



## **Information paper**

---

The 2011 Census: Assessment of initial user requirements on content for England and Wales

-Population, demographics and travel

<b>1. Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Visitors</b> .....	<b>4</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	4
2.2 User Need.....	4
2.3 Small Geographies and Populations .....	4
2.4 Alternative Sources .....	4
2.5 Multivariate Analysis .....	5
2.6 UK Comparability.....	5
2.7 Continuity.....	5
2.8 Conclusion .....	5
<b>3. Second residences</b> .....	<b>6</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	6
3.2 User Need.....	6
3.3 Small Geographies and Small Populations.....	7
3.4 Alternative Sources .....	7
3.5 Multivariate Analysis .....	7
3.6 UK Comparability .....	7
3.7 Continuity .....	7
3.8 Conclusion .....	7
<b>4. Marital or civil partnership status</b> .....	<b>9</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	9
4.2 User Need.....	9
4.3 Small Geographies and Populations .....	9
4.4 Alternative Sources .....	10
4.5 Multivariate Analysis .....	10
4.6 UK Comparability.....	10
4.7 Continuity.....	10
4.8 Conclusion .....	10
<b>5. Household and family relationships</b> .....	<b>11</b>
5.2 User Need.....	11
5.3 Small Geographies and Populations .....	11
5.4 Alternative Sources .....	11
5.5 Multivariate Analysis .....	12
5.6 UK Comparability .....	12
5.7 Continuity .....	12
5.8 Conclusion .....	12
<b>6. Address of workplace and travel to place of work</b> .....	<b>13</b>
6.1 Introduction .....	13
6.2 User Need.....	13
6.3 Small Geographies and Small Populations.....	13
6.4 Alternative Sources .....	14
6.5 Multivariate Analysis .....	14
6.6 UK Comparability.....	14
6.7 Continuity.....	14
6.8 Conclusion .....	14
<b>7. Studyplace address and travel to place of study</b> .....	<b>15</b>
7.1 Introduction .....	15
7.2 User Need.....	15
7.3 Small Geographies and Small Populations.....	15
7.4 Alternative Sources .....	16
7.5 Multivariate Analysis .....	16
7.6 UK Comparability .....	16
7.7 Continuity .....	16
7.8 Conclusion .....	16

## **1. Summary**

In May 2005 ONS published a consultation document 'The 2011 Census: Initial view on content for England and Wales'. Responses were received from nearly 500 users, presenting arguments for the inclusion of around 70 topics (over 2,000 'topic responses').

Each topic was evaluated using the criteria detailed in the consultation document and a scoring system based on the criteria was used to rank the topics according to the strength of user requirement.

This paper provides a summary of the user requirements, and the scores given, for the following topics:

- Visitors
- Second residences
- Marital or civil partnership status
- Household and family relationships
- Address of workplace and travel to place of work
- Address of study-place and travel to place of study

## **2. Visitors: Total score = 83**

### **2.1 Introduction**

In the ONS consultation document published in May 2005, the topic of visitor information was placed in category 1, meaning that ONS believed that this information would be collected in the 2011 Census.

There were over 40 responses received commenting on the subject of visitor information from a variety of central government, local authority and other data users.

### **2.2 User Need: Score=9**

A number of potential uses of information on visitors have been identified from across the Census user community.

The key requirement of this data is to inform service provision. Cambridgeshire County Council stated that *"some districts have large numbers of visitors who are studying or working. A count is necessary to measure the total pressure on services, e.g. transport, health"*. This was supported by Westminster City Council who stated that *"KPMG (in July 2002) estimated that 90% of planning costs, 80% of environmental health service costs, 75% of environmental service costs, 40% of libraries and archive, and 40% of recreation costs were to meet the needs of non-residents"*.

Visitor information is also essential as an indicator in resource allocation. The information is used in The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's (ODPM) day time net inflow and foreign visitors indicators. This use was also identified by a number of local government authorities.

The collection of information on visitors in the Census would also be used to inform policy development. The Department for Education and Skills stated that *"for children we have a particular interest in identifying accurately the vulnerable groups such as those in separated families who have more than one home, improving the evidence base for policy making"*.

A number of respondents suggested that the main use of the data would be to improve enumeration, rather than for analysis. Hampshire County Council stated that *"this information is mainly required for the efficient conduct of the Census, to enable checks on full enumeration to be made"*.

### **2.3 Small Geographies and Populations: Score=9**

Information on visitors would be required for small geographies so that resources could be targeted more effectively, and to help in the planning of services used by visitors to an area. Users suggest that information is required at Output Area level to achieve this.

A question on visitors would need to identify small population groups to allow the uses outlined in the User Need section of this report to be completed effectively.

### **2.4 Alternative Sources: Score=10**

All of the responses to the consultation concluded that there are no suitable alternative sources to the Census for the collection of national information on visitors.

ODPM stated that *"as information on visitors was not included in the 2001 Census, we are using 1991 Census data in the formula [for resource allocation] until the information becomes available from the 2011 Census"*.

### **2.5 Multivariate Analysis: Score=4**

Users have some interest in analysing visitor information with other Census variables, however, multivariate analysis would be limited. Analysis with usual residence is suggested by various users.

### **2.6 UK Comparability: Score=8**

Almost all users who responded to the consultation stated that visitor information is required for the whole of the UK. This is essential to inform resource allocation and service provision, and would allow the data to be analysed nationally in a consistent and comparable manner.

### **2.7 Continuity: Score=1**

Information on visitors was collected in the 1991 Census, but was not collected in the 2001 Census.

### **2.8 Conclusion**

The consultation responses identified a number of uses for data on visitors from a variety of respondents. Of these uses, informing service provision and resource allocation are the most common reasons cited by respondents for requiring the information.

The majority of users requested that the data should be available at small levels of geography and this should be Output Area level if all users are to be satisfied. No alternative sources of the information exist, and there is a strong case for requiring the information for the whole of the UK. Users have some interest in using visitor information, which was collected in the Census in 1991, for multivariate analysis.

There is a clear requirement for this information at detailed levels of geography. Therefore, the topic of visitor information remains in category 1.

### **3. Second residences: Total score = 69**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

In the ONS consultation document published in May 2005 the topic of second residences was placed in category 2, meaning that ONS believed further work was required before a decision could be made on whether to include this topic in the 2011 Census.

There were over 80 responses received commenting on the subject of second residences from a variety of central government, local authority and other data users.

#### **3.2 User Need: Score=7**

A wide range of potential users have responded to the topics consultation about second residence information.

The key need for this data from Census users appears to centre around the requirement to gain a better understanding of the fluidity of the population and how this has an effect on the demand for housing.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister stressed that Census information on this topic would be important because *"understanding the scale and incidence of multiple residences is an important facet of the evidence base for policy development in housing growth management"*. ODPM also stated that *"the availability of affordable housing at a local level is an important consideration in the development of housing strategies, and the impact of second residences at this level needs to be assessed"*.

Many other respondents, including several local authorities, suggested that the main use for these data would be to inform housing affordability and development policies. There was a clear indication that second homes data collected from the 2011 Census would improve users' understanding of the housing market across England and Wales and therefore patterns of housing demand.

Additionally, there was an indication that this data could be used by central government for resource allocation.

A number of users refer to service provision in their responses. A common belief was that knowing the incidence and economic impact of different types of second home owners in a local area would improve users' ability to effectively target public finance for health, waste and public transport services.

Westminster City Council suggested that 90% of planning costs and a high percentage of other public service costs are planned for people that are not usually resident in the authority and therefore in their case this information is essential. Many of the respondents state that any second homes information collected from the Census would allow outputs to be produced on weekday and weekend populations and therefore improve the targeting of local services.

Other respondents considered that information on second homes would improve localised issues such as land use planning, labour market analysis, infrastructure requirements planning and also assist with localised resource allocation. Some respondents also suggested that second residence information could affect the LA grant settlement and also improve the quality of council tax records.

A number of users indicated that this data may improve coverage in the 2011 Census. ONS recognise this use for the data and are currently investigating how second residence information might be used to aid coverage assessment.

However, as this is an internal use for the data and it is not yet clear exactly how useful these data will be, this use has not been considered when scoring this topic.

### **3.3 Small Geographies and Small Populations: Score=9**

There was a clear need identified by Census users to collect this information at detailed levels of geography. The Department for Transport indicated that the information is needed at detailed levels of geography *"because transport behaviour varies systematically between urban and rural, city centre and non-city centres"* and the incidence of second residences is believed to have a significant effect on commuting patterns.

Additionally, respondents suggested that the data are also needed at low levels of geography so they can be linked with small area workplace data. Many other users agreed arguing the data are either needed at Super Output Area or Output Area level due to the range of uses the data could be used for such as area profiling, localised resource allocation and accessibility planning.

### **3.4 Alternative Sources: Score=8**

The common feeling amongst respondents is that no alternative source would meet user needs. Some respondents cited council tax records and suggested government surveys such as the Survey of English Housing and the Omnibus Survey as alternative ways of collecting this information. However, the majority of users had reservations about the quality of data that could be gained from these sources compared to the Census.

### **3.5 Multivariate Analysis: Score=5**

Users suggest a range of Census variables that they could use with information about second residences. The most common are location of main residence, dwelling type, household composition, information on total, vacant and shared dwellings, workplace address and address of place of study.

It was suggested that multivariate analysis is required for second residence data to identify the characteristics of multiple residency population groups and also assess factors affecting the distribution of housing ownership across England and Wales.

### **3.6 UK Comparability: Score=8**

A substantial need for UK-wide data on second residences was identified to allow consistency and comparability of UK Census outputs. Also, some respondents indicated that these data are required at this level as commuting patterns, which are likely to have a significant effect on the prevalence of second home ownership, cover the whole of the UK.

### **3.7 Continuity: Score=0**

Questions on second residences have not previously been asked on Censuses in England and Wales.

### **3.8 Conclusion**

The consultation responses identified many different uses for data on second residences from a variety of respondents. Of these uses, housing development strategies and service provision appear to be the most common reasons that respondents cited for requiring the information. However, it should also be noted that several users, including those from central government, suggested that these data could be used to aid resource allocation.

The majority of users requested that the data should be available at small levels of geography and this should be lower than ward level if all users are to be

satisfied. No suitable alternative sources were identified and reasonable case was made for using second residence data for multivariate analysis. It is clear these data are sought after across the UK for consistency and comparability reasons. No questions about second residences have been asked of individuals in previous Censuses within England and Wales.

There is a clear user requirement for this information at detailed levels of geography. Work is currently underway to establish whether questions can be developed to accurately collect second residence information in a manner that satisfies the user requirement that has been identified. Therefore, the topic of second residences remains in category 2.

#### **4. Marital or civil partnership status: Total score = 90**

##### **4.1 Introduction**

In the ONS consultation document published in May 2005, the topic of marital/civil partnerships status was placed in category 1, meaning that ONS believed that this information would be collected in the 2011 Census.

There were over 30 responses received commenting on the subject of marital/civil partnership status from a variety of central government, local authority and other data users.

##### **4.2 User Need: Score=10**

A wide range of potential uses of information on marital/civil partnership status have been identified from across the Census user community.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister stated that they *"have an interest in all the basic demographic questions and use them for grant allocation, household projections and for multivariate analysis across a range of other topics"*. Information on marital status is used to produce both national and regional household projections. These projections are then used to inform resource allocation.

The information would also be used to assess the future need for services and housing. The Association of Greater Manchester said that *"if an area has an above average percentage of young single people living at their parents home then a significant proportion can be expected to become first time buyers in the future. Also, a concentration of young couples in an area will lead to higher than average birth rates, thereby increasing the demand for health and local authority services"*.

The inclusion of a question on marital/civil partnership status would support the social inclusion agenda by providing evidence of differences in experience for people associated with their marital/civil partnership status. The Equal Opportunities Commission stated that such a question is needed to *"provide important information on the family structure of individuals, and the interaction of family structure with employment, income, etc"*.

The Defence Analytical Services Agency supports the collection of information on marital status, stating that *"marital status and associated divorce rates are key measures of impact of operations and service terms and conditions on family life. They constitute an important element of the evidence submitted to the Armed Forces Pay Review Body"*.

It is important to capture information on civil partnerships as they give same-sex couples the same rights as married couples in respect to pensions, benefits, etc. The inclusion of civil partnerships in the marital status question would support the government's aim of giving equal treatment to those in a civil partnership.

##### **4.3 Small Geographies and Populations: Score=7**

Information on marital/civil partnership status would be required for small geographies to allow effective targeting of resources and local services. Users suggest that information would be required at Super Output Area level to achieve this.

A question on marital/civil partnership status would need to identify small population groups to allow all of the uses outlined in the User Need section of this report to be completed effectively.

#### **4.4 Alternative Sources: Score=7**

Information on marital status is collected from most household surveys. However, many users responding to the consultation exercise do not consider these surveys to be suitable alternative sources to the Census. This is because they do not provide the information for small population groups, there is no comparison between different areas of the country, and the information is not cross-classified with other variables. The Association of Greater Manchester Authorities stated that "*research workers nearly always use Census data for this information*".

The majority of responses to the consultation conclude that there are no suitable alternative sources to the Census that meet all of their requirements. The Economic and Social Research Council said that "*there is no alternative source which can offer the combination of topic coverage and geographical resolution*".

#### **4.5 Multivariate Analysis: Score=9**

Information on marital/civil partnership status would be analysed with most other Census variables to achieve the uses outlined in the User Need section of this report. Cross-tabulating marital status with other variables enables councils to better understand and analyse the make-up of their population groups and provides essential information for resource allocation.

#### **4.6 UK Comparability: Score=10**

All users who responded to the consultation exercise stated that this information is required for the whole of the UK. This would allow consistent and comparable national analysis and is essential for central government resource allocation.

#### **4.7 Continuity: Score=9**

A question on marital status has been asked in every Census since 1851. However, the question asked in 2011 will need to reflect the civil partnership legislation that came into effect in December 2005.

#### **4.8 Conclusion**

The consultation responses identified a number of uses for data on marital/civil partnership status from a variety of respondents. Of these uses, informing household projections is the most common reason cited by respondents for requiring the information.

The majority of users requested that the data should be available at small levels of geography and this should be Super Output Area level if all users are to be satisfied. Alternative sources of the information do exist, however they do not fully satisfy user requirements. A strong case was made for using marital status information for multivariate analysis, and there is a very strong case for requiring the information for the whole of the UK. A question on marital status has been included in the Census since 1851.

There is a clear requirement for this information at detailed levels of geography. Work will be carried out to determine how the marital status question asked in previous Censuses should be revised to reflect the recent Civil Partnership legislation, however this information will definitely be collected in the 2011 Census. Therefore, the topic of marital/civil partnership status remains in category 1.

## **5. Household and family relationships: Total score = 92**

### **5.1 Introduction**

In the ONS consultation document published in May 2005, the topic of household and family relationships was placed in category 1, meaning that ONS believed that this information would be collected in the 2011 Census.

There were over 25 responses received commenting on the subject of household and family relationships from a variety of central government, local authority and other data users.

### **5.2 User Need: Score=10**

A range of potential uses of information on household and family relationships have been identified from across the Census user community.

Information on household and family relationships would be used to inform central government resource allocation. ODPM stated that *"the accurate collection of these data is essential for grant allocation and calculating household formation rates"*.

The information is also essential for the planning of service provision as the demand for services, particularly support services, varies between different types of households and families. This use was identified by a number of national and local government authorities.

Information on household and family relationships would also be used for policy development, particularly in relation to housing. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister stated that household and family structure *"are needed to identify the balance between housing supply and demand to develop and formulate housing policy"*. The identification of concealed households, which many respondents say is only possible from an analysis of household and family relationships, is particularly important for assessing the current and future demand for dwellings.

The inclusion of a question on household and family relationships would also inform social structure analysis and would enable monitoring of changes in types of household composition. Hampshire County Council stated that *"the distinction between households and families is important in understanding social structure"*.

The Economic and Social Research Council support the collection of information on household and family relationships, stating that the information is *"key to understanding how to best model relationships between addresses and population, and thus to ongoing small area population estimation"*.

### **5.3 Small Geographies and Populations: Score=7**

Information on household and family relationships would be required for small geographies to allow small area population variation to be understood, enabling resources to be targeted effectively. Users suggest that information would be required at Super Output Area level to achieve this.

A question on household and family relationships would need to identify small population groups to allow all of the uses outlined in the User Need section of this report to be completed effectively.

### **5.4 Alternative Sources: Score=9**

The majority of responses to the consultation conclude that there are no suitable alternative sources to the Census for the collection of national information on

household and family relationships. The Local Area Data Network stated that *"there are no other sources that are as detailed as the Census in asking questions on the relationships in the household"*.

While a number of major surveys include a relationship matrix, information from the Census is still required. Surveys may suffer from differential non-response for different types of household, and they may not have sufficient sample sizes to identify certain rarer household relationships, or to differentiate by other variables such as age. They also cannot provide information down to a sufficient level of geography for some users.

#### **5.5 Multivariate Analysis: Score=8**

Information on household and family relationships would be analysed with a range of other Census variables to achieve the uses outlined in the User Need section of this report. Cross-tabulating household and family relationships with other variables enables councils to better understand and analyse the make-up of their population groups, and supports resource allocation.

#### **5.6 UK Comparability: Score=10**

All users who responded to the consultation exercise stated that this information is required for the whole of the UK. This would allow consistent and comparable national analysis and is essential for central government resource allocation.

#### **5.7 Continuity: Score=8**

Information on household and family relationships has been collected in every Census since 1851.

#### **5.8 Conclusion**

The consultation responses identified a number of uses for data on household and family relationships from a variety of respondents. Of these uses, informing resource allocation and service provision are the most common reasons cited by respondents for requiring the information.

The majority of users requested that the data should be available at small levels of geography and this should be Super Output Area level if all users are to be satisfied. No suitable alternative source of the information exists, and is not likely to be by 2011. A strong case was made for using household and family relationships information for multivariate analysis, and there is a very strong case for requiring the information for the whole of the UK. Information on household and family relationships has been collected in the Census since 1851.

There is a clear requirement for this information at detailed levels of geography. Although it not yet known what the format of these questions to collect this information will be, the information will definitely be collected in the 2011 Census. Therefore the topic of household and family relationships remains in category 1.

## **6. Address of workplace and travel to place of work: Total score = 84**

### **6.1 Introduction**

In the ONS consultation document published in May 2005 the topics of workplace address and mode of transport used to travel to work were placed in category 1, meaning that ONS believed these data would be collected from the 2011 Census.

There were over 90 responses received commenting on the subjects of workplace address and mode of transport used to travel to work from a variety of central government, local authority and other data users.

These topics have been combined for this report due to the number of respondents that replied to the consultation and made a case for them as one topic.

### **6.2 User Need: Score=9**

There is a clear requirement from central and local government to use this information for resource allocation purposes. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister stated that the data is essential for its grant allocation indicators, whilst The Department for Transport (DfT) noted that daytime population, which can be derived from workplace address data, *"is an element of distribution of capital funding for small transport projects to local authorities"* and suggested that about £500m is allocated to these schemes. The Department of Health (DH) would also use this information in resource allocation.

A comprehensive case has been made for this data to be used for transport planning and modelling and also effective transport and non-transport service provision. DfT suggested that *"travel to work information is a vital input to transport planning"* and many users cited that the daily inflow/outflow of commuters from/to areas inform national and local policies surrounding transport accessibility, such as the reduction in private car usage. Nevertheless, other policy uses for the information were noted.

The Home Office stated that these data could be used for emergency planning purposes and DH noted that working populations are required for policy formation and service provision relating to healthcare. Respondents also suggested that travel to work and workplace data could be used to help develop housing policies and in deprivation analysis.

Another key reason for collecting workplace information cited by many users is the flexible population outputs that the question allows. The Demographics User Group claimed that workplace population is the most important output base they use. Moreover, the MRS (Market Research Society) stated that workplace and daytime population bases are *"essential for supporting research into behaviour that is location based"*. Users also suggested that workplace information is required to ensure that population projections can be flexible.

DfT also commented that travel to work statistics can be used for stratification purposes in the National Travel Survey (NTS).

### **6.3 Small Geographies and Small Populations: Score=9**

The majority of respondents require this data at detailed levels of geography to enable transport planning and resource allocation to be carried out at low levels. DfT suggested that the data is required at Output Area level to satisfy their requirements.

It should be noted that concerns were raised about the suitability of using residential geographies for workplace statistics.

#### **6.4 Alternative Sources: Score=7**

Some alternative sources for gathering this information were suggested such as the Labour Force Survey and localised travel surveys. However, the quality of these sources causes concern for respondents and many respondents doubted any alternative source could come close to replacing Census data.

#### **6.5 Multivariate Analysis: Score=7**

There is a clear need to link this data to information relating to vehicle ownership as well as linking together workplace address and mode of transport used to travel to work data. Some respondents believe this data could also be easily linked with travel to study place data if this is to be collected. A number of respondents also suggest that they would use this data alongside labour market statistics and also basic demographics.

#### **6.6 UK Comparability: Score=9**

These data are considered nationally important by respondents as they allow comparisons across the UK and facilitate local authorities' competitive bidding process for public funds. This information also enables the analysis of cross-border commuter flows.

#### **6.7 Continuity: Score=9**

This information has been collected on many previous Censuses in England and Wales, although the questions have not been totally consistent.

#### **6.8 Conclusion**

The consultation has identified a strong requirement for origin-destination and workplace related statistics to be gathered from the Census. A number of central and local government users have stated that these are used heavily for resource allocation and transport service provision. Several non-transport service and policy uses have also been identified for these data through the consultation.

It is clear that a significant requirement for workplace related statistics remains and a number of respondents suggest that data on daytime/workplace populations are key to their work.

Many users require origin-destination information down to the lowest level of geography and there are no alternative sources that can provide this level of detail. Respondents have proved that the information is required for multivariate analysis, is nationally important across the UK and that collecting travel to work data would ensure consistency across Censuses.

A strong case exists for asking questions on workplace address and the mode of transport that a respondent uses to travel to work, and therefore both of these topics remain in category 1.

## **7. Studyplace address and travel to place of study: Total score = 66**

### **7.1 Introduction**

In the ONS consultation document published in May 2005 the topics of study place address and mode of transport used to travel to study were placed in category 2, meaning that ONS believed further work was required before a decision as to whether these data would be collected from the 2011 Census or not.

There were over 60 responses received commenting on the subjects of study place address and mode of transport used to travel to study from a variety of central government, local authority and other data users.

These topics have been combined for this report due to the number of respondents that replied to the consultation and made a case for them as one topic.

### **7.2 User Need: Score=7**

A number of uses for this data were suggested by users with some users suggesting this data could be as valuable as travel to work data.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister indicated that this information may help to inform daytime population outputs and therefore aid resource allocation. A number of local authorities also believed that this information could be used to more effectively target resources to their communities.

Many respondents believed that this data could be used extensively for service provision and policy monitoring. It was suggested that travel to study statistics may help better inform policies aimed to help reduce the impact of the 'school run', lessen congestion in certain areas and also inform transport planning across the country. For example, Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council would like the information to inform a local strategy to increase the number of children walking to school and Norfolk County Council believe that the data would be used to monitor and review local transport plans and bus routes as required under the Transport Act (2000) and the Road Traffic Reduction Act (1997). Additionally, Greenwich Council believes that this information could help define school catchment zones.

Several users suggested that the capture of student travel information would significantly improve the completeness and robustness of the travel data collected by the 2011 Census, as it could be combined with travel to work statistics. The importance of this was emphasised by several users. Nottingham City Council suggested that 10% of its population are university students, and the Greater London Authority cited the Department for Transport statistics which 12% of car journeys in London between 8:00a.m. and 9:00a.m. involve taking children to school.

It should also be noted that many respondents also believed that study place address data would help ONS to produce the flexible population outputs that users require by giving a more complete picture of students' daytime movements.

### **7.3 Small Geographies and Small Populations: Score=9**

Respondents state that this information would be required at Output Area level to reflect the distances being travelled to a place of study.

It was thought data at these levels would help to identify small pockets of non-participation in education. Additionally, one respondent suggested the information

is required at low geographical levels to provide a benchmark for these statistics that is not available elsewhere.

#### **7.4 Alternative Sources: Score=7**

There was a feeling that some alternatives for this information do exist. The Department for Education and Skills suggested this information can be obtained from Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) data, and some users suggested Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) outputs could potentially be used as an alternative. However, there are quality issues surrounding these sources, for example, in PLASC a pupil's residential postcode is often replaced with the postcode of their school when the residential postcode is unknown.

Other respondents suggested that various small-scale surveys and administrative data held by individual institutions could also be used as a substitute for Census data. However, some concerns existed about the ease with which data from separate institutions could be obtained.

#### **7.5 Multivariate Analysis: Score=7**

Respondents noted that there was a reasonably strong requirement to use information on study place address and the mode of transport used to travel to a place of study for multivariate analysis. A number of variables were suggested by users. The most common suggestion was that these two data items could be used in conjunction with each other to assess students' daily travel patterns with this information being used to inform transport policy.

Many users also suggested that outputs on the number of vehicles available for use within a household would be used with this data, as well as travel-to-work outputs which some respondents believed could be combined with travel-to-study outputs to gain a more complete picture of national travel statistics.

#### **7.6 UK Comparability: Score=2**

Some users stated that the main reason this data is nationally important is because it is required to make UK-wide comparisons. There was also some feeling that this information could inform nationwide policies.

#### **7.7 Continuity: Score=0**

This information has not previously been collected in the Census in England and Wales. However, the information was collected in the Census in Scotland in 2001.

#### **7.8 Conclusion**

The consultation responses demonstrated that there is a case for considering collecting information on study place address and the mode of transport used to travel to a place of study further. Users have made a clear case for collecting this information based on the need to gain a more complete picture of daily travel patterns being able to better inform a range of policies at local levels. It is clear that if collected, users require this information at very low geographical levels for it to be useful.

Some alternative sources for this data were suggested by some respondents, though it should be noted concerns exist about their suitability. A clear requirement exists to use this data alongside other Census variables. A moderate case was made as to why this data is nationally important across the UK and the information has not previously been collected by a Census in England and Wales.

Whilst there is a relatively strong case for collecting this data, the case made by users is not as strong as that made for many other topics. For this reason the topics of study place address and mode of transport used to travel to a place of study have been placed in category 2.

Further work is required over the next couple of years before a decision can be made about collecting this information from the 2011 Census. Due to the constraints on questionnaire space outlined in the main consultation response, if this information is to be collected it is highly likely that the questions would be combined with those asking about workplace address and mode of transport used to travel to work, as was the case in Scotland in the 2001 Census. The work undertaken by ONS will therefore not only consider the strength of the user requirement for these data in more detail, but will also investigate the burden placed on respondents of combined questions. Moreover, it will be concerned about the quality of data that can be obtained from such questions from a Census questionnaire.