

DEALING WITH STUDENTS FOR 2002- BASED HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS

Introduction

1. When SE produce the 2002-based household projections, in 2004, we will be making use of the 2001 Census data. However, headship rates which will be produced from the 2001 Census data will not be consistent with the headship rates which we have for the earlier Census years. This paper discusses this issue, and suggests possible ways forward for the next round of projections. **Members are invited to comment.**

Background

2. In previous Census' students were counted at their home address. The headship rates derived for the 1971, 1981 and 1991 Census years are therefore based on students living at their home address – most likely resulting in fewer households headed by young people, than if students had been counted at their term time address. The population projections therefore could be said to be projections of the numbers of households which exist out of term time.

3. However, given the fact that the population projections include students at their term time address, which may be in a different council area, its impossible to say what exactly the final household projections represent (see the illustrative example in the Annex). It would make sense if possible, therefore, if the headship rates and the population projections both dealt with students on the same basis.

4. The 2001 Census counted students at their term time address, as well as at their home address. Because of the way the information was collected, it will be possible to count students either (a) at both their home address and their term time address, or (b) at their term-time address only.

5. Although student were counted at their home address in the 1991 Census, there was a question on the 1991 Census form which asked if the student lived elsewhere during term time, and if so to give their address. In theory is would be possible therefore to reproduce headship rates for 1991 with students at their term time address, although the process of doing so would not be all that straightforward and GROS would probably require considerable notification if this was required.

Possible Ways Forward

6. Two possible options:

6.1 Use 1991 and 2001 Census years only for the 2002-based projections, and rework the 1991 headship rates so that students are counted at their term address. This would have the advantage that the headship rates and population projections would then deal with students consistently; but would have the disadvantage that future projections would not be consistent with previous ones.

6.2 Assess the affect of moving students to their term time address on the 1991 headship rates for the youngest age group, say, and if it is not significant then leave the earlier Census years headship rates as they were. This would have the advantage

of having 1981 Census available for projecting headship rate trends for the 2002-based projections.

**SE Housing Statistics
May 2002**

Annex

The following example shows that the way in which students are counted in the household projections is not straightforward, or easily interpreted. Population projections count students at their term time address; whereas headship rates derived from previous Census (and therefore those that are projected) count students at their home address.

The following example assumes that when term finishes 5,000 students move from a particular urban council to a particular rural council. At term time these 5,000 students were living together in 1,000 households, but out of term time they all go back to their family home. The resulting figures for households headed by a 16-24 year old – as would be derived through the current household projections methodology – resemble neither the term-time nor the out of term figures.

Council	In term time		
	Number of 16-24 year olds: population figures	Number of households headed by a 16-24 year old	% of 16-24 year olds that head households
Rural Council	5,000	250	5%
Urban Council	10,000	1,500	15%

Council	Out of term time		
	Number of 16-24 year olds	Number of households headed by a 16-24 year old	% of 16-24 year olds that head households: Census Derived Headship Rates
Rural Council	10,000	250	2.5%
Urban Council	5,000	250	5.0%

Council	Number of households headed by a 16-24 year old: resulting household projection figures
Rural Council	125
Urban Council	500