

**Census Advisory Groups\Papers\1998**

AG Paper (98/12)

**The Census Household Test June 1998**

<b>SECTION 1: Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SECTION 2: BACKGROUND</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>SECTION 3: Research Methodology</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SECTION 4: Objectives of the Research and Analysis</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>SECTION 5: Response Rates and Frequency Distributions</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Section 6: Public Acceptability</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>SECTION 7: VARIATIONS BETWEEN THE HOUSEHOLD DEFINITIONS IN TERMS OF COVERAGE OF INDIVIDUALS AND HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>SECTION 8: Enumerators' and Follow Up Interviewers' Perceptions</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>ANNEX A</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>ANNEX B</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>ANNEX C</b>	<b>27</b>

## SECTION 1: Summary

There is no universal definition of a household and it is a term that is used to cover a multitude of social and economic situations. A comprehensive household definition however, is required when carrying out Censuses and Surveys to ensure that all persons know which form they should be included on and which group of persons (if any) that they belong to. Public acceptability of a household definition within a Census self-enumeration methodology is imperative and may affect coverage if an inappropriate definition is implemented.

In the 1991 Census the household definition was:

*One person living alone*

Or

*A group of persons (not necessarily related) sharing common housekeeping – that is sharing a sitting room or at least one meal a day.*

The identification of households, especially in multi-occupied buildings was identified as a problem in the 1991 Census Validation Survey (CVS). The CVS suggests that the 1991 Census undercounted households in shared dwellings by 41 per cent. “The main reason was that in a number of cases (just 16 out of the sample of about 6,000 addresses which returned census forms) the enumerator failed to realise that the occupants of a dwelling formed more than one household” (Heady et al. 1994, p. 47).

After the 1991 Census this problem was identified as a possible cause of undercoverage and led to Census Division commissioning Social Survey Division (SSD) to carry out research into public perceptions of a household. It was felt that if a household definition were adopted that was more acceptable to the public’s notions of a household it would assist in reducing undercoverage.

Research carried out by SSD during 1995 and 1996 found that:

- Most respondents defined a household in relation to the idea of common housekeeping rather than that of sharing a meal or a living room. Common housekeeping being sharing bills, expenses and leisure time (Avery et al. 1995 p.3).
- In some large households made up of unrelated adults, persons may not share meals or a sitting room but may still consider themselves to be a household because of their decision to live together and the relationships between them; other activities they share (for example, payment of rent and bills, ‘putting out the bins’); and other shared facilities such as kitchens (Sykies, et al. 1996 p.7).

The household definition was subsequently changed for the 1997 Census Test to:

*One persons living alone*

Or

*A group of persons (not necessarily related) sharing common housekeeping – that is the sharing of domestic bills other than just the rent, such as gas, electricity, food etc.*

The change to the household definition however, possibly created problems for people paying rent inclusive of bills and women and families with teenage children who often felt that they did not directly contribute to bills

The household definition was therefore further re-assessed. An accommodation-based 1998 household definition was proposed which was:

A household is:

*One persons living on their own with their own kitchen or cooking facilities*

Or

*A group of people (not necessarily related) sharing a kitchen or cooking facilities.*

The proposed 1998 household definition was tested in a randomised block design with the 1991 household definition to compare the definitions in a simulated census environment and:

- (a) Assess which household definition is more acceptable to the public;
- (b) Assess which household definition improves coverage of individuals and households; and
- (c) Examine enumerator's ability to understand and apply the definitions.

### **Public Acceptability**

The results of the test showed a general pattern for types of households and their preferred household definition. This is maintained when preferred household definition and type of household is sub-divided by self-contained accommodation, not self-contained accommodation, owned accommodation and rented accommodation. The patterns shown were that:

- The majority of related households did not have an overall preference for either of the household definitions. For those households that did state a preference the 1991 household definition was preferred as it reflected their living arrangements, relationships and social aspects of their households.
- The majority of single person households did not have an overall preference for either of the household definitions. For those households that did state a preference the 1998 household definition was preferred as it reflected their living arrangements.
- The majority of unrelated households preferred the 1998 household definition. For those households that commented why this was their preferred household definition they stated that it was because it was applicable to their living arrangements.
- The majority of mixed households did not have an overall preference for either of the household definitions. For those households that did state a preference the 1998 household definition was preferred.

The 99% confidence interval for other households' (unrelated, mixed and single person households) indicates a significant preference for the 1998 household definition.

### **Coverage of individuals and households**

Of the 879 households that had the 1991 household definition on their forms:

- 0.6% (5) households would have preferred to have the 1998 household definition, as they would have been a single household under that definition. Two of the five households actually completed their form as if using the 1998 household definition, as they did not share under the 1991 household definition. There was therefore the potential in these five households that the implementation of the 1991 household definition would have missed the other person(s) in the dwelling that the formfiller regarded as really constituting part of their household.
- 0.2% (2) households stated that they did not share under either of the household definitions. One of the two households incorrectly included a lodger on their Test form who did not share a sitting room, meals or a kitchen with them;
- 0.5% (4) households failed to include persons on their form that should have been included under the form definition.
- 0.1% (1) households stated that they shared under the 1991 household definition but not the 1998 household definition.

Of the 815 households that had the 1998 household definition on their forms:

- 0.3% (2) households stated that they did not share under either of the household definitions.
- 0.3% (2) households failed to include persons on their form that should have been included under the form definition.
- 0.1% (1) households stated that they shared under the 1998 household definition but not the 1991 household definition.

#### **Enumerator's ability to understand and apply the definitions**

- All enumerators stated that they had particular problems making contact with persons in multi-occupied accommodation
- If contact was made the enumerators felt that they experienced no problems determining the number of households. For multi-occupied buildings even if contact was just made with one person in the accommodation it was possible generally to ascertain how many households were in the building.
- All of the enumerators felt that the definition card was helpful and assisted them with their confidence for the first few addresses that they contacted.

#### **Concluding Comments**

Although this was a relatively small-scale test the results do indicate that:

- Overall the public's perceptions of a household may not be in line with the 1991 Census definition;
- Although the numbers are very small the 1998 household definition was observed to improve the coverage of individuals in households;
- There is very little indication that a change in the household definition would dramatically change the number of households; and
- The identification of households in multi-occupied buildings remains problematic.

**Jacqueline Jones**  
**Senior Researcher**  
**Census Division**  
**Office for National Statistics**

## SECTION 2: Background

Defining a household will always be problematic as there is no universal definition and it is a term that is used to cover a multitude of social and economic situations. It can be one person living alone, a married couple with no children, a married couple with dependent children and/or independent children, a lone parent with dependent and/or independent children, a group of related and unrelated persons or a group of totally unrelated persons.

### The 1981 Census

Checks made in the 1970s confirmed that census form-fillers had their own, reasonably consistent, ideas about who should be included on their form. However, these ideas were not necessarily in line with the formal definition of a household used in instructing census enumerators and interpreting census results. The formal definition assumed that only those groups of people who catered in common and regularly shared meals were counted as a single household. Tests showed that groups of unrelated adults who shared a living room were generally assumed by form-fillers to constitute a single household, even if they seldom or never sat down to a common meal.

It was accordingly decided that the formal definition of a household had to be adjusted to bring it into line with current perceptions.

This was done by re-defining a household as:

a group of people residing at an address who

either

*shared at least one meal a day*

or

*shared a living room*

The definition of a household was not however changed on the 1981 Census form and remained stated as in 1971 as

*A household comprises either one person living alone*

or

*A group of persons (who may or may not be related) living at the same address with common housekeeping.*

This change in the formal census definition probably had very little effect upon the actual behaviour of census form-fillers in 1981, as compared with 1971. It is, therefore, unlikely that it introduced any significant discontinuity into the census time series of household-based statistics.

However, it drew attention to the fact that, in a small proportion of cases (probably less than 1%) practice in interview surveys had diverged from practice in the census. This was because trained interviewers were in a position to impose the definition upon informants even in situations where it was not entirely natural.

The effects of changing the definition, on national estimates, was to reduce the overall estimate of the number of households by 108,000 households or 0.6% of the total. Approximately 79,000 of this total loss of households in England was in the privately rented furnished sector (Todd & Griffiths, 1986)

## **The 1991 Census**

The 1991 Census maintained the 1981 definition of a household but for the first time the specification of common housekeeping was stated on the Census form – *sharing at least one meal a day or sharing a living room or sitting room.*

The 1991 Census for the first time also included absent households in the household figures, which comprised of actual returns and imputed data. There were 409,820 enumerated absent households and 455,154 imputed absent households. This represents 4.0% of all households with residents which is a far larger change than the estimated 0.6% reduction in households in 1981.

## **The 1991 Census Validation Survey (CVS)**

After the 1991 Census the CVS found that:

- *“The Census often failed to distinguish distinct households occupying the same building - instead treating everyone in the building as members of a single household” (Heady et al. 1994, p. 53).*

The CVS suggests that the Census undercounted households in shared dwellings by 41 per cent. “The main reason was that in a number of cases (just 16 out of the sample of about 6,000 addresses which returned census forms) the enumerator failed to realise that the occupants of a dwelling formed more than one household” (Heady et al. 1994, p. 47).

The report suggested that a fundamental reason for this might be that that “people who share a single dwelling probably share cooking and washing facilities as well as a single front door. Given that they have this much in common, the additional facts of sharing, or not sharing, a living room and/or a daily meal may not be what determines whether or not they think of themselves as a single group. Equally, if not more, important might be whether they are related to each other, and whether or not they have separate tenancy agreements. It may be that the data needed to distinguish separate households - according to the current definition - are hard to collect because they do not correspond to people’s own ways of thinking about the domestic group they belong to” (Heady et al. 1994, p. 48).

The CVS suggested a household/dwelling approach to rectify this problem and stated that “at the vast majority of addresses there would not be practical difference between such a procedure and what was done in 1991”. However, “a possible disadvantage would be that in some situations - such as houses that have been divided into multiple bed-sits - it might be difficult to organise all the residents to complete the same census form” (Heady et al. 1994, p. 48).

## **Post 1991 Census research**

In 1995 Social Survey Division (SSD) of the Office for National Statistics (ONS) carried out cognitive interviews, with members of the public concerning the household definition. SSD concluded from their research that most respondents defined households in relation to the “idea of common housekeeping” rather than that of sharing a meal or a living room. Common housekeeping in this instance being sharing bills, expenses and leisure time (Avery et al, 1995, 3).

Other SSD research carried out in January 1996 found that “in some larger households made up of unrelated adults the household definition may be difficult to apply. People who have elected to live together in a large house, for example, may share neither meals nor a living room but may consider themselves to be a household because of:

- Their decision to live together and the relationships between them;
- Other activities they share (for example, payment of rent and bills, ‘putting out the bins’); and
- Other shared facilities – such as kitchens”.

Conversely, people living in bed-sit accommodation, who have little to do with one another but who have a common sitting room, may not be inclined to regard themselves as a household (Sykies et al. 1996, p. 7).

Following the results of research carried out by SSD the household definition was changed for the 1997 Census Test to:

*one person living alone;*

or

*a group of people (not necessarily related), living at the same address with common housekeeping.*

The defining characteristics of common housekeeping were not specified on the 1997 Census Test forms but only in the enumerators' instruction manual. This stipulated that common housekeeping was the *sharing of domestic bills other than just rent, such as gas, electricity, food etc*

Evaluation carried out after the 1997 Census Test found that the change in the household definition could possibly create problems for persons paying rent inclusive of bills, families with teenage children in the household and women that did not feel they contributed to the bills.

Research carried out by Census Division in 1997 asked 250 University students why they would include named persons in their household. The most commented initial responses were because they lived together (47.4%) or that they spent time together or shared their social lives (21.8%).

The students were also asked questions concerning the sharing of kitchens, sitting rooms and bills with other household members. 97% stated that they shared a kitchen; 95% stated that they shared a sitting room; and 90% stated that they shared bills. When asked about sharing bills there were some problems for students paying rent fully inclusive of bills as they did not perceive this as sharing bills (Jones et al. 1998).

### **The implementation of the 1991 household definition in the census and surveys.**

The 1991 household definition is a harmonised definition for the Census and most Government Surveys With the exception of FES & NFS.. There are however variations between the implementation of the definition in the Census and Surveys. For the Census households are expected to satisfy either the sharing of a living room or the sharing of a meal a day in order to group themselves together as a household. For Government Surveys that use the harmonised definition interviewers are instructed to implement that criteria but also that:

- Sharing at least one meal a day "should consist of a main meal but does not imply that the household must always sit down to a meal together provided the food is bought and prepared for joint use".
- Accommodation may still be counted as shared where the address does not have a living room, which is separate from the kitchen, that is, where the main living room of the accommodation forms part of the same room as the kitchen. Similarly a household can be treated as one if the living room also has to be used as a bedroom". (McCrossan, 1991, p.51).

The variations between the way the household definition is implemented in a Census and a Survey undoubtedly produces differentials in the count of households.

### **Identified problems**

- There is no universal definition of a household.
- The household definition was identified by the 1991 CVS as a possible causal factor in undercoverage particularly for identifying households in multi-occupied buildings.
- The 1997 Census Test household definition had the possibility of excluding persons who were paying rent inclusive of bills.

- There are variations between the way the household definition is implemented for the Census and Surveys.

The problem still remains that the 1991 household definition potentially was problematic in the 1991 Census with regard to public acceptability and possibly undercoverage. It was therefore decided to test a new household definition based on an accommodation-based approach against the 1991 household definition.



## SECTION 3: Research Methodology

### The selection of the sample

Four 1991 Census Enumeration Districts (EDs) were chosen in each of three inner city areas - London, Portsmouth and Southampton. The areas were stratified according to levels of multi-occupancy and then the four EDs with the highest level of multi-occupancy in each of the areas were selected. Multi-occupancy was chosen as the determining factor for selection as the identification of households proved difficult in these types of buildings in the 1991 Census. Based on 1991 figures, these areas contained approximately 2,000 households.

The methodology used to test the definitions utilised a randomised block design. The 1991 and 1998 household definitions were randomly allocated to each of the four areas in Portsmouth, Southampton and London. Thus two Enumeration Districts in each area were enumerated using the 1991 definition of a household, and the other two districts with the proposed 1998 definition.

The test was carried out as a full census exercise. External Enumerators were recruited and trained to carry out an Advance Round and Delivery Round. Each Enumerator was instructed to find all the households in their ED, according to the relevant household definition for their area, and to deliver test forms to each household.

A revised doorstep drill was implemented in all areas. Enumerators in the 1991 Census, when making contact, asked how many persons lived at the address and how many households there were. Enumerators then issued a census form to each household. For this test each Enumerator was issued with a definition card, which instructed them to ask:

*'how many people usually live here'*

and

*'do you all share the same sitting room or meals' (if in a 1991 definition area)*

or

*'do you all share the same kitchen' (if in a 1998 definition area).*

Census Test day was on 14th June and the day after ONS volunteers started collecting the test forms from householders and asking follow-up questions regarding:

- The number of persons in the household;
- Whether the household definition had been correctly applied as regards the sharing of either a sitting room or meals (1991 definition) or a kitchen (1998 definition), and whether the alternative definition would have made any difference to who would have been included in the household; and
- Whether there was any other person(s) who should have been included on the form, under either of the household definitions, and was not.

The follow up was carried out over a period of seven days and each day an attempt was made to collect the form from households. On the final day of the follow up for the households where there remained no contact, postal follow up questionnaires were distributed for households to complete and return with their Census Test form.

#### **SECTION 4: Objectives of the Research and Analysis**

The objectives of the Test were to compare the definitions in a simulated census environment and:

- (a) Assess which household definition is more acceptable to the public;
- (b) Assess which household definition improves coverage of individuals and households; and
- (c) Examine enumerator's ability to understand and apply the definitions.

The results have been sub-divided into four sections:

- (a) Response rates;
- (b) Public acceptability;
- (c) Variations between the household definitions in terms of coverage of individuals and households; and
- (d) Enumerators' and follow up interviewers' perceptions of the household definitions.

## SECTION 5: Response Rates and Frequency Distributions

### Response Rates

In the selected household test areas the enumerators and follow up interviewers identified in total 1694 households. Tables 1 and 2 show the number of households identified for each Enumeration District (ED) and the response rates.

**Table 1 : Response rates for enumeration district with the 1991 household definition.**

	Area	1991 household definition	Number of Households identified by enumerators These numbers exclude communal establishments, non-residential accommodation and unoccupied accommodation.	Number of Test forms returned	Response rate of Test forms	Number of Test forms with follow up form	Response rate of Test form & follow up
ED 2	Portsmouth	1991	204	132	64.7%	108	52.9%
ED 4	Portsmouth	1991	192	89	46.4%	75	39.1%
ED 5	Southampton	1991	125	60	48%	45	36.0%
ED 7	Southampton	1991	132	41	31.1%	33	25.0%
ED 10	London	1991	64 *	55	85.9%	52	81.3%
ED 11	London	1991	162	95	58.6%	88	54.3%
TOTAL	-----	-----	<b>879</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>45.6</b>

\* The number of household in this ED was low as there had been re-development in the areas since the 1991 Census.

**Table 2 : Reponse rates for enumeration districts with the 1998 household definition.**

	Area	1998 household definition	Number of Households identified by enumerators These numbers exclude communal establishments, non-residential accommodation and unoccupied accommodation.	Number of Test forms returned	Response rate of Test forms	Number of Test forms with follow up form	Response rate of Test form & follow up
ED 1	Portsmouth	1998	140	65	46.4%	39	27.9%
ED 3	Portsmouth	1998	171	100	58.5%	68	39.8%
ED 6	Southampton	1998	208	110	52.9%	94	45.2%
ED 8	Southampton	1998	130	55	42.3%	39	30.0%
ED 9	London	1998	43 *	34	79.1%	34	79.1%
ED 12	London	1998	123	76	61.8%	43	34.9%
TOTAL	-----	----	815	440	54.0%	317	38.9%

\* The number of household in this ED was low as there had been re-development in the areas since the 1991 Census.

Overall there were 64 more Test forms distributed with the 1991 household definition than with the 1998 household definition. With regard to returned form 32 more 1991 household definitions forms were returned compared to 1998 household definition forms. The response rates to the follow-up was however, better in the 1991 areas compared to the 1998 areas.

In total 912 completed Test forms were returned. However, only the 718 responses of households that returned a Test form and a follow up questionnaire were analysed.

Tables 3 to 5 show the distributions of the sample in the Test for household characteristics. Annex B contains additional frequency distribution of variables.

**Table 3: Number of persons in household by form type returned with a follow up questionnaire**

Number of Persons in the Household	Test form type		Total
	1991 Definition Form	1998 Definition Form	
1	155 38.7%	109 34.4	264 36.8%
2	102 25.5	74 23.3	176 24.5%
3	49 12.3	45 14.2	94 13.1%
4	54 13.5	48 15.1	102 14.2%
5	19 4.8	21 6.6	40 5.6%
6	5 1.3	8 2.5	13 1.8%
7	3 0.8	4 1.3	7 1.0%
8	2 0.5	4 1.3	6 0.8%
9	2 0.5	2 0.6	4 0.6%
10	2 0.5	1 0.3	3 0.4%
14	1 0.3		1 0.1%
Missing	7 1.8	1 0.3	8 1.1%
Total	401 100.0%	317 100.0	718 100.0%

Table 3 shows that there are similar proportions of household size in both the 1991 and 1998 definition areas.

**Table 4: Household type**

	Frequency	Percent
Related	348	48.5
Unrelated	76	10.6
Mixed	12	1.7
Single Person	263	36.6
Missing	19	2.6
Total	718	100.0

The distribution of household types is shown in table 4. It is evident that related households were the greatest participants followed by single person households, unrelated households and then mixed (comprising of related and unrelated person) households. The 2.6% of households that have a missing value for household type were from households with two or more persons who did not complete the relationship matrix on the Test form. It must be noted that there were similar distributions of household types in both the 1991 and 1998 areas.

**Table 5: Self-contained accommodation**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	608	84.7
No	65	9.1
Missing	45	6.3
Total	718	100.0

## Section 6: Public Acceptability

As the Census employs a self-enumeration methodology public acceptability to a household definition is imperative and may directly affect coverage. Respondents in both 1991 and 1998 definition Test areas were asked in the follow up, which household definition they preferred and why? The following tables show the results.

**Table 6: Preferred household definition**

	Frequency	Percent
1991 Household Definition	182	25.3
1998 Household Definition	213	29.7
No Preference	273	38.0
Missing	50	7.0
Total	718	100.0

Table 6 shows that overall there was no preference for either of the household definitions but for those households who did state a preference the 1998 household definition was preferred. Overall at a 95% level there is no statistical significance between the preferred definitions.

**Table 7: Type of household by preferred household definition.**

HH Def	Household Type					Total
	<i>Related</i>	<i>Unrelated</i>	<i>Mixed</i>	<i>Single Person</i>	<i>Missing</i>	
<i>1991 Definition</i>	115 34.6%	23 31.5	3 25.0	38 16.2	3 17.6	182 27.2%
<i>1998 Definition</i>	91 27.4	31 42.5	4 33.3	84 35.9	3 17.6	213 31.9%
<i>No Preference</i>	126 38.0	19 26.0	5 41.7	112 47.9	11 64.7	273 40.9%
<i>Total</i>	332 100.0%	73 100.0%	12 100.0%	234 100.0%	17 100.0%	668 * 100.0%

\* excludes 50 cases where no response was give to the preferred household definition.

In table 7 the preferred household definition is crosstabulated against the type of household. For related, mixed and single person households overall there is no preference for either of the household definitions (38.0%, 41.7% and 47.9% respectively). However, for those related, mixed and single person households that did state a preference related household (34.6%) preferred the 1991 household definition and mixed (33.3%) and single person households (35.9%) preferred the 1998 household definition. In contrast unrelated households overall stated a preference for the 1998 household definition (42.5%).

The 95% confidence interval for related households' preference for the 1991 household definition is

48.9% to 62.66%. This includes the 50% mark and there is thus no significant difference in preference for either of the household definitions. However the 95% confidence interval for other households' (unrelated, mixed and single person households combined) preference for the 1998 household definition is 58.14% to 71.86%. This does not include the 50% mark there is thus a significant preference for the 1998 household definition. For other households the 99% confidence interval is also significant (56.1% to 73.9%) in preference for the 1998 household definition.

**Table 8: Household type by preferred household definition sub-divided by self-contained accommodation.**

HHDef	Household Type					Total
	<i>Related</i>	<i>Unrelated</i>	<i>Mixed</i>	<i>Single Person</i>	<i>Missing</i>	
<i>1991 Definition</i>	107 36.0%	22 32.4	3 27.3	30 16.9	3 21.4	165 29.1%
<i>1998 Definition</i>	82 27.6	28 41.2	4 36.4	64 36.2	3 21.4	181 31.9%
<i>No preference</i>	108 36.4	18 26.5	4 36.4	83 46.9	8 57.1	221 39.0%
<i>Total</i>	297 100.0%	68 100.0%	11 100.0%	177 100.0%	14 100.0%	567 100.0%

Table 8 is a subset of table 7 for those households in self-contained accommodation only. For related households there are virtually no percentage differences between no preference and the 1991 household definition (36%). For single person households there remains an overall preference for neither of the household definitions (46.9%) and where preference is stated it remains to be the 1998 household definition (36.2%).

For mixed households there is no differential between those who stated no preference and those who preferred the 1998 household definition (36.4%) and unrelated households continue to prefer the 1998 household definition (41.2%).

**Table 9: Household type by preferred household definition sub-divided by not self-contained accommodation.**

HHDef	Household Type					Total
	<i>Related</i>	<i>Unrelated</i>	<i>Mixed</i>	<i>Single Person</i>	<i>Missing</i>	
<i>1991 Definition</i>	5 29.4%			6 15.8		11 19.0%
<i>1998 Definition</i>	4 23.5	1 50.0		14 36.8		19 32.8%
<i>No preference</i>	8 47.1	1 50.0	1 100.0	18 47.4		28 48.3%
<i>Total</i>	17 100.0%	2 100.0%	1 100.0%	38 100.0%	0	58 100.0%



Table 9 is a subset of table 7 for those households in not self-contained accommodation only. It must be highlighted that the numbers are very small. For related and single person households there remains no overall preference for either of the household definitions (47.1% and 47.4% respectively). Of those related households that stated a preference there is very little differential between the two definitions. For single person households the 1998 household definition remains the preferred definition (36.8%).

The same overall preferences for related and single person households are observed when household type and preferred household definition is sub-divided by whether the household own or rent their accommodation (please refer to tables 10 and 11).

**Table 10: Household type by preferred household definition sub-divided by owned accommodation.**

HHDef	Household Type					Total
	<i>Related</i>	<i>Unrelated</i>	<i>Mixed</i>	<i>Single Person</i>	<i>Missing</i>	
<i>1991 Definition</i>	69 36.3%	3 27.3	2 20.0	12 14.6	1 20.0	87 29.2%
<i>1998 Definition</i>	46 24.2	3 27.3	4 40.0	27 32.9	2 40.0	82 27.5%
<i>No preference</i>	75 39.5	5 45.5	4 40.0	43 52.4	2 40.0	129 43.3%
<i>Total</i>	190 100.0%	11 100.0%	10 100.0%	82 100.0%	5 100.0%	298 100.0%

For mixed and unrelated households there are very few households that own their accommodation and therefore very little variation between the household definitions. For related households there is little variation between no preference (39.5%) and the preferred 1991 household definition (36.3%). Single person households continue to have no overall preference (52.4%). For single person households that did state a preference they continue to favour the 1998 household definition (32.9%).

**Table 11: Household type by preferred household definition sub-divided by rented accommodation.**

HHDef	Household Type					Total
	<i>Related</i>	<i>Unrelated</i>	<i>Mixed</i>	<i>Single Person</i>	<i>Missing</i>	
<i>1991 Definition</i>	44 33.3%	19 31.7	1 50.0	24 17.3	2 20.0	90 26.2%
<i>1998 Definition</i>	41 31.1	27 45.0	0	54 38.8	1 10.0	123 35.9%
<i>No preference</i>	47 35.6	14 23.3	1 50.0	61 43.9	7 70.0	130 37.9%
<i>Total</i>	132 100.0%	60 100.0%	2 100.0%	139 100.0%	10 100.0%	343 100.0%

For unrelated households in rented accommodation overall preference is for the 1998 household definition (45.0%). Single person households continue to have no overall preference (43.9%) but when a preference is stated continue to overall favour the 1998 household definition (38.8%). For related households there is very little difference between no preference and the two household definitions. Mixed households in rented accommodation are not adequately represented.

Households that stated a preference for a particular household definition were asked to comment on why they preferred that definition. The comments were thematically sorted under the headings listed in table 12. The most mentioned comment in relationship to a preferred household definition was with regard to the applicability of it to the households living arrangements (49.5%) (please refer to table 12).

**Table 12: Comments for preferred household definition**

	Frequency	Percent
Relationship	11	12.1
Sociability	9	9.9
Students	4	4.4
Applicable to living arrangements	45	49.5
Simpler	5	5.5
Other	13	14.3
Not sure	4	4.4
Total	91	100.0

Table 13 shows the distribution of comments with regard to each of the stated preferred household definitions. The breakdown of comments under each of the headings is shown in Annex C.

**Table 13: Comments for preferred household definition by preferred household definition**

Comments	Preferred Household Definition		Total
	1991 Definition	1998 Definition	
<i>Relationship</i>	9 22.5%	2 3.9	11 12.1%
<i>Sociability</i>	8 20.0	1 2.0	9 9.9%
<i>Students</i>	2 5.0	2 3.9	4 4.4%
<i>Applicable to living arrangements</i>	11 27.5	34 66.7	45 49.5%

<i>Simpler</i>	0	5 9.8	5 5.5%
<i>Other</i>	9 22.5	4 7.8	13 14.3%
<i>Not Sure</i>	1 2.5	3 5.9	4 4.4%
<i>Total</i>	40 100.0%	51 100.0%	91 100.0%

Table 13 shows applicability to the households living arrangements was the most frequently mentioned reason for preferring both of the household definitions. For households that preferred the 1991 household definition however only 27.5% felt that it was applicable to their living arrangements. In contrast 66.7% of households that stated a preference for the 1998 household definition felt that it was applicable to their living arrangements.

With regard to the households who preferred the 1998 household definition only 3.9% commented that it was because of relationships and 2.0% because of sociability in contrast to 22.5% and 20.0% of households that preferred the 1991 household definition.

The comments for the preferred household definitions were then crosstabulated with household type for households preferred definition (please see tables 14 & 15).

**Table 14: Comments for preferred household definition by type of household sub-divided by households who preferred the 1991 household definition.**

Comments	Type of Household					Total
	Related	Unrelated	Mixed	Single Person	Missing	
Relationship	8 26.7%	1 33.3				9 22.5%
Sociability	7 23.3	1 33.3				8 20.0%
Students	2 6.7					2 5.0%
Applicable to living arrangements	8 26.7			2 40.0	1 50.0	11 27.5%
Other	4 13.3	1 33.3		3 60.0	1 50.0	9 22.5%
Not Sure	1 3.3					1 2.5%
Total	30 100.0%	3 100.0%		5 100.0%	2 100.0%	40 100.0%

Table 14 shows that related households are far greater represented than any of the other types of households. Related households comments for the preferred 1991 household definition were almost

equally distributed between relationship, sociability and applicability to living arrangements. No single person households stated that their preferred household definition was because of relationship and sociability reasons

**Table 15: Comments for preferred household definition by type of household sub-divided by households who preferred the 1998 household definition.**

Comments	Type of Household					Total
	Related	Unrelated	Mixed	Single Person	Missing	
Relationship	1 5.3%	1 8.3				2 3.9%
Sociability	1 5.3%					1 2.0%
Students	1 5.3			1 5.3		2 3.9%
Applicable to living arrangements	9 47.4	10 83.3		15 78.9		34 66.7%
Simpler	3 15.8		1 100.0	1 5.3		5 9.8%
Other	2 10.5	1 8.3		1 5.3		4 7.8%
Not Sure	2 10.5			1 5.3		3 5.9%
Total	19 100.0%	12 100.0%	1 100.0%	19 100.0%		51 100.0%

Table 15 shows that related and single person households are equally represented. For related, unrelated and single person households the most frequently mentioned comment for household preference was the applicability to their living arrangements. Very few households commented that it was preferred due to relationship or sociability reasons.

## Summary

The results of the test showed that there is a general pattern for types of households and their preferred household definition and that this is maintained when preferred household definition and type of household is sub-divided by self-contained accommodation, not self-contained accommodation, owned accommodation and rented accommodation. The patterns shown were that:

- The majority of related households did not have an overall preference for either of the household definitions. For those households that did state a preference the 1991 household definition was preferred as it reflected their living arrangements, relationships and social aspects of their households.
- The majority of single person households did not have an overall preference for either of the household definitions. For those households that did state a preference the 1998 household definition was preferred as it reflected their living arrangements.
- The majority of unrelated households preferred the 1998 household definition. For those households that commented why this was their preferred household definition they stated that it was because it was applicable to their living arrangements.
- The majority of mixed households did not have an overall preference for either of the household definitions. For those households that did state a preference the 1998 household definition was preferred.

The 99% confidence interval for other households' (unrelated, mixed and single person households) indicates a significant preference for the 1998 household definition.

**Section 7: Variations between the household definitions in terms of coverage of individuals and households.**

This section describes the analysis of 20 of the Test forms and follow up questionnaires where:

- Households failed to include person(s) on the Test form that should have been included under the form household definition;
- Households incorrectly included person(s) on the Test form that should not have been included under the form household definition; and
- Households, when asked, stated that they did not share under either of the household definitions.

**Summary of variations between the household definitions for the 1991 test forms.**

Form Type	Type of household	Self-contained accommodation	Share under 1998 household definition	Share under 1991 household definition	Person(s) incorrectly omitted under form definition	Person(s) incorrectly included under form definition	Prefer 1998 household definition	Prefer 1991 household definition
1991	Unrelated	No	No	No			No preference	No preference
1991	Mixed	Yes	No	No		Yes	No preference	No preference
1991	Unrelated	No		No		Yes		
1991	Unrelated	Missing		No		Yes		
1991	Related	Yes			Yes			
1991	Mixed	Yes			Yes			
1991	Single Person	No			Yes			
1991	Related	Yes			Yes		No preference	No preference
1991	Single person	No				*		
1991	Unrelated	Yes				*		
1991	Related	Missing				*	No preference	No preference
1991	Unrelated	Yes	No					
Total	-----	-----	9	8	4		6	2

\* Would have preferred to include additional person(s) as felt that they were actually a single household. Under the 1998 household definition they would have been a single household.

Of the 879 households that had the 1991 household definition on their forms:

- 0.6% (5) households would have preferred to have the 1998 household definition, as they would have been a single household under that definition. Two of the five households completed their form as if using the 1998 household definition, as they did not share under the 1991 household definition. There was therefore the potential in these five households that the implementation of the 1991 household definition would have missed the other person(s) in the dwelling that the formfiller regarded as really constituting part of their household.
- 0.2% (2) households stated that they did not share under either of the household definitions. One of the two households actually incorrectly included a lodger on their Test form who did not share a sitting room, meals or a kitchen with them;
- 0.5% (4) households failed to include persons on their form that should have been included under the form definition.
- 0.1% (1) households stated that they shared under the 1991 household definition but not the 1998 household definition.

**Summary of variations between the household definitions for 1998 test forms.**

Form Type	Type of household	Self-contained accommodation	Share under 1998 household definition	Share under 1991 household definition	Person(s) incorrectly omitted under form definition	Person(s) incorrectly included under the form definition	Prefer 1998 household definition	Prefer 1991 household definition
1998	Related	Yes	No	No	*			
1998	Unrelated	Yes	No	No	*			
1998	Unrelated	No		No				
1998	Single person	No						
1998	Unrelated	Yes					No preference	No preference
1998	Related	Yes					No preference	No preference
1998	Single Person	No			yes			
1998	Single person	No			yes			
Total	-----	-----	6	5	2	0	3	3

\* person(s) would be omitted under both definitions.

Of the 815 households that had the 1998 household definition on their forms:

- 0.3% (2) households stated that they did not share under either of the household definitions.
- 0.3% (2) households failed to include persons on their form that should have been included under the form definition.
- 0.1% (1) households stated that they shared under the 1998 household definition but not the 1991 household definition.



## **SECTION 8: Enumerators' and Follow Up Interviewers' Perceptions**

### **Enumerators' Perceptions**

All enumerators stated that they had particular problems making contact with persons in multi-occupied accommodation:

- Generally the people were less co-operative;
- There was a higher incidence of non-contact;
- Occasionally when asking about the number of usual residents, persons thought enumerators were referring to the whole building until they were subsequently asked whether they all shared the facilities as dictated by the household definition being used in that area; and
- There was a general problem that the number of doorbells often did not equate to the number of units of accommodation within and were subsequently often a poor indication of the number of households in the building. For example enumerators often found two doorbells on large properties and if contact was made found that it was only household. There were also many cases of multi-occupied buildings that had say eight to ten bells but there was at least one unit of accommodation without its own bell.

If contact was made the enumerators felt that they experienced no problems determining the number of households. For multi-occupied buildings even if contact was just made with one person in the accommodation it was possible generally to ascertain how many households were in the building.

All of the enumerators felt that the definition card was helpful and assisted them with their confidence for the first few addresses that they contacted.

On the whole the enumerators felt that the public understood the household definitions but that they did not seem that interested in either of the definitions.

### **Follow up interviewers' perceptions**

- Ethnic minorities generally had more problems understanding both of the household definitions.
- Generally interviewers felt that members of the public could not distinguish between the two household definitions and in one of the areas it was felt by the interviewers that the households rarely read the household definition on the Test form.
- In all areas more households were found by the follow up interviewers compared to the enumerators in their advance and delivery rounds. If contact was made, by the follow up interviewers, these households were included in the sample.
-

## REFERENCES

Avery et al, (1995) *2001 Census question testing programme: Report on the findings of the first phase of cognitive interviews carried out with members of the public in June 1995* London, OPCS

Heady, P. et al. (1994) *1991 Census Validation Survey: coverage report* HMSO

Jarvis, L. (February 1998) *1998 Census Test: Cognitive testing of ability of those sharing accommodation to complete census forms accurately* SSD, ONS.

Jones, J.; Northwood, K. and Corbin, L. (January 1998) *2001 Census Testing Programme: Report on the findings of interviews with students November 1997* Census Divison, ONS.

McCrossan, L. (1991) *A handbook for interviewers* London: HMSO

OPCS (1971) *Census 1971 England and Wales, General Report, Part 1, Definitions* London: HMSO

OPCS (1981) *Census 1981 Definitions, Great Britain* London: HMSO

OPCS (1992) *1991 Census Definitions Great Britain* London: HMSO

Sykes, W. et al (April 1996) *2001 Census Question Testing Programme January 1996 Test: Report of cognitive interviews carried out with members of the public* SSD, ONS

Todd, J. & Griffiths, D. (1986) *Changing the definition of a household: a study based on the 1981 Labour Force Survey in England to estimate the effect on housing data of a change in the definition of a household* London: HMSO

**ANNEX A****Table 1: Distribution of communal establishments, non-residential accommodation and unoccupied accommodation by enumeration district.**

	<b>Communal Establishment</b>	<b>Non- residential</b>	<b>Unoccupied</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>ED 1</b>			5	5
<b>ED 2</b>	5		5	10
<b>ED 3</b>		2	10	12
<b>ED 4</b>	5	23	22	50
<b>ED 5</b>	4	1	4	9
<b>ED 6</b>	3	2	13	18
<b>ED 7</b>	2	2	3	7
<b>ED 8</b>		4	10	14
<b>ED 9</b>				
<b>ED 10</b>				
<b>ED 11</b>		17	11	28
<b>ED 12</b>			2	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>155</b>

## ANNEX B

**Table 1: Type of Accommodation**

	Frequency	Percent
Detached	61	8.5
Semi-detached	91	12.7
Terraced	205	28.6
Purpose built flat	168	23.4
Converted/shared house	163	22.7
Commercial building	9	1.3
Missing	21	2.9
Total	718	100.0

**Table 2: Own or Rent Accommodation**

	Frequency	Percent
Owns outright	128	17.8
Buying with a mortgage or loan	191	26.6
Part rent/part mortgage	17	2.4
Rents	346	48.2
Lives rent free	4	0.6
In some other way	5	0.7
Missing	27	3.8
Total	718	100.0

**Table 3: Landlord of Rented Accommodation**

	Frequency	Percent
Council (Local Authority) Housing	107	28.0
Association/Co-operative or Charitable Trust	72	18.8
Private landlord or letting agency	173	45.3
Employer of a household member	1	0.3
Relative or friend or a household member	9	2.4
Other	3	0.8
Missing	17	4.5
Total	382	100.0

## **ANNEX C**

### **Comments for preferred 1991 household definition**

#### **1. RELATIONSHIP**

Shows that there is an element of relationship between residents  
Because it is more like a family x 2  
Because in our culture a family shares the meals and the sitting room  
More of a family group  
Because that is what families do- you can share a kitchen but it does not mean that you live together  
Because the relationship is better  
I take it as a unit ie. Mum, dad & children sharing a flat together therefore sharing everything as one.  
Because a household means living together as a family sharing facilities.

#### **2. SOCIABILITY**

More social  
Because sharing the kitchen/cooking facilities doesn't necessarily mean that you live together as a household  
Because in the living room there are facilities to be together  
Because we are all together  
Because people sharing part of their day together seems to constitute a household rather than just sharing facilities.  
The most important feature is social contact and social interaction between members of any particular household.

#### **4. STUDENTS**

Because students - shared kitchens not necessarily a household  
1998 definition not applicable to students

#### **6. APPLICABLE TO LIVING ARRANGEMENTS**

Because we share everything together - a meal and a sitting room  
More applicable to them x 2  
Because a family eat together  
Seems more household like  
Cooks for girlfriend  
They share meals and class themselves as a household  
More people use the sitting room  
Because we eat together  
Better indication of independent people  
Implies an alternative communal living arrangement.

#### **7. SIMPLER**

#### **8. OTHER**

Common housekeeping and money to define a household  
In the sitting room everyone can do what they want  
Too many cooks in the kitchen  
More arguments and division in sharing a kitchen  
Better definition x 2  
Because it is close to being a household. The alternative would require more forms but would allow more accurate statistics on shared structures.  
Would include persons living in bedsitters who may have no connection with those whom they have to share cooking facilities with. It would also allow those who live in bedsitters to treat a shared kitchen as a living room or sitting room in the case where they do feel connected enough to constitute a household.

#### **9. NOT SURE**

Not sure

## **Comments for preferred 1998 household definition**

### **1. RELATIONSHIP**

More families share cooking facilities  
Covers more families

### **2. SOCIABILITY**

Because we do everything together

### **4. STUDENTS**

Student houses

If in a student house might not be in together to share meals etc. but still a household  
Student household would qualify as one household under this definition

### **6. APPLICABLE TO LIVING ARRANGEMENTS**

More people eat in the kitchen now

Most people share in the kitchen today

More applicable to their style of living

More applicable to modern habits

People usually share a kitchen without sharing a meal together - therefore a better definition

We do not sit down altogether anymore for meals

More applicable for a shared property

More applicable to 4 young professionals living together

Kitchen or cooking facilities are more applicable to lodgers

Its basically the way this place operates but it is still a household.

It may not be possible to share a meal because of commitments. The kitchen is the focal point of a household

For the co-op there are no family ties between the residents. All single dwellings.

Do not all share meals or cook together

Because living in that type of accommodation

Teenage children with own rooms/don't eat together

Get more people under the umbrella

Easier to group people x 2

Thinks groups of people together is better

Better for grouping people

Because you feel you are part of the team and are free to use it when you feel like it.

Sums up circumstances

More natural - sitting rooms/meals would be a sub-set of kitchens

Option 2 relates more to people's living habits today

More in keeping with reality - no nuclear families any more

Only share kitchen and bathroom

2 lazys share the kitchen

Different lifestyles

Describes person

Just describes your situation

Describes situation

Cooking is more communal and thus more in keeping with the meaning of a household.

Is more applicable to my arrangements.

I don't share meals with my flatmates.

### **7. SIMPLER**

Simpler

More clear

Explains it more

Much clearer

Easier to read

## **8. OTHER**

Shorter answer

Common housekeeping is an ambiguous term with no strict definition. The definition given still leaves room for variation in interpretation. As the census results are used as the basis for many further studies sharing kitchens is statistically more reliable.

Just because one or more people live together it doesn't mean they share at least one meal a day.

General expenses/provisions maybe shared eg. Bills, milk etc. but they may not even have a shared living room.

## **9. NOT SURE**

Just prefer it

Prefer wording

Don't know

---