

Editor: **Melanie Channon***

The British Society for Population Studies Newsletter



Merry Christmas



We've finally reached the end of 2014, which means that Christmas is upon us and, if you're anything like me, you still need to struggle round the high street panic-buying last minute gifts while failing to get into the festive mood.

This is a bit of a bumper newsletter, with reports from the 2014 BSPS Conference in Winchester, as well as multiple day meetings. We also have a couple of book reviews, in case you're on the look out for some new reading material. Also, look out for the announcement of next years conference (p.5), which will be held at the University of Leeds.

You may have noticed that my name has changed since, for those of you who didn't know, I got married just before the BSPS conference this year. No prizes for working out which former newsletter editor I married. Since it's a demographic event, I thought I'd find out a little more about marriage in the UK, ably helped by the ONS website. I apologise in advance to those of you who research this for a living, but since most of my



research is concerned with South Asia, this was new turf for me. It turns out that I am rather typical as 70% of marriages are now civil ceremonies and 67% are the first marriage for both partners. On the other hand the mean age at first marriage for women is now 34 making me a little on the young side. I also discovered that the largest percentage increase in the number of marriages was for men and women aged 65 to 69, rising by 25% and 21% respectively. In fact, recently there has been an increase in the number of marriages overall. I also took a quick look at the divorce statistics and discovered that 60% of marriages last to their 20th anniversary and that for those marrying in the most recent years, since 2000, the percentage of marriages ending in divorce appears to be falling.

It only remains for me to wish you a Merry Christmas, and I hope to see many of you in 2015!

Contact me:

melanie.channon@ageing.ox.ac.uk

Tweet BSPS: @bspsuk Tweet me: @frostyalyear

Contents

Page 1: Introduction

Page 2: Postgraduate student rep & council members

Pages 3-5: BSPS Conference Report

Page 4-5: Prize winners

Page 5: 2015 BSPS Conference News

Pages 6-7: Day Meeting Report on Usual Residence

Page 8: Book review: The Social Atlas of Europe

Page 9: Spotlight on Research: Amie Kamanda

Page 10-11: Book review: Names, Ethnicity and Population

Page 12-13: Public Event Report: Myths of Migration

Page 13: PopFest 2014 Report

New Postgraduate Student Representative: Ridhi Kashyap

For those who keenly follow this section of the newsletter and may have become familiar with Julia Mikolai's face here, I'd like to take the opportunity to introduce myself as the new BSPS postgraduate student representative. I took over from Julia in September at the BSPS conference in Winchester where I enjoyed meeting many of you. For those I missed, I'm a second-year PhD student at the University of Oxford. My current research seeks to develop computational models that help quantify the impact of sex-selective reproductive behaviours, fertility decline and technology diffusion on sex ratio at birth (SRB) distortions. I am more generally interested in the fertility decline in settings with strong son preference, demographic causes and implications of sex ratio imbalances, and agent-based modelling and computational models. When I am not at my computer, I enjoy sport particularly cricket, cooking, and reading fiction.



One of the highlights of this year's BSPS conference for

me was the chance to listen to the interesting and wide-ranging research of BSPS student members who were well represented across the different thematic sessions at the conference. It was at the conference where I heard student member Amie Kamanda's fascinating research on the demographic impact of the civil war in Sierra Leone – and she shares more about her research in the 'Spotlight on Research' section.

I encourage you to contact me at ridhi.kashyap@nuffield.ox.ac.uk with ideas on how the BSPS can better engage with student concerns, events you'd like to see organised at the BSPS conferences or suggestions for BSPS day meetings. And of course, you're not really a BSPS student member unless you're a member of the Facebook group so please do join us at: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/300124886760445/>. I wish you all the very best for the festive season and a wonderful start to the New Year!

A Little Light Reading

[Does Fertility Spread Among Friends by Nicoletta Balbo](#)

[Afghanistan: Happy with high maternal mortality? By Bart de Bruijn](#)

[Are Suicidal Behaviors Contagious in Adolescents? By Seth Abrutyn](#)

Also, take a look at this new website on health statistics in Africa: <http://www.africanhealthstats.org/cms/>

CURRENT COUNCIL MEMBERS

Hon. Officers:

President: Professor Tony Champion - tony.champion@ncl.ac.uk

Vice-President: Professor Jane Falkingham - j.c.falkingham@soton.ac.uk

Hon. Treasurer: Dr. Dermot Grenham - dermot.grenham@gmail.com

Hon. Secretary: Professor Wendy Sigle-Rushton - W.Sigle-Rushton@lse.ac.uk

Council members:

Greg Ball - greg.ball@orangehome.co.uk

Professor Francesco Billari - francesco.billari@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Dr. Romola Davenport - rjd23@cam.ac.uk

Piers Elias - piers.elias@teesvalleyunlimited.gov.uk

Dr. Paula Griffiths - p.griffiths@lboro.ac.uk

Dr. Julie Jefferies - julie.jefferies@ons.gsi.gov.uk

Dr. Stephen Jivraj - stephen.jivraj@manchester.ac.uk

Dr. Monica Magadi - m.magadi@hull.ac.uk

Kirsty MacLachlan - kirsty.maclachlan@gro-scotland.gsi.gov.uk

Dr. Alan Marshall - alan.marshall@manchester.ac.uk

Postgraduate Student Representative:

Ridhi Kashyap - ridhi.kashyap@nuffield.ac.uk

Newsletter Editor:

Dr Mel Channon - melanie.channon@ageing.ox.ac.uk

Secretariat - pic@lse.ac.uk

BSPS Conference 2014, Winchester

This year's BSPS annual conference was held at the University of Winchester, with attendance surpassing 300 for the first time ever. The venue itself was splendid, and BSPS were favoured with three days of bright and sunny weather, always a bonus. Over the course of the Conference, 186 submitted papers were presented in 40 strand sessions, with 6 sessions running simultaneously in each time slot. This year saw a particularly lively poster session, with over 50 posters on display, attracting much comment and discussion. Training sessions were offered on How to analyse UK Census Flow data: Wifi and Excel, and How to create and compare demographic projections for local planning & estimate the children from new housing. Additionally, a PhD workshop gave graduate students an opportunity to present and discuss their planned dissertations with senior academics. BSPS is very grateful to all who gave their time and expertise to bring these special sessions to Conference, and to all those who organised strands.

Two plenary sessions attracted large audiences. David Satterthwaite (International Institute for Environment and Development – IIED) presented on the theme of Can a finite planet support an urbanizing world? Eilidh Garrett (University of St. Andrews) spoke on Historical Demography: past, present and future, a genealogist's view.

The BSPS website at www.bsps.org.uk has the full Conference programme (including all the paper abstracts) available to download as a PDF. Abstracts are also presented separately there by strand, with contact details of presenters if further information is required.

Plenary 1: “Can a finite planet support an urbanizing world?” - David Satterthwaite

In the first plenary of the conference David Satterthwaite challenged us to envision what the ideal, sustainable city might look like. The rapid pace of urbanization in recent years in the developing world has indicated that the future is irrefutably urban. On the one hand, he argued, this trend holds much promise: cities have a comparative advantage by providing compact and agglomeration economies where opportunity and talent can be fulfilled, and resources can be pooled to reduce risk arising from natural disasters, climate change or poverty. On the other, however, cities as the centres of population growth and the concentration of wealthy groups can often – though not inevitably – be heavily polluting and more burdensome in their environmental impact.

Having laid out the problem, Dr Satterthwaite's plenary was structured in three parts. In the first part of the talk,

he presented data on green house gases (GHG) emissions for several cities across the world to illustrate their differential environmental burden and highlighted the shortcomings of existing indicators to track emissions. With the richest 2% of the world contributing 50% of the world's GHGs, high-consumption lifestyles are a root cause of high GHG emissions. Larger, less dense and automobile-dependent cities, such as Washington, DC, and Denver, Colorado, are some of the worst culprits in their GHG emissions. This does not imply, however, that all rich cities are equally culpable and inherently unsustainable. Oslo, Copenhagen and Porto Alegre provide positive counterexamples of compact, wealthy cities with comparatively low GHG emissions per capita.

Given that most cities across the world currently fail to meet sustainability standards, where might we find a positive template to guide us? In the second part of his talk, Dr Satterthwaite provocatively revealed insights on planning sustainable cities from the most unlikely of places – the world's largest urban slum in Mumbai, Dharavi. With a staggering population of 400,000 within two square kilometres, he argued that Dharavi provides several valuable lessons to city planners in its compact use of space, recycling-intensive and renewable-energy focused diverse economies, and high levels of community participation. Through a series of photographs, anecdotes and local perspectives gained through fieldwork and projects there, Dr Satterthwaite spoke with an intimate familiarity of the ways in which Dharavi is pioneering but also the ways in which it is flawed. Its most serious challenges, such as poor sanitation, lack of toilets and poor occupational and ecological health, need urgent redress and he emphasized the salient role of local stakeholders and a federation of slum residents in organizing for change. Ultimately, while Dharavi remains an imperfect example, it is one that encapsulates a number of challenges that similar contexts in the developing world are already facing or will do so in the near future.

Dr Satterthwaite concluded his talk by setting forth the goals cities ought to target to enable 'a finite planet to support an urbanizing world'. Cities, he underlined, must seek to cut GHG emissions by facilitating infrastructure and encouraging lifestyle changes that decouple a 'high lifestyle' from 'high energy consumption' one. They must pool their resources more efficiently to facilitate disaster risk reduction, poverty reduction and a more equitable provision of resources. Cities more urgently than ever need to generate methods to adapt and mitigate the risks of climate change. Tackling all these issues, he acknowledged, is no easy task but one that requires greater autonomy and resources to be entrusted to city

BSPS Conference 2014, Winchester

governments, plus the growing participation and recognition of local stakeholders and residents.

Plenary 2: Historical Demography: Past, present and future, a genealogist's view – Eilidh Garrett

The main thrust of Dr Garrett's lively talk was to welcome a breaking down of barriers within the field of historical demography and the resulting dialogue between different areas of the discipline, both within the UK and internationally. Dr Garrett welcomed this new and exciting era for historical demography, one which follows the recent celebration of the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure's 50th anniversary.

The changes this new era has brought have largely been heralded, in the UK at least, by the arrival of two new datasets which Dr Garrett drew upon to illustrate her talk. She also drew comparisons with other existing datasets such as the North Atlantic Population Project. However it was data from the UK that was at the forefront of her talk.

To introduce genealogy, Dr Garrett talked of the popular television show, 'Who do you think you are?'. This program has raised the profile of genealogy, encouraging a diverse group of amateur genealogists to begin researching their family tree. Dr Garrett emphasised that it is this popularity which has prompted organisations to digitise individual records and place them online: for a small fee, amateur and professional genealogists alike can access these records instantly. Her talk went on to discuss how the ready availability of these data is welcome to historical demographers who build up from these individual records to explore trends and patterns in the population.

However, despite the advances in technology which have eased conducting this kind of research, Dr Garrett emphasised that historical demography is hampered so long as those working in this field remain 'boxed' into their own sub-disciplines, defined by their use of different data sources, methods or even their interest in different spaces or times.

To help illustrate the importance of talking to fellow historical demographers and demonstrate how this can help enhance our understanding of different historical events, Dr Garrett used the example of the fertility transition in Europe. This example also served to introduce the Integrated Census Microdata (I-CeM) held at the University of Essex. She discussed how the team has collated census data for Britain between 1851 and 1911, harmonising the data over time.

Dr Garrett showed the audience how sub-registration district-level data can help us understand the fertility transition in a way that previous notable attempts such as the Princeton surveys or work by Robert Wood were unable to do. She talked of how these studies, using either county-level or registration district-level data were not detailed enough to help explain why or where the fertility transition began. However, using sub-registration district-level data from I-CeM, she showed the audience how differences in fertility rates between areas devoted to textile or mining industries might help explain the fertility transition.

For the final section of the plenary, Dr Garrett introduced another new dataset which plays a similar role in breaking down the 'boxes' of historical demography: the 'Digitising Scotland' project will digitise 24 million Scottish record images of births, marriages and deaths since 1855, and has the potential to be a great tool for demographic research. She talked enthusiastically about the prospect of such a rich data source where deaths will be coded to ICD-10 codes and variables such as occupation will be comparable across time.

Dr Garrett concluded her inspiring talk by thanking genealogists and records offices who have prompted the establishment of two new data sources with the potential to bring historical demography to the forefront of population studies. It is hard not to share in the excitement for a new era of historical demographic research.

BSPS PRIZE 2014

The 2014 BSPS Prize, for the entry adjudged to be the best Masters dissertation on a demographic topic, has been awarded to Emily Clay, University of Southampton. Emily is now at the Office for National Statistics. Her winning dissertation was entitled Modal age at death: mortality trends in England and Wales, 1814-2010. From the comments of one of the judges: a clear objective and an original contribution. Careful & thorough transformation of an impressive data set. The results contribute to demographic knowledge and suggest that the modal age of death should augment rather than supplant life expectancy.

Emily received a cheque for £300 at the 2014 BSPS Conference. Many congratulations to her.

Details of the 2015 BSPS Prize will be available in April 2015. Submissions must come from the supervising institution and not the candidates themselves.

BSPS Conference poster prize 2014

Each year, BSPS gives a prize for the best poster from the

BSPS Conference 2014, Winchester

Conference poster display. In 2014, the prize was split between the best student and the best non-student poster. The [best student poster](#) award went to Heini Vaisanen (LSE) for her poster The association between education and induced abortion in Finland: a cohort perspective.

The best non-student poster award went to John Black (Cambridge Group for the History of Population & Social Structure) for his poster Burial practices in Manchester, 1750-1850.

Both Heini and John received book tokens for £50 - congratulations to them both.

BSPS Conference quiz winners

The 2014 Conference quiz was won by a team from National Records of Scotland, who knew more about arcane population matters than anyone else! Congratulations to them.

*With thanks for plenary reports provided by:
Ridhi Kashyap (University of Oxford) – David Satterthwaite
Fran Darlington (University of Leeds) – Eilidh Garrett*

BSPS Conference 2015 University of Leeds, 7th-9th September

The 2015 BSPS Conference will be held at the University of Leeds (main campus), 7-9 September. All Conference sessions will be held on site, where excellent on-site accommodation will also be available at very reasonable cost. Plenary speakers are announced as Professor John Stillwell (University of Leeds), and Professor Helga de Valk (NIDI and Vrije Universiteit Brussel).

The call for sessions suggestions is now open, with a closing date of **Friday 9 January 2015**.

Provisional timetable for the Conference:

- ⇒ Closing date for proposals for Conference sessions & strands - **Friday 9 January 2015**
- ⇒ Call for papers & posters issued - **Mid-January 2015**
- ⇒ Closing date for submission of papers & posters - **Wednesday 8 April 2015**
- ⇒ Deadline for contributors' registration & early-bird registration rates - **Friday 24 July 2015**
- ⇒ Conference booking closes - **Monday 24 August 2015**
- ⇒ Conference - **Monday 7 September - Wednesday 9 September 2015**

BSPS Council invites members (including new members) and non-members to suggest ideas for individual Conference sessions & strands, and to propose strand & session organisers. Please be as specific as possible in filling in the information on the downloadable form, available at:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/socialpolicy/bsps/annualconference/home.aspx>

An individual contributed session will allow a co-ordinated consideration of a single topic and will be allocated 90 minutes to include 3-4 presentations, with time for questions at the end of each presentation or session. Strands will include multiple sessions. Session and strand themes may be focussed on a methodological or substantive topic or a specific data set. The organiser would be able to solicit offers of presentations (or may have these in mind already), which could then be submitted via the conference online submissions form, either individually or as a set. After the close of the call, the organiser would be responsible for advising which papers should be included in the strand or session, and organising a chair(s) for the session(s) (which may be themselves, if they are not presenting in the session).

NB: Sessions may be integrated into strands if appropriate, by agreement with session organisers.

Alternatively, BSPS is keen to encourage innovative formats, such as panels, forums, training sessions, sessions with discussant, discussions or workshops. Suggestions for such would be very welcome. Fringe meetings to run in conjunction with Conference will need to be proposed in detail also by 9 January 2015.

If you would like to contribute your ideas, please complete the form and return to pic@lse.ac.uk by Friday 9 January 2015.

NB: Conference attendance is at the presenter's expense (although student members presenting a paper or poster are eligible to apply for a bursary).

The concept of usual residence: has it reached its sell-by date?

A BSPS day meeting, Friday 24th October 2014

Report by Richard Potter (Analytics Cambridge) and Tony Champion (Newcastle University)

This meeting at LSE set itself the task of looking at how far the population bases currently used to present statistics meet the needs of users, with the central issues revolving around the concept of usual residence and its definition and utility. The immediate trigger was the government's decision in summer 2014 to go ahead with a census in 2021, but these issues were also seen as relevant to statistics generated by surveys and administrative datasets. This is because the world has become a much more complicated place due to changing mobility behaviours, reflected in such phenomena as weekly commuting, seasonal movements, living apart together and transient labour migration.

Richard Potter (Analytics Cambridge) set the scene by describing the commonality of what might be considered "unusual" residences as might be seen in a walk through Cambridge. He followed up by describing the differing definitions of usual residence that were applied in range of functions from taxation and the health services to the electoral roll and when applying for bank accounts or school places. He finished by asking:

Has the way people are living changed sufficiently to merit a new definition?

Whether or not this is the case, has our ability to measure where people are (and for how long) improved?

Should we make available additional population measures more suited to customer needs?

At a time of austerity, do we need more and better information to allocate resources?

Next, under the title 'To be or not to be (usually resident)?', Ian White (formerly of ONS, now with UN Economic Commission for Europe) described the international recommendations on usual residence being put forward for the 2020/2021 round of censuses. He gave examples of previous censuses in the UK which had used the 'population present' definition and of the problems caused by a variety of factors including good weather leading to large numbers of people temporarily at seaside locations. He then reported on the UNECE and EU recommended population base and gave examples of who should be included in the usually resident population of a place, giving particular attention to those who regularly live in more than one residence within the country during the year and to children who alternate

between two households.

In the final part of the morning session, two ONS speakers looked at alternative population in the 2011 Census and beyond. Claire Pereira (from Census 2011) started by describing the consultation which had taken place to identify user preferences about the population bases to be used for 2011 Census outputs. While there was a strong preference for usual residence, there were also requests for outputs to be provided on the basis of short term residents, workday and workplace populations, together with out of term populations and possibly those showing where people spent the majority of their time. She went on to show some results from analyses using some of these alternative bases.

Ann Blake (from Beyond 2011) then looked forward to the 2021 census and even beyond that, identifying three strands of work: on the 2021 online census itself, on the further integration of census, survey and administrative sources (feeding into updates on population estimates and characteristics from 2015), and on the development of new methods that could be assessed against the 2021 Census results. Current planning for the 2021 Census is on the basis of usual residence definition, with further definitions driven by user requirements through topic consultation and feedback from the 2011 outputs. Similarly, work to date on administrative data has also been using the usual residence definition, with requirements being developed in parallel with those for the Census.

The afternoon began with a paper by Cédric Duchene-Lacroix (Basel University) on multi-local living arrangements in Switzerland. He gave examples of the salience of issues surrounding the 'usual residence' concept there, including the rise of transnational 'super commuters' and local actions to restrict the number of second homes. His definition of multilocal living included the use of two or more residences by the same dweller(s), the circular mobility of a person between her/his residences and alternated phases of presence and absence in each of her/his residences. He then quoted studies that have shown that 11% of French residents fall within his definition and 28% of the Swiss. Drawing on the results of his own survey work, he demonstrated some of the many complexities, including the fact that some people spent more of their time in an average year at a residence other than the one that they regarded as their most important.

Next, Tony Champion (Newcastle University) described some of the challenges of applying the 'usual residence' definition in the context of rising mobilities and then of

Continued from previous page...

interpreting results presented on that basis. Work with Martin Bell (Brisbane) on temporary migration in Australia illustrated the typical fractions of time spent away from home by different groups of people including seasonal migrants, weekenders, weekly commuters, holidaymakers, FIFOs (FlyIn/FlyOut workers) and business travellers. These forms of movement could well be linked to the reduction in the propensity of people to change their usual residence noted in the USA – something also found in his UK work with Ian Shuttleworth (Queen’s, Belfast) that showed a decrease in 10-year address-changing from 55% to 45% between the 1970s and 2000s.

Mike Coombes (Newcastle University) then shared thoughts on whether usual residence was the best option for the ‘home’ base for flow datasets as living and working patterns are becoming increasingly complex and varied. He described how flow datasets have two geographies, a ‘from’ place and a ‘to’ place. Migration combines home location with previous home place, with the usual residence at census time being the place the migrant goes to, while in commuting datasets the usual residence is the place the commuter goes from. Both datasets have important policy uses, for example in defining Housing Market Areas and Travel to Work Areas. Crucial to the migration datasets is that the ‘home’ base should be defined in the same way as respondents answer the question about their location one year ago. For data on commuting, issues arise where people have two jobs, engage in teleworking or carry out some or all of their work in trips made from their home.

The final part of the day comprised a discussion session, initiated by short presentations from Mark Fransham (Oxford City Council), Richard Cameron (Greater London Authority), and Ewan Kennedy (Home Office), together with Southwark London Borough (presented by Richard Potter) and Ludi Simpson (Manchester University, but presented by Tony Champion in Ludi’s absence due to changing his own usual residence that day!). Among the points raised by these, plus the speakers’ panel and the floor, were:

- How far usual residence provided a good measure of demand for services, given that this demand, generated by people, varies according to the time, day, month and season.
- Usual residence is used to allocate resources, planning service demand, comparing areas, but could there be better or different measures?.
- People are not just in one place: for some services they may be in one place, for other services they may be in a different place, so people could legitimately be counted twice and thus the information does not need to be constrained to national totals.

- For the national picture, the time series currently available provides a basis for policy, as does the ability to compare the position with other countries.
- How reliable are answers to the Census question, “Including the time you have already spent here, how long do you intend to stay in the United Kingdom?” in providing information on migration?
- Administrative data won’t be able to capture people’s intentions for the future.
- The Census offers only a snapshot in time, so can additional information be usefully drawn on from other sources such as travel and tourism surveys?
- Definitions of usual residence and migration must be considered together and be consistent with each other.
- Are we using suitable definitions of migration: should moving from one street to the next be counted as migration?
- Given the increasing interest in vacant properties, should holiday homes that are let to short-term tenants still be counted as vacant dwellings?
- As we are living more complex lives, how can we capture this between censuses, given that we can’t make the latter do everything?
- Usual residence is not just about the amount of time spent in a place: it is also about attachment to the place and the intensity of use.
- One approach to usual residence can be to look at the amount of time spent away from home.
- There is no substitute for the Census, so can we improve the meta data to help its better use?

No matter how sophisticated is the modelling of the data, users still need to be able to trust it.

A lot of questions, for most of which the meeting did not provide definitive answers! – besides mainly echoing the results of the ONS consultation on population definitions for the 2011 Census that opted for usual residence as the basis for most tables with supplementary tables on the several alternative bases that Claire had described. In any case, however, the day had been designed primarily as a scoping exercise for opening up issues rather than closing them down. With preparations for the 2021 Census getting underway, it is now vital to consider whether user views have altered since the consultations of nearly a decade ago. As this will depend on how useful the 2011 tables on alternative bases are proving, this meeting will have served a useful purpose if it gets users to look more closely at these statistics and come to an informed view on this before final decisions need to be made for 2021.

Copies of the presentations can be found on the BSPS website at:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/socialPolicy/BSPS/dayMeetings/The-concept-of-usual-residence-has-it-reached-its-sell-by-date.aspx>

Book Review: *The Social Atlas of Europe* by Dimitris Ballas, Danny Dorling & Benjamin Hennig

Review written by Paul Norman

Book published by Policy Press: Bristol. £24.99.

I have had this book for a couple of months now both at home on my 'coffee' table and at work by my desk. It has been looked at by a variety of people who have different backgrounds socially, academically and technically. One thing this book does really well is to get people talking.

For those who haven't seen the book, it is what it says on the tin and after contents and glossary pages there is an introductory section which explains the mapping approaches used in the book. If you are not familiar with 'cartograms' they differ from conventional maps because the area being displayed, rather than being the physical size of the location, is scaled by the value of the phenomenon being mapped. More rural areas tend to be sparsely populated but larger in areal extent compared with more urban areas. A cartogram would present a map of population density constraining the size of the mapped area of the rural areas and expanding the size of the urban areas. Ballas and colleagues explain this much better than I can and after these explanations and illustrations, the book has main sections on Identity and Culture, Demographics, Education, Employment and much, much more. In the main, each page is on a topic with a cartogram of the distribution across Europe and a couple of paragraphs of definitional and descriptive text.

In fairness to the people I have shown the book to, almost nobody had the opportunity to really read the detail of the text (particularly the explanations in the first few pages). When I hand the book to people and ask what they think of it, most people just open the book somewhere and start looking at what is shown. The discussion points which follow have inevitably been about the cartogram approach which mystifies those who have never seen the technique before (and there tends to be a Marmite effect with people rarely ambivalent to cartograms). Nevertheless, as more detail has been looked at, discussions centre around those areas which appear relatively large or small due to the phenomenon being mapped which can be extreme particularly for the more economic facing facets. For the 'Identity and Culture' section, discussions are around the survey questions being asked, for example, about the justification of the death penalty and of asking about various subjective topics (importance, satisfaction, etc.).

This book comprises over 200 pages and the majority has a map! In my recent experience, whenever either I or somebody else looks at this book, the tendency is only to look at a handful of pages. This itself leads to a discussion on the particular topic and ideas for trying to understand better what is being shown. During the next few months, both undergraduate and postgraduate students will be thinking about what to do for a dissertation. I will be using this book to help people formulate topics and research questions. Almost every page of this book could be the start of a new research project. I didn't think I wanted to supervise a dissertation on Eurovision Song Contest voting but am now wondering about voting patterns before the break up of Yugoslavia!

The Great Britain Sasakawa Foundation: Butterfield Awards for UK-Japan Collaboration in Medicine and Health

The principal intention of the programme is to enable Japanese and British researchers, practitioners, policy makers and voluntary sector workers to share experience and advance knowledge and good practice, and to facilitate UK-Japan professional exchanges and small-scale collaborations.

Applications can be in any relevant field of medicine and health. Projects in the economics and management of healthcare, public health and the interface between medical and social care are particularly welcome. The grants may be used for travel expenses or to contribute to other costs as appropriate, for example, to help towards travel and living expenses of such research collaborations, or towards seminars, conferences, workshops or publications.

It is intended that, wherever possible, the project should involve partners in both the UK and Japan. Preference will be given to those who have not previously been involved in a UK-Japan collaboration, and applications from early-stage researchers are particularly welcome.

A number of awards are available, worth up to £5,000 per year over a maximum of three years. Applications for smaller and, exceptionally, larger sums may be considered.

Note they also award Small Grants, closing dates: 31 March 2015, 15 September 2015: <http://www.gbsf.org.uk/link/index.html>

Spotlight on Research: Amie Kamanda, University of Southampton

I am in the final year of my PhD. I am supervised by Professor Sabu Padmadas and Dr Jakub Bijak at the University of Southampton. I hold a BA in History and an MSc in Demography from the University Southampton, as well as an MSc in Violence, conflict and development from the School of Oriental and African Studies.

My main research interest is in the demographic and human rights consequences of conflict in West Africa. In my doctoral thesis, I am examining the effect of the civil war in Sierra Leone (1991-2002) on period fertility and mortality rates and forced migration. I aim to reconstruct mortality and fertility trends from 1991 to 2005, to examine the components of population change that contributed the most to these trends and to map the war-time violations. My research was inspired by the work undertaken by several authors in the 2006 edited collection *The demography of conflict*.

My research is interdisciplinary, drawing on a number of sources of data. The study uses the 1985 and 2004 Population and Housing census of Sierra Leone to guide the assumptions about demographic trends. There was no census during the war, hence the need to reconstruct fertility and mortality trends using births data from the Sierra Leone Demographic and Health Survey (SLDHS). The analysis of the 2008 SLDHS births data shows that the period fertility rate remained very high and stable from 1991 to 2005, above 5.5 births per woman. Meanwhile, evidence from the 2008 and 2013 SLDHS shows that childhood mortality rates were very high during the war. By applying indirect estimation techniques to childhood mortality rates, period life tables can be obtained for five year periods from 1991 to 2005. The results show that life expectancy at birth declined for both males and females during the most violent period of the war (1996-2000), and only increased in the post-war period. I will apply these rates to reconstruct the civil war population.

The war caused unprecedented forced displacement of

the population. Data from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees show that more than 2 million Sierra Leoneans, more than 50% of the pre-war population, were forcibly displaced. Mass population displacement is just one of the human rights violations identified by the Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission (SLTRC) in 2002, based on the individual testimonies submitted by Sierra Leoneans in the post-war period. Using information on the type of violation, the year and geographical location of the violation, this data are mapped by phase of the conflict to show the spatial and temporal variation in the type of violations committed during the war. The findings show that no district was left untouched by the war. Moreover, while areas in the Eastern and Southern Regions were most affected at the start of the war because the rebels launched the rebellion there, it is clear that the areas in the Eastern and Northern Regions bore the brunt of the war. The Eastern Region was contested due to its wealth in diamonds, which fuelled the war, while the Northern Region was also contested due to its proximity to the capital city, Freetown. The maps of human rights violations will be exhibited at the Sierra Leone Peace Museum.

A final aspect of my research which had to be cancelled due to the Ebola outbreak is fieldwork in one of the diamondiferous districts in the Eastern Region which reported a decline in its population size. The humanitarian crisis unfolding has forced me to reflect more critically on the legacy of the war, and to consider not only the demographic, but also the socio-economic consequences as well.

This research is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council.

For more information about my research, please visit: http://www.southampton.ac.uk/socsci/postgraduate/research_students/ak904.page or email: a.kamanada@soton.ac.uk



Book Review: *Names, ethnicity and populations: tracing identity in space*, by Pablo Mateos

Review written by Ludi Simpson

Book published by Springer: Dordrecht. £90.00.

This book has emerged from Pablo Mateos' decade-long review of theoretical understanding and practical analysis of names as indicators of identity both for individuals and for populations. "In the UK, the Census of population ethnicity classification is too coarse and rigid to reflect the fine-grained reality of London's population change over the last 20 years. ... The traditional statistical tools available to understand population composition have failed to capture the rapidly changing, small scale geographical processes that relate particular neighbourhoods with regions all around the world." (p201).

For those who have been unsure of the links between genetics and demography, Pablo Mateos has performed a service. In most societies surnames follow from the male parent to each child. Tracing a name's location over time provides a map of migration. Forenames are more apt to fashion, but are nonetheless cultural indicators of people and populations that have experienced similar influences. Brenda, for example, is most likely to indicate a more elderly person in the UK, but someone middle-aged in the USA, and a young adult in Mexico.

The first and largest part of the book reviews theories: ethnicity and its measurement, the development and meaning of names, and the definition and measurement of populations in genetics. The links between these usually separate studies are made abundantly clear. Names, genes, and identities all serve "two antithetical but complementary functions: differentiation and categorisation of individuals" (p45). Our name identifies us as different from others, but also indicates our similarity to those with similar names, for example Brown and Smith as different from Garcia and Mateos. The parallels between name histories and language histories are made apparent, as is the importance of both for establishing long-range historical and global migration.

Mateos has made his own highly significant contributions to the use of names to identify populations, but in this book he provides wide, historical and balanced reviews with abundant use of examples. One anecdote nicely brings names and genetics together, concerning Charles Darwin's son, who was concerned to quantify the health impact on children (such as himself) of marriages between first cousins. George Darwin counted parents with the same premarital surnames, to estimate the lack of a relation to the prevalence of mental disorders. Along the way he discovered a method of discounting an appropriate proportion of those that were distantly related or unrelated, to estimate the prevalence of consanguineous marriages (p66).

The second part of the book traces the analysis of names to indicate classifications of ethnicity. An early example arose from the USA 1924 Immigration Act which demanded the use of the 1790 Census record of surnames to establish the 'founding' national origins of the USA. Immigration during the 1920s and up to 1965 was limited using quotas in proportion to those founding origins.

Lists of reference surnames, Spanish or Chinese or South Asian for example, have been the basis for many classifications of whole populations into ethnic categories. At Bradford Council I helped to implement a reference list of South Asian names first developed by the Linguistic Minorities Project of the 1970s. The resulting Nam Pehchan computer programme helped local demographic estimation as well as research on the national Cancer Registries, in the many situations where ethnic group was not collected. Pablo Mateos fairly reviews evaluations of various attempts at name analysis, including Nam Pehchan and Sangra from the UK, and others from Canada, USA and Germany.

The methodologically exciting chapter 7 describes and develops a new approach, pioneered by Ken Tucker at Carlton University in Canada and taken forward by Mateos and colleagues at UCL in the 2000s. A seed list of forenames associated with particular cultural-ethnic-linguistic populations is matched to lists of many millions of forenames and surnames taken from electoral lists, telephone directories and other near-complete population databases. Surnames gain a distance from each other based on the frequency with which they are linked to the same forenames. Brown and Smith are closer than Brown and Garcia, for example. The process is iterative: once surnames are classified in a probabilistic framework with cultural-ethnic-linguistic groups, the other forenames associated with them are scored, and so on in a network analysis followed by cluster analysis. The choice of assumptions is discussed in a manner that persuades in favour of the resulting emergence of forty cultural-ethnic-linguistic groups, for example Pakistani, Persian, Polish and Portuguese.

Book Review: *Names, ethnicity and populations: tracing identity in space*, by Pablo Mateos

Application of the approach is demonstrated with insights for long-term migration within the UK (comparing names 1881-2001), for ethnic diversity of London by estimating the size of many communities only partially identified even by the multiple questions of the 2011 Census, for world distribution of names, and for analysis of ethnic segregation.

As a whole the book is very well structured, each chapter clearly introduced and concluded with ample thoughtful links between chapters, reflecting meticulous writing by the author; his occasional Spanish-English idioms remain uncorrected by editors, though without disturbing the book's clarity.

How promising is name analysis for improved official statistics? The current emphasis on administrative data as a source of social statistics to complement and to rival traditional census and survey methods should give it great relevance. Name analysis is already used in the commercial sector to segment populations for marketing purposes. The successful use of name analysis for official statistics does involve numerous challenges. The issues of confidentiality, coverage, and inclusion of other information relevant to social policy are common to other statistical use of administrative records. These challenges are being worked on with some potential for success through data linkage.

There are specific questions for the use of name analysis to complement or substitute ethnicity variables. The cultural-ethnic-linguistic groups identified generally reflect geographical origins; could religions (or other categories) that are associated with names, be identified by choice of appropriate seed names in the system? How limiting is the general problem one of dividing European-origin names between those with recent European origins and those bearing those names but with centuries of ancestors in ex-colonies – making it difficult to distinguish whole populations of White British and Black Caribbean for example? Is the probabilistic approach that leads to fuzziness in population estimates a problem for acceptability, since it is not a result of individual choice of ethnic identity?

The book claims only to document an innovative method that provides a promising agenda for future research. Pablo Mateos achieves a great deal more through his careful and entertaining reviews of the construction and analysis of ethnicity and naming systems. If this book also leads to further development of methods and helpful applications, it will have served a very useful purpose.

International Conference on Population Geographies 2015

The Spatial Dimensions of Population

We are delighted to announce that the 8th International Conference on Population Geographies will be held at the University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, from 30th June to 3rd July 2015.

The call for papers is now open. The deadline for submissions is **Monday 16th February 2015**.

We invite papers from all fields of population geography and allied disciplines, especially contributions around the following themes:

- Spatial demography
- Migration and development
- Ethnicity and segregation
- Migration and the environment
- Households and housing
- Demography of the life course
- Fertility and the family
- Towards the end: death and dying
- Ageing and morbidity
- Indigenous populations
- Official statistics
- Exploiting big data
- Data visualisation and communication
- Demographic projections
- Applications of demography
- Population health

We also welcome proposals for other sessions and offers to organise or convene sessions.

Abstracts for papers and posters should be around 250 words and include the title, authors, affiliations, and contact email, and be sent to icpg2015@uq.edu.au. For all other aspects of the conference, contact icpg2015@absoluteevents.com.au.

Key dates

- **Monday 16th February 2015** - Deadline for submitting abstracts
- **Monday 9th March 2015** – Notification of acceptance.
- **Monday 16th March** – Registration opens.
- **Monday 4th May** – Deadline for Early bird Registration.

Other essential details of the conference including venue, accommodation, and travel will be made available progressively on the Conference website at: <http://www.icpg2015.org>

Myths of migration: the changing British population

A joint BSPS/BA event held at the British Academy on 17 November 2014

As part of its celebrations of the 25th anniversary of the publication of *The Changing Population of Britain* (edited by Heather Joshi, Blackwell, 1989), the BSPS teamed up with the British Academy for an evening public event on UK migration. Three speakers were invited to address the following questions: Given that the movement of people shapes our neighbourhoods and communities, what are the realities of these changes, and where do the myths of migration end and the realities of population change begin? What are the new patterns of internal and trans-national migration? Who are the new immigrants, where are they from, and where do they go? Do immigrants isolate or integrate? Are we flocking to the cities, or escaping to the countryside? The event was chaired by Francesco Billari, the President of EAPS and a BSPS Council member, who welcomed the full house of attendees and introduced the speakers.

Tony Champion, the current BSPS President, focused on within-UK migration. He set up three 'straw men' (the term that he preferred to 'myths') and managed to demolish two of them. 'Migration' is not synonymous with 'immigration', despite the high salience of the latter in the media and indeed ONS's usage in 2011 Census outputs. Ten times as many residents moved home within the UK in the 12 months leading up to the Census as had been living outside the UK a year earlier and have the potential for considerably altering the size and composition of local populations. Secondly, the latest research shows that, while we may be living in an increasingly mobile world, residential mobility in the UK is lower now than 20-30 years ago, with an especially steep fall in shorter-distance moving. The jury is out, however, on his final question as to whether the recent signs of urban resurgence spell the end of net migration from city to countryside. Most important in UK policy terms is whether a sustained recovery from the 2008/09 recession will lead to the acceleration of the exodus from London that has been experienced in previous cycles. The major changes since the early 1990s recession, including the drop in home moving rates just mentioned, the altered housing behaviour of younger adults in recent years and the rising ethnic minority share of city populations, may be combining to produce to a new internal migration regime.

Ludi Simpson, the immediate past President of BSPS, described the two eras of globalisation, both connecting demographic and economic change. The first, in the 18th

and 19th centuries, was associated with emigration from Europe, and the second, which we have experienced since the middle of the 20th century, is associated with widening inequalities which make Europe and North America particularly attractive. Within this context, immigration to the UK is not extreme, and may not be amenable to legal attempts to change it. The impact on sub-national Britain has been to create a diversity of diversities that continues to change. Movement from city central zones to suburbs and beyond began before significant immigration rather than being caused by it, and continues for all ethnic groups. Analysis of segregation is technically unable to answer questions about the barriers to equal movement, but suggests steady and slow geographical integration of ethnic groups as we currently measure them. A crude projection of ethnic diversity suggests that diversity will increase, but the most diverse local authority of Britain, the London Borough of Newham, is about as diverse as any authority will become in the next twenty years. There will be few areas in which a single group other than White British is the largest group. Often, the next largest group will be what we now call 'Other', a mix of different origins relatively new to Britain. The measurement of ethnicity will have to change in response to the increasingly diverse nature of local diversity.

Norma Cohen, who has just retired as Demography correspondent after 27 years at the Financial Times, challenged perceptions of the relative attractiveness of Britain as the destination of first choice for those seeking to uproot themselves. In fact, migrants tend to choose countries that already are host to a significant community of their own citizens and which bear some similarity in language and culture to their own. While that makes Britain very attractive to migrants from other English-speaking nations, it makes it less so to many others. A quick look at UN migration data suggests that far more migrants – including residents of countries likely to attract the most alarmed headlines – choose destinations other than Britain. For example, migrants from India ranked Britain sixth on the list of most likely destinations, with 760,000 from there making a home here. But that compares with 2.9m Indians in the UAE, 2.0m in the USA and 1.8m in Saudi Arabia. Pakistanis rank Britain fourth, with 1.3m and 1.1m in Saudi Arabia and India respectively compared with 460,000 in the UK. And despite fears that Britain would be swamped by an influx from Albania, Romania and Bulgaria, the UK appears far down on the list of choices for residents from these nations. For Albanians,

Myths of migration: the changing British population

A joint BSPS/BA event held at the British Academy on 17 November 2014

nearby Greece is the first choice with 570,000, Italy second with 450,000 and Britain 7th choice with only 20,000 Albanian-born residents. There are more than 10 times as many Bulgarians in Turkey as in the UK, and as many choose Italy or Greece as choose Britain. There are 10 times as many Romanians living in Italy and 8 times as many in Spain as are living in the UK. In fact, there are more Romanians in Israel than in Britain. Thus, the fear that failure to close the gates to migrants will leave Britain 'swamped' with foreigners is greatly overblown.

Predictably most of the ensuing discussion from the floor focused on immigration to Britain. Could Ludi's projections to 2031 provide ammunition to the UK Independence Party? How can the government resolve the tension between following the public desire to limit immigration and allowing employers to plug labour and skill shortages in finance, elderly care, etc.? How is it that the majority population can happily co-exist with ethnic minority neighbours in the same street, but want to see the UK close its doors to new arrivals? It was suggested that people should try hard to suppress their

Ids and develop their Superegos, also that public acceptance of immigration would increase if newcomers quickly learnt to speak good English. Some links to internal migration were also made. Why is there a general perception that 'white flight' exists when the urban exodus rates are similar across all ethnic groups? Is there a parallel between trying to stop immigration to the country and trying to stop people moving into the countryside? What, if any, is the link between net immigration to the UK and the patterns of within-UK migration, especially in relation to London? To what extent is it population ageing that is slowing down within-UK migration? Ultimately, the discussion turned on two main points: the need for more research focusing on the processes behind migration and, above all, the need to do better at getting the key messages from research into the public domain. It was felt that public events such as this were a useful way of doing this, but more could and should be done. To help towards this, an audio recording of this event is available on the British Academy website at <https://www.britac.ac.uk/events/2014/MythsofMigration.cfm>

PopFest 2014 Round Up

Between the 4th and 6th August University College London hosted PopFest 2014, the 22nd Annual postgraduate Studies Conference. The primary goal of the conference is to help population researchers in the early stages of their academic careers to develop their skills and ideas.

PopFest 2014 brought together research students from a variety of disciplines with a common interest in population, providing them with the opportunity to network and present their work in an encouraging and friendly environment. We had the enormous pleasure of welcoming 30 delegates from across a number of different UK universities. The conference featured over 30 presentations across seven sessions.

In addition to presentation sessions, a number of events were organised to allow delegates to network informally. On Monday evening a BBQ buffet was enjoyed by all. On Tuesday Dr Martin Zaltz Austwick and Dr Adam Dennett organized a two-hour walk around London, inspired by Charles Booth's seminal poverty maps of London. Using extracts from his notebooks and the maps he produced, delegates were given a unique insight into London's past and how the city, and the resident population, has changed over the last 100 years.

We were also very fortunate to be able to welcome four excellent keynote speakers. The first keynote speaker was Emily Grundy, Professor of Demography in the Department of Social Policy at the London School of Economics. Professor Grundy discussed population ageing and later life health from a European perspective. In our second keynote session we heard from Dr James Cheshire and Dr Daniel Lewis, who both completing their PhD's in recent years. They were able to offer their perspective on the postgraduate experience and their career progression since graduating. They also provided an overview of how they have gone on to develop their population research in their current roles. Our final keynote speaker was Keith Dugmore MBE, Director of Demographic Decisions and Demographics User Group. Keith brought a commercial perspective to population research, giving delegates an opportunity to see how their research can be applied outside of academia.

Finally, we would once again like to take this opportunity to thank the sponsors of the conference, all staff and students at UCL that provided help and all the delegates that attended for making PopFest 2014 such a success. We would also like to wish Plymouth University the very best of luck with organising PopFest 2015. We hope to see everyone next year in Plymouth!