wife or civil partner
- b. Unmarried partner
- c. Children aged under 18
- d. Other (please specify)

Not all participants understood what was meant by ‘dependant’ when presented with the original question, therefore a definition was included in the question. The definition chosen was that used when applying for dependant visas, which is very strict on what relationships are considered as dependent. The first revised version of the question asked only about the relationship, omitting any question of financial support. However, participants found this a confusing question and some felt it was intrusive. One participant was uncomfortable being asked about his wife and children and questioned the purpose of the question before answering. This version of the question also did not account for the fact that the individual being interviewed might be the dependant person, and therefore answer this question positively without those individuals being dependent on them.

The second revised version included a definition of dependant to address this last point, making it clear the individuals needed to be financially dependent on the participant. However, the question was still difficult for participants to understand and seemed to ask them more than one question at once. It also did not address the question of intrusiveness. As a result, the final approach was to split the question, asking first whether the person has dependants, and then what their relationship to them is. This approach was easier for participants to understand and, to an extent, countered the intrusiveness question by not identifying individuals immediately.

These questions are also asked of dependants living outside the UK and were revised accordingly.

2.4 Questionnaire Section 3: Citizenship

Overall findings

This section asks respondents about their intentions to apply for UK Citizenship or Permanent Residence and their knowledge of the processes for doing so. Few changes were required in this section, with the questions being well understood by participants. For participants with EU Citizenship, there was little knowledge of how applying for UK Citizenship might improve their situation. In addition, few participants were familiar with Permanent Residence and how it differed from UK Citizenship. There was interest amongst participants in applying for UK Citizenship, with participants seeing it as an opportunity to be more secure in their residency and obtain a UK passport.

Questions

Final question (unchanged): 3.3 Why are you applying for UK Citizenship/Permanent Residence?

In the early drafts of the questionnaire this question appeared with a precode list, but was treated as an open question for the purpose of cognitive testing. Key reasons given for wishing to gain UK Citizenship (few participants opted for Permanent Residence) were:

- to obtain a UK passport – allowing easier travel and more security;
- to have more rights in the UK;
- to feel more settled or more secure.

Although there were common themes mentioned by participants, it is recommended that this question remain open until a full-scale pilot is conducted and the question is reviewed before the mainstage survey. Following this a code frame can be developed and the question amended either to a showcard, allowing participants to choose from a list, or to a precoded list where interviewers code the answers.

Original question: Do you intend to apply for UK Citizenship?

Final question: 3.4 How likely or unlikely are you to apply for UK Citizenship?

- a. Very likely
- b. Fairly likely
- c. Neither likely nor unlikely
- d. Fairly unlikely
- e. Very unlikely

The original version of this question presented participants with too bold a choice. Some participants were unsure as to whether they would apply or not, particularly if more recently arrived. They felt they may apply in future, but at the current time were undecided, so could not answer the question as posed. The decision was therefore taken to replace this question with a likely/unlikely scale. This allows it to distinguish between those who are clear on whether they do or do not want to apply for Citizenship, and those who may apply at some point in the future. The data gathered will allow for more subtle analysis of people's real intentions. While third country nationals tended to be fairly clear on their intentions, participants with EU Citizenship were less certain about their intentions, primarily due to not being clear on how UK Citizenship might benefit them, given the right to work and residence they already enjoyed.

Original question: Do you intend to apply for Permanent Residence?

Final question: 3.5 How likely or unlikely are you to apply Permanent Residence?

- a. Very likely
- b. Fairly likely
- c. Neither likely nor unlikely
- d. Fairly unlikely
- e. Very unlikely

As with the previous question, the wording here was changed and a scale introduced, in order to allow participants to better reflect their true wishes. There was less knowledge amongst participants of Permanent Residence and the benefits it might bring, therefore this question was more difficult to answer. This is likely to be because 'permanent residence' is a new term, which was part of a new policy proposal being considered at the time of the Feasibility Study. Interviewers were provided with a definition of Permanent Residence to give to participants; this may need to be done for the mainstage survey as well. This question would need to be trialled again within a full-scale pilot prior to the main survey fieldwork to check if it is suitable for inclusion.

Final question (unchanged): 3.7 The Government has recently announced their proposals for Earned Citizenship, which will require non-UK citizens to 'earn' the right to apply for UK Citizenship or Permanent Residency. Before today, had you heard about the Earned Citizenship proposals?

This is a long question and required interviewers to ask it carefully to ensure participants heard the question properly. Despite it being long, it was generally understood. Knowledge of Earned Citizenship was uncommon (because it was part of a new policy proposal which was under consideration at the time of the feasibility study) so the follow-up question on where participants had heard about Earned Citizenship could not be fully tested. Given this question is very specific to a certain time period and a policy that was under consideration, it may not be suitable for inclusion in its current form in subsequent waves of the questionnaire. This question should be reviewed for suitability prior to roll-out of the main stage survey.

Original question: To get UK Citizenship/Permanent Residence faster, Earned Citizenship asks you to do voluntary work. Would you do this if it meant getting UK Citizenship/Permanent Residence faster?

Final question: 3.9. To get UK Citizenship/Permanent Residence faster, Earned Citizenship asks you to do voluntary work, for example for a charity or community group. Would you do this if it meant getting UK Citizenship/Permanent Residence faster?

Participants' understanding of 'voluntary work' was tested in the first phase and feedback was mixed from both the cognitive testing and the piloting. Although participants did generally understand voluntary work as being unpaid, they could not always give examples of such work. The decision was therefore taken to include examples of voluntary work to improve understanding.

Generally, participants were willing to do voluntary work. Where there was unwillingness this was due in one instance to the participant feeling he/she already contributed to society through taxes and should not be expected to do additional work on top of this. Another participant felt it would depend on how much faster it made the application; if it was significantly faster he/she would be more inclined to do voluntary work than if there was little impact.

Deleted question: How soon after receiving indefinite leave to remain (ILR) or permanent status did you apply for UK Citizenship?

This question, originally asked of refugees who had obtained UK Citizenship, was removed from the final questionnaire. Respondents had great difficulty recalling how long it had been, even when given prompts. The questionnaire already collects the date individuals receive their asylum decision and all individuals who have obtained Citizenship are asked the date they they did so, both of which were much easier to recall. Although some people may take longer to successfully obtain Citizenship, using the average time period will give an approximation of how long individuals wait between getting a successful asylum decision and applying for UK Citizenship.

2.5 Questionnaire Section 4: The immigration system

Overall findings

This section asks respondents how well they understand the immigration system and their satisfaction with the process. It is only asked of non-EU citizens. This section was generally well understood by participants, who were familiar with most of the technical terms used. Some simplifying of language was required to improve understanding, and one question was deleted completely due to participants not understanding it.

In addition to the questions below, participants were asked how they would rate their experience of the UK immigration system and, if applicable, the service they received from the National Asylum Support Service (NASS). These questions were well understood and did not require amending. Generally, participants had good perceptions of their dealings with the immigration system and NASS. In particular, NASS was appreciated for providing support and housing to asylum seekers who otherwise would have nothing.

This section includes a series of questions asked only of asylum seekers, asking about their views of the UK Border Agency, how easy it was to make a claim, knowledge of assisted return, how easy it was to get legal representation and their relationship with their case worker. These questions were all well understood by participants and changes were not needed.

Questions

Deleted question: Are you aware of any immigration rules or restrictions that you must follow during your stay in the UK? OR Are you aware of any asylum rules or restrictions that you must follow while you are claiming asylum in the UK?

Most participants found this question difficult to understand. They were not sure what 'rules and regulations' referred to and found the wording difficult to follow. Many participants answered 'no' to this question, despite then being clearer on their immigration status and the rules that applied to them. As the question was so poorly understood and the following questions, which looked more specifically at rules, were well understood, the decision was made to remove the question.

Original question: How well do you understand the following?

- a. When you need to reapply to extend or change your leave to remain in the UK
- b. The rules regarding the hours you are allowed to work
- c. The rules regarding who you are allowed to work for
- d. The rules about when you can change employer
- e. Whether you are allowed to be self-employed
- f. Whether you are allowed to change your leave category whilst in the UK

Final question: 4.1 How well do you feel you understand the following?

- a. The application process
- b. The rules regarding the hours you are allowed to work
- c. The rules regarding who you are allowed to work for
- d. The rules about reapplying to extend or change your visa

The original version of this question was difficult for participants with poorer English language skills to understand. Phrases such as 'leave category' and 'leave to remain' were not always clearly understood in the context of the question. The statements on changing employer or being self-employed were not understood by most participants, leading them to answer 'not very well' or 'not at all well' when it was the question they did not understand, rather than the rules. Given this low level of understanding and the complex wording of some statements they were simplified and shortened to four key statements. Using 'visa' instead of 'leave category' was much easier for participants to understand and they could confidently answer the new question. As a result, participants' answers should better reflect their actual understanding of the rule under discussion.

Original question: How well do you understand the following?

- a. The asylum process
- b. What the 'active review' period is
- c. Your rights to appeal a decision
- d. The outcome of your asylum application
- e. How long you are allowed to stay in the UK
- f. When you need to report to the reporting office

Final question: 4.2 How well do you feel you understand the following?

- a. The asylum process
- b. Your rights to appeal a decision
- c. The outcome of your asylum application
- d. How long you are allowed to stay in the UK
- e. When you need to report to the reporting office

Refugees and asylum seekers are asked this equivalent question about their knowledge of immigration rules relating to them. The original version tested well and few problems with understanding were encountered. Actual self-reported understanding varied amongst participants; those who felt they had less understanding tended, on further questioning, to rely on their solicitor to understand and explain these issues to them.

Very few participants were familiar with the 'active review' period and therefore this option was removed. The term is one used more regularly within the UK Border Agency and not necessarily familiar to asylum seekers or refugees themselves.

Original question: What improvements might the UK Border Agency make to further assist people with understanding the immigration rules and restrictions?

Final question: 4.3 What improvements might the UK Border Agency make to help people with understanding the immigration rules and restrictions?

- a. Offer more translations
- b. Offer better translations
- c. Better signposting on website
- d. Provide community support
- e. Provide simpler and clearer information
- f. More detailed information
- g. Other (specify)

This question was simplified to aid understanding, changing 'further assist' to 'help'. The codes chosen were agreed by the Steering Group, based on their priorities and answers commonly given during the cognitive testing and pilot. Providing simpler and clearer information was a common request from participants, who sometimes found it difficult to understand the rules. One participant commented that even the professionals he spoke to could not understand what the rules were.

2.6 Questionnaire Section 8: Integration

Overall findings

This section of the questionnaire covers use of local public services, claiming of benefits, keeping in touch with friends and family, sending money home, and sense of feeling a part of the local area, region, the UK and home country. In the initial version of the questionnaire it also contained questions on identity and attitudes to violent extremism and terrorism. These were moved to a new section 'Feelings about yourself and others' during testing to improve respondent comprehension and the flow of the questionnaire.

The questions in this section change from very factual – Have you ever claimed any of these benefits? – to very subjective – How strongly do you feel a part of your local area? It also contains a number of questions originally taken from existing surveys, such as the Citizenship Survey. This was a crucial section to cognitively test to ensure migrants understood the subjective questions in the same way, particularly where English was not their first language or cultural variation might lead to different interpretations. Due to the differing understanding of some concepts, pre-existing questions had to be adapted to ensure participants understood them.

Questions on claiming benefits were easy for participants to answer, as if they were in receipt of a benefit they generally recognised it. However, participants could not distinguish between income-based and contribution-based jobseeker's allowance, so this distinction was removed.

Questions

Original question: Please indicate how frequently you or your family have used the following public services in your local area.

Almost every day, At least once a week, about once a month, within the last six months, within the last year, less frequently, never used

- a. Police force
- b. Fire and rescue service
- c. GP (Family doctor)
- d. Hospital
- e. Dentist
- f. Midwifery services
- g. Counselling services
- h. Sport/leisure facilities
- i. Libraries
- j. Public transport (e.g. buses, trains)

Final question: 8.1 Please indicate how often you or your family have used the following public services in your local area.

Almost every day, two to three times a week, about once a week, about once a month, about once every six months, less often, never used

- a. Police force
- b. GP
- c. Hospital
- d. Dentist
- e. Libraries
- f. Public transport (e.g. buses, trains)

The original version of this question was taken from the Place Survey, undertaken by Local Authorities. The codes for midwifery services and counselling services were added in for the migrant audience. On testing, a number of problems presented themselves. The initial problem was the scale for the question, which participants noted combined frequency (at least once a week, about once a month) with the last occasion they had done something (within the last six months). This conflation of scales made it difficult for participants to answer the question accurately, particularly for less used services such as the police force. Some participants with the original scale answered they had used the police force within the last six months, because factually this was the case. However, this was the only time they had ever used the police force. Knowing someone has used the police force once does not give any idea of the real nature of their public service use. For this a frequency scale has to be employed, if the findings show that someone uses the police force about once every six months they have a better idea of the planning implications of this level of use. As a result, an alternative scale was included based only on frequency of doing activities.

The language of the question was also amended to facilitate better understanding. Participants found the phrase 'how frequently' more difficult to understand, so this was replaced with 'how often'. The services asked about were reduced for length and

comprehension. When asked about use of sports and leisure services, participants were not sure whether to include private gyms or exercise classes. Midwifery services were not well understood, even by those who had English as a first language; for example one respondent from Ireland did not understand the word 'midwifery' but understood 'midwife'. Counselling services were felt to be a very personal issue by some participants, and was misheard as council services by others, who when asked to explain the term talked about rubbish collections. As these were felt to be areas of less priority, the terms were removed rather than amended.

Final question: 8.3 Why do you not use the service?

Suggested codes: You believe there is a charge to use the service. You have been told by friends/family that the services are not very good. You believe you are not entitled to use the service. You have not needed to access the service. You were not aware of the service. You do not speak/read English well enough to use the service. Other (specify).

This question is asked as a follow-up to 8.1, to see why participants are not using services they have identified as 'never used'. The suggested codes could not be tested adequately as most participants in both cognitive testing and piloting, when asked the question, said they had not used services because they had not needed to. Some EU participants preferred to access GP and dental services in their own country and said they would return home when they needed treatment.

Original question: Have you ever claimed any of the following public funds/benefits?

- a. Income-based jobseeker's allowance
- b. Income support
- c. Child tax credit
- d. Working tax credit
- e. A social fund payment
- f. Child benefit
- g. Housing benefit
- h. Council tax benefit
- i. State pension credit
- j. Attendance allowance
- k. Severe disablement allowance
- l. Carer's allowance
- m. Disability living allowance
- n. An allocation of local authority housing; and
- o. Local Authority homelessness assistance

Have you ever claimed any of the following benefits, based on National Insurance contributions?

- a. Contribution-based jobseeker's allowance
- b. Incapacity benefit
- c. Retirement pension
- d. Widow's benefit and bereavement benefit
- e. Guardian's allowance
- f. Statutory maternity pay
- g. Maternity allowance

Revised question 1 Have you ever claimed any of the following public funds/benefits?

Revised follow-up question 1: You said you received jobseeker's allowance; can you tell me if this was income-based or contribution/National Insurance-based

Final question: 8.4 In the week ending Sunday the [XXXX date], were you claiming any State benefits or tax credits (including State pension, Allowances, Child benefit or National Insurance Credits)

Final question: 8.5 Which of the following types of benefit (or tax credits) were you claiming

- a. Unemployment-related benefits, or National Insurance Credits?
- b. Income support (not as an unemployed person)?
- c. Sickness or Disability benefits (including Employment and Support Allowance; not including tax credits)?
- d. State pension
- e. Family-related benefits (excluding Child benefit and tax credits)
- f. Child benefit
- g. Housing, or Council tax benefit (GB only) rent or rate rebate (NI only)?
- h. Tax credits?
- i. OTHER
- j. None of these

Participants generally found it easy to recall most of the major benefits they received, for example Child benefit was easily recognised. However, although they might be able to identify the broad category of a benefit, they found it more difficult to identify finer detail. Originally it was felt important to capture those who were receiving income-based jobseeker's allowance and those in receipt of National Insurance-based jobseeker's allowance. However, testing showed that participants were generally not able to distinguish which type they were in receipt of. They were unclear on what the difference between the two benefits were and even with explanation still found it difficult to answer.

In the original question, where benefits were divided into two separate categories, this lack of knowledge around benefit types may have resulted in individuals mistakenly reporting their true situation, as they would see income-based jobseeker's allowance first. The question

was therefore revised to ask about jobseeker's allowance first and then including a follow-up question on whether this was income-based or National Insurance-based. However, this did not solve the problem of participants not understanding the difference between the two.

An added issue here was that the benefits questions asked were not ONS harmonised. In order to provide the opportunity to benchmark and capture the most accurate data the question was replaced with an ONS harmonised version. This has proved easier for participants to understand and has the added benefit of a shorter showcard. Even with this, migrants may misidentify which benefits they are receiving due to a lack of understanding of the benefits system.

Original question: How often, if at all, in the last year have you sent money to friends and/or family in your home country?

Final question: 8.10 Excluding birthday or other gifts, how often, if at all, in the last year have you sent money to friends and/or family in your home country?

Every week, every month, less often, never

When asked the original question, participants tended to include one-off gifts of money they had sent to buy birthday presents for family members, rather than regular remittances. This question was poorly received by a small number of participants, who did not like to be asked about financial matters. Generally, participants were happy to answer both this question and the follow-up asking how much money they had sent. Reasons for sending money home included paying for education and health care, paying back loans, and generally improving the living conditions of family or friends.

Original question: I would now like to ask you some questions about your feelings about different areas. First your local area; how strongly do you feel you belong?

Very strongly, fairly strongly, not very strongly, not at all strongly

Final question: 8.18 I would now like to ask you some questions about your feelings about different areas. First your local area; how strongly do you feel a part of your local area?

Also asked for: England/Scotland, UK and home country.

The original question was taken from the Citizenship Survey, but tested less well with migrants than the general population. The concept of what it meant to 'belong' to a particular area was not widely understood by participants. Some found this question straightforward and felt belonging was about being a part of somewhere, having links, perhaps having family or friends there and knowing something of the culture. Others did not understand what was meant by belonging and could not answer these questions. When asked if they felt a part of somewhere, they found this much easier to understand and, again, spoke of having links and knowing the culture.

Responses to the questions themselves were mixed. Those who had been in the UK for a shorter period tended not to feel strongly that they were a part of the local area or the UK. They felt that this would come with time as they became more familiar with the place and the way of life. Participants in England found the inclusion of a question about feeling a part of England and a question about feeling a part of Scotland somewhat difficult to grasp. They did not always have a full understanding of the make-up of the UK and tended to conflate England and the UK. In contrast, those in Scotland recognised the difference between Scotland and the UK, and in some cases felt more strongly part of Scotland than the UK as a whole.

Deleted questions: Are you actively practising your religion?

How often do you visit a place of worship such as a church or mosque?

Where else, if anywhere, do you practice your religion?

What informs your religious beliefs?

These four questions around religion were all removed after testing poorly. The interpretation of what 'actively practising' a religion meant was very specific to a religion. One Catholic participant spoken to did not consider he actively practised his religion as he did not go to church every week. However, he did pray regularly and observed religious holidays. In contrast, a Muslim participant did not go to a mosque regularly or pray, but did consider herself to actively practise her religion. In addition to this, participants with poorer English language skills did not understand the term 'actively practise' at all.

Similarly, the questions on what informs religious belief and where people practice their religion were poorly understood by participants. The inclusion of showcards for prompts was tested, but participants still found this question too difficult and could not answer.

Two questions which will provide information on how actively participants practice their religion, and what activities they undertake, remain in the questionnaire. These questions are:

Q8.7: Which of the following things do you do at least once a month.

- a. Attend a place of worship, such as a church or a mosque
- b. Visit a community centre
- c. Visit an internet cafe
- d. Attend cultural events
- e. Attend music events
- f. Attend parent and baby/toddler groups
- g. Attend youth club
- h. Go to bars/pubs/clubs
- i. Go to cafes/eat out
- j. Go to the gym/ play sports
- k. OTHER

Q.8.23: What religious activities have you undertaken in the last month? [SHOWCARD]

- a. Praying
- b. Attending religious meetings and study groups
- c. Speaking at religious events
- d. Participating in religious discussions and debates
- e. Reading religious texts
- f. Handing out leaflets/putting up posters to advertise religious groups
- g. OTHER

Deleted question: I'm going to ask you about help and support you have received in the past year [if have not been in the UK for a year ask for 'since you came to the UK']. Please look at this showcard and tell me if you have received any of the following types of help or support in the past year. Please read out the letter for all that apply.

- a. Legal advice
- b. Information about the UK education system
- c. Language (interpretation/translation)
- d. Assistance with finances
- e. Immigration advice
- f. Help looking for work
- g. Help looking for housing
- h. Getting a National Insurance Number
- i. Registering with a GP
- j. Registering with a dentist
- k. Opening a bank account
- l. Accessing English language classes
- m. Accessing Citizenship classes
- n. None of these

This question was removed as participants found it very difficult to understand. It was not clear from the question what sorts of help and support were covered, for example if help from a family member or friend was included. Participants also tended to think back to when they first came to the UK and based their answer on this, rather than thinking about the last year. As a result, the information would not be representative of what support was given to migrants in the last year and would create an image of greater burden than truly exists.

Participants also found reading the long list challenging and did not understand all the items on the list. Given all these problems the decision to remove the question, rather than try to amend it, was taken.

2.7 Questionnaire Section 11: Feelings about yourself and others

Overall findings

This section was created during the testing process to improve the flow of the questionnaire by grouping questions on similar subjects together, and away from other influencing questions. The section asks questions around people's identity, their views on violent extremism and terrorism, and where people get information on news and current affairs from.

The questions contained in this section were particularly challenging for participants and interviewers as they deal with very sensitive issues. Interviewers for both the cognitive testing and the piloting reported that there seemed to be a good deal of social desirability influencing answers, with participants giving the 'right' answer rather than a genuine one requiring careful delivery and amendments to questions in order to help minimise these effects. The questions also require long introductions to familiarise participants with key terms, such as violent extremism, which participants do not always listen to or fully understand.

Questions

Original question: Different people describe themselves in different ways. Which of the following would you say defines your identity – who you are? Please select all that apply.

- a. The country in which you were born
- b. The country in which your parents/family were born
- c. Your home country
- d. The UK
- e. Your nationality
- f. Your ethnicity
- g. Your religion/faith
- h. Your political views
- i. Other (specify)

Final question: 10.1 Looking at the options on this card, which three are most important in shaping your sense of who you are?

- a. The country in which you were born
- b. Your home country
- c. Your ethnic or racial background
- d. Your nationality
- e. Your occupation
- f. Your religion
- g. Your family
- h. Your social class
- i. The country your family came from originally
- j. Your gender
- k. Your age and life-stage
- l. Your level of income
- m. Your level of education

Participants found the initial version of this question very difficult as they did not understand what was meant by 'defines your identity'. Some participants also selected everything on the list, making their choices less meaningful. Although the following question asks people which one of the things they mentioned is most important, the subtlety of the question is still lost.

Some participants also felt the original list was incomplete and felt their gender, income or education was more important.

The amendments to the question improved participants' understanding of it, although those with poorer English language skills do still find it a problematic concept.

New preamble: The following questions are about violent extremism: that is taking actions to cause injury or death to people in order to make a political protest. IF RESPONDENT REQUIRES EXPLANATION OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM: Some examples of violent extremism you may have heard about include letter bomb attacks by animal rights activists or the tube bombings by Islamic fundamentalists in London in 2005. It is when people use extreme violence as a way of getting what they want.

Final question: 10.3 How right or wrong do you think it is for people to use violent extremism in the UK to protest against things they think are very unfair or unjust?

10.4 And how right or wrong do you think people in the UK using violent extremism, in the name of religion, to protest or achieve a goal is?

These questions were taken from the Citizenship Survey. On testing, participants did not always understand what 'violent extremism' was or the difference between this and terrorism. As a result, a preamble was added giving examples of violent extremism to help participants understand the question. Question 10.4 is almost identical in wording and participants did not always pick up on the religion element. This question requires careful delivery and sometimes prompting from the interviewer to ensure participants understand it properly. Participants generally always answered 'always wrong' to these two questions. The one exception was a participant who felt that if your country was under attack then you could defend the country.

Final question: 10.6 The following questions ask your opinions on terrorism, which is often associated with violent extremism. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

- a. My life has been affected by terrorism and the response to it
- b. Terrorism is more of a problem in the UK than in my home country
- c. I would like to make the UK a safer place
- d. Terrorists are criminals
- e. We must continue to fight terrorists who threaten our security and lives
- f. Muslims are unfairly treated because of recent terrorist acts

Originally this question had 11 statements; these were reduced to six key statements for time, understanding and acceptability. When testing the long list of statements, participants found it difficult to distinguish the statements and understand the scale. As there were a mix of positive and negative statements, participants would put themselves on the 'wrong' end of the scale to their true position, saying they strongly disagreed when they strongly agreed, or vice versa.

Participants were generally happy to be asked the questions, although two non-Muslim participants felt they were too critical of Muslims and might be found offensive. Interestingly, one participant strongly disagreed with statement (d) on the grounds that criminals are people who steal, whereas terrorists kill people and are far worse.

Original question: People get information about local and community issues/UK news and current affairs/International news and current affairs in many different ways. From which of these sources do you get information on X?

Final question: 10.7 From the options on this card, can you tell me where you get your information about news and current affairs, for example politics, from?

- a. UK Government
- b. Governments in other countries
- c. UK-based media (e.g. newspapers, TV, websites)
- d. International-based media (e.g. newspapers, TV, websites)
- e. Friends and/or family in the UK
- f. Friends and/or family in other countries
- g. Nobody
- h. Other (specify)

The original version of this question had 18 options for individuals to choose from for each of the three areas. In testing the question took up considerable time and participants' responses were generally uniform over the three areas. The lengthy list was difficult for participants to absorb and understand, and it was not clear that all participants were reading to the end of the list. As a result, the question was simplified to ask generally about news and current affairs and a shorter list developed for the showcard. Participants found this much easier to follow and were able to answer the question more successfully.

2.8 Additional sections

The following sections were not tested to the same extent as earlier sections, due to the majority of questions being pre-existing, harmonised and well tested.

- Education
- Employment - standardised Standard Occupation Classification (SOC) questions have been used here to allow for full analysis if required.

- Health
- Demographics

In addition the following two sections were tested where possible, but routing and the unproblematic nature of the sections mean they were fundamentally unchanged.

- Feelings about your home and local area
- Dependants

Relevant findings on specific questions from these sections are included here.

Questions

Original question: What is the highest qualification you have obtained?

Final question: 5.1 Which phrase on this card comes closest to describing what sort of qualification your highest is?

The original questionnaire asked a series of open questions about education to allow coding after the interview, allowing for complete translation of respondents' qualifications to the UK equivalent. However, participants found being asked the series of open questions difficult and some participants tried to translate their qualifications themselves, or gave incomplete answers to questions such as the institution they got the qualification from. This would make back coding very problematic and introduce flaws in the data. In addition, back coding in this way is a lengthy and expensive process. For this reason, the original questions were replaced with the final version and a showcard, as used in the 4th Survey of Ethnic Minorities.

Original question: What is the main reason you are not currently doing paid work?

- Must complete education
- Looking after the family/home
- Temporarily sick or injured
- Long-term sick or disabled
- Not eligible to work
- Other (specify)

Final question: 6.12 Using this card, which of these descriptions applies to what you have been doing for the last seven days?

- In paid work (or away temporarily) – employee, self-employed
- Unpaid work for your family business
- Unpaid work in kind, e.g. in return for accommodation
- Unpaid or voluntary work, e.g. for a charity, community group
- In education even if on vacation
- Unemployed and actively looking for a job
- Unemployed, wanting a job but not actively looking for a job
- Unemployed, not eligible to work
- Permanently sick or disabled

- j. Retired
- k. In community or military service
- l. Doing housework
- m. Looking after children or other persons
- n. Attending formal English language courses
- o. Informally learning English

Amongst those participants who were not currently working, the most frequent reason for this was that they had been unable to find a job. The original question did not cater for these individuals and did not capture enough information to understand what people who were not working were doing. As a result, the question was replaced with a standard pre-existing question, normally asked of dependants' activities, which includes more scenarios and can distinguish between different types of activity.

Original question: How much do you agree with the following statements?

- a. My employer treats me the same as people from the UK I work with
- b. I am paid less than people from the UK who do the same job
- c. I am paid more than people from the UK who do the same job

Final questions:

6.26 Does your employer treat you better or worse than people from the UK, or about the same?

6.27 And does your employer pay you more or less than people from the UK, or about the same?

Participants found the original wording of this question very difficult to understand, requiring interviewers to repeat the question several times. This question saw many incompletes as participants could not understand the question in order to answer it. As a result, the question was split into two questions with a simple three-point scale, rather than a five-point scale. The reworded question was well received and understood.

Original question: Have you ever been homeless whilst in the UK? (If necessary prompt as sleeping outside on the streets).

Revised question 1: Have you ever been homeless whilst in the UK? That is not having a fixed address or sleeping on the streets.

Final question: 9.8 Have you ever been homeless whilst in the UK? That is not having a fixed address or sleeping on the streets.

Final question: 9.9 Looking at this card, which of these options best describes where you would usually stay the night when you were homeless?

- a. Outside/on the street
- b. In supported accommodation such as sheltered housing, refuge or foyer
- c. In any other temporary accommodation such as Bed and Breakfast (B&B), night shelter
- d. With friends or family
- e. OTHER

Testing of the homelessness question was challenging as the vast majority of participants had never been homeless. Nevertheless, the question here underwent changes in order to improve its ability to capture useful information. It was felt that the first iteration of the question gave too narrow a definition of homelessness, referring only to street homelessness and therefore not capturing migrants who may be staying on a temporary basis with friends, family or are in other temporary accommodation. The definition was therefore widened to include not having a fixed address.

Although this provided a wider definition, it still did not gather any information on exactly where homeless migrants stay. As a result a follow-up question was included to ask where migrants normally spent the night when homeless. It has not been possible to test this follow-up question and this will need to be revisited after a larger pilot survey is conducted.

Deleted question: How satisfied are you with your accommodation?

Very satisfied, fairly satisfied, neither satisfied nor unsatisfied, fairly unsatisfied, very unsatisfied.

This question faced several problems when tested and the decision was taken to remove it. Participants who owned their own home found it strange to be asked this question, as they felt they had the influence over their accommodation. Asylum seeking participants tended to rate their satisfaction highly, which on probing was revealed to be gratitude that they had accommodation, as opposed to real satisfaction with the quality. As a result their responses could not be considered an accurate representation of their views.

**Deleted question: Do you have any of the following problems with your accommodation?
Please read out the letter which corresponds to the problems you have.**

- a. Too small
- b. Too dark, not enough light
- c. Limited heating facilities
- d. Leaky roof
- e. Mould/damp walls, floors, etc.
- f. Rot in windows, frames or floors
- g. Too noisy
- h. Badly furnished
- i. Lack of facilities for disabled persons
- j. Too crowded
- k. Dirty
- l. Distance from local facilities/services

This question was removed in conjunction with the previous question on satisfaction. Again, people who owned their own accommodation found it an inappropriate question to be asked. Some of the terms were not understood by those with poorer English language skills, such as mould and damp and badly furnished.

Original question: In which of these areas is the place you have considered moving to?

- a. Scotland
- b. England
- c. Wales
- d. Northern Ireland
- e. Outside the UK?

Revised question 1: In which of these areas is the place you have considered moving to?

- a. London
- b. Outside London
- c. Other England
- d. Scotland
- e. Wales
- f. Northern Ireland
- g. Outside the UK

Final question: In which of these areas is the place you have considered moving to?

- a. London
- b. Anywhere else in England
- c. Scotland
- d. Wales
- e. Northern Ireland
- f. Outside the UK

This question is asked of individuals who have said they have considered moving to other parts of the UK. In the early stages of questionnaire design a great deal of thought was given to what level respondents should be able to identify the location. Naming towns was considered, but this would provide a great deal of data to code and it was recognised that respondents may not have a particular town in mind. Government Office Region was also considered, but it was felt that migrants may not be familiar with the UK regions and therefore would be unable to answer the question accurately. This question was particularly of interest to the Scottish Government, and it was therefore decided that the minimum information required was intentions to leave or move to Scotland.

In the original draft of the question, the options given were the four regions of the UK. Although this question could not be tested robustly as few participants wished to move, with those it was tested it became clear immediately that an option for London had to be included. This would cover individuals living in London who wished to move outside and those who specifically wished to move to London. Of those interviewed, these were the two responses most commonly received.

The second draft of the question was recognised to be logically inconsistent, as 'Outside London' means the same as every response other than 'London'. In the redraft this was removed.

Final question 13.6 What is your ethnic group?

White

a. Any White backgrounds

Mixed/multiple ethnic groups

b. White and Black Caribbean

c. White and Black African

d. White and Asian

e. Any other mixed/multiple ethnic background (specify)

Asian

f. Indian

g. Pakistani

h. Bangladeshi

i. Chinese

j. Any other Asian background (please specify)

Black African/Caribbean

k. African

l. Caribbean

m. Any other Black African/Caribbean background (please specify)

Other ethnic group

n. Arab

o. Any other ethnic group (please specify)

The Steering Group felt it was important to include a question on ethnicity and that this should be a self-defining question, rather than interviewers coding respondents' ethnicity. How to ask this question of migrants, who would have different understandings of ethnicity and also come from many different ethnic backgrounds, was a difficult issue to address. The concept of ethnicity is a complex one and understood in different ways by different cultures. It can be defined by country of birth, or parental heritage and it can be based on language, religion or skin colour. Research into the area uncovered that there is no universal way of asking about ethnicity. As a result, the standard UK approach was taken as being in keeping with other UK major surveys. Some adaptations were made to it, including removing the specific categories under 'White'. This was done as in a survey of migrants it was felt inappropriate to include these categories. Discussion of whether to include an option to capture migrants from Central and South America was considered, but rejected as it was felt there was not appropriate terminology to do so.

Testing the ethnicity question was challenging and underlined the different ways ethnicity is understood. Some participants were unable to categorise themselves and refused to answer the question. Others gave their nationality as an answer; this was particularly common amongst Turkish respondents. This question should be considered again before the mainstage survey to ensure it is capturing useful information.

2.9 Next steps

Once the feasibility study is completed, and before potentially moving on to a full survey, a full pilot survey is recommended. This will allow for codes to be built for currently open questions and for the survey methods and questionnaire to be tested for workability in the field.

Following agreement of the final questionnaire wording in English, the questionnaire was sent for translation. This was followed by an additional 35 cognitive interviews conducted in the selected languages to test the translation and make changes if required. Findings from the translation process and associated cognitive testing are outlined in section 3 of this report.

3. Cognitive Testing in Translation Report – May 2010

3.1 Introduction

This report documents findings from the cognitive testing of questionnaire translations in 12 different languages. It was recognised that some migrants would not have good enough English to respond to the survey in its English form. Once the English language questionnaire was finalised, the UK Border Agency undertook exploratory work to establish the languages that might be most needed by migrants in the UK. Within the available budget, the steering group agreed upon 12 languages for translation:

Arabic	Bengali	Cantonese/Mandarin
Farsi	French	Gujurati
Polish	Portuguese	Sorani (Kurdish)
Somali	Turkish	Urdu

Translations were conducted by an independent translation agency and these were checked by the Ipsos MORI translation team. Once the translation was confirmed, cognitive testing took place to confirm the accuracy of the translation. The intention behind the translation was to maintain the meaning of the questions, rather than produce a literal translation.

Methodology

Cognitive testing

Cognitive testing aims to ensure that survey questions are interpreted in the way they are intended. It involves carrying out a small number of interviews in which the questions are asked in the usual way but, instead of the answers themselves being important, it is the thought process of the respondent that is of most interest. For each question included in the testing, the interviewers examine, with the respondent, what the question means to them, what made them give the response they gave, and which factors influenced their answer. This technique can identify areas of uncertainty for respondents and gives an opportunity to revise and improve the questions before the survey takes place.

Interviews were conducted by native speakers of the language and participants were also required to be native speakers. Interviews were conducted in a place of the respondent's choosing, whether this was the respondent's home, a local community organisation, or another venue such as a café. Interviews conducted in public places were always done at the respondent's request. Respondents taking part in cognitive testing received £20 in high street vouchers as a thank you for their participation.

Recruitment

In total, 35 interviews took place across 12 languages. The total number of interviews conducted for each language are displayed in the table below. Recruitment was done using face-to-face recruitment and contacts established through recruiters and interviewers. As with the previous round, there was general willingness to participate in the survey. However, recruitment for some languages was more challenging. In particular, recruiting Turkish speaking participants who had arrived since 1990 was difficult, with most contacts approached being Kurdish speaking rather than Turkish.

All testing took place in London between February-March 2010.

Table 2 *Participants and languages for cognitive testing*

Language	Total interviews conducted	Respondent types
Arabic	3	3 x economic migrant
Bengali	2	2 x economic migrant
Cantonese/Mandarin	2	2 x economic migrant
Farsi	3	2 x economic migrant, 1 x refugee
French	5	2 x economic migrant, 3 x asylum seeker
Gujarati	3	3 x economic migrant
Polish	3	3 x economic migrant
Portuguese	2	2 x economic migrant
Sorani (Kurdish)	3	2 x refugee, 1 x asylum seeker
Somali	3	1 x refugee, 2 x economic migrant
Turkish	1	1 x economic migrant
Urdu	3	3 x economic migrant

3.2 Findings

Key findings and actions taken to address them are presented by language. Interviewers worked with the Ipsos MORI translation team to refine the questions and ensure the finalised questionnaire was understandable, while still retaining the same meaning as the English language version.

Arabic

Feedback on the Arabic interviews was generally positive; where problems were reported these were in areas already identified for further investigation in a larger pilot. One general recommendation was the use of English words where this would be more familiar to participants, for example when asking about what level of school their children attend or when talking about Government initiatives.

Q2.3 Using this card, can you tell me how strongly you agreed or disagreed with these statements before coming to the UK? Q2.4 And how strongly do you agree or disagree with these statements now? C. The UK has good job opportunities.

Participants found this question difficult to answer due to their experiences of trying to secure jobs. They were unsure whether to agree or disagree as they had faced difficulties finding work recently and were not sure if this was due to jobs not being available or them looking in the wrong places. There were no problems with the wording of the question, just challenges in securing work caused by the current economic climate.

Q2.9 From these cards, can you tell me what type of visa do you currently hold?

Participants found it somewhat difficult to locate their visa type on the showcards, some of which are very long. Splitting the showcards off may assist with this and it may be appropriate to give English translations alongside to allow for those who may recognise the English ahead of its translation.

Q3.7 The Government has recently announced their proposals for Earned Citizenship, which will require non-UK citizens to ‘earn’ the right to apply for UK Citizenship or permanent residency. Before today, had you heard about the Earned Citizenship proposals?

Participants found this question difficult and did not fully understand it. During the English testing this question was problematic as Earned Citizenship had not been rolled-out and many had not heard of it. When asking the question in translation it may be more appropriate to use the English for ‘Earned Citizenship’ as participants could be more likely to recognise the term in English, although the need for this question would be reviewed in light of policy developments, before being used in any language in a survey of migrants.

Q4.1 How well do you feel you understand the following? A. The application process.

Participants found the first option in this question difficult as they were not immediately certain what application process was being referred to. This was not seen in the English testing, but came up in some interviews in translation. The question is preceded by an introduction explaining the questions are about the immigration system, and in English participants understood the question referred to the visa application process. It may be appropriate to amend the statement to ‘The visa application process’ in all languages to remove any ambiguity.

Q4.3 What improvements might the UK Border Agency make to help people with understanding the immigration rules and restrictions?

In this question ‘UK Border Agency’ had been translated and was not recognised by participants. Names of government organisations should always remain in English as this is likely to be more familiar to participants.

Q5.13 Which phrase on this card comes closest to describing what sort of qualification you are currently studying for?

The translation of qualifications was not always understood by participants; consideration should be given to whether this showcard should be translated, remain in English, or give English and translated terms.

Q11.2 What level of school does your child attend?

Participants found the translation unclear; it may be more appropriate to provide options in English alongside or instead of Arabic.

Q5.1 Which phrase on this card comes closest to describing what sort of qualification your highest is?

Participants were unsure about the options given in this question and chose more than one response. Clear interviewer instructions will be needed to avoid this in the main survey.

Q10.6 The following questions ask your opinions on terrorism, which is often associated with violent extremism. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Generally speaking, participants found these questions uncomfortable, with some answering 'do not know' to all the sub-questions. Some were unwilling to give an explanation or discuss their answers in more detail; others felt the question had political bearings. On statement D, 'Terrorists are criminals', there was discussion over who exactly terrorists were. Was it those who execute explosions to defend their occupied land, as in Palestine?

Statement E says "we must continue to fight terrorists who threaten our security and lives". One participant wondered if it meant instigating attacks on other countries, or just defending the UK and was unable to answer.

These two statements were the most problematic for participants in terms of understanding; the others were felt to be more clear.

Bengali

Few problems were reported with the Bengali questionnaire, with participants generally understanding it well and happy to answer the questions. The main issue identified was that in some cases the English version of a word would be better understood by participants than its English equivalent. This was seen for technical terms such as 'asylum' and 'self-employed', as well as for more everyday terms such as 'voluntary' or 'tourism'. Where an English word would more commonly be used this should be the preferred option.

Chinese

This questionnaire was translated into simplified Chinese script, allowing it to be read out in Mandarin and Cantonese. Overall, the quality of the translation for the Chinese questionnaire was felt to be good and the questions seemed to have worked well with this audience. As with other languages, the recommendation is to include the English version of official terms such as 'visa' and benefit types.

Respondents from the cognitive interviews were able to understand what was being asked. When asked to describe what their understanding of concepts such as 'quality of life' and 'terrorism' was, their description was in line with what would be expected if the interview had been carried out in English instead.

Section 7 – Volunteering

The introduction of section 7 (volunteering) did not work particularly well with this audience. When asked to think about their 'involvement' in groups, organisations or clubs, respondents asked for clarification on what was meant by 'involvement'. Although the translation was accurate, the main issue is that there is not an overarching term for 'involvement' in Chinese. Having said this, respondents were able to identify things they were involved in from the showcard once the questions were asked, so this may not be a problem for the main survey.

Section 8 – Integration: I would now like to talk to you about the public services you use in your local area. By local area I mean the area within 15-20 minutes walking distance from your home.

One of the respondents had problems understanding what her 'local' area was. She found it hard to visualise a 20-minute radius because to her, 20 minutes means going from point A to point B. Covering terms such as this in the interviewers briefing will help interviewers to expand on the explanation in order to allow respondents to visualise the concept.

Violent extremism questions

One participant found the questions about violent extremism and terrorism uncomfortable. She felt they were very sensitive and she ought to have been warned about the nature of the questions at the beginning of the survey.

Showcards

Translating the questionnaire into simplified Chinese worked well. However, the interviewer recommended that the showcards be translated into traditional Chinese as well, as people from Hong Kong and Taiwan may not be able to read simplified Chinese.

Farsi

The feedback on the Farsi interviews was generally positive, although in some places it was felt the translations could be improved by using more common language. Some translations were felt to be too literal, although these were generally where a Farsi equivalent did not exist and, in fact, the English word might be more appropriate.

Q.2.3 Using this card, can you tell me how strongly you agreed or disagreed with these statements before coming to the UK?

The translation for 'The UK offers a good quality of life' given was 'The UK offers a desirable life'. This wording was not well understood by participants and did not seem to reflect the same meaning as the English version. An alternative translation is being substituted to better reflect the concept.

Q9.8 Looking at this card, which of these options best describes where you would usually stay the night when you were homeless?

While the question was understood, the answer options were more complex as the translations were felt to be too literal, losing the meaning, for example ‘sheltered accommodation’. It was felt that there may not be a concept of ‘sheltered accommodation’ in Farsi so providing the English word may be more appropriate.

Q10.1 Looking at the options on this card, which are most important in shaping your sense of who you are?

It was felt that this had been translated too literally and participants found it hard to understand what the question was really asking. The translation is being revisited to provide a more suitable option.

Q13.6 What is your ethnic group?

Participants found it strange to be asked this question and presented with a full showcard when interviewed in their own language, as they felt it was obvious they would generally be of Asian origin.

French

The French questionnaire for economic migrants worked well, and required only minor changes to the text. With asylum seekers the questionnaire was felt to be more challenging, primarily due to the differences in level of education. Asylum seekers found detailed questions more difficult to understand and found the longer showcards more daunting. This fits with previous findings from the English cognitive testing, where those with lower literacy skills found the questionnaire more difficult. The asylum seekers were also more nervous about the interview and the purposes behind it.

As with other interviews, it was felt to be more appropriate to include government bodies’ names in English, along with common benefits and so on.

Q1.11 When you moved to the UK on ... were you: a citizen of the UK only, a citizen of both the UK and another country, a citizen of one or more non-UK countries?

This question was felt to be confusing and had to be repeated before the participants could understand it. The asylum seekers taking part found the question a little offensive, given that they were seeking asylum and therefore could not be UK citizens. Further consideration of this question should be given after the pilot to see if it is collecting the information it should.

Q1.15 Have you claimed asylum at any time during your stay in the UK?

Participants found this a strange question to be asked, as they were EU citizens. However, some UK citizens may have claimed asylum in the past, for example Roma from Eastern Europe, or people from the former Yugoslavia, so routing out EU citizens may not be appropriate.

Q4.3 What improvements might the UK Border Agency make to assist people with understanding the immigration rules and restrictions?

This was felt to be quite a long question and difficult to follow. Asylum seeker respondents did not know how to answer it. Consideration could be given to turning this into a showcard question to help respondents, but this could lead to people choosing all options on the showcard and thus making the information less useful.

Q5.3 Have employers in the UK recognised the qualifications you gained outside the UK?

Participants found it hard to judge their answer for this question, as it was not always immediately obvious to them if employers really understood their qualifications or not.

Q8.1 Please indicate how often you or your family have used the following public services in your local area.

During the asylum seeker interviews, the interviewer felt it was not appropriate to begin with asking about the police service, as the participants were nervous about the interview. Amending the order of this question may be appropriate, to avoid alienating participants.

Q10.1 Looking at the options on this card, which three are most important in shaping your sense of who you are?

The asylum seeker respondents struggled with this question and did not entirely understand the concept behind it. The translation was felt to be problematic so this has been amended, but close attention still needs to be paid to this question during the pilot to ensure it is working.

Gujarati

Three interviews were conducted with Gujarati speaking economic migrants. Generally the questionnaire worked well, with a few areas where translation required improvement.

Key issues:

The word used for 'asylum' was not generally understood by respondents and was also not one the interviewer recognised. The feeling was it may be too high level, although a more appropriate term was not immediately apparent to the interviewer or participants. A potential solution to this may be to instruct interviewers in the main survey to use the English term if Gujarati is not understood. Asylum is likely to be a phrase understood even by non-English speakers if they have come to the UK to claim asylum.

Q1.12 Can you tell me what other countries you have spent at least a month in during the last five years?

Participants found this question confusing as it seemed to assume they would have spent time somewhere else. This was not a problem seen in the English cognitive testing or piloting. It may be beneficial to look at this again following a larger pilot.

Q. 5.1 Which phrase on this card comes closest to describing what sort of qualification your highest is?

The current question gives 'undergraduate degree' as the option with 'Bachelors degree' as an example in brackets. 'Bachelors degree' is the term more easily understood by Gujarati speakers so it may be advisable to put this option first.

Q.8.13 To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?

While the translation for this was accurate, some participants found it a little difficult to answer. The language used is quite formal and a more colloquial format may be better received. The translators will be asked to look again at this question and see if they can agree on alternative wording, which maintains the meaning of the question but is more accessible.

Q. 8.23 What religious activities have you undertaken in the last month?

All three respondents gave an answer for this that is not currently included as a code, so was recorded under 'other'. This was the Hindu concept of 'Darshan'. This was explained as referring to being in the presence of God in a holy space, like a temple, although it can also be used to describe a small shrine in the home. It is not praying and most Hindus would not put it in that category as they are not actually performing any kind of prayer, just going to a holy place and receiving a blessing by being there. It is one of the primary religious activities of Hindus. The interviewer suggested that in English it might be described as 'Visiting / spending time at a place of worship' and translated to 'Darshan' for the Gujarati version.

In addition, participants were not clear whether 'attending religious meetings and study groups' was meant to include religious services. The inclusion of the additional code would perhaps clarify this and could be tested in a larger pilot. The change would require adjustments made to all translations as well as the English questionnaire.

Q10.1 Looking at the options on this card, which three are most important in shaping your sense of who you are?

Although the translation for this question was felt to be good, the participants still struggled to answer it. They found the concept challenging, which reflects issues seen in the cognitive testing of the English questionnaire. Participants tended to name their ethnic or racial background and their ethnicity as important. Given the focus of the questionnaire on coming to the UK and nationality, there is the potential that participants' answers are being influenced by other content. It was also noted that there is no 'other' category for participants to specify an option not given on the card.

Kurdish Sorani

The Kurdish Sorani translated questionnaire was generally well understood by participants. Some changes in language were made to improve understanding. This was generally required where the initial language used was too formal and a simpler, more widely understood alternative was available.

Q2.16 What is your immigration status?

This question is asked of refugees and in translation was challenging to answer, as the participant was more familiar with the English terms. It is therefore recommended that the English options be included on the showcard.

Q4.6 Have you received any of the following benefits? National Asylum Support Service/ NASS support, Refugee Integration and Employment Service/RIES support.

The participant had not heard of the Refugee Integration and Employment Service before, but was familiar with NASS.

Q5.1 Which phrase on this card comes closest to describing what sort of qualification your highest is?

Although participants were able to answer this question, option E, 'trade apprenticeship', was not understood as the concept does not exist in Kurdish Sorani.

Q6.30 Do you think you were unsuccessful or turned down for a job because of any of the reasons on this card?

Participants were not familiar with the phrase used for 'sexual orientation' and the concept was felt not to translate simply into Kurdish Sorani. This is being looked at again by the translation team to arrive at a suitable phrasing.

Polish

The Polish questionnaire tested well, with only small changes required to use a more commonly understood word.

Q9.5 Of the people who live in this property, how many of them are: friends known to you before you moved in to the property; friends unknown to you before you moved in to the property; unknown to you.

Participants queried the use of the word 'friend' in this question. The translation used implied a very close level of friendship and it was felt did not reflect the friendship someone might have with a person who they had not known before living with them. An alternative word was suggested which still conveyed friendship, without the additional context of depth or length of friendship.

Q10.6 The following questions ask your opinions on terrorism, which is often associated with violent extremism. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements? A. My life has been affected by terrorism and the response to it.

Participants were generally willing to answer the questions on violent extremism. However, this question led to participants querying whose responses were being referred to, whether it was theirs, the UK Government's, or some other response.

Portuguese

Generally speaking the Portuguese cognitive interviews did not result in substantial issues. However, there were some minor issues with the translation, mainly where more common words could be used. There were also challenges around the difference between Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese, with some words not being understood in both. These are being reviewed by the translators to see if common words can be found.

Q1.3 What other nationalities have you had?

As occurred in some other languages, for example Turkish, the word for 'Citizenship' is more commonly used than 'nationality' and would make a better alternative. While in the English translation 'Citizenship' was not well understood, for some native languages it is a better term.

Q1.6 When did you leave...?

On this question the option to specify winter, spring, summer or autumn is given. However, one respondent pointed out that seasons do not happen at the same time of year across the world. Spring in Brazil does not match to spring in the UK. She was therefore unsure whether the question was asking what the season would have been in the UK, the country she had left, or the country she was going to. As this will be a general problem it is recommended that these options be removed from the questionnaire. The calendar provides a sufficient memory jog to not require an additional one.

Q1.11 When you moved to the UK on ... were you a citizen of the UK only, a citizen of both the UK and another country, a citizen of one or more non-UK countries?

The Portuguese word used for 'moved' was equivalent to 'migrated'. One participant felt that she had not migrated as she had only come to study. The translation will be revisited, but this comment is interesting in any case as it suggests a potential difference between students and workers, which may become more apparent during a pilot.

Somali

The cognitive interviews in Somali did not highlight any problems with the translation and questions were generally understood by participants. The interviewer felt that, although the translation could not be improved, the questions themselves were complex and would be difficult for Somalis with less education to answer, whether in Somali or English. Indeed one older participant did find the questionnaire very challenging. However, in the English round of testing a good number of Somalis, from differing educational backgrounds were interviewed, and found the questionnaire straightforward. In addition, the other participants interviewed in Somali found the questions easy to answer. It is therefore suggested that the questionnaire should continue in its current format.

Turkish

Recruitment for the cognitive testing in Turkish was very challenging, as mentioned in the introduction. Recruiters reported that the majority of potential respondents they spoke to had either arrived before 1990, or were Kurdish speaking. Local community organisations were approached for their assistance, but they reported the same pattern of migration and were unable to source potential participants. As a result, the decision was taken not to conduct interviews in Turkish. Instead, the questionnaire was given to an additional translator to check through and comment on the language used.

Urdu

Cognitive testing in Urdu revealed some issues with the formality of the language used in the translation. In several instances it was felt that Urdu speakers would generally use an English word, with its Urdu equivalent being too formal and only used by very highly educated people. In some cases, the translation used had additional connotations that made it unsuitable for inclusion.

Q5.1 Which phrase on this card comes closest to describing what sort of qualification your highest is?

As with some other languages, it was felt that here the English terms might be more appropriate. In particular, the Urdu translation for 'degree' is rarely used, with people generally using the English.

Q8.4 In the week ending Sunday the [xxx], were you claiming any State benefits or tax credits (including State pension, Allowances, Child benefit or National Insurance credits)?

The translation used for 'tax' in this question was felt not to be suitable as it has additional connotations of protection money given to mafia-style organisations. An alternative was suggested, and again the English term was felt to be well understood.

3.3 Next steps

Following the cognitive testing in translation, suggested changes were agreed and incorporated by the interviewers and Ipsos MORI translation team. However, prior to conducting a main stage survey, it is recommended that a pilot of approximately 200 interviews be conducted to fully test the questionnaire. Translated versions may then need to be revisited to address any issues raised in the pilot or changes to the English questionnaire.

The recommendations made after the English cognitive testing also apply to the translated questionnaires. Additional key recommendations from this round of cognitive testing are as follows.

- English options should be provided where this is likely to be more recognisable to participants, for example, in qualifications, immigration terms, benefits, and school levels. This may require providing English showcards in addition to translations, or including interviewer instructions.
- The showcards for the Chinese translation should be made available in Mandarin and Cantonese.
- Further consideration of how to present the questions on violent extremism, particularly to those with Muslim backgrounds, is required.