**SOC2010 Revision: Review of Major Group 2 ‘Professional Occupations’**

SOC Revision Working Group Proposals

This document outlines the decisions made from the Major Group 2 SOC Revision Working Group. These decisions are all preliminary. Please refer to the spreadsheet for the proposed new structure on the webpage.

If you have any comments/feedback related to the proposals please contact [socrevision@ons.gov.uk](mailto:socrevision@ons.gov.uk)

The issues reported in this document are in the majority relating to major group 2. This is not the complete list; there are remaining issues that require further analysis. Proposals on these will be communicated at a later date.

**Issue 1: Should ‘Web Design and Development Professionals’ (2137) be disaggregated to separate designers and developers?**

Research into these occupations found that there is no separation between web designers and web developers. These roles include the same tasks, and the terms are often used interchangeably.

**Proposal:** No further action required.

**Issue 2: Should ‘Graphic Designers’ (3421) be moved from Major Group 3 to Major Group 2?**

Research using survey data and job advertisements suggest that a degree is not necessarily needed to be employed as a graphic designer; much of the learning is on the job except for formal training in industry specific software. Therefore, historically graphic designers have been coded as unit group 3421 within Major Group 3. However, the majority of graphic designers do have higher qualifications, and survey data has shown that many in this occupational group stated that qualifications were a formal requirement in obtaining a job; or that while a degree wasn’t a formal requirement it gave them an advantage. Research also found that progress without formal training can be difficult.

Further research found that the skill specialism for ‘Web Design and Web Development Professionals’ (2137) are sufficiently similar to ‘Graphic Designers’ (3421) that we propose a new minor group is created in Major Group 2.

**Proposal:** To create a new minor group in Major Group 2 for ‘Web and Multimedia Designers and Development Professionals’ to include the unit groups for ‘‘Web Design and Web Development Professionals’ (2137) and ‘Graphic Designers’ (3421).

To rename Graphic designers (3421): ‘Graphic and multimedia designers’.

**Issue 3: Should a new unit group ‘Database Administrators’ be formed?**

Research conducted found that there are sufficient numbers for a new unit group to be created for database and web content occupations. The group would consist of ‘content’ occupations from Web Design and Development Professionals’ (2137) and ‘database and content’ occupations from IT Operations Technicians’ (3131).

**Proposal:** anew unit group to be created in Major Group 3 for ‘Database Administrators and Web Content Technicians.

**Issue 4: Should a new unit group for ‘Systems Management and Support Managers/Professionals’ be created?**

Research was undertaken to explore whether a new unit group should be created in the areas of: user support, service support, operations support, systems engineer, service manager and operations manager, that would fall under the heading of ‘Systems Management and Support Managers/Professionals’, to sit within the minor group 213 ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Professionals’

There was little evidence in the survey data that the above occupational terms are being used in the job title for IT occupations, and that the terms cover a multitude of industries, not just IT and therefore a new group would not be viable.

**Proposal:** No further action required.

**Issue 5: Should a new unit group be created for ‘Product Management Managers/Professionals’?**

Research was undertaken to explore whether a new unit group for ‘Product Management Managers/Professionals’ should be created, to sit within the minor group 213 ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Professionals’. The research focused on finding out whether there is a distinct group of occupations that could be coded here, and whether these can be described as IT product managers.

Research found evidence of the occupational term ‘product manager’ being used; however the majority are involved in marketing, rather than IT. The numbers for those working as IT product managers were small and therefore a new group is not viable.

**Proposal:** No further action required.

**Issue 6: Should a new unit group be created for ‘Applications Design and Development Professionals’?**

Research indicates application design and development is a growing occupational area. Job descriptions for roles involving applications tend to mention software design and development, indicating that these roles fit with existing unit group codes in minor group ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Professionals’ (213) as follows:

* Applications designers are coded to ‘IT Business Analysts, Architects and Systems Designers’ (2135)
* Applications developers and programmers are coded to ‘Programmers and Software Development Professionals’ (2136)
* Applications consultant are coded to ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Professionals n.e.c.’ (2139)

Occupations involving application design and development are growing, and this should be reflected in the unit group descriptions.

**Proposal:** The descriptions in SOC Volume 1 for unit groups 2135, 2136 and 2139 to be amended to include information on ‘applications’.

To rename Programmers and Software Development Professionals’ (2136): Programmers and Software Design and Development Professionals’

**Issue 7: Should ‘Programme Managers’ be moved out of ‘IT Project and Programme Managers’ (2134) and ‘Programme Managers and Directors’ from ‘Business and Financial Project Management Professionals’ (2424)**

Research highlighted that’ Programme Managers’ that code to 2134 and ‘Programme Managers and Directors’ in 2424 oversee a number of projects; therefore a distinction should be made between a ‘project’ manager, who is managing a project, and a ‘programme manager/director’ who has greater responsibilities.

**Proposal**: ‘IT Programme Managers’ to be moved to ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Directors’ (1136) and ‘Programme Managers and Directors’ (non IT) should move to ‘Functional Managers and Directors n.e.c.’ (1139).

To rename IT project and programme managers (2134): IT project managers

**Issue 8: Can the unit group ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Professionals n.e.c.’ (2139) be disaggregated?**

The unit group ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Professionals n.e.c.’ (2139) is a catch-all group for the IT occupations. Analysis of the occupations within this unit group was undertaken, identifying three groups that could potentially be disaggregated from the n.e.c. unit group. These are:

* Cyber Security Professionals
* Quality and Testing Professionals
* Network Analysts, Consultants and Engineers

The unit groups ‘Quality Testing Professionals’ and ‘Network Analysts, Consultants and Engineers both contain sufficient numbers to be viable. ‘Cyber Security Professionals’ is just below the threshold, however evidence shows that it is a growing occupation and so it was agreed this will be added to the list of proposed new unit groups.

**Proposal:** Three new unit groups as listed above to be added to minor group 213 ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Professionals’. Note, ‘Network Managers’ will remain in ‘IT Specialist Managers’ (2133).

**Issue 9: Is the name of minor group ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Professionals’ (213) still suitable?**

The term ‘telecommunications’ is now rarely used in job titles for occupations in Major group 2. It has been suggested that this term should be removed from the minor group 213 and the associated ‘n.e.c.’ unit group names, to become ‘Information Technology Professionals’.

**Proposal:** To remove the term ‘telecommunications’ from the title of the minor group 213 and the ‘n.e.c.’ unit group 2139.

**Issue 10: Are there occupations that should be disaggregated from the unit group ‘Mechanical Engineers’ (2122)**

The issue has been raised that the unit group ‘Mechanical Engineers’ (2122) includes a number of types of engineer that could be disaggregated, such as aeronautical engineers, automotive engineers and rail engineers. Analysis of survey data shows that aerospace/aviation engineers are identifiable as a separate group, but automotive/rail engineers, and marine engineers/naval architects do not have sufficient numbers to make these groups viable.

**Proposal:** To add a new unit group for ‘Aerospace Engineers’

**Issue 11: Can the unit group ‘Engineering Professionals n.e.c.’ (2129) be disaggregated?**

Analysis of the unit group ‘Engineering Professionals n.e.c.’ (2129) found two possible groups could be disaggregated: ‘Project Engineers and ‘Project Managers’. Both have sufficient numbers to be viable groups.

Both these groups cover a wide range of varying tasks, and there may be some overlap, therefore these two potential groups are to be grouped together to create a new unit group ‘Project Engineers and Managers’.

**Proposal:** To create a new unit group ‘Project Engineers and Managers’

**Issue 12: Can the current unit group ‘Journalists, Newspaper and Periodical Editors’ (2471) be divided on the basis of seniority?**

The issue has been raised that unit group ‘Journalists, Newspaper and Periodical Editors’ (2471) should be divided into two groups based on seniority:

* Newspaper, Periodical and Broadcasting editors
* Journalists and Reporters (Newspapers, Periodicals and Broadcasting)

Analysis shows that these groups both have sufficient numbers to form viable unit groups, and the occupations can be easily identified as having different levels of seniority. It is therefore suggested that the unit group 2471 be divided into two separate groups. Note that broadcasting occupations code to ‘Actors, Entertainers and Presenters’ (3413) and ‘Arts Officers, Producers and Editors’ (3416) therefore the suggested group titles above have been amended to reflect this.

**Proposal:** Two new groups to be created for ‘Newspaper and Periodical Editors’ and ‘Newspaper and Periodical Journalists and Reporters’.

**Issue 13: Can teaching jobs be identified separately by subject taught**?

Research has found that coding secondary, further and higher education teachers by subject is not possible, as the survey data showed that the majority of teachers do not include subject taught in their job title and are therefore difficult to identify.

**Proposal:** No further action required.

**Issue 14: Can Social Scientists be separately identified from within unit groups ‘Social and Humanities Scientists’ (2114) and ‘Natural and Social Science Professionals n.e.c.’ (2119)?**

Analysis of social scientists within the unit groups 2114 and 2119 was conducted. Survey data showed that the numbers for social science occupations were small and therefore not viable.

**Proposal:** No further action required.

**Issue 15: Can the unit group ‘Health Professionals n.e.c.’ (2219) be disaggregated?**

Analysis of the unit group ‘Health Professionals n.e.c.’ (2219) found the largest occupational groups coded here to be dietician, audiologist and mental health professional. However none of these groups had sufficient numbers to be viable.

**Proposal:** No further action required

**Issue 16: Can the unit group ‘Therapy Professionals n.e.c.’ (2229) be disaggregated?**

Analysis of the unit group ‘Therapy Professionals n.e.c.’ (2229) found some possible separate groups including psychotherapist, chiropractor, osteopath, acupuncturist and nutritionist. However none of these groups had sufficient numbers to be viable.

‘Psychotherapists’ could be split out to form a separate unit group with ‘Cognitive Behaviour Therapists’ as research found that the skills and knowledge for these occupations are similar.

**Proposal:**  Create a new unit group for ‘Psychotherapists and Cognitive Behaviour Therapists’.

**Issue 17: Can the unit group ‘Legal Professionals n.e.c.’ (2419) be disaggregated?**

Analysis of the unit group ‘Legal Professionals n.e.c.’ (2419) identified enough numbers in the survey data to form a new group for ‘Lawyers’.

**Proposal:** Create a new unit group for ‘Lawyers’

**Issue 18: Is ‘Draughtspersons’ (3122) still a valid unit group?**

Analysis of the job titles coded to the unit group ‘Draughtspersons’ (3122) found that while many used the term ‘Draughtsman’, the term ‘CAD’ (e.g. ‘CAD Technician’, ‘CAD Designer’) was also used regularly, and is a more up to date description of this occupation.

**Proposal:** To rename ‘Draughtspersons’ (3122) to ‘CAD and Drawing Technicians’.

**Issue 19: Should ‘Chemical Engineer’ be reinstated as a unit group?**

‘Chemical Engineers’ were last included as a separate unit group in SOC2000, and subsumed into ‘Production and Process Engineers’ (2127) in SOC2010. Research using survey data found that these do not have sufficient numbers to form a separate unit group.

**Proposal:** No further action required.

**Issue 20: Can we identify any new unit groups for occupations involving food production and nutritional sciences?**

Research was conducted involving a search of job titles and descriptions to identify occupations in food production and nutritional sciences, and whether there are any areas that have sufficient numbers to justify a separate unit group. This research found no areas that could form a separate unit group; however new job titles to include in the SOC index have been identified.

**Proposal:** No further action required**.**

**Issue 21: Do we need to take into account the new initiative for nursing degree apprenticeships?**

The nursing degree apprenticeship will enable people to train to become a graduate registered nurse through an apprentice route. Does this need to be taken into account for the SOC revision?

This should not affect the SOC coding frame as all persons in training for an occupation or profession would be coded to the relevant occupation for which they are training towards. However there is further investigation being conducted into the coding of apprenticeships, which may in turn affect apprentice nurses.

**Proposal:** No further action required.

**Issue 22: Review of graduate and non-graduate jobs; are there any occupations currently coded outside of Major Group 2 that are graduate jobs?**

Many occupations are increasingly requiring a degree where this was not required in the past, meaning that some roles previously considered ‘non-graduate’ might now be considered to be ‘graduate’ jobs. As a result there are a number of occupations that have existing unit group codes outside of Major Group 2 that would now be considered to require graduate level skills.

A review of two separate pieces of research will be carried out to determine whether an occupation should be placed in Major Group 2 or Major Group 3. The underlying premise is to identify occupations which require the skills and expertise that are generally developed as part of studying for a degree rather than use the proportion of people employed in that role that have a degree.

The original strands of research that had already been conducted are:

* Green and Henseke research using quantitative regression analysis methods to identify whether an occupation is graduate or non-graduate
* Elias and Purcell research using qualitative methods of reviewing job descriptions to identify whether an occupation requires a degree or not

For some occupations the two strands of research had come to different outcomes. Where this was the case ONS conducted further research that entailed reviewing job advertisements and survey data to identify whether a degree was required by employers, whether a degree was helpful in obtaining a job or whether a degree was not required. This was undertaken for all occupation unit group codes where Green and Henseke, and Elias and Purcell graduate classification disagreed.

Elias and Purcell/Green and Henseke have now reached an agreed version of their graduate classifications and have submitted this to the ONS in evidence. For completeness ONS will also carry out further research into the unit groups where the two strands of research agreed.

**Proposal:** The outcomes from this research will be reported at a later date.

If you have any comments or evidence which supports or refutes any of these proposals, please send them to [socrevision@ons.gov.uk](mailto:socrevision@ons.gov.uk) by **9 October 2017**. These will be considered before any final decisions are made.
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