

## GRO Scotland 2007 Census Consultation CGG Consultation Response

### 1 Name

Dr Barry Leventhal

### 2 Are you responding as an individual on the behalf of an organisation?

An organisation – the MRS Census and Geodemographics Group, an advisory committee of MRS (The Market Research Society)

### 3 Do you agree to your responses being made available to the public?

Yes

### 4 Would you be prepared for GROS to contact you if we need to clarify your response?

Yes

### 5 Address

15 Northburgh Street, London EC1V 0JR

### 6 Telephone number

020 7490 4911

### 7 e-mail address

[barryleventhal@uk2.net](mailto:barryleventhal@uk2.net)

[barry.leventhal@ncr.com](mailto:barry.leventhal@ncr.com)

## Consultation Points

### **Consultation Point 1: We would welcome your views about our plans to have three rather than four pages of personal questions in the 2011 Census Questionnaire.**

We strongly disagree with your plans – four pages will capture significantly more individual data than three, and evidence from UK research suggests that the impact on response rate would be minimal.

### **Consultation Point 2: We would welcome views on the approaches to gathering information on housing quality discussed in paragraphs 4.3.4 and 4.3.5 in the consultation document.**

Housing quality information is of low priority, with the exception of “lowest floor level of accommodation” – this is the only way to identify high rise living, and for that reason is very important.

### **Consultation Point 3: We would welcome your views on whether or not a question on income should be included in the 2011 Census.**

Income is a high priority topic, provided that the question ranges are not too heavily skewed to low incomes.

**If a personal income question takes up too much space, would a household income question be sufficiently useful?**

A household income question would be acceptable, however attention should be paid to harmonisation with the other Census Offices, in order to deliver consistent income results across the UK.

**If you believe a personal income question is vital, what other topics would you be prepared to exclude to accommodate it?**

Not applicable

**Consultation Point 4: We would welcome your views on the proposed changes to the questions on health and care.**

**Would an extended question on limiting long-term illness, which identifies specific conditions, add value to your use of Census data? If so, please tell us how.**

We believe that the Census questionnaire should ask short, simple high-level questions on a wide range of topics. Extended questions should be excluded – users requiring this information should consider conducting in-depth follow-up surveys.

**Do you consider that the question on care should be a high priority? If so, please tell us why.**

This question topic is a low priority.

**Consultation Point 5: What impact would dropping the question on religion of upbringing have for you or your organisation?**

No impact.

**If you think this is still a priority, what other topic would you be prepared to exclude to accommodate this question?**

Not applicable.

**Consultation Point 6: Do you think that we should continue to ask a combined question on travel to work or study? Or should we only ask about travel to work? (asking two separate questions is unfeasible on space grounds.)**

Information on travel to work is essential.

Travel to study is of low priority and does not need to be asked. We have no objection if a combined question is asked, together with a supplementary question to identify which applies.

**Consultation Point 7: Do you consider that information on languages other than Gaelic should be a priority for the Census?**

This should not be a priority for the Census.

**If so:**

**What aspects of language should be gathered?**

Not applicable

**If a comprehensive question cannot be accommodated, would a simpler question be better than nothing?**

Not applicable

**What languages are you interested in?**

Not applicable

### **Consultation Point 8: What are your priorities for migration information from the Census?**

There is a high priority for “Address one year ago” in order to produce origin-destination migration information, on a consistent basis with the rest of the UK.

### **What are your views on the collection of information on citizenship?**

Citizenship information is of very low priority and should not be collected.

### **Consultation Point 9: What impact would the changes to the collection of NS-SEC and Labour Market data, discussed in section 4.11 of the consultation document, have on your use of Census data?**

Social Grade is a more widely used social classification in the business sector. For the 2001 Census our Group supplied an algorithm which was applied to the Census database in order to derive approximate Social Grade. We wish to obtain equivalent Social Grade data from the 2011 Census, however your proposed changes would significantly reduce the accuracy of the approximation.

We are particularly concerned about the loss of information on industry – this is the only way to differentiate generic terms such as “engineer” or identify agricultural workers.

### **Consultation Point 10: Do you use qualifications data from the Census?**

#### **If you consider it a high priority, please tell us why.**

Qualifications data is a high priority topic, as an important predictor of consumer activity (particularly if income is not collected). However, the question should be kept as simple as possible, in harmonisation with the rest of the UK, in order to aim at capturing the stage of education that was reached.

### **Consultation Point 11: Would you use Census information on second residences?**

Yes - Second residences is a high priority question topic.

Outputs for dwellings are generally of lesser priority in market research, however **second residences** are becoming increasingly important, therefore it would be very useful to have information from the Census on their extent and geographical dispersion. This data would be beneficial in estimating household populations for small areas, e.g. enabling counts of addresses from the Postcode Address File to be modified according to the proportion of second dwellings in each area. Such information is not available from any other source.

It would be useful if information on second residences also included:

- **Location of second residence** – there has been significant growth in second homes outside GB, and this trend seems likely to continue. Therefore, we would suggest that the Census should collect locations of second residences, including outside UK – the latter could be broadly located into ‘rest of Europe’ and ‘outside Europe’.
- **Proportion of time spent in each residence** – main vs. secondary – this information would help to verify the respondent’s usual address (i.e. residence where they spend most of their time) and also enable resources (such as refuse collection) to be allocated on a ‘time spent’ basis. If question space is very limited, this information would be a “nice to have”.

**We welcome your views on the proposed population definitions.**

We are in agreement with the proposed population definition.

### **Consultation Point 12: Ethnicity Consultation**

**Q1 In which of these topics do you or your organisation have an interest?**

**Ethnic Group**                      yes  
**National Identity**                yes

**Q2 What role or responsibility does your organisation have in respect of the areas you have ticked above (Q1)? Please state in the box below.**

Market research on these topics; use of these topics in geodemographic classifications and market analysis. We make similar use of all other topics collected in the census.

**Q3 For which UK countries/areas do you need this information? Tick all that apply.**

**Scotland**                      yes  
**England**                        yes  
**Wales**                         yes  
**Northern Ireland**        yes  
**Great Britain**                yes  
**United Kingdom**        yes

**Q4 If a separate question on national identity (i.e. the country which a person identifies with most) were to be adopted on the 2011 Census, what would you use this information for?**

Market and social researchers need the information in order to help clients understand how these communities perceive their identity. Information will be used in geodemographic systems and market analysis.

**Q5 Do you need ethnic group information from the 2011 Census?**

**Yes** go to Q6                      Yes  
**No** go to Q13

**Q6 Which type of ethnic group information do you require? Tick all that apply.**  
**General information on the ethnic composition of the population**        yes

**Information on specific ethnic groups, please specify.**                      Yes  
e.g. East Europeans and new as well as established ethnic communities

**Information on combinations of ethnic group (e.g. total minority ethnic population, the Asian population etc.)**                      yes:  
e.g. Black, Asian, East European etc. See also our response to Q9.

**Other, please write in**                      not applicable

**Q7 For what purpose(s) do you need this information? Tick all that apply.**

**Service provision**                      yes  
**Policy development**                yes  
**Workforce monitoring**                yes  
**Promoting equal opportunities**        yes

**Tackling discrimination**    yes  
**Other, please write in**    yes

Market and social researchers need this in order to help clients understand these communities and develop products, services and marketing that meets their needs

**Q8 Looking at the ethnicity questions presented on page 28 of the Consultation Document, which do you consider best meet your data needs?**

**Prefer the 2006 Census Test questions go to Q9**    yes

**Prefer the 2001 Census question go to Q9**

**No preference go to Q10**

**Q9 Why does the 2001 or 2006 Census Question best meet your data needs? Please state your reasons.**

It's imperative for research users that the distinction between different Asian groups is maintained, i.e. Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi. Also we need to be able distinguish between Afro-Caribbean and African groups.

**Q10 If, in 2011, an ethnicity classification were to be adopted which replaced the terms 'Black' and 'White' with 'European' and 'African' (such as the 2006 question shown on page 28 of the consultation document) what impact would this have on your organisations' ability to use the Census data or other surveys you conduct which are based the Census ethnicity classification?**

This would not matter to us, subject to our response to Q9, provided that the classification and questions were harmonised with those adopted by ONS for England and Wales. We require comparable results across all geographical areas within the UK.

**Q11 If a revised ethnicity classification is used on the 2011 Census this would have an impact on the level of comparability that could be achieved with 2001 Census data. What effect, if any, would this have on your organisation?**

Comparability at broad ethnic group level is desirable but not crucial.

**Q12 If the ethnicity classification adopted on the 2011 Scottish Census differs slightly from that adopted on other UK Censuses this would have an impact on the level of achievable UK comparability. What effect, if any, would this have on your organisations?**

We require UK-wide comparability and if this were not achievable it would greatly diminish the value of the information.

**Q13 Please use the space provided below for any other comments you wish to add.**

We could support a radical simplification of this section of the census form, provided that it was comparable with the approach taken by ONS for England and Wales.

**Consultation Point 13: Comments and views on the suggestion that we should offer the option of filling in the Census form on the internet are welcome.**

We think that this option is essential in order to maximise coverage in 2011, although processes will be required to avoid inclusion of multiple responses by the same household.

Similarly, you should also include the option of form completion by telephone – this should be practical using an automated system that does not require human operators.

Internet surveys are a highly specialised area and require expertise. The UK market research industry has had around ten years experience of conducting internet surveys and we can provide some potential contacts to assist you, if required.

**Consultation Point 14: Comments and views on the 2011 Census Gaelic Language policy are welcome.**

This is a low priority topic for us.

**Consultation Point 15. Comments and views on the provision of Census Output are welcome.**

**Which three of the 17 aims listed in paragraph 7.1.2 are the most important to you?**

1. Outputs free at the point of delivery
2. Joined-up and comparable UK outputs
3. A database fully adjusted for missing question responses and under- and over-coverage

**Would you prefer to obtain most of the 2011 Census data that you need on-line rather than on paper?**

On-line output is preferable to paper, however provision must be made for bulk delivery in CSV format – for users requiring outputs on all variables for all Output Areas.

**Would you use a flexible on-line table generation system, or would you expect to rely on pre-planned output (in either paper or electronic form)?**

We would expect to use pre-planned output in electronic form (on bulk supply media) in order to satisfy most requirements.

An easy-to-use flexible system may be beneficial as part-replacement to commissioning customised tables, which can be a very slow process.

**Consultation Point 16: Do you share our view that the 2001 approach to geography should be adopted again in 2011?**

No – the majority of our Group disagrees with the approach of freezing on 1991 geography for the following two censuses. We mainly believe that the geography should be optimised for communication of the 2011 Census results, rather than for comparability over time. We also think that a consistent approach to output geography should be developed across the UK – for your information, we attach our response to the recent ONS geography consultation, which explains our views more fully.