



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

Citation for published version:

Bond, R 2011, 'The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland: Anticipating the 2011 Census', *Scottish Affairs*, vol. 75, pp. 1-24.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Scottish Affairs

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Bond, R. (2011). The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland: Anticipating the 2011 Census. *Scottish Affairs*, 75, 1-24

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



THE NATIONAL IDENTITIES OF MINORITIES IN SCOTLAND: ANTICIPATING THE 2011 CENSUS

Ross Bond¹

The 2011 Census in Scotland included, for the first time, a question on national identity, and this new question was also introduced in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. This article anticipates the kind of data that might be yielded by this new question, most specifically in relation to Scotland's minority ethnic and religious groups. It is with respect to these minorities that the new data offer most research potential, and the decision to introduce the question also appears to be strongly related to the identities of these groups. This article will provide some brief background on the gestation of the new question before considering what the data it will produce might add to our existing knowledge of minority identities in Scotland. It will then introduce an existing data source that can be used to provide some indication of the shape that these data are most likely to take. The analysis will contextualise the national identities of minorities in Scotland through direct comparison with England. It will suggest that the specific national context (i.e. Scotland or England), the specific national identity (Scottish, English or British) and individuals' birthplace (in Scotland/England or overseas) are the three key factors underlying minority national identities.

THE 2011 CENSUS QUESTION ON NATIONAL IDENTITY

The recent UK Census of population was conducted on Sunday 27 March 2011². The content of the Census changes across time in response to social and

¹ *Ross Bond is a Lecturer in Sociology in the School of Social and Political Science, University of Edinburgh.*

Scottish Affairs

demographic change and the requirements of those who use the data. An area that has seen notable change across recent censuses is that relating to the ethnic and national origins of the population. A question to ascertain people's country of birth has been a long-established feature of the Census and while this has remained important (not least as a means of analysing migration to and within the UK) it became an increasingly unsatisfactory proxy indicator of ethnicity as more and more people in minority ethnic groups were born in the UK. In response, a specific question on ethnicity was introduced for the first time in 1991. This was followed by the introduction of a question on religion in 2001 in Scotland and in England and Wales (a question on religion had been asked in previous censuses in Northern Ireland). The 2001 data on ethnicity in Scotland showed that almost exactly 2% of the population were not in one of the white ethnic groups, with Pakistani being the largest non-white ethnic group (0.63% overall). A broadly similar overall proportion (1.87%) professed to belong to any non-Christian religion, with Muslims (0.84%) being the largest of these groups (General Register Office for Scotland 2003). For the 2011 Census, in all parts of the UK the questions on ethnicity and religion were supplemented by a question on national identity.

While this question will provide an additional means of assessing the national identities of the wider population, arguably it is at this general level where it is needed least. A number of social and political surveys based on sizeable samples of the population have, since around the 1990s, consistently included questions on national identity. These include the British and Scottish Social Attitudes Surveys, British Election Studies, Northern Ireland Life and Times Surveys, Wales Life and Times Studies, Labour Force Surveys, Citizenship Surveys and British Household Panel Surveys. However, these surveys have been less useful in enabling analysis of national identities among minority ethnic groups. This limitation has been particularly acute in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, where, compared to England, survey sample sizes are generally lower and minority populations are smaller both in absolute and proportionate terms. The greater preponderance of people in minority ethnic categories in England also sometimes enables boosted samples from these

² *Formally, separate censuses are conducted in England and Wales (by the Office for National Statistics), Scotland (by the General Register Office for Scotland) and Northern Ireland (by the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency). However, as well as taking place on the same day, the nature of the data collected varies little between the different censuses.*

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

groups (such as the 1997 British Election Study and the annual Citizenship Surveys). But, given the considerable diversity of minorities, even the larger samples in surveys in England are often not adequate for the analysis of national identities among these groups.

It is not surprising, then, that documentation relating to the development of question content for the 2011 Census suggests that the impetus to include a question on national identity was closely related to the issue of ethnicity, and most specifically to minority ethnicity. The Scottish Government and General Register Office for Scotland's review of ethnicity classification for the 2011 Census, for example, in its discussion of why a question on national identity was also being developed, argued that 'For many (but not all) people, national identity is closely related to ethnicity' (Scottish Government and General Register Office for Scotland 2008, p. 10). It also stressed that for minorities in particular, it was important that the Census addressed both ethnicity and national identity:

Asking a national identity question before an ethnicity question helps to ensure that all people living in Scotland can express their national identity – be that 'Scottish', 'British' or any other national identity – without that becoming confused with their ethnic origin or heritage. This is particularly important for people born in Scotland or who have been living in Scotland a long time, whose parents or grandparents are not born in the UK. For example, many people with an 'Asian' or an 'African', 'Caribbean' or 'Black' ethnicity also have a strong 'Scottish' or 'British' identity. (ibid. 2008, p. 10)

Similarly, the Office for National Statistics' (ONS) discussion of the origins and development of the national identity question for the Census in England and Wales noted that the demand for the question had originated in part from a desire to 'improv[e] the acceptability of the ethnic group question' (2009, p. 4). It is also revealing that this document notes that a majority of respondents to the ONS's consultation on ethnicity, identity, language and religion in the Census 'expressed a requirement for information on national identity' (2009, p. 4), and that demand had been strongest from local and regional government. These conclusions reflect an earlier report by the ONS (2007) on the results of this consultation. Among the reasons behind the expressed requirement for a question on national identity were the desire 'to gain a better understanding of local populations and communities' and 'to provide a measure of community cohesion' (2007, p. 44). It was also believed that the question might encourage

Scottish Affairs

response from British-born people from minority ethnic groups who wanted to distinguish between their national identity and ethnic background.

The national identity question used in the Census in Scotland was ‘What do you feel is your national identity?’. It should be noted that this question wording differs somewhat from the Census question used in other parts of the UK (‘How would you describe your national identity?’). Indeed the ‘describe’ version was also used in the 2009 Census Rehearsal in Scotland. The decision to use the ‘feel’ version may be related to pre-testing of the national identity question carried out by Ipsos MORI (see Ipsos MORI 2009). People in each part of the UK were presented with five explicit options (six in Northern Ireland): English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish and British. There was also an ‘Other’ category with space to write in the specific identity³. The initial question was followed by an explicit instruction to ‘tick all that apply’ so that people could express dual or multiple national identities if they so wished.

Having reviewed the origins and nature of the Census question on national identity and noted its potential value for research concerning minority groups, we now consider how the data this will create might articulate with previous research in this area, especially in Scotland.

MINORITIES AND NATIONAL IDENTITIES IN SCOTLAND (AND ENGLAND)

Quantitative survey-based analysis of national identities among minority groups in Scotland is rare, not only because of the aforementioned difficulties in accessing adequate samples but also due to a wider neglect of smaller nations like Scotland in research concerning minority ethnicity and religion and a tendency to conflate larger national and state territories such as England/Britain (Virdee et al 2006; Hopkins 2008; cf. Rex 1996). One may, for example, highlight recent quantitative research which considers the relationship between state and supra-state identification among minorities in

³ *The additional explicit option in Northern Ireland was Irish. The order of these categories varied across the different UK territories: in England, English came first, in Scotland, Scottish etc. In Northern Ireland, British was the first named category, whereas in the other territories it was the penultimate category (before Other). Previous research has noted that the order in which national identities are listed may affect response (ONS 2009).*

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

the UK but pays no heed to the possibility of sub-state variation (Cinnirella and Hamilton 2007), or which putatively concerns 'ethnic minority national identification in Britain' but is in fact based on data which completely excludes Scotland (Maxwell 2009, p. 1454).

However, this does not mean that no relevant research has been conducted in Scotland – far from it. While the sample sizes in surveys such as Scottish Social Attitudes (typically around 1,500 people) preclude much meaningful analysis of national identities *among* minorities, a number of questions employed in this survey in recent years have explored the views of the overall population concerning whether certain minorities should be able to identify as Scottish (Bond 2006; Bond and Rosie 2006; McCrone and Bechhofer 2008, 2010). Studies such as these show that place of birth is a particularly important 'marker' of national identity. The national self-identification of minorities has also been addressed by Hussain and Miller's research among 'ethnic Pakistanis' (2006, p. 23) in Scotland. Unusually for Scottish-based research in this area, this also included a substantial quantitative element of over 700 telephone survey interviews. Their findings suggested that identification as Scottish is common among this group, which substantiates an earlier qualitative study among similar (albeit younger) respondents (Saeed et al 1999). Hussain and Miller (*ibid.*) propose that one of the reasons for this is that Pakistanis' primary identities are less territorially-centred and more cultural/religious.

Qualitative research in an ethnically-diverse Glasgow neighbourhood by Virdee and his colleagues (Virdee et al 2006; Kyriakides et al 2009) focused on Asian Muslims and found that 'race' did not exclude people from choosing to identify as Scottish. However, they also acknowledge the existence of a racialised discourse of the nation 'that draws on historical constructions of Scottishness as white' (Virdee et al 2006, section 3.14). Minority identification as Scottish is not necessarily straightforward and it may be difficult for minorities to feel 'fully Scottish'. The reasons why this is so include the extent to which historical images of Scotland are 'bound-up with Whiteness' (Penrose and Howard 2008, pp. 100-101); the perceived views of the white majority (Hussain and Miller 2006, p. 151); and the cultural practices of (some) minorities which set them apart from more conventional perceptions of Scottishness, together with a more general 'sense of social difference or distance from "Scottish people"' (Qureshi and Moores 1999, p. 321; see also Hopkins 2007, p. 71). It is important to note that most of these conclusions are based on research which is focused on one particular minority group and/or geographical area, and a broader comparative perspective on minority

Scottish Affairs

identification in Scotland is thus lacking. This is where the new Census question will be particularly valuable in Scotland in that it will enable comparison of national identities across various minority groups living in different parts of Scotland.

Hopkins (2008, p. 120) has drawn an explicit comparison between the considerable degree to which ethnic minorities in Scotland identify as Scottish and the more ambivalent perspectives of minorities in England towards Britishness and Englishness. However, when considering national identities among minorities it is important that these 'state' and 'sub-state' national identities are teased apart. The 'fuzziness' of British identity highlighted by Cohen (1994, p. 7) partly relates to whether Britishness was and is inclusive or exclusive of those of a non-white ethnic background. Prior to the mid-twentieth century, legal conceptions of Britishness were in many ways multi-racial and multi-national, such that early post-1948 migrants from the Empire/Commonwealth could claim to be just as British as the 'indigenous' British population, regardless of race (Goulbourne 1991, p. 91; Cohen 1994, p. 6). Moreover, this mass migration in itself undermined the notion that Britishness was essentially a white identity (Cohen *ibid.*, p. 18). However, more exclusive conceptions of Britishness also relate, paradoxically, to the imperial legacy, in that Britishness was partly defined in contradistinction to those 'alien' peoples who became part of the overseas empire (Colley 1992; Jacobson 1997a, p. 197). Goulbourne (1991, p. 122) argues that migrants to the UK from the (former) colonies 'find themselves still effectively excluded from membership of the nation', principally because of ethnic conceptions of the British nation, and others have argued that this exclusion extends to the British-born offspring of these immigrants (Gilroy 1987, p. 46).

The ambiguity of British identity is also highlighted by Jacobson's 'boundaries of Britishness' (1997a, p. 188). The 'civic' boundary relates to citizenship, and is relatively inclusive of minorities although somewhat lacking in emotional depth. It is what we might call a formal-legal sense of Britishness. Jacobson's 'racial' boundary is defined on the basis of (perceived) ancestry or 'blood' (*ibid.*, p. 188), and is more exclusive because '... a non-white skin may be regarded as a definitive indicator of a lack of British ancestry' (*ibid.*, p. 191). The third, 'cultural' boundary, which relates to values and lifestyle (*ibid.*, p. 188) is more ambiguous with respect to its in/exclusive character. While some minorities will feel that their cultural and religious practices problematise identification as British, especially for those who have been socialised in

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

Britain there is often a sense that, in some contexts at least, their lifestyle and values define them as British (ibid, p. 195).

It is commonly argued that, compared to Britishness, Englishness has a more unequivocally 'ethnic' or 'racial' nature which tends to exclude those who are not white, even when they were born in England (Jacobson 1997a; Ifekwunigwe 2001; McCrone 2002; Modood 2001). Condor and her colleagues, however, argue that constructions of Englishness may (similarly to Britishness) be subject to civic or ethnic conceptions (2006, p. 129). They also highlight the contextual employment of identities in that even respondents who do not identify as English on principle will at other times discursively include themselves in the English nation (ibid., pp. 138-44).

The degree to which people in minority ethnic groups identify as Scottish, British or English might also be expected to vary according to their other cultural attributes (and indeed other attributes, such as their length of residence in Scotland or their language competencies). This is a question which is highly relevant to the group who have tended to dominate contemporary debates concerning national belonging, ethnicity and religion in Britain: Muslims. Ansari (2004, p. 9) argues that '... Muslim identity in Britain is being constructed very much against a background of negative perceptions about who and what Muslims are. It is evolving as an identity of "unbelonging" ... in contest with hegemonic British identity'. A further reason why we might expect weak identification with state and/or sub-state national identities among Muslims relates to traditional Muslim rejection of nationalism in favour of a more global religious identification (Jacobson 1997b, p. 245; Werbner 2000, p. 314). However, once more there is some evidence to suggest that Muslims in Scotland may be more ready to identify in national terms (Virdee et al 2006, section 5.2; Hopkins 2007, p. 70; Kyriakides et al 2009, p. 296).

Research concerning the national identities of other prominent UK minorities has been largely confined to England and is rare in Scotland, reflecting the size and structure of Scotland's minority population (Hopkins 2008, pp. 116-117). Research on Sikhs (Hall 1995, p. 249) and Hindus (Raj 2000, p. 551) presents the familiar observations that British and English identification is limited by their continuing association with white, 'Anglo-Saxon' characteristics. In Hall's words, even for young Sikhs socialised in England, '... to become English is to attempt to become what one never can be' (1995, p. 260). The Chinese have tended to attract less attention from researchers (Parker 1994, p. 621; Song 1997, p. 345), but Song's work with young people of Chinese origin shows that although often born and brought up in Britain, their physical

Scottish Affairs

appearance and cultural stereotypes will limit the degree to which identification as British or English is possible in the eyes of the white majority (Song 1997, 2003).

INVESTIGATING MINORITY NATIONAL IDENTITIES USING THE ANNUAL POPULATION SURVEY

The data that will result from the new question on national identity in the 2011 Census will allow a more comprehensive investigation and comparison of patterns of national identification among these minority groups in Scotland and England than has been possible before (and indeed in Wales and Northern Ireland, which have not been considered in the above review). But these data will probably not be available before late 2012 at the earliest. While no existing data sources for Scotland offer the same research potential, in anticipation of the Census data and what it might show we can turn to a particular data source which, although it has some limitations which will be discussed later, can be used as an indicative means of investigating minority national identities in Scotland and comparing these directly with England.

The UK Annual Population Survey (APS), conducted by the ONS, brings together the Labour Force Survey (LFS), the Local LFS (in England), the Welsh LFS and the Scottish LFS. Although these surveys have a 'panel' element in that the same respondents are interviewed at quarterly intervals over a period of one year, APS data are supplied in the form of an annually representative sample, in which each respondent is represented only once. Initial analysis is based on the period January-December 2008 (Office for National Statistics 2010b). Due to the large sample size⁴ the APS enables the analysis of small sub-groups of the population such as ethnic and religious minorities. However, even these large samples do not circumvent the problem of small minority populations in Scotland, often because certain groups which are quite prevalent in England (such as Black Caribbeans or British-born Bangladeshis) are largely absent north of the border.

The APS includes the question 'What do you consider your national identity to be?'. This is not identical to the 2011 Census questions but it is of a very similar nature. The explicit response categories are also very similar, with the

⁴ For APS January-December 2008 there were more than 250,000 cases in England and nearly 50,000 in Scotland.

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

exception that Irish rather than Northern Irish is offered. Indeed, the APS/LFS question was one of those tested for the 2011 Census. The reason for its rejection in favour of the alternative wording does not appear to be related to any fundamental methodological problems, but the rather more mundane issue of space. The reason for offering Northern Irish rather than Irish is related to a desire for consistency and a recognition that, for a UK Census, identities specifically related to all four UK territories should be offered (ONS 2009). A more general issue is whether it is ever methodologically robust to explore national identity in this rudimentary, one-question, fashion. Condor et al (2006, pp. 125-6, 150) question survey-based research which takes self-categorisation as British, English etc. at face value rather than recognising the flexibility which is inherent in the conception and employment of such terms. Hopkins (2007, pp. 66-67) makes a similar argument concerning the diversity in understandings of Scottishness. The fact that following extensive consultation and testing the ONS and the parallel agencies in Scotland and Northern Ireland have concluded that a question of this sort on national identity would represent a robust and valuable addition to the Census does offer some methodological vindication for this approach, but of course the great advantage that the Census (and surveys more generally) confer in terms of the breadth of their coverage among the population is inevitably achieved at the expense of depth. These limitations should certainly be borne in mind when interpreting quantitative data on national identities.

A further limitation that has to be dealt with when analysing APS data on national identity is that these include 'proxy' data in that some respondents answer the national identity question on behalf of others in their household (predominantly, but not exclusively, children and young people under sixteen). Since the validity of at least some of these responses will be doubtful, analysis here is based only on data that relate to personal responses regarding people's own national identities. Unfortunately, this reduces the sample sizes of the various minorities still further. Particularly with respect to the Scottish data, in some instances this means the number of respondents in some categories is very small indeed and thus potential sampling error is large. Hence it is important to stress that these data must be interpreted with great caution and that they only provide an indication of likely patterns of national identity across minority populations in Scotland. The Census will provide much more reliable data.

However, this does not mean that the APS data are without value. Although sample sizes for minority ethnic groups in Scotland are generally small, in at

Scottish Affairs

least some instances they are far from trivial. Further, data from England are often based on larger and more reliable samples, and where consistent and substantial differences between Scotland and England are repeatedly observed, this might provide a good indication of differences that are likely to be found in the larger Census. One way in which we can attempt to mitigate the limitations of the data and increase the robustness of our conclusions is to analyse data for more than one APS. The initial findings from the 2008 APS were therefore compared with APS data from *two* earlier periods (January-December 2004 and 2006) (Office for National Statistics 2008, 2010a). In the discussion below, unless otherwise stated, the data from the other surveys are broadly consistent with the data for APS 2008.

We begin by comparing national identification in Scotland and England for different ethnic groups, displaying data separately for those born in Scotland/England and those born overseas. This is repeated for different religious groups. All analysis is based on weighted data but quoted sample sizes are unweighted.

Ethnicity, birthplace and national identity in Scotland and England

Tables 1 and 2 show identification as Scottish/English and/or British, or as neither, for different ethnic groups, displaying data separately for those born outside the UK and Ireland (table 1) and those born in Scotland/England (table 2). To aid comparison the figures for Scotland are shown followed by the corresponding figure for England in brackets. Many ethnic groups are excluded from the tables. The various 'Other' categories (Other White, Other Mixed, Other Asian, Other Black and Other) have been omitted in order to simplify the analysis and also because the inevitable heterogeneity of these groups makes it difficult to draw any specific conclusions about them. Also excluded are those groups where there were 5 or fewer respondents in Scotland, since these do not provide data of much value. Hence in table 1 the various 'Mixed' ethnic groups are excluded (White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, and White and Asian), as are Bangladeshi and Black Caribbean. All these groups are also excluded from table 2, and so too is Black African. A final preliminary point is that dual identification as both Scottish or English and British is generally very low in this survey⁵ and data are not presented separately for

⁵ *Dual identification is only around 8 per cent in both Scotland and England and tends to be much lower among minority ethnic groups. Other surveys such as the British and*

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

those who chose both 'sub-state' and 'state' identities. This means that the row percentage totals in each category often exceed 100.

Table 1
Ethnic group and national identity in Scotland (England) for those born overseas only

		Scottish (English)	British	Neither	<i>N</i>
(White) British	%	54 (31)	41 (63)	11 (11)	450 (2,701)
Indian	%	9 (5)	23 (56)	68 (40)	56 (1,830)
Pakistani	%	25 (6)	41 (67)	35 (28)	35 (901)
Black African	%	16 (4)	13 (40)	71 (57)	36 (1,261)
Chinese	%	15 (2)	28 (37)	57 (61)	51 (421)

Source: Annual Population Survey January-December 2008 ('Personal Responses' only – i.e. excluding proxy data)

Table 2
Ethnic group and national identity in Scotland (England) for those born in Scotland (England) only

		Scottish (English)	British	Neither	<i>N</i>
(White) British	%	86 (69)	25 (41)	* (1)	21,050 (107,231)
Indian	%	41 (14)	58 (81)	5 (8)	10 (641)
Pakistani	%	44 (12)	59 (86)	4 (6)	19 (497)
Chinese	%	58 (12)	41 (79)	13 (11)	7 (93)

Source: Annual Population Survey January-December 2008 ('Personal Responses' only – i.e. excluding proxy data)

* < 0.5%

Scottish Social Attitudes surveys consistently show much higher levels of dual identification.

Scottish Affairs

The tables show that in all ethnic groups where sample sizes in Scotland are sufficient to allow comparison, levels of Scottish identification are notably higher than English identification. For those in the minority ethnic groups (i.e. excluding the White British) differences between Scotland and England are most evident among those born in Scotland/England. *British* identification is much higher in England than in Scotland among comparable ethnic groups. To some extent, this relates to the low levels of dual identification in both countries, such that if people are not identifying as Scottish/English they will be much more likely to identify as British, and vice versa. But it also shows that the proportion of those choosing neither national identity is low, at least among those born in Scotland/England. As this point suggests, a second clear finding from comparing the tables is that birthplace is important, especially in Scotland. Levels of Scottish identification are markedly higher among the Scottish-born compared to the overseas-born in all minority ethnic groups where comparisons are possible. This is true to a much more limited extent with respect to English identification in England. Previous research that suggests that Englishness is a more 'ethnicised' identity (Jacobson 1997a; Ifekwunigwe 2001; McCrone 2002; Modood 2001) is substantiated in that even among those born in England, only small minorities of those in minority ethnic groups identify as English.

A third finding we may draw from these tables is that British identification is more weakly associated with birthplace, especially in England. Aside from the majority White group, levels of *British* identification among the *overseas*-born in England are much higher than levels of *English* identification among the *English*-born. Overall, it seems that ethnic minorities in England often feel able to include themselves within the 'boundaries of Britishness'. Further analysis of national identities by *citizenship* in England for those born overseas suggests that the 'civic boundary' may be very important. Seventy-four per cent of those who have British citizenship identify as British, compared to 12 per cent who do not have British citizenship. The modest sample sizes for minority groups in Scotland, and the fact that levels of British identification overall are much lower than in England, makes it more difficult to draw firm conclusions with respect to the impact of birthplace on British identification in Scotland. Indeed looking across all three APS surveys, it is harder to identify strictly consistent patterns. One consistent similarity with England is that with the (marginal) exception of Black Africans in 2008, the overseas-born are more likely to identify as British than they are Scottish/English. To some degree citizenship also has a similar effect on identification as in England, although a clear difference remains that in Scotland, even taking citizenship into account,

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

British identification overall is much lower, and Scottish (as opposed to English) identification much higher. Of the overseas-born who also have British citizenship, 48 per cent identify as British (and a further 48 per cent as Scottish), whereas of those who do not have British citizenship only 5 per cent identify as British (11 per cent Scottish).

Finally, national identities do vary between specific minority ethnic groups in at least some respects. This variation seems most obvious with regard to Scottish rather than English identity, with, e.g., overseas-born Pakistanis somewhat more likely to identify as Scottish than are their Indian counterparts. Among the overseas-born, Pakistanis are also more likely to identify as British than are those in other ethnic groups in both Scotland and England.

Religion, birthplace and national identity in Scotland and England

Tables 3 and 4 present data on religion and national identities, once more differentiating by birthplace by showing data separately for those born overseas (table 3) and those born in Scotland/England (table 4). As noted above, of particular interest here is whether Muslims will be less likely to identify as Scottish, English or British than will other minorities. Looking first at table 3, compared to overseas-born people as a whole, Muslims are marginally less likely to identify as Scottish, but they are *more* likely to identify as British and less likely to choose neither identity. British identification in APS 2004 data is similar but in 2004 overseas-born Muslims were much less likely to identify as Scottish (both in absolute and comparative terms) than they were in 2006 and 2008.

The proportion of Muslims choosing neither national identity in 2004 was also marginally higher than respondents overall, although still lower than some other minority religious groups such as Hindus and Sikhs. So although the data are not entirely consistent, they do not suggest that Muslims are markedly less likely to identify as Scottish and/or British. In England, although identification as English among overseas-born Muslims is somewhat lower than overseas-born respondents in general, it is similar to that in the other (predominantly) Asian religious groups. Muslim identification as British is relatively high and they are less likely than overseas-born respondents as a whole to identify as neither English nor British.

Scottish Affairs

Table 3
Religion and national identity in Scotland (England) for those born overseas only.

		Scottish (English)	British	Neither	<i>N</i>
Christian	%	25 (11)	18 (35)	59 (56)	744 (7,824)
Buddhist	%	5 (4)	48 (31)	47 (66)	14 (264)
Hindu	%	1 (4)	29 (51)	70 (46)	36 (1,164)
Jewish	%	41 (8)	46 (51)	14 (43)	8 (134)
Muslim	%	22 (4)	29 (53)	50 (43)	64 (2,777)
Sikh	%	15 (5)	47 (63)	38 (32)	10 (435)
None	%	32 (12)	24 (34)	48 (56)	238 (1,741)
All	%	25 (9)	22 (40)	56 (52)	1,132 (14,625)

Source: Annual Population Survey January-December 2008 ('Personal Responses' only – i.e. excluding proxy data)

Table 4 suggests that few Muslims born in Scotland identify as neither Scottish nor British, as is true of all religious groups⁶. The clearest contrast is between those in specified minority religions who tend to be fairly evenly divided between Scottish and British identifiers, and those in the larger groups (Christians and those of no religion⁷) who identify as predominantly Scottish as opposed to British. The obvious exception is the Buddhist group, but since 83% of Scottish-born Buddhists describe themselves as white, it seems likely that most of them will have been born of white Scottish parents and adopted the Buddhist religion, thus explaining their national identification. APS 2004 and 2006 data are by no means entirely consistent with these findings, with

⁶ *Hindus are omitted from table 4 because there were only three Hindu respondents born in Scotland.*

⁷ *It is possible that the data exaggerate the extent of Christian identification compared to those with no religion. This might relate both to the wording of the question ('What is your religion even if you are not currently practising?') and its positioning immediately after the ethnicity question (see Voas and Bruce 2004).*

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

variation doubtless related to the very small numbers in some groups. These tend to show higher levels of Scottish as opposed to British identification among the minority religions. However, the important point is that in no survey is there much evidence to suggest that Muslims feel little association with Scottishness or Britishness. In England, where sample sizes are sufficiently large for us to have more confidence in the findings, the results are even less equivocal. It is clear that it is not Muslims specifically who are unlikely to identify as English, but all the predominantly ‘non-white’ religious groups: national identities among Sikhs and Muslims are very similar⁸. In these groups the proportions identifying as neither English nor British are also low, and they are also much more likely than those in other groups to identify as British as opposed to English. So the evidence in table 4 does not suggest that national identification among Muslims is consistently lower than among other minority religious groups in Scotland or England.

Table 4
Religion and national identity in Scotland (England) for those born in Scotland (England) only.

		Scottish (English)	British	Neither	<i>N</i>
Christian	%	87 (69)	24 (40)	* (1)	18,842 (90,268)
Buddhist	%	92 (49)	12 (50)	0 (7)	30 (173)
Jewish	%	58 (53)	49 (61)	0 (1)	27 (535)
Muslim	%	54 (13)	48 (83)	3 (7)	23 (902)
Sikh	%	51 (16)	44 (79)	4 (8)	11 (291)
None	%	88 (65)	21 (44)	* (1)	3,913 (18,855)
All	%	87 (68)	23 (42)	* (1)	23,054 (112,301)

Source: Annual Population Survey January-December 2008 ('Personal Responses' only – i.e. excluding proxy data)

* < 0.5%

⁸ Although not shown in the table, the same is true of Hindus in England.

Scottish Affairs

The relative importance of birthplace, ethnicity and religion

Some analysis of the data was also carried out to compare the relative importance of birthplace, ethnicity and religion in influencing national identities in Scotland and England. This was done through four separate binary logistic regression models for each of the three APS surveys, as follows:

A model for England with English identification as the outcome variable
(i.e. did an individual identify as English, yes or no?)

A model for England with British identification as the outcome variable

A model for Scotland with Scottish identification as the outcome variable

A model for Scotland with British identification as the outcome variable

In each of these models birthplace, ethnicity and religion are the explanatory variables. The categorisation of religion and birthplace was the same as in tables 3-4, but a rather simpler categorisation of ethnicity was used, mainly in the interests of retaining adequate sub-samples in Scotland. The categories employed were Asian, Black and Chinese. Although attendant to the potential problems of homogenising diverse groups in categories such as 'Asian', the earlier analysis did not show any marked variation in national identities between the more specific categories within this group. However, in England Black Caribbean and Black African groups were analysed separately (this was not necessary in Scotland since nearly all Black respondents there are in the African category).

Since the primary interest is the national identities of minorities, and it is evident that these are quite different from the white majority, analysis is limited to non-white cases although this did present some limitations (e.g. the exclusion of Jewish respondents because in both countries very few non-white people are also Jewish). The reference categories for the three explanatory variables are: for birthplace, those born in England/Scotland; for ethnicity, Asians; and for religion, Christians.

For readers interested in the details, the models for English and Scottish identification in the 2008 APS are presented in the appendix. In the interests of space, none of the other models are shown but the principal findings from all the analyses will now be outlined. These largely reflect the data in tables 1-4, although there are some interesting details. A useful way to interpret these models is to compare the odds ratios shown in the final column. Odds ratios less than 1 indicate that, compared to the reference category, a given group are

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

less likely to identify as English or Scottish, while odds ratios greater than 1 show that they are more likely so to identify.

Birthplace has a similarly marked and significant association with Scottish identification in all three surveys. While the 2008 model suggests that the effects of ethnic group and religion are also significant, in fact similar statistically significant findings were not evident in all three surveys. The effect of birthplace is not the same in each survey, however, with respect to British identity in Scotland. The 2004 data (in contrast to 2006 and 2008) showed that non-white people born overseas were actually *more* likely to identify as British than their Scottish-born counterparts. So this is at least one context where we cannot conclude that identifying with a specific identity is necessarily less common among those born overseas. British identification in Scotland is also not significantly associated with ethnic group. Although there is considerable variation in the results for religion, one of the few consistent findings is that Muslims are significantly more likely than (non-white) Christians to identify as British.

How do these findings compare with England? Like Scottishness, birthplace has a marked association with English identification. Even though (compared to Scotland) only a relatively small minority of non-white people identify with the 'sub-state' national identity, where they are born is a significant predictor of this. In contrast to Scottishness, there are some significant findings with respect to ethnicity and religion, although the effect of these variables is less obvious than birthplace and there is less consistency in the findings across all surveys. Black Africans and Chinese are consistently less likely than Asians to identify as English. While Muslims are consistently less likely to identify as English than are (non-white) Christians, so too are Hindus and Sikhs, and so Muslims are not especially unlikely to see themselves as English.

There is also a contrast with Scotland in that in each survey birthplace is significant with respect to *British* identity in England, and in fact it is the most influential variable, albeit that the effect is not as marked as it was for English identification. The 'boundaries' of Britishness may be somewhat wider than Englishness for minorities, but they are not so wide that birthplace is not an important factor. With respect to ethnicity the findings are quite similar to those related to English identification. Black Caribbeans have a broadly similar propensity to Asians to identify as British (although they are somewhat more likely to do so in APS 2006 and 2008, in 2004 they do not differ significantly). Black Africans and Chinese are less likely than Asians to identify as British in all three surveys, although the differences between these groups tend to be

Scottish Affairs

small. With respect to religion, a similarity to the findings in Scotland is that Muslims are consistently and significantly *more* likely to identify as British than their Christian counterparts once we control for birthplace and ethnicity. There is little consistent evidence to suggest that the British identification of any other religious group differs markedly from (non-white) Christians. Overall these findings confirm that Britishness is more 'open' to at least *some* minorities than is Englishness, and also suggest that this is especially so of Muslims.

CONCLUSIONS

The national identities of minority ethnic and religious groups most obviously vary depending on a) the specific national context – i.e. Scotland or England; b) the specific national identity being considered – i.e. Scottish, English or British; and c) the individual's birthplace. These factors are also more important than ethnic and religious differences between minority groups, and these are not particularly significant in Scotland and only to some degree in England. The analysis partly confirms previous conclusions from more small-scale, qualitative research and/or that based on more specific minority groups, but does so on the basis of larger samples incorporating a number of different minorities. Minorities have been shown to be more ready to identify as Scottish than English. Arguments such as those of Condor et al (2006) that such generalisations fail to do justice to the nuanced manner in which national identities are actually understood and used in everyday life are certainly important. Conclusions must also be tempered by the limitations of the sub-sample sizes in Scotland. However, it seems unlikely that the kind of marked and consistent differences we have observed do not reflect fundamental differences in minority perspectives on these two sub-state national identities.

Similarly, the argument that groups such as Pakistani-Muslims find it relatively easy to adopt a Scottish national identity because their primary identities are cultural as opposed to territorial (Hussain and Miller 2006) does not extend to English national identity. This is shown by the profound differences in national identification we observe within such groups when we compare those living in two nationally distinct parts of the same state: Scotland and England. Hussain and Miller's explanation also cannot account for the importance of birthplace, which the findings suggest shapes national identities to a greater extent than any other single factor, once more confirming earlier evidence concerning the importance of this 'marker'. While recognising that the data have not enabled

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

the exploration of national identities with much appreciation for the complexities of their conception and employment, comparing sub-state territories such as Scotland and England also shows that we cannot dismiss national identification as mere recognition of a legal formality. While the breadth of British identification and its evident association with citizenship suggests that for some at least Britishness may indeed correspond to Jacobson's 'civic' boundary, identification as Scottish or English does not correspond to any form of legal citizenship. So once more we are led to conclude that differences in minority identification reflect the fact that national identities are understood and employed differently in different national contexts. Once more employing Jacobson's (1997a) terms, there may be contrasts in the perceived 'racial' boundaries of different identities.

To the extent that ethnicity or religion makes a difference to national identities over and above national location and birthplace, it is interesting that (in England only) non-identification as either English or British was most evident among Black Africans and Chinese, not the group whose status has generated most public controversy and political debate: Muslims. The evidence does not suggest that Muslims are particularly unlikely to identify in national terms in either Scotland or England, and indeed in both these national contexts they were comparatively enthusiastic British identifiers.

Of course, many of these conclusions must be offered with some caution, especially so with respect to the Scottish data with the very small numbers of respondents in some of the minority groups that have been analysed. However, the findings presented here with respect to the APS hopefully provide some indication of what we might expect from the new Census question on national identity. Notwithstanding the limitations of investigating national identities through survey questions, for those with an interest in this area – research or otherwise – the new question should prove a valuable addition.

References

- Ansari, H. (2004) **'The Infidel Within': Muslims in Britain since 1800**. London: Hurst.
- Bond, R. (2006) 'Belonging and Becoming: National Identity and Exclusion', **Sociology**, 40(4): 609-26.
- Bond, R. and Rosie, M. (2006) 'Routes into Scottishness?', in C. Bromley et al (eds) **Has Devolution Delivered?**, pp. 141-58. Edinburgh: EUP.

Scottish Affairs

- Cinnirella, M. and Hamilton, S. (2007) 'Are all Britons reluctant Europeans? Exploring European identity and attitudes to Europe among citizens of South Asian ethnicity', **Ethnic and Racial Studies** 30(3): 481-501.
- Cohen, R. (1994) **Frontiers of Identity: the British and others**. London: Longman.
- Colley, L. (1992) 'Britishness and Otherness: An Argument', **Journal of British Studies**, 31(4): 309-29.
- Condor, S., Gibson, S. and Abell, J. (2006) 'English identity and ethnic diversity in the context of UK constitutional change', **Ethnicities** 6(2): 123-58.
- Gilroy, P. (1987) **There Ain't no Black in the Union Jack**. London: Hutchinson.
- General Register Office for Scotland (2003) **Scotland's Census 2001: Key Statistics for Council areas and Health Board areas Scotland**, www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/files1/stats/key_stats_chareas.pdf
- Goulbourne, H. (1991) **Ethnicity and Nationalism in Post-Imperial Britain**. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hall, K. (1995) '“There's a Time to Act English and a Time to Act Indian”: The Politics of Identity among British-Sikh Teenagers', in S. Stephens (ed.) **Children and the Politics of Culture**, pp. 243-64. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hopkins, P. (2007) '“Blue Squares”, ‘Proper’ Muslims and Transnational Networks: Narratives of national and religious identities amongst young Muslim men living in Scotland', **Ethnicities** 7(1): 61-81.
- Hopkins, P. (2008) 'Politics, Race and Nation: The Difference that Scotland Makes', in C. Dwyer and C. Bressey (eds) **New Geographies of Race and Racism**, pp. 113-24. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hussain, A. and Miller, W. (2006) **Multicultural Nationalism: Islamophobia, Anglophobia, and Devolution**. Oxford: OUP.
- Ifekwunigwe, J. O. (2001) 'Re-Membering “Race”: On Gender, “Mixed race” and Family in the English-African Diaspora', in D. Parker and M. Song (eds) **Rethinking ‘Mixed Race’**, pp. 42-64. London: Pluto.
- Ipsos MORI (2009) **2011 Census Question Testing – The National Identity Question (2009)**, www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/files2/the-census/preparations/2011-census-national-identity-question.pdf
- Jacobson, J. (1997a) 'Perceptions of Britishness', **Nations and Nationalism** 3(2): 181-99.
- Jacobson, J. (1997b) 'Religion and Ethnicity: dual and alternative sources of identity among young British Pakistanis', **Ethnic and Racial Studies** 20(2): 238-56.

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

- Kyriakides, C., Virdee, S. and Modood, T. (2009) 'Racism, Muslims and the National Imagination', **Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies** 35(2): 289-308.
- McCrone, D. (2002) 'Who Do You Say You Are? Making Sense of National Identities in Modern Britain' **Ethnicities** 2(3): 301-20.
- McCrone, D. and Bechhofer, F. (2008) 'National Identity and Social Inclusion', **Ethnic and Racial Studies** 31(7): 1245-66.
- McCrone, D. and F. Bechhofer (2010) 'Claiming National Identity', **Ethnic and Racial Studies**, 33 (6): 921-948.
- Maxwell, R. (2009) 'Caribbean and South Asian identification with British society: the importance of perceived discrimination', **Ethnic and Racial Studies** 32(8): 1449-69.
- Modood, T. (2001) 'British Asian Identities: Something Old, Something Borrowed, Something New', in D. Morley and K. Robins (eds) **British Cultural Studies: Geography, Nationality, and Identity**, Oxford: OUP.
- Office for National Statistics (2007) 2011 Census: Ethnic Group, National Identity, Religion and Language consultation. Summary report on responses to the 2011 Census stakeholders consultation 2006/07.
- Office for National Statistics (2008) **Social and Vital Statistics Division, Annual Population Survey**, January - December, 2004 [computer file]. 4th Edition. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], July 2008. SN: 5334.
- Office for National Statistics (2009) **Final recommended questions for the 2011 Census in England and Wales: National Identity**.
- Office for National Statistics (2010a) **Social and Vital Statistics Division, Annual Population Survey**, January - December, 2006 [computer file]. 2nd Edition. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], May 2010. SN: 5685
- Office for National Statistics (2010b) **Social and Vital Statistics Division, Annual Population Survey**, January - December, 2008 [computer file]. 2nd Edition. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], April 2010. SN: 6280.
- Penrose, J. and Howard, D. (2008) 'One Scotland, Many Cultures: The Mutual Constitution of Anti-Racism and Place', in C. Dwyer and C. Bressey (eds) **New Geographies of Race and Racism**, pp. 95-111. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Qureshi, K. and Moores, S. (1999) 'Identity Remix: Tradition and translation in the lives of young Pakistani Scots', **European Journal of Cultural Studies** 2(3): 311-30.
- Parker, D. (1994) 'Encounters Across the Counter: Young Chinese People in Britain', **New Community** 20(4): 621-34.
- Raj, D. S. (2000) '“Who the hell do you think you are?” Promoting religious identity among young Hindus in Britain', **Ethnic and Racial Studies** 23(3): 535-58.

Scottish Affairs

- Rex, J. (1996) 'National Identity in the Democratic Multi-Cultural State', **Sociological Research Online** 1(2).
- Saeed, A., Blain, N. and Forbes, D. (1999) 'New Ethnic and National Questions in Scotland: Post-British Identities among Glasgow Pakistani Teenagers', **Ethnic and Racial Studies** 22(5): 821-44.
- Scottish Government and The General Register Office for Scotland (2008) **Scotland's New Official Ethnicity Classification: For Scottish Official Statistics and Recommended for Scotland's 2011 Census**.
- Song, M. (1997) 'You're becoming more and more English': investigating Chinese siblings' cultural identities', **New Community** 23(3): 343-62.
- Song, M. (2003) **Choosing Ethnic Identity**. Cambridge: Polity.
- Virdee, S., Kyriakides, C. and Modood, T. (2006) 'Codes of Cultural Belonging: Racialised National Identities in a Multi-Ethnic Scottish Neighbourhood', **Sociological Research Online**, 11(4).
- Voas, D. and Bruce, S. (2004) 'The 2001 Census and Christian Identification in Britain', **Journal of Contemporary Religion** 19(1): 23-28.
- Werbner, P. (2000) 'Divided Loyalties, Empowered Citizenship? Muslims in Britain', **Citizenship Studies** 4(3): 307-24.

The National Identities of Minorities in Scotland

Appendix: Logistic regression models

Identification as Scottish (non-white cases only), Scotland, 2008

	B	S.E.	Sig.	Odds ratio
Birthplace				
(Scotland)				
Overseas	-1.997	0.031	0.000	0.136
Ethnic group				
(Asian)				
Black	-0.484	0.042	0.000	0.617
Chinese	-1.126	0.045	0.000	0.324
Religion				
(Christian)				
Buddhist	0.519	0.085	0.000	1.680
Hindu	-2.291	0.077	0.000	0.101
Muslim	-0.033	0.034	0.340	0.968
Sikh	-0.951	0.066	0.000	0.386
None	0.966	0.036	0.000	2.627

Annual Population Survey January-December 2008 ('Personal Responses' only – i.e. excluding proxy data)

Scottish Affairs

Identification as English (non-white cases only), England, 2008

	B	S.E.	Sig.	Odds ratio
Birthplace				
(England)				
Overseas	-1.399	0.006	0.000	0.247
Ethnic group				
(Asian)				
Black Caribbean	-0.040	0.011	0.000	0.961
Black African	-0.294	0.012	0.000	0.745
Chinese	-0.971	0.018	0.000	0.379
Religion				
(Christian)				
Buddhist	-1.474	0.064	0.000	0.229
Hindu	-0.424	0.014	0.000	0.655
Muslim	-0.502	0.011	0.000	0.606
Sikh	-0.347	0.014	0.000	0.707
None	0.269	0.008	0.000	1.309

Annual Population Survey January-December 2008 ('Personal Responses' only – i.e. excluding proxy data)
