



Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/CES/GE.41/2009/4
17 August 2009

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

Group of Experts on Population and Housing Censuses

Twelfth Meeting
Geneva, 28-30 October 2009
Item 2 of the provisional agenda

COMPLIANCE WITH CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS RECOMMENDATIONS

Changes in the residence of third level students in Portugal: treatment and implications

Note by the Statistics Portugal¹

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Population and housing censuses characterise population and housing in a given country, from a viewpoint that is determined by the “de jure” residence or “de facto” present population. Although the whole population is observed by reference to the census day, there is always a clear distinction – both in the observation model and in the quantity of data collected – that is established by the “de jure” or “de facto” situation in the enumeration of population and its relationship to housing. Hence, a living quarter can only be considered as occupied if there is a person residing therein, regardless of him/her being present or absent on census day. The priority topics included in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) recommendations were oriented towards measuring the characteristics of the usually resident population. Thus, most countries with stable population in terms of migration choose to measure the characteristics of the resident (de jure) population in a more extensive manner, while de facto population resident elsewhere is only counted with a reduced number of variables.

¹ This paper does not reflect necessarily the opinion of Statistics Portugal Board.

2. Determining the residence of a given population also plays an important role when presenting census results. Initially a difference between two major population groups is established: a stable population group, with the “right” to expect infrastructure support such as schools, hospitals, communications, etc. Another population group has “floating” characteristics, for example tourists or persons travelling on business, who do not vote in political elections, but also demand access to existing infrastructure. The population included in this group changes frequently, although its demographic characteristics, at least in terms of age and gender, is not very different (many of them are active business travellers and many are elderly tourists). Determining the resident population is a key element to characterise population and housing.

3. Due to the location and access limitations of the national universities as well as international exchange programmes offered by universities, third level students are, nowadays, a significant population group spending most of the year in living quarters rather than living with their families. UNECE recommendations have always considered them as part of population groups for which there would be a need to better clarify the residence rules that are applied. It was not until the recommendations for 2010 that these rules clearly state how these students should be classified; it is assumed that they should be considered as residents in the living quarters where they spend most part of the year, which was not consensual in the approval of the latest recommendations, due to a number of inconsistencies.

4. This paper analyses these issues within the international context, and also analyzes Portugal’s approach and its method of handling the issues in 2011. The paper also puts forward a number of suggestions for future consideration.

II. INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

5. The 2006 UNECE recommendations for censuses underwent a number of substantial changes. After the changes were introduced the response options were clarified. However, situations with similar characteristics and a different response option were left without clarification. In paragraph 162, various subparagraphs feature situations that can be considered similar to the definition of third level students, for example persons who work away from their place of origin during the week and secondary students in a) and b) of the said paragraph.

6. In the 1998 recommendations provided by the UNECE, the reference was made only to situations in the various subparagraphs of paragraph 36. Yet, it is necessary to clarify the response option in order to ensure consistency for the total population of each country.

7. However, the 2006 recommendations explicitly state that a concept of residence was altered in paragraphs 158 and 159. Subparagraph b) of paragraph 159 states “persons who have arrived in their place of usual residence during the twelve months before Census Day with the intention of staying there for at least one year”. This new wording means that the intention of staying in a given place is predominant regardless of any other conditions (such as the residence in the former location, authorisation from local and national authorities to reside in the reference location, etc.). Paragraph 161 suggests a certain exception for international migrants, indicating that for short-term migrants the country of departure should continue to be the country of usual residence of the international migrant, during his/her stay abroad. The latter criterion explicitly refers to a number of situations applicable to short-term migrants, but it does not include

students. Footnote 11 of this paragraph is not completely clear whether using the expression “either ...or” can be interpreted as alternatives. It would be better if it provided a clear definition and the explanation of who is included in the category of long-term migrants, such as: international migrants who have lived in the country of destination for a continuous period of at least twelve months before Census Day; and those international migrants who have arrived in the country of destination during the twelve months before Census Day with the intention of staying there for at least one year.

8. For third level students (paragraph 162 c)), the only exception is where the place of education is within the country (the place of usual residence may be considered to be the family home). Those studying abroad should always be considered as residents in the place where they are studying. Nonetheless, there is no reference to future intentions, and it is therefore not clear whether the general rule of intention or the factual rule for emigrants is applied (if they have been staying in the country of destination for less than one year they can be considered as residents in their country of origin). Paragraph 162 d) is much clearer as to the “inmate” having spent or being likely to spend twelve months or more in the relevant institution.

9. Neither the 2006 UNECE recommendations nor the Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration provide specific definitions of who is considered to be a student. Hence, students are included in the same category as migrants who are defined as short-term migrants and permanent migrants. However, the above mentioned Regulation does not make any distinction between short-term and long-term migrants, since the basic definition assumed is always a residence for a period of at least twelve months and, when less than 12 months, the intention of staying for at least twelve months. Thus, persons can be considered as migrants if they meet at least one of the two conditions indicated above. Under these terms, reference to short-term migrants in UNECE recommendations should always be understood as referring to non-resident population in the country of destination. Therefore, these persons are always considered as residents in the country of origin.

Table 1

Comparison between immigrants and third level students in the recommendations

Situation	Type	Conditions	Situation in the destination country
Immigrant	Temporary	Stay >3 and <12 months	Not resident
	Permanent	Stay > 12 months or the intention to stay more than 12 months	Resident
3rd level student	Not relevant	Para. 159 b) combined with the criteria of parag. 162 c)	Resident
	Not relevant	Only para. 162 c)	Resident ?

10. Taking into account the resident population in the recommendations, the criterion for breaking down migrants into temporary and permanent categories may become blurred. It eventually mixes different realities (students, workers who have the intention of staying less than

twelve months, tourism related to prolonged visits to relatives), all liable to be classified as temporary migration, and therefore being counted in the non-resident population.

11. In view of the growing “migration movements” of third level students, strongly stimulated by international exchange programmes, population censuses will deal with a population that can hardly accurately fall under this residence model: they do not expect to stay more than twelve months in their current location and many of these students will also not be referenced in the location of school from where they left before going abroad, given that they lived in the respective living quarters on a provisional basis.

12. Let us assume a situation which is quite frequent in Portugal: a student who had been studying and living most part of the year in a city in his/her country, but far from his/her family, and who is now involved in the Erasmus Programme attending for one year abroad; let us also take as reference full compliance with paragraphs 159 and 162:

- (a) Usually, the place/living quarter where he/she was living as a student was rented and shared with another person, quite possibly another student, and no one has any data on this other student;
- (b) As was the case with the prospect of living abroad for one year, there is a doubt on whether he/she should be considered as resident in the place where he/she is studying:
 - (i) In principle, it seems logical to apply the criterion in paragraph 159 b), jointly with the criterion in paragraph 162 c);
 - (ii) However, paragraph 162 c) is not explicit as to the intention of staying, nor does it define how it is subject to paragraph 159;
 - (iii) It should be noted that the school year always lasts less than twelve months and, in general, third level students return to their families during the holidays, as do all other students;
- (c) A significant share of this student’s expenses is being paid by the family or a scholarship, usually granted in his/her own country;
- (d) Almost only the family knows where this student is and the respective population register, if there is one in the country where he/she is studying! In any event, his/her official residence in the country of origin is also maintained, given that administrative records are not crosschecked across countries and a great majority of these students do not change their administrative record in the country of origin;
- (e) Therefore, unless there is a specific reminder for these cases, either this student will not be enumerated or there will be a natural tendency to consider him/her as resident in the respective household.

13. As referred to in footnote 12 of paragraph 162 of the UNECE recommendations, for National Accounts purposes third level students living away from home are included at their home address. This may lead to a certain inconsistency in analyses, considering that the

evaluation of the stock of these specific population groups is made on the basis of census results and regularly monitored through the Labour Force Survey. Hence, the implementation of this new allocation methodology of third level students' residence needs to be crosschecked with the concept of household used in current surveys. This ensures that census evaluation is consistent with the evaluation of current household surveys, in particular the Household Budget Survey and the Labour Force Survey. If this crosschecking is carried out, national accounts will not continue to maintain consistency, since their most important data sources can never reallocate these students to their families of origin. They must therefore form "autonomous" households in their places of education.

14. Finally, paragraph 165 attempts to break down the population into 3 major groups, according to subparagraphs a), b) and c): persons usually resident and present at the time of the census (present residents), persons usually resident but temporarily absent at the time of the census (absent residents) and persons temporarily present at the time of the census that are usually resident elsewhere (present non-residents). The difference between the first and the second is not of significant statistical importance. However, the counting – albeit simplified – of de facto population that is resident elsewhere appears to be important, given the relevance of these temporary population flows in a number of countries and the important role that it plays in the clarification of people's situations with regard to residence/non-residence.

III. THE MODEL OF ENUMERATION OF THIRD LEVEL STUDENTS IN THE 2001 CENSUS

A. Models used prior to 2001

15. The model used in 2001 evolved from the solution adopted in the 1981 and 1991 Censuses. In those censuses, the residence status distinguished resident population from de facto population resident elsewhere; resident population present in or absent from the living quarter on census day was observed; no indication was given as to the respective residence the majority of the year. This type of observation did not make it possible to distinguish persons who were absent for 2 or 3 days from the home address from those who were absent for living in another living quarter the majority of the year, to study or work; in some cases, those persons, despite not being in the household living quarters the majority of the year, could actually be present on census day.

16. In turn, the variables "location of place of work/school", "distance travelled to work or school and time taken" and "mode of transport" were only observed for the resident population that was present in the place of usual residence on census day. In fact, one of the main gaps in the 1981 and 1991 Censuses was precisely the fact that there were no data on the "location of place of work/school" for those persons who, although residing in the living quarters, were not present on census day.

17. The changes introduced in the 2001 Census made it possible to fill these gaps, and find a model that would match the identification of the location of place of work/school for every person with data on their residence in the living quarters the majority of the year.

B. Model of enumeration of third level students in 2001

18. The 2001 Census had resident (de jure) population as the reference population, and also counted de facto population. In the 2001 Census the general rule defining the place of usual residence was: “persons are considered as residents in the place where they spend the majority of the year with their household members and where they have the whole or most of their personal belongings”. However, a series of situations were identified where people, despite the possibility of living away from their place of usual residence the majority of the year, did not cease to be considered as residents in the living quarter for that reason.

19. These situations were the following:

- (a) Students who are away from home, not engaged in paid employment and who live in a school or university residence or as boarders in a household are considered as residents at their family’s address. However, if students are engaged in paid employment they will be considered as residents in the living quarters where they live, not being enumerated at their home address. There was no distinction based on the level of education, i.e. this rule was applied both to primary and secondary students as well as third level students;
- (b) Persons work away from home during the week and who usually return to the family home at weekends should consider the family home as their place of usual residence;
- (c) Persons in compulsory military service, patients in hospitals, prisoners were considered as having their place of usual residence in the family home.

20. The 2001 Census observed a set of variables that made it possible to enumerate students in the living quarters of their household and simultaneously to identify their place of study. The key for the treatment of these situations was the observation of two variables:

- (a) Residence status. This variable makes it possible to distinguish resident persons from persons who are only temporarily present in the living quarters; persons residing in the living quarters can also be broken down into those residing in the living quarters the majority of the year and those who do not reside in the living quarters the majority of the year due to work, study or other purposes. Presence at the time of the census is also used for the resident population.

Figure 1

3 WHERE IS YOUR USUAL RESIDENCE?	
In this living quarter and live here most time of the year	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
In this living quarter but do not live here most time of the year on account of studies, illness, etc.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
Elsewhere, just staying here temporarily.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 → Finish fulfilling
3.1. WHAT IS YOUR SITUATION AT 12 MARCH 00.00:	
Present in dwelling	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
Absent	<input type="checkbox"/> 3

- (b) Location of school. This variable has been collected for all students as of primary education. The location of school makes it possible to identify the place where students commute to, thus shedding further light on commuter flows.

Figure 2

16. ANSWER TO QUESTION 16.1 IF YOU ARE EMPLOYED OR STUDENT (If you work and study give an answer on the place of work.)	
16.1 PLACE OF WORK OR STUDY:	
♦ Parish where you live	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
♦ Other parish in the municipality where you live	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
♦ Other municipality, write in:	
<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
♦ Foreign	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
ANSWER TO QUESTIONS 16.2 AND 16.3 IF YOU LIVE IN THIS LIVING QUARTER MOST TIME OF THE YEAR (CODE 1 IN QUESTION 3) AND YOU ARE EMPLOYED OR STUDENT	
16.2 ON AVERAGE, HOW MUCH TIME DO YOU SPEND ON A TRIP TO YOUR PLACE OF WORK OR STUDY?	
♦ None	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
♦ 16 - 30 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
♦ 61 - 90 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
♦ Up to 15 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
♦ 31 - 60 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
♦ More than 90	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
16.3 WHAT IS THE MAIN MODE OF TRANSPORT USED TO GO TO YOUR PLACE OF WORK OR STUDY?	
♦ None, walk	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
♦ Bus	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
♦ Underground or light train	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
♦ Train	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
♦ Company or School collective transport	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
♦ A car or a van:	
as a conductor	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
as a passenger	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
♦ A motorcycle or a bicycle	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
♦ Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 9

21. As far as commuter flows are concerned, observations also include, in addition to the “location of place of work and school”, “distance travelled to work or school and time taken”, and “mode of transport to work or school”. However, while data on the “location of place of work” and the “location of school” are observed for all employed persons and students respectively, the variables “distance travelled to work or school and time taken” and “mode of transport to work or school” are only collected for residents in the living quarters for the most part of the year. This is due to the fact that these persons actually commute to their place of work or school on a daily basis. Hence, for students who are away from home the majority of the year no data are collected for the variables “distance travelled to work or school and time taken” and “mode of transport to school”.

22. This enumeration model makes it possible to enumerate students who are away from home, but included within their households, to count them and at the same time to identify their place of study.

23. Hence, an analysis by location of school makes it possible to identify the number and characteristics of those studying in a specific location. With this methodology students may be

matched with their characteristics and the location of school, at the minimum geographical level of municipality (LAU 1), with no need to change their place of usual residence.

C. Some data on third level students who were away from home in 2001

24. According to the 2001 Census the number of third level students was 240,459, of which 87,946 were away from their households (36.6 per cent). Out of those who were away from home, the majority, i.e. 85,641 (97.4 per cent) were pursuing their education in the country while 2,305 were abroad.

25. Most students were integrated into private households containing four or three persons, i.e. 44.6 per cent and 24.9 per cent respectively. The number of students forming one-person households was low, accounting for only 2.4 per cent.

Table 2

Third level students away from home by size of private household and type of household

Type of household	Total	1 person	2 persons	3 persons	4 persons	5 persons	6 or more persons
Private households	87,732	2,068	3,792	21,819	39,095	14,384	6,574
Institutional household	214						

26. Taking as reference the typology of family nucleus, 84 per cent of students are integrated in nuclei of a couple with children. The most common are couples with two children, followed by couples with just one child. One-parent nuclei accounted for roughly 9 per cent, the vast majority of which were composed of lone mothers with at least one child.

Table 3

Third level students away from home by type of family nucleus

Type of family nucleus	No	%
Married Couple or cohabitating couple without children	338	0.4
Married Couple or cohabitating couple with a child	73,846	84.0
With 1 child	20,159	22.9
With 2 children	40,006	45.5
With 3 children	10,635	12.1
With 4 or more children	3,046	3.5
Lone father	1,164	1.3
Lone mother	7,656	8.7
Grandparents with grandchildren	281	0.3
Lone grandfather	24	0
Lone grandmother	275	0.3
Not member of a family nucleus	4,362	5.0
Total	87,946	100.0

27. The “family status” variable shows that the vast majority of students are children within a nuclear family, and a very low number are husbands or wives, partners in consensual unions or lone fathers or lone mothers. At this stage of life most of these individuals have not yet started an autonomous family and depend on their parents’ family structure.

Table 4

Third level students away from home by family status

Family Status	No	%
Husband/Wife in a married couple	344	0.4
Partner in a consensual union	171	0.2
Lone father / Lone mother	146	0.2
Child	82,343	93.6
Grandson	580	0.7
Not member of a family nucleus	4,362	5.0
Total	87,946	100.0

28. The analysis of the main source of livelihood of third level students who were away from home shows that they are strongly dependent on their households, which are the financial support of almost all these students. According to the 2001 Census results, 97.1 per cent of students were classified as “dependent” as far as their main source of livelihood was concerned, while the remaining 2.9 per cent were divided into the following categories: benefits and allowances, income from property or other sources.

29. The analysis of the location of school of third level students who were away from home shows that they are concentrated – as would be expected – in major Portuguese cities, where there are a greater number of universities. In 2001 the 3 largest Portuguese cities included around 45 per cent of total students who were away from their families.

Table 5

Third level students away from home by location of school (ten big municipalities and abroad)

Municipality	No
Lisboa	16,049
Coimbra	12,925
Porto	10,604
Aveiro	3,742
Braga	3,664
Vila Real	3,322
Évora	2,827
Viseu	2,769
Faro	2,729
Bragança	2,496
Abroad	2,305

30. This information enables the calculation of the number of students who, although not having been considered as residents in these municipalities, were studying therein and therefore are likely boarders in a household or university residence during part of the (school) year in these cities. Thus the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of this population group can be attributed to places of education. Hence, this floating population can be allocated to these municipalities in the cases where it makes more sense, for instance in the planning for specific infrastructure development.

IV. THE MODEL FOR 2011

31. For the 2011 Census, the model of enumeration to assess the case of students who were away from their family homes will be similar to the one followed in 2001. Hence, the residence status will be similarly observed, i.e. by distinguishing resident population from de facto population, and for the resident population by distinguishing those who reside most of the year in the living quarters from those who do not. In addition, and given that the 2011 Census also counts de facto population, presence in the living quarters on census day will be observed.

32. However, based on the UNECE recommendations a few changes have been made to the definition of residence rules. As we have seen, the recommendations suggest that students who were away from their families should be classified as residents of the living quarters in the place of education. There is nonetheless an exception for those cases where the location of school is in the country where the family home can be considered as the place of usual residence. Portugal will apply this exception, and all third level students studying in the country will be classified as students living in their family home. We consider this option to be more in line with the treatment of similar situations and a continuation of procedures followed in the past.

33. The main difference from the 2001 Census concerns third level students attending an educational establishment abroad as long as their absence is for a period of at least one year. These students cease to be considered as residents in the family home and are integrated as the resident population of the country where they are studying. However, those students that attend an educational establishment abroad, but intend to be absent for less than one year shall be considered as residents in their family homes, in line with the general twelve-month-rule and immigrant typology.

34. The “location of school” variable will be measured as it was in 2001, which means that it is collected for all students considered as residents in the living quarters. There is, however, a minor change in scope: in 2001 respondents were students from the first stage of basic education, whereas in 2011 children attending pre-primary education will also be included.

35. The implementation of this model will enable the counting and situation of students who are away from their families to be ascertained. The location of their schools will be able to be identified, with no need to fragment households and family nuclei of origin. This will provide consistent treatment with persons who are absent from their family home to work.

V. IN THE NEAR FUTURE

36. In the 2011 Census, Portugal decided to use the exception measure as outlined in paragraph 162 c) of the UNECE recommendations for third level students whose place of education is within the country, living in public or private facilities other than their family home. This was a more logical measure, consistent with the household concept and in accordance with the existing census series. We assume that students who are abroad with the intention of staying there for over twelve months should be considered as residents in their place of education and not in their family home. Both measures stem directly from the EU implementation regulations. Nonetheless, this phenomenon should be further analysed, from the viewpoint of alternative models, which render consistent results at multiple levels.

37. Third level students who are away from their households are a growing and floating population, both when away from home on international exchanges and in the residence where they temporarily live at a national university. When living at university residences they will almost certainly not stay there for a period of over one school year; the same happens with boarders in households (e.g. rented rooms). Third level students also move quite frequently from one school year to the next. This often implies a change in the basic administrative unit. Hence, the intention of staying in particular living quarters for a period of over twelve months may be interpolated from the perspective of the exact address where they live and not necessarily the geographical reference area. From the latter perspective, the most consistent solution to enumerate this population would be to consider them as residents in the place where they are present at the time of the census. This is similar to nomads. However, in most of these situations, the link to the family will be their most stable bond in terms of residence. Also, the family is where a permanently updated knowledge of their situation lies.

38. These problems create most difficulties in cities with universities which have relatively large student populations and the consequent increased demand for services (transport, health, housing, etc.) of a population not residing in that location in census terms. Whilst the questionnaires are filled in and this situation is not taken into account it might lead to the problems of undercounting or over counting the resident population in households of their countries of origin.

39. The following table summarises the advantages and disadvantages of these students' residence in their respective households:

Table 6

Advantages and disadvantages on the enumeration of third level students, away from home, in the households in their countries of origin

	Advantages	Disadvantages in relation to residence in the location of school
Residence in the household of origin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintains the household and family structure; - Integrates the household members' revenue-to-expenditure ratio; - Avoids building one-person households with atypical, dependent income or from another 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction of resident population in university areas; - Increase in the number of residents who are not living with their families most of the year;

	source; - Keeps consistency with national accounts; - Similar treatment to other similar situations; - Allows for extended statistical knowledge (household's place of residence and location of school) of a very specific population group; - Current perception by families that students are a part of them; - Avoids the accumulation of resident population in major university cities, with no links to the supporting family.	- Exception to the rule of residence as a determinant of the place where a person usually spends his/her daily night-rest; - Risk of these persons being forgotten due to proxy interviews
--	--	---

40. There seems to be a clear imbalance between the advantages and disadvantages, in the sense that negative impacts arising from these students not being accounted as residents of their households in the country of origin lead to changes in household structure. Also, they do not bring an adequate solution to undercounting problems for third level students.

41. The importance of allocating students to the respective locations of schools is accepted. This problem was experienced in Portugal with the 1981 and 1991 censuses, and a solution was sought that made it possible to combine the different political and economic interests at stake by structuring the characterisation of residence and location of school, as previously explained. Hence, a simpler solution and more in line with the census model would be to collect the variable "location of school" as a core item for all residents, albeit dissociated from commuting patterns.

42. The distinction between de facto and de jure population is a characterisation in descending order, given the marked tendency to consider resident (de jure) population together with international reference population for the census characterisation of the respective countries. Distinguishing present and absent resident population does not strike us as the most important census scenario vis-à-vis other needs and new models for living, in which members of the households only meet on weekends. Therefore, another important element to be taken into account will be an assessment of the time spent by these persons in the family home for the most part of the year. Situations, with residents being temporarily absent from the living quarters correspond to situations with a very low statistical value per se, since they are treated in an equivalent manner to present residents in the presentation of results.

43. Hence, the best situation that characterises the population is one that can be defined as a prolonged absence measured in number of days in a year, while there is an actual integration and frequent presence in the respective household, namely on most weekends. This situation is essential in characterising third level students who are away from home, and will in addition help to clarify and solve similar cases which do not fall under the general rule of the usual place of daily night-rest. Most of these situations correspond to the various subparagraphs of paragraph 162. These situations would be more precisely characterised if the definition of "absent resident" was changed to a modality that better defines usual presence in living quarters of a respective family (lives therein but does not spend most of his/her daily night-rest the majority of the year ... to study, work, etc.).

44. Therefore, the fact that third level students are systematically not considered as resident with their reference households is not deemed to be the best possible solution and should be re-assessed in the future. This re-assessment should be a result of a critical and exhaustive analysis of census practices in 2011 with the following aspects considered:

- (a) Which countries have applied the rule for third level students consistently in statistical terms as a whole (national component + international component)? Was the instruction explicit (clear reference to third level students and associated with the criterion of intention of staying for over twelve months, or only with reference to a third level student)?
- (b) Which countries have applied the rule for third level students only referring to third level students abroad? With an explicit reference to the intention of staying for twelve months or more? Or just with a reference to studying abroad?
- (c) How are third level students treated in each country's national accounts and which data sources are used for that purpose?

45. In summary, Portugal proposes:

- (a) To keep third level students as residents in the respective households of origin;
- (b) To change paragraph 165 b) to "resident persons who do not spend most of their daily night-rest therein the majority of the year, to study, work, or for health reasons, returning home on most weekends";
- (c) To consider the location of school as a core variable for students classified as economically inactive.
