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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The Scottish Government (SG) wishes to ensure that policy makers consider how needs differ between urban and rural areas of Scotland and adapt policies to meet local circumstances. This will ensure that effort can be directed towards the Scottish Government purpose of sustainable economic growth, and that everyone has the opportunity to participate and contribute, no matter where people live. To develop a better understanding of the particular circumstances and needs in urban areas, small towns, rural and remote areas requires a consistent classification system.

The Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification\(^1\) was first released in 2000 (when it was called the Scottish Household Survey Urban Rural Classification). This definition uses two key criteria – settlement size and drive time to major settlements. The six fold classification distinguishes between urban, rural and remote areas and includes the following categories. These can be combined into broader categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Large Urban Areas</td>
<td>Settlements of over 125,000 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Other Urban Areas</td>
<td>Settlements of 10,000 to 125,000 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Accessible Small Towns</td>
<td>Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Remote Small Towns</td>
<td>Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Accessible Rural</td>
<td>Settlements of less than 3,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Remote Rural</td>
<td>Settlements of less than 3,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Objectives

This study was commissioned, by the SG, in order to gather information on the extent to which this classification is used, how it is used and by whom.

Methodology

The study combined an on-line questionnaire and telephone interviews. Questionnaires were received from 412 people and, from these, 30 were selected for the telephone interviews, which were designed to explore issues identified in the analysis of the questionnaire responses. Data collection was preceded by a desk based study to review work using urban rural classifications and develop the questionnaire. Fieldwork was carried out in February and March 2009.

---

\(^1\) Link to information on the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification
http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/About/Methodology/UrbanRuralclassification
Summary of Desk Research Findings

The desk research identified that the way urban and rural areas are defined has changed over time. Currently several urban rural classifications are being used in the UK, with different systems for Scotland, England and Wales, and Northern Ireland. The key system identified as being used in Scotland is the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification. In recent years two new classification systems have been developed for very specific purposes in Scotland – the Fragility Index (Highlands & Islands Enterprise) and the Small Town Classification (Scottish Enterprise and COSLA).

Respondent Profile

The sample was largely drawn from SG distribution lists which included those with a rural interest, those who had registered with ScotStat and those who already received information on the SG Urban Rural Classification. Just over half those who participated in the online survey worked within either the SG (30%) or a Local Authority (22%). The sample included users in the NHS, in universities and in private consultancy or commercial organisations. Just under one in three described themselves as an analyst, just over a quarter described themselves as a researcher; and a third categorised themselves as a policy maker/policy influencer. The responses of policy makers and analysts/researchers were analysed separately.

What the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is used for

A large majority of respondents (87%) make a distinction between urban and rural areas in their work. Those who do not make a distinction said this was because such a distinction was not of relevance, rather than because of reservations about classification systems.

Over 80% of the sample were aware of the SG Urban Rural Classification and, of these, nearly three quarters made use of it; that is around half of the initial sample.

Users appear to be largely satisfied with how it can be used in their work. Respondents identified its use in a wide range of topic areas. The most commonly identified were population, community, and economy.

While most of the policy makers said that the Classification is used to aid policy development, for analysts it is seen primarily as a standard variable for analysis and presentation of data. A third of the analysts said that they use it in response to demands from policy colleagues.

About a quarter of policy respondents, and half of all respondents in local government, said that they used it to establish eligibility for funding. A number of respondents (especially those in local government) also referred to its relevance to monitoring Single Outcome Agreements. However, it should also be noted that SIMD was mentioned by a greater number of respondents in relation to funding and Single Outcome Agreements.
How the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is used

The analyst respondents provided a long list of data sources to which they apply the SG Urban Rural Classification. The most frequently mentioned was the Scottish Household Survey, but it is also applied to other secondary data sources including ONS and SG surveys and the Census, and to primary data sources including administrative data.

The most widely used breakdown is the 6-fold classification, which distinguishes between urban, rural and remote areas.

The online survey showed that attitudes towards the SG Urban Rural Classification are largely positive and this impression was reinforced by comments from respondents participating in the telephone interviews.

Benefits and weaknesses

Key perceived benefits of this classification are that it:

- allows comparisons to be made for urban rural areas across Scotland;
- is an officially recognised classification that fits with other datasets;
- is straightforward, easy and flexible to use;
- is available for a range of geographies; for example post codes, output areas or data zones;
- is useful in determining eligibility for funding;
- can be used consistently across all Scottish Local Authorities.

Respondents identified some limitations which they associate with the SG Urban Rural Classification. It should be emphasised that these are perceptions and may indicate misunderstandings over the use of the classification. Perceived limitations included:

- Lack of consistency with classifications used in the rest of the UK so that it is difficult to make comparisons with rest of UK;
- Does not take local conditions into account / local level discrepancies;
- Data zone does not match Local Authority boundaries / postcode areas;
- Not suitable for islands / does not distinguish between types of island settlement or those with low population density;
- Lack of continuity over time / changes to boundaries;
- Focus on settlement size / population based / drive time;
- It can be difficult to understand / use, that a degree of statistical literacy is required to use it effectively or that it is too technical for a layperson;
- The categories are too detailed for requirements.

Awareness and Use of Other Geographical Classifications and Databases

Respondents were asked about their awareness and use of other geographic classifications and databases. While the level of awareness for the SG Urban Rural Classification was high, the classification with the highest level of awareness was the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD), which is not an urban rural
classification but is used to identify concentrations of multiple deprivation across Scotland. Awareness of others varies; almost half of respondents were aware of the Royal Mail’s Postcode Address File (PAF). One in ten were aware of the Randall Definition; a system which classifies 14 Local Authorities as rural based on their low population density.

Among other geographic classifications used, the SIMD was used most often by respondents. Other systems used by respondents include DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England, PAF and the socio-geographic segmentation systems Acorn or Mosaic.

The online survey shows that respondents tend to use more than one geographical classification system in their analysis. Almost 90% of the users of the SG Urban Rural Classification named another geographical classification system that they used (most commonly SIMD). Almost a fifth of that sample used other classifications but not the SG Classification.

Just under a fifth of analysts conduct cross-border or UK-wide analysis, involving the use of different Urban Rural Classifications, and they identified problems in the lack of comparability with the rest of the UK because the classifications are based on different definitions.

Adequacy of Information and Communication about the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

A majority of respondents (64%) said they have access to all the information and associated guidance they need, and agreed that the information and associated guidance is clear and easy to understand (69%). However, it is worth noting that 17% of those who responded that they did not know whether they had access to the information they need, and 23% did not know whether the available guidance was clear.

There are some indications of the need for more information to be provided to existing and potential users of the SG Urban Rural Classification. For example, although SG officials say that funding within the life of a programme will not be affected by changes to the classification, a small number of telephone interviewees were unclear about whether funding for existing programmes could be affected by changes in the classification. The existing guidance focuses on the six and eight fold classification and some users seemed unaware of the less detailed categories. Problems in matching data zones to local authority boundaries may in reality not be as great as some respondents believe.

A majority of users use each update of the SG Urban Rural Classification when it becomes available, although just over 1 in 5 is unaware as to what version they are using. A quarter are not using the most recent update from August 2008. For some this was to maintain consistency of geographic boundaries over time.

While the ScotStat network is widely perceived to be an appropriate vehicle for information updates, not all telephone respondents (when questioned) were aware of
this or had registered with it. There is an expectation that information is available via the SG website.

Conclusions

Although it has to be borne in mind that the survey sample was largely drawn from SG distribution lists which included those with a rural interest, those who had registered with ScotStat and those who already received information on the SG Urban Rural Classification, the results from this study provide a generally positive assessment and show that:

Awareness of the SG Urban Rural Classification is fairly high and, on the whole, those who use the classification appear to be largely satisfied with the way it has been developed and have few problems using it.

Generally people felt they were able to make sensible choices about which classification system was most appropriate for their work.

There was a reasonably high level of satisfaction with the availability and content of support material, but respondents did put forward a range of suggestions for how it might be improved.

Suggestions for promoting the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification in the future

- Respondents suggested that, as well as providing information on the SG website, it would be useful to provide a named individual and telephone number as a single point of contact for queries that cannot be answered on the FAQ section of the website.

- Consider a better system for informing all existing and potential users of the SG Urban Rural Classification. This would ensure that information in relation to the SG Urban Rural Classification is provided to all relevant individuals and would help to maintain and increase awareness and usage of the classification.

- Examine ways in which the SG Urban Rural Classification can be used alongside other forms of classification and demonstrate how these can be used to complement each other for analysis.

- Respondents suggested providing additional information in the form of case histories and practical examples to existing and potential users to demonstrate ways in which the SG Urban Rural Classification can be applied. This is particularly important for users and potential users who are not statisticians or who may be infrequent users.
1 BACKGROUND

Introduction

1.1 The Scottish Government states, in The Government Economic Strategy (2007), that “delivering sustainable growth with opportunities for all is at the heart of the Government’s Purpose” with three “golden rules” of growth – solidarity, cohesion and sustainability - that reflect the importance of social equity, regional balance and respect for the environment. It goes on to state that “Sustainable growth and prosperity need to be shared across Scotland. At present, differences in income, participation and growth across Scotland act as drag on our economic performance and potential. Increased participation and enhanced quality of employment across our cities, towns and rural areas will enhance our performance and deliver a more inclusive Scotland so that, no matter where people live, opportunities are open to them.”

1.2 The impact of sectoral policies in areas such as transport, education and health can differ between urban and rural communities and the Scottish Government seeks to reflect this in mainstream policy development. Policy makers are required to consider how needs and delivery mechanisms differ between areas and adapt policies to meet local needs and circumstances.

Rural Scotland

1.3 The definition of rurality is an issue facing government, local authorities and other organisations, and a range of definitions have been adopted in different countries. The Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification was introduced in 2000; initially as the Scottish Household Survey Urban Rural Classification. It is updated every 2 years to use the most recent Small Area Population Estimates from the General Register Office for Scotland (GROS).

1.4 The SG Urban Rural Classification is intended to provide a consistent way of defining urban and rural areas across Scotland and has been designed to be straightforward and easy to understand and apply. The SG Urban Rural Classification can be used to show the degree of urbanity, rurality and remoteness.

1.5 The SG core definition of rurality defines settlements with a population of 3,000 or less to be rural. It also classifies areas as remote based on drive time from settlements of 10,000 or more. The Classification has been developed based on two key criteria:

- Settlement size, as defined by the General Register Office for Scotland (GROS). A settlement is defined as a contiguous group of high density postcodes with a population of 500 or more.
- Accessibility to key services, based on drive times to settlements with a population of 10,000 or over.

1.6 The SG Urban Rural Classification can be used to distinguish between accessible and remote areas, irrespective of rurality, and the classification contains 6 main categories (the 6-fold classification) shown in table 1.1.
1.7 There are a number of ways in which the classification is used. For example, sometimes it may be reduced to a 3-fold classification (remote rural, accessible rural and the rest of Scotland); and there may be other instances where only a 2-fold distinction (urban and rural) is used.

1.8 An additional version of the classification contains 8 categories (8-fold classification) that further splits remote (both towns and rural) into remote and very remote. Only the 6-fold and 8-fold classifications are described explicitly in the guidance.

1.9 Further details of this classification are provided in Chapter 3 which summarises the findings of desk research. Information on the SG Urban Rural Classification is available on the SG website.

Table 1.1 Scottish Government Urban Rural 6-fold Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Large Urban Areas</td>
<td>Settlements of over 125,000 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Other Urban Areas</td>
<td>Settlements of 10,000 to 125,000 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Accessible Small Towns</td>
<td>Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Remote Small Towns</td>
<td>Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Accessible Rural</td>
<td>Settlements of less than 3,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Remote Rural</td>
<td>Settlements of less than 3,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A need for research

1.10 The Scottish Government wished to find out who is using the classification and what they are using it for. For example, the extent to which this classification is used as the basis for analysis, determining eligibility for funding, monitoring Single Outcome Agreements, etc.

1.11 As well as the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification, there are a number of other different geographic classifications available, some of which incorporate a rurality dimension. The SG wanted to ascertain the importance accorded to the SG Urban Rural Classification relative to other classifications, and find out whether the classification is understood by researchers, analysts, policy makers and those who influence policy.

---

2 Link to information on the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification
   [http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/About/Methodology/UrbanRuralclassification](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/About/Methodology/UrbanRuralclassification)

3 In 2008 the SG and Local Authorities began working towards Single Outcome Agreements. These aim to set out the way in which both the SG and each authority will work towards improving national outcomes with each agreement aimed at reflecting local circumstances and priorities in order to improve national outcomes for local people.
1.12 The SG commissioned research that aimed to provide a better understanding of the extent and purpose to which geographic classifications are currently being used; both the SG Urban Rural Classification and other classifications from Scotland and the rest of the UK; identify any perceived issues with their use and gather suggestions for development of the SG Urban Rural Classification. The findings of this research will be used to consider how best to support use of the classification.

1.13 The objectives of this project were to:

- Investigate the level of use and understanding of the classification among analysts in the SG and also in local government, agencies, academia and private bodies.
- Investigate the level of use and understanding of the classification among policy makers in the SG and local government and those who influence policy making in agencies, academia and private bodies.
2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 This chapter outlines the methodological approach adopted for this project.

Overall Approach

2.2 The brief prepared by the Scottish Government asked for information from a sample of users that was large enough to include users from a variety of organisations and disciplines and with a range of interests. The sample was not meant to be statistically representative but large and varied enough to provide a qualitative understanding of the range of uses and the understanding of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification. This was to be achieved through a combination of questionnaire and interview. Desk-based research was also conducted to prepare for the fieldwork.

Desk Research

2.3 The first stage of this study was desk-based research to identify classifications (with a geographic component, particularly relating to an urban rural dimension) used throughout the UK, examining the criteria behind these classifications as well as their benefits and limitations.

2.4 This element of the project was also used to help develop the sampling frame for the quantitative (online) and qualitative (telephone interview) phases and fed into the questionnaire and topic guide development.

Sample and Distribution

2.5 A sampling frame was developed using Scottish Government distribution lists and names that emerged in the desk-based research. Scottish Government distribution lists included those with a rural interest, those who had registered with ScotStat and those who already received information on the SG Urban Rural Classification. The distribution lists were cross-referenced and de-duplicated where necessary. De-duplication of ScotStat names was conducted by the Scottish Government to comply with data protection regulations.

Online Survey

2.6 The online survey was hosted on the researcher's dedicated survey website and was live from 11th February until 3rd March 2009. The key strength of this approach was that it allowed respondents to complete the survey at a time that suited them, in a format that was easily accessible in their working environment and which allowed them to pause to look up any information that they did not have to hand. The questionnaire format consisted of mainly closed (tick box)

---

4 ScotStat is a network for both users and providers of Scottish Official Statistics. Through ScotStat, the SG can consult with those who use or provide data about its statistical products and services. ScotStat also allows data users and providers to give feedback or to seek advice about SG products.
type questions but free-text spaces were made available for respondents to add additional information if required.

2.7 An additional benefit of the online approach was that questions that were relevant to one type of respondent but not to another could be ‘routed’ appropriately. This helped to maximise response rates by keeping the questionnaire as short and straightforward as possible for respondents.

2.8 The questionnaire was developed in conjunction with the project team at the Scottish Government. In order to ensure the questionnaire was clear and easy to understand, 5 pilot interviews were conducted among individuals from the Scottish Government, Local Authorities and Health Boards. All these respondents had experience of the SG Urban Rural Classification. In the light of comments made during these interviews, the online questionnaire was finalised.

2.9 Once a final questionnaire was agreed, each potential respondent was sent a request either by email or post to participate in the project. This request contained a link to the online questionnaire and asked the recipient to forward the information on to other potential respondents. A brief definition of the classification as well as a hyperlink to the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification was included within the questionnaire to enable respondents to access relevant information if required.

2.10 A total of 412 individuals responded to this survey and their profile is provided in Chapter 4. Due to the nature by which the requests were disseminated, meaningful response rates cannot be calculated and any results should not be taken as representative of all policy makers and analysts within the relevant organisations.

2.11 A copy of the online survey questionnaire is provided in Appendix 1.

Telephone Interviews

2.12 A series of telephone interviews was undertaken in order to more fully explore some of the issues emerging from responses to the online survey as well as to gain insight into the way the SG Urban Rural Classification and other classifications are perceived and used across sectors. These interviews were completed between 6th and 20th March 2009.

2.13 All respondents participating in the online survey were asked if they were prepared to participate in a subsequent stage of work and 152 respondents agreed. Individuals for the telephone stage were selected according to their responses to the online questionnaire. This included those who used a range of different population classifications across a number of different organisation types. In addition, any issues emerging from the answers given online which needed clarification or more in-depth study were noted and respondents with possible contributions to these issues were identified. The telephone discussions were conducted by experienced researchers at George Street Research.
2.14 A total of 30 in-depth telephone interviews were conducted and the sample profile is provided in Chapter 4.

2.15 A copy of the topic guide used in the telephone discussions is provided in Appendix 2.

**Approach to Reporting**

2.16 The questionnaire included a number of core questions for all respondents who were then routed to different questions depending on whether they described themselves as policy makers/influencers or as analysts/researchers. The text in the report makes explicit where these questions were only asked of analysts/researchers or those involved in policy.

2.17 This report provides text of a primarily qualitative nature, although tables and charts have been added to illustrate responses from the closed questions from the online questionnaire and differences between groups of respondents have been highlighted.

2.18 The following chapter provides findings from the desk research and then Chapters 4 to 8 outline key findings from the online survey and telephone interviews and Chapter 9 provides concluding comments.
3 SUMMARY OF DESK RESEARCH FINDINGS

Overview

3.1 These findings are based on a desk search of data sets and reports that use urban rural classification systems, and assessing their usage amongst various stakeholders. The desk research involved a comprehensive examination of the range of publications and data produced by both the Scottish Government and UK Government, local government departments, agencies and academic institutions and private bodies. The research assessed the range of classifications used by both analysts and policy makers throughout the UK and in particular within Scotland. A full list of identified reports which were assessed for the purposes of this study is provided in Appendix 5.

Defining Urban and Rural Areas

3.2 The use of urban and rural classifications for official purposes stretches as far back as the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The structure of local government itself was based on a clear distinction between ‘urban’, i.e. county boroughs, municipal boroughs and urban districts, and ‘rural’, i.e. rural districts and most counties. Subsequently these two types of area formed the basis for the reporting of a wide range of official statistics, especially the Census of Population. Since the mid-1950’s onwards there have been several approaches that have evolved to define types of area – primarily using population density, land use and catchment area for shopping. However, it was not until the local government reforms in the 1970’s, spurred on by an increasing conflict between local government boundaries and geographical development leading to urban land across administrative boundaries, that different approaches were required to define urban and rural areas. As the use of classification systems has progressed, they have been used to support research and policy formation on key issues such as transport, education and health.

3.3 Use of a classification system aids understanding of the issues facing urban, accessible rural and remote rural areas which are likely to have differing needs both in terms of infrastructure and the socio-economic factors affecting communities. Over the past two decades a number of different classification systems have been developed in order to help define urban and rural areas, to help clarify the nature of communities and to create guidelines for defining boundaries between ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ according to: geographical perimeters, e.g. Local Authority boundaries; by socio-economic parameters, e.g. population density, social deprivation, settlement size; or spatial parameters, e.g. accessibility by drive times.

3.4 There have been a number of different approaches to defining urban and rural areas within government in the UK. The core elements of these are:

- Administrative boundaries which are used to define major ‘urban’ areas based upon former metropolitan authority and current unity authority boundaries.
• Urban land use and population size as represented by the ONS Urban Areas for England and Wales.
• Characteristics of places as in the classification of Local Authority districts and wards used by the Countryside Agency and various ONS classifications of administrative areas.
• Settlement size and accessibility to key services. The data from these two indicators are combined in the SG classification.

3.5 Three approaches have been commonly employed in determining urban areas. These include: tracing the extent of the built up area; classifying levels of population density; and finally, plotting the functional area of the town which includes not only the built up area but large settlements within the ‘countryside’. By comparison, commonly used key factors for assessing rurality include: extensive land use; economic activity / employment levels; community cohesion / governance; and population density. Those who have created classification systems have tried to capture the multiplicity of types of rural area that exist, ranging, for example, from small settlements on the fringe of large towns and cities to remote villages and hamlets; from ‘green belt’ agriculture areas through to areas of extensive arable farming; the economic and social changes that have taken place in rural areas linking them more closely to an urban style of life and work. More recent definitions tend to have crossover areas, e.g. remote small town, accessible rural and rural renaissance.

Range and Type of Classification Systems

3.6 During the course of the desk research a wide range of urban rural classification systems were identified in the UK. Some classification systems could be called 'legacy' systems, because they have been abandoned - superseded by newer, more effective models or modified urban rural classification systems. However, it should be borne in mind that many of the older systems are referred to and acknowledged in recent reports and data sets, due to the dated nature of the source information, e.g. old census material. These older systems are now seen to be historically valid, but no longer current with the needs of study classifications.

3.7 All identified urban rural classification systems (inclusive of those seen to be 'legacy' systems) are detailed in a more comprehensive list which we have included in Appendix 3. In addition, Appendix 3 also details other geographic classifications that do not have an urban-rural dimension including the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD), the Postcode Address File (PAF) and the geodemographic segmentation systems ACORN / MOSAIC. The key elements of each system are detailed, alongside any perceived benefits or limitations each may have.

3.8 The urban rural classification identified as being most widely used in Scotland is the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification system. Others used include the Randall Classification, Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) Fragility System and Scottish Small Towns Classification. In Northern Ireland

---

5 The Urban Rural Divide: Myth or Reality? 2007, Socioeconomic Research Group (SERG), Macaulay Institute, Aberdeen.
the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA) Urban Rural Definition is predominantly used. In England and Wales, most use is made of the Urban Settlement Definition provided by the ONS, which is based on land use, and additionally the Administrative Area Classification Definition, based on socio-economic variables (again provided by the ONS). DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England is made use of to a lesser extent.

Summaries of the Urban Rural Classification Systems Used in the UK

3.9 In Scotland, the majority of reports produced within central Scottish Government departments and also within the local government environment tend to use some version of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification. Most of the reports that have used the SG Urban Rural Classification system have focused upon socio-economic aspects i.e. studies have focused on key areas such as employment, household expenditure / living standards, education and health.

3.10 The Scottish Government developed data zones in 2004. These provide the geographic building blocks for the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics and the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation which provide the Scottish Government and its partners with the ability to monitor and develop policies at a small area level. As the SG Urban Rural Classification is based on accessibility, data zones were not designed to nest within it and as a result some straddle the SG Urban Rural Classification. The Scottish Government has carried out analysis to identify the extent and measure the effect of this straddling and determined that the fit between data zones and the SG Urban Rural Classification was good.

3.11 Reports examining socio-economic issues such as health, education, employment / deprivation or social changes, e.g. demographic change through migration, generally make use of the SG Urban Rural Classification system. Other systems have been employed in cases where in-depth regional detail is required. These tend to be more locally focused studies which are commissioned or undertaken by local government and agencies, e.g. community studies assessing the local impacts of policy or change of infrastructure, and they make use of Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics and the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (both using data zones) and also HIE’s Fragility Index.

3.12 The Scottish Small Towns Task Group was set up in 2005 by the South of Scotland Alliance, supported by COSLA, and undertook a detailed examination of the role of small towns within the socio-economic fabric of Scotland. The researchers involved with the study based their classifications around the Scottish Urban Rural Classification system, but widened the parameters for the limits of population size to define a ‘small town’. Their report\(^6\), from 2006, stated “what is important is the role and potential of small towns rather than adherence to strict and inflexible population criteria. There are many settlements which function as small towns with either populations above 20,000 or below 2,000”.

Therefore, this 'Small Town Classification' may be useful at a local level rather than at a national level.

3.13 The Randall system which categories Scottish local authorities as rural or urban on the basis of population density has been used less frequently in research studies, but due to its basic nature it is more likely to be used as a quick 'spot check' method than for the purposes of detailed study.

3.14 In England and Wales two classification systems seem to be widely used amongst both policy makers and analysts. These are both issued by the ONS on behalf of the Office of The Deputy Prime Minister / DEFRA / Countryside Agency:

- The Urban Settlement Definition is based on land use (England and Wales). The basis of the definition is land with an irreversibly urban use and it is independent of administrative area boundaries.
- The Administrative Area Classification Definition is based on socio-economic variables. The Countryside Agency classification of rural and urban administrative areas is based on a range of socio-economic characteristics of the population at Local Authority and ward levels.

3.15 DEFRA's Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England is made use of to a lesser extent than the Urban Settlement Definition or the Administrative Area Classification Definition and complements the ONS Rural and Urban Area Definitions. These two DEFRA approaches adopt different methodologies designed to reflect the numerical significance of settlement size in different administrative area frameworks. For this reason the classification should not be regarded as a definition of the level of rurality within Local Authority Districts. This term is reserved for the level of rurality at smaller geographic scales. Both methods are seen as tools for the purposes of presenting and analysing data that are only available at Local Authority District level on a comprehensive national basis. The classification is not usually used to inform detailed policy design by local government or agencies, e.g. for targeting local service delivery.

3.16 In Northern Ireland, the NISRA Urban Rural Definition is the most popular urban rural classification used on a regional basis as it addresses the issue of urban sprawl and a key issue that Northern Irish settlements have historically not been clearly defined between 'urban' and 'rural'. This system is tailored to address the characteristic settlement patterns within Northern Ireland. For the purpose of this definition, statutory settlement development limits provided by the DOE Planning Service have been used as the best geographical delineation for defining settlements. It should be noted that settlement development limits are designated by the NI Planning Service in order to protect the character of settlements and prevent urban sprawl into the surrounding countryside whilst providing for future development needs. Their purpose is not solely to define settlements geographically. In an attempt to clarify the urban rural definitions, three criteria have been identified as relevant in ascribing urban characteristics to settlements: population size, population density and service provision. It was recognised that none of these criteria in isolation was sufficient and that a
combination of these data indices was required to classify settlements, particularly for use by central government departments.

3.17 It is apparent that there are fairly clear divisions in usage of classification systems according to country (Scotland, England & Wales, Northern Ireland) when undertaking countrywide assessments – these ‘tailored’, specific systems are created to take into account the administrative differences of each country. However, when undertaking more ‘localised’ assessments, researchers tend to use more specialist classification systems that allow for a very detailed examination of local area socio-economic issues. In locally focused studies, the diversification of classification systems is much wider. It should be borne in mind that the SG Urban Rural Classification cannot be applied in all instances and it is not designed to replace other systems.

3.18 Use of statistics by policy makers tends to follow researchers’ (analysts’) lead, and policy decisions may be informed by a range of research studies or custom data which has been extracted from specialist databases. (This general trend has been identified whilst looking at the executive summaries of the reports wherein government and commissioning Local Authorities have acknowledged the recommendations of internal research departments or external consultants). Appropriate classification system(s) are used according to the focus of the study, for example, reports examining social, economic, political, travel, geographic issues or with a localised focus. In particular, the SG Urban Rural Classification has been used to examine social-economic characteristics and lifestyle, e.g. Scottish Household Survey Annual Report, Rural Scotland Key Facts. It has also been used for rural planning and development purposes, e.g. Rural Scotland: Better Still, Naturally. Some studies assessing deprivation and poverty in rural areas in Scotland have also used the SG Urban Rural Classification system, e.g. The Experience of Rural Poverty in Scotland: Qualitative Research with Organisations Working with People Experiencing Poverty in Rural Areas.

---

In summary,

- A wide range of classifications exist, using location variables (geography) including travel time, settlement size and type, socio-economic criteria.

- There are clear differences in approach across the UK with different systems in place for Scotland, England & Wales, and Northern Ireland.

- In Scotland specifically, a number of reports identified by the desk research had used the SG Urban Rural Classification. Reports where this classification has been used as part of the analysis have focused on planning and development and various socio-economic issues such as deprivation and poverty, employment and standards of living.

- The SG Urban Rural Classification cannot be applied in all instances and it is not designed to replace all other systems. Some systems are limited to a local basis and are not relevant for national studies e.g. HIE Fragility Index; or for their use covering the wide spectrum of urban to rural areas e.g. Small Towns Classification, Urban Settlement Definition.
4 RESPONDENT PROFILE

4.1 Research was conducted by means of an online survey and by telephone interviews with some of the online respondents who agreed to participate further. SG distribution lists and names that emerged from the desk-based research formed the basis of the sample. The SG distribution lists included those with a rural interest, those who had registered with ScotStat and those who already received information on the SG Urban Rural Classification.

The online survey

4.2 In order to help with analysis of the online data and ascertain any differences between groups of those who responded to the online survey, all respondents were asked to give some basic details about themselves.

4.3 As table 4.1 shows, over half the respondents worked either for the Scottish Government (30%) or for a Local Authority (22%). Smaller proportions worked for other organisation types. Those within the Scottish Government worked across a range of different directorates. Seven of the NHS Boards were represented. Thirteen respondents worked within the NHS although not for a specific Health Board. Most Scottish Local Authorities were represented.

Table 4.1: Online Sample Profile (Base: 412)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation work for</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Scottish Government</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>- Policy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local Authority</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>- Analyst</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Agency / NDPB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>- Researcher</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- University / College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Private consultancy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commercial organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Voluntary organisation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NHS Board</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scottish Government Directorate</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>- Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>- Angus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Justice &amp; Communities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>- Argyll &amp; Bute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Environment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>- Clackmannshshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Health</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>- Dundee (City)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finance &amp; Corp Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>- East Ayrshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- East Dunbartonshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- East Lothian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Edinburgh (City)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Eilean Siar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Falkirk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Fife</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Glasgow (City)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Highland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Midlothian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Moray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- North Ayrshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Orkney</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Renfrewshire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shetland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- South Ayrshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stirling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NHS Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Borders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grampian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greater Glasgow</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Highland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lothian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tayside</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OTHER NHS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.4 In terms of their role, just under one in three (32%) described themselves as a policy maker/policy influencer and the same proportion described themselves as an analyst. Just over a quarter (27%) described themselves as a researcher. A small number, 9%, had different job roles; many of these ‘other’ respondents were public sector project officers working in areas such as health and housing, along with teachers and consultants or business advisers, among others.

4.5 For the purposes of the questionnaire, those who identified themselves as analysts and researchers were treated/routed the same and for the rest of this report they are referred to as a single group (analysts).

Telephone interviews

4.6 Responses to the online questionnaire were examined for topics which required more intensive exploration. These were then discussed with the SG and a topic guide was then drawn up which detailed the issues that had been identified for further investigation. Main topic areas included:

- reasons for using / not using the SG Urban Rural Classification;
- how the classification is used;
- relationship to other classifications;
- use of other classifications;
- potential changes;
- communication.

4.7 A copy of the topic guide is included at Appendix 2.

4.8 At the end of the online survey, respondents were asked if they were prepared to participate in a subsequent stage of work. From the 152 that agreed, 30 respondents were selected for interview by telephone; this sample included those who used a range of different population classifications and approximately reflects the spread of different organisation types from the online survey.

4.9 Details on the profile of respondents who participated in the telephone discussions are shown in table 4.2.
### Table 4.2: Telephone interview Sample Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Role</th>
<th>No of interviews</th>
<th>Classification used[^10]</th>
<th>No of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SG Urban Rural Classification</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PAF</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ACORN / MOSAIC</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SIMD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent Organisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency / NDPB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial organisation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private consultancy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University / college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary organisation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^10]: Does not add to 30 because the question allowed more than one response.
5 WHAT IS THE SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT URBAN RURAL CLASSIFICATION USED FOR AND WHY?

Making a distinction between urban and rural areas

5.1 During the online questionnaire, all respondents were asked to say if, in the course of their work, they made a distinction between urban and rural areas and a large majority (87% or 359 of the 412 respondents) said this was the case.

5.2 Reasons for not making a distinction between urban and rural in their work were given by 49 of the 53 respondents who said that they do not make a distinction. These reasons related primarily to whether or not they perceived a need to make this distinction and included:

- No need to distinguish between urban and rural (18 respondents);
- Only deal with rural areas / not applicable to urban areas (8);
- Only deal with urban areas (6);
- Work is the same whether carried out in urban or rural area (6);
- Involved at national level (6);
- Involved at regional level (5).

Awareness of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

5.3 All respondents were then asked whether they had been aware of the SG Urban Rural Classification prior to reading the information given in the survey; as can be seen in table 5.1, 81% said that they had.

- Awareness of the SG Urban Rural Classification was highest among those working in NHS Boards;
- Within Scottish Government specifically, awareness of the SG Urban Rural Classification was highest among those within the Education and Health Directorates.

Table 5.1
Awareness of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (412)</th>
<th>SG &amp; others* (171)</th>
<th>Local Authority (92)</th>
<th>Other (149)</th>
<th>Policy (133)</th>
<th>Analyst (279)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QPA4: All respondents
* This category comprises Scottish Government, Scottish Government Agencies and the Scottish Parliament.

Usage of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

5.4 Those respondents who said that they were aware of the SG Urban Rural Classification and who make an urban rural distinction in the course of their work were then asked whether they use it. As shown in table 5.2, 72% said that they did.
Table 5.2
Use of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (296)</th>
<th>SG &amp; others* (121)</th>
<th>Local Authority (58)</th>
<th>Other (117)</th>
<th>Policy (91)</th>
<th>Analyst (205)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QPA5; All respondents aware of SG Urban Rural Classification and who make an urban rural distinction
* This category comprises Scottish Government, Scottish Government Agencies and the Scottish Parliament.

5.5 Looking at those who make a rural / urban area distinction as part of their work, and who said that they were aware of the SG Urban Rural Classification:

- Sub-group analysis shows highest levels of usage of the SG Urban Rural Classification were within Commercial Organisations (6 out of 6) and NHS Boards (16 out of 19). Lowest level of use was reported by Private Consultants (13 out of 21).

Reasons for using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

5.6 Those respondents who use the SG Urban Rural Classification were then asked to say why they use it.

Table 5.3 Reasons for using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (210)</th>
<th>SG &amp; others* (87)</th>
<th>Local Authority (41)</th>
<th>Other (82)</th>
<th>Policy (60)</th>
<th>Analyst (150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a standard variable in analysis</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For statistical publications</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested by colleagues in policy development</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To define eligibility for funding</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help with (monitoring of) single outcome agreements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic analysis</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Ministerial / Political speeches, debates or briefings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A10 (n=150), P10 (n=60)
* This category comprises Scottish Government, Scottish Government Agencies and the Scottish Parliament.

5.7 When we examine sub-group data in relation to the SG Urban Rural Classification:

- Over half of those who use the SG Urban Rural Classification to define eligibility for funding were within Local Authorities;
• Of the 9 analysts and 6 policy respondents who use the SG Urban Rural Classification to help with monitoring of single outcome agreements, almost half were working within Local Authorities;
• Only a minority of analysts within Local Authorities used the SG Urban Rural Classification as a standard variable in analysis, compared with the majority of respondents from within Scottish Government and SG Agencies and all analysts responding from NHS Boards;
• Usage of the SG Urban Rural Classification as a standard variable in analysis was highest (at least 4 in 5) within the Education, Justice & Community, Environment and Health Directorates of the SG; compared to under half in the Economy Directorate;
• Highest proportions, almost half, of analysts using the SG Urban Rural Classification ‘because it is requested by colleagues in policy development’ were within Scottish Government;
• Highest proportions of analysts using the SG Urban Rural Classification in relation to academic analysis came from within Universities / Colleges.

Reasons for not using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

5.8 Those who said they were aware of the SG Urban Rural Classification but reported that they did not use it were asked why and 74 respondents commented. Key reasons for not using the SG Urban Rural Classification were:

• Not relevant to my type of work (26 respondents) – highest among analysts in SG;
• Classification too detailed for needs (14);
• Not needed to use it to date (9).

5.9 The telephone interviews aimed to investigate this issue in more detail and most of the non-users interviewed noted that this classification was simply not appropriate to their needs. For example, one respondent who used Acorn, DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England, PAF and SIMD claimed that their work had simply not taken them in the direction to use the SG Urban Rural Classification.

“We have used PAF to identify residential areas and business areas and then map data. Defra, we have used in England and Wales. Acorn has been used alongside crime data in England and Wales. PAF has been used the most because I can link the postcodes to other data areas.”

(University, Researcher)

5.10 A respondent within the SG highlighted the simplicity of the Randall Definition and its consistency over time. They noted,

"We’ve used the Randall definition, primarily because it’s very easy to remember and to apply without reference to any notes."

5.11 A small number of respondents participating in the interviews also referred to the fact that use (or non-use) of classifications was sometimes historical; a
Local Authority respondent commented:

“I think the six-fold one - if I can be blunt about it - was what was used by my predecessors in my position …it was used for [our] Strategy back in 2007 and I felt no reason to change from using that.”

Topic areas for which the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is used

5.12 Respondents were asked with which topic areas they use the SG Urban Rural Classification and, as can be seen in table 5.4 below, the most widely cited was the area of Community / Population Change (46% of the total). For those respondents who only use the SG Urban Rural Classification and no other classifications, the most commonly reported topic area was the Economy / Economic Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Policy (%)</th>
<th>Analysts (%)</th>
<th>Use SG URC only (%)</th>
<th>SG UR &amp; others (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities / population change</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy / economic development</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellbeing</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QPA11; those using SG Urban Rural Classification, n = 213

5.13 Sub group analysis shows that higher proportions of respondents within Local Authorities than within the Scottish Government used the SG Urban Rural Classification in relation to the area of Economy / Economic Development.

5.14 Other differences include:

- Those in Commercial Organisations were more likely to use the SG Urban Rural Classification in the area of Business than those in the Scottish Government.
- Not surprisingly, those respondents within the NHS were more likely to use the SG Urban Rural Classification in relation to Health and Wellbeing than any of the other sectors.

5.15 As could be expected, findings from the telephone interviews show that the topic areas for which the SG Urban Rural Classification is used relate in the
main to the respondent’s role and / or the organisation for which they work. However there was, once again, an element of historical usage, especially in projects where changes needed to be tracked over time.

Benefits of using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

5.16 Both policy and analyst respondents were asked to say what they felt were the benefits of using the SG Urban Rural Classification. As can be seen in chart 5.1, the main perception from both types of respondent was that the SG Urban Rural Classification allows comparisons to be made for urban rural areas across Scotland.

Chart 5.1
Benefits of using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Analysts</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows comparisons to be made for urban rural areas across Scotland</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officially recognised classification; fits with other Scottish</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government datasets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to work with</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits with what required by policy colleagues</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available at postcode level (asked of analysts only)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigorous &amp; transparent definition</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works well with any Geographic Information System</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More appropriate than others for rural areas</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides uniformity when allocating funding (asked of policy</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respondents only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A12 n=148, P12 n=58

5.17 There was a difference regarding the perception that the SG Urban Rural Classification ‘allows comparisons to be made across urban / rural areas throughout Scotland’ with analysts working in the SG much more likely to cite this reason than those working in Local Authorities. In addition, those working within the NHS were significantly more likely to identify ‘availability at postcode level’ as a benefit than Private Consultants.

5.18 Those using the SG Urban Rural Classification in the topic areas of Employment and Housing were most likely to identify ‘allows comparisons to be made for urban rural areas across Scotland’ as a benefit, as were those using the SG Urban Rural Classification in the area of Justice, although this had a much lower base size. Those working in the areas of Business were least likely to identify ‘allows comparisons to be made for urban rural areas across Scotland’ as a benefit.
Respondents participating in the telephone discussions perceived a number of key benefits to using the SG Urban Rural Classification. Noted by many was that this is a straightforward and easy to use classification, using a common reference point and language that can be applied and compared across Scotland. Information is also provided on how the data is derived. In the words of one researcher,

“It’s an official and recognised classification that allows comparisons to be made across Scotland.”

One analyst noted that the SG Urban Rural Classification is flexible to use and available at multiple geographies. It was also noted by some that this classification is useful in applying for funding or in allocating funding to specific projects. One Local Authority analyst noted the benefit of a classification that can be used consistently across different Local Authorities,

“It kind of gives a different approach really, and it helps me …. to try and get a consistent approach across different parts of the Council, which is often a problem. Lots of councils do different things and classify things in different ways, so if there is a standard approach, (even if it is not perfect and they have some issues in consistency overall), singing from the same hymn sheet.”

Limitations / complications in using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

Both analyst and policy respondents were asked to identify any limitations or complications in using the SG Urban Rural Classification. Answers were not pre-coded, rather, respondents could provide free-text responses. As respondents generally only compose free-text responses if they have a particular point to raise, this may have contributed to a lower number of responses to this question (93 respondents, 38 policy and 55 analyst) and the corresponding small numbers giving any one answer.

It should be emphasised that these are perceptions and some may reflect misunderstandings over the use of the classification. For example, the discrepancy between postcode area and data zones may be overstated; data zones, while not a perfect match to post codes, are an almost perfect match to Local Authorities. The following perceptions came from a mix of both policy and analyst respondents unless stated:

- No limitations (8 respondents);
- Not consistent with classifications used in rest of UK / difficult to make comparisons with rest of UK (8 analysts);
- Data zone does not match LA boundaries, postcode areas (7);
- Does not take local conditions into account / local level discrepancies (7);
- Not suitable for islands / doesn’t distinguish between types of island settlement (7);
- Lack of continuity / frequent updates make it difficult to identify change over time (5);
- Focus on settlement size / population based (5);
- Difficult to understand, use / statistical literacy required to use effectively / too technical for layperson (5);
- Definitions are not rigorous / insufficient distinction between categories (4);
- Not suitable for areas with low population density (4);
- Limited use in rural areas / rural dimension not sufficiently developed / too urban oriented / urban bias (4);
- Information may not be up to date / not regularly updated (4 analysts).

5.23 Comments made during the telephone discussions highlighted these limitations and identified some more. Several said that they thought that the SG Urban Rural Classification is not the most appropriate in the more remote parts of Scotland, primarily within the Highlands and Islands region. There was a view that the use of settlement size and drive time is not always appropriate for these more remote areas, where some small settlements will play an important role as a service centre within their region.

5.24 For respondents who are conducting cross-border analysis, often within an academic setting or working for organisations that are UK-wide, a limitation of the SG Urban Rural Classification was that it does not allow for cross-border analysis or comparison of data with the rest of the UK. This was not unique to the SG Urban Rural Classification but was also noted as a limitation for other urban rural classifications.

5.25 A number of respondents referred in some way to a need for IT skills and expertise. Two respondents perceived that users of this classification need to reach a certain skills level to be able to use this. Another analyst within a Local Authority noted that he had a clear understanding of how this, and other classifications, could be used and that he provided ‘less classification literate’ colleagues with the information they needed.

5.26 One recently appointed analyst noted that they had not used the SG Urban Rural Classification as they did not understand the underlying principles or how to apply this in their work.

5.27 There were some concerns that changes over time impact upon usage of the classification and one analyst noted he was still working with an older version of the SG Urban Rural Classification to maintain consistency in his work. One analyst noted,

“Changes over time can make things inconsistent. There was an update recently which led to the reclassification of some of the smaller towns. Some smaller villages were aggregated up and classified as one larger settlement and this caused issues when people asked questions about why the classifications had changed. People on the ground who don’t understand the ins and outs of the system are confused by changes like this and it can be difficult to explain.”

5.28 Overall, while respondents outlined some limitations of this classification, most respondents did not feel there was a more suitable alternative and had the
intention of continuing to work with this because the benefits outweighed the limitations. However, two organisations have been instrumental in developing their own classification, at least in part because of the perceived limitations of the SG Urban Rural Classification. These were the Fragility System developed by HIE and the Scottish Small Towns Task Group undertaken by Scottish Enterprise / COSLA (Appendix 3 provides further detail on these two classifications). One individual in a Local Authority noted,

“This [SG Urban Rural Classification] doesn’t allow for inclusion of how cities / towns interrelate with their hinterlands. For example, on the Islands or in very rural areas where one town which may be relatively small, it is in fact a service centre for quite a wide area. You may want to take in a range of industries, employment opportunities, housing options, tourism, countryside leisure and a whole range of factors ie a less simple way of categorising urban and rural. Scottish Enterprise has developed a typology based on types of place – Scotland is split into 317 places / town districts, based on the economic geography of Scotland.”

5.29 While the Fragility System has been developed for use in the Highlands and Islands region, there was a suggestion that this could also be used in other remote rural areas such as Dumfries & Galloway or the Borders where there are small towns that act as major service centres both for the small town and its hinterland. Another respondent hypothesised that the Scottish Small Towns Task Group Classification could be used across Scotland as a whole.

Frequency of use

5.30 Respondents were asked how regularly, on average, they used the SG Urban Rural Classification. As chart 5.2 demonstrates, across the online sample as a whole, the average number of times the SG Urban Rural Classification is used per year is 3.3.

Chart 5.2: Regularity of using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

Average = 3.3 times per year

- 21% every month or more regular
- 12% < once mth - quarterly
- 50% 1 - 3 times per yr
- 18% < once yr

Source: PA14 n=213
• does not add to 100% due to rounding
5.31 The highest level of usage was reported by Commercial Organisations (average = 6.75 times per year) and respondents within the Scottish Government (average = 3.6 times per year).

In summary,

- A large majority of those responding to the online survey make a distinction between urban and rural areas in their work. Where this distinction is not made, this is generally due to a perceived lack of relevance to their work.

- Around half the online respondents use the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification specifically and appear to be largely satisfied with the way this has been developed and how it can be used in their work.

- The SG Urban Rural Classification is most commonly used in the topic areas of Communities / Population Change.

- Key perceived benefits of this classification are that it:
  - Allows comparisons to be made for urban rural areas across Scotland;
  - Is an officially recognised classification that fits with other datasets;
  - Is straightforward and easy to use;
  - Uses a common reference point and language that can be applied and compared across Scotland;
  - Is flexible to use;
  - Is available at multiple geographies;
  - Is useful in applying for funding or in allocating funding to specific projects;
  - Can be used consistently across all Scottish Local Authorities.

- There are some perceived limitations associated with the SG Urban Rural Classification though some of these may reflect misunderstandings over the use of the classification. Limitations identified by respondents included:
  - Lack of consistency with classifications used in rest of UK or that it is difficult to make comparisons with rest of UK;
  - Data zone does not match LA boundaries, postcode areas;
  - Does not take local conditions into account / local level discrepancies;
  - Not suitable for islands / does not distinguish between types of island settlement or those with low population density;
  - Lack of continuity over time / changes to boundaries;
  - Focus on settlement size / population based / drive time;
  - It can be difficult to understand / use, that a degree of statistical literacy is required to use it effectively or that it is too technical for layperson.

- Key reasons for non-usage of the SG Urban Rural Classification are its perceived lack of relevance, or that it is has not been needed to date. In addition, some mentioned that the classification is too detailed for requirements; this seems to indicate a lack of awareness of the 2-fold classification which although commonly used is not described in the guidance for the SG Urban Rural Classification.
6 HOW THE SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT URBAN RURAL CLASSIFICATION IS USED

6.1 The online questionnaire posed a number of questions to analysts in relation to the SG Urban Rural Classification that were not asked of other classifications being used. This was because the SG Urban Rural Classification was the primary focus of the research.

Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification Breakdowns Used

6.2 Analysts were asked which of the SG Urban Rural Classification breakdowns they tended to use; as can be seen in chart 6.1, the highest usage level was for the 6-fold classification and this usage was highest among those within NHS Boards (89%) and the SG (82%). It should be noted that some respondents were using more than one breakdown. The telephone interviews show that respondents use which ever breakdown is perceived to be most appropriate for a specific piece of analysis.

Chart 6.1: Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification Breakdowns used (analysts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Usage Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 fold classification</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 fold classification</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 fold classification</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 fold classification</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QA15; Analysts, n = 148

6.3 Highest use of the 6-fold classification was among respondents within NHS Boards and Scottish Government and use of the 3-fold definition highest among those in Private Consultancies.

6.4 Use of the 8-fold classification specifically was highest among respondents within Universities / Colleges.

6.5 The 8 and 6 fold classifications are used mostly in the topic areas of Communities / Population Change and Health and Wellbeing.

6.6 The 3 and 2 fold classifications are used mostly in the topic areas of Communities / Population Change and Economy / Economic Development.
Geography Selected

6.7 Looking at the geographic boundaries selected when using the SG Urban Rural Classification, respondents tend to use either data zones and/or postcodes.

Chart 6.2: Geographic boundaries selected when using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data zone</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output area</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QA16; Analysts, n = 143 (respondents could select more than one of these geographies)

6.8 Looking at the geographic boundaries selected against the classification used shows:

- Those using the 8 and 3 fold classifications tend to select postcode;
- More of those using the 6-fold classification select data zone;
- Analysts using the 2-fold classification mainly select postcode and data zone.

Dataset used

6.9 Analysts were asked with what type(s) of dataset they use the SG Urban Rural Classification and responses show that:

- Within the Scottish Government, highest proportions of respondents were using survey data;
- Within Local Authorities, highest proportions were using official or national statistics sources;
- Among NHS Boards, highest proportions were using administrative data.

It should be noted that there is likely to be overlap in the responses to this as, for example, the Scottish Household Survey could be classified as either survey data or official or national statistics.
6.10 Examination of the topic areas where the SG Urban Rural Classification was used shows that Communities / Population Change was most commonly mentioned by those using all datasets:

- Administrative data (51%);
- Survey data (47%);
- Secondary data (58%);
- Official or National Statistics source (59%).

6.11 Economy / Economic Development was second most common among those using secondary data and Official or National Statistics, while Health and Wellbeing was second among those using administrative data and survey data.

Data Sources to which the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is applied

6.12 The SG Urban Rural Classification can be applied to data sources. This means that the classification is attached (by postcode, data zone, etc) to existing data sources to allow for urban rural analysis. Analysts were asked to “name the specific data sources to which you apply the SG Urban Rural Classification” and 81 analysts mentioned almost 100 sources; these were either named or a general description given. A list of named data sources is included at Appendix 4.

6.13 Those mentioned by over 5% were:

- Scottish Household Survey (15 respondents) – this was mentioned by a third of those responding from the Scottish Government;
- Census (7);
- Scottish House Condition Survey (5);
- Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics (5);
- The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) (4).
6.14 Table 6.1 shows the main sources identified as being used by at least 4 respondents and indicates that the SG Urban Rural Classification is applied to all topic areas with these larger sources. Other, more specific sources, tended to show predictable results with relationships between the topic and the source. For example, 2 respondents identified the Pupil Census as the main source to which they applied the SG Urban Rural Classification and that this work was focusing on Education and Lifelong Learning.

### Table 6.1: Topic areas and datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Communities / population change (35)</th>
<th>Health &amp; Wellbeing (29)</th>
<th>Economy / economic development (23)</th>
<th>Education &amp; Lifelong Learning (23)</th>
<th>Housing (22)</th>
<th>Transport (20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Household Survey</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish House Condition Survey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QA18; Analysts naming specific data sources to which they apply the SG Urban Rural Classification

### Attitudinal statements

6.15 Both analysts and policy respondents were asked to rate a number of statements in relation to the SG Urban Rural Classification. It should be noted that there were high numbers saying ‘don’t know’ at each statement, which may indicate a lack of information about the SG Urban Rural Classification.
6.16 “There are limitations in using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification to assess change over time”:

- Responses to this statement were fairly consistent across all sectors and respondent types. Key perceived limitations were outlined in Chapter 5.

6.17 “I would like to use the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification more for policy development”:

- Agreement with this statement was highest among those working within Local Authorities and Voluntary Organisations, although no respondents from these two categories agreed strongly. A third of those working within Scottish Government said they tended to agree, with just over 1 in 20 agreeing strongly. A small number of respondents participating in the telephone interviews noted they would like to use this classification more, although opportunities for increased usage were fairly limited.

6.18 “I prefer to use other classifications that sit within Local Authority boundaries”:

- Around half of those working in Local Authorities and Private Consultancies agreed with this statement; this compares to less than 1 in 5 of those working within the SG. No respondents within Health Boards agreed with this statement. Findings from the telephone interviews indicate that these fairly low levels of agreement are because other classifications used are perceived to be more appropriate for the analysis in hand.
“There are other forms of classification available that are more appropriate”:

- Again, there was a fairly high level of disagreement with this statement and those working within Universities / Colleges were most likely to disagree. The telephone interviews indicate that appropriateness is related to the type of project and analysis being undertaken; where the SG Urban Rural Classification is used it is, generally speaking, because it is seen as the most appropriate classification for that particular piece of work.

### Future use

6.20 All analysts and policy respondents were asked about future work involving an urban rural distinction. More than half of respondents said they were aware of future work that will require an urban rural distinction to be made. Those participating in the telephone interviews noted the importance being attributed to policy work in this area.

6.21 Over three-quarters of respondents claimed they will start to use, or continue to use, the SG Urban Rural Classification in the future.

- This was highest among those from Commercial Organisations and Universities / Colleges and lowest among those from Private Consultancies.
- 40 respondents (10 policy, 30 analysts) who are not already using the SG Urban Rural Classification intend to use it in future.

6.22 Those who said they would not be using the SG Urban Rural Classification in future were asked to give reasons and 72 replied (28 policy and 44 analyst respondents). The key reasons identified were:

- That it is not relevant to / useful for their area of work / type of data (20 respondents);
  - This answer was given by 17 analysts but only 3 policy respondents.
- No need for it (at present) (9 respondents).
- Not relevant to their local situation / area (7);
  - All these respondents came from within Local Authorities.
- Not relevant to urban areas / no rural areas in this location / areas of work have an urban focus (6);
  - All these respondents came from within Local Authorities.
- Might use it in future if appropriate / if it was specifically asked for (5).
- General concept of rural and urban is sufficient for their work / no need for such detailed distinctions (4).
In summary,

- The most widely used breakdown is the 6-fold classification.

- Respondents cited a very wide range of data sources to which they apply the SG Urban Rural Classification; the most frequently mentioned was the Scottish Household Survey.

- Attitudes from the online survey towards the SG Urban Rural Classification are largely positive and fit with comments made by respondents participating in the telephone interviews. Of the online respondents commenting on a number of attitude statements:
  - Most commenting agree there are limitations in using the SG Urban Rural Classification to assess change over time;
  - Most commenting would like to use the SG Urban Rural Classification more for policy development;
  - Some commenting would prefer to use other classifications that sit within local authority boundaries;
  - Most commenting disagreed there are other forms of classification that are more appropriate.

- Just over half of respondents were aware of future work involving an urban rural distinction; over three-quarters claim they will continue to use, or start to use, this classification in the future; responses from those claiming they will not use it in the future show that this is because the classification is not perceived as being needed rather than because of reservations about it.
7 USING OTHER GEOGRAPHIC CLASSIFICATIONS

7.1 There are various geographical classification systems in use and this chapter looks at which ones are known to respondents, both online and telephone. Quantitative data from the online responses shows the level of awareness and usage of 5 main tools in addition to the SG Urban Rural Classification. During the telephone interviews, reasons for use or non-use were explored in more detail. The online questionnaire prompted respondents with a list of classifications or databases, but also gave them the opportunity to add any others. Further information on these, and other classifications, is given in Appendix 3. The prompted list consisted of:

- The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD);
  - designed to identify area concentrations of multiple deprivation across all of Scotland presented at data zone level.

- PAF (Postcode Address File);
  - the Royal Mail’s database of UK addresses.

- ACORN or Mosaic;
  - socio-demographic segmentation systems.

- DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England;
  - a 6-fold urban rural classification.

- The Randall Definition;
  - a means of classifying local authorities based on population density; using the Randall Classification 14 Local Authorities are classed as rural.

Awareness of classifications

7.2 All respondents were asked to say which classifications they had heard of and were prompted with the list of 5 classifications. Respondents were provided with an opportunity to add any others of which they were aware. Results are shown in chart 7.1 alongside awareness of the SG Urban Rural Classification.

7.3 As shown in chart 7.1, the highest level of awareness was for the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) at 88% of all respondents, followed by the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification (81%). Only 28 respondents said they were aware of other classifications;

- ONS output area classification (8 mentions);
- Carstairs Deprivation Scores (3);
- Scottish Enterprise - Economic typology of places across Scotland (2);
- SuperProfiles (2);
- Fragile Areas / HIE Fragile Areas (2);
- CAMEO (2).
7.4 Sub group analysis shows:

- Awareness of SIMD was highest among those in Scottish Government, Local Authorities and NHS Boards;
- Awareness of Acorn or MOSAIC was highest among Universities / Colleges;
- Awareness of DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England was highest among those in Universities / Colleges and Private Consultancies;
- Awareness of PAF was highest among those in Scottish Government;
- With exception of SIMD, awareness of each classification was higher among analysts than those involved in policy;
- Awareness of SIMD was 86%+ for all roles.

Usage of Classifications

7.5 As with the question on awareness, respondents were prompted with a list of 5 classifications and given the opportunity to add any others they used. Results are shown in chart 7.2 alongside use of the SG Urban Rural Classification. As shown in chart 7.2, highest levels of usage for these classifications were for SIMD (89%) and the SG Urban Rural Classification (72%). Other classifications were used by around one in three or less respondents.
7.6 Sub-group analysis shows:

- Highest levels of usage for SIMD were seen within NHS Boards (93%), Local Authorities (89%) and Voluntary Organisations (86%).

7.7 After identifying other classifications ever used in the course of their work, respondents were asked which they used most often. This question did not include the SG Urban Rural Classification.

### Table 7.1 Usage of other classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total (254)</th>
<th>SG &amp; others* (100)</th>
<th>Local Authority (53)</th>
<th>Other (101)</th>
<th>Policy (73)</th>
<th>Analyst (181)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIMD</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorn or MOSAIC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PA20b  
*This category comprises Scottish Government, Scottish Government Agencies and the Scottish Parliament.

### Other Urban Rural Classifications

7.8 Other urban rural classifications identified as being used most often included:
• DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England (14 respondents);
• Randall (7 respondents).

7.9 These classifications were reported as used most often by a mixture of policy respondents and analysts.

**DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England**

7.10 DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England, was used by 14 respondents (3 policy and 11 analysts); 6 respondents reported that they used this classification for ‘academic analysis’.

7.11 This classification was used most commonly in the topic area of Communities / Population Change and Transport.

7.12 Of the 13 respondents who commented on the benefits of using DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England, 8 said that it is easy to work with.

7.13 Comments on limitations or complications involved in using this classification were identified by 3 respondents, one mention each for difficulty of use, lack of transparency / clarity, limited number of geographies.

7.14 Frequency of use for DEFRA’s Classification of Local Authority Districts and Unitary Authorities in England was reported as an average of 3.77 times per year.

**Randall Definition**

7.15 The Randall Definition, a Local Authority urban rural definition, was used by 7 respondents (3 policy and 4 analysts); 3 respondents mentioned that they use Randall ‘for statistical publications’.

7.16 The main topic areas where Randall was used were Communities / Population Change (2 analysts) and Housing (2 policy).

7.17 Main benefits identified were:

- ‘Allows comparisons to be made across urban / rural areas throughout Scotland’ (5 respondents)
- Easy to work with (2 respondents);
- Provides uniformity when allocating funding” (2 SG policy respondents).

7.18 Comments on limitations or complications involved in using Randall were identified by 4 SG respondents:

- Information may be out of date (1 policy);
- Lack of precision / too general (2 policy) and, on a similar note, Some LAs are too big to be categorised as either purely urban or rural (2 analysts);
Can produce illogical / anomalous classifications (2 policy).

7.19 Frequency of use for Randall was reported as 3 times per year.

Other Geographic Classifications / Databases

7.20 Other non Urban Rural Classifications identified as being used most often included:

- SIMD (193 respondents);
- PAF (28 respondents);
- Acorn or Mosaic (5 respondents).

7.21 While both policy respondents and analysts reported that they use SIMD and PAF, Acorn / Mosaic was only selected by analysts. All 5 using Acorn / Mosaic were analysts working outwith local or Scottish Government.

Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD)

7.22 The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) was mentioned by 193 respondents (47% of the 412 total). The SIMD was designed with the purpose of identifying area concentrations of multiple deprivation across Scotland and is presented at data zone level; this means that small pockets of deprivation can be identified. It provides a ‘scale’ of deprivation.

Who uses SIMD and why?

7.23 The different purposes that SIMD and the SG Urban Rural Classifications have been designed for is reflected in the number of respondents who report using both the SG Urban Rural Classification and SIMD, either in conjunction or separately, depending on the work being undertaken.

7.24 Highest usage of SIMD was among policy respondents. In relation to sector, usage was highest among respondents working within the NHS and Local Authorities.

7.25 Looking at Scottish Government Directorates; all respondents within Health reported that they used SIMD while usage was lowest for those within Environment.

7.26 138 respondents who reported that they use SIMD most often also used the SG Urban Rural Classification.

7.27 The pattern of usage for SIMD is similar to that of the SG Urban Rural Classification, with highest proportions of analysts within Local Authorities claiming to use this to ‘define eligibility for funding’ or to ‘help with monitoring of single outcome agreements’. Highest proportions of analysts using SIMD ‘as a standard variable in analysis’ were from the Scottish Government.
A difference between reasons given for using SIMD, as opposed to those given for using the SG Urban Rural Classification, appears in relation to single outcome agreements. Although similar numbers use both classifications (188 and 210 respectively), SIMD is more commonly used in relation to single outcome agreements, especially within Local Authorities.

SIMD (24%) is also used slightly more than the SG Urban Rural Classification (17%) for defining eligibility for funding, and this use is more common among users in local government than in central government.

**Topic areas for which SIMD is used**

Respondents reported that the main topic areas where they use SIMD were Health and Wellbeing (57%), Communities / Population Change (52%) and Economy/ Economic Development (41%).

**Benefits of using SIMD**

Both policy and analyst respondents were asked to say what they felt were the benefits of using SIMD. The main response from both types of respondent was that it is an officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets; this was the main response given by analysts in all sectors.

Policy respondents working within the Scottish Government and SG agencies, however, were more likely to identify ‘fits with policy requirement’ as the main benefit.

**Limitations / complications in using SIMD**

Both analyst and policy respondents were asked to identify any limitations or complications in using SIMD. As with the question on the SG Urban Rural Classification, answers were not pre-coded and respondents were free to provide free-text responses. Again there was a smaller number of responses (n=66) and corresponding small numbers giving any one answer. The following perceptions came from both policy and analyst respondents unless stated:

- Limited use in rural areas (24 respondents); this answer was given by 9 of those working in Local Authorities;
- Difficult to use / statistical literacy needed (6);
- Lack of continuity / frequent updates make it difficult to quantify change over time (6 analysts);
- Not suitable for areas with low population density (6);
- Data zones don’t match LA boundaries / post code areas (5).

In recognition of the fact that SIMD and the SG Urban Rural Classification were designed for different purposes, respondents chose whichever one best fitted the analysis they were undertaking at the time.
Frequency of use

7.35 Respondents were asked how regularly, on average, they used SIMD and 29% of those using SIMD said they use it every month or more; this is a higher figure than the users of the SG Urban Rural Classification where only 12% reported that they used the classification every month or more frequently.

PAF

7.36 PAF, (Postcode Address File), was used most often by 28 respondents, only 4 of whom were policy respondents. 12 of the 24 analyst respondents said that they use PAF ‘as a standard variable in analysis.

7.37 The main topic areas where PAF was used were Communities / Population Change and Education and Lifelong Learning; both mentioned by 8 respondents.

7.38 The main benefit, given by 20 out of 24 analyst respondents in relation to PAF, was that it is available at postcode level.

7.39 Only 5 respondents identified limitations or complications in using PAF. Cost, lack of precision and the need to keep it up to date were each identified by 2 respondents.

7.40 Frequency of use for PAF was an average use of 4.13 times per year.

ACORN or Mosaic

7.41 ACORN or Mosaic, socio-geodemographic profiling tools, were used by 5 analysts; 3 mentioned using them ‘for statistical publications’ and ‘as a standard variable in analysis’.

7.42 The main topic areas where Acorn or Mosaic were used were given as Housing and Economy / Economic Development (2 mentions each).

7.43 The main benefit identified was that these are available at a postcode level (4 mentions).

7.44 Only 2 analysts mentioned a limitation / complication involved in using Acorn or Mosaic and this was cost.

7.45 Frequency of use was an average of 5.4 times per year.

Overall usage of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification and/or other classifications

7.46 This section looks at different classifications in use and examines whether this usage relates to the respondents’ job function or work sector, topic areas, or other datasets and sources that are also in use. As table 7.2 shows, the highest proportion of respondents used a combination of the SG Urban Rural Classification and other(s), while only a small minority used the SG Urban Rural Classification only.
Table 7.2 Usage of classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SG &amp; others*</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Analyst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(412)</td>
<td>(171)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(149)</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>(279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use any classification</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SG UR only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SG UR and other(s)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use other(s) only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PA5, PA20x
* This category comprises Scottish Government, Scottish Government Agencies and the Scottish Parliament.

7.47 123 (30% of the total) do not use any form of classification in their work:

- This figure includes analysts and policy respondents from across all sectors; 70 of these respondents reported that they do make a distinction between urban and rural areas in their work and 47 were aware of other types of classifications. Given that 70 respondents do make a distinction but do not use any form of classification, this issue was examined further in the telephone interviews to ascertain why this might be the case.

7.48 There were two key reasons provided by respondents participating in the telephone interviews for not using any classification in their work. First, the nature of their work meant that it was not perceived as being necessary to use any of the available classifications. Second, a small number of respondents (primarily those involved in policy) noted that their use is indirect. These respondents were provided with information by colleagues who have used one of the available classifications, for example, in briefing papers or publications. As one policy respondent noted,

“I have never used the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification, although that doesn’t mean to say I haven’t used data produced by colleagues who have used it. There are probably a number of people within this organisation who will be using it.”

7.49 27 (7%) use only the SG Urban Rural Classification:

- Again this figure included analysts and policy respondents from across most sectors, although more than half were policy respondents; the main topic area for which the SG Urban Rural Classification was being used was Economy / Economic Development (12 respondents).

7.50 187 (45%) use the SG Urban Rural Classification and also use one or more other classifications:

- The other classification most frequently mentioned was the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD); 167 respondents reported they use the SG Urban Rural Classification and also use SIMD. The SG Urban Rural Classification was used mainly in the area of Communities / Population Change (91 respondents) while Health and Wellbeing was the main topic area for those who also used SIMD (70 respondents).
7.51 75 (18%) use one or more other classifications but do not use the SG Urban Rural Classification:

- This included 51 who only used one classification. Again SIMD was the classification most frequently mentioned (by 55 respondents); 35 respondents used SIMD in the area of Health and Wellbeing and 31 in the area of Communities / Population Change.

Using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification and other classifications

7.52 Analysts who use the SG Urban Rural Classification were asked whether they used different classifications in conjunction with the SG Urban Rural Classification or for different purposes (base = 144):

- 28 used the SG Urban Rural Classification in conjunction with other classifications;
  - this was highest amongst University / College analysts (7 out of 20).
- 17 used other classifications for different purposes;
  - highest amongst Local Authorities (5 out of 22).
- 99 answered no, they do not use different classifications in conjunction with the SG Urban Rural Classification or for different purposes;
  - All of the 7 Voluntary Organisation analysts answered no to this question.

- Classifications identified as being used in conjunction with each other or for different purposes included (base = 32):
  - SG Urban Rural Classification and SIMD / SG Urban Rural Classification and SIMD in conjunction (8 respondents);
  - Using SIMD only but using it for a variety of purposes (8);
  - SIMD and Acorn for a variety of purposes (2);
  - Derived bespoke classifications for different purposes (2).

- Reasons for using classifications in conjunction with each other included (base = 26):
  - They measure different things / provide more than one dimension of analysis (4 respondents);
  - They are the best available / best suited to purpose (2);
  - Offers a sufficiently local base to be meaningful in analysing communities (2).

7.53 In order to understand why different classifications were being used, the respondents participating in the telephone interviews were asked to explain how they make a decision on which classification(s) to use. Respondents reported that the classification(s) were selected primarily according to each particular project being undertaken and its objectives. In some instances, classifications were used in conjunction with each other or for different purposes because they had previously been used and there was a requirement for consistency in data reporting over time. As had already been mentioned in responses to the online
survey, respondents again indicated that each classification was distinct in its own right and used for specific purposes.

**UK wide analysis involving urban and rural classifications**

7.54 One of the questions asked of analysts, but not policy respondents, in the online survey was whether respondents conduct cross-border or UK wide analysis that involves using different urban rural classifications:

- Less than a fifth of analysts (24 out of 147) who responded said that they do, with highest proportions from within Universities / Colleges (12).

7.55 Analysts were then asked to identify any issues in using more than one urban rural classification for cross-border or UK-wide analysis. Nineteen respondents gave an answer. The main issues identified were:

- Different classifications / different definitions (7);
- Lack of comparability (with rest of UK) (4 out of the 5 who said this were from Universities / Colleges).
In summary,

- Amongst other classifications, the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) was identified as being used most often by most respondents.

- The pattern of usage for SIMD was similar to that noted for the SG Urban Rural Classification, although SIMD is used more than the SG Urban Rural Classification in relation to single outcome agreements and slightly more for defining eligibility for funding.

- A key benefit identified by analysts for SIMD is that it is an officially recognised classification that fits with other SG datasets; policy respondents note that SIMD fits with policy requirements. SIMD is of limited use in rural areas as populations in rural areas are more sparse and mixed so concentrations of multiple deprivation are less likely to occur.

- The classification with highest levels of awareness is SIMD, followed closely by the SG Urban Rural Classification. Awareness of other classifications varied; while almost half were aware of PAF, only 1 in 10 knew of the Randall Definition.

- SIMD has the highest level of usage among respondents; closely followed by the SG Urban Rural Classification. Less than one in three respondents used any other classification.

- Almost 90% of the users of the SG Urban Rural Classification also used at least one other geographic classification systems, most commonly the SIMD.

- Some online respondents conducting cross-border or UK-wide analysis face difficulties because of the use of different urban rural classifications which are not comparable.
8 ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION ABOUT THE SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT URBAN RURAL CLASSIFICATION

8.1 A key issue in relation to the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is whether existing and potential users are able to access all the information required to enable them to make better use of the classification.

Attitudes towards Information and Communication

8.2 All respondents were asked to give their level of agreement with 2 attitudinal statements in relation to the provision of information on this classification. As shown in chart 8.1, a majority of respondents claimed that they had access to all information / associated guidance they needed (64%) or that the information / associated guidance they had access to is clear and easy to understand (69%). Less than 20% disagreed with either of these statements. At both statements, around a fifth said ‘don’t know’.

Chart 8.1: Levels of agreement with attitude statements on the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Tend to Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have access to all the Scottish Government urban rural classification</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information / guidance that I need (286)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information / associated guidance on the Scottish Government urban</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural classification is clear and easy to understand (287)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QPA19; all respondents answering each statement

8.3 “I have access to all the information / associated guidance on the SG Urban Rural Classification that I need”:

- Agreement with this statement was highest among those working in Agencies / NPDBs and Commercial Organisations and lowest among those from the SG.
- Disagreement came mainly from those working within Voluntary Organisations and Local Authorities. More policy respondents disagreed than analysts.
- Almost 1 in 5 said ‘don’t know’ or ‘not applicable’; this was highest amongst those working within SG and among non-users.
8.4 “The information / associated guidance I have access to on the SG Urban Rural Classification is clear and easy to understand”:

- Higher proportions of those working within Agencies and Commercial Organisations agreed with this statement.
- Respondents from Voluntary Organisations again tended to disagree more than others.
- Almost a quarter said ‘don’t know’ or ‘not applicable’; again this figure was highest amongst those working within SG and among non-users.

8.5 Most respondents participating in telephone discussions felt they had enough information on the SG Urban Rural Classification, particularly those who used this on a regular basis and who had an analytical or statistical background. That said, some felt that they obtained information due to their own pro-activity rather than information automatically being supplied by the Scottish Government. A small number who had not been provided with information assumed they could readily access this if required via the Scottish Government website.

Usage of Updates

8.6 The Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is updated every two years and 59% of analysts claimed to use each update when it is available. In terms of organisation they work for, highest proportions using the updates were found in the SG. In terms of Scottish Government directorate, this was highest among those in Environment and Economy.

Chart 8.2: Whether each update of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is used when available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usage of Updates</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QA7; Analysts, n = 150

8.7 From the online survey, just over half of analysts claimed to be using the most recent update, released in August 2008.

8.8 Of those participating in the online survey, just over one in five were unaware as to which version they were using; this was highest among respondents from
Voluntary Organisations and within the SG and lowest among those working in Private Consultancies.

8.9 Updates were also discussed during the telephone interviews, with respondents asked about the details given in their online responses. While some respondents noted they were automatically provided with information when a new download was available, this was not universal and some referred to obtaining information or updates via a colleague either at their place of work or via a contact within SG.

8.10 A quarter of those responding to the online survey claimed not to be using the August 2008 update. Highest proportions of those using the most recent update were in Local Authorities, ‘Other’ organisations and the Scottish Government.

8.11 In terms of the Scottish Government Directorates, highest proportions of those using the most recent version were within Economy and Environment.

**Chart 8.3: Whether August 2008 Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is being used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QA8; Analysts, n = 150

8.12 A large majority (80%) of those claiming to use each update when it becomes available were currently using the updated August 2008 version. Of the small number (n = 37) not using the updated August 2008 version, key reasons given were that they did not have the updated version or that the new version was not appropriate to the data they use.

8.13 Some respondents participating in the telephone interviews noted non-use of the most recent update was not purely related to a lack of information about updates but was also sometimes due to personal preference. Indeed, a small number of telephone respondents noted a continued use of an older version of the SG Urban Rural Classification in order to retain consistency over time. For example, when there are changes in a new version that may impact on eligibility for funding, there may be a preference to continue working with the older version.
8.14 Another respondent noted problems with funding of a specific project because of changes to the definition of a settlement. They had funding for a rural project over a three year period but, due to reclassification of a specific settlement, adopting the updated version would mean their eligibility for funding became invalid part way through the funding process. Scottish Government officials assure us that any areas eligible for SG funding will remain so for the life of the programme unless stated otherwise in the relevant legislation. This issue highlights the importance of clarity when adopting the SG Urban Rural Classification in the design of funding mechanisms.

8.15 Just over one in two analysts responding to the online survey used each updated version either because they were automatically sent an update or because they worked with the online version. Just over one in ten requested an update; half of these worked within the Scottish Government (various Directorates).

Chart 8.4: Whether an update is sent automatically when a new version is published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automatically</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request update</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use online version</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QA9; Analysts, n = 150

Information Provision

8.16 While most telephone respondents felt that ScotStat is a useful communication tool for information provision on the SG Urban Rural Classification, not all respondents had registered with ScotStat.

8.17 One Local Authority analyst felt that visibility of the SG Urban Rural Classification was limited and noted,

“If it appeared in more publications it would get picked up by other people more. The Urban Rural Classification is not a SIMD, not a ‘turn to’ variable that people are very familiar with.”

8.18 Some telephone respondents felt it would be useful to have some kind of forum where information could be shared on how the classification can be used and explanations provided as to how it has been developed. For example, one analyst who had only been in post a short while, although aware of the
classification, knew very little about it and would have liked to access a discussion forum where information could be shared, questions could be asked and examples of usage be provided.

8.19 One analyst who regularly used the classification and who often used this to provide information to policy colleagues, felt that information on the benefits of using this classification could be given to colleagues and would be beneficial in terms of helping to increase awareness and usage.

8.20 One respondent mentioned the possibility of roadshows to demonstrate ways in which the SG Urban Rural Classification can be used, although others felt that attendance at something like this could be very limited and a costly exercise for the SG that would bring about little real benefit in terms of increasing awareness and usage.

8.21 While the concept of a roadshow received little enthusiasm, some respondents noted that case studies of how the classification can be used could be useful. Firstly, to provide practical examples as to how the classification can be applied, and secondly, case studies can be used by analysts to demonstrate to colleagues how it works and how it can be used.

8.22 The concept of providing additional information was welcomed by policy respondents participating in the online survey. When asked whether they thought it would be helpful if analysts in their organisation provided them with more information on different classification systems that are available; of the 124 giving a response, 60% said yes it would; this included 31 of the 43 Local Authority policy makers who responded.

8.23 There was a preference from most telephone respondents for information to be provided via email, although there was also an expectation that the website would also provide a contact name and phone number.

8.24 One Local Authority analyst suggested that there was a need for the Scottish Government to engage further with Local Authorities to ensure they are optimising usage of the SG Urban Rural Classification.
In summary,

- A majority of respondents claimed to have access to all the information / associated guidance they need; a majority also claimed that the information and associated guidance is clear and easy to understand. Those likely to be seeking any information assumed this would be available via the Scottish Government website.

- There are some indications of the need for information to be provided to existing and potential users. For example, nearly one in four respondents were unable to provide comment as to whether the information / associated guidance on the SG Urban Rural Classification is clear and easy to understand. There was also a lack of understanding that any areas eligible for funding will remain so for the life of the programme unless stated otherwise in the relevant legislation.

- A majority use each update of the classification when it becomes available, although just over 1 in 5 were unaware as to what version they were using and a quarter were not using the most recent update from August 2008. A small number of respondents had a preference to continue working with an older version of the SG Urban Rural Classification in order to maintain consistency over time. As use of the classification should depend on the purpose it may be correct to use an older version.

- While ScotStat is perceived to be an appropriate vehicle for information updates, (when prompted) not all telephone interview respondents were aware of ScotStat or had registered with it. As such, there were suggestions for additional ways in which information on the SG Urban Rural Classification can be disseminated to existing and potential users and these included:
  - discussion forums
  - leaflets outlining benefits
  - case studies demonstrating how the SG Urban Rural Classification can be used
  - information that analysts can pass onto other colleagues

- There is an expectation that information will be available via the Scottish Government website and that this will also include a contact name and telephone number for any queries.
9 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

9.1 It is important to classify Scotland into urban and rural areas because the context for policy making is different when addressing urban and rural areas. There are further differences within both urban and rural areas. They have different needs and characteristics.

9.2 During the course of the desk research a wide range of urban rural classification systems were identified throughout the UK and Scotland. Each classification tends to use a combination of location (geography) including travel time, and/or settlement size and type, and/or socio-economic criteria.

9.3 The primary research (both the questionnaire and the interviews) presents a generally positive picture of use and understanding of the SG urban rural classification, though it should be borne in mind that the survey sample was largely drawn from SG distribution lists which included those with a rural interest, those who had registered with ScotStat and those who already received information on the SG Urban Rural Classification.

9.4 Respondents have access to a number of classifications, and each tends to be selected according to specific requirements. For the individuals who do make a distinction between urban and rural in their work, the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is widely used. There was a high level of recognition among respondents. The use of this is usually complemented by the use of other geographic classifications such as the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) to create further layers of analysis. Data from the online survey shows that there is often a need for multi dimensional levels of analysis, and 45% of online respondents used both the SG Urban Rural Classification and another classification, primarily SIMD.

9.5 Available classifications tend to be used infrequently, and data from the online survey suggests that usage levels are likely to remain at a similar level. A majority of respondents (57%) were aware of future work involving an urban rural distinction. Responses from those claiming they will not use the SG Urban Rural Classification in the future show that this is because the classification is not perceived to be needed, rather than because of reservations about the classification itself.

9.6 Users of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification appear to be largely satisfied with the way this has been developed and how it can be used in their work. The SG Urban Rural Classification and SIMD are widely used but neither is designed to meet all user requirements; as a result they are not considered to be appropriate in all circumstances and two key Scottish organisations – Highlands and Islands Enterprise and Scottish Enterprise – have been involved in the development of classifications to meet their own purposes.

9.7 Data from the online survey shows a high degree of satisfaction with the availability, clarity and comprehensiveness of the information and guidance available on the SG Urban Rural Classification.
9.8 There is a need to consider how best to effectively disseminate information on the SG Urban Rural Classification and how this can be applied. Guidance addressing what the SG Urban Rural Classification can and cannot be used for, as well as the provision of case studies with practical examples could be a welcome means of providing further information to existing and potential users. Where the classification is used to establish eligibility for funding there is a need to clarify that any areas eligible for funding will remain so for the life of the programme unless stated otherwise in the relevant legislation. While ScotStat is perceived to be an appropriate vehicle for information updates, not all telephone interview respondents were aware of ScotStat.

9.9 Users, particularly policy makers in central and local government, have a responsibility to ensure that they understand how the classification is, and should be, used in legislation, the designing of programmes and performance monitoring.

Messages from the research: suggestions for promoting the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification in the future

- As well as providing information on the SG website, provide a named individual and telephone number as a single point of contact for queries that cannot be answered on the FAQ section of the website.

- Consider a better system for informing all existing and potential users of the SG Urban Rural Classification. This will ensure that information in relation to the SG Urban Rural Classification is provided to all relevant individuals and help to maintain and increase awareness and usage of the classification.

- Examine ways in which the SG Urban Rural Classification can be used alongside other forms of classification and demonstrate how these can be used to complement each other for analysis.

- Provide additional information in the form of case histories and practical examples to demonstrate ways in which the SG Urban Rural Classification can be applied. This is particularly important for users and potential users who are not statisticians and / or who may be infrequent users.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1
ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE
Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification

This survey is aimed at all analysts, policy makers and those who influence policy. The survey is being undertaken for the Scottish Government as part of a project to investigate the extent to which you make a distinction between urban and rural areas.

We are particularly interested in the awareness and use of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification. However, we are also interested in the use of other approaches to classifying the population.

Your views and experiences are extremely valuable to the project and we would appreciate it if you could complete this short questionnaire. It should take you no more than 10 minutes. The findings from the research will help the Scottish Government identify how to better support the use of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification.

This survey is being undertaken and analysed by George Street Research, an independent research company. George Street Research operates in accordance with the strict code of conduct of the Market Research Society, which ensures confidentiality and preserves the anonymity of individuals and organisations participating in research. The research findings will be reported in aggregate form only and no comments would ever be attributed to you in the reporting.

Please could you also forward this to any colleagues who use any population classifications with a request for them to complete a questionnaire.

This is a secure site operated by George Street Research, 0131 478 7505.

Section A - About You
In order to help us with our analysis, we would be grateful if you could provide the following information.

C1  Do you work for ….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Scottish Government</th>
<th>Agency / NDPB</th>
<th>University / college</th>
<th>Private consultancy</th>
<th>Commercial organisation</th>
<th>Voluntary organisation</th>
<th>NHS Board</th>
<th>Other - Please state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


### C1a Which Local Authority do you work for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen (City)</td>
<td>Highland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>Midlothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll &amp; Bute</td>
<td>Moray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannanshire</td>
<td>North Ayrshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td>North Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee (City)</td>
<td>Orkney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>Scottish Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>Shetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh (City)</td>
<td>South Ayrshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eilean Siar</td>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>West Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow (City)</td>
<td>West Lothian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C1b Which Scottish Government Directorate do you work for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice &amp; Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Corporate Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C1c Which NHS Board do you work for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayrshire &amp; Arran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lothian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C2 Would you describe yourself as …
- Policy maker / policy influencer (who uses data provided by analysts and researchers in the development and/or evaluation of policy)
- Analyst (ie user / handler of data sets)
- Researcher
- Other
C2a Other - Please state

For the remainder of the questionnaire:
Questions beginning P only – answered by policy respondents
Questions beginning A only – answered by analysts, researchers and others
Questions beginning PA – answered by all respondents

Section B - Distinguishing between urban and rural areas

PA1a In your work, do you make a distinction between urban and rural areas?
Yes
No

PA1b What are your reasons for not making a distinction between urban and rural areas in your work?

The Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification defines settlements of 3,000 or less people to be rural. It also classifies areas as remote or accessible based on drive times from settlements of 10,000 or more people. It includes the following categories:

1 : Large Urban Areas
Settlements of over 125,000 people.

2 : Other Urban Areas
Settlements of 10,000 to 125,000 people.

3 : Accessible Small Towns
Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more.

4 : Remote Small Towns
Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.

5 : Accessible Rural
Settlements of less than 3,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more.

6 : Remote Rural
Settlements of less than 3,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.

Further information can be found Here (web link)
This link is also available on the thank you screen at the end of this survey.
PA4 Prior to reading the above, were you aware that the Scottish Government has an Urban Rural Classification?
Yes
No

PA5 Do you use the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification?
Yes
No

PA6 What are your reasons for not using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification?

A7 The Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is updated every two years. Do you use each update of the classification as it becomes available? Yes
No
Don't know

A8 In August 2008 the Scottish Government produced an updated Urban Rural Classification. Are you using this updated version?
Yes
No
Don't know

A8 Why are you not using this updated version?
- We do not have an updated version
- It is not appropriate for the data we use
- Other

A9 When a new version of the classification is published, are you automatically sent this update, or do you specifically request an update?
- Automatically sent update
- Request update yourself
- I use the online version
- Don’t know

A10 Why do you use the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification? Please tick all that apply
- As a standard variable in analysis
- For statistical publications
- Requested by colleagues in policy development
- To define eligibility for funding
- To help with monitoring of single outcome agreements
- Academic analysis
- Other

A10a Other - please state
P10  Why do you use the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification in your work? Please tick all that apply
- For statistical publications
- Policy development
- For Ministerial / Political speeches, debates or briefings
- To determine eligibility for funding (e.g. for rural communities)
- To assist with single outcome agreements
- Other
P10a Other - please state

PA11  And in what topic areas is this classification used? Please tick all that apply
- Communities / Population change
- Health and Wellbeing
- Economy/Economic development
- Planning
- Business
- Housing
- Employment
- Justice
- Education and Lifelong Learning
- Environment
- Culture
- Transport
- Tourism
- Other
PA11a Other - please state

A12  What are the benefits of using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification? Please tick all that apply
- It fits with what is required by policy colleagues
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Easy to work with
- Available at postcode level
- Other
A12a Other - please state
What are the benefits of using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification? Please tick all that apply
- Fits with policy requirements
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/rural areas throughout Scotland
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Provides uniformity when allocating funding
- Easy to work with
- Other

Other - please state

And what are the limitations/complications in using this classification?

How regularly on average do you use the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification?
- Every month or more frequently
- Less than once a month - Quarterly
- 1 - 3 times a year
- Less than once a year

Which of the Scottish Urban Rural Classification breaks do you use? Please tick all that apply
- 8-fold classification (large urban areas, other urban areas, accessible small towns, remote small towns, accessible rural, remote rural, very remote small towns, very remote rural)
- 6-fold classification (large urban areas, other urban areas, accessible small towns, remote small towns, accessible rural, remote rural)
- 3-fold classification (remote rural, accessible rural, rest of Scotland)
- 2-fold classification (urban, rural)

Which geography do you select when using the Urban Rural Classification?
- Please tick all that apply
- Postcode
- Data zone
- Output area
- Other

Other - please state
A17 With what type of dataset do you use the Urban Rural Classification? Please tick all that apply
- Administrative data
- Survey data
- Secondary data
- Official or National Statistics Source
- Other source type

A17a Other source type - please state

A18 Please use the space below to name the specific data sources to which you apply the Urban Rural Classification

PA19 Below are a number of statements that have been made by users of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification specifically. Please could you tick one box for each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement?
(Agree strongly    Tend to agree    Tend to disagree    Disagree strongly    Don’t know / Not applicable)
- There are other forms of classification available that are more appropriate
- I prefer to use other classifications that sit within Local Authority boundaries
- There are limitations in using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification to assess change over time
- I would like to use the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification more for policy development
- I have access to all the information / associated guidance on the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification that I need
- The information / associated guidance I have access to on the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification is clear and easy to understand

PA19x Please use the space below if you wish to comment on any of the above statements

Section C - Use of other classifications

PA20 Which of the following geographical classifications for describing the population, if any, are you aware of? Please tick all that apply
- Acorn or MOSAIC
- DEFRA (Rural and Urban Area Classification)
- PAF (Postcode Address File)
- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Randall Definition (Local Authority urban rural definition)
- Other
- Don’t know
- Not aware of any

PA20a Other classification(s) aware of
PA20x And which of these, if any, do you ever use? Please tick all those that you use.
- Acorn or MOSAIC
- DEFRA (Rural and Urban Area Classification)
- PAF (Postcode Address File)
- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Randall Definition (Local Authority urban rural definition)
- Other
- I'm not sure what we use

PA20x Other classification(s) aware of

PA20 And which one of these do you use most often? Please tick ONE.
- Acorn or MOSAIC
- DEFRA (Rural and Urban Area Classification)
- PAF (Postcode Address File)
- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Randall Definition (Local Authority urban rural definition)
- Other

PA20b Other classification used

A21 Why do you use Acorn or MOSAIC Classification in your work?
- As a standard variable in analysis
- For statistical publications
- Requested by colleagues in policy development
- To define eligibility for funding
- To help with monitoring of single outcome agreements
- Academic analysis
- Other

A21a Other reason

A21 Why do you use DEFRA Classification in your work?
- As a standard variable in analysis
- For statistical publications
- Requested by colleagues in policy development
- To define eligibility for funding
- To help with monitoring of single outcome agreements
- Academic analysis
- Other

A21b Other reason

A21 Why do you use PAF Classification in your work?
- As a standard variable in analysis
- For statistical publications
- Requested by colleagues in policy development
- To define eligibility for funding
- To help with monitoring of single outcome agreements
- Academic analysis
- Other
A21c Other reason

A21 Why do you use Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation Classification in your work?
- As a standard variable in analysis
- For statistical publications
- Requested by colleagues in policy development
- To define eligibility for funding
- To help with monitoring of single outcome agreements
- Academic analysis
- Other

A21d Other reason

A21 Why do you use Randall Definition Classification in your work?
- As a standard variable in analysis
- For statistical publications
- Requested by colleagues in policy development
- To define eligibility for funding
- To help with monitoring of single outcome agreements
- Academic analysis
- Other

A21e Other reason

A21 Why do you use an other Classification in your work?
- As a standard variable in analysis
- For statistical publications
- Requested by colleagues in policy development
- To define eligibility for funding
- To help with monitoring of single outcome agreements
- Academic analysis
- Other

A21f Other reason

P21 Why do you use Acorn or MOSAIC Classification in your work?
- For statistical publications
- Policy development
- For Ministerial / Political speeches, debates or briefings
- To determine eligibility for funding (e.g. for rural communities)
- To assist with single outcome agreements
- Other

P21a Other reason
P21 Why do you use DEFRA Classification in your work?
- For statistical publications
- Policy development
- For Ministerial / Political speeches, debates or briefings
- To determine eligibility for funding (e.g. for rural communities)
- To assist with single outcome agreements
- Other

P21b Other reason

P21 Why do you use PAF Classification in your work?
- For statistical publications
- Policy development
- For Ministerial / Political speeches, debates or briefings
- To determine eligibility for funding (e.g. for rural communities)
- To assist with single outcome agreements
- Other

P21c Other reason

P21 Why do you use Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation Classification in your work?
- For statistical publications
- Policy development
- For Ministerial / Political speeches, debates or briefings
- To determine eligibility for funding (e.g. for rural communities)
- To assist with single outcome agreements
- Other

P21d Other reason

P21 Why do you use Randall Definition Classification in your work?
- For statistical publications
- Policy development
- For Ministerial / Political speeches, debates or briefings
- To determine eligibility for funding (e.g. for rural communities)
- To assist with single outcome agreements
- Other

P21e Other reason

P21 Why do you use an other Classification in your work?
- For statistical publications
- Policy development
- For Ministerial / Political speeches, debates or briefings
- To determine eligibility for funding (e.g. for rural communities)
- To assist with single outcome agreements
- Other

P21f Other reason
PA22 And in what topic areas is Acorn or MOSAIC classification used?
- Communities / Population change
- Health and Wellbeing
- Economy/Economic development
- Planning
- Business
- Housing
- Employment
- Justice
- Education and Lifelong Learning
- Environment
- Culture
- Transport
- Tourism
- Other
P22a Other reason

PA22 And in what topic areas is DEFRA classification used?
- Communities / Population change
- Health and Wellbeing
- Economy/Economic development
- Planning
- Business
- Housing
- Employment
- Justice
- Education and Lifelong Learning
- Environment
- Culture
- Transport
- Tourism
- Other
P22b Other reason

PA22 And in what topic areas is PAF classification used?
- Communities / Population change
- Health and Wellbeing
- Economy/Economic development
- Planning
- Business
- Housing
- Employment
- Justice
- Education and Lifelong Learning
- Environment
- Culture
- Transport
- Tourism
Other

PA22 Other reason

And in what topic areas is Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation classification used?
- Communities / Population change
- Health and Wellbeing
- Economy/Economic development
- Planning
- Business
- Housing
- Employment
- Justice
- Education and Lifelong Learning
- Environment
- Culture
- Transport
- Tourism
- Other

PA22 Other reason

And in what topic areas is Randall Definition classification used?
- Communities / Population change
- Health and Wellbeing
- Economy/Economic development
- Planning
- Business
- Housing
- Employment
- Justice
- Education and Lifelong Learning
- Environment
- Culture
- Transport
- Tourism
- Other

PA22 Other reason

And in what topic areas is an other classification used?
- Communities / Population change
- Health and Wellbeing
- Economy/Economic development
- Planning
- Business
- Housing
- Employment
- Justice
- Education and Lifelong Learning
A23 What are the benefits of using Acorn or MOSAIC classification?
• It fits with what is required by policy colleagues
• Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
• An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
• Easy to work with
• Available at a postcode level
• Rigorous and transparent definition
• Works well with any form of geographic information system
• More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
• Other

A23 What are the benefits of using DEFRA classification?
It fits with what is required by policy colleagues
• Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
• An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
• Easy to work with
• Available at a postcode level
• Rigorous and transparent definition
• Works well with any form of geographic information system
• More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
• Other

A23 What are the benefits of using PAF classification?
• It fits with what is required by policy colleagues
• Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
• An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
• Easy to work with
• Available at a postcode level
• Rigorous and transparent definition
• Works well with any form of geographic information system
• More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
• Other
A23  What are the benefits of using Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation classification?

- It fits with what is required by policy colleagues
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Easy to work with
- Available at a postcode level
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other

A23d Other reason

A23  What are the benefits of using Randall Definition classification?

- It fits with what is required by policy colleagues
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Easy to work with
- Available at a postcode level
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other

A23e Other reason

A23  What are the benefits of using an other classification?

- It fits with what is required by policy colleagues
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Easy to work with
- Available at a postcode level
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other

A23f Other reason
What are the benefits of using Acorn or MOSAIC classification?
- Fits with policy requirements
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Provides uniformity when allocating funding
- Easy to work with
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other

What are the benefits of using DEFRA classification?
- Fits with policy requirements
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Provides uniformity when allocating funding
- Easy to work with
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other

What are the benefits of using PAF classification?
- Fits with policy requirements
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Provides uniformity when allocating funding
- Easy to work with
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other
What are the benefits of using Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation classification?

- Fits with policy requirements
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Provides uniformity when allocating funding
- Easy to work with
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other

What are the benefits of using Randall Definition classification?

- Fits with policy requirements
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Provides uniformity when allocating funding
- Easy to work with
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other

What are the benefits of using an other classification?

- Fits with policy requirements
- Allows comparisons to be made across urban/ rural areas throughout Scotland
- An officially recognised classification that fits with other Scottish Government datasets
- Provides uniformity when allocating funding
- Easy to work with
- Rigorous and transparent definition
- Works well with any form of geographic information system
- More appropriate than other classifications for rural areas
- Other

And what are the limitations/complications of using Acorn or MOSAIC classification?

And what are the limitations/complications of using DEFRA classification?
PA24c And what are the limitations/complications of using PAF classification?

PA24d And what are the limitations/complications of using Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation classification?

PA24e And what are the limitations/complications of using Randall Definition classification?

PA24f And what are the limitations/complications of using an other classification?

A25 How regularly on average do you use Acorn or MOSAIC classification?
   - Every month or more frequently
   - Less than once a month - Quarterly
   - 1 - 3 times a year
   - Less than once a year

A25 How regularly on average do you use DEFRA classification?
   - Every month or more frequently
   - Less than once a month - Quarterly
   - 1 - 3 times a year
   - Less than once a year

A25 How regularly on average do you use PAF classification?
   - Every month or more frequently
   - Less than once a month - Quarterly
   - 1 - 3 times a year
   - Less than once a year

A25 How regularly on average do you use Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation classification?
   - Every month or more frequently
   - Less than once a month - Quarterly
   - 1 - 3 times a year
   - Less than once a year

A25 How regularly on average do you use Randall Definition classification?
   - Every month or more frequently
   - Less than once a month - Quarterly
   - 1 - 3 times a year
   - Less than once a year

A25 How regularly on average do you use an other classification?
   - Every month or more frequently
   - Less than once a month - Quarterly
   - 1 - 3 times a year
   - Less than once a year
P25 How regularly on average do you use data provided to you by analysts or researchers using Acorn or MOSAIC classification?

- Every month or more frequently
- Less than once a month - Quarterly
- 1 - 3 times a year
- Less than once a year

P25 How regularly on average do you use data provided to you by analysts or researchers using DEFRA classification?

- Every month or more frequently
- Less than once a month - Quarterly
- 1 - 3 times a year
- Less than once a year

P25 How regularly on average do you use data provided to you by analysts or researchers using PAF classification?

- Every month or more frequently
- Less than once a month - Quarterly
- 1 - 3 times a year
- Less than once a year

P25 How regularly on average do you use data provided to you by analysts or researchers using Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation classification?

- Every month or more frequently
- Less than once a month - Quarterly
- 1 - 3 times a year
- Less than once a year

P25 How regularly on average do you use data provided to you by analysts or researchers using Randall Definition classification?

- Every month or more frequently
- Less than once a month - Quarterly
- 1 - 3 times a year
- Less than once a year

P25 How regularly on average do you use data provided to you by analysts or researchers using an other classification?

- Every month or more frequently
- Less than once a month - Quarterly
- 1 - 3 times a year
- Less than once a year

Section D - Multi Use of classifications

A26 Do you conduct cross-border or UK-wide analysis that involves using different Urban Rural Classifications?
- Yes
- No
A27 What issues, if any, do you have with using more than one Urban Rural Classification for cross-border or UK-wide analysis?

A28 Following on from the last example, are there any other instances you can think of when you use different classifications in conjunction with the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification or for different purposes?

For example, do you use the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification along with one of the following:
- Acorn / MOSAIC
- DEFRA (Rural and Urban Area Classification)
- PAF (Postcode Address File)
- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Randall Definition
- etc

Yes, in conjunction
Yes, for different purposes
No

A29 Please identify in the space below what classifications you use in conjunction with each other or for different purposes?

A30 And please use the space below to indicate your reasons for choosing to use these classifications in conjunction with each other.

Section E - Future Use of Classifications

PA31 Are you aware of any work you will be doing in the future that will require an urban rural distinction to be made?
Yes
No

PA31 Now that you know more about the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification, do you think you will start to or continue to use it?
Yes
No

PA31c Why do you think that you will not be using the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification in the future?

P32 Would it be helpful to you if analysts in your organisation provided you with more information on different classification systems that are available? Yes
No

PA33 Please use the space below to add any other comments you wish to make about use of the Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification, or to expand on any of the answers you have given.
It is possible that we will be conducting a further stage of research where we would like to talk to a small number of people in greater depth about their use of the Urban Rural Classification. If you are willing to take part in this, please complete the details below.

Name

Organisation

Telephone Number

Email address

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Please could you also forward this to any colleagues (including those within policy) who are using any type of population classification with a request for them to complete a questionnaire.
APPENDIX 2
TOPIC GUIDE
The following question areas have been developed to provide a framework for discussion. All relevant topic areas should be discussed and covered at some stage during the group session, but should be addressed in such a way that facilitates a relaxed and natural flow of conversation.

Introduction to the research
Thank respondents for participating in online survey and for agreeing to be recontacted. Reassure respondents that all views will be confidential and anonymous. Findings will be reported in aggregate form only. Explain that we are interested in following on from their initial questionnaire submissions.

Refer to online questionnaire and code frames developed from this. This should form basis of discussion

Background information & recap from online questionnaire

Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification
- (Users) Why use and what for? If used, what is the frequency of use (online questionnaire had broad bands but does once a week mean it is used in one table once a week or are geographical distinctions at the core of their work?). Explore any benefits / limitations referred to
- (Non-Users) Why not used; what is preferred to Urban Rural Classification and why
- Fit with other classifications used; fit with UK wide analysis if required

Other Classifications used
- Why use and what for? Explore any benefits / limitations referred to
- Fit with other classifications used; fit with UK wide analysis if required

Potential changes to Urban Rural Classification
- There is no plan to alter the fundamentals (i.e. the methodology and basic definitions) of the classification. Hypothetically, what adaptations/additions, if any, could / should be made to Urban Rural Classification to address business needs and increase usage for a) respondent; b) others
- What business needs could be met by making these adjustments? [Particularly probe for details re: UK-wide analysis]

Communication
- How did respondent first hear about Urban Rural Classification; what type(s) of information are they provided with;
- (where provided with information) how regularly are they provided with information; how well does information provided fit with informational needs
- What information would respondents like to have provided on SG Urban Rural Classification;
- (Analyst Users) Are respondents actually interested in how classification is linked to their data. The QR for analysts assumed that they are personally responsible for combining the U-R dataset with others but maybe they have dataset where it has already been added as a variable by others.
• What informational channels are preferred e.g. email / direct mail / other and why. Have they heard of ScotStat? - Would this be a good medium for the dissemination of Urban Rural Classification news and related issues?
• Do they know who they could contact if they have any problems/queries with using the classification?

Any other comments
CLASSIFICATIONS

SCOTLAND URBAN RURAL SYSTEMS

1 The Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification (version 2007-2008)
2 Randall Definition (Scottish Government)
3 HIE Fragility System
4 Scottish Enterprise / COSLA – Scottish Small Towns Task Group

REST OF THE UK URBAN RURAL SYSTEMS

5 Northern Ireland, Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency, NISRA Urban Rural Definition
6 Urban Settlement Definition: Office of National Statistics, on behalf of the Office of The Deputy Prime Minister / DEFRA / Countryside Agency
7 Administrative Area Classification Definition: Office of National Statistics, on behalf of the Office of The Deputy Prime Minister / DEFRA / Countryside Agency
8 DEFRA Classification of Local Authority Districts / Unitary Authorities in England
9 Local Government Finance ‘Sparcity’ Measures
10 ONS Area Classification - District Level Clusters
11 ONS Area Classification - Ward Level Clusters
12 Countryside Agency Rural Services Survey Parishes

NON URBAN RURAL SYSTEMS

13 PAF (Postcode Address File)
14 ACORN / MOSAIC Geodemographic Segmentation
15 SIMD (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation)

SCOTLAND URBAN RURAL SYSTEMS (CURRENT SYSTEMS)

1 The Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification (version 2007-2008)

The Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification (version 2007-2008, which updates the 2005-2006 version) was first released in 2000 and is consistent with the Government's core definition of rurality which defines settlements of 3,000 or less people to be rural. It also classifies areas as remote based on drive times from settlements of 10,000 or more people. The definitions of urban and rural areas underlying the classification are unchanged.

Population thresholds are used to distinguish between urban and rural areas; the settlements dataset is classified into 'large urban areas', 'other urban areas', 'small towns' or 'rural areas'. Drive times are then estimated around Settlements classed as 'large urban areas' and 'other urban areas' to distinguish between accessible and remote areas.

The 6-fold breakdown of the classification includes:

- Large Urban Areas - Settlements of over 125,000 people
- Other Urban Areas - Settlements of 10,000 to 125,000 people
- Accessible Small Towns - Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more.
- Remote Small Towns - Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.
• Accessible Rural - Settlements of less than 3,000 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more
• Remote Rural - Settlements of less than 3,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more

An additional version of the classification contains 8 categories (8-fold classification) that further splits remote (both towns and rural) into remote and very remote.

Benefits:
These definitions appear to have been widely adopted among both public and private institutions in Scotland inclusive of academic, local government and analysts and policy makers. The 8-fold and 6-fold classifications offer a high level of detail for analysis purposes

Limitations:
Some caution should be exercised when comparing data using different versions, as there have been some slight changes in settlement populations and settlement boundaries.

2 Randall Definition (Scottish Government)

Originally produced in 1985 for the Scottish Economic bulletin (SEB) as a means of profiling economic trends and indicating need for support in rural Scotland. The system is based upon population density within a unitary authority. Where a unitary authority has a population density of less than one person per hectare it is considered Rural. On this basis there are 14 rural unitary authorities. These are:

• Aberdeenshire
• Angus
• Argyll and Bute
• Dumfries and Galloway
• East Ayrshire
• Highland
• Moray
• Orkney Islands
• Perth and Kinross
• Scottish Borders
• Shetland Islands
• South Ayrshire
• Stirling
• Western Isles (Eilean Siar)

According to the Randall definition of rurality, 89% of Scotland’s landmass and 29% of its population is classified as rural (defined in 1995).

Benefits:
Unitary Authority data is readily available and it is therefore very easy to use this system for classification.

Limitations:
Since the classification system is Unitary Authority based, some urban pockets including Stirling and Inverness, are classified as rural.

3 HIE Fragility System

A comprehensive review of ‘fragile areas’ and areas of employment deficit was undertaken in late 2007 using updated demographic, geographic and economic indicators.

Fragile areas are characterised by weakening of communities through population loss, low incomes, limited employment opportunities, poor infrastructure and remoteness. HIE gives these areas priority, with support targeted at projects that will grow the economy and contribute to the long-term strengthening of these communities.
Four key indicators of fragility have been identified: population sparcity; population decline; level of prosperity and accessibility / peripherality. These are estimated by measuring population density, % population change, % change in population aged 0-15, income support claimant rate, long term unemployment, 10 min drive time to 5 key services and areas outwith 1.5 hr drive time of Inverness.

Taken in order of zones of fragility, highest to lowest, these were identified as:

- North East and Central Sutherland
- South/west Caithness
- Skye
- South Wester Ross, extending inland to Dingwall
- North West Sutherland
- South West Lochaber and Kyle area
- Mid Ross and North Easter Ross
- North Caithness
- South Nairn/Remote Inverness
- Badenoch & Strathspey and East Lochaber (excluding Fort William and environs)
- North Wester Ross
- South East Sutherland
- Inverness / Inner Moray Firth area
- Fort William and immediate hinterland (least fragile)

Benefits:
The method of evaluating a range of indices to provide the fragility score is possibly transferable to other areas (with the exception of drive time to Inverness).

Limitations:
Limited to specific regions i.e. Highlands and Islands region of Scotland.

4 Scottish Enterprise / COSLA – Scottish Small Towns Task Group

The Scottish Small Towns Task Group was formed to highlight the issues and challenges facing small towns in Scotland as their contribution tends to be underemphasised with current policy focusing on cities and remoter rural areas.

Due to their size, geographical location and environmental conditions, policy instruments for the development of small towns needs to be flexible and linked to their relationship with city/metro regions through to the rural hinterlands.

The task force undertook a Local Authority survey of small towns 2005 – 06. They defined small town settlements as being between 2,000 and 20,000 population (compared to the Scottish Government’s definition of 3,000 to 10,000).

Four categories of town have been defined:

- Within 30 miles of cities with good transport links and relatively large commuter population
- Declining traditional industry which are on the edge of cities, or relatively remote from city influences
- Relatively beyond the influence of cities and other major towns and act as a main market town / service centre for surrounding areas
- Both seaports and services centres, located on islands

Benefits:
Specific application of system for Scottish small urban settlements – an area of study that has not been focused on in as much detail by the Scottish Government as have cities or remote rural areas.

Limitations:
Analysis of population levels in towns is complicated by expanding town boundaries, which makes
comparison complex. A very specific system, tailored to study only one type of settlement as opposed to the full range of urban – rural settlements. Each Local Authority uses their own definition of town boundary and methods for defining these boundaries may differ between each Local Authority, and thus homogeneity of urban measurement may not be guaranteed within this classification system.

REST OF THE UK URBAN RURAL SYSTEMS (CURRENT SYSTEMS)

**Northern Ireland**

5 Northern Ireland, Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency, NISRA Urban Rural Definition

Statutory settlement development limits provided by the DOE Planning Service have been used as the best geographical delineation for defining settlements. Settlement development limits are designated by the NI Planning Service in order to protect the character of settlements and prevent urban sprawl into the surrounding countryside whilst providing for future development needs. Their purpose is not solely to define settlements geographically.

Classification includes:

- Band A: Belfast Metropolitan - Urban Area (BMUA) c580,000
- Band B: Derry Urban Area (DUA) c90,000
- Band C: Large town 18,000 or more and under 75,000 (outside BMUA and DUA)
- Band D: Medium town 10,000 or more and under 18,000 (outside BMUA and DUA)
- Band E: Small town 4,500 or more and under 10,000; (outside BMUA and DUA)
- Band F: Intermediate settlement 2,250 or more and under 4,500 (outside BMUA and DUA)
- Band G: Village 1,000 or more and under 2,250 (outside BMUA and DUA)
- Band H: Small village, hamlet and Settlements of less than 1,000 open countryside people and open countryside (outside BMUA and DUA)

In the absence of a programme-specific definition, Bands A-E can be defined as urban and Bands F-H as rural. This reflects the broad consensus of past departmental usage that the divide between urban and rural lies among settlements whose populations are between 3,000 and 5,000.

**Benefits:**

An up to date classification system designed specifically to assess settlement patterns in Northern Ireland.

**Limitations:**

The system is custom matched for the geographic area, namely Northern Ireland, and is not directly transferable for assessing other areas of the UK. Historically, the distinction between ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ in Northern Ireland has not been clear-cut. In an attempt to clarify the urban rural definitions, three criteria have been identified as relevant in ascribing urban characteristics to settlements: population size, population density and service provision. It was recognised that none of these criteria, in isolation, was sufficient and that a combination of these data indices were required to classify settlements (for use by central government departments).

**England and Wales**

All systems in this section apply to England and Wales as a whole.

6 Urban Settlement Definition: Office of National Statistics, on behalf of the Office of The Deputy Prime Minister / DEFRA / Countryside Agency

This system is based on land use in England and Wales. The basis of the definition is land with an irreversibly urban use and it is independent of administrative area boundaries.

The definition appears as computer readable boundaries of all built up settlements with a minimum population of 1,000 and a minimum land area of 20 hectares.
The user can choose a settlement size above which land is treated as urban for their purposes. All settlements of over 10,000 are treated as urban areas.

Limitations:
The classification system is focused on definition of urban settlement and therefore can not be used for evaluation of rural areas.

7 Administrative Area Classification Definition: Office of National Statistics, on behalf of the Office of The Deputy Prime Minister / DEFRA / Countryside Agency

The Countryside Agency classification of rural and urban administrative areas based on a range of socio-economic characteristics of the population at Local Authority and ward levels.

County level classification, based on the ward level classification, is recommended with the reservation that it should be used only where there is no other choice.

Limitations:
At a high geographical level it is less meaningful to describe an area as urban or rural, so this definition has limited use.

8 DEFRA Classification of Local Authority Districts / Unitary Authorities in England

The DEFRA approach adopts different methodologies designed to reflect the numerical significance of settlement size in different administrative area frameworks.

The classification provides a 6-fold grouping of districts:

- Major Urban
- Large Urban
- Other Urban
- Significant Rural
- Rural – 50
- Rural – 80

These six classes represent the ‘core’ or ‘most purposes’ level of the classification. However, the 6-fold grouping can be aggregated or disaggregated further. The six classes can be aggregated to three classes: ‘Predominantly Urban’ (Major, Large and Other Urban), ‘Significant Rural’ and ‘Predominantly Rural’ (Rural-50 and Rural-80).

Limitations:
DEFRA’s classification system should not be regarded as a definition of the level of rurality within Local Authority Districts. This term is reserved for the level of rurality at smaller geographic scales.

Both methods are seen as a tool for the purposes of presenting and analysing data that are only available at Local Authority District level on a comprehensive national basis. The classification is not usually used to inform detailed policy design by local government or agencies e.g. for targeting local service delivery.

9 Local Government Finance ‘Sparcity’ Measures

A by-product of the formulae used to determine central government support to Local Authorities.

The system uses the notion of low levels of habitation relative to land area as a measure of sparcity based on aggregating Enumeration District (ED) resident populations, classifying them by their sparcity and grouping into Local Authority units.

Benefits:
This measure could be used as an effective discriminator between rural and non-rural authorities and
help towards reproducing classifications determined by methods on socio-demographic measures.

Limitations:
This method is rarely used for measuring rurality – possibly due to lack of knowledge of the system or preference for other classification systems.

REST OF THE UK URBAN RURAL SYSTEMS (LEGACY SYSTEMS)

England and Wales

All systems in this section apply to England and Wales as a whole.

10 ONS Area Classification - District Level Clusters

Based on census material and Local Authority administrative boundaries using socio-demographic variables to define areas. Areas are defined as 'families':

- Rural*
- Alongside Urban Fringe
- Coast & Services
- Prosperous England
- Mining Manufacturing & Industry
- Education Centres and Outer London
- Inner London.

*Rural family is then broken down into Rural Amenity (A) and Remoter Rural (B).

The method is based on creating 'similar profiles' drawn from a range of social, economic, demographic and housing variables.

Limitations:
Not designed to define urban or rural areas. Rural clusters are only produced because their members share similar profiles on the selected range of social, economic, demographic and housing variables and that, taken together (and when represented on a map), these members 'appear' to an informed observer to be 'rural'. Some users have, however, used them as such. This is more a result of the way the families and groups have been named (providing a likely choice for someone in search of a definition), than an indication that the classifications are seen as suitable means of defining urban and rural areas.

11 ONS Area Classification - Ward Level Clusters

This approach has a ward variant that complements the Local Authority classification described in District Level Clusters.

This method includes a slightly larger population and area in comparison with the Local Authority scale described in the District Cluster method.

The method is based on creating 'similar profiles' drawn from a range of social, economic, demographic and housing variables.

Limitations:
This classification was not designed to define urban or rural areas. Rural clusters are only produced because their members share similar profiles on the selected range of social, economic, demographic and housing variables and therefore 'appear' to an informed observer to be rural by being 'named' rural. Some users have, however, used them as such.
12 **Countryside Agency Rural Services Survey Parishes**

An urban settlement population of 10,000 has been used in the past by the Rural Development Commission and by the Countryside Agency as a broad threshold value distinguishing urban settlements from smaller ‘rural’ settlements and the remaining rural land.

**Limitations:**
There is little contemporary data collected for these units outside of the Rural Services Surveys and the system of agricultural returns. Much of the contextual social and economic data dates back to the 1991 census which would prove inaccurate given that this data is now nearly two decades old.

**NON URBAN RURAL SYSTEMS (CURRENT SYSTEMS)**

13 **PAF (Postcode Address File)**

Based on the Royal Mail’s database of all known UK postcodes and addresses. It is the master database containing complete postcode and address information for over 28 million UK addresses. It is a relational raw data product (this means that it contains grouped or related address data, as well as Mailsort codes and Delivery Point Suffix data).

Within the PAF, a ‘locality’ is a geographical postal area – currently PAF defines around 30,000 localities within the UK. A locality consists of a post town with ‘dependent locality’ and ‘double dependent’ locality, further defining the geographic area where required. A double dependent locality is a small village or sub-district. Double dependent localities are never present in postal addresses without Dependent Localities.

**Benefits:**
The PAF database provides comprehensive coverage of the UK with classification of areas available to a very detailed, localised level.

**Limitations:**
This database was not designed to delineate between urban and rural areas. However, the use of ‘double dependent localities’ may aid researchers in finding more ‘rural’ locations versus urban town or city based populations.

14 **ACORN / MOSAIC Geodemographic Segmentation**

Geodemographic segmentation systems such as ACORN and MOSAIC, use a multivariate statistical classification technique for discovering whether the individuals of a population fall into different groups by making quantitative comparisons of multiple characteristics. This comes with the assumption that the differences *within* any group should be less than the differences *between* groups.

A Classification Of Residential Neighbourhoods (ACORN) system: is conducted by Consolidated Analysis Centers Incorporated (CACI). It is a popular geodemographic tool to identify and understand the UK population and the demand for products and services.

ACORN categorizes all 1.9 million UK postcodes using over 125 demographic statistics within England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and employing 287 lifestyle variables. The classification system of ACORN contains 56 types of household under the 14 groups in 5 categories.

MOSAIC UK is the latest version of Experian’s MOSAIC classification that covers the UK’s 46 million adult residents and 23 million households and uses 400 demographic variables. It classifies all consumers in the UK into 61 socio-economic types aggregated into 11 groups. The system is also very popular as a tool for identifying societal consumer trends in the UK.

**Benefits:**
The use of geographic segmentation system allows access to a wide range of readily available data which has full UK coverage, with the facility to ‘drill down’ to local levels.
Limitations:
These systems are designed to identify social profiles and are not focused solely on urban / rural splits. They may be used as general indications of urbanity, but is more limited with rurality definitions.

15 SIMD (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation)

The SIMD was designed with the purpose of identifying area concentrations of multiple deprivation across all of Scotland. It provides a ‘scale’ of deprivation. The SIMD is an area based measure it does not pick out deprived individuals - not all deprived people live in the most deprived areas, and not all those living in deprived areas are deprived.

Presented at data zone level, enabling small pockets of deprivation to be identified. The data zones, which have a median population size of 769, are ranked from most deprived (1) to least deprived (6,505) on the overall SIMD and on each of the individual domains. The result is a comprehensive picture of relative area deprivation across Scotland.

The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2006 combines 37 indicators across 7 domains, namely: current income, employment, health, education, skills and training, housing, geographic access and crime.

The overall index is a weighted sum of the seven domain scores. The weighting for each domain is based on the relative importance of the domain in measuring multiple deprivation, the robustness of the data and the time lag between data collection and the production of the SIMD. The domain weightings are subject to sensitivity analysis to assess the effects of any changes in weights on the overall index ranks.

The Scottish Government will publish the next update of the SIMD in October 2009 and is continuing to develop guidance and promote the correct use of the index as it is not appropriate to use in all situations.

Benefits:
It allows effective targeting of policies and funding where the aim is to wholly or partly tackle or take account of area concentrations of multiple deprivation.

Limitations:
It should be noted that SIMD has been designed to identify area concentrations of multiple deprivation. Where other aspects of deprivation, e.g. individual or rural, are of interest then other methods need to be used. SIMD 2006 is an update with improvements on SIMD 2004 and uses the same geographical base as the SIMD 2004 of data zones. Because the SIMD is a relative scale it cannot be used to make absolute comparisons over time, but individual indicators and the employment domain can be used.
APPENDIX 4
LIST OF DATA SOURCES TO WHICH SG URBAN RURAL CLASSIFICATION IS APPLIED
### List of data sources to which SG Urban Rural Classification is applied (QA18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult population surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Securing Planning Consent Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Population Survey in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Small Business Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British birth cohorts data (Millennium Cohort Study, British Cohort Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and National Child Development Study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings at Risk Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census / 2001 Census / 2011 census planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime data / SCVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARTS (diabetes patient data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination of Leavers from Scottish Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ResoUrban Rural Classifications Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Small Businesses – “Raising the Barriers” (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free School Meals Trial Uptake Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Entrepreneurship Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROS death registrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROS household estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROS population and migration estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing Up in Scotland (GUS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher recruitment and retention surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Revenue and Customs VAT Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIE Quality Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Associations – Annual Performance and Statistics Returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-departmental Business Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal student survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISD Standard Morbidity Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KnowFife dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord Registration dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Statistics – population estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMIS – benefits data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus Survey of Attitudes towards Greenspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONS/DWP Claimant Count Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordnance Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion of Forestry – Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil attendance / absence / exclusion data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Ambulance Service data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Cancer Registrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Health Service Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish House Condition Survey / SHCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Household Survey / SHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation / SIMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Legal Aid Board – internal data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Vacant and Derelict Land Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScotXed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS Culture and Sport Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNS – benefits data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database/Sample Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNS / Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQA – attainment data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQA – examination data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQA - School Leaver Qualifications in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATS 19 (road accident data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Council – Business database / directory / panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMSS sampling frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Model for Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for Families database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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